



Nationalism and education for masses in British India: 1880-1920

Dr. Radhika Mishra

Assistant Professor, University Department of History, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, Bihar, India

Abstract

In this article, I analyse how Indian nationalists dealt with the question of education for Masses between 1880 and 1920. This period was dominated by the Indian National Congress and I examine its position on education in different phases of its history. It is important to understand how far the colonial policies were influenced by the nationalist pressure, and also what were the ideological positions of the Congress leaders on the question of mass education at various points of time?

Keywords: British India, nationalism and education, Indian National Congress

Introduction

As far as education is concerned, unlike the European countries, national education in India did not grow out of the need to spread nationalism and patriotic feelings among the people by the state. Rather, it grew in opposition to the English education system introduced by the colonial government. One school of thought criticized colonial education on the ground of its negligence of indigenous education, while other had problems with the medium of instruction. Historians of education have also emphasized that the demand of national education was the result of a sentiment of cultural degeneration of the country. Yet we see that questions of education came only after the main political question.

Congress, education and historiography

The rise of Indian Nationalism in the second half of nineteenth century has been looked at by historians in two opposed ways. One school of thought represented by scholars like C.A Bayly ^[1] see it as a result of indigenous and traditional patriotism of Indians. Whereas the other school represented by writers like Partha Chatterjee ^[2] have seen it as a 'derivative discourse' which he however revised later to show that Indian nationalism was a combination of traditional beliefs in the private sphere and modernist outlook in the public sphere ^[3]. Gyan Prakash argues that this differentiation between the two spheres was not very sharp. He also points out that the focus was on capture of state power for nation building and over emphasis on homogeneity led to a very hollow and elitist brand of nationalism which made it very fragile as many internal contradictions, including that of class, caste and gender, were not seriously engaged with ^[4]. This explanation may suit the dominant discourse amongst the mainstream nationalists but as pointed out by scholars like Ania Loomba there was hardly any one single voice of Indian nation and nationalism was always and still is a very contested terrain. The relation between nationalism and education of the working people has to be seen in the same context ^[5].

As far as the rise of early nationalism is concerned, John Darwin writes about three contradictory tendencies in colonial India in second half of nineteenth century. First, British realised the anti- imperialist sentiment of the subaltern masses. Second, educated Indian elite wanted to become the direct heir of the British Empire. Third, there was a need felt by some Indians to respond to the western encroachment in the traditional Indian society. They felt that religion must be renovated; social discipline reinforced; moral order reasserted; language reformed; literature reinvented; history rewritten; the nation (or nations) remade. It was in this uneasy atmosphere that the terms of India's connection with the emerging British world-system became the object of a subdued (by later standards) but fierce political struggle between 1880 and 1914 ^[6].

In terms of education the stand of Congress or National leaders is best summed up by Sabyasachi Bhattacharya

It seems that the educational discourse was a surrogate for a political debate. The reason was that the agenda of education depended on how the nation was imagined and how the path to nationhood was perceived. Difference in such perceptions brought about difference in ideas concerning almost every aspect of education ^[7].

There can be no doubt that during early nineteenth century there existed two Indian nationalist theories. One school of thought, under the influence of English political and economic doctrines, turned towards contemporary European nationalism. While the other school, threatened by deep intervention of foreign civilisation turned towards revival of ancient Hindu culture ^[8]. One interesting contradiction that remained in this was that the both theories were sometimes developed by the same individuals. And thus, sometimes they oscillated between these

two theories according to their own convenience and demands of the time. Nineteenth century reformers were the first one to point out about education while talking about the evils in the society. Gradually, there were varieties of nationalist educational thought. Here, 'Mainstream' nationalist thought has to be received with an awareness of its limited character, although influential in shaping contemporary Indian education. It must also be borne in mind that the policies and practices emerging from such a discussion was made operational through the consciousness and purposes of only an expressive and assertive part of India's elite: north Indian, largely upper caste Hindus, with a substantial sprinkling of Muslims, Parsis, Western Indians, south Indians and, of course, Bengalis, also upper caste, middle class Hindu males who are very well represented and very much in the lead.^[9] The British spoke very confidently about people's faith in their rule. In a despatch addressed to the Secretary of State (8th June 1880) it was argued that the people of India accept British rule without any need for appeal to arms, because British keep the peace and do justice. It was believed that they had brought the material good to the country and there is no other power which could substitute them. For the educated the despatch points out that 'To the minds of at least the educated among the people of India – and the number is rapidly increasing- any idea of the subversion of British power is abhorrent from the consciousness that it must result in the widest anarchy and confusion^[10].

