

SOME ASPECTS OF THE HINDU-MUSLIM RELATIONSHIP
IN INDIA, 1876-1892.

Shamsun Nahar

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts,
in the University of London.

School of Oriental and African Studies,

July 1966.



ProQuest Number: 10731243

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10731243

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Abstract

This thesis is a study of some aspects of Hindu-Muslim relationships in India between 1876 and 1892. These years have been chosen because within them a decisive shift in those relationships occurred.

The first chapter first shows Hindus and Muslims in harmony in their political relationships, and ready, down to 1885, to act conjointly in defence or pursuit of common interests. The second chapter traces the growth of ill-feeling between the two communities, and examines the social and political roots of that ill-feeling. The third chapter examines a series of important communal riots which occurred between 1885 and 1892, seeks to establish their causes, and shows how they helped harden ill-feeling into settled and divisive hostility between the two communities.

Contents

	Page
Abstract	2
List of Abbreviations	4
Chapter I Political: A Period of mutual tolerance 1876-1884	5
Chapter II Political: The Growth of bitterness 1885-1892	78
Chapter III The Communal Riots 1885-1892	146
Conclusion	203
Bibliography	209
Appendix	222

Abbreviations

B.M.	= British Museum.
Beng.N.N.R.	= Bengal Native Newspaper Report.
Bom.N.N.R.	= Bombay Native Newspaper Report.
Div.	= Division.
H.D.S.	= Home Department Serial.
I.L.P.	= Indian Legislative Proceedings.
I.O.L.	= India Office Library.
I.H.P.P.	= Indian Home Public Proceedings.
J and P	= Judicial and Public.
L.	= Letter
N.W.P.	= North Western Provinces.
N.W.P.N.N.R.	= North Western Provinces Native Newspaper Report.
Offg.	= Officiating.
Pvt.	= Private.
Prog.	= Proceeding.
P.P.	= Parliamentary Paper.

Chapter I

5

Under British rule in India, some limited upper and middle class groups among the Hindus had become conscious of themselves as groups in the 1850's, and had begun to think on Parliamentary lines because of their acquaintance with British ideas and institutions. In the 1850's political associations were founded in the presidencies of Madras, Bombay and Bengal. But these associations were essentially provincial in character. For example, the Madras Native Association, which was founded by the upper and middle class Hindus of Madras in 1852, occupied itself with the welfare of the people of Madras only.¹ It made several petitions to the Government in 1852 for the construction of roads, and for the expansion of

1. Petition to the Imperial Parliament, Madras 1852, Madras Native Association, p.1.
There were some wealthy Muslims in this Association, for instance, Nauzim Jung Bahadoor, a Muslim advocate of the Association, was a landholder of Madras.
Memorial to Stanley, Secretary of State for India, Madras Native Association, Madras 1859, p.37.

educational facilities, such as the establishment and development of schools and colleges in Madras.¹ Likewise, the Bombay Association, which was founded on 26 August 1852 by the "principal inhabitants" consisting of businessmen, landholders and middle class professionals, though claiming to be concerned with the general welfare and interests of the people of India, was mainly concerned with the needs and grievances of the people of Bombay.² Thus in 1852, in a petition to Parliament, the Association asked for the construction of railways, roads and harbour piers in Bombay, because the Presidency suffered from insufficient internal communications.³ It also urged that the Government should give proper attention to the educational needs of the Bombay people.⁴ Thus, this association confined its

1. Petition to the Imperial Parliament, Madras 1852, Madras Native Association, pp.20-22 and 29-32.
2. Minute of the Proceedings of the Bombay Association, Bombay 1852, pp.10, 11 and 24. Although the Bombay Association was mainly subscribed to by the Hindus, there were some Muslim contributors: Mohammed Ibrahim Muckba, a Bombay Muslim, was a subscriber to this association.
3. Petition to Parliament from the Members of the Bombay Association, 1852, p.20.
4. Ibid., p.22.

7

activities to the promotion of the welfare of the Bombay people. The British Indian Association was founded in Calcutta on 29 October 1851 by members of the wealthy and aristocratic classes of Bengal.¹ The Association was concerned mainly with Bengal until February 1877, when it became involved in an All-India question. When on 24 February 1876 Salisbury² reduced the age limit for the Civil Service examination from 21 to 19, the British Indian Association sent a memorial to the Secretary of State for India protesting against his order.³

-
1. Heimsath, C. H., Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, p.61; Administrative Report of Bengal, 1874-75, Pt.2, p.94. The Association had no Muslim member; all its members were Hindus. Second Report of the British Indian Association, 13 January 1854, p.24.
 2. Robert Arthur Talbot Gascoigne Cecil Salisbury (1830-1903): Educated at Eton and Christ Church Oxford; M.P. for Stamford, 1853-68; Secretary of State for India, 6 July 1866 - 9 March 1867 and 22 February 1874 - 30 March 1878; Foreign Secretary, 1878; Leader of Opposition in Lords, 1881; Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, 1885; resigned on passing of vote of censure in House of Commons, February 1886; again Prime Minister, July 1886; Foreign Secretary, 1886; defeated at General Election, 1892; formed coalition ministry as Premier and Foreign Secretary, 1895.
 3. The Hindoo Patriot, 2 February 1877.

8

It argued that the duties of administration required men of mature mind and well trained intellect, but that the reduction of the age limit would debar such men from entering the service.¹ Again, the object of the Social Science Association, which was established in Bengal by some Europeans and Indians² on 22 January 1867, was "to promote the development of social progress in the presidency of Bengal, by uniting Europeans and Natives of all classes in the collection, arrangement and classification of the facts bearing on the social, intellectual and moral conditions of

1. The Hindoo Patriot, 2 February 1877.
2. The following were the prominent members of the Association:

Hon'ble W. S. Seton Karn,
Hon'ble J. P. Norman,
Hon'ble J. B. Phear,
Rev. J. Long,
W. S. Atkinson,
J. Farquhar,
Major F. B. Norman,
A. Mackenzie,
Manockjee Rostumji,
Babu Romanath Tagor,
Babu Digumber Mitter,
Babu Kissory Chand Mitter,
Babu Rajendralal Mitter,
Mui. Abdul Latëof Khan Bahadur.

Transactions of Bengal Social Science Association,
Vol.1, p.1.

the people."¹ It mainly dealt with social problems, such as health, education, marriage and divorce and refrained from discussing political questions. Another Association, the Indian League, was founded in Calcutta by Sisir Kumar Ghose, the Bengali editor of the newspaper, Amrita Bazar Patrika, in September 1875. Although its declared aim was to work for the political and economic progress of India, it was pre-eminently concerned with Bengal.²

Apart from being provincial in programmes and policies, these associations consisted mostly of the upper and upper middle class of "landholders and others of wealth and station."³ Membership fees were often high (for example, it was Rs. 50 per annum for the British Indian Association⁴) well above the means of the average middle class Indians. The new Hindu middle class, having acquired an

1. Prospectus of Bengal Social Science Association, Vol.1, p.1.
2. Bagal, J. C., History of the Indian Association 1876-1951, pp.8 and 10.
3. Administrative Report of Bengal, 1874-75, Pt.2, p.94.
4. Rules of the British Indian Association, p.30.

English education, and travelled widely over the Indian subcontinent, was gradually becoming conscious of All-India problems and accordingly critical of the provincial organizations. It was in order to fulfil this need for an All-India political organization that the Indian Association was founded in Calcutta on 26 July 1876. Among the founders of this Association were Surendranath Banerjea¹ and his friend and co-worker Ananda Mohan Bose.² Though the Indian Association was founded in Bengal, unlike the previous associations, it did not confine its activities to that Presidency, but found a ready response throughout India. In Surendranath Banerjea's own words, its aim was to kindle in the young the beginnings of public spirit and to inspire them with

-
1. Surendranath Banerjea (1848-1925): In 1869 passed the competitive examination in England for the Indian Civil Service; ceased to be a member of the Civil Service in 1874; Professor of English Literature in the Metropolitan Institutions in 1876; founded the Ripon College in 1882; proprietor of the Bengalee in 1878; established the Indian Association in 1876; President of the Congress in 1895 and 1902.
 2. Ananda Mohan Bose (1847-1906): A brilliant student of Calcutta University; the first Indian wrangler of Cambridge; an active member of the Brahmo Samaj; the first Secretary of the Indian Association; and President of the Congress in 1898.

a patriotic ardour, fruitful of good to them and to the motherland.¹ It was to unite the Indian races and people upon the basis of common political interests and aspirations and to promote friendly feelings between the Hindus and the Muslims. The executive committee of this Association consisted of thirty one middle class Hindus in 1876. Of these, six were editors of journals, seven pleaders, eight teachers, while other members seem to have only one thing in common - a University degree.²

While the Indian Association was formed in 1876, the Central National Mahommedan Association was founded by the Muslims in 1877 under the guidance of Syed Ameer Ali,³ a notable Muslim of Bengal.⁴

1. Banerjea, S.N., A Nation in Making, p.35.
2. The Bengalee, 5 August 1876.
3. Syed Ameer Ali (1849-1928): Son of Syed Saadat Ali of Unao, Oudh, of a family originally from Persia; educated at Hughli College, Bengal; M.A. and B.L. from Calcutta University; in 1873 practised in Calcutta High Court; Fellow of the Calcutta University in 1874; Magistrate and Chief Presidency Magistrate, Calcutta, 1878-81; Member of the Bengal Legislative Council, 1878-83, and of Governor General's Legislative Council, 1883-85; Tagore Law Professor in 1884; founder of the Central National Mahommedan Association and its Secretary, 1876-90, and in 1904 left India and settled in England.
4. 'Memoirs of Ameer Ali' - Islamic Culture, Vol. V, 1931, p.451.

