THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

CONTEXT AND CAUSES OF THE REVOLUTION

The process of centralization from the 16th century strengthened absolutism in France and by the early 18th century the French monarchy under Louis XIV became the model of centralized absolutism based on feudal social structures. Since the 17th century, tensions were mounting between centralizing and decentralizing pressures. The French Revolution brought about a complete destruction of the feudal order and its state apparatus. The National Assembly and later Napoleon worked very hard and systematically to recast the old kingdom into a modern nation-state. Attempts were made to transform institutions- Legislation, administration, justice, bureaucracy, education, finances and even religion. The new structure had a popular base and thus had a lasting influence not only on France but countries elsewhere.

In 1774, 20 years old Louis XVI ascended the throne of France. Long years of war had drained the financial resources of France. Under Louis XVI, France helped the 13 American colonies to gain their independence from the common enemy, Britain. The debt had risen to more than 2 billion livres, therefore increasing the percentage of its budget on interest payments alone. To meet its regular expenses, such as the cost of maintaining an army, the court, running government offices or universities, the state was forced to increase taxes. Moreover, the French society in the 18th century was divided into Three Estates, and only members of the third estate (all others except first estate- clergy and second estate- nobility) paid taxes. The society of estates was part of feudal system that dated back to the middle ages.

Peasants made up about 80% of the population and they were highly suppressed. However, only a small number of them owned the land they cultivated. About 60% of the land was owned by nobles, the Church and other richer members of the third estate. Peasants were obliged to render services to the lord to work in his house and fields, to serve in the army or to participate in building roads. The Church too extracted its share of taxes called tithes from the peasants.

Moreover, the population of France rose from about 23 million in 1715 to 28 million in 1789. This led to a rapid increase in the demand for foodgrains. Production of grains could not keep pace with the demand. So the price of bread which was the staple diet of the majority rose rapidly. But wages did not keep pace with the rise in prices. So the gap between the poor and the rich widened. Things became worse whenever drought or hail reduced the harvest.

The 18th century witnessed the emergence of social groups, termed the middle class, who earned their wealth through an expanding overseas trade and from the manufacture of goods such as woolen and silk textiles that were either exported or bought by the richer members of society. In addition to merchants and manufacturers, the third estate included professions such as lawyers or administrative officials. All of these were educated and believed that no group in
society should be privileged by birth. Rather, a person’s **social position must depend on his merit.**

These ideas envisaging a society based on freedom and equal laws and opportunities for all were put forward by **philosophers** such as **John Locke** and Jean Jacques **Rousseau**. Locke sought to refute the doctrine of the divine and absolute right of the monarch. Rousseau carried the idea forward, proposing a form of government based on a **social contract** between people and their representatives. **Montesquieu** proposed a **division of power** within the government between the legislative, the executive and the judiciary. The **American constitution** and its guarantee of individual rights was an important example for political thinkers in France.

**The Causes can be mentioned as:**

1. **Grievance of the Third Estate**
   a. **Peasantry**: Poverty of the Peasantry due to backward methods of farming. Over-population and overcrowding of agriculture; and shortage of land and uneconomical land holdings. Steep increase in the prices of industrial goods but not of agricultural goods and; heavy and innumerable **taxes and other dues** of the Church, nobles and state.
   b. **Bourgeoisie**: sprawling **middle class** resented the privileges of the first two estates more than any other section and were the most ardent opponents of the old order. Being educated with more resources and better organized, they rallied all the opponents of the old regime and led the movement.
   c. **Urban workers**: they joined the revolutionary forces mainly because of their unenviable working and living conditions.

2. **Degeneration of the Absolute Monarchy**: absolute monarchy reached its peak under Louis XIV, and began to degenerate during his lifetime. Refusal of Louis XV to remedy the abuses of the old order, inefficiency of Louis XVI, all added to the initiation of the process of revolution. His beautiful but ‘empty-headed’ wife, **Marie Antoinette**, squandered money on festivities and interfered in state appointments.

3. **Degeneration of the First and Second Estates**: among **First Estate**: Crumbling of the social and economic foundation of the clergy, particularly the higher clergy and their complete moral degeneration. Among **Second Estate**: The higher nobility completely neglected their duties, and degenerated into a band of greedy and vicious courtiers. People in these two classes were **exempted from almost all taxes**. They controlled most of the administrative posts and all the high-ranking posts in the army.

4. **Influence of the Philosophers**: **Voltaire** believed all religions absurd and contrary to reason. He believed that man’s destiny lay in this world rather than in heaven. Writings attacking religion fed the fires of revolution because the Church gave support to autocratic monarchy and the old order.
   :: **Rousseau** asserted the doctrine of popular **sovereignty and democracy**. He recognized **property** in modern societies as a ‘necessary evil’. What was needed was a new ‘**social contract**’ to guarantee the freedom, equality and happiness which man had enjoyed in the state of nature. No political system can maintain itself without the **consent of governed**. **Montesquieu**: establishment of a democratic government- based on the principle of separation of powers.
The cumulative effect of their influence manifested itself in the 3 watchwords "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity", which became the guiding principles or of the French Revolution. Thus the French Revolution, though an outcome of the realities (the socio-economic and political conditions), was realised or made possible by the intellectual movement. Without the ideas spread by French philosophers, the French Revolution would simply have been an outbreak of violence.

5. Age of Reason: Because of the ideas expressed by the French intellectuals, the 18th century has been called the Age of Reason. Christianity had taught that man was born to suffer. The French intellectuals asserted that man was born to be happy. They believed that man can attain happiness if reason is allowed to destroy prejudice and reform man’s institutions. They either denied the existence of God or ignored Him. In place of God they asserted the doctrine of ‘Nature’ and the need to understand its laws. They urged faith in reason.

The French economists of the time believed in “Laissez faire”. According to this theory, a person must be left free to manage and dispose of his property in the way he thinks best. They said that taxes should be imposed only with the consent of those on whom they were levied. These ideas were a direct denial of the privileges and feudal rights that protected the upper classes.

6. Immediate Cause: A financial crisis manifested itself in a growing deficit, further swollen by French aid to the Americans in their war of Independence; attempt of Louis XVI to improve the situation by levying a uniform tax from all the Three Estates; his summoning of the Estates General and its replacement by the National Assembly whose reforms destroyed the old regime.

THE OUTBREAK OF THE REVOLUTION

In May 1789, Louis XVI called together an assembly of the Estates General to pass proposals for new taxes. The first and second estates sent 300 representatives each, while there were 600 members of the third estate. Peasants, artisans and women were denied entry to the assembly. Voting in the Estates General in the past had been conducted according to the principle that each estate had one vote. This time too Louis XVI was determined to continue the same practice. But members of the third estate demanded that voting now be conducted by the assembly as a whole, where each member would have one vote. This was one of the democratic principles put forward by philosophers like Rousseau. When the king rejected this proposal, members of third estate walked out of the assembly in protest.

The representatives of the third estate viewed themselves as spokesmen for the whole French nation. In June they assembled at Tennis Court and declared themselves a National Assembly and decided not to disperse till the drafting of the constitution. While the National Assembly was busy at Versailles drafting a constitution, the rest of France seethed with turmoil. A severe winter led to a bad harvest and the price of bread rose. Crowds of angry women stormed into the shops. In July, the agitated crowd stormed and destroyed the Bastille (a fortress prison-symbol of despotic powers of the king). In the countryside, rumours spread from village to village. They looted hoarded grain and burnt down documents containing records of manorial dues. A large number of nobles fled from their homes, many of them migrating to neighbouring countries.
Faced with the power of his revolting subjects, Louis XVI finally accorded recognition to the National Assembly and accepted the principle that his powers would from now on be checked by a constitution. On the night of 4 August 1789, the Assembly passed a decree abolishing the feudal system of obligations and taxes. Members of the clergy too were forced to give up their privileges. Tithes were abolished and lands owned by the Church were confiscated.

**FRANCE BECOMES A CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCH**

Two debates of the Constituent Assembly were crucial from the point of view of the principles of legitimacy. Those were, (a) the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and (b) the subject of sovereignty. By destroying the feudal regime, the Constituent Assembly had redefined the French people as individuals who were free and equal. Liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression were made some of the basic rights. In short, the subjects of the French ruler were made citizens of the nation. The Declaration of the Rights of Man brought about a radical conception of society, and organized the new public authorities to protect these rights by way of a written constitution based on revolutionary doctrines.

The second debate concerned the question of the nature and attribution of sovereignty. The issue of 'sovereign' proved to be extraordinarily difficult. It was nearly impossible to reconcile the sovereignty of the nation with the direct exercise of its rights by all the members of the nation. In the following years, a fundamental conflict developed between the popular and parliamentary concept of democracy, each of them claiming indivisible sovereignty.

The National Assembly completed the draft of the constitution in 1791. Its main object was to limit the powers of the monarch. These powers instead of being concentrated in the hands of one person, were now separated and assigned to different institutions the legislature, executive and judiciary. This made France a constitutional monarchy. The Constitution of 1791 vested the power to make laws in the National Assembly, which was indirectly elected. That is, citizens voted for a group of electors, who in turn chose the Assembly. Not all citizens, however, had the right to vote.

Only men above 25 years of age who paid taxes were given the status of active citizens, that is, they were entitled to vote. The remaining men and all women were classed as passive citizens. The Constitution began with a Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. Rights such as the right to life, freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, equality before law, were established as natural and inalienable rights, that is, they belonged to each human being by birth & could not be taken away. It was duty of state to protect each citizen's natural rights.

**The Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen**

1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights.
2. The aim of every political association is the preservation of the natural and inalienable rights of man; these are liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression.
3. The source of **all sovereignty resides in the nation**; no group or individual may exercise authority that does not come from the people.

4. **Liberty** consists of the power to do whatever is not injurious to others.

5. The law has the right to forbid only actions that are **injurious to society**.

6. **Law is the expression of the general will.** All citizens have the right to participate in its formation, personally or through their representatives. All citizens are equal before it.

7. No man may be **accused, arrested or detained**, except in cases determined by law.

8. Every citizen may **speak, write and print** freely; he must take responsibility for the abuse of such liberty in cases determined by the law.

9. For the maintenance of the public force and for the expenses of administration a **common tax** is indispensable; it must be assessed equally on all citizens in proportion to their means.

10. Since **property is a sacred and inviolable right**, no one may be deprived of it, unless a legally established public necessity requires it. In that case a just compensation must be given in advance.

**FRANCE BECOMES A REPUBLIC**

The situation in France **continued to be tense** during the following years. Although Louis XVI had signed the Constitution, he entered into **secret negotiations** with the King of Prussia. Rulers of other neighbouring countries too were worried by the developments in France and made plans to send troops to France. Before this could happen, the National Assembly voted in 1792 to **declare war against Prussia and Austria**. Thousands of volunteers thronged from the provinces to join the army. They saw this as a war of the people against kings and aristocracies all over Europe.

The **revolutionary wars** brought losses and **economic difficulties** to the people. Large sections of the population were convinced that the revolution had to be **carried further**, as the Constitution of 1791 gave political rights only to the richer sections of society. **Political clubs** became an important rallying point for people who wished to **discuss government policies** and plan their own forms of action. The most successful of these clubs was that of the **Jacobins**.

The members of the Jacobin club belonged mainly to the **less prosperous sections of society**. Their leader was Maximilian Robespierre. A large group among the Jacobins decided to start wearing **long striped trousers** similar to those worn by dock workers. This was to set themselves apart from the fashionable sections of society, especially nobles, who wore knee breeches. These Jacobins came to be known as the **sans-culottes**, literally meaning ‘those without knee breeches’.

In the summer of 1792 the Jacobins stormed the **Palace of the Tuileries**, massacred the king’s guards and held the king himself as hostage. Later the Assembly voted to **imprison the royal family**. Elections were held. From now on **all men of 21 years** and above, regardless of wealth, got the right to vote. The newly elected assembly was called the **Convention**. On 21 September 1792 it **abolished the monarchy and declared France a republic**. Louis XVI was **sentenced to death** by
a court on the charge of treason. In January 1793 he was executed publicly. The queen met with the same fate shortly after.

JACOBIAN PERIOD: REIGN OF TERROR (1793-94)

The period from 1793 to 1794 is referred to as the Reign of Terror. Robespierre followed a policy of severe control and punishment. All those whom he saw as being 'enemies' of the republic - ex-nobles and clergy, members of other political parties, even members of his own party who did not agree with his methods - were arrested, imprisoned and then tried by a revolutionary tribunal. Robespierre’s government issued laws placing a maximum ceiling on wages and prices. Meat and bread were rationed. Peasants were forced to transport their grain to the cities and sell it at prices fixed by the government. Equality was sought to be practised through forms of speech and address. Churches were shut down and their buildings converted into barracks or offices. Robespierre pursued his policies so relentlessly that even his supporters began to demand moderation. Finally, he was convicted by a court in 1794, arrested and beheaded.

THERMIDORIAN REPUBLIC (1795-99): A DIRECTORY RULE IN FRANCE

The fall of the Jacobin government allowed the wealthier middle classes to seize power. A new constitution was introduced which denied the vote to non-propertied sections of society. It provided for two elected legislative councils. These then appointed a Directory, an executive made up of 5 members. This was meant as a safeguard against the concentration of power in a one-man executive as under the Jacobins. The Right to Equality was accompanied by the declaration of 'Duties' aimed at avoiding the tension between the unlimited nature of rights and the necessity for social order based on law.

The bulk of the petty bourgeoisie was barred from all offices, voting existed only in name and politics was dominated by the oligarchs and professional administrators. Directory inaugurated social and political reign of notables - a class which dominated in the 19th century. However, the Directors often clashed with the legislative councils, who then sought to dismiss them. The political instability of the Directory paved the way for the rise of a military dictator, Napoleon Bonaparte. Through all these changes in the form of government, the ideals of freedom, of equality before the law and of fraternity remained inspiring ideals that motivated political movements in France and the rest of Europe during the following century.

COURSE OF REVOLUTION IN SHORT

A. Period of the National Assembly (1789-91)
   1. Abolition of Feudalism: Payment of taxes by all; Equal bearing of all public expenses by all; giving up of 'tithe' by the clergy; Surrender of medieval rights of the nobility, Abolition of serfdom, Prohibition of the sale of judicial offices, and Rights of every citizen to get any kind of post.
   2. Declaration of the Rights of Man
   3. Economic measures: Confiscation of Church lands; Issue of "assignants" or paper notes used to pay the government's debt. Abolition of guilds and internal tariffs and tolls, and Abolition of labour organisations and ban of strikes.
4. **Civil Constitution of the Clergy (1790):** Reduction of the number of bishoprics by more than 1/3rd and transformation of bishops and priests into civil officers. Its provisions stripped the Pope of his effective authority.

5. **Constitution of 1791:** Reform and reorganisation of Local Government; Reconstruction of the Central Government on the basis of separation of powers; Though it went, a long way towards instituting popular government, it stopped well short of full democracy, because it divided Frenchmen into "Active Citizens" and "Passive Citizens" and gave the right to vote only to the former.

**B. Period of National Convention (1792-95)**

1. Abolition of Monarchy and the establishment of the First French Republic.
2. **Passing of the democratic constitution of 1793:** Grant of universal manhood suffrage and giving supreme power to a single legislative chamber.
3. **Reign of terror:** Scrapping Local Government of much of the local self-government and trend towards centralization.
4. Patriotism and success in War of 1793 with the other European powers.
5. **Economic Measures:** Issue of the "Maximum" i.e. placing ceiling on prices and wages. Rationing of scarce commodities. Seizure of the remaining properties of the 'emigres' and other opponents of Republic and recommended their distribution among landless Frenchmen.
6. **Constitution of 1795:** Denial of the vote to the poorest section of the nation; and establishment of a two-house legislature. These two houses nominated 5 directors who headed the executives.

**WHY IN FRANCE**

1. **Feudalism:** Feudalism did exist in almost all the European countries at that time. But unlike in other European countries, the French feudal lords already lost their vitality and failed to discharge their duties properly though they were enjoying the same privileges as other European Countries.
2. **Middle Classes:** Quite strong and active in France unlike in other European countries.
3. **Common People:** The lot of the common people was not worse than those of other European countries. The small peasants of France were; in fact, better off than their counterparts in other European countries. But what made the difference was that the French common people were made conscious of their sufferings by the propaganda of the philosophers and were eager to improve their lot, which was not the case in the rest of Europe.

**ROLE OF WOMEN IN REVOLUTION**

From the very beginning women were active participants in the events which brought about so many important changes in French society. They hoped that their involvement would pressurize the revolutionary government to introduce measures to improve their lives. Most women of the third estate had to work for a living. Most women did not have access to education or job training. Their wages were lower than those of men. In order to discuss and voice their interests women started their own political clubs and newspapers. About sixty women's clubs came up in different French cities. The Society of Revolutionary and Republican Women was
the most famous of them. One of their main demands was that women enjoy the same political rights as men.

Women were disappointed that the Constitution of 1791 reduced them to passive citizens. They demanded the right to vote, to be elected to the Assembly and to hold political office. In the early years, the revolutionary government did introduce laws that helped improve the lives of women. Together with the creation of state schools, schooling was made compulsory for all girls. Divorce was made legal, and could be applied for by both women and men. Women could now train for jobs, could become artists or run small businesses. Women’s struggle for equal political rights, however, continued. During the Reign of Terror, the new government issued laws ordering closure of women’s clubs and banning their political activities. Many prominent women were arrested and a number of them executed.

IMPACT OF FRENCH REVOLUTION

The Abolition of Feudal Structure & the Absolutist State

One of the first actions of the National Assembly was to destroy the relics of feudalism and aristocratic privileges of nobles, clergy, towns and provinces along with the state apparatus in order to create a modern state of France. Though the political forms continued to change from constitutional monarchy (1789-91) to Democratic Republic (1792-1794), Thermidorian rule (1795-99), and Consulate and Empire (under Napoleon 1799-1815), the structural reforms of this period were more fundamental and long-lasting. Most of the administrative divisions of the ancient regime disappeared forever along with its officials and institutions. For a while there was a real decentralization of authority with a focus on the elective principle; but the period of the Jacobin Republic and Terror followed by the Consulate of Napoleon witnessed an ever-increasing process of centralization.

Reconstruction of France, Administrative and Legal

The destruction of the old regime with all its administrative structure required a sweeping re-organization of administrative units. The new structure formulated in 1790 established 83 departments, each named after a geographical feature of its area. It aimed at promoting national unity. The administrative system of 1790 provided the basic structure on which Napoleon created his famous civil administrator. Napoleon’s domestic measures achieved a thorough reconstruction of France under a strong centralized government to restore peace and order. The pattern of executive power was one of authority dispensed downwards through the ranks of authority. It created a police state but it was more sophisticated in its functioning than its predecessor.

The Department of Administration created by the National Assembly (also called the Constituent Assembly) in 1790 was slightly modified into arrondissements and cantons under Napoleon and it still rules France. The new system of centralized administration enabled the government to utilize the wealth of the country more effectively than before. Tax collection became the responsibility of paid officials under the central treasury. The entire work of tax collection became systematic and efficient. For the sake of unity, another important innovation tried by the
National Assembly in 1791 was the introduction of the **metric system of weights and measures** - grams, metres, litres, etc. It had a **lasting influence** the world over. It brought much needed **order and uniformity** out of earlier chaos and variety by adopting convenient decimal divisions.

**Legal reforms** under Napoleon became the instrument of unifying the nation and establishing the Consular and Imperial regime. In **family matters**, Napoleon's code revealed a shift towards conservatism. **Paternal authority** was re-established; divorce was retained but was subjected to stricter limits. Women became the principal victims of this code. The **Code Napoleon**, as it came to be called, included the civil code (1804), code of civic procedure (1806) and the code of criminal procedure. It was designed to **establish order and stability** in interpersonal relations, quick court action, national uniformity in place of variegated regional customs, civil equality, freedom of religion and a powerful nation-state. It was revolutionary in its impact and profoundly influenced social development, not only in France but in several other countries including Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, etc.

**Abolition of Slavery**

One of the most revolutionary social reforms of the Jacobin regime was the abolition of slavery in the **French colonies**. The colonies in the Caribbean, Martinique, Guadeloupe and San Domingo were important **suppliers of commodities** such as tobacco, indigo, sugar and coffee. This was met by a **triangular slave trade** between Europe, Africa and the Americas. The slave trade began in the seventeenth century. The exploitation of slave labour made it possible to meet the **growing demand in European markets** for sugar, coffee, and indigo.

Throughout 18th century there was little criticism of slavery in France. The National Assembly did not pass any laws, fearing opposition from businessmen whose incomes depended on the slave trade. It was finally the **Convention** which in 1794 legislated to **free all slaves** in the French overseas possessions. This, however, turned out to be a short-term measure: 10 years later, **Napoleon reintroduced slavery**. Slavery was finally abolished in French colonies in 1848.

In 1804, **Napoleon Bonaparte** crowned himself **Emperor** of France. He set out to **conquer neighbouring European countries**, dispossessioning dynasties and creating kingdoms where he placed members of his family. Napoleon saw his role as a **modernizer of Europe**. He introduced many laws such as the protection of **private property** and a uniform system of weights and measures provided by the decimal system. Initially, many saw Napoleon as a **liberator** who would bring freedom for the people. But soon the Napoleonic armies came to be viewed everywhere as an **invading force**. He was finally **defeated at Waterloo in 1815**. Many of his measures that carried the revolutionary ideas of liberty and modern laws to other parts of Europe had an impact on people long after Napoleon had left.

**Religious Divide and Concordat**

The **Catholic Church** was viewed as an important pillar of the old regime and so the Revolutionary regime under the National Assembly implemented the **Civil Constitution of the Clergy** in 1790. Subsequently, the Catholic Church was completely
nationalized and its property seized and put to sale. The religion became a major issue that divided the French people. It led to a coalescence of counter-revolutionary forces - royalists, émigrés and staunch supporters of the Catholic Church against the revolutionaries. The National Convention also pursued a policy of dechristianization which made more enemies of the revolution than friends. As a result the Catholic religion instead of acting as a unifying force was becoming a source of disunion. Yet, France paved the way for a secular society as the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen recognized the freedom of religion.

Napoleon regarded the Catholic Church a useful instrument of social control. Instilling morality and discipline, and preaching subservience to lawful authority. He reached an understanding with the Pope in 1801, which is known as the Concordat. In this agreement the Pope and the Catholic Church recognized the French Republic, thus breaking the possible alliance of European monarchs with the Papacy. The Roman Catholic religion was recognized as the religion of only the majority of the French people. Thereafter Protestants and Jews were also given protection by the state. Despite several serious difficulties, the Concordat remained one of the bases on which modern France was built.

New Bureaucracy

The bureaucratic apparatus of the ancient regime developed through the sale of government jobs or venality of office as it was called. This remained its principal weakness. The destruction of old structure required a new bureaucratic structure. The Revolutionary government had created 83 departments as the new units of administration. In place of powerful royal officials, a new 3-tier uniform system of local government departments, districts and communes were created. At each level, local government officials were elected by active citizens. Even judges, tax collectors, parish priests, and bishops were chosen on the basis of the ballot.

Napoleon personally worked on rationalizing the bureaucratic structure of France by developing a powerful centralized administrative machine. He retained the department administration but eliminated the locally elected assemblies by new officials, the most important of which were the prefects. They were all appointed directly or indirectly by Napoleon himself. The prefects were charged with vast responsibilities and granted immense power in their respective departments. The selection of these prefects was based on the principle of merit, talent and elections, but Napoleon strongly believed that scouting for talent could be possible only from superior social strata, including from the military.

Other Outcomes

a. Another lasting result was the building up of a new economic system in place of the feudal system which had been overthrown. This system was capitalism. Even the restored monarchy could not bring back the feudal system or destroy the new economic institutions that had come into being.

b. The French Revolution gave the term 'nation’ its modern meaning. A nation is not the territory that the people belonging to it inhabit but the people themselves. France was not merely the territories known as France but the ‘French people’.
c. From this followed the idea of sovereignty, that a nation recognizes no law or authority above its own. And if a nation is sovereign, that means the people constituting the nation are the source of all power and authority. There cannot be any rulers above the people, only a republic in which the government derives its authority from the people and is answerable to the people.

d. Under the Jacobin constitution, all people were given the right to vote and the right of insurrection. The constitution stated that the government must provide the people with work or livelihood. The happiness of all was proclaimed as the aim of government. Though it was never really put into effect, it was the first genuinely democratic constitution in history.

e. Napoleon’s rise to power was a step backward. However, though he destroyed the Republic and established an empire, the idea of the republic could not be destroyed.

f. The Revolution had come about with the support and blood of common people—the city poor and the peasants. In 1792, for the first time in history, workers, peasants and other non-propertied classes were given equal political rights.

g. Although the right to vote and elect representatives did not solve the problems of the common people. The peasants got their lands. But to the workers and artisans—the people who were the backbone of the revolutionary movement—the Revolution did not bring real equality. To them, real equality could come only with economic equality.

h. France soon became one of the first countries where the ideas of social equality, of socialism, gave rise to a new kind of political movement.

IMPACT OF FRENCH REVOLUTION ON THE WORLD

a. The French Revolution had been a world-shaking event. For years to come its direct influence was felt in many parts of the world. It inspired revolutionary movements in almost every country of Europe and in South and Central America. For a long time the French Revolution became the classic example of a revolution which people of many nations tried to emulate.

b. Even though the old ruling dynasty of France had been restored to power in 1815, and the autocratic governments of Europe found themselves safe for the time being, the rulers found it increasingly difficult to rule the people.

c. The French soldiers, wherever they went, carried with them ideas of liberty and equality shaking the old feudal order. They destroyed serfdom in areas which came under their occupation and modernized the systems of administration.

d. Under Napoleon, the French had become conquerors instead of liberators. The countries which organized popular resistance against the French occupation carried out reforms in their social and political system. The leading powers of Europe did not succeed in restoring the old order either in France or in the countries that the Revolution had reached.

The ideas of liberty and democratic rights were the most important legacy of the French Revolution. These spread from France to the rest of Europe during the 19th century, where feudal systems were abolished. Colonised peoples reworked the idea of freedom from bondage into their movements to create a sovereign nation state. Tipu Sultan and Rammohan Roy are two examples of individuals who responded to the ideas coming from revolutionary France.
Revolutions in Central and South America

The impact of the Revolution was felt on the far away American continent. Revolutionary France had abolished slavery in her colonies. The former French colony of Haiti became a republic. This was the first republic established by the black people, formerly slaves, in the Americas. Inspired by this example, revolutionary movements arose in the Americas to overthrow foreign rule, to abolish slavery and to establish independent republics.

The chief European imperialist powers in Central and South America were Spain and Portugal. Spain had been occupied by France, and Portugal was involved in a conflict with France. During the early 19th century, these two imperialist countries were cut off from their colonies, with the result that most of the Portuguese and Spanish colonies in Central and South America became independent. The movements for independence in these countries had earlier been inspired by the successful War of American Independence. The French Revolution ensured their success.

By the third decade of the 19th century, almost entire Central and South America had been liberated from the Spanish and the Portuguese rule and a number of independent republics were established. In these republics slavery was abolished. It, however, persisted in the United States for a few more decades where it was finally abolished following the Civil War. Simon Bolivar, Bernardo O'Higgins and San Martin were the great leaders in South America at this time.

NAPoleONIC ERA – ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN WORLD HISTORY

Educated for the army in France, he became a second lieutenant at the age of 16; did not take active part in the Revolution, but gained prestige through his own military victories. Successfully led an expedition into Italy at the age of 26; also led an expedition against Egypt with the aim of crippling English Commerce. Though it was a military failure, he used it to abolish the Directory and establish a thinly veiled dictatorship in the form of the consulate, of which he became the first consul.