The part about educated seems quite true for a while. Though early Nationalist leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji and R.C Dutt had already started questioning the aspects of material prosperity of India under British rule, but the idea of an original British rule being just was accepted along with a criticism of British rule. It came in a way of not applying all the facets of ruling as it existed in Britain. Initially, Nationalist leaders even though criticized British government for looting India were still in favour of the British rule. They were rather critical of having un-British rule in India. Naoroji invoked for the duty of British people, their British instincts of fair play and justice, and upon the 'faithful and conscientious fulfilment' of all their great and solemn promises and *pledges*^[11].

Question of representing the people

The question of representing the people was very important for Congress as only by claiming this The Congress could have justified its demands. However, it has been seen by Historians that how Congress failed to really represent the people. Even before Congress, Indian Association in 1880 claimed to represent people^[12]. Mc Cully shows that the organisation was hardly able to get support of educated Mohammedan population and remained an organisation of educated Hindus and failed to talk about the masses although it talked about mass education^[13]. Recent scholars have also shown the very limited mass appeal of early nationalists.

The first question that arises is that what was the need for Congress to represent people? Answers of this can be given in many ways. Firstly, it could be due to the weightage which might be given to the voices of its elite leadership if they could make believe the British Government that their demand is of the people and for the people. It would not only help in growing popularity of Congress, but also help them to ask for political favours on the basis of this representation. It would also help in countering the British claim that they represented people. By 1890's the politics of radical nationalism was emerging. It was found necessary to reach to the masses and to fill their minds with nationalist sentiment. In fact, by 1905, Congress claimed to represent people in all ways. The most important legitimation to represent people came from the Education that most of its leaders had. It claimed that these representatives of the people were not selected by any authoritative or scientific process, but representatives in immediate touch and contact with them, representatives realising in themselves the wants, the wishes, the sentiments, the aspirations of the people^[14].

Krishna Kumar has argued that the idea of national education can be looked at as the result of three questions: 1) equality 2) progress and 3) nationalist quest for self-identity. However, while seeking self-identity the elite leaders of national movement could not relate with the popular masses as they themselves identified with British and English culture. It was due to their own education in English language and English culture. Therefore, there was lot of appreciation for the western education and no matter how much they criticised colonial system some aspects of it were not only appreciated, but also demanded by them. They could never imagine an indigenous model of education which would have suited the vast majority of peasant population. Rather they created a difference between them and uneducated.

Education was a pursuit of equality by which it leads to lower caste and women's demand for education. Various leaders such as Phule, Ambedkar, Gandhi and Gokhale favoured such demands in their own ways. It was quest for self-identity in a way by which control of national education was sought through the making of their own national curriculum, criticising government policies. Through various means such as Boycott, Swadeshi, Non-Co-operation and the development of the national language i.e., Hindi a common identity was built. In progress, spiritual progress was sought more than the material and western kind of progress.

Poromesh Acharya in his essay on the law and politics of primary education in Bengal clearly shows that Hindu Bengali Bhadrakol were not in favour of the primary education for the masses. The demand for free and compulsory education for the masses only arose after Curzon's policy of accepting this as a duty of state. Acharya rightly argues that the middle-class beneficiaries of 'English education' at high schools and colleges vehemently criticised government policy of extending compulsory primary education because they were afraid that it might lead to reduction in the funds for the higher education. Efforts in the late 1920's to enact a law to tax the rural wealthy to fund schools for the poor were opposed by middle class associations and proto-political groups^[15].

There was an accepted understanding that these western educated people were different from those who were not educated in the western system of education. Especially, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century education came to be identified with its special character of western aspect. For example, in 1886, Bankimchandra wrote that the term *sikshita* was used to designate those who were trained in western education. He also said that because these Indians were more westernised in their life they were alienated from the traditional learning. Ranajit Guha points out that “it is by identifying *siksha* thus as antonyms to *vidya*, and education as a displacement of tradition, that Bankimchandra identified himself as one of the communities of the *sikshita*.^[16] *Siksha* was understood as a way of thinking and it was exactly the motive of British government to project education in such a way. However, there was more to education than that, it also stood for authority. But it is wrong to assume that English education meant same for everyone. There existed lot of contradictions for the different sections of people.