This may be called the first All-India Muslim organization which professed to include Muslims of all classes. The Mahomedan Literary Society, which was founded by Nawab Abdul Latif Khan Bahadur in 1863 in Bengal, had been an organization mainly of upper class Muslims. It was concerned with literary activity and held discussions mostly in Arabic, Persian, Urdu and English.¹ As a result, the middle and lower class Muslims had little, if any, chance to express their views. But the Central National Mahomedan Association was for all classes of Muslims, since its chief aim was to promote political consciousness among the Indian Muslims. The question may arise as to why Syed Ameer Ali could not work through Banerjea's Indian Association and had to found a separate association for the Muslims. Perhaps the answer lies in his observation that, if the Muslims did not have a political organization of their own, they would be submerged "in the rising tide of the new Hindu nationalism" and lose their

1. Proceedings of the Mahomedan Literary Society, 23 November 1870, Calcutta 1871, p.126; Also, Bradley, F. B., Twelve Men of Bengal in the the Nineteenth Century, p.125.

identity.¹ The aim of this association was to promote "by all legitimate and constitutional means the well-being of the Mussulmans of India." It was founded essentially upon the principle of loyalty to the British crown. It derived "its inspiration from the noble traditions of the past" and proposed "to work in harmony with western culture and the progressive tendency of the age." It aimed at "the political regeneration of the Indian Muslims by revival and by constant endeavours to obtain from Government a recognition of their just and reasonable claims." The managing committee of the Association was given the power to co-operate with any other political body in matters of general welfare of the people of India, because the Association believed that the "welfare of the Muslims" was ultimately connected "with the well-being of other races."² Non-Muslims also could be Honorary and Ordinary members of this Association. The annual report of

1. 'Memoirs of Syed Ameer Ali' - Islamic Culture, Vol.V, 1931, pp.540-541.

2. Report of the Central National Mahommedan Association, 1883-1884, p.ii.

A

the Central National Mahommedan Association of 1883 recorded that Jotendra Mohon Tagore, Kristodas Pal, W. C. Banerjea, Rajendralal Mitter, Modhusudan Das, Surendranath Banerjea and Ramesh Chandra Mitter were Honorary members of this Association, but it did not mention what part these members played in the Association.¹

Like Surendranath Banerjea, Syed Ameer Ali travelled throughout India, propagating the aims of his association, opening branches and exhorting Muslims to unite. He succeeded in establishing as many as fifty three branches of the Association in Bengal, Bombay, Madras, the Punjab, the United Provinces and Bihar.² The activities of these branch associations were co-ordinated from Calcutta. It is noteworthy, however, that though a separate communal organization, the Central National Mahommedan Association, in this period, acted in harmony and

-
1. Report of the Central National Mahommedan Association, 1883-1884, pp.31-32. Also Khatun, L., Some Aspects of the Social History of Bengal with Special Reference to the Muslims, 1854-1884 (London M.A. thesis, 1960), p.254.
 2. Gopal, R., Indian Muslims: A Political History (1858-1947), p.51

in active co-operation with Hindu organizations. While fostering political consciousness and feelings of unity among the Muslims of India, the Muslim association co-operated with the Hindu organizations in matters which affected the interests of both communities such as:

- (a) in organizing famine relief measures;
- (b) in agitation for the raising of the age-limit for entrance in the civil service examinations;
- (c) in protesting against the restrictions imposed on the Vernacular Press;
- (d) in agitation against the Arms Act;
- (e) in advocating the extension of Local Self Government;
- (f) in supporting the Ilbert Bill.

Even such a movement as Syed Ahmed Khan's¹ Aligarh movement, which was intended for the educational and cultural advancement of the Muslim community, received encouragement and generous contributions from the Hindu organisations. Their contributions to the foundation of the Aligarh Oriental College on 8 January 1877 amounted to not less than

1. Syed Ahmed Khan (1817-1898): Entered Government service, 1837; rose to a Subordinate Judge in the N.W.P; visited England, 1869; retired from Government service, 1876; founded Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, 1877; Member of the Legislative Council, N.W.P.; Additional Member of the Governor General's Legislative Council, 1878-1882; K.C.S.I., 1888.

58,000 rupees.¹ Commenting on the Hindu attitude to the Muslims, Syed Ahmed Khan remarked that "true toleration and genuine sympathy could be found in the large hearted and liberal minded Hindus."² We may, therefore, turn to examine briefly the Hindu-Muslim attitude towards each of the political questions enumerated above.

During the Madras famine in 1877, a meeting organized by the Indian Association, was held in Calcutta on 29 August 1877.³ The Central National Mahommedan Association and Mahommedan Literary Society played an important role in that meeting, supporting the Indian Association's proposal for the organization of a central relief committee. Again, we find co-operation between the Hindus and Muslims in the problem of raising the age-limit for entrance in the civil service examinations, when on 24 February 1876 Salisbury reduced the age-limit

1. The most prominent donors were:
The Maharajah of Viziangram,
The Maharajah of Benares,
Sir Mohario Raja Mohandar Singh,
Maharajah of Calcutta.
Graham, G. F. I., The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, K.C.S.I., pp.176-7.
2. The Aligarh Institute Gazette, 12 September 1877.
3. The Bengalee, 22 September 1877.

71

for the competitive examination from twenty one to nineteen.¹ It may be noted here that in 1853, during the first competitive examination for the Indian civil service, the upper age limit was fixed at twenty three and the lower at eighteen. The object was that a civil servant of the East India Company "should have received the best, the most liberal, the most finished education that his native country affords."² In 1860, the age-limit was reduced from twenty three to twenty two on the ground that candidates selected at a later age, if kept in England for even one year for special study, would be too old to commence life in India.³ In 1866, when the successful candidates were required to spend a probation of two years in England, the maximum age of admission was further lowered to twenty one and the minimum to seventeen.⁴ The object of this later change, in the words of the Civil Service Commissioners, was to attract "to the

1. Salisbury to Lytton, 24 February 1876, L.No.19. P.P., 1876, Vol.XXII, Paper No. 1587, pp.527-530.

2. Report of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87. P.P., 1888, Vol.XLVIII, Paper No. C.5327, p.13.

3. Ibid., p.14.

4. Ibid., pp.14-15.

competitive examinations from the principal public schools many distinguished youths who have not yet taken the first step towards a University or professional career at home."¹ Then, in 1876, the upper limit was further reduced to nineteen years by Salisbury with a lower limit of seventeen years.² The candidates spent their two years of probation in England at the Government's expense (£150 per year).³ The avowed objects of this change were "to bring the selected candidates to their work in India at an earlier age than heretofore, and to secure for them, as far as was possible, the moral supervision of some academical body during their period of probation."⁴ Salisbury also based his argument on the ground that even if a candidate failed to qualify in the civil service examination at nineteen, it was not too late for him to seek some other career, whereas if he failed at twenty three or

1. Ibid., p.15.

2. Report of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87. P.P., 1888, Vol. XLVIII, Paper No. C.5327, p.15.

3. Salisbury to Lytton, 24 February 1876, L.No.19, P.P., 1876, Vol.XXII, Paper No. 1587, p.530.

4. Ibid.

twenty two, it would be too late for him to seek an alternative.¹

The change of 1876 evoked a widespread discontent among Hindus and Muslims alike.² In their opinion, the new limit was too low for Indians to compete with English candidates in England with any reasonable prospect of success. They argued that the upper age limit should be raised at least to twenty two, when Indian students, having graduated, could appear for the examination with some hope of success. Under the rules adopted in 1870, the minimum educational standard demanded from candidates for the civil service was to have passed the entrance examination of any recognized Indian university. Indian students usually passed this at the age of eighteen, with their B.A. at twenty one and M.A. at twenty three. If the age-limit were raised to twenty two Indian students appearing for the civil service examination

-
1. Salisbury to Lytton, 24 February 1876, L.No.19. P.P., 1876, Vol.XXII, Paper No. 1587, pp.527-30.
 2. Roy, N. C., The Civil Service in India, p.83.

could have completed their B.A. and so have acquired the necessary sound knowledge of English. The registrars of Bombay and Madras universities both pointed out that by the age of nineteen the Indian student could not have properly mastered English.¹ To attempt to secure the necessary knowledge by the age of nineteen, as the Hindoo Patriot pointed out "will lead to more cramming and consequently to less efficiency, while it will impair the health of the learners."²

Moreover, the Indian candidate had to leave his home, travel some thousands of miles by sea, and live in a foreign country before he could appear at the open competition. So he could be scarcely trusted by his guardians to do all these at the age of eighteen, when "his experience, his self-reliance, and his strength of will have not been matured, and his plans of life have not been

1. P. Peterson, Registrar of Bombay University, to H. M. Primrose, Private Secretary to the Viceroy, 9 August 1884, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July to December 1884, Enclosure No. 70. Also, D. Duncan, Registrar of Madras University, to H. M. Primrose, 1 August 1884, Ibid., Enclosure No. 53.

2. The Hindoo Patriot, 12 February 1877.

formed."¹ According to B. M. Malabari, the editor of the Indian Spectator, writing to H. M. Primrose, Private Secretary to the Governor General: "19 is really too low for the Indian, mainly, I believe, because it necessitates his leaving home for a foreign country at a time when the character is not quite formed and the sense of responsibility scarcely realised."² Apart from these principal causes of objection, there was a strong prejudice among the Hindus against travelling overseas, for a Hindu crossing the seas was likely to lose his caste, and an equally strong prejudice among the Muslims against wine, to which parents feared the boy would become addicted while in England. As the Hindoo Patriot put it, on 3 April 1882, the lowering of the upper age limit from twenty one to nineteen "absolutely closed the covenanted civil service to

-
1. R. C. Dutt's note on the limit of age prescribed for candidates for admission into the Indian Civil Service. P.P., 1884-85, Vol.LVIII, Paper No.C.1580, p.37.
 2. B. M. Malabari to H. M. Primrose, 4 August 1884, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, July to December 1884, LNo.61.

the Indians."¹

The Hindus were the first to oppose the measure through the Indian Association, which resolved to appeal to the whole people of India. On 24 March 1877, the Indian Association submitted a petition to Parliament on the civil service question demanding that the maximum age-limit for the open competitive examination be raised to twenty two years and that examinations be held simultaneously both in England and India. The underlying aim of the agitation about entrance qualifications was to arouse "a spirit of unity and solidarity among the people of India."² On 26 May 1877, Surendranath Banerjea started his tour in India to organise public opinion for this purpose, and he established several branches of the Indian Association in Lahore, Meerut, Allahabad, Cownpore and Lucknow. Referring to the tour of Surendranath Banerjea, Henry Cotton³ remarked:

1. The Hindoo Patriot, 3 April 1882.

2. Banerjea, S. N., A Nation in Making, p.44.

3. Henry John Stedman Cotton (1845-1915): Entered Indian Civil Service 1867; Chief Commissioner of Assam, 1896-1902; K.C.S.I., 1902; retired in 1902; M.P., 1906-10.