The Consulate (1799-1804)

By manipulating the public opinion, he succeeded in abolishing the Directory and establishing the Consulate. A new constitution was ratified by the French people. Napoleon, as First Consul presided over the most important body, viz. the Council of State and all the local government officials were appointed directly by him, a fact which shows the amount of centralization achieved by him.

Napoleonic Empire (1804-1814)

Before beginning his task of subduing Europe, he made himself the Emperor of France and tried to revive the dignity of the old empire. Except England which remained invincible, all the continental European powers (Spain, Prussia, Austria, etc.) fell before his well-directed military campaigns. He tried unsuccessfully to cripple England through the 'Continental System' (blocking the continental ports in order to cripple English commerce which was the main source of her strength), and his control over Europe gradually dwindled.
Though he could conquer kings and inefficient armies, he could not do the same when the peoples, aroused by his imperialistic activities, rose in rebellion. Defeated in Russia in 1812, the Allies closed in on France. England in alliance with continental powers defeated him in the "Battle of Nations" at Leipzig (1813) and he was sent into exile on the island of Elba in 1814; His escape and return to France in 1815; his "Hundred Day" rule and his final defeat in the "Battle of Waterloo" and his imprisonment in St Helena till his death in 1821.

After the defeat of Napoleon, the old ruling dynasty of France was restored to power. However, within a few years, in 1830, there was another outbreak of revolution. In 1848, the monarchy was again overthrown though it soon reappeared. Finally, in 1871, the Republic was again proclaimed.

Causes for His Fall

1. Weaknesses of the Napoleonic System: defects of dictatorship; too much dependence on one person; its militaristic nature (War face cannot be continued for ever); Adoption of his tactics of warfare by the opponents from 1819; etc.
2. Spirit of Nationalism: Spread of Nationalism in the conquered territories and the growing hatred among the subject people for the foreigners.
3. Naval superiority and strong finances of Great Britain.
4. Failure of the Continental system.
5. Peninsular War with Spain and Russian Campaign: while the former exhausted the resources of France, the latter ended in disaster for Napoleon and for France.

Significance

1. Preservation and popularization of the important theories and ideals of the French Revolution such as the ideals of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, and the theories of Nationalism, Democracy etc.
2. Introduction of "New Regime" which was marked by a centralized government based on the doctrine of popular sovereignty and supported by a national army, a national school system and a parliament that represented the citizen body instead of the classes.
3. Introduction of the "Code Napoleon" consisting of a civil code, codes of civil Procedure and Criminal procedure, a penal code and a commercial code; it preserved the fruits of the French Revolution not only for France but almost for the whole of Western Europe and part of America.
4. Adoption of the policy of religious toleration by the state for the first time.
5. Encouragement to the technological and industrial revolution.
6. Public work at structure of bridges, roads, monumental buildings etc; and beautification of the cities.
7. Educational reforms by opening of state supported schools to all citizens and perpetuation of the principles of lay education.
WORLD WARS

The two wars were caused by a variety of factors. The beginning of the century witnessed the division of the world into major international forces based on distinct ideologies. These forces were well equipped with the weapons of modern welfare. In the initial decades of the 20th century they competed with each other for a domination of the entire world. Since their conflicts and rivalries could not be resolved through any peaceful mechanism, they resulted in the outbreak of the two world wars.

The damage caused by this war had no precedent in history. In the earlier wars, the civilian populations were not generally involved and the casualties were generally confined to the warring armies. The war which began in 1914 was a total war in which all the resources of the warring states were mobilized. It affected the economy of the entire world the casualties suffered by the civilian population from bombing of the civilian areas and the famines and epidemics, caused by the war far exceeded those suffered by the armies. The battles of the war were fought in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Pacific. Because of the unprecedented extent of its spread and its total nature, it is known as the First World War.

THE WARRING NATIONS IN THE WORLD WARS

The theatre for the First World War got located in the Balkans which was then a region of competing nationalisms and ethnic conflicts. Briefly the drama of the First World War unfolded in the following manner:

Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia on 28th July 1914
↓
Germany declared a war on Russia, Belgium and France in 3rd August 1914.
↓
Austria-Hungary attacked Russia on 6th August
↓
France and Britain declared war on Austria-Hungary on 12th August

German violation of Belgium neutrality gave the British a convenient excuse to enter the war on the side of France and Russia. British world-wide interests made the war a global conflict, drawing into it the dominions of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the greatest British colonial possession, India; and later the United States, because of close British links with it. Italy, diplomatically aligned with Austria and Germany since the Triple Alliance of 1882, declared its neutrality at the start of the war. It was avidly pursued by France and Britain. In May 1915, the Italian government succumbed to Allied temptations and declared war on Austria-Hungary in pursuit of territorial expansion.
In the **Second World War**, division of the world into two armed camps followed more or less **same pattern** as for the First World War. Only a few states such as Italy, Japan, Turkey, and Romania switched their sides either because of **dissatisfaction** with territorial gains in the first War or due to **ideological reasons**. Germany, Italy and Japan (known as the **Axis Powers**) were joined by Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Albania, Finland and Thailand. The **Allied armed camp** mainly consisted of Britain, France, and Soviet Union, Belgium, Denmark, Turkey and the United States. Other major belligerents siding with the Allies included Argentina, Australia, Canada, Brazil, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, South Africa, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AXIS POWERS IN WW-II</strong></th>
<th><strong>ALLIED POWERS IN WW-II</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Netherlands, Norway, Poland, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italy, Japan, Turkey, and Romania switched their sides from WW-I

**WARS AS THE WARS OF IDEOLOGIES**

Modern politics, inaugurated by the revolutions of 18th and 19th centuries and institutionalized through elections, parties and representation, also served to **divide European society and polity along ideological lines**. The spectrum of politics had created **3 major bands** in the 19th century - **left, centre** (liberal democratic) and **right** (counter-revolutionary).

These grouping of territorially demarcated states were based on **basic, ingrained political proclivities** of these states. Britain, France, America, the main **allies** in both wars, had well-established **liberal democratic** traditions. Germany, Austria, Italy, Japan, Hungary lacked such democratic traditions. The **Russian autocracy** under the Romanovs supported western democracies owing to **economic compulsions** as 25% of investments from abroad came from France and Russian banking, railway development and the Southern Russian Industrial Complex all depended on **French capital**. During World War II, ideological compulsions again compelled Communist Soviet Union to ally itself with western liberal democracies against the danger of **extreme right-wing dictatorships** despite inter-war recriminations.

Although **Japan and Italy** helped the Allies in the First World War, both left them during Inter-war period itself and with their dictatorial, authoritarian regimes found their natural allies (the Central Powers) during World War II. The **Ottoman Empire** supported the Central Powers (Axis Powers) during World War-I. However, a **democratically reformed Turkey** joined the Allies in the Second World War.
However, what differentiated the liberal democratic world from the Central European Empires was not the existence of elections, voting rights and parliaments, but responsible, accountable governments. German empire established by Bismarck after the Franco-Prussian War (1870) was a revolution carried out by the Prussian military. The German Constitution of 1871 entrusted formal sovereignty to a Federal Council (Bundesrat). It also established a Reichstag or parliament of 400 deputies elected by a direct, secret, adult male suffrage. However, there was complete lack of parliamentary responsibility in this system. The empire retained control over the three pillars of absolutism in the dominant Prussian state, the army, the bureaucracy and the foreign affairs. Karl Marx described the German state as a military despotism.

Similarly, the Habsburg monarchy of Austria-Hungary was also dominated by medieval social institutions and military methods. Although a sham constitutional government was established in Austria-Hungary in 1861, the representative elements in parliament remained restricted and it was dominated by nominated members from the clergy and the big landowning classes. Universal adult male franchise was introduced in 1907 but the nature of state remained unchanged. Similarly, a representative parliamentary government was established under the leadership of Young Turks in 1908 and the Ottoman Empire started disintegrating. However, a reformed democratic policy in Turkey could emerge only after the fall of Sultan Muhammad VI in 1922.

War further forced every individual to take a stance. Internal ideological cleavages were to be avoided to face the enemy from outside. War put the squeeze on ideological space (hegemonic space) available within a state. It tended to homogenize citizens, within territorially organized states, at least in their attitudes towards war and national defence and in demonizing enemy states.

CAUSES OF FIRST WORLD WAR (1914-1918)

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

a. It was a complete war. It was fought on the land, in the air and over the seas.
b. It was fought in different countries distributed throughout the length and breadth of the world.
c. Almost all the countries of the world, either directly or indirectly experienced vibrations of the war.

Economic imperialism

England, France and Holland first experienced industrialisation. By the end of the 19th century Germany and Italy emerged as independent nations and immediately started competing with the other industrialized countries. This period also witnessed substantial developments in the scientific and technological sectors. These industrialized countries tried to possess colonies for the supply of raw-materials and to serve the purpose of markets in every nook and corner of the world. That led to bitterness and rivalries. The underlying causes of the war were the rivalries and conflicts among the imperialist countries.
The imperialist conquest of Asia and Africa was accompanied with conflicts between the imperialist countries. Sometimes the imperialists were able to come to ‘peaceful settlements’ and agree to divide a part of Asia or Africa among themselves without resorting to the use of force against each other. At other times their rivalries created situations of war. Wars were generally avoided at that time because the possibilities of further conquest were still there. By the end of the 19th century, however, the situation had changed. Most of Asia and Africa had already been divided up and further conquests could take place only by dispossessing some imperialist country of its colonies.

The efforts to establish colonies, Protectorates and spheres of influences in various parts of the world also resulted in bad blood among nations. Germany tried to capture markets which were already under the control of Britain; that led to bitterness between the two countries. Another important factor that fanned the flames of rivalry and enmity was tariff restrictions. Every country preferred exports but not imports. Thus there were tariff wars between the various countries. It resulted in the worsening of the relations between the nations. Both Britain and France were alarmed at the expansion of German manufactures as they considered it a serious threat to their position.

Italy, which after her unification had become almost an equal of France in power, coveted Tripoli in North Africa which was under the Ottoman Empire. She had already occupied Eritrea and Somaliland. France wanted to add Morocco to her conquests in Africa. Russia had her ambitions in Iran, the territories of the Ottoman Empire including Constantinople, the Far East and elsewhere. The Russian plans clashed with the interests and ambitions of Britain, Germany and Austria. Japan which had also become an imperialist power had ambitions in the Far East and was on way to fulfilling them. She defeated Russia in 1904. Britain was involved in a conflict with all other imperialist countries because she had already acquired a vast empire which was to be defended.

Conflicts within Europe

The Balkan countries had been under the rule of Ottoman Turks. However, in the 19th century, the Ottoman rule had begun to collapse. The Russian Czars hoped that these areas would come under their control. They encouraged a movement called the Pan-Slav movement. Other major European powers were alarmed at the growth of Russian influence in the Balkans. Corresponding to the Pan-Slav movement, there was a Pan German movement which aimed at the expansion of Germany all over central Europe and in the Balkans. Italy claimed certain areas which were under Austrian rule.

Militarism and Formation of Alliances

The conflicts within Europe had begun to create a very tense situation. European countries began to form themselves into opposing groups. In the early part of the 20th century, most of the powerful countries in Europe started building up powerful standing armies, elaborate espionage system, strong navies. Much of the national wealth was spent to increase the strength and power. These powerful
armaments were alleged to be for defence and in the interest of peace. They actually created a sense of universal fear, suspicion, mistrust and hatred in between the nations. This is amply attested by naval competition between England & Germany. Such a race in building powerful and dangerous weapons could end only in a war.

In 1882 was formed the Triple Alliance comprising Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. As opposed to this, emerged the Triple Entente comprising France, Russia and Britain in 1907. European countries also entered into secret treaties to gain territories at the expense of others. Often, these secret treaties leaked out and fear and suspicion grew in each country about such treaties.

Lack of machinery to control international relations

There was confusion and anarchy in the international relations of the nations. Everything was kept as secret and nothing was known about them to the people. It was found that the secrets of diplomacy were not even known to all the members of the same ministry. Even the legislatures were kept completely in the dark with regard to international commitments. Secret diplomacy created a lot of confusion in the minds of people. Although there was a code of international law and morality
there was no power to enforce the same. Many resolutions were passed in the international conferences. The states followed these resolutions more in breaching rather than in honoring.

**Excessive or narrow nationalism**

The excessive or narrow nationalism and competitive patriotism fanned the flames of hatred, enmity and bitterness amongst nations. The love of one’s country demanded the hatred of another. Love of Germany demanded the hatred of France and vice versa. Italy and Germany after unification started the policy of expansion at the expense of the national sentiments of others. It was the intense nationalism in Serbia which created bitterness between Serbia and Austria-Hungary.

**Allssace-Lorraine question**

The Franco-Prussian War and the Treaty of Frankfurt enabled Germany to occupy Allssace and a part of Lorraine. The government of the Third Republic in France left no stone unturned to keep alive the spirit of revenge and the hope of recovery of Allssace and Lorraine. There was also economic motive for getting back the Allssace and Lorraine. The iron deposits are found in abundance in these regions. The iron and steel magnates of France felt that their industries were paralyzed on account of the loss of Allssace and Lorraine.

**COURSE OF THE WAR**

Germany had hoped that through a lightning strike through Belgium, she would be able to defeat France within a few weeks and then turn against Russia. When German troops were within 20 km of Paris, Russia had opened attacks on Germany and Austria on the eastern front. Soon the German advance on France was halted and the war in Europe entered a long period of stalemate. In the meantime the war had spread to many other parts of the world and battles were fought in West Asia, Africa and the Far East.

A new type of warfare developed. The warring armies dug trenches from which they conducted raids on each other. On the Western Front, which included eastern France and Belgium, the troops of the warring sides dug trenches and continued their raids on each other’s positions for about 4 years. On the Eastern Front, Germany and Austria succeeded in repulsing the Russian attack and capturing parts of the Russian empire. They were also successful against Rumania, Serbia and Italy. Japan occupied German possessions in East Asia, and Britain and France seized most of the German colonies in Africa.

In April 1917, the USA declared war on Germany. USA had become the main source of arms and other essential supplies for the Entente countries. Economic considerations had turned them even more in favour of the Entente countries. These countries had raised vast amounts of loans in USA to pay for the arms and other goods bought by them. Many Americans had subscribed to these loans which could be paid back only, if these countries won the war. There was also a fear that if Germany won the war, she would become a serious rival to USA.
Another major development that took place in 1917 was the withdrawal of Russia from the war after **October Revolution**. Russia decided to withdraw from the war and signed a peace treaty with Germany in March 1918. The **Entente powers** which were opposed to the revolution in Russia and to the Russian withdrawal from the war started their **armed intervention in Russia** in support of the elements which were opposed to the revolution. This led to a **civil war** which lasted for three years and ended with the defeat of foreign intervention.

**END OF FIRST WORLD WAR**

In **January 1918**, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, proposed a peace programme. This has become famous as President **Wilson's Fourteen Points**. These included the conduct of negotiations between states openly, freedom of navigation, reduction of armaments, independence of Belgium, restoration of Alsace Lorraine to France, creation of independent states in Europe, formation of an international organization to guarantee the independence of all states, etc. Some of these points were accepted when the peace treaties were signed at the end of the war.

Faced with an effective **British blockade**, fierce resistance from the British and French Armies, the entrance of the **United States Army**, political unrest and starvation at home, an **economy in ruins**, mutiny in the navy, and mounting defeats on the battlefield, the German generals requested **armistice negotiations with the Allies** in November 1918. Under the terms of the armistice, the German Army was allowed to remain intact and was not forced to **admit defeat** by surrendering. The failure to force the Germany to admit defeat would have a huge **impact on the future of Germany**.

Although the army was later reduced in size, its impact would be felt after the war as a political force **dedicated to German nationalism, not democracy**. The German General Staff also would support the false idea that the army had not been defeated on the battlefield, but could have fought on to victory, except for being betrayed at home, the infamous '**Stab in the Back**' theory. This 'Stab in the Back' theory would become hugely popular among many Germans who found it impossible to swallow defeat. During the war, **Adolf Hitler** became obsessed with this idea, especially laying blame on Jews and Marxists in Germany for undermining the war effort. To Hitler, and so many others, the German politicians who signed the armistice on November 11, 1918, would become known as the '**November Criminals**'.

**Treaty of Versailles with Germany**

The Germans submitted to the ultimate peace based on the US President **Woodrow Wilson’s 14 Points**, however, but they had to sign was something else. Germans felt cheated. Moreover, the German delegates who came for peace settlement were **humiliated**. It was in these circumstances that they signed the treaty in June 1919. **Main Provisions** of the treaty were:

a. German emperor William II was charged with the **supreme offence against international morality** and the sanctity of treaties. He was to be tried by a tribunal. Germany was forced to admit that she was responsible for the war.

b. Germany was to **pay reparations for the damage done to the Allies**; the amount was fixed at 6,600 million.
c. An attempt was made to cripple once for all the military strength of Germany: a) The German General Staff was abolished; b) The total strength of the German army was fixed at one lakh and c) Restrictions were placed on the manufacture of armaments, munitions and the other war materials by the Germany.

d. Germany was forced to give up all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions and these were distributed among Allies. The Allies also reserved to themselves the right to retain or liquidate all property, rights and interests of the German nationals or companies abroad and the German government was required to pay compensation to them.

e. The German rivers, Elbe, Oder, Danube and Niemen were internationalized.

f. Germany had given Allsace-Lorraine to France, a large part of Posen and western Prussia to Poland and many other areas to Belgium & other countries.

g. Danzing was taken away from Germany and setup as a free city under the League of Nations, thus creating a “Polish corridor”.

h. Germany had to give up her right over the coal mines of the Saar valley. The Rhineland was demilitarized. Germany was forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications on either side of the Rhine River.

i. Complete independence & full sovereignty of Belgium, Poland & Czechoslovakia were recognized by Germany. Germany gave up her special rights and privileges in China, Egypt, Thailand, Morocco and Liberia.

EFFECTS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Many of the seeds of World War-II in Europe were sown by the Treaty of Versailles that ended World War-I. In its final form, the treaty placed full blame for the war on Germany and Austria-Hungary, as well as exacted harsh financial reparations and led to territorial dismemberment. The treaty caused resentment and a deep mistrust of their new government, the Weimar Republic. The need to pay war reparations, coupled with the instability of the government, contributed to massive hyperinflation which crippled the German economy. This situation was made worse by the onset of the Great Depression. The return of annexed colonies and other terms of treaty were seemed harsh and humiliating by the Germans who could not accept it.

Rise of Fascism and Nazism (discussed in detail elsewhere)

In 1922, Benito Mussolini and the Fascist Party rose to power in Italy. Believing in a strong central government and strict control of industry and the people, Fascism was a reaction to the perceived failure of free market economics and a deep fear of communism. Highly militaristic, Fascism also was driven by a sense of belligerent nationalism that encouraged conflict as a means of social improvement. By 1935, Mussolini was able to make himself the dictator of Italy and transformed the country into a police state.

In Germany, Fascism was embraced by the National Socialist German Workers Party, also known as the Nazis. Swiftly rising to power in the late 1920s, the Nazis and their charismatic leader, Adolf Hitler, followed the central tenets of Fascism while also advocating for the racial purity of the German people and additional German Lebensraum (living space). Playing on the economic distress in Weimar Germany and backed by their "Brown Shirts" militia, the Nazis became a political force.
In 1935, in clear violation of the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler ordered the remilitarization of Germany, including the reactivation of the Luftwaffe (air force). As the German army grew through conscription, the other European powers voiced minimal protest as they were more concerned with enforcing the economic aspects of the treaty. In a move that tacitly endorsed Hitler's violation of the treaty, Great Britain signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement, which allowed Germany to build a fleet one third the size of the Royal Navy and ended British naval operations in the Baltic. Hitler further violated the treaty by ordering the reoccupation of the Rhineland by the German Army.

Not wanting to become involved in another major war, Britain and France avoided intervening and sought a resolution, with little success, through the League of Nations. Emboldened by Great Britain and France's reaction to the Rhineland, Hitler began to move forward with a plan to unite all German-speaking peoples under one "Greater German" regime. Again operating in violation of the Treaty of Versailles, German troops crossed the border to enforce annexation of Austria. A month later the Nazis held a plebiscite and received 99.73% of the vote. International reaction was again mild, with Great Britain and France issuing protests, but still showing that they were unwilling to take military action.

Other Effects

The period after the war saw the beginning of the end of the European supremacy in the world. Economically and militarily, Europe was surpassed by the United States which emerged from the war as a world power. The Soviet Union was also to soon come up as a major world power. The period after the war also saw the strengthening of the freedom movements in Asia and Africa. The weakening of Europe and the emergence of the Soviet Union which declared her support to the struggles for national independence contributed to the growing strength of these struggles. The Allied propaganda during the war to defend democracy, and the participation of Asian and African soldier in the battles in Europe also helped in arousing the peoples of Asia and Africa.

The European countries had utilized the resources of their colonies in the war. The forced recruitment of soldiers and labourers for war, and the exploitation of resources of the colonies for war by the imperialist countries had created resentment among the people of the colonies. The population of the colonial countries had been nurtured on the myth that the peoples of Asia and Africa were inferior to the Europeans. The role played by the soldiers from Asia and Africa in winning the war for one group of nations of Europe against another shattered this myth. Many Asian leaders had supported the war effort in the hope that, once the war was over, their countries would be given freedom. These hopes were, however, belied. While the European nations won the right to self-determination, colonial rule and exploitation continued in the countries of Asia and Africa.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

The treaty was concluded between the Allies and Germany. The Germans had expected the peace terms to be based on the Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson. But they were cheated. The peace settlement was a “Carthagian Peace”. It was
immeasurably harsh and humiliating. It was based on the principle: To the victor belong the spoils and allies are the victors. The treaty of Versailles was imposed on the people of Germany. It was a dictated peace. The Germans were not in a mood to accept the treaty, but it was only when they were threatened with the invasion of their country they surrendered and signed the treaty. It had absolutely no moral backing.

The peace settlement was made in a spirit of revenge. The peace makers ought to have remembered treatment of Germany was more likely to maintain peace in Europe than the punishment of the German people. The allies not only scored victory over Germany but also converted it as a Republic. The victors should have treated the Germans kindly and accorded the required strength and support to the Republic. As they did not do so, the Republican forces in Germany were weakened from the very beginning. If the bad treatment of France by Bismarck in 1870-71 led to the war of 1914, the treaty of Versailles of 1919 was partly responsible for the Second World War.

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

The peace makers also cold not realize the importance of the Italian contribution in the war. Thus Italy was very much disappointed at the peace settlement. Very big and tempting promises and assurances were given to Italy in 1915 and hence she deserted the Central Powers and joined the Allies. She had lost millions of soldiers and lost millions of dollars during the course of the war. After the end of the war Italy got very little as compared with what was secured by Great Britain, France and Japan. The Italian patriots were upset when they got no colonial possessions.

It has been advocated that the principle of national self-determination received due recognition in the peace settlement. More people were placed under governments of their own nationality than ever before in Europe. Poland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia were created on the basis of this principle. However, 3 million Germans were placed in Czechoslovakia and 1 million in Poland. It was done with the view that these new states needed them to be economically viable. These instances gave Hitler an excuse to begin territorial demands on these countries. Further, the attempt of France to get Rhine frontier and of Italy to get Dalmatia could not be justified on the grounds of nationality.

The authors of the peace settlement were condemned for their attitude toward Armenian Christians. These people had suffered terribly under the Turkish yoke and there were wholesale massacres from time to time. During the war, Britain declared that the Armenians would be liberated from the Turkish domination. However, when the final settlement was made with Turkey, the promise was not kept. The unfortunate Armenians were left at the mercy of the Turks and had to suffer immensely later on.
In conclusion we may state that this collection of peace treaties was not a conspicuous success. It had the unfortunate effect of dividing Europe into the states. Some wanted to revise the settlement and the others desired to preserve it. The real weakness of the Versailles system, however, lies not in the creation of small states to the east and south of the Germans but in the absence of any effective means of maintaining and defending their existence.

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

OTHER TREATIES

1. Treaty of Germaine (1919): This was concluded between the Allies and the Austria-Hungary. Hungary was cut off from Austria and the latter was made to recognize the independence of the former. Bohemia and Moravia were taken away from Austria and were formed the part of a new state by name Czechoslovakia. Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina were given to Serbia. Montenegro was later on added to it. Thus the new state of Yugoslavia was formed.
2. Treaty of Trianon (1920): This treaty was concluded between the Allies and Hungary. Slovak provinces were given to Czechoslovakia, Transylvania to Rumania and Croatia was given to Yugoslavia.
3. Treaty of Neuilly (1919): This treaty was concluded between the Allies and Bulgaria. Bulgaria gave up most of those territories which she had got during the Balkan wars of 1912-13 and the First World War. Bulgaria gave up Macedonia to Yugoslavia.
4. Treaty of Severes (1920): This treaty was signed between the Allies and Turkey. Armenia was made into a Christian Republic and she was put under an international guarantee. Syriya was given to France, and Mesopotomia, Palestine & Trans-Jordan were given to England under the mandate of the League of Nations. The straits of Dardanelles and Bosporus were internationalized.

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

THE GREAT DEPRESSION

The Great Depression was a period of worldwide economic depression that lasted from 1929 until approximately 1939. The starting point of the Great Depression is usually listed as October 29, 1929, commonly called Black Tuesday. This was the date when the stock market fell dramatically 13%. This was after two previous stock market crashes on Black Tuesday (October 24), and Black Monday (October 28). The Dow Jones Industrial Average would eventually bottom out by July, 1932 with a loss of approximately 89% of its value.
During the next 4 years, more than 9,000 American banks closed down and millions of people lost their life’s savings. The manufacturers and farmers could not get any money to invest and as people had little money to buy, the goods could not be sold. This led to the closing of thousands of factories and throwing of workers out of employment. The purchasing power of the people was thus reduced which led to the closing down of more factories and to unemployment. Further, a severe drought across America meant that agricultural jobs were reduced.

However, the actual causes of the Great Depression are much more complicated than just the stock market crash. In fact, historians and economists do not always agree about the exact causes of the depression. It was the worst economic crisis faced by capitalism in general and all the capitalist economies in particular. The Depression began to spread to all the capitalist countries of Europe in 1931. After the First World War, the economies of the countries of Europe, excluding Russia, had become closely connected with and even dependent on the economy of USA, particularly on the American banks. The consequences of the Depression in Europe were similar to those in the USA and in some cases even worse. The economies of the colonies of the European countries were also affected.

Further, the roots of the Depression lay in a fundamental imbalance in the economic structure, aggravated by the peace settlement following World War-I. Seeming prosperity in the USA during the 1920s concealed the dangers, but agriculture and other important actors were depressed, as was much of Europe’s economy. What the Wall Street crash did was to expose all these weaknesses of the US as well as other capitalist’s economies. Other Causes included:

a. Unequal income distribution, which limited the consumer goods market and made investment and luxury spending erratic.
b. Fraudulent business such as boarding, black-marketing;
c. Defective banking structure (which contained too many small independent units).
d. The new creditor position of the USA and the problems related to it.
e. The poor state economic intelligence.

It may appear surprising that the crisis was caused by overproduction. When production increases but the purchasing power of the workers remains low, the goods cannot be sold unless their prices are reduced. However, the prices cannot be reduced because this would affect the profits. So the goods remain unsold and the factories are closed to stop further production. With the closure of factories people are thrown out of employment which makes the situation worse as the goods which have been produced cannot be sold. Such crises occurred often in almost every country after the spread of the Industrial Revolution. The only country which was not affected by the depression was the Soviet Union.

Impacts of Depression

Economic Impact

A. Effects on USA
   a. Several factories, mills and shipyards were closed down.
   b. Unsalable expensive cars piled up;
c. Farmers went bankrupt and their lands went wild.