On the effect of English education there was still ambiguity in the minds of nationalist leaders. For example, Vishnu Krishna Chiplunkar (1850-1882) who in 1874, started a monthly called *Nibandhamala* said, “crushed by English poetry, our freedom has been destroyed^[17] This demonstrates the Indian critique of the hegemonic character of the British Empire. However, he does not fully criticise the English education. In the same text he appreciates that being a colony we got to receive vast body of knowledge from the west on its own. In fact, he said that without this knowledge our country would have remained backward. Even demand for independence is the outcome of this knowledge. In this way there was a tension in the way the British rule was understood by the nationalists. On the one hand it was responsible for the enslavement of people’s mind but on the other hand it was responsible for the western knowledge that British had brought with them^[18].

Moderates and the critique of government’s education policy (1885-1915)

On education front, the Congress passed certain resolutions and even worked out a policy of national education, but there too one problem that surfaced again was that it did not always demand education for the masses and did not have any clear program me for this. Rather in most of its sessions, Congress was rather busy in criticising the Government policy of education. A historical analysis of various demands put forward by Congress is necessary to look at its policy of education.

In Madras, in the third annual Session, 1887, poverty of the people was discussed and devising of an elaborate system of technical education was asked for. Here the concern was not only to develop education for poor but also to provide for the industrial development of the country. So, it was said that technical education should be ‘suitable to the condition of the country to encourage indigenous manufactures by a stricter observance of the orders already existing, in regard to utilising such manufactures for State purposes, and to employ more extensively than at present the skill and talents of the people of the country^[19]. Next year the demand was extended for general education and government policy of reducing the Imperial expenditure on education was highly criticized^[20]. Three years later again the need for the encouragement of technical education was reinstated. It also asked for the appointment of a mixed Commission to inquire into the present industrial condition of the country. This demand which was put forward in Nagpur Session of 1891 was further re-affirmed in Allahabad in 1892. Alfred Webb in 1894 at Indian National Congress held at Madras said that Government is giving priority to the issue of Education of the masses. At the same time, he cautions that if state has provided education it did not mean that state would provide for employment also. For him education had a larger meaning which was to make people fit to lead a better life^[21]. Though at this time it was observed that Government is perhaps investing a lot on education, but the amount spent on military has been way higher than that of spent on education due to which educational demands of the country was not met. This became a concern for Suerndranath Banerjee who in the next year presidential Congress speech at Poona compared the money spent on education in all the colonies of the British Empire with that of India^[22].

In 1894 and 1895 the congress also included the issue of grants for higher education but expediency of establishing Technical Schools and Colleges were also invoked at the same time. In the next year, however, issue of higher education becomes more important where it was argued that ‘greater facilities are imperatively required for higher education and the proper development of the Indian intellect than what are at present offered by the Examination alone^[23]. However, from 1898-1900 in different sessions the question of technical education was raised again,

The system of technical education now in vogue is inadequate and unsatisfactory, and prays that having regard to the poverty of the people and the decline of indigenous industries, the Government will introduce a more elaborate and efficient scheme of technical instruction and set apart more funds for a better and more successful working of the same^[24].

When the announcement of university commission was made, Congress showed its full faith in the Government policy, and demanded adequate representation to Indian interests by appointing a sufficient number of Indian gentlemen to be members of the Commission.

However, on University Commission recommendations for the first time there came a heavy criticism of government policy,

Congress views with the gravest alarm many of the Commission's recommendations, the acceptance of which will, in its opinion reverse the policy steadily pursued during the last half-a-century by the British Government in the matter of higher education, by checking its spread and restricting its scope, and by virtually destroying such limited independence as the Universities at present enjoy ^[25].

In case of schools, they particularly criticised the virtual licensing of all secondary schools by making the existence of private schools dependent upon their recognition by the Director of Public Instruction ^[26].

In the presidential address of 1902 Surendra Nath Bannerji criticised the British Government for not including members of Indian Community in the University Commission. According to him the Hunter commission found representatives of the educated community suitable to provide suggestions in 1880 then how come the natives of India were not competent to advise government in the making of education policy in 1902. For him non-inclusion of provincial representatives of Indian community among the members of the Universities Commission was responsible for the stir and dissatisfaction caused by the report ^[27].

Similarly, while comparing University Commission to Indian education commission of 1882, he said that while in 1882 government was against employing any uniform system of education and foster a spirit of independence and self-help and encourage private enterprise, in 1902, it laid special stress upon the need of restraining the efforts to private enterprise in the name of standard of efficiency ^[28].