"The Bengalee Baboos now rule public opinion from Peshwar to Chittagong... at the present moment the name of Surendranath Banerjea excites as much enthusiasm among the rising generation of Mooltan as in Dacca."¹ On 26 March 1883, the Indian Association, in another memorial presented to Kimberley,² Secretary of State for India, stated that the reduction of the age-limit had proved "disastrous to the prospects of Indian candidates."³ The Indian Association pointed out that from 1877 to 1881 only two persons had been appointed members of the Covenanted Civil Service of Bengal.⁴ It showed that since the reduction in the maximum age-limit the service had failed to secure a good number of Indians with university degrees.⁵ On 24 February 1883, the

-
1. Cotton, H. J. S., New India or India in Transition, pp.15-16.
 2. John Woodhouse Kimberley, First Earl of (1826-1902): Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1852; Secretary of State for India from April to November 1864; December 1882 to 1885; from 7 February to 4 August 1886; and again from 19 August 1892 to 10 March 1894; Lord President of the Council and Foreign Secretary, 1894-5.
 3. Anand Mohan Bose, Honorary Secretary of Indian Association, to Kimberley, 26 March 1883. P.P., 1884-85, Vol.LVIII, Paper No.C.4580, p.5.
 4. Ibid.,
 5. Ibid.

Hindus of Burdwan also submitted a memorial to Kimberley stating that the reduction of age would seriously impair the efficiency of the service, and weaken the character of the Indian administration.¹ On 5 August 1884, K. T. Telang,² Member of the Bombay Legislative Council, wrote to C. P. Ilbert, the Law Member of Ripon Council: "For myself, I should indeed prefer that the candidates should not be less than 22 years of age."³ In the opinion of K. C. Majumdar, Secretary of the Sadharan Hitashadhini Sabha of Pabna, the expectation of good results from the reduction of age-limit "was"quite delusive."⁴ The Muslims also gave their whole hearted support to the Hindus in this matter. On 23 July 1884, Syed

-
1. Sajani Kant Chatterjee, Secretary of Burdwan Hindu Association, to Kimberley, 24 February 1883. P.P., 1884-85, Vol.LVIII, Paper No. C.4580, p.7.
 2. K. T. Telang (1850-1893): Member of the Education Commission in 1882; Member of the Bombay Legislative Council in 1884; Judge of the High Court, Bombay; one of the organisers of Indian National Congress.
 3. Telang to Ilbert, 5 August 1884, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, July to December 1884, L.No.63.
 4. Majumdar to Kimberley, 24 February 1883. P.P., 1884-85, Vol.LVIII, Paper No. C.4580, p.8.

Mahmood¹, a Muslim lawyer of the United Provinces, argued that the Government's proposal to award scholarships to Indian candidates in order to enable them to visit England and appear at the civil service examination would be frustrated if the age-limit was nineteen.² Syed Ahmed Khan also argued that the "real object" of Government in reducing the age-limit for the competitive examination was "to exclude Natives from the civil service appointments" and to deprive Indians of one of their rights.³ He informed Ripon⁴ that as a result of this measure "a kind of political discontent" had arisen among educated Indians.⁵

-
1. Syed Mahmood Muhammed (1850-1903): Son of Syed Ahmed Khan; Bar-at-law; practised in the High Court, Allahabad; District Judge at Rai Bareli in Oudh, 1879; Member of the Education Commission, 1882; acted as a Puisne Judge of the High Court North West Provinces, 1882,84,86,87, confirmed on May 9, 1887; retired November 1893.
 2. Syed Mahmood to C. P. Ilbert, 23 July 1884, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, July to December 1884, L.No. 34.
 3. Quoted in the Governor General's Minute, 10 September 1884. P.P., 1884-85, Vol.LVIII, Paper no. C.4580, p.30.
 4. Robinson George Fr derick Samuel, First Marquess of Ripon (1827-1909): Secretary of State for India 1866; Viceroy of India, 1880-84; Colonial Secretary, 1892-5; Lord Privy Seal, 1905-8.
 5. Quoted in the Governor General's Minute, 10 September 1884. P.P., 1884-5, Vol.LVIII, Paper No.C.4580, p.30.

The views of both Hindus and Muslims thus forcibly expressed led the Viceroy Ripon to take up the question of reform of civil service recruitment with his Council from 1882 onwards and after 1884 with the Secretary of State Kimberley. Ripon stressed that there was no question upon which the educated, politically active Indians felt more strongly or were more united, and he urged that the age-limit be raised. He was met however by a public statement from Kimberley that the age limits would not be altered.¹ Ripon could not move Kimberley, and the question therefore remained a continued source of grievance to Hindus and Muslims, and from 1885 a major demand of the newly formed Indian National Congress.

1. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.169.

Again the Hindus and Muslims co-operated in protesting against the restrictions which were imposed on vernacular newspapers in 1878. From 1835 when Charles Metcalfe,¹ provisional Governor General, had removed control of the press, except that exercised by the general laws of the land, the press in India, English or vernacular, had remained free, except for a brief emergency period during the mutiny of 1857. The only restriction was that printing presses and newspapers had to be registered. Then in 1870 a provision was inserted in the Penal Code which covered press sedition such as incitement to rebellion, but this, as has been pointed out, "was not intended to apply to mere political libels, that is, unjust or unbecoming and intemperate attacks upon public men or measures."² During the early 1890's, with the growth of nationalist feelings, Indians began to show themselves more critical of

-
1. Charles Theophilus Metcalfe (1785-1846): Provisional Governor General of India, 1835-6; Lieutenant-Governor of the North Western Provinces, 1836-8; Governor General of Canada, 1843-5; retired in 1845.
 2. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.66.

of the Government. Sometimes Indian newspapers charged the Government with "injustice and tyranny."¹ According to these writers, Alexander Arbuthnot, a member of the Viceroy's Council, in his speech on 14 March 1878 in the Council, stated: "There is no crime, however heinous, and no meanness, however vile, which, ... is not habitually practised by their English rulers."² Supporting this statement, Lytton³ quoted from several newspapers, the Suhrid, the Sadhrani and the Amrita Bazar Patrika.⁴ The Suhrid had commented that "in these days wherever we turn our eyes we see dark oppression and injustice prevailing throughout India. The hostility of Government towards the Natives, and its favouritism to Englishmen have become palpable in various instances"; the Sadhrani had declared that "The British Government has destroyed the respect and honour enjoyed by the

1. I.L.P., 14 March 1878, Vol.1208, Prog. No.144.

2. P.P., 1878, Vol.LVII, Paper No. C.2040, p.45.

3. Edward Robert Bulwar Lytton (1831-1891): Educated at Harrow and Bonn; Private Secretary to Lord Dalling at Washington and Florence; Secretary to the embassy in Paris 1872-4; British Minister at Lisbon, 1872; Viceroy of India, 1876-80; Ambassador at Paris, 1887-91.

4. P.P., 1878, Vol.LVII, Paper No. C.2040, p.9.

respectable middle classes of the Hindu society. A common constable now arrests a responsible Zamindar," while the Amrita Bazar Patrika had said: "The policy of the British Government is to destroy our national life, and to keep us under their subjection for ever." Such examples of the "increasing seditious violence" of the Indian Press convinced Lytton that stringent measures must be taken. On 13 March 1878 he telegraphed Salisbury that there was an urgent need for a better control of the Indian Press,¹ and with Salisbury's assent² he introduced a new Vernacular Press Act in the Legislative Council on 14 March 1878.³ The main object of this Act was to place Indian vernacular newspapers under control, and to furnish the Government with more effective means of punishing seditious writings calculated "to produce disaffection

-
1. Telegram from Lytton to Salisbury, 13 March 1878. P.P., 1878, Vol.LVII, Paper No.2040, p;1.
 2. Telegram from Salisbury to Lytton, 14 March 1878, Ibid., p.2.
 3. I.L.P., 14 March 1878, Op. cit.

towards the Government in the minds of the ignorant population."¹ Another object was to prevent unscrupulous writers from using their papers as a means of intimidation and exhortation.² The Act excluded the English Press in India from the operations of the Act on the ground that it had no desire to subvert the Government.³ Under the Act, the magistrates, with the previous sanction of the Provincial Government, were empowered to demand a bond from the printers and publishers of vernacular newspapers not to print or publish anything likely "to excite feelings of dissatisfaction to the Government, or antipathy between persons of different races, castes, religions, or sects."⁴ The printers

-
1. I.L.P., 14 March 1878, Op. cit.;
Also, Buckland, C.E., Bengal Under the Lieutenant Governors, Vol.11, p.714.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, pp.66-7.
 4. I.L.P., 14 March 1878, Op. cit.

and publishers were required either to deposit a certain sum of money with the Government or to submit their copy to the censor before publication.¹ If any newspaper at any time published anything for the purpose of extortion, the Provincial Governments had the power to issue warrants and to ban the paper.² The editor could also be punished with a fine or six months imprisonment or both.³ However the section relating to pre-publication censorship was repealed by Cranbrook,⁴ the Secretary of State for India, in September 1878, because of "the variety of Indian languages."⁵

The Vernacular Press Act was strongly criticised by both Hindus and Muslims. On 9 April 1878, the

-
1. Lytton's Speech in the Legislative Council, 14 March 1878, Mss. Eur. E.218,522/7, p.201.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Gathorne-Hardy, Gathorne, first Earl of Cranbrook (1814-1906): Educated at Eton and Oriel College, Oxford; Conservative M.P. for Leominster, 1856-65; Under-Secretary for home department, 1858-9; Home Secretary, 1867-8; Secretary of State for War under Disraeli, 1874-8; succeeded Lord Salisbury as Secretary of State for India, 1878; Lord President of the Council, 1885-92.
 5. Quoted in Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.67.