B. Effects on European Countries
   a. American investment in Germany ceased in 1929 and next year American loans were called in.
   b. The wicked and absurd system based on reparations now had its natural results; bank after bank broke down in almost all the countries.
   c. London had been the financial centre of World. But with the breakdown of the pound and the abandonment of the gold standards, international trade was now in chaos.

Social Impact

1. Mass unemployment which reached tragic proportions. US-14 million (25% of labour force); UK-3 million (same percentage as in US); Germany- 40% trade unions.
2. Drastic decline in living standards; wholesale misery and privatization in almost all countries; leading to frustration and tensions.

Political Impact

1. USA- Democrats (Liberal) in place of Republicans (Conservative) came to power.
2. Spain-Republic instead of Monarchy.
3. UK-Conservatives in place of Liberals.
4. Japan-militarists and fascists in place of liberal politicians.
5. Germany- Nazis in place of social democrats.
6. Countries in Eastern and Central Europe and in South America-dictators instead of parliamentary governments.

Governmental Response

Since 1930s the economists began to feel that governments should have intervened with appropriate weapons of social reconstruction to remedy the situation. This Depression had such severe consequence that even reluctant governments could not stand aside. The Price of non-intervention was social revolution and intervention was or could be a remedy to counter-revolution. Intervention, therefore took place pragmatically, and its forms were at first Orthodox in that they consisted of old well trained methods. As the depression continued, protection tended to be used increasingly aggressively to bargain with other countries and penetrate foreign markets. The immediate effect of all these measures was to reduce the volume of international trade and create conditions of trade war.

The depression itself had prepared the ground for recovery through the normal cyclical process and most years of the 1930s were years of recovery. Recovery came slowly and in many countries was far from complete by World War-II. All governments realized that something had to be done to relieve what amounted to a national Catastrophe. The Soviet Union’s example had begun to turn thoughts towards planning. But the real innovation came when what was done in some cases by accident was pursued systematically. Two experiments had to character of mode is to be
emulated or to be avoided. First- National Socialist Policy, adopted in Germany by Adolf Hitler Second- the New Deal proposed and practiced by Roosevelt in U.S.A.

Franklin Roosevelt and His New Deal

Herbert Hoover was president at the beginning of the Great Depression. He tried to institute reforms to help stimulate the economy but they had little to no effect. By 1933, unemployment in the United States was at a staggering 25%. Franklin Roosevelt became president in March 1933 and immediately instituted the First New Deal. This was a comprehensive group of short-term recovery programs. It not only included economic aid and work assistance programs but also the end of the gold standard and of prohibition. This was then followed by the Second New Deal programs which included more long term assistance such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Social Security System, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), Fannie Mae, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and the Security and Exchange Commission (SEC).

However, there is still question today about the effectiveness of many of these programs as a recession occurred in 1937-38. During these years, unemployment rose again. Some blame the New Deal programs as being hostile towards businesses. Others state that the New Deal, while not ending the Great Depression, at least helped the economy by increasing regulation and preventing further decay. In 1940, unemployment was still at 14%. However, with America's entry into World War II and subsequent mobilization, unemployment rates dropped to 2% by 1943. While some argue that the war itself did not end the Great Depression, others point to the increase in government spending and increased job opportunities as reasons why it was a large part of the national economic recovery.

FAILURE OF THE DISARMAMENT POLICY

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

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

Unfortunately, when hostility was growing between the two camps there was no effective international organization which could bring the leaders of the two camps on a common platform and bring about reconciliation between them. The League of Nations was practically dead. It had ceased to exist as an effective political force after her failure on the question of Manchuria and Abyssinia. Both big and small states lost their confidence in that international organization and the only alternative left was that the parties should have a trial of strength by an armed conflict. It was unfortunate that the very people who could have worked for the success of the League were not honest and made sincere in their actions. They all tried to use the League to serve their personal ends.

PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE NATIONAL MINORITIES

During the course of the first World War and when it was about to be terminated the American President Woodrow Wilson announced his famous Fourteen Points of which the principle of national self determination was the most prominent one. Its application was conditioned by such factors as economic necessity, military defence, religious and political traditions and punishing of the defeated nations. In some areas of Central Europe, the principle could not be applied as the national minorities were intermixed in such a way that the drawing of clear-cut frontiers was not possible.

The result was that the members of one nationality were included in the boundaries of the other states in which they were in minority. It is these minority groups which became the hot-beds of discontents and dissent. Germany under Hitler raised the cry that the Germans were being mercilessly persecuted and she had every right to liberate them. That served as a convenient pretext to Hitler for the annexation of Austria, the Sudetenland and subsequently Poland which led to the Second World War.

MANCHURIAN CRISIS

The desire and determination of Japan to have firm control over Manchuria is said to be the main motive for Japan to wage innumerable wars and also its participation in the World War II. The whole episode of occupation of Manchuria, the creation of Manchukuo and the withdrawal of Japan from the League is known as the Manchurian Crisis. Manchuria held importance to Japan due to its economic and strategic factors. Manchuria was the granary in Asia and its richness in minerals and fertile soils attracted Japan. Strategically, due to its topographical location and also due to its two ice-free ports of Arthur and Dairen, it was important to Japan. Following incidences created this crisis:

- Treaty of Shimonoseki (1895): After the Sino-Japanese war, China through this treaty ceded Liotung Peninsula or Southern Manchuria to Japan. But the Triple Intervention (Russia, Germany and France) nullified this part of the treaty.
- Treaty of Portsmouth (1905): Russia, after her defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, by this treaty, transferred her lease of Liotung Peninsula along with his mining and railway privileges there to Japan. But the USA objected to this, and Japan was compelled to accept Open Door policy in the case of Manchuria.
- **21-Demands** (1916): Japan served these demands on China, one of which was meant to **eliminate all competition** to Japan in Manchuria. She was, however, obliged to accept the Open Door Policy in the case of China, including Manchuria, at the Washington Conference of 1921-22.

After some minor incidents in Manchuria in **1931**, Japan used them as an excuse to occupy the whole region. She created the **new state of Manchukuo** in 1932. When the League of Nations, on the appeal of China, objected to the Japanese sections, she withdrew from the League. This occupation revealed the **weakness of League**. In the home front, it relegated political parties in Japan to the background and **strengthened the hold of the militarists**. These developments caused alarm among the Western Powers that brought them together against Japan. It strengthened Japanese due to **systematic exploitation** of Manchuria by Japan.

**AMERICAN ISOLATIONISM IN THE 1930s**

During the 1930s, the combination of the Great Depression and the memory of tragic losses in World War-I contributed to pushing **American public opinion** and policy toward isolationism. Isolationists advocated **non-involvement in European and Asian conflicts** and non-entanglement in international politics. Although the United States took measures to avoid political and military conflicts across the oceans, it continued to **expand economically** and protect its interests in Latin America. George Washington had advocated non-involvement in European wars and politics. For much of the 19th century, the expanse of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans had made it possible for the United States to enjoy a kind of "free security" and remain largely detached from **Old World conflicts**.

During **World War-I**, however, President Woodrow Wilson made a case for U.S. intervention in the conflict and a U.S. interest in maintaining a **peaceful world order**. Nevertheless, the American experience in that war served to bolster the arguments of isolationists; they argued that **marginal U.S. interests** in that conflict did not justify the number of U.S. casualties; claiming that American **bankers and arms manufacturers** had pushed for U.S. involvement for their **own private profit**. The 1934 publication of the book *Merchants of Death*, followed by the 1935 tract *War Is a Racket* served to increase popular suspicions of wartime profiteering and influence public opinion in the direction of neutrality.

The worldwide **economic depression** and the need for increased attention to domestic problems served to bolster the idea that the United States should isolate itself from troubling events in Europe. During the interwar period, the U.S. Government repeatedly chose **non-entanglement** over participation or intervention as the appropriate response to international questions. Immediately following the First World War, Congress rejected U.S. **membership in the League of Nations** out of concern that it would draw the United States into European conflicts. During the 1930s, the League **proved ineffectual** in the face of growing militarism, partly due to the U.S. decision not to participate.

The **Japanese invasion of Manchuria** and subsequent push to gain control over larger expanses of **Northeast China** in 1931 led President Herbert Hoover to establish the **Stimson Doctrine**, which stated that the United States would not
recognize the territory gained by aggression and in violation of international agreements. With the Stimson Doctrine, the United States expressed concern over the aggressive action without committing itself to any direct involvement or intervention. Other conflicts, including the Italian invasion of Ethiopia and the Spanish Civil War, also resulted in virtually no official commitment or action from the US Government.

Upon taking office, President Franklin Roosevelt tended to see a necessity for the United States to participate more actively in international affairs, but his ability was limited by the strength of isolationist sentiment in the U.S. Congress. In 1933, President Roosevelt proposed a Congressional measure that would have granted him the right to consult with other nations to place pressure on aggressors in international conflicts. The bill ran into strong opposition from the leading isolationists in Congress. As tensions rose in Europe over Nazi Germany's aggressive maneuvers, Congress pushed through a series of Neutrality Acts, which served to prevent American ships and citizens from becoming entangled in outside conflicts.

The 2nd Sino-Japanese War in 1937, outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 did not suddenly diffuse popular desire to avoid international entanglements. Instead, public opinion shifted from favoring complete neutrality to supporting limited U.S. aid to Allies short of actual intervention in the war. The surprise Japanese attack on the U.S. Navy at Pearl Harbor in December 1941 served to convince the majority of Americans that the United States should enter the war on the side of the Allies.

CAUSES OF SECOND WORLD WAR

Second World War was the global conflict of 1939-1945, which was in the greatest and most destructive war in the history of mankind. It included gigantic struggles not only in Europe, but also in Asia, Africa, and Island of the Pacific Ocean. It strained the economic capabilities of many nations and left many countries on the verge of collapse. It was an unnecessary war, because chances have been offered to prevent it, but the governments have refused to take them. Their reasons had differed in details, but basically the cause had been unwillingness to face the truth-a belief that peace could be secured by ignoring disagreeable facts.

Origins of the War (details have been already discussed)

2. Demands of Imperialism- the needs of the newly risen imperialist powers, viz., Germany, Japan and Italy, but jealous attitude of the old imperialist powers (France and England) in protecting their colonies, and hence the conflict of their interests.
3. Rise of dictatorships in Germany Italy and Japan, and their aggressive activities.
4. Failure of the League of Nations to maintain international peace- Repudiation of the League by Japan (invasion and occupation of Manchuria) and its withdrawal from it; Germany’s violation of the League and its withdrawal; Italy’s disregard of the League and its invasion of Libya; etc.
5. Isolationist Policy of the USA- after the World War I the USA did not join the League, and reviving their old policy of isolationism, the Americans believed that they could simply contract out of world history.
6. Problem of minorities & refugees which arose due to the irrational adjustments made in the territorial limits of different nations after the World War-I.
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COURSE OF WW-II

The **German invasion of Poland was the starting point** of the war. When the Germans were smashing the Polish resistance, Russians also invaded Poland from the east. The result was that Poland was conquered and divided between Russia and Germany. In 1939 **Russia attacked Finland** and demanded a part of Finnish territory. Russia had no faith in Germany. It was feared that Germany might conquer Finland and thereby **endanger the safety of Russia**. In 1940, Germany occupied Denmark, Norway, Belgium and Holland. **France was attacked by Germany** from the side of Belgium. France could not stand the might of Germany and surrendered in 1940.

**Italy** joined the war after the collapse of France. After the entry of Italy into the war, the conflict started between **Italy and Great Britain** in North Africa. Mussolini with the help of the Germans captured **Greece, Create and Yugoslavia**. At this time Britain was left all alone in Europe. Under the dynamic leadership of Churchill, Great Britain was able to pull her up.

Having conquered almost the entire Europe, except Britain, Germany **attacked the Soviet Union** in June 1941, despite the Non-Aggression Pact. Hitler had **grossly underestimated** the strength of the Soviet Union. In the first phase of the war with the Soviet Union, Germany achieved significant victories. However, soon the German onslaught was halted. The Soviet Union had built up her **industrial and military strength**. With the German invasion of the Soviet Union, a new vast theatre of war had been opened. An important development that followed was the emergence of the **British-Soviet-American unity** to fight against aggression. It was as a result of this unity that Germany, Italy and Japan were ultimately defeated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germany invaded Poland followed by invasion by Soviet Union &amp; Poland’s division</th>
<th>September 1939</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet troops invade Finland in November</td>
<td>Germany occupation of Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium &amp; France in April-June 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Britain- Royal Air Force of Britain played a heroic role in its defence against air raids; successfully resisted Germans under Winston Churchill.</td>
<td>Italy declares war on Britain and France in Africa in June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed; Helped by Germany</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany invades Greece and Yugoslavia, attacks the Soviet Union in April-June 1941</td>
<td>Japan attacks Pearl Harbour and the Malaya, Philippines in December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Entry of the USA into the war on the side of the Allies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Coral Sea, Midway Island and Guadalcanal in May-November 1942; Eventual US victory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1942 marked the turn of the tide for the Allies, Defeat of the Germans by the Americans in the Battle of Midway; Defeat of the Germans by the Russians and their retreat; Defeat of the Germans and the Italians by the Allies in Africa and their expulsion from Africa; Beginning of the offensive by the Allies, capture of Sicily and then the whole of Italy by the Allies and the surrender of Italy, gradual advance of the Russians against the Germans on the eastern front; Massive build up of the allied forces on the Western front and their success in pushing the Germans back; Allied reoccupation of the Philippines, and other South East Asian countries; Unconditional surrender of all German forces to Britain, Russia, and the United States; Dropping of the Two Atomic Bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the Americans and the Society invasion of Manchuria and the final surrender of the Japanese.

NATURE OF THE WARS

The nature of modern warfare was the result of two simultaneous processes:
1. One was the emergence of modern politics which implied mobilization of masses around some specific idea, goal or policy. Its manifestation was in the idea of 'nation in arm' or conscription in the French Revolution. This 'democratization of war' transformed wars into mass-wars or people's war in which civilians and civil-life itself became the proper and sometimes the main target of military strategy.
2. The other was the growth of industrial economy which provided the resources, the organizational techniques and methods of motivation needed to fight mass-wars thus remodeling them as total wars, i.e., towards total involvement of entire industrial societies in war.

WW-I: Trench Warfare and War of Attrition

World War-I deadlocked into positional trench warfare along the Western Front - a massive seize of 600 miles from Switzerland to the North Sea. This continuous front marked the end of local, small, isolated and restricted warfare. Millions of men faced each other across the sand-bagged, parapets of trenches, under which they lived like, and with rats and, lice. There was total mobilisation of human and industrial resources. Warfare became a clash of national resources of industrial might and supply capacity, a war of attrition. It required complete subordination of the whole life of people and the economy to the cause of war. The war machine consumed people en masse. The battle of Verdun in 1916 caused one million casualties. The war, though a European conflict, forced the European powers to draw supplies from all over the globe to maintain such huge consumption of resources.

WW-II: Unparalleled Mass Mobilisation

The character of industrial mobilisation changed markedly during the World War-II. Instead of the mass production of a few key items, as in the First World War, the second global conflict drew on virtually every phase of industry. The new engines of war, tanks, aircraft, radar etc. were highly complex and delicate. It required an elaborate system of mass production of several million items according to schedules and priorities which went on shifting with new technical development and the changing emphasis of war strategy. This could be planned only by states at a high level of economic development. In 1943-44, 1/3rd of world production was for war purposes.
A high level of armed mobilisation, which hovered around 20% for most powers during the Second World War, produced a kind of social revolution in the employment of women, temporarily in the World War I and permanently in the World War II. Only Germany avoided this integration of women in the labour market for ideological reasons, as the Nazi State did not consider women worthy of employment outside their houses.

Another important aspect of war was that it was waged as a zero-sum game, i.e., as a war which could only be totally won or totally lost. Unlike the earlier wars which were fought for specific and limited objectives, world wars were waged for unconditional surrender. In the Second World War, this found expression in the phrase ‘unconditional surrender’. This was another valid reason why total war necessitated the use of all productive resources (of national as well as other allied economics). The British economy, for instance, despite the concentration of resources on arms production, was unable to cover its own demands for armaments and depended heavily on American deliveries which prided itself as being the ‘arsenal of democracy’.

Use of Nuclear Weapons & Latest Warfare

The World War-II witnessed the use of modern warfare technologies including latest machine guns, tanks, sub-marines, aircrafts and more. Germany developed V1 and V2 missiles which became the precursors of modern ballistic missiles. US started the Manhattan Project to make atom bomb a practical reality. A plutonium weapon– Trinity was tested in July 1945. On 6 August 1945, a US bomber named Enola Gay flew over Hiroshima. The untested U-235 bomb nicknamed Little Boy was air-burst 1900 feet above the city to maximize destruction. It released energy equaling 15000 tons of chemical explosive T.N.T. from less than 130 pounds of Uranium. The effects were devastating– about 2/3rd of city was completely, destroyed and 140000 persons died by the end of the year. It was more miserable for those who survived. A second weapon, suppcicate of plutonium-239 implosion assembly which was tested as Trinity, and nicknamed Fatman was dropped on Nagasaki on 9th August. The results were no different. Hence the total war had already perfected means of total annihilation as well as ‘safest’ possible efficient means of delivering them anywhere on the globe.

There were two vital aspects of the world wars. One, it is possible to interpret the two world wars as one long war that started around 1914, had a long period of truce in between and culminated in 1945 with decisive winners and loser. Some of the unresolved aspects of the first war (or first phase of the war) were resolved, decisively and conclusively in the second. Two, the war may have been fought primarily on European territory and had European countries as major participants (expect, of course, Japan and USA), but it was truly a global war because the major forces fighting the war were aspiring for a domination of the total world, not just Europe.

There was the triple ideological division of Europe into forces of liberal democracy (represented by Britain and France in the main), fascism (represented mainly by Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini) and the socialist world (represented by the USSR). It was precisely these three forces which
competed with each other for a total domination of the earth. In the decisive phase of the war the forces of liberal democracy and socialism got together to defeat and eliminate the third force, fascism. This was the essence of the World War. The post-war period witnessed fierce competition between two remaining forces (liberal democracy and socialist) although without a war.

RESULTS/ IMPACT/ IMPORTANCE OF TOTAL WAR: WORLD WAR-II

The war brought about unprecedented misery and destruction for mankind. Never before, had so many people died in a single event. The war also led to mass destruction, genocide and apartheid like never before.

1. Mass Destruction: The total war involved mass destruction of physical resources, productive capacities and human resources of both the victors and vanquished. In the World War-I, the total number of people killed and dying for other war-related reasons was over 8 million. The estimated deaths in the World War II were between 3-5 times the estimated figures for the World War-I. About 20% of total population of the USSR, Poland and Yugoslavia was wiped out in the second war. The loss of productive capacities was also enormous. About 20% per-war capital assets of USSR, 13% of Germany and 3% in Britain were destroyed during the World War II. However, US economy grew at the rate of 10% per annum in the Second World War aided by its remoteness from the war theatre and growing demand of arsenals from the Allies. Infrastructure was also heavily damaged in Europe and the Far East.

2. Genocide: The total war saw the first modern attempts to eliminate an entire population. In the First World War, Turkey killed an uncounted number of Armenians (an estimated 1.5 million). The term Genocide was invented to describe such attempts, the systematic extermination of national, political, ethnic or religious groups by organized groups, usually government. The night of 9 November 1938, ‘the night of broken glass’ inaugurated the Holocaust or the mass murder of about 5 million European Jews by the Nazis.

3. Apatride: The total war was not only an age of massacre; it was also an age of mass flight. The aftermath of World War-I saw a large number of homeless and stateless people, including the 13 million Greeks were repatriated to Greece mainly from Turkey. In all, the period 1914-22 created roughly 4-5 million refugees. The League of Nations set up a Refugee organization to help these people. A new document, a certificate delivered by national authorities on the recommendations of League of Nations High Commissioners for Refugees in 1920s, the so-called ‘Nansen passport’ was accepted as a travel document by over 50 countries. In the World War II, the uprooted people in Europe was 40 million, excluding non-German, forced labourers in Germany and Germans who fled before the advancing Soviet armies. Other major by product of war, partition of India and the Korean War produced 15 million and 5 million displaced persons. The Establishment of Israel – another war-effect uprooted about 1.3 million Palestinians.
Immediate Impact of WW-II

1. **Loss of Men and Material:** It was the most destructive in the history of mankind; the war greatly weakened various countries and brought chaos and anarchy everywhere.

2. **Impact on the Axis Powers:**
   a. **Germany:** end of Nazism and the division of Germany into East Germany (under the control of the Soviet Union) and West Germany (under the control of USA, France and Great Britain).
   b. **Italy:** end of Fascism and establishment of **limited monarchy** under the strict supervision of the American offices.
   c. All of them suffered **heavy materials and human loss**, and their economies were thoroughly shattered; all their conquests and colonies were taken away.

3. **Impact on the Allies Powers:** It was not only Axis powers but also some of the Allies Powers (England and France) that had to suffer a lot due to the war; **Reduction of the position of England** to a second-rate power; Loss of former power and prestige by France as well; Besides, France witnessed too much of political instability after the war.

Long-Term Impact of WW-II

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

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

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

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

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

6. The **United Nations Organization** emerged as the successor of the League of Nations to try and to maintain peace in the world. On the whole it was more successful in its achievements than its unfortunate predecessor.
The Marshall Plan (officially the European Recovery Program, ERP) was the American program to aid Europe, in which the United States gave economic support to help rebuild European economies after the end of World War II in order to prevent the spread of Soviet Communism. The plan was in operation for 4 years beginning in April 1948. The goals of the United States were to rebuild a war-devastated region, remove trade barriers, modernize industry, and make Europe prosperous again. Much of this aid was designed to restore infrastructure and help refugees.

The reconstruction plan offered the same aid to the Soviet Union and its allies, but they did not accept it, as to do so would be to allow a degree of US control over the Communist economies. During the four years that the plan was operational, US $15 billion in economic and technical assistance was given to help the recovery of the European countries that had joined in the Organization for European Economic Co-operation. The Marshall Plan was replaced by the Mutual Security Plan at the end of 1951. Much more important were efforts to modernize European industrial and business practices using high-efficiency American models, reducing artificial trade barriers, and instilling a sense of hope and self-reliance.

By 1952, as the funding ended, the economy of every participant state had surpassed pre-war levels. The Marshall Plan was one of the first elements of European integration, as it erased trade barriers and set up institutions to coordinate the economy on a continental level— that is, it stimulated the total political reconstruction of Western Europe. The only major powers whose infrastructure had not been significantly harmed in World War II were the United States and Canada. They were much more prosperous than before the war but exports were a small factor in their economy. Much of the Marshall Plan aid would be used by the Europeans to buy manufactured goods and raw materials from the United States and Canada.

The United Nations also launched a series of humanitarian and relief efforts almost wholly funded by the United States. These efforts had important effects, but they lacked any central organization and planning, and failed to meet many of Europe's more fundamental needs.

Effects and legacy

The political effects of the Marshall Plan may have been just as important as the economic ones. Marshall Plan aid allowed the nations of Western Europe to relax austerity measures and rationing, reducing discontent and bringing political stability. The communist influence on Western Europe was greatly reduced, and throughout the region communist parties faded in popularity in the years after the Marshall Plan. The trade relations fostered by the Marshall Plan helped forge the North Atlantic alliance that would persist throughout the Cold War. At the same time, the non-participation of the states of Eastern Europe was one of the first clear signs that the continent was now divided.

The Marshall Plan also played an important role in European integration. Both the Americans and many of the European leaders felt that European integration was necessary to secure the peace and prosperity of Europe, and thus used Marshall
Plan guidelines to foster integration. In some ways this effort failed, as the OEEC never grew to be more than an agent of economic cooperation. Rather it was the separate European Coal and Steel Community, which notably excluded Britain that would eventually grow into the European Union. However, the OEEC served as both a testing and training ground for the structures that would later be used by the European Economic Community. The Marshall Plan, linked into the Bretton Woods system, also mandated free trade throughout the region.

After the fall of communism several proposed a "Marshall Plan for Eastern Europe" that would help revive that region. Others have proposed a Marshall Plan for Africa to help that continent. "Marshall Plan" has become a metaphor for any very large scale government program that is designed to solve a specific social problem. It is usually used when calling for federal spending to correct a perceived failure of the private sector.

ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION IN POST-WAR EUROPE

The War had damaged the economies of nearly all the European countries. The immediate task therefore war to recover the losses incurred and somehow restore the pre-war levels of economic development. The next step was to attain new level of economic prosperity. This process of economic recovery and development followed different trajectories in the liberal democratic and the socialist world.

Economy in Capitalist Europe: Recovery and Boom

The first phase of economic recovery, from 1945 to 1947, was effected through bilaterally negotiated US loans and grants and the food aid disbursed through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA). These sufficed to avert the general collapse of the economy that industrial dislocation and poor harvest threatened; they were adequate even to raise industrial output to prewar levels. Longer-term American objectives however required first, a monetary and trading system permitting the unrestricted movement of capital and commodities, and second, a bloc of politico-military partners whose defence did not have to be permanently subsidised. But, neither of the American aims could be pursued without further economic expansion.

During the next phase of recovery, 1948-1951, European countries willing to participate in the US-sponsored recovery programme received 13 billion dollars. This was supplemented by a 1 billion dollar loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). The largest beneficiaries of this programme were Britain, France, Italy, and West Germany. It established an international body of recipient nations, the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), to which each nation submitted a national plan every 4 years. These aid-receiving nations were required, under the "counterpart" clause, to be spent in ways approved by the US. They had to agree to use the aid to finance food imports only from the US whether or not cheaper alternative sources were available.

Between 1947 and 1951, the West European economies saw the restoration of financial discipline. The following features were common: state
management of the economy, nationalisation of key sectors like energy, transport, and banking, and deflationary policies. It led on to a long economic boom that lasted until the mid-1970s. Although the deflationary policies created sane employment, they also led to the economic boom. As a result the period after the 1970s witnessed a near full employment. It yielded a "new capitalism" of near full employment, high productivity, high wages, and extensive social welfare. Ambitious social welfare programmes entailed a dramatic increase in government expenditure. Such expenditures sustained demand and fuelled investment: at the same time, they led to higher tax revenues. Industrial and agricultural activity expanded: exports rose, leading to reduction in the trade deficit with the USA: and accumulation mounted.

However, the results were uneven across West Europe. Less developed countries like Ireland, Spain, and Portugal were less affected by the quantitative and qualitative transformations achieved by advanced economies. Growth and the standard of living varied between countries, and so did income distribution patterns within them. Nonetheless, Europe made astonishing advances in productivity and standard of living. It induced the belief that a new form of managed capitalism had been established: that it would transcend the notorious cyclical tendencies and internal crises of capitalism, and that government intervention would ensure general social welfare.

However the long boom came to an end in 1973 with the first oil shock, when oil-producing countries unilaterally and dramatically raised the prices of oil. European economies suffered inflationary pressures, output decelerated, and unemployment rose. They immediately led to restrictive policies within the parameters of the existing system of economic management, and more gradually, to a change of economic perspective. New political programmes proposed to restrict social welfare to the minimum necessary. All these led to the privatization of nationalized industries, extensive deregulation, and the adoption of monetarist and supply side policies. In effect, in most of capitalist Europe, a new "free market" economic consensus emerged.

Economy in Socialist Europe

In the Soviet bloc, reconstruction was hindered by the relatively lower capacity of the leading power, the Soviet Union. External capital was in short supply, except on terms that were unacceptable to the Soviet system. Capital for the industrialization programme therefore had to be internally generated. In the newly sovietized countries, nationalization permitted rapid expansion in heavy industrial capacity. Radical agrarian programmes, of farm collectivization and nationalization on the Soviet model soon plunged the agricultural sector into turmoil and led to food shortages. East Europe was thus preoccupied with the problem of adjusting to a new system of production and stagnation in the very sectors whose boom was the basis of West European prosperity.