Regarding efficiency he said that there was a view among the government officials that aided and unaided colleges were not as efficient as they might be. In that context he asked that whether government colleges were to be considered as the models of excellence and efficiency? He directly attacked government colleges and said,

Do we not occasionally hear in connection with them of serious breaches of discipline and of drastic measures enforced to ensure respect for authority? If there is to be a standard of efficiency, let it be of uniform application, and not judged solely by reference to external appliances, such as libraries and laboratories, but by the larger, though perhaps more impalpable, moral results, which it is the aim and the end of all education to secure. The efficiency of the affiliated colleges is tested by the annual examinations of the university. It is to their interest that their students should be successful and occupy high places at the examinations. They have thus to study efficiency from the point of view of self-interest, and efficiency is best ensured when it is associated with a motive which so powerfully appeals to our strongest impulses ^[29].

Surendra Nath Bannerjee was critical of the question of college fees in University Commission.

The increase in the rate of fees would defeat its object and diminish the total receipts of the f larger allotment should be made than at present out of the public funds for educational expenditure so as, college from that source. Further, the raising of the fees would throw difficulties in the way of the higher education of the deserving poor. The diffusion of education among the people, including the deserving poor, has been the steadfast concern of Government in the past ^[30].

Here it was echoed that how Education Commission of 1882 found the rate of fees then levied as adequate. It was argued that if College fees were adequate then they cannot be inadequate or insufficiently low now. It says the condition of middle classes since have not improved. Educated opinion here goes entirely with Dr. Guru Dass Banerjee's view of the question that the minimum rate of college fees should be left to adjust itself according to the circumstances of each province, and the Universities should not interfere in determining it unless there are very strong reasons for doing so ^[31].

Surendra Nath Bannerjee also throws light on the problem of cramming which only got worse after the recommendation of University Commission. Instead of reducing the burden on student, commission recommended an addition by recommending an additional subject for the B.A. Examination of the Calcutta University.

In the Calcutta University it was after a hard fight that the number of subjects for the B.A Examination was reduced from four to three by the almost unanimous vote of the Senate. A teachers' Conference, which recently sat in Calcutta, unanimously protested against the proposed increase in the number of subjects for the B.A. Examination ^[32].

The nationalists considered the Hunter Commission as an ideal and The Wood's despatch of 1854 was seen as the major foundation of policy and deviation from these two were shown as major flaws in government's own policy. It seems that demand for the same policy objectives as they existed in England led to the criticism of the University Commission in a way where comparison with educational policy in England was sought regularly. However, at the same time if it was found that government was abnormally trying to do something similar as it existed in England even than also that was criticised. For example, Lal Mohan Ghose, (1849-1909), who was President of INC, in 1903 held at Madras criticises Universities Commission's report. He argued that the commission wanted to make educational institute approach as nearly as possible the standard of Eton and Oxford. It was naturally difficult for him to understand 'why poor men (such as the majority of our middle classes happen to be) should be anxious to receive a sort of education which poor people's children in England do not aspire to receive ^[33].

Aparna Basu has noted a change that came with the expansion of primary education under Curzon. She points out that earlier the focus of Congress was in demanding greater grants from the government on higher education.

Appeals were made in 1893, 1894, and 1895. From 1901 onwards resolutions were passed opposing Curzon's policy of higher education, but primary education was not talked about. In 1904 a resolution was passed which demanded increase of government expenditure on primary education for the first time. It was demanded that much larger allotment should be made than at present out of the public funds for educational expenditure so as,

1. To spread primary education more widely among the mass of the people, and to make a beginning in the direction of free and compulsory education;
2. To make due provision for imparting instruction in manual training and in scientific agriculture;
3. To provide for the better manning and equipment of Government colleges and high Schools so as to make them really model institutions,
4. To establish at least one central fully equipped polytechnic Institute in the country, with minor technical schools and colleges in different provinces. (Bombay, Twentieth Session, 1904)

These kinds of resolutions became a part of Congress's agenda from then on. The debate on compulsory free education started at the same time. Congress observed that leaving Russia and Turkey aside, in all of the European countries provision were made by the state for the free education of all subjects. In England, though initially it was not popular because of the compulsory attendance of children at school, but soon the benefits of this were realised and now there were hardly any poor who cannot read and write. It is the system of compulsory free education which made it possible for representatives of the working classes to enter the British House of Commons^[34]. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, in 1905 Benares session criticised Curzon's policy of primary education. He criticised government on allocating little funds for education and giving much more to the Army^[35].