Aligarh Institute Gazette, a prominent Muslim newspaper of the United Provinces, condemned it as "unjust, inexpedient and ineffective."¹ On 13 April 1878, the Urdu Guide, another Muslim newspaper of Bengal, deplored the Act, commenting that it was strange to stifle the Vernacular Press, while one could write anything one wished in English.² It was the subject-matter treated in the paper not the languages in which it was written, which should concern Government.³ On 17 April 1878, the Indian Association protested against the Act in a meeting held at the Calcutta Town Hall. About 5,000 Hindus and Muslims attended the meeting and condemned the Act as a repressive and retrogressive measure.⁴ Surendranath Banerjee in his speech in this meeting stated that the vernacular newspapers were loyal to the Government. In support of his statement,

1. The Aligarh Institute Gazette, 9 April 1878.

2. Quoted in The Bengalee, 13 April 1878.

3. Ibid.

4. The Aligarh Institute Gazette, 23 April 1878.

he quoted Richard Temple,¹ the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal (1874-1877), who had declared during his term of office: "... my general conclusion is decidedly favourable in respect to the loyalty and good-will of the Bengali Press towards the British Crown and nation, and towards the British rule in the main;... the case on behalf of the British is put by the Bengali Press with a warmth and an impressiveness hardly ever surpassed, and seldom equalled by zealous advocates among ourselves."²

Then he commented: "to-day the Vernacular Press is loyal and respectful to the Government. To-morrow's sun dawns upon it, and all on the sudden, down goes its character for loyalty, and it becomes seditious, disloyal, spreading the taint and pollution of treason

-
1. Richard Temple (1826-1902): Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces of India in 1862; Foreign Secretary to the Government of India 1868; Financial Member of Council from 1868 to 1874; Lieutenant Governor of Bengal from April 1874 to January 1877; Governor of Bombay, 1877; retired, 1880; Member of Parliament for Evesham Division of Worcestershire, 1885-92; the Kingston Division of Surrey, 1892-5.
 2. Palit, R.C. Speeches of Babu Surendranath Banerjea 1876-1880, Vol.1, p.102.

throughout the length and breadth of the land, and it becomes necessary to produce a Gagging Act."¹ On 13 May 1878, the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha of Madras, founded in 1870, sent a memorial to the Viceroy requesting him to repeal the Act.² The Sabha stated it was necessary for the success of all Government that the Governed should be permitted to speak out their grievances and to express their opinions on all public affairs freely.³ This was the more necessary in a country where "the people had no voice whatever in the actual administration of their affairs."⁴ "It is absolutely necessary," the Sabha continued, "that they should have the broadest freedom to express with all openness possible their thoughts about such administrative measures as the Government may think to be best adapted to their condition."⁵ Moreover, attempts were made to raise the question

1. Palit, R.C., Op. cit., Vol.1, p.102.

2. The Hindoo Patriot, 13 May 1878.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

of repealing the Act in the British Parliament. Thus in July 1878 the Indian Association presented a memorial to Gladstone, the Opposition leader in the House of Commons,¹ and believed to be the most severe critic of the Act.² His devotion to "the basic principles of English Government, his affection for the forms of democratic procedure, and his convictions as to Britain's duty in India" were in fact all seriously hurt.³ He repeatedly placed the question of Vernacular Press Act before the House of Commons in 1878 and 1880 and pleaded against such limitation of the freedom of the Indian press. In his speech in the House of Commons in 1880, he commented: "I cannot tell you how dishonouring to England I consider to have been the Government of India during the last three years."⁴

1. The Bengalee, 14 September, 1878.

2. Buckland, C.E., Op. cit., p.719.

3. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.68.

4. Quoted in Gopal, S., Ibid., p.1.

In 1880, Ripon, at Hartington's¹ suggestion² took up the matter.³ Hartington was in favour of repeal; the Act, he argued, had unquestionably provoked strong feelings of discontent and resentment, and encouraged a belief among the Indians that the Government of India was still animated by a spirit of class legislation and still regarded the Indians, notwithstanding its repeated professions of confidence, with distrust and suspicion.⁴

The situation in the Viceroy's Council was, however, delicate. Baring, the Finance Member, recommended immediate legislative action.⁵ He

-
1. Cavendish, Spencer Compton, Marquess of Hartington and eighth Duke of Devonshire (1833-1908): Educated in Trinity College, Cambridge, 1854; elected Liberal M.P. for North Lancashire, 1857; Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1870-4; Secretary of State for India, 1880-2; Secretary of State for War, 1882-5; Lord President of the Council, 1895-1903.
 2. Hartington to Ripon, 25 June 1880, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1880, L.No.9.
 3. Ripon to Hartington, 12 July 1880, ibid., L.No.11.
 4. Secretary of State to Government of India, 1881, Enclosure to Hartington to Ripon, 14 January 1881, L.No.3, and Hartington to Ripon, 28 January 1881, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1881, L.No.5.
 5. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.70.

argued that Lytton's administration had got altogether out of harmony with Indian feeling and commented: "This is all wrong, and, moreover, when once this state of feeling is produced, the Government loses half its power for good in the country. We rather want something to bring back this very sentimental and imaginative people into sympathy with us."¹ But Gibbs, the Home Member, felt that to repeal the Act would tend to weaken the Government,² and all the other members more or less shared the same view, though Rivers, Thompson and Stewart suggested amendments of the Act.³ But Ripon argued that any compromise would involve retaining the restrictions on the press and the discrimination between English and vernacular newspapers, and so would fail to satisfy Indian opinion.⁴ Finally the majority in the Viceroy's Council admitted that there were grave

1. Baring to H.W. Primrose, Private Secretary to Viceroy, 29 January 1881: Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, 1881, L.No.42^A.

2. Gibbs to Ripon, 15 February 1881, ibid., L.No.70.

3. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.71.

4. Ibid. Also, Ripon to Hartington, 12 February 1881, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with Secretary of State for India, 1881, L.No.9.

objections to the Act and suggested that a public announcement of eventual repeal be made but that no immediate steps be taken.¹ The Legislative Department was directed to prepare a repealing Bill, which was finally passed on 19 January 1882.

Both the Hindus and Muslims thanked Ripon for repealing the Vernacular Press Act. On 28 February 1882, in a letter to Ripon, Hindu and Muslim representatives of the Vernacular press in Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Madras expressed their "heart-felt gratitude."² They wrote:

"To a distinguished statesman, bred up in the free atmosphere of the British Parliament, nothing new or original can be said with respect to the noble privilege of a Free Press... With the removal of the Vernacular Press Act

-
1. Telegram from Ripon to Hartington, 16 February 1881, Ripon Papers, Telegraphic Correspondence with Secretary of State for India, 1880-84, Vol.1, L.No.518. Also Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.72.
 2. The Representatives of the Vernacular Press to Ripon, Calcutta, 28 February 1882, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, January to June 1882, L.No.149.

from the Indian Statute-book, Your Excellency has the satisfaction of seeing that the whole country rejoices at this noble act."¹

Again, on 4 April 1882, ninety-eight Hindu and Muslim newspaper editors of Bombay, Bengal and the United Provinces thanked Ripon.² They declared:

"We feel that as we have been the sternest in our opposition to the Press Act, we should be also the foremost in expressing our deep sense of thankfulness to the ruler whose high-minded statesmanship has repealed that Act, and has restored to the Vernacular Press its lost liberty."³

We also find Hindu-Muslim co-operation in opposing the Arms Act of 1878. From the early years

-
1. The Representatives of the Vernacular Press to Ripon, Calcutta, 28 February 1882, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, January to June 1882, L.No.149.
 2. Editors of Bengal, Bombay and United Provinces, to Ripon, Enclosure to Surendranath Banerjea, Secretary to the Committee of Native Editors, to H.W. Primrose, 4 April 1882, ibid., L.No.219.
 3. Ibid.

of British rule in India, the Government had exercised some control over the exportation and the importation of arms and ammunition of war. People in most parts of the country were forbidden to go about with arms on their person, and in certain local enactments the police were empowered to disarm and arrest persons carrying weapons.¹

In 1857, during the mutiny disturbances, the first general Arms Act (xxvIII of 1857) was passed.²

The Act vested the Government with the power "to regulate the importation, manufacture, and sale of arms and ammunition."³ The Act was to operate for two years only in those districts to which its provisions had been extended by the Local Governments.⁴

After its expiry, another Act was passed in 1860 for

1. Acts xIII of 1856 (Presidency Towns Police Act) and xxIV of 1854 (Malabar Offensive Weapons Act) may be cited as an example. Papers connected with the Indian Arms Act (xI of 1878) Vol.1: Lytton Papers, Mss. Eur. E.218. Also, Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.76.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. The Act was operated in a greater part of the N.W. Provinces & Oudh, the Punjab, the Central Provinces, Bombay, Madras and a smaller portion of Bengal, Ibid.

five years; it had some new provisions and its scope was wider.¹ In 1865 this was extended for another year and in 1866 it was decided that this Act should remain in operation for an indefinite period, until the Governor General in Council should "declare otherwise."² In 1870, the Government of Bengal complained that this Arms Act was "inefficient and inadequate", for it permitted "the importation of thousands of cheap guns and rifles, which found their way into the hands of hostile frontier tribes and robbers and other disturbers of the public peace."³

Since 1870 the question had been discussed by the different Local Governments, and it was

-
1. The Act of 1860 prohibited the importation or manufacture of cannon, arms, and certain munitions of war without a license provided for the supervision of the dealings of licensed vendors of arms. The Local Governments were authorised to prohibit transport of arms from one place to another and could order the disarming of any district or province. The magistrates were empowered to search for arms and sieze them. Under this Act none could posses arms in a disarmed district without a license. Ibid.
 2. Papers connected with the Indian Arms Act (xI of 1878), Vol.1, Lytton Papers, Mss. Eur. E.218.
 3. Ibid.

finally agreed that there should be some changes in the existing Act in order to make it more efficient and effective. Eventually the Arms Act of 1878 was passed. It introduced licensing of fire arms throughout India and imposed a heavy import duty of Rs. 50 on a gun and Rs. 15 on a pistol.¹ But the Act was not to affect official and nonofficial Europeans and those Indians whom the Government had granted titles.²

The Act thus made a distinction between Indians and Europeans, exempting the latter from its jurisdiction. This inequality and the heavy import duty on guns attracted the attention of both the Hindus and Muslims, who jointly opposed the Act. They argued that the Act debarred ordinary people from possessing arms, making their lives insecure against wild animals. Moreover, the Bengalee remarked the measure "has cast an unmerited slur upon the loyalty of the people of India."³ The Hindu Patriot complained on 30 January

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. The Bengalee, 22 May 1880.