The plan-driven economies of the eastern bloc, with the exception of the USSR, began with a very low industrial base. Since investment priorities were largely determined by the state, national plans focused excessively on developing heavy industry. The resulting imbalance led to chronic shortages of consumer goods. The collectivization model in Poland in the 1940s and the early 1950s had failed. In Yugoslavia, industries were not state-owned but given over to Workers’ Councils to be
run for profit. Disparities in the domestic availability of resources also determined the extent of reliance on the USSR for material aid.

In the initial stages, trade and economic relations were confined to the region, that is, the eastern bloc. However, the shortage of capital and of agricultural product, especially wheat, led to a parallel dependence on western countries. Poland and Romania borrowed extensively from the West in the 1970s to finance their industrialization programmes; but servicing these debts demanded austerity measures and higher food prices to reduce subsidies on food. In Bulgaria and Hungary, the shortage of consumer goods and misallocation of investment led to reforms designed to decentralize planning and stimulate investment. These were however withdrawn in Bulgaria following the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

By the early 1970s, the USSR was compelled to import grain from the USA. Import of foodgrains and light industrial products from the hard currency areas (the West) without corresponding exports, resulted in a combined balance of payments deficit of 10 billion dollars by 1975. These were financed by borrowings from western banks. Imports were cut back and the deficit was eliminated; but, by 1982. East bloc debts stood at 81 billion dollars and its debt service ratio stood at 100 percent, that is, it was borrowing money solely in order to pay back debts. Soviet export earnings deteriorated with the collapse of world oil prices in the mid 1980s.

Further import restrictions were hindered by domestic compulsions; the trade deficit was therefore financed through the sale of gold. Of the east European economies, Poland was the largest debtor, with loans to the tune of 35 billion dollars. East European economies made rapid advances in heavy industry; but their deficiencies in the provision of consumer goods and in agrarian stagnation led to domestic crises by the mid-1980s. The final consequence was as in the West the repudiation of the statist paradigm and the replication of its free market model.
SOCIALISM

Socialism is a social and economic doctrine that has the following basic tenets:

- Public rather than private ownership or control of property and natural resources.
- Individuals do not live or work in isolation but live in cooperation with one another.
- Everything that people produce is in some sense a social product, and everyone who contributes to the production of a good is entitled to a share in it.

Under capitalism, the means of production such as factories and the things produced by factories were owned and controlled by a few people. The vast majority of the people who worked in the factories had no rights. Their conditions of work and living were miserable. They were frequently without jobs. The workers gradually began to organize themselves into trade unions to protect their common rights though for a long time there were laws against workers combining themselves into unions. The governments were also forced to pass laws against some of the worse features of capitalism. For example Laws to protect workers from unsafe conditions of work were passed in many countries. Some progress was also made in regulating hours of work. In England, a new political movement, Chartist movement started which aimed at winning political rights for workers. The greatest challenge to capitalism came from the ideas of socialism and the movements based on those ideas.

EVOLUTION OF SOCIALISM/ GROWTH OF SOCIALISM IN EUROPE

The idea grew that capitalism itself is evil and that it needs to be replaced by a different kind and economic system in which the means a production would be owned by the society as a whole and not by a few individuals. Many philosophers and reformers in the past had expressed their revulsion against inequalities in society and in favour of a system in which everyone would be equal. The French Revolution in 1789 with its promise of equality had given a new impetus to these ideas. But the French Revolution, while it put an end to the autocratic rule of the French king, it did not did not usher in an era of equality in economic, social and political life.

It created serious discontent among the people leading to an attempt to overthrow the existing government in France with a view to building a society based on socialist ideas. This attempt, known as Babeuf Conspiracy, is an important event in the history of socialism. The Conspiracy was the work of Babeuf who had participated in the French Revolution. He organized a secret society called the Society of the Equals. He believed that it was necessary to make another revolution which would do away with the terrible contrasts between rich and poor, masters and servants; and the time has come to set up the republic of equals. The society planned an uprising but it had failed. However, his ideas exercised an important influence on the growth of socialist movement.

Blanqui was another prominent philosopher and revolutionary who helped in spreading ideas of socialism. He played a leading role in every uprising in Paris from the 1830s to 1860s. He believed that through a revolutionary conspiracy, power could
be captured to bring about socialism. Many groups and organisations were also formed to spread socialist ideas and organise workers. One of these was the League of the Just or Communist League which had members in many countries of Europe. Internationalism was one of its important features. It declared as its aim as the downfall of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the overthrow of the old society of middle class, based on class distinction, and the establishment of a new society without classes and without private property. It instructed Karl Marx and Frederick Engels to draft a manifesto.

Marxian Socialism

The Communist Manifesto first appeared in German in 1848. The influence of this document in the history of the socialist movement is without a rival. It was the work of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. They gave a new direction to socialist ideology and movement. Their philosophy is known as Marxism and it has influenced almost every field of knowledge. Their view of socialism is called scientific socialism. The Communist Manifesto stated that the aim of workers all over the world was the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. It pointed out that socialism was not merely desirable, but also inevitable. Marx analysed the working of capitalism in his famous work Das Kapital (Capital) and pointed out the characteristics that would lead to its destruction:

1. Workers produce more ‘value’ than they get in the form of wages, the difference being appropriated by the capitalists in the form of profits.
2. This constitutes the basis of conflict in capitalist society. Profits can be increased at the cost of workers’ wages and, therefore, the interests of workers and capitalists are irreconcilable.
3. Economic crises were inevitable under capitalism because of the discrepancy between the purchasing power of workers and total production. These crises would be resolved only if the private ownership of the means of production is abolished and the profit motive eliminated from the system of production. With this, production would be carried on for social good rather than for profits for a few
4. The exploiting classes would disappear and a classless society would emerge in which there would be no difference between what was good for the individual and for society as a whole.

Marx and Engels believed that this would be accomplished by the working class which was the most revolutionary class in capitalist society. They advocated that the emancipation of the working class would emancipate the whole human race from all traces of social injustice. Around the time the Communist Manifesto was published, revolutions broke out in almost every country in Europe. These revolts aimed at the overthrow of autocratic governments, establishment of democracy and also, in countries such as Italy and Germany, at national unification. One of the major forces in these revolutions was the workers who had been inspired by ideas of socialism. The Communist League participated in these revolutions in many countries. However, all these revolutions were suppressed.

The First International, 1864

One of the most important events in the history of the socialist movement was the formation in 1864 of the International Working Men’s Association, or the
First International. With its formation, socialism stepped on the stage of history as a world movement. The meeting at which it was formed took place in London and was attended by delegates from Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Poland and Switzerland. The emancipation of the working classes, it was declared, must be won by the working classes themselves. The central aim of the International was declared to be the total ‘abolition of all class rule’. The universal character of the struggle of the working class was emphasized. From the time of its formation, the International was considered by the governments of the time as a menace and attempts were made to exterminate it. It was persecuted and declared illegal in many countries.

During the short period of its existence, the International exercised a tremendous influence on workers’ movements in Europe and North America. It played a particularly important role in creating bonds of international solidarity by arranging aid from workers of many countries in support of the workers’ struggle in any particular country. Though its membership was not very large, it was feared by the rulers for the sense of workers’ solidarity that it had succeeded in creating.

The Paris Commune, 1871

One of the finest examples of workers’ solidarity was evidenced at the time of the war between Prussia and France in 1870. The war between France and Prussia led to an uprising by the workers of Paris and the seizure of power by them. This is one of the most important events in the history of socialism. Within a few weeks of the war the French army had been defeated and the French emperor Louis Bonaparte had been taken prisoner. A new government had come into being and had declared France a republic. This government was dominated by the propertied classes and had agreed to Bismarck’s terms for truce including the surrender of Paris, cession of Alsace-Lorraine and the payment of a huge war indemnity.

The workers of Paris regarded the surrender by the government as treacherous. They refused to surrender. The government withdrew from Paris and asked for German help to crush Paris. The workers of Paris elected a council which assumed the title of the Paris Commune. It was elected by universal adult franchise and represented the workers and the lower middle classes of Paris. The Paris Commune was the result of an upsurge in which the workers had played the dominant role, the result of the first workers’ revolution in history. The French government which had established its headquarters in Versailles attacked Paris with a huge army with the help of Germany and the Commune was finally exterminated.

The extermination of the Commune was followed by systematic attempts to destroy the International in almost every country of Europe. The International had organised support for the Commune and after its destruction was engaged in aiding the refugees from Paris. It appeared to gain strength in many countries of Europe inspite of the fact that the revolution in Paris had been suppressed. However, soon it collapsed as a result of internal differences. The International was not a homogeneous organisation. Due to differences on aims and methods, it was dissolved in 1876. In the meantime, however, the socialist parties in many countries of Europe had begun to grow.
The Second International, 1889

In the 1870s and 1880s in almost every country in Europe and in Japan and USA, socialist parties were formed. Some of them became quite strong having lakhs of members. They participated in national elections and in some countries came to have a fairly large representation in the parliament. Similarly, the strength and membership of the trade unions also increased and there were many strikes. German Socialist Party was the largest socialist party in Europe. In Britain, where the trade unions had a membership of a million, had been formed the Social Democratic Federation, the Socialist League and the Fabian Society. In France there were many socialist parties. Thus though the First International had been dissolved, the movement had become a mass movement.

To unite the socialist parties in various countries into an international organisation, a Congress was held in Paris in 1889 known as the Second International. It represented a new stage in the history of socialism. An important step taken at the Congress was to make the 1st May every year as a day of working class solidarity. It was decided to organise on that day a great international demonstration. The period thereafter saw a steady increase in the strength of the socialist parties and of trade unions. The socialist and workers’ movement had become a major force in almost every country of Europe.

The most significant achievements of the Second International were its campaign against militarism and war and in asserting the principle of the basic equality of all peoples and their right to freedom and national independence. The period from the last decade of the 19th century saw the growing militarization of every country in Europe. Europe was getting divided into groups of warring blocs, the struggle for colonies being the main cause of conflicts between them. They expressed the conviction that capitalism was the root cause of war. The second International also decided that the socialists should utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war, to rouse the masses and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist rule. The Second International also condemned colonialism and committed the socialist parties to oppose the robbery and subjugation of colonial peoples.

However, in spite of its many achievements and its growing strength, the Second International suffered from many weaknesses. Unlike the First International, it was a loose federation of socialist parties of many countries. While the socialist parties in many countries had become mass parties, basic differences had arisen among them. While some sections believed in the necessity of a revolution to overthrow capitalism, others began to believe that socialism could be achieved through gradual reforms. On the question of war, the Second International suffered a fatal blow. When the First World War broke out, most of the socialist parties extended their support to their respective governments. This had serious consequences for socialist movement. The Second International ceased to function and the socialist movement in every country was split during First World War.

However, though the socialist movement did not succeed in bringing about a socialist revolution in any country in the 19th century, it brought about widespread awareness of the problems created by capitalism and the inadequacies of democracy. It also emerged as a powerful political movement in a number of countries. It was to
play an increasingly important role in the coming years all over the world, making socialism, along with democracy and nationalism, the **dominating factor** in the history of the world in the 20th century.

**Third International or the Comintern**

Soon after the **Russian Revolution**, the Communist International, also known as the Third International or Comintern, was formed for **promoting revolutions on an international scale**. The left-wing sections in many socialist parties now formed themselves into **communist parties** and they affiliated themselves to the **Comintern**. Communist parties were also formed in other countries, often with the active involvement and support of the Comintern.

Thus the international communist movement arose under **one organization** which decided on policies to be followed by all communist parties. The **Soviet Union** was considered the leader of the world communist movement by the communist parties in various countries and the **Communist Party of Soviet Union** played a leading role in determining the policies of the Comintern. With the formation of the Comintern, the socialist movement was divided into **two sections** — **socialist and communist**. There were **many differences** between them on the methods of bringing about socialism and about the concept of socialism itself.

**POST-WORLD WAR-II SCENARIO IN EUROPE**

A. **France**: In the first government formed in France after the war, the **Communist Party** of France was represented. However, it quit the government in 1947 because of differences over **economic policies** and over the question of independence for the countries comprising **Indo-China**. The French government was trying to reestablish its rule over Indo-China which the Communist Party opposed.

B. **Italy**: In the Italian government, the **Communist Party and the Socialist Party** were an important force. In 1946, **monarchy was abolished** and Italy became a republic. In 1947 the Christian Democratic Party came to power and the Communist Party quit the government. However, even though the Communist and Socialist parties were out of the government in these two countries, they were together a **powerful force in the politics** of the two countries.

:: For many years, in both Italy and France, the socialist parties became the **ruling parties** either alone or in alliance with other parties The Communist parties, however, were almost throughout the period after 1948 kept out of the government. In recent years, while the **Italian Communist Party** — it is now called the Democratic Party of the Left — has remained a powerful force, the influence of the French Communist Party has declined.

C. **Britain**: **Rise of Labour Party**: In Britain, the elections were held in **1945**. The Conservative Party whose leader Winston Churchill had been the Prime Minister during the war lost and the **Labour Party came to power**. India won her independence during this period. During the Labour Party’s rule many significant changes took place in the economy of the country. Many important industries such as coal mines and railways were **nationalized**. Steps were taken to provide **social**
security to the people, and to build a welfare state in Britain. In 1951, the Conservative Party was returned to power and the Labour Party became the ruling party in 1964. Thus, neither of these parties remained in power for long and both of the parties were more or less equally matched.

D. Rest of Europe: Many countries in Europe had been liberated from German occupation by the Soviet armies. These countries were Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia. The Communist parties and other anti-fascist parties in these countries had played an important role in the struggle against German occupation of these countries. By the end of 1948, the governments of all these countries were dominated by the Communist parties. In Albania and Yugoslavia, the struggle against German occupation had, been led by the Communist parties of these countries. In these countries too Communist parties formed the governments.

:: The establishment of the Communist parties’ rule in these countries was a significant development after the Second World War. Up to the Second World War, the only country in Europe, and the world, ruled by a Communist party was the Soviet Union. Now a large number of European countries were ruled by Communist parties. In these countries, other political parties were either not allowed to exist or had only a nominal presence. The presence of Soviet troops in these countries ensured the continuance of the Communist parties’ monopoly of power. Sometimes, the Soviet troops were used to suppress movements which opposed the domination of Communist parties.

:: Within the Communist parties themselves, differences over policies were not allowed and the power within, the Communist parties became concentrated in a few hands. As in the Soviet Union, dissent even within the ruling parties was not tolerated and many veteran communists were shot or sentenced to long periods of imprisonment after fake trials. Sometimes these countries were branded as ‘satellites’ of the Soviet Union. The Communist party of Yugoslavia was the only ruling Communist Party which refused to be dominated by the Soviet Union. But at the same time, the government of Yugoslavia did not allow other political parties to function.

THE BIRTH OF SOCIALIST PLANNING

It is often thought that the idea of socialism derives from the work of Karl Marx. In fact, Marx wrote only a few pages about socialism, as either a moral or a practical blueprint for society. The true architect of a socialist order was Lenin, who first faced the practical difficulties of organizing an economic system without the driving incentives of profit seeking or the self-generating constraints of competition. Lenin began from the long-standing delusion that economic organization would become less complex once the profit drive and the market mechanism had been dispensed with as self-evident.

In fact, economic life pursued under these rules rapidly became so disorganized that within four years of the 1917 revolution, Soviet production had fallen to 14% of its pre-revolutionary level. By 1921 Lenin was forced to institute the New Economic Policy (NEP), a partial return to the market incentives of capitalism. This
brief mixture of socialism and capitalism came to an end in 1927 after Stalin instituted the process of **forced collectivization** that was to mobilize Russian resources for its leap into industrial power. The system that evolved under Stalin and his successors took the form of a **pyramid of command**. At its apex was Gosplan, the highest state planning agency, which established such general directives for the economy as the **target rate of growth** and the allocation of effort between military and civilian outputs, between heavy and light industry, and among various regions.

Gosplan transmitted the **general directives** to successive ministries of industrial and regional planning, whose technical advisers **broke down the overall national plan into directives** assigned to particular factories, industrial power centers, collective farms, and so on. These thousands of individual sub-plans were finally scrutinized by the factory managers and engineers who would eventually have to implement them. Thereafter, the blueprint for production rescinded the pyramid, together with the suggestions, emendations, and pleas of those who had seen it. Ultimately, a completed plan would be reached by negotiation, voted on by the **Supreme Soviet**, and passed into law. Thus, the final plan resembled an **immense order book**, specifying the nuts and bolts, steel girders, grain outputs, tractors, cotton, cardboard, and coal that, in their entirety, constituted the national output. But there was a vast and **widening gap** between theory and practice.

**SOCIALIST MODE OF PRODUCTION**

A socialist economy is a system of production where goods and services are **produced directly for use**, in contrast to a capitalist economic system, where goods and services are produced to generate profit and therefore indirectly for use. Goods and services would be **produced for their usefulness, or for their use-value**, eliminating the need for market-induced needs to ensure a sufficient amount of demand for products to be sold at a profit. Production in a socialist economy is therefore "planned" or "coordinated", and does not suffer from the business cycle inherent to capitalism. In most socialist theories, economic planning only applies to the **factors of production** and not to the **allocation of goods and services** produced for consumption, which would be distributed through a market.

Karl Marx stated that "lower-stage communism" would consist of compensation based on the **amount of labor** one contributes to the social product. The **ownership of the means of production varies** in different socialist theories. It can either be based on public ownership by a state apparatus; direct ownership by the users of the productive property through worker cooperative; or commonly owned by all of society with management and control delegated to those who operate/ use the means of production.

Management and control over the activities of enterprises is based on **self-management and self-governance**, with **equal power-relations** in the workplace to maximize occupational autonomy. A socialist form of organization would **eliminate controlling hierarchies** so that only a hierarchy based on technical knowledge in the workplace remains. Every member would have decision-making power in the firm and would be able to participate in establishing its overall policy objectives. The policies/ goals would be carried out by the technical specialists that form the
coordinating hierarchy of the firm, who would establish plans or directives for the work community to accomplish these goals.

However, the economies of the former Socialist states, excluding SFR Yugoslavia, were based on bureaucratic, top-down administration of economic directives and micromanagement of the worker in the workplace inspired by capitalist models of scientific management. As a result, socialists have argued that they were not socialist due to the lack of equal power-relations in the workplace, the presence of a new "elite", and because of the commodity production that took place in these economies. These economic and social systems have been classified as being either Bureaucratic collectivist, State capitalist or Deformed workers' states, the exact nature of the USSR et al remains unresolved within the socialist movement.

SOCIALISM ECONOMIES IN THEORY

There are 5 economic models within the rubric of socialist economics:

- **Public Enterprise Centrally Planned Economy** in which all property is owned by the State and all key economic decisions are made centrally by the State, e.g. the former Soviet Union.
- **Public Enterprise State-Managed Market Economy**, one form of market socialism which attempts to use the price mechanism to increase economic efficiency, while all decisive productive assets remain in the ownership of the state, e.g. socialist market economy in China after reform.
- **A mixed economy**, where public and private ownership are mixed, and where industrial planning is ultimately subordinate to market allocation, the model generally adopted by social democrats e.g. in twentieth century Sweden.
- **Public Enterprise Employee Managed Market Economies**, another form of market socialism in which publicly owned, employee-managed production units engage in free market exchange of goods and services with one another as well as with final consumers, e.g. mid twentieth century Yugoslavia.
- **Public Enterprise Participatory Planning**, an economy featuring social ownership of the means of production with allocation based on an integration of decentralized democratic planning, e.g. stateless communism, libertarian socialism.

There are 5 distinct classifications for socialism:

- **Classical/ Marxist conception**, where socialism is a stage of economic development in which wage labour, private property in the means of production and monetary relations have been made redundant through the development of the productive forces, so that capital accumulation has been superseded by economic planning. Economic planning in this definition means conscious allocation of economic inputs and the means of production by the associated producers to directly maximise use-values as opposed to exchange-values, in contrast to the "anarchy of production" of capitalism.

- **Walrasian/ Market Socialist** which defines socialism as public-ownership or cooperative-enterprises in a market economy, with prices for producer goods set through a trial-and-error method by a central planning board. In this view, socialism is defined in terms of de jure public property rights over major enterprises.
Leninist conception, which includes a form of political organisation based on control of the means of production and government by a single political party apparatus that claims to act in the interest of the working class, and an ideology hostile toward markets and political dissent, with coordination of economic activity through centralised economic planning (a "command economy").

Social Democratic concept, based on the capitalist mode of production, which defines socialism as a set of values rather than a specific type of social and economic organisation. It includes unconditional support for parliamentary democracy, gradual and reformist attempts to establish socialism, and support for socially progressive causes. Social democrats are not opposed to the market or private property; instead they try to ameliorate the effects of capitalism through a welfare state, which relies on the market as the fundamental coordinating entity in the economy and a degree of public ownership/public provision of public goods in an economy otherwise dominated by private enterprise.

East Asian model, or socialist market economy, based on a largely free-market, capital accumulation for profit and substantial private ownership along with state-ownership of strategic industries monopolized by a single political party.

The goal of socialist economics is to neutralize capital or, in the case of market socialism, to subject investment and capital to social planning, to coordinate the production of goods and services to directly satisfy demand as opposed to market-induced needs, and to eliminate the business cycle and crisis of overproduction that occur as a result of an economy based on capital accumulation and private property in the means of production.

Socialists generally aim to achieve greater equality in decision-making and economic affairs, grant workers greater control of the means of production and their workplace, and to eliminate exploitation by directing the surplus value to employees. Free access to the means of subsistence is a requisite for liberty, because it ensures that all work is voluntary and no class or individual has the power to coerce others into performing alienating work. Socialist economic theories base the Economic value of a good or service on its use value, rather than its cost of production or its exchange value.

PRACTICE OF SOCIALISM IN ECONOMIES

Economic planning is a mechanism for the allocation of economic inputs and decision-making based on direct allocation, in contrast to the market mechanism, which is based on indirect allocation. An economy based on economic planning appropriates its resources as needed, so that allocation comes in the form of internal transfers rather than market transactions involving the purchasing of assets by one government agency or firm by another. Decision-making is carried out by workers and consumers on the enterprise-level.

Economic planning is not synonymous with the concept of a command economy, which existed in the Soviet Union, and was based on a highly bureaucratic administration of the entire economy in accordance to a comprehensive plan formulated by a central planning agency, which specified output requirements for productive units and tried to micromanage the decisions and policies of enterprises. The
command economy is based on the organizational model of a capitalist firm, but applies it to the entire economy.

**Centrally planned economies**

A centrally planned economy combines public ownership of the means of production with centralised state planning. This model is usually associated with the Soviet-style command economy. The planning process was based around material balances — balancing economic inputs with planned output targets for the planning period. Aside from the USSR and Eastern bloc economies, this economic model was also utilized by the People's Republic of China, Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Republic of Cuba and North Korea.

However, there is dispute over the Soviet model. Critics claim that the Soviet economy was structured upon the accumulation of capital and the extraction of surplus value from the working class by the planning agency in order to reinvest this surplus into the economy indicating the Soviet Union (and other Soviet-style economies) were state capitalist economies. More fundamentally, these economies are still structured around the dynamic of capitalism: the accumulation of capital and production for profit (as opposed to being based on production for use — the defining criterion for socialism), and capitalism based on a process of state-directed accumulation.

Other critics point to the lack of socialist social relations in these economies — specifically the lack of self-management, a bureaucratic elite based on hierarchical and centralized powers of authority, and the lack of genuine worker control over the means of production — leading them to conclude that they were not socialist but either bureaucratic collectivism or state capitalism. Lenin's April Theses stated that the goal of the Bolshevik revolution was not the introduction of socialism, but was intended to bring production and the state under the control of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

China embraced a socialist planned economy after the Communist victory in its Civil War. Private property and private ownership of capital were abolished, and various forms of wealth made subject to state control or to workers' councils. The Chinese economy broadly adopted a similar system of production quotas and full employment by fiat to the Russian model. The Great Leap Forward saw a remarkably large-scale experiment with rapid collectivisation of agriculture, and other ambitious goals. Results were less than expected, (e.g., there were food shortages and mass starvation) and the program was abandoned after three years.

In recent decades China has opened its economy to foreign investment and to market-based trade, and has continued to experience strong economic growth. It has carefully managed the transition from a planned socialist economy to a market economy, officially referred to as the socialist commodity market economy. As a result, centralized economic planning has little relevance in China today. The current Chinese economic system is characterized by state ownership combined with a strong private sector that privately owned enterprises.
The state sector is concentrated in the 'commanding heights' of the economy with a growing private sector engaged primarily in commodity production and light industry. Centralized directive planning based on mandatory output requirements and production quotas have been superseded by the free-market mechanism for most of the economy and directive planning is utilized in some large state industries. A major difference from the old planned economy is the privatization of state institutions. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has pursued similar economic reforms, though less extensive, which have resulted in what is officially called a Socialist-oriented market economy, a mixed economy where the state plays a dominant role intended to be a transitional phase in establishment of a socialist economy.

Social Democratic Mixed Economies

Many of the industrialized, open countries of Western Europe experimented with one form of social democratic mixed economies or another during the 20th century. These include Britain (mixed economy and welfare state) from 1945 to 1979, France (state capitalism and indicative planning) from 1945 to 1982, Sweden (social democratic welfare state) and Norway (state capitalist mixed economy) to the present. They can be regarded as social democratic experiments, because they universally retained a wage-based economy and private ownership and control of the decisive means of production.

After gaining independence from Britain, India adopted a broadly socialist-inspired approach to economic growth. Like other countries with a democratic transition to a mixed economy, it did not abolish private property in capital. India proceeded by nationalizing various large privately run firms, creating state-owned enterprises and redistributing income through progressive taxation in a manner similar to social democratic Western European nations than to planned economies such as the USSR or China. Today India is often characterized as having a free-market economy that combines economic planning with the free-market. It did however adopt a very firm focus on national planning with a series of broad Five-Year Plans.

Nevertheless, these western European countries tried to restructure their economies away from a purely private capitalist model. Variations range from social democratic welfare states, such as in Sweden, to mixed economies where a major percentage of GDP comes from the state sector, such as in Norway, which ranks among the highest countries in quality of life and equality of opportunity for its citizens. Elements of these efforts persist throughout Europe, even if they have repealed some aspects of public control and ownership. They are typically characterized by:

- Nationalization of key industries, such as mining, oil, steel, energy and transportation. A common model is for a sector to be taken over by the state and then one or more publicly owned corporations set up for its day-to-day running. Advantages of nationalization include the ability of the state to direct investment in key industries, the distribution of state profits from nationalized industries for the overall national good, the ability to direct producers to social rather than market goals, greater control of the industries by and for the workers, and the benefits and burdens of publicly funded research and development are extended to the wider populace.
• **Redistribution of wealth**, through both tax and spending policies that aim to reduce economic inequalities. Social democracies typically employ various forms of **progressive taxation** regarding wage and business income, wealth, inheritance, capital gains and property. On the spending side, a set of social policies typically provides free access to public services such as education, health care and child care, while subsidized access to housing, food, pharmaceutical goods, water supply, waste management and electricity is also common.

• **Social security schemes** where workers contribute to a **mandatory public insurance** program. The insurance typically include monetary provisions for retirement pensions and survivor benefits, permanent and temporary disabilities, unemployment and parental leave. Unlike private insurance, governmental schemes are based on public statutes and not contracts, so that contributions and benefits may change in time and are based on solidarity among participants. Its funding is done on an ongoing basis, without direct relationship with future liabilities.