In 1906, Congress asked Government to take immediate steps for first making primary education free and gradually compulsory all over the country, second assigning larger sums of money to secondary education (special encouragement being given, where necessary, to educationally backward classes), third making the existing Universities more free from official control and providing them with sufficient means to take up the work of teaching, and fourth making adequate provision for technical education in the different provinces, having regard to local requirements. (Calcutta, Twenty second session, 1906)^[36]

In 1910 a resolution was passed where it was said: "In the opinion of this Congress, the time has arrived when a substantial beginning should be made in the matter of elementary education Free and compulsory throughout the country." By comparing the 1882 standard set by the Hunter commission, they were still able to criticise the condition of education. They pointed out that after 25 years 85,000 schools had increased to 113,000 and the number of pupils therein rose from 25 lakhs to. This discouraging situation was due to the small amount spent on Education during these years. They also figured out that increase in military expenditure was 13 crores, in railways 11 crores, in civil and revenue Departments each 8 crores, while on Education it was only 57 lakhs^[37].

The government in turn argued that free education would mean increase in taxation which would be very unpopular. The Congress demanded that it should be provided without increasing the taxes and instead by decreasing the expenditure on other spheres like defence^[38].

By 1911 it was established that in any sort of educational advance there was a need for free and compulsory education. By this time comparisons from the across world were made and it was shown that how India lagged behind its contemporaries. Gokhale in his speech on the introduction of his bill on free education in the Imperial Council said that in India, according to the census of 1901, less than 6 per cent of the whole population could read and write, while even in Russia the proportion of literates was 25 per cent. As regards attendance at school, in America 21 per cent of the whole population were receiving elementary education; in Great Britain and Ireland, from 20 to 17 per cent; in Japan, 11 per cent; in Russia, between 4 and 5 per cent, while in India the proportion was 1.9 percent. In most of the European countries elementary education is both compulsory and free; in India it is neither compulsory nor free. As regards the expenditure on elementary education in some of the countries referred to by Mr. Gokhale, it is interesting to observe that while in the United States of America, the expenditure per head of the population is 16s. in England and Wales 10s., in Japan 1s. 2d., and in Russia 7.5 d., in India it is barely one penny.

Gokhale while introducing the bill said

The Bill is not a perfect measure, which perhaps no measure is, and may have to undergo several changes before it becomes a law; but if we are to have elementary education for the masses, there is no escape from its two fundamental principles, compulsion and education rate. The principle of compulsion is suggested by the practical experience of the whole civilised world; and no argument has yet convinced me that, with proper safeguards it is not equally applicable to India^[39].

In 1911 Congress supported the principles of the Gokhale's Elementary Education Bill and expressed its earnest hope that the Government would be pleased to afford the necessary facilities for the further stages of this Bill in Council. (Calcutta, Twenty-seventh Session, 1911). It was here only that need for organising independent system of literary, Scientific, Technical and Industrial Education, suited to the conditions of the different Provinces of India was stressed upon.

In 1913, Karachi, twenty-ninth session Congress reiterated that Government should make education free and compulsory. Interestingly here for the first time, Congress criticises the government bias in appointing teachers. It criticises the Government of India for vetoing the selection by the Calcutta University of Messrs. Rasul,

Suhrawardi and Jayaswal, as lecturers, on the ground of their connection with politics; this bar of politics according to them would exclude the best scholarship from becoming lecturer ^[40].

This question of bias further came up when Congress urged

This Congress is strongly of opinion that Government should assign larger sums of money to secondary and higher education than is done at present and that the rules relating to the maximum number of admissions into a class, fees and grants-in-aid the present differences between European and Indian students should be abolished and facilities afforded to all deserving pupils irrespective of race, caste or creed, for receiving the benefits of higher education ^[41]. (Lucknow, Thirty-second session, 1916).

In this session the issue of religion was also raised. It was said

in the opinion of this Congress compulsory religious instruction in any school or college aided out of public funds to pupils, the consent of whose parents has not been previously obtained, is incompatible with the policy of religious neutrality to which Government has pledged itself, and urges the early insertion of a conscience clause in the educational Code to prevent interference on the part of school or college authorities with the religious beliefs of their pupils ^[42].