1882 that a leopard had killed three Muslim ryots and injured two in the Polasi village of Jagooly before the villagers had killed the animal with lathis (bamboo sticks). The paper commented that they would have been successful in killing the leopard without any loss of human life if they had had guns.²

The dealers in firearms also objected to the imposition of a heavy duty on guns as they apprehended a loss in their trade. The "sporting community" opposed the Act on the ground that they would not be able to buy guns cheaply; the imposition of duty, wrote the Pioneer on 20 February 1878, "presses heavily on the peaceful and loyal sporting community", which included both Hindus and Muslims.²

Seeing the public reaction to the Act, Lord Ripon attempted to amend it² but failed to do so

1. The Hindu Patriot, 30 January 1882.
2. The Pioneer, 20 February 1878. There seems to be no separate and independent Muslim comment on the Act. Possibly the Muslims did not like to come out openly against the Act thinking that this might lead the British to speculate that the Muslims might rise in arms against the English in future. This was more likely when the Muslims had already been suspected by the authorities of organising the revolt of 1857.

in the manner he had desired, because "the India Council was hostile, and Ripon was unable to secure a decision in his favour before the Ilbert Bill agitation thrust everything else into the background."¹

Both the Hindus and the Muslims favoured the Local Self-Government policy of Ripon. In the pre-British period, there had been an element of tribal or clan self-government among Afghans settled in India and among the Rajputs of the United Provinces and Oudh, both of whom might indulge in joint management of land. Among the Hindus, there was also caste self-government, the panchayat. And in the village, Hindu or Muslim, the headmen, patwari or village leaders formed a sort of local government in opposition to the State and its demands, and to the occasional threat of robbers.² But there was little sign of the notion of voting or of majorities, rather that of securing a concensus between interested groups. The British rulers allowed the existing institutions to continue,

1. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.81.

2. Tinker, H.R., The Foundations of Local Self-Government in India, Pakistan and Burma, p.18.

and attempted gradually to infuse in them the spirit of western Local Self-Government. Efforts were made first in the presidency cities and later on in the district towns. As early as 1668, to stimulate local taxation, a municipal corporation was formed at Madras; and by 1726, Bombay and Calcutta were provided with municipal bodies; they were largely confined to the exercise of judicial functions.¹ Gradually these bodies were developed, their functions increased, including sanitation, construction of roads and the assessment of households, and the principle of election was introduced in them. In 1872, the Bombay corporation was expanded to include sixty-four members; half the members were to be elected by the ratepayers, one-quarter to be nominated by the Government and the remainder by the Justices of the Peace.² In Calcutta in 1876, two-thirds of the corporation were elected by the ratepayers. And from 1878, the Madras corporation consisted of thirty-five

1. Tinker, H.R., Op. cit., pp.25-26.

2. Ibid., p.41; Also Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.85.

members; the President and two Vice-Presidents were salaried heads of the executive, sixteen members were nominated non-officials and the rest were elected by the ratepayers.¹

Also Local Self-Government was encouraged outside the Presidency cities, particularly from 1850, when local governments were empowered to create municipalities in those towns where the inhabitants desired them to carry out improvements.² By 1868, indeed, municipalities had been created in many towns, and the election of members by the ratepayers and the grant of large powers were authorised in 1873.³ By Ripon's day elections were

1. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.85.

2. Ibid., pp.85-86.

3. Ibid., p.86.

In 1858, the Indian debt, caused largely by wars and the Mutiny, stood at ninety eight million pounds. In the 1860's the Government, in order to give relief to the Imperial finances, emphasized the need of transferring the responsibility for roads and public works to local bodies, thus stimulating the development of local institutions.

Tinker, H.R., Op. cit., p.35.

held in seventy-three out of eighty-one municipalities in the North Western Provinces and in fifty-eight out of sixty-two in the Central Provinces. In the remaining provinces, the principle of elections had been applied to a very limited extent.¹

Local Self-Government in rural areas was to some extent stimulated by the Government of India's resolution of 1870, which emphasized that local interest, supervision, and care were necessary for the successful management of funds devoted to education, sanitation, medical charity and public works.² District Committees were formed under the presidency of the District Magistrates to administer the land revenue cesses, spent largely on the construction of roads.³ Although some

1. Memorandum of Ripon on the policy of the Government of India in regard to Local Self-Government, 26 December 1882, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, July to December 1882, L.No.262.

2. Ibid. Also, Hunter, W.W., The Earl of Mayo, ii, p.58; Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, p.87.

3. Tinker, H.R., Op. cit., p.39.

statutes envisaged election no members were in fact elected. "The committees", wrote Tinker, "were nothing more than a convenience for the District Magistrate to supply him with information or to carry out miscellaneous duties."¹

However, if by 1880 the elective principle had been put into practice in some local bodies, particularly in the United Provinces and the Central Provinces, in many areas control was still firmly in the hands of Government servants. The wide variations of practice, as Ripon saw, were due to "the varying inclination of different Governors and Lieutenant Governors."² Ripon proposed further legislation therefore, which should considerably widen the scope for elected Indian members of local bodies. The underlying motives of his policy were as follows: first, in his opinion, the extension of

1. Tinker, H.R., Op. cit., p.39.

2. Memorandum of Ripon on the policy of the Government of India in regard to Local Self-Government, 26 December 1882, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, July to December 1882, L.No.262.

local municipalities was required to cope with the increases in local works.¹ He observed that the reports of the Provincial Governments of Bombay, Madras, and Bengal showed that local officials were very often heavily overburdened by works. So, he thought, it had become "imperatively necessary" to look around for some means of relief.

Secondly, he realized that with the advancement of English education, there was rapidly growing up all over the country an intelligent class of people, "whom it is not only bad policy, but sheer waste of power, to fail to utilise." Unless outlets were provided for their political ambitions, he felt, this new class would become "the most bitter opponents of British Government in India."²

Lastly, Lord Ripon believed that the Indians should be largely associated with the administration

-
1. Memorandum of Ripon on the policy of the Government of India in regard to Local Self-Government, 26 December 1882, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, July to December 1882, L.No.262.
 2. Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1889, p.84.

of the Government.¹ He thought that the participation of Indians in the management of their local affairs would help to develop their "political and popular education."² On 18 May 1882, with the approval of the Provincial Governments, the Governor General in Council stated in a resolution that one-third of the members in each municipality were to be nominated and election "in some form or other should be generally introduced in towns of any considerable size, but may be extended more cautiously and gradually to the smaller municipalities and to backward rural tracts."³ The Provincial Governments, through their district officers, should consult the leading Indians of each locality on the possibility of introducing the elective system and on the arrangements most likely to meet their local circumstances.⁴ They should use "every effort" to make the schemes adopted "as consonant as possible to the feelings and habits of the people."⁵

1. Memorandum of Lord Ripon on the policy of the Government of India in regard to Local Self-Government, 26 December 1882, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, July to December 1882, L.No.262.

2. Ibid.

3. Resolution of the Government of India, 18 May 1882, No.17/747-759. P.P., 1883, Vol.LI, Paper No.93-1, p.29.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p.5.

Both Hindus and Muslims expressed their deep gratitude to Ripon for his earnest desire to give the people a real share in the management of their local affairs. Babu Sisir Kumar Ghose, the editor and proprietor of the Ananda Bazar Patrika, wrote to A.O. Hume¹ on 24 May 1882: "... the scheme of Lord Ripon has given me pleasure."² On 18 December 1882, Janerilal Umasankar Yajnik of Bombay, on behalf of the Bombay people, offered their thanks for this boon to the Indians.³ Raja Harbans on 18 April 1883 in course of discussion on Punjab Local Self-Government expressed his opinion that the measures proposed were "proper and well-judged."⁴ Rai Mulraj, Officiating Extra Assistant Commissioner, Gujrat, wrote to the Secretary to the Government of the

-
1. Allan Octavian Hume (1829-1912): Entered Bengal Civil Service 1849; C.B. 1860; Secretary to the Government of India in the Revenue and Agriculture Department, 1870-9; retired, 1882; General Secretary of the Indian National Congress, 1885-1906.
 2. Babu Sisir Kumar Ghose to A.O. Hume, 24 May 1882, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, January to June 1882, L.No.343.
 3. Janerilal Umasankar Yajnik to H.W. Primrose, Pvt. Secy. to the Viceroy, 18 December 1882, Ibid., L.No.375.
 4. Opinion of Raja Harbans Singh, Lahore, 18 April 1883, Enclosure to W.M. Young, Secy. to Govt., Punjab, to Secy. to Govt. of India, 9 May 1883, L.No.1077, I.L.P., December 1883, Vol.2093, Prog. No.25.