• **Minimum wages, employment protection** and trade union recognition rights for the benefit of workers. The objectives of these policies are to guarantee living wages and help produce full employment. There are a number of different models of trade union protection which evolved, but they all guarantee the right of workers to form unions, negotiate benefits and participate in strikes. Germany, for instance, appointed union representatives at high levels in all corporations and had much less industrial strife than the UK, whose laws encouraged strikes rather than negotiation.

**State capitalism**

Various state capitalist economies, which consist of large commercial **state enterprises** that operate according to the **laws of capitalism and pursue profits**, have evolved in countries that have been influenced by various elected socialist political parties and their economic reforms. While these policies and reforms did not change the fundamental aspect of capitalism, and non-socialist elements within these countries supported or often implemented many of these reforms themselves, the result has been a set of **economic institutions** that were at least partly influenced by socialist ideology.

**Worker Self Management**

Yugoslavia pursued a socialist economy based on autogestion or **worker-self management**. Rather than implementing a centrally planned economy, Yugoslavia developed a **market socialist system** where enterprises and firms were socially owned rather than publicly owned by the state. In these organizations, the management was elected directly by the workers in each firm.

**IMPACT OF SOCIALISM**

Despite all the differences, socialism became one of the **most widely held ideologies** within a few decades after its emergence. The spread of the influence of socialist ideas and movements after the First World War was in no small measure due
to the success of the Russian Revolution. The growing popularity of socialism and many achievements made by the Soviet Union led to a redefinition of democracy. Most people who did not believe in socialism also began to recognize that for democracy to be real, political rights without social and economic rights were not enough. Economic and social affairs could not be left to the capitalists.

The idea of the state playing an active role in regulating the economy and planning the economy to improve the conditions of the people was accepted. The popularity of socialism also helped to mitigate discriminations based on race, colour and sex. The spread of socialist ideas also helped nip promoting internationalism. The nations, at least in theory, began to accept the idea that their relations with other nations should go farther than merely promoting their narrow self-interests. The universality and internationalism which were fundamental principles of socialist ideology from the beginning were totally opposed to imperialism. The Russian Revolution served to hasten the end of imperialism.

The new Soviet state came to be looked upon as a friend of the people of the colonies struggling for national independence. Russia after the Revolution was the first country in Europe to openly support the cause of independence of all nations from foreign rule. Immediately after the Revolution, the Soviet government had annulled the unequal treaties which the Czar had imposed on China. The Russian Revolution also influenced the movements for independence in so far as the latter gradually broadened the objectives of independence to include social and economic equality through planned economic development. Writing about the Russian Revolution in his Autobiography, Jawaharlal Nehru said, "It made me think of politics much more in terms of social change".
DAWN OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE CHALLENGES FOR NATION BUILDING

India was born in very difficult circumstances. Perhaps no other country by then was born in a situation more difficult than that of India in 1947. Freedom came with the partition of the country. The first few years in the life of independent India were full of challenges. Some of the most pressing ones concerned national unity and territorial integrity of India. There were 3 major challenges of nation building were successfully negotiated in the first decade after 1947.

- Freedom came with Partition, which resulted in large scale violence and displacement and challenged the very idea of a secular India.
- The integration of the princely states into the Indian union needed urgent resolution.
- The internal boundaries of the country needed to be drawn afresh to meet the aspirations of the people who spoke different languages.

The first and the immediate challenge was to shape a nation that was united, yet accommodative of the diversity in our society. India was a land of continental size and diversity. Its people spoke different languages and followed different cultures and religions. At that time it was widely believed that a country full of such kinds of diversity could not remain together for long.

The second challenge was to establish democracy. Constitution granted fundamental rights and extended the right to vote to every citizen. India adopted representative democracy based on the parliamentary form of government. These features ensure that the political competition would take place in a democratic framework. A democratic constitution is necessary but not sufficient for establishing a democracy. The challenge was to develop democratic practices in accordance with the Constitution.

The third challenge was to ensure the development and well-being of the entire society and not only of some sections. Here again the Constitution clearly laid down the principle of equality and special protection to socially disadvantaged groups and religious and cultural communities. The Constitution also set out in the Directive Principles of State Policy the welfare goals that democratic politics must achieve. The real challenge now was to evolve effective policies for economic development and eradication of poverty. Issue of national unity and security became a primary challenge at the time of Independence. However India chose to shape itself into a nation, united by a shared history and common destiny.

Independent India embarked on its tasks with the benefit of an outstanding leadership, having tremendous dedication and idealism besides the presence of a strong nationwide party, the Congress. The leaders of independent India were persons of total personal integrity and had an austere lifestyle. The leaders shared a common vision of independent India. They were committed to the goals of
rapid social and economic change and democratization of the society and polity, and the values imparted by the national movement. These leaders differed with Nehru primarily on the question of socialism and class analysis of society.

PARTITION: DISPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION

According to the ‘two-nation theory’ advanced by the Muslim League, India consisted of not one but two ‘people’, Hindus and Muslims. That is why it demanded Pakistan, a separate country for the Muslims. The Congress opposed this theory and the demand for Pakistan. But several political developments in 1940s, the political competition between the Congress and the Muslim League and the British role led to the decision for the creation of Pakistan. It was decided to follow the principle of religious majorities. The idea might appear simple, but it presented all kinds of difficulties.

First of all, there was no single belt of Muslim majority areas in British India. There were two areas of concentration, one in the west and one in the east. There was no way these two parts could be joined. So it was decided that the new country, Pakistan, will comprise two territories, West and East Pakistan separated by a long expanse of Indian Territory. Secondly, not all Muslim majority areas wanted to be in Pakistan. Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, the undisputed leader of the North Western Frontier Province and known as ‘Frontier Gandhi’, was staunchly opposed to the two-nation theory. Eventually, his voice was simply ignored and the NWFP was made to merge with Pakistan.

The third problem was that two of the Muslim majority provinces of British India, Punjab and Bengal, had very large areas where the non-Muslims were in majority. Eventually it was decided that these two provinces would be bifurcated according to the religious majority at the district or even lower level. The fourth problem was the problem of ‘minorities’ on both sides of the border. Lakhs of Hindus and Sikhs in the areas that were now in Pakistan and an equally large number of Muslims on the Indian side of Punjab and Bengal found themselves trapped. They were to discover that they were undesirable aliens in their own home, in the land where they and their ancestors had lived for centuries. As soon as it became clear that the country was going to be partitioned, the minorities on both sides became easy targets of attack.

The year 1947 was the year of one of the largest, most abrupt, unplanned and tragic transfer of population that human history has known. There were killings and atrocities on both sides of the border. In the name of religion people of one community ruthlessly killed and maimed people of the other community. Cities like Lahore, Amritsar and Kolkata became divided into ‘communal zones’. Minorities on both sides of the border fled their home and often secured temporary shelter in ‘refugee camps’. They often found unhelpful local administration and police in what was till recently their own country.

The Partition was not merely a division of properties, liabilities and assets, or a political division of the country and the administrative apparatus. The employees of the government and the railways were also ‘divided’. Above all, it was a violent separation of communities who had hitherto lived together as neighbours. It is estimated
that the Partition forced about 80 lakh people to migrate across the new border. Approximately 5 to 10 lakh people were killed in Partition related violence. Even after large scale migration of Muslims to the newly created Pakistan, the Muslim population in India accounted for 12% of the total population in 1951.

There were competing political interests behind these conflicts. The Muslim League was formed to protect the interests of the Muslims in colonial India. It was in the forefront of the demand for a separate Muslim nation. Similarly, there were organisations, which were trying to organise the Hindus in order to turn India into a Hindu nation. But most leaders of the national movement believed that India must treat persons of all religions equally and that India should not be a country that gave superior status to adherents of one faith and inferior to those who practiced another religion. All citizens would be equal irrespective of their religious affiliation. Being religious or a believer would not be a test of citizenship. They cherished therefore the ideal of a secular nation. This ideal was enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

Mahatma Gandhi was saddened by the communal violence and disheartened that the principles of ahimsa (non-violence) and Satyagraha (active but non-violent resistance) that he had lived and worked for, had failed to bind the people in troubled times. Gandhiji went on to persuade the Hindus and Muslims to give up violence. Gandhiji’s death had an almost magical effect on the communal situation in the country. Partition-related anger and violence suddenly subsided. The Government of India cracked down on organizations that were spreading communal hatred. Communal politics began to lose its appeal.

The great danger was that the atmosphere and the mentality generated by Partition and the riots might persist and strengthen communal tendencies in Indian politics. But Indian nationalism was able to withstand the test. Communalism was thereby contained and weakened but not eliminated, for conditions were still favourable for its growth. For communalism to be eclipsed a consistent struggle against it would be needed for a prolonged period. Nehru carried on a massive campaign against communalism to instill a sense of security in the minorities, through public speeches, radio broadcasts, and speeches in parliament, private letters and epistles to chief ministers. He repeatedly declared: ‘No State can be civilized except a secular State’.

The government had to stretch itself to the maximum to give relief to and resettle and rehabilitate the nearly 6 million (60 lakh) refugees from Pakistan by 1951, the problem of the rehabilitation of the refugees from West Pakistan had been fully tackled. The task of rehabilitating and resettling refugees from East Bengal was made more difficult by the fact that the exodus of Hindus from East Bengal continued for years. While nearly all the Hindus and Sikhs from West Pakistan had migrated in one go in 1947, a large number of Hindus in East Bengal had stayed on there in the initial years of 1947 and 1948. But as communal riots broke out periodically in East Bengal, there was a steady stream of refugees from there year after year till 1971. Providing them with work and shelter and psychological assurance, therefore became a continuous and hence a difficult task.

Most of the refugees from west Punjab could occupy the large lands and property left by the Muslim migrants to Pakistan from Punjab, Uttar Pradesh.
and Rajasthan and could therefore be resettled on land. This was not the case in West Bengal. Also because of linguistic affinity, it was easier for Punjabi and Sindhi refugees to settle. The resettlement of the refugees from East Bengal could take place only in Bengal and to a lesser extent in Assam and Tripura. Along with the Kashmir issue, an important source of constant tension between the two countries was the strong sense of insecurity among Hindu in East Bengal, fuelled primarily by the communal character of Pakistan’s political system.

This led to the steady migration of the persecuted Hindus from East Bengal to West Bengal and retaliatory attacks on Muslims in West Bengal, leading to their migration. Many urged the Government of India to intervene in East Bengal militarily to protect the minority there. But, though very concerned about the fate of Hindus in East Bengal and the rise of communal sentiment in India, Nehru and the Government of India refused to get provoked into retaliatory action. Regarding it as a human problem, the government tried to solve it through persuasion and pressure, even while taking strong action against attacks on Muslims in West Bengal. In 1950, the prime ministers of India and Pakistan signed an agreement known as the Nehru-Liaqat Pact to resolve the issue of protection of the minorities.

The pact met with the strong disapproval of the Hindu communalists and the two ministers from Bengal, Syama Prasad Mookerjee and K.C. Neogi, resigned from the cabinet in protest. It was plain sailing for the pact elsewhere in the country, given Sardar Patel’s support for it. The migration of Hindus from East Bengal, however, continued despite the pact. In general, the Government of India followed the policy of trying to improve relations with Pakistan and, above all, to prevent the emergence of a climate of hostility and hatred. Nehru, in particular, repeatedly assured the people of Pakistan that India did not think of Pakistan as an enemy. One of the reasons for this policy was the effort to preserve and strengthen the secular atmosphere within India, which was being endangered by the Hindu communalists. And, undoubtedly, it did serve that purpose in the long run, even though it failed to mollify Pakistan or convince it of India’s good intentions.

INTEGRATION OF PRINCELY STATES

British India was divided into what were called the British Indian Provinces and the Princely States. The British Indian Provinces were directly under the control of the British government. On the other hand, several large and small states ruled by princes, called the Princely States, enjoyed some form of control over their internal affairs as long as they accepted British supremacy. This was called paramountcy or suzerainty of the British crown. Princely States covered one-third of the land area of the British Indian Empire and one out of four Indians lived under princely rule.

Just before Independence it was announced by the British that with the end of their rule over India, paramountcy of the British crown over Princely States would also lapse. This meant that all these states, as many as 565 in all, would become legally independent. The British government took the view that all these states were free to join either India or Pakistan or remain independent if they so wished. This decision was left not to the people but to the princely rulers of these states. This was a very serious problem and could threaten the very existence of a united India.
The problems started very soon. First of all, the ruler of Travancore announced that the state had decided on Independence. The Nizam of Hyderabad made a similar announcement. Rulers like the Nawab of Bhopal were averse to joining the Constituent Assembly. This response of the rulers of the Princely States meant that after independence there was a very real possibility that India would get further divided into a number of small countries. The prospects of democracy for the people in these states also looked bleak. This was a strange situation, since the Indian Independence was aimed at unity, self-determination as well as democracy. In most of these princely states, governments were run in a non-democratic manner and the rulers were unwilling to give democratic rights to their populations.

Government’s approach

The interim government took a firm stance against the possible division of India into small principalities of different sizes. The Muslim League opposed the Indian National Congress and took the view that the States should be free to adopt any course they liked. Sardar Patel was India’s Deputy Prime Minister and the Home Minister during the crucial period immediately following Independence. He played a historic role in negotiating with the rulers of princely states firmly but diplomatically and bringing most of them into the Indian Union.

The government’s approach was guided by three considerations. Firstly, the people of most of the princely states clearly wanted to become part of the Indian union. Secondly, the government was prepared to be flexible in giving autonomy to some regions. Thirdly, in the backdrop of Partition which brought into focus the contest over demarcation of territory, the integration & consolidation of the territorial boundaries of the nation had assumed supreme importance.

Patel’s first step was to appeal to the princes whose territories fell inside India to accede to the Indian Union in three subjects which affected the common interests of the country, namely, foreign relations, defence and communications. He also gave an implied threat that he would not be able to restrain the impatient people of the states and the government’s terms after 15 August would be stiffer.

Before 15 August 1947, peaceful negotiations had brought almost all states whose territories were contiguous to the new boundaries of India, into the Indian Union. The rulers of most of the states signed a document called the ‘Instrument of Accession’ which meant that their state agreed to become a part of the Union of India. Accession of the Princely States of Junagadh, Hyderabad, Kashmir and Manipur proved more difficult than the rest. The issue of Junagadh was resolved after a plebiscite confirmed people’s desire to join India.

Smaller states were either merged with the neighboring states or merged together to ‘form centrally administered areas’. A large number were consolidated into 5 new unions, forming Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan, Patiala and East Punjab States Union (PEPSU), Saurashtra and Travancoure-Cochin. In return for their surrender of all power and authority, the rulers of major states were given privy purses in perpetuity, free of all taxes. The privy purses amounted to Rs 4.66 crore in 1949 and were later guaranteed by the constitution.
Hyderabad, the largest of the Princely States was surrounded entirely by Indian Territory. Some parts of the old Hyderabad state are today parts of Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. Its ruler carried the title, ‘Nizam’. The Nizam wanted an independent status for Hyderabad. He entered into what was called the Standstill Agreement with India in November 1947 for a year while negotiations with the Indian government were going on.

In the meantime, a movement of the people of Hyderabad State against the Nizam’s rule gathered force. The peasantry in the Telangana region in particular, was the victim of Nizam’s oppressive rule and rose against him. Women who had seen the worst of this oppression joined the movement in large numbers. Hyderabad town was the nerve centre of this movement. The Communists and the Hyderabad Congress were in the forefront of the movement. The Nizam responded by unleashing a paramilitary force known as the Razakars on the people. The atrocities and communal nature of the Razakars knew no bounds. The central government had to order the army to tackle the situation. In September 1948, Indian army moved in to control the Nizam’s forces. After a few days of intermittent fighting, the Nizam surrendered. This led to Hyderabad’s accession to India.

The Maharaja of Manipur, Bodhachandra Singh, signed the Instrument of Accession with the Indian government. Under the pressure of public opinion, the Maharaja held elections in Manipur in June 1948 and the state became a constitutional monarchy. In the Legislative Assembly of Manipur there were sharp differences over the question of merger of Manipur with India. The Government of India succeeded in pressurizing the Maharaja into signing a Merger Agreement in September 1949, without consulting the popularly elected Legislative Assembly of Manipur. This caused a lot of anger and resentment in Manipur, the repercussions of which are still being felt.

REORGANISATION OF STATES

The process of nation-building did not come to an end with Partition and integration of Princely States. Now the challenge was to draw the internal boundaries of the Indian states. The boundaries had to be drawn in a way so that the linguistic and cultural plurality of the country could be reflected without affecting the unity of the nation. During colonial rule, the state boundaries were drawn either on administrative convenience or simply coincided with the territories annexed by the British government or the territories ruled by the princely powers.

Our national movement had rejected these divisions as artificial and had promised the linguistic principle as the basis of formation of states. In fact after the Nagpur session of Congress in 1920 the principle was recognised as the basis of the reorganisation of the Indian National Congress party itself. Things changed after Independence and Partition. Our leaders felt that carving out states on the basis of language might lead to disruption and disintegration. The central leadership decided to postpone matters. The need for postponement was also felt because the fate of the Princely States had not been decided. Also, the memory of Partition was still fresh.

The Indian leadership felt that the most important task for the present was to consolidate national unity; and any effort undertaken immediately to redraw the
internal boundaries might dislocate administration and economic development, intensify regional and linguistic rivalries, unleash destructive forces, and damage the unity of the country. Hence, while still committed to linguistic states, Nehru and other leaders accorded the task of redrawing India’s administrative map a low priority. The Constituent Assembly appointed the Linguistic Provinces Commission, headed by Justice S.K. Dar was appointed in 1948, to enquire into the desirability of linguistic provinces.

The Dar Commission advised against the step at the time for it might threaten national unity and also be administratively inconvenient. Consequently, the Constituent Assembly decided not to incorporate the linguistic principle in the constitution. Congress appointed a committee (JVP) in December 1948 consisting of Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramayya, president of the Congress, to examine the question afresh. This committee advised against the creation of linguistic states for the time being, emphasizing on unity, national security and economic development as the needs of the hour.

This decision of the national leadership was challenged by the local leaders and the people. Protests began in the Telugu speaking areas of the old Madras province, which included present day Tamil Nadu, parts of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Karnataka. The Vishalandhra movement demanded that the Telugu speaking areas should be separated from the Madras province of which they were a part and be made into a separate Andhra province. Potti Sriramulu, a Congress leader and a veteran Gandhian, went on an indefinite fast that led to his death after 56 days. This caused great unrest and resulted in violent outbursts in Andhra region. Finally, the Prime Minister announced the formation of a separate Andhra state in December 1952. The formation of Andhra Pradesh spurred the struggle for making of other states on linguistic lines in other parts of the country.

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

Considering this, Nehru appointed in 1953, States Reorganization Commission (SRC), with Justice Fazl Ali, K.M. Panikkar and Hridaynath Kunzru as members, to examine ‘objectively and dispassionately’ the entire question of the reorganization of the states of the Union. Throughout the two years of its work, the Commission was faced with meetings, demonstrations, agitations and hunger strikes. SRC submitted its report in 1955. While laying down that due consideration should be given to administrative and economic factors, it recognized for the most part the linguistic principle and recommended redrawing of state boundaries on that basis. On the basis of its report the States Reorganisation Act was passed in 1956. This led to the creation of 14 states and 6 union territories.

The Telangana area of Hyderabad state was transferred to Andhra; Kerala was created by merging the Malabar district of the old Madras Presidency with
Travancore-Cochin. Certain kannada-speaking areas of the states of Bombay, Madras, Hyderabad and Coorg were added to the Mysore state. Bombay state was enlarged by merging the states of Kutch and Saurashtra and the Marathi-speaking areas of Hyderabad with it. The states of PEPSU had been merged with Punjab, which, however, remained a trilingual state having three language speakers-Punjabi, Hindi and Pahari-within its borders. In the Punjabi-speaking part of the state, there was a strong demand for carving out a separate Punjabi Suba (Punjabi-speaking state).

Unfortunately, the issue assumed communal overtones. The Sikh communalists used the linguistic issue to promote communal politics. Nehru and the Congress leadership were clear that they would not accept any demand for the creation of a state on religious or communal grounds. Finally, in 1966, Indira Gandhi agreed to the division of Punjab into two Punjabi-and Hindi-speaking states of Punjab and Haryana, with the Pahari-speaking district of Kangra and a part of the Hoshiarpur district being merged with Himachal Pradesh. Chandigarh, the newly built city and capital of united Punjab, was made a Union Territory and was to serve as the joint capital of Punjab and Haryana.

There was an experiment of ‘bilingual’ Bombay state, consisting of Gujarati and Marathi speaking people. After a popular agitation, the states of Maharashtra and Gujarat were created in 1960. Another major reorganisation of states took place in the north east in 1972. Meghalaya was carved out of Assam in 1972. Manipur and Tripura too emerged as separate states in the same year. The states of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram came into being in 1987. Nagaland had become a state much earlier in 1963.

Now it is more than fifty years since the formation of linguistic states. We can say that linguistic states and the movements for the formation of these states changed the nature of democratic politics and leadership in some basic ways. The path to politics and power was now open to people other than the small English speaking elite. Linguistic reorganisation also gave some uniform basis to the drawing of state boundaries. It did not lead to disintegration of the country as many had feared earlier. On the contrary it strengthened national unity.

Above all, the linguistic states underlined the acceptance of the principle of diversity. When we say that India adopted democracy, it does not simply mean that India embraced a democratic constitution, nor does it merely mean that India adopted the format of elections. The choice was larger than that. It was a choice in favour of recognising and accepting the existence of differences which could at times be oppositional. Democracy, in other words, was associated with plurality of ideas and ways of life. Much of the politics in the later was to take place within this framework.

Events since 1956 have clearly shown that loyalty to a language was quite consistent with, and was rather complementary to, loyalty to the nation. By reorganizing the states on linguistic lines, the national leadership removed a major grievance which could have led to fissiparous tendencies. States reorganization is, therefore, ‘best regarded as clearing the ground for national integration’. Equally important, linguistic reorganization of the states has not in any manner adversely affected the federal structure of the Union or weakened or paralysed the Centre as.
many had feared. The central government wields as much authority as it did before. Thus, states’ reorganization has not only not weakened the unity of the country but as a whole strengthened it.

Language did not, however, remain the sole basis of organisation of states. In later years sub-regions raised demands for separate states on the basis of a separate regional culture or complaints of regional imbalance in development. Three such states, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand, were created in 2000. The story of reorganisation has not come to an end. There are many regions in the country where there are movements demanding separate and smaller states. These include Telangana in Andhra Pradesh, Vidarbha in Maharashtra, Harit Pradesh in the western region of Uttar Pradesh and the northern region of West Bengal.

THE ISSUE OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

The controversy on the language issue became most virulent when it took the form of opposition to Hindi and tended to create conflict between Hindi-speaking and non-Hindi-speaking regions of the country. India was a multilingual country and it had to remain so. The Indian national movement had carried on its ideological and political work through the different Indian regional languages. The issue of a national language was resolved when the constitution-makers virtually accepted all the major languages as ‘languages of India’ or India’s national languages. But the matter could not end there, for the country’s official work could not be carried on in so many languages. There had to be one common language in which the central government would carry on its work and maintain contact with the state government.

The leadership of the national movement was convinced that English would not continue to be the all-India medium of communication in free India. For example, even while appreciating the value of English as a world language, through which Indians could access world science and culture and modern Western ideas, Gandhiji was convinced that the genius of a people could not unfold nor could their culture flower in a foreign language. Hindi had been accepted by leaders because it was considered to be the most widely spoken and understood language in the country. In its sessions and political work, the Congress had substituted Hindi and the provincial languages in place of English.

Sharp differences marked the initial debates as the problem of the official language was highly politicized from the beginning. It was accepted that Hindi would be the official and not the national language. The issue of the time-frame for a shift from English to Hindi produced a divide between Hindi and non-Hindi areas. The spokespersons of Hindi areas were for the immediate switchover to Hindi; while those form non-Hindi areas advocated retention of English for a long if not indefinite period. Nehru was for making Hindi the official language, but he was also in favour of English continuing as an additional official language, because of its usefulness in the contemporary world.

The critics of Hindi talked about it being less developed than other languages as a literary language and as a language of science and politics. But their main fear was that Hindi’s adoption as the official language would place non-Hindi areas, especially South India, at a disadvantage in the educational and economic spheres,
and particularly in competition for appointments in government and the public sector. Such opponents tended to argue that imposition of Hindi on non-Hindi areas would lead to their economic, political, social and cultural domination by Hindi areas. The constitution-makers were aware that as the leaders of a multilingual country they could not ignore, or even give the impression of ignoring, the interests of any one linguistic area. A compromise was arrived at. The constitution provided that Hindi in Devanagari script with international numerals would be India’s official language.

English was to continue for use in all official purposes till 1965, when it would be replaced by Hindi. Hindi was to be introduced in a phased manner. After 1965 it would become the sole official language. However, parliament would have the power to provide for the use of English for specified purposes even after 1965. The constitution laid upon the government the duty to promote the spread and development of Hindi and provided for the appointment of a commission and a Joint Parliamentary Committee to review the progress in this respect. The state legislatures were to decide the matter of official language as the state level, though the official language of the Union would serve as the language of communication between the states and the Centre and between one state and another.

Nehru and the majority of Indian leaders, however, remained committed to the transition to Hindi as the official language. In the interests of national unity as also economic and political development they also realized that full transition to Hindi should not be time-bound and should await a politically more auspicious time when the willing consent of the non-Hindi areas could be obtained. In 1956, the Report of the Official language Commission, set up in 1955 in terms of constitutional provision, recommended that Hindi should start progressively replacing English in various functions of the central government with effective change taking place in 1965.

To implement the recommendations of the Committee, the president issued an order in April 1960 stating that after 1965 Hindi would be the principal official language but that English would continue as the associate official language without any restriction being placed on its use. Hindi would also become an alternative medium for the Union Public Service Commission examinations after some time, but for the present it would be introduced in the examinations as a qualifying subject. In accordance with the President’s directive, the central government took a series of steps to promote Hindi. These included the setting up of the Central Hindi Directorate, publication of standard works in Hindi or in Hindi translation in various fields, compulsory training of central government employees in Hindi, and translation of major texts of law into Hindi and promotion of their use by the courts. All these measures aroused suspicion and anxiety in the non-Hindi areas and groups. Nor were the Hindi leaders satisfied.

To allay the fears of the non-Hindi people, Official Languages Act was passed in 1963. The object of the Act was to remove a restriction which had been placed by the Constitution on the use of English after. The Act laid down that the English language may Continue to be used in addition to Hindi. The non-Hindi groups criticized the use of the word ‘may’ in place of the word ‘shall’. This made that Act ambiguous in their eyes; they did not regard it as a statutory guarantee. As 26 January 1965 approached, a fear psychosis gripped the non-Hindi areas, especially Tamil Nadu, creating a strong anti-Hindi movement. On 17 January, the DMK organized the Madras
State Anti-Hindi Conference which gave a call for observing 26 January as a day of mourning.

In 1967 Indira Gandhi moved the bill to amend the 1963 Official Language Act. The Act gave provided that the use of English as an associate language in addition to Hindi for the official work at the Centre and for communication between the Centre and non-Hindi states would continue as long as the non-Hindi states wanted it, giving them full veto powers on the question. The states were to adopt a three-language formula according to which in the non-Hindi areas, the mother tongue, Hindi and English or some other national language was to be taught in schools while in the Hindi areas a non-Hindi language, preferably a southern language, was to be taught as a compulsory subject. India had arrived at a widely accepted solution to the very difficult problem of the official and link language for the country. Since 1967, this problem has gradually disappeared from the political scene.