But how far was the Congress successful in getting its resolutions implemented? It has been argued by some historians that till 1915, before the entry of Gandhi, the Congress was a 'white elephant which cost at least one lakh rupees annually, and did nothing but make some speeches and pass a few stereotyped resolutions ^[43]. While it is true that the moderates could not do much apart from passing resolutions, their efforts made education one of the agendas of nationalist agitation. We should not forget that one of their stalwart leaders Gokhale led the campaign for free and compulsory primary education. Although he himself failed in this regard, but Congress supported and raised this demand time and again. It was accepted as a principle in 1920s and with coming of Diarchy, the Government enabled the provinces to implement it. This had its own practical difficulties which we have already discussed in chapter two. Although initially Moderates were more bothered with higher education, but gradually they also demanded an expansion in state expenditure on primary education and made a critique of state's policy. However, their own vision of education did not go beyond western education. An alternative version came up only in the Swadeshi movement.

Conclusion

To conclude, we can say that the moderates believed in western education and complained to the British for not expanding it. Interestingly, it has been argued by some scholars that in their initial phase, they focused more on higher education as they argued that British focused only on primary education. But from the beginning of twentieth century, moderate leader Gopal Krishna Gokhale started campaigning for free and compulsory primary education. However, their interest largely remained centered on English education. The extremists tried to develop an alternative by advocating indigenous education in vernacular languages, giving English a position of second language, but their reach to the peasants and workers was limited and their focus remained Bhadra Lok students. Even this progress got diluted when the Swadeshi movement died out. Nevertheless, this kind of 'national' education was able to produce strong sentiments of anti-colonialism amongst the petty-bourgeois youth. I have argued that when elite nationalists demanded expansion of education from the government or espoused their alternatives of national education, their class positions were revealed. Most of the time they were unable to come out of the dominance of western education, as pointed out by scholars like Sanjay Seth and the 'Indianizing' method they proposed was that medium of instruction should be vernacular ^[44]. The implementation of even this idea was also not very successfully attempted during the Congress ministries rule between 1937 and 1940.

Reference

1. Bayly CA, the origins of nationality in South Asia: Patriotism and Ethical Government in the making of Modern India, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.)
2. Partha Chatterjee. Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse? (London: Zed Books, 1986.)
3. Partha Chatterjee. Nation and its Fragments, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.)
4. Gyan Prakash. Another Reason (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.)
5. Ania Loomba. Colonialism/Postcolonialism (London and New York: Routledge, 1998.)
6. John Darwin. The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World System, 1830-1970, (The rise and fall of the British Empire (London: Cambridge University Press, 2011.)
7. Sabyasachi Bhattacharya, Joseph Bara, Chinna Rao Yagati. Educating the nation: Documents on the Discourse of National Education in India, 1880-1920, (Delhi: Kanishka Publishers, 2003), Introduction,
8. Bruce Tiebout McCully, English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism. (Gloucester Mass.: Columbia University Press, 1966), 390. McCully describes 'oddly enough both of these contradictory doctrines in some instances were expounded by the same persons. This paradox reflected that inner conflict which practically every educated native experienced at some time or other in the course of his life Many members of the educated class never succeeded in resolving the conflict. To the end of their days some of