Punjab on 15 May 1883, on the introduction of the Local Self-Government policy in the Punjab: "My educated countrymen believe that the Punjab will succeed in developing Local Self-Government in the country, when it recognizes that election in one form or another is not altogether unfamiliar to Native ideas."¹ On 4 June 1883, the Lahore Branch of the Indian Association suggested to the Secretary of the Government of the Punjab an elaborate plan of elective members in the Punjab Local Self-Government. The Association wrote: "The minimum proportion of elections should be fixed at three-fourths the total number of members of the Committee. A provision like this would be very appropriate, as it would recognize and firmly establish the principle of election; and in course of time, as Committees prove themselves fit, the number of nominations might be still further reduced by the Local Government."² On 14 July 1883,

1. Rai Mulraj to Secy. to Govt., Punjab, 15 May 1888, L.No.444, I.L.P., December 1883, Vol.2093, Prog. No. 35.

2. Indian Association, Lahore, to Secy. to Govt., Punjab, 4 June 1883, Ibid.

Gurdyal Singh, Assistant Commissioner of Hoshiarpur, expressed the same view to C.L. Tupper, Junior Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, that election was the only mode to secure "the real representatives of the people."¹

The Muslims also took a keen interest in Local Self-Government, though they greeted its introduction with more reserve than the Hindus. On 12 January 1883, Syed Ahmed Khan, in the course of his discussion on the Central Provinces Local Self-Government Bill, said that the introduction of the principle of election, "pure and simple" for representation of various interests on the local boards and district councils was unsuited to India, "where religious distinctions were violent, where education in its modern sense had not made an equal or proportionate progress among all sections of the population."² He maintained that so long as differences of race and creed and the distinctions of caste formed an important element in the socio-

1. Gurdyal Singh to C.L. Tupper, 14 July 1883, L.No.848, Ibid., Prog.No.67.

2. Philips, C.H. (ed.), The Evolution of India and Pakistan 1858-1947, p.185.

political life of India, and influenced her inhabitants in matters connected with the administration and welfare of the country at large, the system of election could not be safely adopted.¹ He added that the larger community would totally override the interests of the smaller community.² Nevertheless he commended Ripon's Local Self-Government policy for the following reason:

"Government, in reserving to itself the power of appointing one-third of the members of the local boards and district councils, is adopting the only measure which can be adopted to guarantee the success of Local Self-Government, by securing and maintaining that due and just balance in the representation of the various sections of the Indian population which the system of election pure and simple, would fail to achieve."³

The Muslims of Kasur also upheld the views of Syed Ahmed Khan and wrote to the Secretary to the

1. Philips, C. H. (ed.), Op. cit., p.185.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

Government, Punjab, on 31 July 1883:

"To avoid this evil [the evil of being totally swept aside by the Hindu majority], Government had very appropriately reserved to itself the power of appointing one-third of the members by nomination."¹ As a member of the Viceroy's ^{Legislative} Council, Syed Ameer Ali likewise wrote to H. W. Primrose on 12 April 1884 that he was "an enthusiastic advocate of the Local Self-Government scheme. What I want is that my people should not, as they are apt from sheer force of majority to be, excluded from representation."² It is notable that one Muslim community which expressed its gratitude to Ripon without reservation or emphasis on safeguards was that of Peshawar. They commented enthusiastically on his Local Self-Government policy that it would prove "beneficial to the community

1. Opinion of the Anjuman-i-Am, Kasur, 31 July 1883, I.L.P., December 1883, Vol.2093, Prog.No.94.

2. Ameer Ali to H. W. Primrose, Pvt. Secy. to Viceroy, 12 April 1884, Ripon Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, January to June 1884, L.No.158^a.

generally" - but Peshawar was of course an overwhelmingly Muslim majority district.¹

Again, the distinction which was made between the powers and jurisdiction of the Indian and British magistrates in 1872 was invidious and anomalous and aroused the bitterest of controversy - the Ilbert Bill controversy of 1883 - among the Europeans and Indians. Previously, under the Criminal Procedure Code of 1861 (sections 39, 40 and 41 of Act xxv of 1861), magistrates or justices of the peace, whether European or Indian, had the power to enquire into charges against Europeans and to commit them to the High Court for trial.² In 1869 (Act ii of 1869), it was enacted that only Europeans or Covenanted Civil Servants should hold the appointment of the justice of the peace. Under Act x of 1872, it was further enacted that no Indian Covenanted Civil Servant, even though

1. Qazi Tila Mahommed, Honorary Secy., Anjuman-i-Peshawar, to Secy. to Govt., Punjab, 2 May 1883, I.L.P., December 1883, Vol.2093, Prog.No.33.

2. P.P., 1883, Vol.LI, Paper No.C^m3512, p.7.

a first class magistrate and justice of the peace, should have power "to enquire into a complaint or to try a charge against a European" outside the Presidency town.¹ Thus, an Indian magistrate stationed in Calcutta was empowered to try an European. But if he was promoted to a higher post and transferred to a district outside Calcutta, he was deprived of such power. Not only this, his European subordinate of the district could try an European. "It is insulting to us", said Badruddin Tayabji, a prominent Bombay Muslim, later on, in 1883,

"first, because it brands even the ablest, the highest, and the most distinguished of our judicial officers with a galling and a perpetual mark of inferiority. It is insulting to us because it draws an invidious distinction between the European and the Native members of the same covenanted civil service."²

The anomalous nature of this judicial arrangement

-
1. P.P., 1883, Vol.LI, Paper No.C.3512, p.7.
 2. Report of the Proceedings of a Public Meeting of Indian inhabitants of Bombay, 28 April 1883. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.3877, p.473.

attracted the Governor General's attention in 1882. Behari Lal Gupta, a Bengal Civil Servant, while officiating as Presidency magistrate in 1881, had full powers over European subjects. He dealt with serious cases with satisfaction to the local Government and the public. But on his removal to a more responsible appointment in the interior he ceased "to be qualified to deal with even the most trivial cases affecting Europeans."¹ After consulting the Provincial Governments, Ripon realised that "the time has come for modifying the existing law and removing the present absolute bar upon the investment of native magistrates in the interior with powers over European British subjects" in order to remove racial distinctions.² On 9 September 1882, he sent this proposal to Hartington.³ On 7 December 1882, Hartington agreed to alternations in the existing

1. Ripon to Hartington, 9 September 1882, L.No.33. P.P., 1883, Vol.LI, Paper No.C.3512, p.4.

2. Ibid., p.5.

3. Ibid.

law,¹ and three months later, on 2 February 1883, C. P. Ilbert, Ripon's law member, introduced a bill to abolish this anomaly. This bill proposed to empower Indian Session Judges (of which there was now an increasing number) to try Europeans in the mofussil or up country districts, a power they already enjoyed in the Presidency towns.²

This bill met with a general opposition from the Europeans and Anglo-Indians. In their opinion, Indians could never become fit judges of Europeans, since their early training, their customs and their habits of thought were "utterly different."³ As the European inhabitants of Ghaziabad in Meerut division explained to Ripon, it was impossible for them to have any confidence in Indian magistrates and judges because of their inferiority in training and education.⁴

1. Hartington to Ripon, 7 December 1882, L.No.33. P.P., 1883, Vol.LI, Paper No.C.3512, p.22.

2. Ibid., Paper No.C.3545, p.9.

3. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.C.3877, p.8.

4. Ibid., p.428.

On 28 February 1883 the European non-officials held a monster public meeting at the Calcutta Town Hall to protest against the bill. It was based, they declared, on no sound principle and must deter "the investment of British capital in the country by giving rise to a feeling of insecurity as to the liberties and safety of European British subjects employed in the mufassal and also of their wives and daughters."¹ Indian judges with their imperfect knowledge of English were incapable of arriving at a sound judgement, and moreover might not be impartial, because of their "strong race prejudices and their known weakness in the matter of bribes, etc."² This might encourage malicious Indians to build up cases on perjured evidence in order to harass Europeans, especially against tea planters and their agents, whose behaviour and motives might often be misunderstood by their workers. This would involve loss to

1. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.C.3877, p.424.

2. Ibid., p.8.

their business and would give rise to an unwillingness to settle in India. All the planters of Malabar, Assam and other parts of India therefore protested against the bill "most emphatically."

The Town Hall meeting was followed up on 9 June 1883 by the presentation of a memorial signed by 11,783 Europeans to Ripon. They claimed again that false evidence was frequent in India - any servant might bring forward false complaints against his European master - and the imprisonment of Europeans upon such evidence must arouse discontent among other Europeans.¹ They added that as the Europeans were the "dominant race", it was proper that they should enjoy special privileges in India: to pass this bill must lower the Europeans' prestige.² Finally they claimed that Indian judges could not properly try European women whose status in society was so different from that of Indian women.³

1. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.C.3877, p.502.

2. Ibid., Paper No.C.3952, p.88.

3. In 1883, about 732 English ladies protested against the bill.

Ibid., Paper No.C.3877, p.461.