THE ISSUE OF MINORITY LANGUAGES

An important aspect of the language problem has been the status of minority languages. Unilingual states were not possible in whatever manner their boundaries were drawn. Consequently, a large number of linguistic minorities, that is, those who speak a language other than the main or the official language of the state, continue to exist in linguistically reorganized states. Overall nearly 18% of India’s population does not speak the official language of the states where they live as their mother tongue. On the one hand, there was the question of their protection, for there was the ever-present danger of them being meted out unfair treatment, on the other, there was the need to promote their integration with the major language group of a state.

A linguistic minority had to be given the confidence that it would not be discriminated against by the majority and that its language and culture would continue to exist and develop. To confront this problem certain Fundamental Rights were provided to the linguistic minorities in the constitution. For example, Article 30 states that all minorities, whether based on religion or language, shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice and, more important, that the state shall not, in granting aid to educational institutions, discriminate against any educational institution on the ground that it is under the management of a minority, whether based on religion or language.

Article 347 lays down that on a demand being made on behalf of a minority, the President may direct that its language shall be officially recognized throughout the state or any part thereof for such purposes as he might specify. The official policy since 1956, sanctioned by a constitutional amendment in that year, has been to provide for instruction in the mother tongue in the primary and secondary classes wherever there are a sufficient number of children to form a class. The amendment also provides for the appointment of a Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities to investigate and report regularly on the implementation of these safeguards.

On the whole, the central government has tended to play a very positive role in defence of the rights of the minorities, but the implementation of the
minority safeguards is within the purview of the state governments and therefore differs from state to state. In general, despite some progress in several states, in most of them the position of the linguistic minorities has not been satisfactory. The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has in his reports regularly noted innumerable cases of discrimination against linguistic minorities in matters of schooling, admission to technical and medical institutions and employment in the state public services because of lack of proficiency in the official language of the state.

Among the minority languages, Urdu is a special case. It is the largest minority tongue in India. Nearly 23 million people spoke Urdu in 1951. Urdu speakers constituted substantial percentages of the population in Uttar Pradesh (10%), Bihar (9%), Maharashtra (7%), Andhra Pradesh (8%) and Karnataka (9%). Moreover, an overwhelming majority of Muslims, India’s largest religious minority, claimed Urdu as their mother tongue. Urdu is also recognized as one of India’s national languages and is listed in the Eighth Schedule of the constitution.

While nearly all the major languages of India were also the official languages of one state or the other, Urdu was not the official language of any state except the small state of Jammu and Kashmir where the mother tongues were in any case Kashmiri, Dogri and Ladakhi. Consequently, Urdu did not get official support in any part of the country. On the contrary, it faced official discrimination and hostility both in U.P. and Bihar. The U.P. government decided early on to declare Hindi as the only official language of the state. In practice, Urdu began to be abolished in many primary schools. Its use as a medium of instruction was also increasingly limited. The U.P. government gave its main justification being that the SRC had recommended that at least 30% population in a state should speak a language before it could be made the second official or regional language.

The governments of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka were more supportive of Urdu. In Andhra, Urdu has been recognized since 1968 as an additional language for the Telangana region. And in both the states, adequate facilities are provided for instruction through the medium of Urdu in the primary stage and for instruction in Urdu at the higher school stages. Two other aspects of Urdu’s position may be noted. First, unfortunately the question of Urdu has got entangled with the communal question. Second, despite active hostility of many and official neglect, Urdu continues not only to exist but even grow in terms of literary output, journals and newspapers and especially as the language of films and television because of its inherent vigour and cultural roots among the Indian people.

THE CHALLENGE OF LEFT

In the early post-independence period, the government was faced with another challenge; this time from the left. The Communists Party of India (CPI) proclaimed the beginning of a general revolution in India in February 1948, declaring the Nehru government of being an agent of imperialist and semi-feudal forces. It initiated militant mass movements in various areas, the most prominent being the attempt to organize a railway strike all over the country in March 1949. It also continued the armed struggle in the Telangana area of the Hyderabad state begun earlier against the Nizam.
Nehru was appalled, but though he was highly critical of the policy and activities of the CPI, he **resisted banning it** till he felt that there was enough proof of its violent activities. Even then he permitted the **banning of the CPI only in West Bengal and Madras** where it was most active. Being in agreement with the basic socio-economic objectives of the Communists, he believed that the best way to combat their politics and violent activities was to **remove the discontent of the people** through economic and other reformist measures. Even so, as soon as the CPI gave up its programme of waging armed struggle, including in Telangana, and declared its **intention to join the parliamentary democratic process**, Nehru saw to it that the CPI was legalized everywhere and its leaders and cadres released. It was also allowed to participate in the general elections of 1951-52.

**NEHRU AND PATEL**

Patel was undoubtedly the main leader of the Congress **right wing**. But his rightist stance has often been grossly misinterpreted. Like Nehru, he fully shared the **basic values of the national movement**: commitment to democracy and civil liberties, secularism, independent economic development, social reform and a pro-poor orientation. He stood for the **abolition of landlordism** but through payment of compensation. A staunch opponent of communalism, he was fully committed to **secularism**. He was also utterly **intolerant of nepotism and corruption**. Patel’s conservatism, however, found expression with regard to the questions of class and socialism. Before 1947, he had **opposed the Socialists** and the Communists.

After 1947, he argued successfully both for **stimulus to private enterprise** and the incorporation of the **right of property** as a fundamental right in the constitution. Thus, the right-wing stance of Patel was basically a matter of social ideology. **Patel and Nehru** had temperamental as well as ideological differences. After 1947, policy differences on several questions cropped up between them. The two differed on the **role and authority to be handled** and the relations with Pakistan. Nehru opposed, though unsuccessfully, Patel’s view that the right to property should be included among the Fundamental Rights in the constitution.

Yet, the two **continued to stick and pull together** and there was no final parting of ways. This was because what united them was more significant and of abiding value than what divided them. Also, they **complemented each other** in many ways: one was a great **organizer** and able **administrator**, the other commanded immense mass support and had a wide social and developmental perspective. Throughout Patel remained Nehru’s loyal colleague, assuring him of complete support for his policies.
LAND REFORMS SINCE INDEPENDENCE

AGRICULTURE AT INDEPENDENCE

Colonialism shattered the basis of traditional Indian agriculture without bringing in any dynamic new forces. Commercialization of agriculture and differentiation within the peasantry occurred on an unprecedented scale. Commercialization of agriculture in colonial India facilitated the extraction of surplus from the peasantry and the transfer of this surplus from India to Britain by bringing agricultural produce to the export market. The ‘unrequited’ export surplus was the size of the surplus extraction or ‘drain’ from India. Similarly, differentiation of the peasantry in India by and large did not lead to the rise of the rich peasant capitalist farmer but to the creation of a renter landlord class.

The colonial state made a very high tax demand on agriculture. In the early colonial period the state made permanent settlements with zamindars fixing the land revenue rates at a very high level. The zamindar was the intermediary between the state and the direct cultivator. He committed to pay fixed land revenue to the state while he collected rent from the actual producers. However, since land revenue was fixed, the actual producers. However, since land revenue was fixed, the colonial state discovered that it was not able to mop up the rise in agricultural income caused by the rise in agricultural prices that occurred over time. The surplus or the increase in income was being largely appropriated by the intermediaries.

Consequently, all subsequent land tax or revenue settlements made by the colonial rulers were temporary settlements made directly with the peasant, or ‘ryot’ (e.g., the ryotwari settlements). The land revenue rates were periodically enhanced pushing them up to the maximum limit. Under colonialism Indian agriculture experienced the growth of landlordism and rack renting on a very wide scale. In the zamindari areas absentee landlordism and sub-infeudation was rampant. So high were the rents and other exactions from the peasant that the gap between what was collected from the peasant and the land revenue paid to the state was in some areas able to sustain scores of layers of intermediaries between the state and the direct cultivator.

The colonial situation created ideal conditions for tenancy and rack-renting. The destruction of traditional handicrafts and artisanal industry and the absence of a rapid growth of modern industry created an enormous population pressure on agriculture. No wonder then that levels of rent in cash or kind were generally higher than 50% of the crop. In addition to the rent demand the landlords resorted to numerous illegal exactions in cash, kind or labour (beggar), which put a severe burden on the peasant. The problem of small holdings was further accentuated by their fragmentation, that is, these being held in dispersed small plots. One estimate is that the average holding in the country had approximately 6 plots of 1.1 acres each.

The heavy demands on the cultivator made by the colonial state and the dominant sections in rural society led to a third major feature of colonial agriculture: extreme indebtedness of the peasantry. Bonded labour or debt bondage became a
common feature in large parts of the country. No wonder, at independence India was faced with an acute food shortage which created near-famine conditions in many areas. The challenge before the independent regime in 1947 was to bring about comprehensive institutional and technological reform in Indian agriculture. Justice Ranade was among the first to argue for a structural change which would replace the existing semi-feudal agriculture with capitalist agriculture.

He argued for a mixed model of capitalist agriculture. He envisaged on the one hand a class of wealthy large-scale farmers who were to be created by the transformation of the existing rentier landlords into capitalist landlords. On the other hand he envisaged a vast mass of independent peasant proprietors free from landlord oppression, with access to cheap credit, and subject only to a low fixed land tax. This policy was accepted by the Government though a number of alternative strategies were also advocated.

Shortly after independence, the AICC appointed a special committee headed by Jawaharlal Nehru to draw up an economic programme. The committee also called the Economic Programme Committee made a 20-point recommendation for agriculture. It recommended all intermediaries between the tiller and the state should be eliminated and all middlemen should be replaced by non-profit making agencies, such as cooperatives. As for cooperative farming or production cooperatives the committee recommended that the state should organize pilot schemes for experimenting with cooperative farming among small holders. The maximum size of holding should be fixed. The surplus land over such a maximum should be acquired and placed at the disposal of the village cooperatives.

The process of land reform after independence basically occurred in two broad phases. The first phase which started soon after independence and arguably continued till the early 1960s focused on the following features: (1) abolition of intermediaries– zamindars, jagirdars, etc., (2) tenancy reforms involving providing security of tenure to the tenants, decrease in rents and conferment of ownership rights to tenants, (3) ceilings on size of landholdings, (4) cooperativisation and community development programmes. This phase has also been called the phase of institutional reforms. The second phase beginning around the mid-or late 1960s saw the gradual ushering in of the so-called Green Revolution and has been seen as the phase of technological reforms.

ZAMINDARI ABOLITION

By 1949, zamindari abolition bills or land tenure legislation were introduced in a number of provinces such as Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Madras, Assam and Bombay. The zamindars in various parts of the country challenged the constitutionality of the law permitting zamindari abolition and the courts, upheld the landlords’ suit. The government responded by getting constitutional amendments passed. The 1st Amendment in 1951 and the 4th Amendment in 1955 were aimed at further strengthening the hands of the state legislatures for implementing zamindari abolition, making the question of violation of any fundamental right or insufficiency of compensation not permissible in the courts.
A major difficulty in implementing the zamindari abolition acts was the absence of adequate land records. Nevertheless, by end of 1950s the process of land reform involving abolition of intermediaries (the zamindars of British India, and jagirdars of the princely states now merged with independent India) can be said to have been completed. Considering that the entire process occurred in a democratic framework, it was completed in a remarkably short period. The abolition of zamindari meant that about 20 million erstwhile tenants now became landowners. The compensation actually paid to the zamindars once their estates were acquired was generally small and varied from state to state depending upon the strength of the peasant movement and consequent class balance between the landlords and the tenants and the ideological composition of the Congress leadership.

Weaknesses in Zamindari Abolition

There were, however, certain important weaknesses in the manner in which some of the clauses relating to zamindari abolition were implemented in various parts of the country. For example, in Uttar Pradesh, the zamindars were permitted to retain lands that were declared to be under their ‘personal cultivation’ making it possible for not only those who tilled the soil, but also those who supervised the land personally or did so through a relative, or provided capital and credit to the land, to call themselves a cultivator. To begin with there was no limit on the size of the lands that could be declared to be under the ‘personal cultivation’ of the zamindar. The result in actual practice, however, was that even zamindars who were absentee landowners could now end up retaining large tracts of land.

Further, in many areas, the zamindars in order to declare under ‘personal cultivation’ as large a proportion of their lands as possible often resorted to large-scale eviction of tenants, mainly the less secure small tenants. Many of the zamindars moved towards progressive capitalist farming in these areas, as this was indeed one of the objectives of land reform. The landlords used every possible method of parliamentary obstruction in the legislatures. Even after the laws were enacted the landlords used the judicial system to defer the implementation of the laws. While the big landlords, who lost the bulk of their lands, were the chief losers, the main beneficiaries of zamindari abolition were the occupancy tenants or the upper tenants, who had direct leases from the zamindar, and who now became landowners.

TENANCY REFORMS

Tenancy reforms had three basic objectives. First, it was to guarantee security of tenure to the tenants who had cultivated a piece of land continuously for a fixed number of years. Second, it was to seek the reduction of rents paid by tenants to a ‘fair’ level; which was generally considered to range between one-fourth and one-sixth of the value of the gross produce of the leased land. The third objective was that the tenant gains the right to acquire ownership of the lands he cultivated, subject to certain restrictions. While attempting to improve the condition of the tenants, tenancy legislation in India, by and large, sought to maintain a balance between the interest of the landowner, particularly the small landowner, and the tenant.

The absentee landowners’ right of resumption of land for ‘personal cultivation’, as well as the tenants’ right to acquire the lands they cultivated, was
operated through a complex and variable system of ‘floors’ and ‘ceilings’ keeping this balance in view. The landowner’s right of resumption was limited (this was aimed at the large landowners) to his total holding after resumption not exceeding a certain limit or ceiling prescribed by each state. Also, while resuming land, the landowner could not deprive the tenant of his entire lands. In some states like Kerala, Orissa, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, the tenant had to be left with at least half his holding.

Tenants right to acquire the landowner’s lands was restricted by the condition that the landowner was not to be deprived of all his lands and that the tenants’ holding after acquisition was not to exceed the ceiling prescribed by each state. Very small landowners could resume their entire holding for self-cultivation. However, the actual experience of implementation of the tenancy laws was more complicated. Large landowners transferred their lands in the names of a number of relatives and others so as to enter the category of ‘small landowner’ and then evicting tenants from such lands by exercising the right of resumption given to small owners.

Even after the tenants got legal protection against eviction, large-scale evictions occurred or example, the Planning Commission’s Panel on Land Reforms noted in 1956 that between 1948 and 1951 the number of protected tenants in the state of Bombay declined from 1.7 million to 1.3 million. In many cases tenancy legislations led to tenancy being pushed underground, that is, it continued in a concealed form. The tenants were now called ‘farm servants’ though they continued in exactly the same status. In the early years of land reform, tenants were often converted to sharecroppers, as surprisingly the latter were not treated as tenants and therefore were not protected under the existing tenancy legislation. In some states such as Uttar Pradesh Only cash rent payers were treated as tenants.

Perhaps what contributed most to the insecurity of tenants was the fact that most tenancies were oral and informal, that is, they were not recorded and the tenants therefore could not benefit from the legislation in their favour. The absence of proper records was seen as a major impediment in the implementation of the Zamindari Abolition and land Reform Act. In the late 1960s a massive programme of conferment of titles to lands to hutment dwellers and tenants was undertaken in Kerala. The programme, which achieved considerable success, was launched with the active participation of peasant organizations. The Left Front government in West Bengal which came to power in 1977 launched the famous Operation Barga with the objective of, in a time-bound period, achieving the registration of sharecroppers, so that they could then proceed to secure for them their legal rights.

Limitations of Tenancy Reform

The first objective of tenancy legislation in India, that of providing security of tenure to all tenants, met with only limited success. While a substantial proportion of tenants did acquire security there were still large numbers who remained unprotected. The partial success stories such as those of Kerala and West Bengal notwithstanding, the practice of unsecured tenancy, continued in India on a large scale. It is the continued existence of large numbers of insecure tenants which, inter alia, made the successful implementation of the second major objective of tenancy legislation
that of **reducing rents to a ‘fair’ level**, almost impossible to achieve. The market condition, for example, the **adverse land-man ratio** that developed in India during colonial rule, led to high rents. Further, the **Green Revolution** which started in some parts of India in the late 1960s aggravated the problems, with **land values and rentals** rising further and reaching, for example, in parts of Punjab, rates as high as 70%.

As for the **third objective** of tenancy legislation in India, that is, the **acquisition of ownership rights** by tenants, this too was achieved only **partially**. Abolition of zamindari led to about **20 million tenants**, the superior occupancy tenants, becoming landowners and many **absentee zamindars** actually turning to direct cultivation in the lands ‘resumed’ for ‘personal’ cultivation. In the **ryotwari areas** nearly **half the tenants**, for example, in Bombay and Gujarat became landowners. Further, about half of the lands from which tenants were evicted were **used by the landowners for direct cultivation**, that is, they were not leased out again in a concealed manner. Also, a very substantial number of **inferior tenants** in former ryotwari areas got occupancy rights.

**LAND CEILINGS**

A major plank of the land reform effort in India was the imposition of ceilings on the size of landholdings, with the objective of **making land distribution more equitable**. On this question, however, **societal consensus** was weak, if not non-existent, and that was reflected in the extreme difficulty in implementing this programme with even a reasonable degree of success. In 1946, a Committee headed by Jawaharlal Nehru had recommended that the **maximum size** of holdings should be fixed. The surplus land over such a maximum should be acquired and placed at the disposal of the **village cooperatives**. Similarly, the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee, chaired by J.C. Kumarappa, in 1949, also recommended a ceiling on landholding which was to be **3 times the size of an economic holding**.

There was no immediate programme of implementing ceilings. In **1959 Nagpur Session of Congress** passed a resolution stating that in order to **remove uncertainty regarding land reforms** and give stability to the farmer, ceilings should be fixed on existing and future holdings and legislation to this effect should be completed in all States by the end of 1959. Further, the land declared **surplus**, that is, above ceiling limits, was to **vest in the panchayats** and be managed through **cooperatives consisting of landless labourers**. Nagpur Resolution contributed considerably towards consolidation of **right-wing forces** both in the rural and urban sectors of the country.

N.G. Ranga and C. Rajagopalachari alarmed at the moves towards land ceilings and **threats of compulsory cooperativisation**. The campaigners and beneficiaries of zamindari abolition, the **tenants who had now become landowners**, also ranged themselves against the next step in land reform, an attempt at redistribution of land-ownership through imposition of land ceilings. States had to formulate and implement legislation. Most states passed the enabling legislation by the end of 1961.

**Weaknesses in Land Ceiling Legislation**

The **long delay**, as well as the nature of the legislation, ensured that the ceilings would have a much muted impact, **releasing little surplus land** for
redistribution. In a situation where more than 70% of landholdings in India were less than 5 acres, the ceiling fixed on existing holdings by the states were very high. For example, in Andhra Pradesh, it varied from 27 to 312 acres (depending on the class of land), Assam 50 acres, Punjab 30 to 60 acres. Moreover, in most states, initially, the ceilings were imposed on individual and not family holdings, enabling landowners to divide up their holdings ‘notionally’ in the names of relatives merely to avoid ceiling.

Further, in many states the ceiling could be raised, for example, by 90% in Madhya Pradesh, 100% in Bihar, Madras and Maharashtra, if the size of the family of the landholder exceeded 5. Certain categories of land could be exempted from ceilings. These were tea, coffee and rubber plantations, orchards, specialized farms engaged in cattle breeding, dairying wool raising, etc., the intention was clearly to promote progressive or capitalist farming done on a large scale. However, the exemptions were often carried to absurd limits with Tamil Nadu reportedly permitting 26 kinds of exemptions. In fact, despite the ceiling legislations which were passed by most states by 1961, till the end of 1970 not a single acre was declared surplus in large states like Bihar, Mysore, Kerala, Orissa and Rajasthan. In Andhra Pradesh, a mere 1,400 acres was declared surplus but no land was distributed.

However, taking India as whole, only 2.4 million acres was declared surplus by the end of 1970, and the area distributed constituted a mere 0.3 per cent of the total cultivated land of India. The year 1970, saw a widespread ‘land grab’ movement by the landless in many parts of the country under the leadership of the Communist and Socialist parties. The total amount of land seized was not very significant and most of it was government wasteland, land takes over by the government but not distributed. The movement was effectively suppressed. The Central averment passed certain guidelines, which marked a break in the history of ceiling legislation in 1972:

a. The ceiling for double-cropped perennially irrigated land was to be within the range of 10-18 acres, it was 27 acres for single-cropped land and 54 acres for inferior dry lands.

b. A ceiling was to be applicable to a family as a unit of 5 members. Additional land per additional member could be permitted for families which exceeded this number but up to a maximum limit of double the ceiling for the five-member unit.

c. In the distribution of surplus land, priority was to be given to landless agricultural workers, particularly those belonging to the SCs and STs.

d. Compensation payable for surplus land was to be fixed well below market price so as to be within the capacity of the new allottees.

Most states passed revised ceiling legislation, lowering the ceiling limits within the range prescribed in the guidelines. Resistance to the ceiling laws and efforts to evade the ceiling continued in a variety of ways. A common method was to seek judicial intervention on a number of grounds. In an attempt to stem this menace the government got the 34th Amendment to the constitution passed in Parliament in 1974, getting most of the revised ceiling laws included in the 9th Schedule of the constitution so that they could not be challenged on constitutional grounds. By 1992, the area declared surplus was 7 million acres and the area distributed was about 5 million acres and the beneficiaries numbered about 5 million. An important impact of
the ceiling laws was that it discouraged concentration of landownership beyond the ceiling level.

In the long run, the high population growth and the rapid subdivision of large holdings over several generations led automatically to little land remaining over the ceiling limits. Except in certain small pockets in the country, very large landholdings of the semi-feudal type are now things of the past. However, any further attempt at land redistribution through lowering of ceilings does not appear to be politically feasible or even economically viable. Perhaps the only viable programme left for the landless was the one which has been to some extent taken up in recent years, of distributing homestead lands or even just home sites, ensuring the payment of minimum wages, as well as providing security of tenure and fair rents to sharecroppers and tenants.

Bhoodan Movement

Bhoodan was an attempt at land reform, at bringing about land redistribution through a movement. Eminent Gandhian constructive worker Acharaya Vinoba Bhave organized an all-India federation of constructive workers, the Sarovodaya Samaj, which was to take up the task of a non-violent social transformation in the country. He and his followers were to do padayatra (foot walk) to persuade the larger landowners to donate at least 1/6th of their lands as Bhoodan or ‘land-gift’ for distribution among the landless and the land poor. The target was to get as donation 50 million acres, which was one-sixth of the 300 million acres of cultivable land in India.

In the initial years, the movement achieved a considerable degree of success, receiving over 4 million acres of land as donation. However a substantial part of the land donated was unfit for cultivation or under litigation. Towards the end of 1955, the movement took a new form, that of Gramdan or ‘donation of village’. Again taking off from the Gandhian notion that all land belonged to ‘Gopal’ or God, in Gramdan villages the movement declared that all land was owned collectively or equally, as it did not belong to any one individual. The movement started in Orissa and was most successful there.

By the end of 1960 there were more than 4,500 Gramdan villages out of which around 2000 were in Orissa. By the 1960s the Bhoodan/ Gramdan movement had lost its élan despite its considerable initial promise. Its creative potential essentially remained unutilized. A proper assessment of the movement particularly its potential is still to be made. It has been too easily dismissed as not only ‘Utopian’ but also as being reactionary, class collaborationist and aimed at preventing class struggle. Its purpose was to ‘serve as a brake on the revolutionary struggle of the peasants’.

However, some very significant aspects of the Bhoodan movement need to be noted. First, the very fact that it was one of the very few attempts after independence to bring about land reform through a movement and not through government legislation from the top is in itself very significant. Second, the potential of the movement was enormous, based as it was on the idea of trusteeship or that all land belonged to God. If the landlords failed to behave as trustees or as ‘equal’ sharers
of property, then a Satyagraha, in the Gandhian mould, could be launched against
them. The movement made a significant contribution by creating a moral ambience,
an atmosphere, which, while putting pressure on the landlords, created conditions
favourable to the landless.

COOPERATIVES

A wide spectrum of the national movement’s leaders including Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, the Socialists and Communists were agreed that cooperativisation world lead to major improvement in Indian agriculture and would particularly benefit the poor. However, there was no general consensus, particularly among the peasantry, on the question of cooperatives. It was clarified that any move towards cooperativisation was to be through persuasion, by getting the goodwill and agreement of the peasantry. The Second Plan envisaged to take such essential steps as will provide sound foundations for the development of cooperative farming so that over a period of 10 years or so a substantial proportion of agricultural lands are cultivated on cooperative lines.

Meanwhile it was reported that China had achieved remarkable increases in foodgrain production and extension of the agricultural infrastructure through cooperativisation. Thus a bold programme of extending cooperative farming in India was recommended by Jawaharlal Nehru, who was deeply committed to the idea of cooperativisation. He started putting pressure on the states to emulate the Chinese example. The states, however, resisted any large-scale plan for cooperativisation, agreeing only to experiments in cooperative farming and that too if they remained strictly voluntary. Congress Nagpur Resolution of 1959 visualized agrarian pattern based on joint cooperative farming and it specified that such a pattern was to be achieved within 3 years.

A wave of opposition, both within and outside the Congress, followed this recommendation. It was argued that the Resolution was the first step towards ending private property and eventual expropriation of the landed classes and that it would lead to forced collectivization on the Soviet or Chinese pattern. The government came in conciliatory mood and argued for setting up ‘service cooperatives’ all over the country over the next 3 years and Cooperative farms were to be set up voluntarily wherever conditions became mature. The Third Plan reflected the mellowed position regarding cooperativisation and took a very pragmatic and cautious approach.

Limitations of Cooperativisation

As for joint farming, two types of cooperatives were observed. First, there were those that were formed essentially to evade land reforms and access incentives subsidies offered by the state. Typically, these cooperatives were formed by well-to-do, influential families who took on a number of agricultural labourers or ex-tenants as bogus members. Forming a cooperative helped evade the ceiling laws or tenancy laws. Second, there were the state-sponsored cooperative farms in the form of pilot projects, where generally poor, previously uncultivated land was made available to the landless. The poor quality of land, lack of proper irrigation facility, etc., and the fact that these farms were run like government-sponsored projects led them to be generally expensive unsuccessful experiments.
In any case, the hope that the service cooperatives would facilitate the transition to cooperative farming was completely belied. The service cooperatives, which fared much better than the farming cooperatives, also suffered from some major shortcomings. To begin with, the leadership of the cooperatives consisted of the leading family or families of the village which, not only owned a great deal of land but also controlled trade and money lending. Low interest agricultural credit made available through cooperative rural banks was used by such families for non-agricultural businesses, consumption and even money lending. The village poor, the landless, got little out of these institutions. Refusal of the cooperatives to issue crop loans on credit was given against land as security; which meant that the landless were essentially excluded from this scheme.

A common shortcoming of the cooperative movement was that instead of promoting people’s participation it soon became like a huge overstuffed government department. A large bureaucracy, instead of becoming the instrument for promoting cooperatives, typically became a hindrance. However service cooperatives had started to play a very important role in rural India. Their role in making available a much increased amount of cheap credit to a wider section of the peasantry was critical. They also helped in bringing improved seeds, modern implements, cheap fertilizers, etc., to the peasants, and, in many areas they also helped market their produce. In fact, in many ways they provided a necessary condition for the success of the Green Revolution strategy launched in the late 1960s.

Milk Cooperatives: Operation Flood

This experiment, which started modestly in Kaira (also called Kheda) district of Gujarat eventually, became the harbinger of the ‘White Revolution’ that spread all over India. Peasants of Kaira district, which supplied milk to the city of Bombay, felt cheated by the milk traders. At the initiative of Patel and Morarji Desai, the farmers organized themselves into a cooperative union and were able to pressurize the Bombay government, albeit with the help of a ‘milk strike’, to buy milk from their union. Thus the Kaira District Cooperative Milk Producers’ Union Ltd, formally registered in 1946, started modestly in Anand. Dr Verghese Kurien was the celebrated and proud employee of the Kaira farmers, and its chief executive.