- them, like Keshub Chandra Sen and his cousin Narendranath Sen, the editor of the Indian Mirror, vacillated between two poles of nationalist thought. Later dissensions in the Congress Party are traceable to the differences represented by the two opposing theories. Even native interpretations of the origins of Indian nationalism have mirrored this dualism.', 391.
9. Shukla, Sureshchandra. "Nationalist Educational Thought: Continuity and Change", in Bhattacharya, Sabyasachi ed. *The Contested Terrain Perspective on Education in India*. (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1998:31:29-54.
 10. Zaidi AM. *Congress Presidential Addresses*. (New Delhi: Publication Department Indian Institute of Applied Political Research, 1985:27:1885-1900.
 11. Dadabhai Naoroji. *Poverty and Un British Rule in India*, (Delhi: Government Publications Division, 1962, 8.)
 12. "The Indian Association", proclaimed the Bengalee, "Speaks and works for the millions and represents all sections of the community.", Quoted from Indian Mirror, letter to the editor by Nanda Lal Ghose, 1879.
 13. McCully, *English Education*, 316.
 14. *Report of the twentieth Indian National Congress* (UK: Printed at the Crown Printing Works, 1905)
 15. Bhattacharya, Sabyasachi. *The Contested Terrain Perspective on Education in India*. (New Delhi: Orient Longman,) Introduction, 1998, 8-9
 16. Ranajit Guha. *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India* (London: Harvard University Press, 1997, 165-166.)
 17. Sudhir Chandra, *The Oppressive Present, Literature and Social Consciousness in Colonial India* (New York/New Delhi: Routledge, 2014), 19.
 18. Chandra. *The Oppressive Present*, 20-21.
 19. Chakrabarty D, Bhattacharyya C ed. *Congress in Evolution, Being a Collection of Congress Resolutions From 1885 to 1934 And Other Important Documents*. (Calcutta: The Book Company Ltd., 1935, 129.)
 20. It was said "Congress being of opinion that it is the first duty of the British Government in India to foster and encourage education, as well general as technical, in all its branches, and that the declaration made in the recent Resolutions of the Government of India on the subject of education is calculated to encourage the tendency to reduce Imperial expenditure on education, and to withdraw from the control of it, respectfully urges upon Government the extreme importance of increasing or at any rate of not decreasing, the present expenditure on education, and of the Government continuing to control the educational institutions of all kinds now existing. (Allahabad, Fourth session, 1888). Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya ed. *Congress In Evolution*.
 21. Zaidi. *Congress Presidential*, 204-5.
 22. He said "in India, the expenditure per head of the population is the lowest as compared with British possessions in other parts of the world-in Asia, America, Africa. Thus, it will be seen that while the expenditure on education per head of the population of Ceylon is over 2 Ans., in Mauritius, it is 10 Ans., in Natal, 1s. 3d., in British Guiana, it is 1s. 11d., and even in Russia it is 3.5d., in India it is only a little over 7 pies. Comment on these figures is unnecessary. I cannot say whether these figures include contributions made by local bodies. Even if such contributions were to be added, it would not, I think, make an appreciable difference. We are indebted to Professor Oxenham for his defence of High Education vs. Primary Education. We are in favour of all Education, High education does not benefit the recipients alone. It benefits the whole community; for if John Stuart Mill is to be accepted as our authority in these matters, the ideas of the educated classes filter downwards and become the ideas of the masses." Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 279.
 23. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, *Congress in Evolution*, 129.
 24. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, *Congress in Evolution*, 130.
 25. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, *Congress in Evolution*, 130.
 26. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, *Congress in Evolution*, 131.
 27. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 123.
 28. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 127.
 29. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 128.
 30. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 129.
 31. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 131.
 32. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 135.
 33. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 220.
 34. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 223.
 35. Zaidi, *Congress Presidential*, 265.
 36. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, *Congress in Evolution*, 133.
 37. The Government of India spends on General education 2 ½ crores of rupees or 1 ½ anna per head, and on elementary education about 1 1/3 crores or 9 pies per head of population; while on General education, England spends 6s. per head, France 5s. 4d. Germany 4s. and Austria 2s. In the neighboring island of Ceylon, a Crown Colony, the Government spends 10 lakhs of rupees annually on a population of 3 ½ millions. If we are to take this proportion into consideration, the Government of India has to spend at least 7 ½ crores on Education. England with a revenue of 88 ½ million sterling spends 17 ½ million sterling on all

Departments of Education; while India, with a revenue of 75 ½ million sterling expends less than two million sterling. In other countries, it ranges from 5 to 21 per cent. while in India alone the percentage is so low as 1.9 per cent. Even in the Philippine Islands that have come but lately under the influence of America, the percentage is now as high as 5 per cent. In this connection we must not omit to mention Baroda where, thanks to the enlightened statesmanship of his Highness the Gaekwar, elementary education is made both free and compulsory and the percentage to the population is already 5 per cent.” Report of the Twenty Fifth Indian National Congress Held At Allahabad 27th, 28th and 29th December 1910, (Allahabad: Pinch Kory Mitra At The Indian Press, 1911) English,78

38. Report Of the Twenty Fifth Indian National Congress, 79.
39. Zaidi, Congress Presidential, 498-499.
40. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, 134.
41. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, 135.
42. Chakrabarty and Bhattacharyya, 135-136.
43. Amrik Singh. "Education and the National Movement." in Sabyasachi Bhattacharya, ed, The Contested Terrain, 70.
44. Sanjay Seth. Subject Lessons: The Western Education of Colonial India, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007.)