Keeping up the pressure, on 23 August 1883 some three thousand Europeans again condemned the Ilbert Bill at a public meeting at Calcutta, and on 30 August sent another memorial to Ripon asking for its withdrawal. Far from weakening the prestige of Government such an action would strengthen its hold "upon the national convictions of the whole community."¹

In the face of this vociferous and concerted agitation the bill was modified on 25 June 1884. Evans, one of the members of the Viceroy's Council, had argued that "the situation had become extremely dangerous, and was becoming more perilous every day", and under such pressure from Council, Ripon in the end gave way.² The modified bill introduced the jury system so far as Europeans and Anglo-Indians trial was concerned.³ A European British subject on trial in a High Court, a Court of Sessions or a District Magistrate's Court could claim to be tried by a jury of which "not less than half the number shall be Europeans or Americans, or both."⁴ A district

1. Memorial of certain European British subjects to Ripon, 30 August 1883, No.75. Ibid., p.542.

2. R.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.C.3952, pp.123-24.

3. Ibid., p.152.

4. Ibid.

magistrate could not pass any sentence other than imprisonment for a term which might be extended to six months or five which might be extended to 2,000 rupees or both.¹

While the Europeans and Anglo-Indians were vehemently criticising the bill, Hindus and Muslims - both officials and unofficials - were firmly supporting it. They were of the opinion that if the British Government recognised the Europeans as a dominant race in India and gave them exclusive rights and privileges, it would stamp Indians as an inferior race. This would engender in the Indians' minds a sense of injustice and wrong, and might create a permanent feeling of discontent, most prejudicial to better administration. On 8 March 1883, the British Indian Association, the Indian Association, the Mahommedan Literary Society, the Central National Mahommedan Association, the Pleaders' Association of the Calcutta High Court, in their joint memorial to the Viceroy, heartily approved of the Ilbert Bill as a "just, sound, and righteous" measure, and expressed their "feelings of deep satisfaction and thankfulness" to Ripon, for

1. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.C.3952, p.152.

proposing it.¹ This was, to them, a step in the right direction towards the establishment of equality in the eyes of the law, which "is the just pride of British jurisprudence and polity, and the guiding principle of British rule in India."² Referring to the bill, the Burdwan Association of Bengal, in a letter of 4 April 1883 to the Government of India, stated that Indian judges were "not unfit, either by their education or by their nationality" to try British Indian subjects.³ The Indian Association of Lahore, in a letter of 19 May 1883 to the Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, expressed "the heart-felt gratitude of the people of India" to Lord Ripon for his "high-minded and statesmanlike" proposal embodied in the bill.⁴ The Satara Sarvajanic Sabha, in a memorial to the Government of India, denied the accusation of Europeans and Anglo-Indians that

1. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.C.3877, p.423.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p.438.

4. Ibid., p.327.

the Indians had race prejudices; such a charge, they said, was baseless. They argued that Indian magistrates and judges daily tried "men of all castes and creeds, Hindus, Mussalmans, Pansis, Christians, Jains, Budhists, etc., and no complaint has been heard that, in trying men and women of so many races, they were swayed by caste-prejudices."¹ They contended that if the Indians were ignorant of European habits and languages, the Europeans, being much more ignorant of Indian habits and languages, were unfit to try Indians. They believed that the educated Indians' knowledge of English was better than many Englishmen's knowledge of the vernacular languages.² Speaking at a public meeting held in the Bombay Town Hall on 28 April 1883, Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, a prominent Bombay resident, stated emphatically that the bill was "intended and calculated to remove an unnecessary and invidious distinction between European and Native judicial officers, founded, not, ... on the

1. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No. C.3877, p.540.

2. Ibid.

question of personal fitness, but only on differences of race."¹ At the same meeting Nahabhoy Byramjee Jeejeebhoy declared: "Our political status, our social well-being, our rights as British subjects, ... suggest to us the necessity of seeing the Hon. Mr. Ilbert's Bill become the law of the land."² "We, for ourselves", he continued, "and on behalf of our countrymen at large, state in the most emphatic and unequivocal terms possible, that we are 'keenly and deeply interested' in the Bill, since the principle therein involved is of the most vital importance to our worldly concerns and welfare."³

The Muslims of the Punjab characterised the arguments of the Europeans and Anglo-Indians as "irrelevant" on the ground that the bill

1. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No. C.3877, P.470.

2. Ibid., p.481.

3. Ibid., p.482. Addressing the audience Dinnath Raghunath said: "... gentlemen, all the opposition to this Bill is based on arguments which, when dropped into the crucible of analysis, appear alike sentimental, illogical, and untenable." Ibid., p.486.

was not intended to do any harm to the latter; rather it only aimed at "removing the disqualification of a judge or magistrate, which is based merely on race distinction."¹ Referring to the bill, Syed Ahmed Khan stated on 9 March 1883 in the Council that "the time has come when the entire population of India, be they Hindu or Muhammedan, European or Eurasian, must begin to feel that they are fellow-subjects; that between their political rights or constitutional status no difference exists in the eye of the law."² The Anglo-Indians' opposition to the bill, Ameer Ali thought, "had the effect of converting this legal controversy into a race difficulty."³ He continued: "If people will insist on looking at a thing upside down, it must necessarily appear wrong. Such seems to me to be the view entertained by those people who consider that the effect of this measure would be to deprive European British subjects of a privilege

-
1. Opinion of the Anjuman-i-Islamia, Amritsar, Punjab, 15 May 1883. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.3877, p.330.
 2. Syed Ahmed Khan's speech in the Governor General's Council, 9 March 1883. P.P., 1883, Vol.LI, Paper No. C.3650, p.32.
 3. Ameer Ali's speech in the Governor General's Council, 4 January 1884. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.3952, p.117.

which they now possess."¹ Supporting the bill, Nasiruddin and Gowher Ali, two Muslim Magistrates of Durbhanga observed that the charge that the Indian judges were partial and incapable of administering justice was imaginary and was not based on experience and sound reasoning.² Indian judges, they said, had hitherto tried civil suits instituted by or against Europeans; they had also tried criminal cases in which Europeans were prosecuted or their servants in a representative character stood accused. "No display of partiality has ever been reported in respect to the trial of such cases."³ Indian judges, they argued, "have an advantage over European judges, in that they can better understand the surroundings of a case occurring in India."⁴ In the same way, Nawab

1. Ameer Ali's speech in the Governor General's Council, 4 January 1884. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No. 3952, p.118.

2. The Local Opinions on the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill, 1883, p.43.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

Abdul Latif Khan Bahadur remarked that the principle of the bill was in accordance with the declared intention of the Sovereign and the Parliament of the United Kingdom to "remove all distinctions of race or creed in the matter of all offices under the British administration of India."¹ In his opinion, to draw a distinction between an Indian and a European judge on the ground of race or nationality "would be/well calculated to disturb the discipline of the administration."² Badruddin Toyabji, a prominent Bombay Muslim, failed to see "any just or valid foundation" of Europeans' objection to the bill.³ He thought that the

1. Nawab Abdul Latif Khan Bahadur, Deputy Magistrate, Sealdah, to Commissioner, Presidency Division, 20 April 1883. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No. C.3877, p.223.

2. Ibid., p.224.

3. Badruddin Toyabji, High Court, Bombay, to Chief Secretary, Government of Bombay, 4 May 1883, The Local Opinion on the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill 1883, p.75. Commenting on Europeans' allegation that Indian judges and magistrates were to be swayed by their prejudices in the decision of cases against Europeans, Badruddin Toyabji told the audience at a public meeting on 28 April in Bombay that "in advancing this argument they have unconsciously let the cat out of the bag, they have in fact been judging by their own standards." Report of the Proceedings of a Public Meeting of Native Inhabitants of Bombay, held in the Town Hall on 28 April 1883. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No. C.3877, p.472.

principle on which the bill was founded was "perfectly unassailable"; the object of legal machinery being simply to secure impartial justice, it ought to have no reference to the race of the judge, but only to his qualifications; the question ought never to be whether a judge was a European or an Indian, but simply whether he was fit for the exercise of the powers entrusted to him.¹ He warned the Government that the moral effect upon the Indians of shelving or withdrawing the bill, under the present circumstances, could not fail to be pernicious. "Such an act", he went on,

"will be looked upon by them as a surrender of right and reason to passion and prejudices, as a triumph of turbulent agitation - however wrong - over calm and respectful representations - however just and well founded. It is impossible not to see the danger of such an idea taking hold of the minds of the 250 million of the natives of this country."²

1. Badruddin Toyabji to Chief Secretary, Government of Bombay, 19 April 1883, The Local Opinion on the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill 1883, p.74.

2. Ibid.

The bill was, thus, welcomed by both Hindus and Muslims. Nevertheless it was modified, as stated above, on 25 January 1884, because of the Europeans' and Anglo-Indians' agitation. The Hindus and Muslims could not prevent the change, but, as Kristodas Pal, a member of the Viceroy's Council put it, accepted it "with gloom and dismay."¹

One curious outcome of the controversy over the Ilbert Bill was the presentation to Ripon on 6 February 1882 of a memorial from Syed Ameer Ali.² This was a plea on behalf of the Indian Muslims for more Muslims to be appointed to the Bench. Ameer Ali argued that there were frequent miscarriages of justice occasioned by the insufficient acquaintance of English and Hindu judges with principles of Muslim law. Moreover Muslims were numerically inferior to the Hindus in

1. P.P., 1884, Vol.60, Paper No. 3952, p.160.

2. Ameer Ali to Ripon, 6 February 1882, Selections from the Records of the Government of India in the Public Works Departments, 1886, No. CCV, H.D.S.No2, pp.237 and 289-292;
Also, Ali, S.A., 'A Cry from the Indian Mahommedans - The Nineteenth Century, August 1882.

the subordinate judicial service. He urged therefore that a number of Muslim judges qualified to expound Muslim law should be appointed in the mufassil and should sit as Assessor Judges in the trial of Muslim cases, and that in the High Courts of Bengal, the North-Western Provinces, Madras, Bombay and the Punjab a Muslim Judge should be appointed to assist the European and Muslim judges in administering Muslim law. To enable more Muslims to enter the judicial service he asked that the possession of a university degree should not be made a condition of appointment, and that separate examinations without this requirement should be instituted for appointments to the subordinate judicial service.

These claims by the Muslims came oddly after their denunciation, jointly with the Hindus, of European claims to special legal treatment of their community, and they might have led to a rift between Hindus and Muslims. However Ameer Ali was at pains in the memorial to stress the need for Hindu-Muslim co-operation, and he stated emphatically that he made his plea "without the smallest animus

against the Hindoos, among whom I reckon many friends."¹

On 15 July 1885 the Government agreed to allow Muslim candidates to take the pleadership examination without having a university degree. Since what the High Court required was that a candidate should have passed some public examinations equivalent to a first degree and should have attended suitable law lectures, Local Governments were urged to introduce some acceptable equivalent public examination. The Governor General in Council also suggested that in provinces like Bengal and Bombay which were deficient in Muslim members of the judicial service, the High Courts should endeavour to secure a certain proportion of Muslims among their judicial officers.