In the process of this rapid growth, the union greatly diversified its activities. In 1955, it had set up a factory to manufacture milk powder and butter. The same year the union chose the name of ‘Amul’ for its range of products. In 1960, a new factory was added which was designed to manufacture 600 tonnes of cheese and 2,500 tonnes of baby food every year – the first in the world to manufacture these products on a large commercial scale using buffalo milk. Cattle owned by cooperative members were provided with insurance cover should anything happen to this major source of their livelihood. An Institute of Rural Management (IRMA) was founded in Anand for training professional managers for rural development projects.

As the ‘Anand Pattern’ gradually spread to other districts in Gujarat, in 1974, the Gujarat Cooperative Milk Marketing Federation Ltd Anand, was formed as an apex organization. A crucial feature of the cooperative movement associated with the ‘Anand Pattern’ was the democratic mode of functioning of the cooperatives. To
spread this experiment to other states, the National Dairy Development Board (NDDB) was created in 1965. NDDB launched ‘Operation Flood’, a programme to replicate the ‘Anand Pattern’ in other milk sheds of the country. A study done by the World Bank of Operation Flood has detailed how the effort to replicate the ‘Anand Pattern’ paid rich dividends. First, the obvious impact of Operation Flood was the considerable increase in milk supply and consequent increase in income of the milk producers, particularly the poor. While national milk production grew at 0.7 per cent per annum till 1969, it grew at more than 4 per cent annually after the inception of Operation Flood.

It was estimated that 60% of the beneficiaries were marginal or small farmers and landless. Milk cooperatives thus proved to be a significant anti-poverty measure. In this connection, the World Bank report highlighted an important ‘lesson’ learnt from operation Floor, a lesson with major politico-economic implications. The ‘lesson’ was that by focusing a project on a predominant activity of the poor, “self-selection” is likely to result in a major portion of the beneficiaries being poor’ thus reaching ‘target’ groups which generally prove ‘elusive to reach in practice’. Further, it may be added the Anand-type milk cooperatives reached the poor irrespective of caste, religion or gender, without targeting any of these groups specifically. Second, the impact of the milk cooperatives and Operation Flood went way beyond just increase in milk supply and incomes.

It led to the indigenization of the infrastructure and technology that considerably lowered costs, making it possible to procure and account for minute quantities of milk. Third, Operation Flood spread and even intensified the impact of the milk cooperatives on women and children and on education. Operation flood in cooperation with NGOs like the Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA), established about 6,000 women dairy cooperative societies (WDCS) were only constituted exclusively of women. They gave women greater control over their lives through the milk income accruing to them and also enabled them to participate in decision-making outside their homes. It contributed to children staying in school longer, that is, it reduced the dropout rate. The spread of the ‘Anand Pattern’ was not to be limited to milk. Cooperatives for fruits and vegetable producers, oilseeds cultivators, small-scale salt makers and tree growers were started at the initiative of the NDDB.

LAND REFORMS: AN OVERVIEW

India witnessed the unique phenomenon of wide ranging land reforms being implemented within a modern democratic structure without any violence or use of authoritarian force. There was no forced collectivization as in the Soviet Union or forcible expropriation of land and pushing of peasants into communes as in China, processes that had cost millions of lives. Independent India successfully transformed the colonial agricultural structure which it had inherited. Large, semi-feudal, rapacious landlords rack-renting the peasantry as well as extracting illegal cesses in cash, kind or labour (beggar) had by and large become a thing of the past. State demand from the peasant, the other major burden on the agriculturist, also gradually virtually disappeared.

The stranglehold of the moneylender over the peasantry was also considerably weakened with the growing availability of cooperative and institutional
credit. Large numbers of zamindars and jagirdars who were formerly absentee landlords now took to modern capitalist farming in the lands that they could retain for personal cultivation. Similarly, the tenants and sharecroppers who either got ownership rights or security of tenure were now prepared to make far greater investment and improvements in their lands. The landless, who received ceiling-surplus or Bhoocondan lands or previously unoccupied government land distributed in anti-poverty programmes, were ready to put in their best into lands which they could now, typically for the first time, call their own.

However, the problem of the landless or the near landless, constituting nearly half the agricultural population has persisted. The high rate of population growth and the inability of the industrialization process to absorb a greater proportion of the agricultural population have made it difficult to deal with this situation. The effort at cooperative joint farming failed as one way of solving the problems of rural poverty, inequity and landlessness. Yet, independent India did succeed in essentially rooting out feudal elements from Indian agriculture and put the colonial agrarian structure that it inherited on the path of progressive, owner cultivator-based capitalist agricultural development; a development the benefits of which trickled down to the poorer sections of the peasantry and to some extent even to agricultural labourers.

GREEN REVOLUTION

India had been facing food shortages since the mid-1950s and in the mid-1960s. Agricultural growth had begun to stagnate in the early 1960s. The massive jump in population growth rates after independence, to about 2.2 per cent annum from about 1 per cent in the previous half century, the slow but steady rise in per capita income, and the huge outlay towards planned industrialization, put long-term pressures on Indian agriculture. The controversial agreements made by India to import food from the US under the PL-480 scheme started in 1956. Given this scenario, economic self-reliance and particularly food self-sufficiency became the top priority.

Critical inputs like high-yield variety (HYV) seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides, agricultural machinery including tractors, pump-sets, etc., soil-testing facilities, agricultural education programmes and institutional credit were concentrated on areas which had assured irrigation and other natural and institutional advantages. Some 32 million acres of land, about 10 per cent of the total cultivated area, was, thus, initially chosen for receiving the package programme benefits on top priority. The Agricultural Prices Commission was set up and efforts were made to see that the farmer was assured a market at sustained remunerative prices. Between 1967-68 and 1970-71 foodgrain production rose by 35%. By 1980s, not only was India self-sufficient in food with buffer food stocks of over 30 million tonnes, but it was even exporting food to pay back earlier loans or as loans to food–deficit countries.

However, doubts about the New Agricultural Strategy began to be expressed from the very early stages of its implementation. One persistent argument had been early stages of its implementation. One persistent argument had been that by concentrating resources on the regions that already had certain advantages the Green Revolution strategy was further accentuating regional inequality. Clearly, the solution to such fears lay in spreading the Green Revolution further and not opposing it per
In the first phase of the Green Revolution, there was a sharp increase in yield in wheat in the north-western region of Punjab, Haryana and western Uttar Pradesh. In the second phase, 1970-73 to 1980-83, with the extension of HYV seed technology from wheat to rice, the Green Revolution spread to other parts of the country, notably eastern Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. In third phase of the Green Revolution, 1980-83 to 1992-95, the Green Revolution now spread to the erstwhile low-growth areas of the eastern region of West Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Orissa, with West Bengal achieving an unprecedented growth.

A considerable opinion emerged that the Green Revolution was leading to class polarization in the countryside. It was argued that rich peasants and capitalist farmers were getting strengthened partly at the expense of the small peasants, tenants, etc., who, unable to access the modern inputs, were being pushed into the rank of the landless. Further, the mechanization of agriculture was displacing labour, leading to increasing unemployment and a fall in wages of agricultural labour. The Green Revolution, far from pushing the small farmer into the ranks of the landless, actually enabled him to survive. With the adoption of the new technology, improved seeds and other agricultural inputs, the small farmer became relatively more viable and did not have to sell out to the large farmer in distress.

Tenants and sharecroppers, who did not have security of tenure, were perhaps the only losers. These sections came under pressure as rents and land values rose rapidly in areas where the Green Revolution spread. Fears of the Green Revolution leading to increasing rural unemployment because of labour-displacing mechanization proved to be baseless. With the spread of the new technology ‘the demand for causal labour has increased and so have wages and the landless labourer is somewhat better off than in the past. In Punjab, for example, the number of agricultural labourers is said to have trebled between 1961 and 1981, while the number of landless agricultural households declined.

Apart from the growth in agricultural employment, it has generated non-agricultural rural and semi-urban employment, through the development of agro-industries, rapid increase in trade and warehousing of agricultural produce and agricultural inputs like fertilizers and pesticides. The surplus stocks of foodgrain that became available as a result of the agricultural breakthrough made it possible to launch employment-generating poverty alleviation programmes on a considerable scale, particularly in the agriculturally backward areas. From about 20 million person-days of employment generated in the mid-1960s, the employment generated under such programmes in the country amounted to 850 million person-days in 1988-89.

The Green Revolution did, however, contribute to an increase in inequality in the countryside. But the poor too benefited in absolute terms though their well-to-do neighbours did far better relatively. Real wages of agricultural labour consistently rose in areas where the Green Revolution spread. Increase in wages in the high-growth areas, such as Punjab, would have been much sharper but for the migration of labour from low-wage the migrant labourers beneficiaries of considerably higher wages, the wage levels in the areas they came from also tended to rise.
CIVIL DISOBEEDIENCE MOVEMENT

Questions Asked

- Why did Gandhi launch the Salt Satyagraha in 1930 and with what results?
- In what way did the CDM affect the different provinces of India? How did it foster peasant movement in India? (250 words)
- Why did Mahatma Gandhi launch CDM? Analyse the intensity of movement in different parts of India? (150 words)
- Analyze Mahatma Gandhi’s main demands presented to Irwin. How did salt emerge as the central issue for launching the Satyagraha?
- We must be able to answer:-
  - Gandhiji’s main demands to Irwin – Analyze
  - Why CDM
  - How salt became central issue
  - Its effect in different provinces
  - How peasants movement was a result of CDM
  - What results of CDM

WHY CDM

British heralded a new era of "Modern India", the India which saw the process of geographical unification, nation building and genesis of political consciousness among masses. This mass consciousness manifested itself in the form of a spontaneous, organized and non-violent Civil Disobedience Movement.

The idea of Civil Disobedience was always there in the mind of Gandhiji, the 1929 Lahore Resolution of Poorna Swaraj, “full and total independence” provided the immediate spark. The background was prepared by:

1. **1919 reforms** were the shortest lasting reforms and had failed to bring any significant change for the Indians.
2. Failure of **Simon Commission** to fulfill demand of Dominion status of INC. Racial discrimination in the Simon Commission as no Indian Representative was taken.
3. **Swarajists** proved that there were no real powers delegated to them. The 1919 reforms were a retrograde step of the government.
4. December **1928 Calcutta Congress** – demand by younger nationalists like Pt. Nehru and S.C. Bose to adopt **Poorna Swaraj** as goal of national movement.
5. Gandhiji traveled extensively the villages during 1929 to prepare people for direct political action.
6. 1929 – CWC organized programme of **foreign cloth boycott** and its public burning.
7. Refusal of Lord Irwin to **Eleven Demands** of Mahatma Gandhi.
8. Spurt generated in the masses by revolutionary activities of **HSRA**.
9. The deteriorating **socio-economic condition of the masses** especially of the peasants and the great depression of early 1930s provided the spurt to the movement. Widespread unemployment infused anger among the Indian youth.

The spark was more because of the **rise of left and induction of new blood in the Congress** during this period. This differentiated CDM from all earlier movements.
GANDHIJI’S DEMANDS

Mahatma Gandhi knew that any movement for liberation must necessarily be a mass movement and for a movement to be a mass movement, it must incorporate grievances of all the sections of society. Thus,

1. The most prominent demand, common to all sections especially the poor, was abolition of salt tax and government’s monopoly on salt.
2. Reduction in land tax so as to reduce burden on Indian peasantry.
3. Reduction of expenditure on army and administration to stop the drain of wealth.
4. Total prohibition; for emancipation of women and children.
5. Release of political prisoners and
6. Protection and development of Indian Industry through reduced exchange rate, protection to textile industry and exclusive right of coastal shipping for Indians.

Gandhi’s 11 point ultimatum to Irwin on 31 January seemed to many a sad climb-down from the Purna Swaraj resolution since no demand was made for any change in the political structure, not even Dominion Status.

WHY SALT

“Salt March” is one of the finest examples of ‘the power of symbols’. It was not just a punch of salt but it represented the unity & integrity of Indian people against a common enemy. Gandhiji choose salt because:

1. Salt links itself with Indian women, for whose emancipation, salt was the most important article.
2. Salt linked itself with the ideal of Swaraj with a universal grievance of rural poor.
3. Unlike in ‘no-rent campaign’, Salt excluded the socially divisive implications within the different sections of Indian society.
4. It offered urban adherents, an opportunity of symbolic identification with mass sufferings.

Finally, there is no other article like salt, outside water, by taxing which, government can reach starving millions, it was the most inhuman poll tax.

SPREAD & INTENSITY OF CDM – MOST INTENSE OF ALL MOVEMENTS

1. Salt disobedience: In Tamil Nadu, C. Raja Gopalachari led a march from Tiruchirapally to Vedaranniyam and in Malabar, K.Kelappan held a march from Calicut to Poyannur.
2. Darsana: Sarojini Naidu, Imam Sahib and Manilal raided Dharsana Salt Works, and were brutally lathi-charged.
3. NWFP - Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan organized Pathans as Khudai Khidamatgars to lead a non-violent movement.
4. Peshawar: a Muslim Province, urban crowd and tribesmen joined agitation against arrest of Congressmen. Garwal Rifles refused to fire on the crowd.
5. Chittagong: Surya Sen revolted and established a provisional government.
6. Maharashtra, Karnataka and Central Provinces: against the forest laws.
7. Sholapur: ‘War Council’ set up and National Flag was hoisted in the town.
8. Assam: agitation against ‘Cunningham Circular’. 

In sharp contrast to what had happened after Chauri Chaura, Gandhi made no move to call off the movement despite the violent incidents at Chittagong, Peshawar and Sholapur.

PEASANT’S MOVEMENTS

During 1901 to 1939, the agriculture production per head fell by 14%, while the per capita production of foodgrains by 24%. Growing taxation in a stagnant economy invariably carries with it the penalty of popular revolt. This was manifested during CDM in the states of Bihar, Bengal, UP and Gujarat. The great depression of early 1930s added fuel to the fire.

1. United Provinces: Non-revenue campaign by Zamindars against paying revenue to the government and a No-Rent Campaign by tenants against Zamindars.
2. UP Kisan Sabha under Swami Shahjananda and Bihar Kisan Sabha nucleus for All India Kisan activities were formed.
4. Bengal: Anti-Chowkidara tax and anti union board tax campaigns.
5. Gujarat: No-tax movement was organized for refusal to pay land revenue.

OUTCOME

Dandi March was a pilgrim’s progress. It rejuvenated the Indian Nationalism and eroded the British legitimacy to the core. CDM is considered as the war of positions, not a war of maneuver. It was the most-organized of all Gandhian movements.

1. Women Participation: Leading role in picketing shops selling foreign goods or liquor and government institutions, courted arrest. British observers wrote that if CDM hadn’t accomplished anything else, it contributed greatly to mass social emancipation of Indian women. Civil Disobedience marked in fact a major step forward in the emancipation of Indian women.
2. Muslims: Though Muslim League called Muslims not to join the movement, still Muslim participation was overwhelming in NWFP, besides their participation in Dacca, Bihar, Delhi & other parts. They belied government’s policy of ‘divide & rule’.
3. Tribals: Came forward in Peshawar, Nagaland, Central Provinces, Maharashtra and Karnataka. This was their first such participation in a national movement.
5. Besides, the students, workers and traders played an important role in the movement in different parts of the country.
6. Signs of cracks in discipline of Army: Garhwali Soldiers refused to fire on crowd even though it meant facing court martial. It shows nationalism begun penetrating Indian army.
7. Gandhi-Irwin Pact at one stroke enhanced the prestige of Congress as the equal of government.
8. Second Round Table Conference placed India on equal footing with Britain.
9. It further strengthened the principle of Satyagraha.
Throughout the movement, Gandhiji urged people to be non-violent first because he didn’t want to achieve Swaraj at the cost of sacred principle of Satyagraha, and secondly because he was leading an unarmed struggle against an armed power and he knew who would win if violence were let loose.

Muslim participation remained low throughout the Civil Disobedience years. Unlike Non-Cooperation, once again, Civil Disobedience did not coincide with any major labour upsurge. The lag in respect of labour and the urban intelligentsia was counter-balanced, however, by the massive response obtained from business groups and large sections of the peasantry. A social history of Civil Disobedience will have to be written largely in terms of the participation-varying between regions as well as over time—of these two basic social classes.

Organizationally, too, the Congress now was much stronger in most parts of the country than in 1921-22, when it had just taken the first step on the road towards becoming a mass party. This had, as we have already mentioned in passing, a somewhat contradictory impact. Organizational discipline and strength made movements on selected, specific issues much more effective, but also sometimes acted as a brake on elemental popular enthusiasm and radicalism.

The strength of Civil Disobedience in its first phase was vividly reflected in the firm stand taken by the national leadership at the abortive Yeravda jail negotiations, attempted by Sapru and Jayakar as mediators in July-August 1930. In Maharashtra, C.P., as well as Karnataka (which had been another area more or less untouched by Non-Cooperation), forest Satyagraha speedily became the most widespread and militant form of Civil Disobedience.

Intelligentsia participation from the beginning was less and urban trader enthusiasm proved shortlived. Another contrast with Non-Cooperation lay in the virtual absence of large-scale Muslim participation. This further weakened the movement in the towns (Muslims in U.P. were 37% of the urban population, though they numbered only 14.5% in the province as a whole), while the Congress seems to have deliberately avoided Muslim-dominated pockets in the countryside when selecting centres for active Civil Disobedience.

The contrast with Non-Cooperation was double-edged, however, for Civil Disobedience in many areas in U.P. did become much more of a villagers’ campaign, and Congress organization now was definitely more widespread, elaborate and disciplined.

CONCLUSION

Though Subhas. C. Bose and Vithalbhai Patel had declared that “the Mahatma as a political leader has failed”, CDM succeeded in further politicizing the people, and in further deepening the social roots of freedom struggle. Indians had won independence in their hearts. It accomplished in weeks, what three-quarters of a century of social reform movements had failed to do for emancipation of Indian women.
PLATE TECTONICS THEORY (PTT)

Plate tectonics is a relatively new theory that has revolutionized the way geologists think about the Earth. **According to the theory, the surface of the Earth is broken into large plates.** The size and position of these plates change over time. The edges of these plates, where they move against each other, are sites of intense geologic activity, such as earthquakes, volcanoes, and mountain building. It **provides a framework** from which most other geological processes can be viewed.

The hypothesis of Plate Tectonics Theory emerges from the fact that the outer, rigid lithosphere of earth consists of several individual segments called **Plates.** These plates **vary in thickness** from 80-100 km in oceans to > 100 km in continents. At places these may be as thick as 400 km.

**PLATES AND THEIR MOTION**

- Total 12 plates in no.:
  - 6 of enormous size called **“Great Plates”**
  - 6 of comparatively smaller size
- Great Plates include:-
  1. **Pacific Plate**: Almost entirely oceanic plus small portion of California. Converging in North and West. Movement: NW
  2. **American Plate**: continental N & S America plus oceanic west of mid Atlantic Ridge. For most of western edge, it is converging
  3. **Eurasian Plate**: largely continental plus fringed on east and north by oceanic. Diverging on west and converging on east.
  4. **African Plate**: continental core plus oceanic periphery.
  5. **Austral Indian**: Mostly Oceanic plus Continental Aust. And peninsular India
  6. **Antarctic Plate**: Antarctica continent surrounded by oceanic lithosphere. Almost completely spreading all around.
- **Other plates**: Nazca, Cocos, Philippine, Arabian, Caribbean & Juan De Fuca plate. Juan De Fuca is diminishing in size & will disappear by subduction under American Plate.

The motion of these plates is related to the molten matter below the earth’s surface. Below the lithosphere, **Asthenosphere** consists of a hotter and weaker zone. **Weak nature of rocks in Asthenosphere** facilitates motion of rigid outer shell. Further two places on same plate are not in motion relative to each other e.g. New Delhi and Chennai. However two places on different plates are in motion relative to each other e.g. distance between New Delhi and Beijing is reducing due to convergence.

**PLATE BOUNDARIES**

There are 3 kinds of Plate boundaries:

1. **Divergent**: plates move apart here... create new sea floor (also called **Constructive** boundaries)
2. **Convergent**: plates move towards each other ... one of the slabs of lithosphere descends beneath other...therefore one plate is consumed into mantle (also called **Destructive** boundaries)

3. **Transform**: plates slide past each other...no creation or destruction of lithosphere.

A. **DIVERGENT BOUNDARY**

- Situated at the crests of **oceanic ridges** (oceanic ridges are mountain like structures that exist beneath the oceans; these are the points where the plates basically diverge from each other) e.g. at mid-Atlantic Ridge
- As plates move away from ridge axis, fractures so created are immediately filled with **molten rock that oozes up from hot asthenosphere below**. Material cools to form new slivers of sea floor. Atlantic Ocean created 165 my ago by this process.
- When a spreading centre develops within a continent (that is **land area** and not oceanic area), **hot rising plume up-warps the crust** directly above it leading to **crustal stretching** & ultimately **tensional cracks**

![Tension Cracks](image)

- As the plates move away, the broken slabs are displaced downward creating down faulted valleys called **Rifts**. **East African rift valley** represents this stage.

![Rift Valley](image)

- As spreading continues, rift valley lengthens and deepens to become a **narrow linear sea**, extending out into the ocean e.g. **Red Sea**, Gulf of California.
- The igneous activity continues, generating new sea floor, resulting into an ever expanding ocean basin. The site of upwelling takes shape of mid oceanic ridge

- African rift valley and Red sea exemplify best the whole phenomenon

B. CONVERGENT BOUNDARIES

- These are the points where the two plates merge into each other.
- Site where lithosphere reabsorbed into mantle.
- Region where an oceanic plate descends into asthenosphere. Also called a subduction zone because of convergence. A deep ocean trench (8-11 km deep) is formed near subduction zone.

Oceanic – Continental Convergence

- Oceanic crust bends and descends into asthenosphere.
- Soft sediments on sinking plate are scrapped off by overriding continental plate and deposit along continental margins.
- At 100 km depth, partial melting of water rich ocean crust and overlying mantle takes place. In the process, less denser than mantle- granitic and andesitic magma is generated that buoys upwards. It cools and crystallizes under continental crust; some migrate to surface resulting into numerous and explosive volcanic eruptions. Volcanic portions of Andes resultant of Nazca plate under American plate.
- Volcanic arcs are created with such subduction. Mountains like Andes have many such parts. Cascade Range and Sierra Nevada in USA another examples.
Oceanic – Oceanic Convergence

- **Volcanic island arcs** form with subduction
- **Partial melting of subducting plate** and overlying mantle generates magma which moves upward and forms **igneous portion of developing arc system**. Aleutian, Mariana, Tonga are examples.
- Over extended time, **numerous episodes of volcanism** and buoyancy by intrusive igneous masses increase its size and elevation. This raises erosion rate and increased sedimentation added to adjacent sea floor and back arc basin.

- Piling up of sediments in front of overriding plate forms **accretionary wedge**. It is folded, faulted and metamorphosed by compressional stresses of converging plates; similar to igneous arc, it comes above sea level over a period of time. **Mature island Arc** with two roughly parallel orogenic belts created e.g. Japan, Philippines and Alaskan peninsula.

Continental – Continental Convergence

- **Neither of the two subducts** because of low density of rocks & their buoyant nature
- **Continental crust is buckled, fractured and generally shortened**
- **Himalayas**, Alps, Appalachians, Urals are examples
Prior to collision, landmasses involved are separated by an ocean basin. Convergence leads to intervening sea floor subduct under one plate. **Partial melting** of subducting plate and mantle results in volcanic arc. Erosion of newly formed arc discharges large quantities of sediments to already sediment laden continental margins. When continental plates collide, squeezing, folding and deforming of sediments takes place. **New mountain range** with deformed sedimentary rocks and fragments of volcanic arc are thus formed. Descending oceanic plate breaks and moves downwards.

**Himalayas** formed in this way *45 my ago*. India once part of Antarctica splitted and moved northward to collide with Asia. Himalayan mountains and Tibetan plateau were thus formed. **Sea sediments** elevated high above sea level. Spreading
centre propelling India northward is still active. This is the reason for the on-going growth of Himalayas @ few cm/year. Evidence: severe earthquakes as north as China and Mongolia. **Urals** formed by collision of European plate with Asian plate. **Alps** formed by collision b/w Africa and Europe during closing of Tethys Sea.

C. **TRANSFORM BOUNDARIES**

- No production or destruction of crust
- Transform faults roughly parallel to the direction of plate mvmt.
- Transform faults **connect convergent and divergent boundaries**, thus enabling divergence occurring at a spreading centre be transformed into convergence at a subduction zone.
- Most transform faults: lie within ocean basins. Few cut continental crust also e.g. **California’s San Andreas Fault** along which Pacific plate moving northwest past American plate. It may result into part of California and Baja Peninsula becomes an island off West Coast of USA.
- **Severe Earthquakes** are caused along these boundaries.

![Transform Fault Diagram](image)

THE DRIVING MECHANISM OF THE PLATES

There are various models that propose the driving mechanism for the plates. However, none of them provides the complete explanation about the plates and...
associated features. Nevertheless, it is clear that the **unequal distribution of heat is the underlying driving force** for plate movement. Arthur Holmes provided one of the first models used to explain the movements of plates. He suggested that large **convection currents** drive plate motion. He says that, in the regions of oceanic ridges, warm and less dense material of the mantle rises. On reaching the bottom of the plates, it spreads laterally and drags the lithosphere along. Eventually, the material cools and begins to sink back into the mantle.

Another model says that as a newly formed **slab of oceanic crust** moves away from the ridge crest, it cools down gradually and becomes denser. Eventually, this cold oceanic slab denser than the asthenosphere begins to descend. When this occurs, the dense sinking slab pulls the trailing lithosphere along.

Another model suggests that relatively narrow, **hot plumes of rock (i.e. Hot Spots)** contribute to plate motion. These hot plumes are presumed to extend upward from the vicinity of the mantle-core boundary. Upon reaching the lithosphere, they spread laterally and facilitate the plate motion away from the zone of upwelling. A dozen or so hot spots have been identified along ridge systems where they may contribute to plate divergence.

In another version of the hot plume model, all upward convection is confined to a few large cylindrical structures. Embedded in these **large zones of upwelling** are most of the earth’s hot spots. The downward limbs of these convection cells are the cold, dense subducting lithospheric plates.

Although there is still much to be learned about the mechanisms that cause plates to move, some facts are clear. The unequal distribution of heat in the earth generates some of thermal convection in the mantle which ultimately drives plate motion. Except for hot spots, upwelling beneath ridges appears to be a shallow feature, responding to the tearing of the lithosphere under the pull of the descending slabs. Furthermore, the descending lithospheric plates are active components of down-welling, and they serve to transport cold material into the mantle.
CONTINENTAL DRIFT THEORY (CDT)

In May 2010, new species of frog were found in Western Ghats in India whose DNA demonstrates that its closest living relatives were of Seychelles in Africa. This discovery and many of its kinds are explained well by the theory of continental drift.

Continental Drift Theory of Alfred Wegener was a revolutionary idea in the field of geography. Despite the fact that many of his postulates were based on imaginations; these imaginations took us closer to reality, though many decades later.

WHAT IS HIS IDEA

According to Wegener, around 300 my ago (Carboniferous Period), all landmasses were united together in one super-continent landmass called “Pangea” surrounded by one water body called “Panthalasa”. Around 200 my ago (Mesozoic Period), Pangea was disrupted into “Laurasia” (N. America, Europe and Asia) in north and “Gondwanaland” (S. America, Africa, India, Australia and Antarctica) in South, and started moving away. Intervening space filled up with water called “Tethys Sea”.

Around 135 my ago, Gondwanaland was disrupted and its constituents drifted apart. Also N. America broke away from Angaraland.
EVIDENCES IN SUPPORT OF CDT

1. **Fit of Continents**: Striking parallelism b/w opposing Coasts of Atlantic; India-Africa-Madagascar etc. A rough zig-saw fit pattern is revealed. He was criticized on the basis of the fact that *coastlines are dynamic* (function of Structure, Time and Process according to Davis). However, a 900 m *isobath* shows a remarkable fit of continents with few overlaps at places of stream depositions. This proves that the continents were joined together earlier.

2. **Fossil evidence**: Identical fossils of Mesozoic Period (200my ago when Laurasia and Gondwanaland separated) were found on widely separated landmasses. Glossopteris found widely distributed. Mesosaurs fossils found in S. America and W. Africa. Marsupials in Australia and S. America.

   ![Continents Diagram](image)

   This explanation was however countered by *Land Bridge hypothesis* b/w these continents which say that there existed a land bridge between all these continents connecting them all and these animals could move freely from one continent to another. However, such a kind of bridge is highly unlikely. Another counter-argument to it was of “parallel evolution” of these animals on all continents. However even this seems impractical.

3. **Rock Type and Structural Similarities**: striking similarity found b/w rocks in N.W. Africa and E. Brazil. If joined together these form a *continuous line*. Similarly Appalachian chains continued in Greenland and N. Europe.

4. **Palaeo-climatic Evidences**: Glacial till in Tropical lands of Africa, India and Australia and that too at same stratigraphic position strongly point out towards the integrity of these landmasses. Further, *coal fields* in mid-latitude, USA, Europe and Siberia are explainable only if all the continents are joined together and taken to South Pole.

5. **Palaeo-magnetic Evidences**: Rock magnetism shows not only direction of poles but also the latitude in which a rock was formed. Palaeo-magnetic Curve for Europe reveals *North Pole wandered* from Hawaii through E. Siberia to its present position. For N. America, similar curve with 30º longitude difference has been identified. As average position of poles remained stationary, it proves that not the poles, but the continents wandered.
6. **Sea Floor Spreading**: Discovery of SFS strengthened the idea of Palaeo-magnetism and provided a driving mechanism for the continents. Pangea broke away through this process. Zone of SFS extended through continents in North-South direction.
SECTULARISM

Secularism is not a mere protest or discontent with excesses of religious zeal. Secularism is defined in the Encyclopedia Britannica as a branch of utilitarian ethics, designed for the physical, social and moral improvement of mankind, which neither affirms nor denies the theistic premises of religion. The process of secularization of practice and thought consists in the withdrawal and separation of ‘religion’ from other spheres of ‘life and thought’.

Secularism is a “process whereby religious thinking, practice and institutions lose their social significance”. Therefore, Secularism means the inevitable “desacrilisation” of the World. The world loses its sacred character as man and nature becomes the object of rational casual explanation in which the supernatural plays no part.

Secularism is the principle of separation of government institutions, and the persons mandated to represent the State, from religious institutions and religious dignitaries. In one sense, secularism may assert the right to be free from religious rule and teachings, and the right to freedom from governmental imposition of religion upon the people within a state that is neutral on matters of belief. In another sense, it refers to the view that human activities and decisions, especially political ones, should be unbiased by religious influence.

SECTULARISM AND SECULARIZATION: A DEFINITION

‘Secularism’ is a value-loaded concept, its values derive from, and must be contextualized in our understanding of the underlying social process and ‘secularism’ is a socio-political ideology. Actual ‘secularism’ can become a reality in our social institutions only in so far as these are affected by ‘secularization’. Therefore, secularism is a product of and in turn, strengthens the process of secularization.

It was the apparent decline in traditional church-oriented religion in recent times that heightened the process of secularization and brought it to its present culmination. Yet it is a process, whose roots can be traced to the very founding of the major religions and in fact, it stands in an ambiguous and dialectical relation to the very phenomena, it supposedly undermines. In this perspective, secularism is a Western concept to the extent that secularization is a process that is located in Western society.

The term ‘secularization’ is defined by Bryan Wilson as the process in which different social institutions become recognized as distinctive concerns operating with considerable autonomy. It is also a process of decline in religious activities, beliefs, ways of thinking and institutions. This decline in religious consciousness is the result of the universal acceptance of pragmatic or scientific approach to secular issues. In another work, Wilson mentions three features of a secular or secularized society, i.e.

a) The prevalence of instrumental values,
b) Rational procedures,
c) Technological methods.

SECULARISM IN INDIA

Right from the beginning, Indian secularism *drew its strength from pluralism*. Secularism in the Indian tradition was *not the opposition of religion but was related to communalism*. While in Europe, being mono-religious, secularism was not the opposite of communalism as there was no struggle for domination between various religious communities. This is the crucial difference between the Western and Indian concepts of secularism.

The word ‘secular’ in political sense was used after the *formation of Indian National Congress in 1885*. The word secular in Indian political terminology came to the used in pluralist settings and not in a Western sense that indicated indifference to religion. It should also be noted that the European society was, for all practical purposes, a mono-religious society.

Thus secularism has a very different connotation in the Western context. It is essentially signified in a political authority totally independent of Church. The concept of secularism in India emerged *in the context of religious pluralism, as against religious authoritarianism in the West*. Secularism was emphasized by the Indian National Congress to allay the apprehension of religious minorities.

THE CONSTITUTION AND SECULARISM

Indian Constitution is a creative blend between state secularism and religiosity of the civil society. The Indian Constitution treats all citizens equal, irrespective of caste, creed, race, sex or religion.

*Article 14* guarantees equality before law.
*Article 15* says, 1) ‘The State shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place or any of them.
*Article 25-30* guarantees to minorities the right to establish their own educational institutions. These Articles from 25 to 30 are extremely significant as far as minority rights are concerned, the minorities could be religious or linguistic.

Though our constitution is secular, originally the word secularism did not occur in it. It was during emergency in 1976 that the words “secular” and “socialist” were added and India was described as “secular and socialist republic”. But the words secularism or secular were not defined. Thus, we see the words secular and secularism remain undefined in the Indian Constitution. ‘Secularism’ in the Indian Constitution connotes that:

1. The state, by itself, shall not espouse or establish or practice any religion,
2. Public revenues will not be used to promote any religion.

The Constitution has undoubtedly *erected a ‘wall of separation’ between the State and religion*. While there are no doors opening from the side of religion in to the State, there are, however, several doors opening from the side of the
State in to religion. If the interests of public order, morality and health so demand, the right to profess, practice and propagate religion may be breached; so also the right of a religious denomination to manage its own affairs in matters pertaining to religion.

The right to profess, practice and propagate religion may also be breached if the enforcement of other fundamental rights requires it or if the demands of the social welfare and reform require it. Thus the constitution contemplates and compels the supremacy of secular authority and secular interest over religious authority and religious interest.

We see, therefore, that secularism under the Constitution is an attitude, and a way of life, partly commanded and partly commended by the Constitution, embodying a system of values in which the relation between fellow human beings and between the State and citizens are freed from the bondage of the prejudices and loyalties of religion, race, caste, language and region and are ruled by a mutual concern for a life with dignity and culture for a society where everyone is free and equal and in which science and reason triumph over superstitious and blind belief and love of humanity over love of any particular section thereof.

The concept of secularism that emerged in India possessed three substantial components:
- The state would not attach itself to any one religion, which would thereby establish as the state religion.
- All citizens had the freedom of religious belief.
- The state would ensure equality among religious groups by ensuring that one group was not favoured at the expenses of another. Correspondingly, the minorities were reassured that they would not be discriminated against in any way.

Therefore, in the first instance, secularism was designed to regulate debilitating religious strife, to assure the minorities of their safety and to set at rest any apprehension that the state would align itself with the dominant religion. In retrospect, it is not surprising that secularism proved to be attractive to Indian leadership. For one, secularism had historically emerged in the West as a formula to put an end to the religious wars that has devastated Europe in the sixteenth century.

In India, the anti-colonial struggle had provoked separate and potentially divisive communities to define themselves not only in opposition to colonialism but also in opposition to each other. This posed a distinct threat to the coherence of the new nation. The articulation of the principle of secularism, a principle that was strictly outside the ideological formulation of these identities, was designed to allow people to live together in civility. This is what contemporary critiques of secularism seem to forget.

For our country, the attraction of secularism lay in the fact that it was the only prudent option for construction of a nation out of the fragmented and polarized identities that had emerged and consolidated themselves during the colonial and the anti-colonial phase. In India, where two new nations had materialized out of a blood drenched partition, i.e. India and Pakistan, the need was to forget that people
who shared the same historical consciousness, the same language and the same folklore for centuries had split over religion.

The need was to **integrate these divided people on new ideologies, new perspectives and new issues**. This issue could only be secularism that gave due recognition to religious identities and yet attempted to transcend them as far as the public sphere was concerned. The state **could not refuse to recognize the religious identities of its people**. That would have been bad politics and bad historical understanding. What it could do, was to stipulate that all religions were in principle equal.

**SECULARISM (THE INDIAN CONTEXT)**

If we were to look for a definition of secularism in the context of the wider world, then the most acceptable one would be: it is a principle, which advocates the separation of religion from politics, what in India we call as *dharma-nirapekshata*. The key term here is separation.

On the face of it, this seems a simple, uncomplicated principle. But on a closer examination, it will be seen that it is not. **Separation can mean many different things and can pose difficulties**, if we work with a single meaning. It can mean different things in different societies. The Indian case poses unique difficulties. Indian version of secularism depends, importantly, on how separation of religion from politics is understood.

**UNDERSTANDING THE INDIAN NEED FOR AND DEBATES ABOUT SECULARISM**

To understand these, let us start by asking: how best to understand the Indian need for **debates about secularism**. It is obvious that secularism as a concept, principle and a set of practices emerged first in a different historical context viz. in the West. It is only in the last 100 years, more so in the 50 years i.e. since the adoption of the Constitution in 1950, that **secularism has become a topic of debate in Indian society**. And in the last 15-20 years, it has also become a matter of serious disputes and contentions.

In the case of India, because she joined late in the history of development of modern ideas and their actualization, we have to understand that why do we need secularism? And, this question has become important because there is a section of people in India, both among intellectuals and political activists, who believe and argue that we can do without secularism.

Their argument goes like this: **our traditions are pluralistic and flexible** and can therefore, be a better **source of toleration**; it is a resource with us in our own history. Therefore, we do not require imposing secularism, an alien concept, on our society. While we all agree that our traditions are plural and flexible, we require to understand that the view that **secularism is unnecessary in India is deeply mistaken**, because these plural traditions cannot sustain democracy under the present circumstances.
WESTERN CONTEXT OF SECULARISM

It is important to go into the origins of secularism or the western context. This will give a picture of historical differences, which can then suggest a possible range of answers to the question that what the reason for need of secularism is. There are things or circumstances in the history of Europe, out of which two principles of understanding emerge in relation to the idea of the secular. Europe saw, throughout the middle ages and right up to the middle of the 17th century, a major struggle between the Roman Catholic Church and the states of the time (state as an institution) for supremacy.

This conflict for supremacy between these two major institutions, both, highly organized and powerful, has come to be known as the ‘Church vs. the State’ controversy. Then, from the middle of the 16th century with the rise of Protestantism (with Luther and Calvin preaching against the Pope of the Roman Catholics), there came about an intolerant debate between the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant sects. This developed into a major war between the two in the early 17th century and was fought out for 30 long years, killing and maiming millions of people all over Europe. This was known as the ‘30 Years War’ or the ‘Sectarian War’, which ended with the Treaty of Westphalia, where a “Modus Vivandi” (an agreement by which parties of conflicting interest can get along) was arrived at between the two warring groups. This Modus Vivandi slowly, over time, grew into a principle of political order and got disseminated among the political class. Secularism came to be the principle, which enunciated separation between the State and the Church.

The other thing of importance was the transformation of religion into a personal matter, which then, went on to reinforce the separation principle. Within the Protestant movement, many churches were emerging, each with its own distinct doctrines and emphases. It came to be accepted that nobody ought to interfere about which church one chose to belong to. Belief was to be a matter of one’s conscience, something personal and private to the individual. (As an aside, non-interference in matters of conscience thus became one of the foundations of the theory of rights, the other being the sanctity of property). The principle of putting church/religion on one side and state/politics on the other, together with the principle of conscience as a matter private to the individual person, became the basis of the rise of secularism as a doctrine. In other words, religion was to be kept out of public affairs and policy making, which were to be the exclusive domain of politics and the state.

It is obvious that one cannot draw any direct lesson from the western experience because India never had a church or a powerful organized state. The Maurya or the Mughal empires were episodic, that is, such a state was not a continuous presence. The idea of clash between the church and the state is therefore, alien to Indian Civilization. Our context and historical heritage are very different. So the need for, and the route of secularism, have to be also necessarily different. But the importance of the principle of conscience, in a different way though, could not be denied.

HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY OF THE NEED FOR SECULARISM IN INDIA

Our secularism is primarily directed against two evils; first, the religious strife between different religious communities and its extreme forms like communal
violence and riots; and, secondly, the danger of religious communities overwhelming the state, each with its own view of “good life” as valid for others, too. Both arose as a problem in the second half of the 19th century. Sometimes, these become disproportionately important and at other times, recede into insignificance. But in the last 20 years, there has been a worrying growth in both these trends, threatening the very fabric of Indian society. Why did this happen? The answer will give us the historical sociology of how the need arose for secularism in India. It is a story worth pursuing in some details. After India came under colonial rule, two changes closely connected to each other, took place in the Indian society. One pertained to the kind of structural changes that came about and the other to the way our social life was organized. Both had far reaching consequences.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES: MODERNIZATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The first had to do with modernization—bourgeois property, extensive trade, industry, urban life, capital accumulation, modern (non-religious) education, etc. Colonial modernization was deeply exploitative, creating uneven divisions between regions and communities, but nevertheless, leading to the economic integration of the country, uniform administrative control and growing cultural harmonization through codification of customs and their applications across different parts. This had a few important consequences. It was creating greater and greater similarity between India and the global structural conditions. It also led to the process of individuation, that is, persons bound within communities slowly becoming individuals (as we have in the western societies).

These two developments together, then, became the basis of new mental capacities. To take one instance, receptivity to ideas from anywhere in the world emerged. We all are aware of how ideas of equality, rights, dignity of person were to others anywhere else in the world. It is shown in the development of printing, the growing importance and popularity of newspapers, periodicals and books in the life our society.

Issues were raised and hotly debated. There was a proliferation of discussion not only at the level of the elite, but at different popular levels. Nobody then divided the ideas into those of foreign origin and those of Indian origin. They debated these ideas as new and of interest and relevance to the Indian society. It looked as if everybody is talking to everybody else in excitement.

As a result of this, secondly, very large number of persons, bound earlier within communities of ritual status or religious beliefs, were let loose from these prior bonds. This is how, what we call today “masses,” were created; people of a new kind. Many implications flowed out of this. Masses were just not an undifferentiated pool of people. It took various structural forms like the formation of new classes, viz. the capitalist and the workers, modern landlords and the farmers and property less so on.

This has had a lasting impact on the social fabric of life in India. It is not that the old style, pre-modern communities like jatis or small religious groups did not survive but their internal form was deeply altered. These got differentiated in terms of income and skills, unlike earlier. Now interests emerged within these communities, which jostled with one another. Earlier, the communities lived side by
side without competition and enjoyed a great deal of local autonomy in how they lived. That local autonomy began to lose ground and today it is lost.

**CHANGES IN THE ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL LIFE**

These also took place on a large scale - efforts at redrawing the community boundaries and efforts at unifying them to confront the perceived onslaught of the modern world and in the same process, to gain benefits for the communities. Resistance to modernity and bargaining for its advantages were and are, paradoxically, two sides of the same coin.

The outcome of both these changes: society was no more the loosely held diversity, living, part unreflectively, by itself. It now faced its alternative, the singular other and modernity. To handle this threat and to defend itself, many of the numerous communities, each related to the larger traditions in different ways also posed diverse notions of the social good. Not only did each of these notions of good competed with one another, but also the conception of good entailed in modernity and which was clouded by the colonial depredations.

The happy coexistence of the numerous communities, each living with minimal interactions, though with cordial understandings, could no more is taken for granted (as was in the earlier times). This was the source of enormous strain on the inherited capacities of people to handle inter-personal, intra-community and inter-community relations. This happened over and above the new competition generated by the establishment of colonial economy and administration along with the struggle for share in power in the new social arrangement, taking shape then. The situation required interlocutors for exchange of opinions and ideas and the adjudication of diverging interests and diverse notions of good between these very differently positioned worlds.

Successful mediation required either people placed outside the numerous communities or those, who could think beyond the limits of these communities, each of which was getting more and more unified as well as assertive. Old style dialogue, as used to take place between adjacent communities enjoying local autonomy, would no more do between people, now more and more distant from one another and demanding things from the world, which was unfamiliar to old type of transactions. All this was to sap the traditionally built-in resources including those of tolerance and mutual perseverance. Agreements or understanding reached by those, claiming to represent these differently positioned worlds, always proved to be fragile and non-lasting. In other words, dialogical deals through the efforts of interlocutors have the character, especially in situations of social transition, of being provisional.

This is a situation in which old style dialogue between the adjacent communities does not work and the interlocutors become unequal to the task required. Therefore, something other than all these communally based competing notions of good was required; a value and a mechanism at the same time, to intercede in the face of the competing notions of good as well as interests were also needed. Compulsions from within this situation triggered the need for what is now called the ‘Secular Doctrine of Governance’.
It was required over and above everything, to seek a mode of doing things in the public life in a way so that the competing, and often irreconcilable, conceptions of good do not vitiate every situation of public interactions among the people. Some way of being secular, a principle of being outside of and at a distance from these competing notions of good, was a need generated from within the alterations taking shape at the very many intersections of society. One can therefore, argue that the principle of secularism is an internally propelled emergence and thus becomes a presence, irrespective of our choice.

It is now clear that the need for secularism arose within and out of the changes in the internal social relations and constitutive features, which make up Indian society. If a need for a new principle or a value or a concept, whether it is secularism or rights or equality or whatever, arises within a society, then it should be obvious that the concept or the principle is neither alien nor can it be looked at as an imposition. In a world, becoming more and more similar due to the processes noted above, certain principles or values and the concepts through which these are expressed do tend to develop roots in societies like ours. This is because of their internal needs even if originating in the West.

APPROPRIATE VERSION OF SECULARISM FOR INDIA

Such being the case, India is not a settled society like France or Germany etc, India is in a transitional stage and therefore, the meaning of or what kind of secularism India shall get will also be dictated by the specific features of this stage. Here, the social structures and beliefs and norms of the old society, though still present, are rapidly changing or giving way to new features. Let us take two examples. In Indian marriage system, the circle of endogamy is fast expanding and slowly, in many instances, the element of choice is entering. People may no longer want to be governed entirely by old, religious customs or rituals. They may want protection for what they desire. To give another example, Indians do not want, any more, to be ruled by the decisions of their caste panchayats. Indians, instead, prefer to be ruled by the elected panchayats. People may not want to be overwhelmed by caste and ritual status, as can happen in the working of the old caste panchayats.

Keeping both these and such others in mind, it becomes clear that these are situations where numerous new types of conflicts and social demands emerge. What one wants to stress here is that all the situations of transitions are also the ones where new conflicts abound and these conflicts are between the old and the new or the confusions and uncertainties generated by these.

Old ways of doing things, or resolving conflicts based on customary notions, will not do as these became inadequate or irrelevant because these were meant to handle small, recurring conflicts between local communities living adjacent to one another. There is no easy application of these on scales as large as in modern politics. Such is the situation prevailing under conditions of transition. Now, given the ever-changing character of conflicts, it is never enough to have merely principles and mechanisms. What is needed is a creative working out of policies and initiatives to meet the ever-changing newness of the conflict situations between religions and ethnic communities and between dissenters from within these communities. The last may take up positions against their own communities.
Secularism, under such conditions of shifting conflicting communal equations, requires **careful and flexible application**. It is no panacea in the sense that it cannot do without sensibly thought out social and economic policies or administrative measures. But there is no other substitute, as seen in the case of traditions and customs, principle to act in these situations. Therefore, it can be said that this is a difficult situation, but not that it **is an impossible principle** or that a secular society in India cannot be realized. Secularism takes a **zig-zag route** through the setbacks to its applications in India.

What should secularism mean for India? In other words, what is an appropriate version for India? This is important because in the West, secularism came to mean an **unambiguous separation of the church from the state**, implying thus, that religion should have nothing to do with politics. Within western recognized domains, they function independent of directions from the others. In America, this came to be known as the **“wall of separation”**. This now is generally seen in the West as the universal model of secularism. This version of secularism is not an appropriate model for India, secularism in India means peaceful co-existence of all religions. The peaceful co-existing people of all religions need not shun their individual religions, but their religious rights must be balanced with some duties.

**CIVILIZATION DIFFERENCES**

In trying to understand the civilizational differences, the following things must be kept in mind. One, **no two cultural belts or civilizations** (more often formed in pre-modern times by different religions) are alike. Civilization in modern India is very different from what it is in the West or what it was, when secularism as a principle arose. There never was an organized **church in India or anything akin to it**. But there is more in India, which goes to make it unique, very different, **sui generis**.

The **boundaries of religion in Hinduism**, or what made it socially recognizable as a distinct religion, have never been dogma or enjoined belief, even though some powerful beliefs are uniformly held, like **Karma or Moksha or Varna**. What made Hinduism recognizably distinct were a set of ritually prescribed practices, enjoined on members differentially in terms of **Varna or caste and Jatis rank**.

These practices were deeply embedded in social structures and marked out that particular social structure by their sheer presence. **Notions of purity and pollution, untouchability**, regulation of social distance between human beings in terms of caste, right to temple entry or drawl of water from wells and many others, like these are based on religious scriptures or so, it is believed. These were extensively practiced in India and have far **from disappeared in the present times**. The news are still frequent of torture being inflicted on people of lower castes for breaking these ritual rules or on women, who go out of bounds from the limits prescribed by the traditions.

The continuous influx of many civilizations through invaders and merchants kept changing the Indian traditions and practices. The multi-culture, multi-religious and multi-ethnic society was the result of these influxes. This diverse society made secularism indispensable for harmony and peace. The civilizational differences have made Indian secularism different from Western secularism.
WESTERN SEPARATION UNWORKABLE IN INDIA

Given these features, “separation” as practiced in the West, will simply not be feasible in India, it may well be impossible. In making democracy actual, every mode of institutional separation has to be informed by certain normative concerns, values that underlie that separation. India seeks to ensure equality between individuals and create conditions that guarantee the dignity of person. These are foremost among many others that our Constitution talks about.

The exclusion of Dalits from temples or village wells is qualitatively not of the same kind as that of Blacks in America from similar things. In case of India, it enjoyed a scriptural i.e. religious sanction. Such is not the case with the Blacks in America. If the American state legislates to outlaw such practices, it does not become a matter of interference in religion, whereas in India, when the state legislates to outlaw such practices of untouchability or enhance the status of women, many people believe and strongly so, that the state is interfering in the religious matters. Many reforms of the Hindu laws have been viewed in this manner.

Many of these practices are in conflict with the normative requirement of the Indian Constitution that every Indian irrespective of caste or creed or gender be treated as equal and ensure dignity to all persons. This aim, cannot be ensured and/or realized without legislating making a practice, viewed as part of religion, as illegal. The “wall of separation” between the state and the church or politics and religion, as in the American Constitution, is out of contention. It simply will not work in the case of India. Many people find secularism impossible for India because they, along with Donald Smith, the first important commentator on Indian secularism work implicitly with such a conception of secularism.

SEPARATION PRINCIPLE: REWORKING REQUIRED IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

If it is now possible to concede that some intervention, strictly regulated according to neutral principles is necessary, and then it is said that separation as a basis of secular state in India has to be a reworked version of the western principle. Implanting western notions uncritically will not do. Different conditions, with their specific difficulties, demand creative application of secularism. Blind adherence to the western principles or the simple rejection of the tested models and practices is not the answer.

It has to guarantee that the many values of the Constitution, which are cherished by all, have to be actualized in our social life. Secondly, democracy requires that all become citizens, because, without citizenship, democracy is not realizable. Therefore, interventions in religious matters are required. But, from the other side, some form of a secular ideal is required. Citizenship calls for, at its minimum, two conditions; viz. people with guaranteed or entrenched rights and that persons be defined independently of religious values of any particular community. The ideas of treating the worth of the individual independently of religion is a secular ideal and of utmost importance in the Indian context.

Any other consideration in treating the worth of the individual other than being human is offensive to democracy. It may be true that many of us derive a lot of
meaning from our religions since that makes for a “good” life. **Secularism is a dry principle;** it is not meant for higher meanings. As a dry principle, it is meant to voter see that conflicts between these higher meanings and beliefs do not become matters of public contention and that they are kept out of political life and policy making at any level of state action.

In the Indian situation, **politics and religion should be like strangers** come face to face and not like in America, where they are barred from seeing each other by a “wall” that stands between them. Strangers, by the logic of their encounter, come to deal with each other like equals, or nearly so. But as they remain strangers, they do not become intimate. Secularism in **India demands the absence of intimacy** between the two, since that happens in communal politics whether of Hindutva, represented by the **Sangh Parivar** or of the **Muslim League or the Akali Dal**. The larger and more widespread the religious group, the greater the danger it poses to the country’s integrity. It is must to look at the danger of communal forces in India in this perspective, given to its citizens by Indian history of religious strife. The need for secularism is crucial for Indians to live **everyday life in a civil manner**, and everyday life is important.

**REWORKED SOLUTION: PRINCIPLED DISTANCE**

The discussion can be summed up by saying, in agreement with Rajeev Bhargava, that in the **Indian version of secularism**, the principle of separation has to be understood as one of principled distance between religion and politics. Here, distance in principle has to be seen as independence of politics from religion, but not necessarily vice-versa. This means that **state activity, political decision making and policy choices are free of the interference of religion**. But this does not mean that politics and state action will have nothing to do with the need of religious reforms. One way separation has to be guaranteed.

This allows for both intervention and abstention. Intervention has to be prudently decided on the basis of issues involved. To reiterate, at the end, all practices (or beliefs), even if sanctified by religion viz. **untouchability, caste discrimination, polygamy, exclusion of women from public life, etc.** have to be outlawed immediately. These are blatantly offensive to the normative order of the Constitution, which is based on the consensus of values evolved through intense popular participation during the freedom struggle. Many, which are **mildly offensive**, the Dwijas only wearing the sacred thread, women not being allowed to plough the fields, etc, may be tolerated for some time to come and people can be persuaded to give these up.

The state here should be interventionist but in a neutral sense, neutral in the sense, that it takes the standpoint of the entire Indian humanity and not the viewpoint of any one religion or community. It should not be helping or giving any advantage to any religion. It should be simply carrying out the injunctions of the Constitution, which created it for precisely this purpose. **Its neutrality should be ensured** by a regime of Equality, Rights and Dignity in the same measure for all. Indian Constitution has created a truly secular state for our coexistence as citizens.

Secularism is **no doubt a principle of separation** of religion from state and politics; it is not just a pragmatic need. But separation has no single, simple meaning. It has to be given meaning and actualized in relation to the context and the
practices embedded in it. Each context has different requirements and these create their own compulsions, which cannot be ignored. The uncritical tendency to extract the history and meaning of secularism from the West and to pose that as the only model applicable to the rest of the world is unacceptable. It is clear from above discussion that secularism is not something any more alien to the Indian society, but has by now become its internal need and indispensable feature of Indian society.