It should be noted that when these facilities were offered to the Muslims, The Bengalee, a Hindu newspaper, wrote: "We welcome the Resolution of the Government and we believe, we speak the sense of

1. Ali, S.A., 'A Cry from the Indian Mahommedans', op. cit, p.206.

the Hindu community, when we say, that they too welcome this Resolution.... The Government has risen to an appreciation of the wants of Mahomedan community.... It appears that to the National Mahomedan Association must belong the credit of having called pointed attention to this important subject."¹ The same newspaper also pointed out that if these rules were laid down to facilitate the admission of Muslims as pleaders, then such rules "will apply" to the Hindus and others as well.²

In this way, both Hindus and Muslims co-operated with each other during the period under review.

Syed Ahmed Khan, during this period, was also constantly striving to bring about friendship and unity between these two communities. On 27 January 1883, he delivered a speech at Patna: ".... the welfare of both the Hindoos and Mahomedans lay in this that they may both regard themselves as one

1. The Bengalee, 25 July 1885.

2. Ibid.

nation, and that they should do nothing which may create an alienation of feeling.... Both my Hindu brethren and my Muslim co-religionists breathe the same air, drink the waters of the sacred Ganges, and the Jamna, eat the products which God has given to this country, live and die together."¹ In the same speech he implored Hindus and Muslims: "India is like a newly wedded bride whose two beautiful and luscious eyes are the Hindus and the Muslims; if the two live in concord with one another, the bride will remain for ever resplendent and becoming, while if they make up their minds to destroy each other she is bound to become squint-eyed and even one eyed."² On 27 January 1884, in his speech at Gurdaspur, Punjab, he pleaded:

"The Hindoos and Mahomedans should try to become one heart and soul and act in union. If united each can support the other. If not, the antagonism of one against the other would tend to the destruction and downfall of both."³

1. The Times of India, 29 January 1883. Also quoted in Sherwani, H.K., 'The Political Thought of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan' - Islamic Culture, Vol.XVIII, No.3, p.247.

2. Ibid.

3. The Times of India, 27 January 1884.

Syed Ahmed Khan's utterances aroused hope among the Hindus. In 1884, the Lahore Branch of Indian Association accorded to him an address of welcome:

"Your noble exertions to improve the condition of the Mahomedan population of India, and to diffuse the blessings of knowledge and enlightenment among them, and the brilliant success you have been able to achieve in this distinction, mark you out as one of the most meritorious of our public men, and deservedly entitle you to the esteem and gratitude of all classes of the Indian people. Our Association, composed of members of all races and creeds in this province, have much pleasure in bearing testimony to the high character of your services to the public, and in expressing their sense of the benefits you have conferred on the country."¹

In reply to this address, Syed Ahmed Khan said:

"The word 'Hindu' that you have used for yourself is in my opinion not correct, because that is not

1. Quoted in Graham, G.F.I., The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, K.C.S.I., p.235-6.

in my view the name of a religion. Every inhabitant of Hindustan can call himself a Hindu. I am, therefore, sorry that you do not regard me as a Hindu although I too am an inhabitant of Hindustan."¹

Thus, during the period under review, Hindus and Muslims, though gradually becoming conscious of their separate entities, showed a tolerant attitude towards each other. When their common interests were affected by the Government policies, they co-operated with each other to express their grievances; they jointly spoke against the lowering of the age-limit for the Indian civil service examination, the Vernacular Press Act and the Arms Act. They jointly showed their high appreciation of Ripon's Local Self Government policy and Ilbert Bill, as these measures were intended to improve the general condition and status of Indians. Sometimes the Muslims did not come out openly with their comments and remarks like Hindus but this was due to their general backwardness and their fear as the weaker community of losing the favour of the Government.

1. Quoted in Gopal, R., op.cit., p.48.

CHAPTER II

As shown in the previous chapter, there existed a harmonious relationship between the Hindus and the Muslims during the period 1876-1884. But the situation began to change from 1885, when the Indian National Congress was founded by a reformist group most of whom were Hindus. The Hindus, Brahmins, Khatris and Kayasths in the main, who were well ahead of the Muslims in western education, were ready both materially and mentally to form an All-India association; the spread of western ideas of liberty and nationality had made them conscious of the need of such an organisation.¹ A person to give the necessary lead was found in A. O. Hume, a retired Secretary to the Government

1. Mazumdar, A.C., Indian National Evolution, p.45; Also, Mehrotra, S.R., India and the Commonwealth 1885-1929, p.16.

of India. Hume for some time had felt the need for an All-India organization to voice Indian opinion. While still in Government service he had seen the voluminous secret police reports which revealed that such measures as the Arms Act and the Ilbert Bill had created wide-spread discontent among the people. He feared that unless an association was established through which people could constitutionally express their views, small groups of dissatisfied people might begin to coalesce into an undesirable movement "like drops of water on a leaf."¹ Hume, therefore, secured Dufferin's² permission to inaugurate the Indian National Congress. Dufferin believed that the formation of such a body would be in the interest of both the ruler and the ruled as it would enable Government to ascertain Indians' views on various matters of administration.³ Such

-
1. Wedderburn, S.W., Allan Octavian Hume, C.B.
"Father of the Indian National Congress" 1892 to 1912, p.81.
 2. Frederick Temple Hamilton-Temple Blackwood, first Marquis of Dufferin and Ava (1826-1902): Under-Secretary for India 1864-6; Governor-General of Canada 1872-8; Ambassador at St. Petersburg 1879-81 and at Constantinople 1881-2; Special Commissioner to Egypt 1882-3; Viceroy of India 1884-8; Ambassador at Rome 1889-91 and at Paris 1891-6.
 3. Philips, C.H., (ed), Op. cit., p.139.

a body, to put forward Indian views, was the more needed because in India there was no opposition such as existed in the English Parliament. Also he argued that if this organization was to serve any useful purpose, it should not be presided over by any local governor as Hume had at first suggested but by an Indian or non-official European.¹ Thus was established the Indian National Congress as a non-official and by its constitution All-India organization.

By the end of 1885, all the leading Hindu political associations scattered all over the country came within the fold of the Indian National Congress where they entered upon a new life.² The fundamental objectives laid down by Congress were the promotion of Indian nationality, the social, moral and political advancement of the Indian people and the consolidation of the union between England and India by securing the modification of such of its conditions as might be unjust or injurious.³

1. Philips, C.H., (ed), Op. cit., p.139.

2. Bagal, J.C., Op. cit., p.93.

3. Wedderburn, S.W., Op. cit., p.47;
Also, Philips, C.H., (ed), Op. cit., p.141;
Mehrotra, S.R., Op. cit., p.16.

These aims were those of the educated classes of India - as W.S. Caine noted, Congress contained within its ranks "men who have during the last ten years entered the national Universities, and draws thousands of recruits yearly from the Government and Missionary colleges, and from High Schools." Every student, he said, who could read English, became "a Congress-walla."¹ Because the Hindus had taken readily to English education they naturally formed the predominant majority in Congress, eighty percent or more of the total membership. Congress thus developed "as a largely Hindu, high caste, middle class gathering drawn from the principal cities",² with most of its delegates drawn from the classes of lawyers, businessmen, proprietors and editors of newspapers and landowners. The following table gives us an idea as to the main classes composing the Congress.³

-
1. Caine, W.S., Letters from India, 29 December 1889, L.No. VIII, The Indian National Congress, Its Origin, History, Constitution and Objects. Political Tracts, 1888-90, p.49.
 2. Philips, C.H. (ed), Op. cit., p.141.
 3. This table is prepared on the basis of figures given by Jones, I.M. (The Origins and Development to 1892 of the Indian National Congress, M.A. thesis, London, (1947.) and provided in relevant Congress reports; these figures must be regarded as approximate only because "lists of the delegates were never complete, a small proportion always forgetting to register, or, even if they registered, omitting to supply details as to their social and professional position." Jones, I.M., Ibid, p.440

Higher landed interests. Percentage of total occupational representation.	The legal profession. Percentage of total occupational representation.	Professional classes other than lawyers. Percentage of total occupational representation.	Higher commercial interests - bankers, money-lenders, contractors, agents, merchants and mill-owners. Percentage of total occupational representation.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1886	28.7%	35%	16%	9%
1889	26.2%	30%	13.1%	25.8%
1890	33%	34.3%	13.7%	12.3%
1892	32.3%	34%	12.6%	13.7%

The above table shows that higher landed interests and legal profession were always well represented. It may be noted here that some landowners were also lawyers or businessmen. For example, in 1889, of 483 landowners present at the Congress session, seventy three were also lawyers, and sixty seven were also businessmen. Commenting on the predominance of lawyers, the second Congress report offered an explanation:

"... the legal profession is the one path to distinction, position and wealth (outside Government service) open to Indians of ability and moderate means, and so, everywhere, a majority of the cleverest men, who are unable to secure or unwilling to take Government Service, enter into the legal profession; and as the bulk of the ablest and cleverest men in the whole country, outside the Government Services, appeared at this late Congress, necessarily the lawyers were strong in it."¹

1. Quoted in Jones, I.M., Op. cit., p.444.

Also the Press was always well represented: from among the ranks of editors and journalists were drawn some of the leading figures of the annual assemblies - Surendranath Banerjea, the editor of The Bengalee, Narendranath Sen, the proprietor and editor of The Indian Mirror, G. Subramania Iyer, the proprietor and editor of The Hindu and M. Veerarghava Chariar, the sub-editor of The Hindu.¹ Comparatively few educationalists - professors and teachers - appeared as delegates. The majority of those engaged in the work of higher education were Government servants and were thus precluded from appearing as delegates.²

Among the Congress delegates, the Brahmin element was prominent, as they were the first to take to western education and being superior among all Hindu castes, they had also a great tradition of authority. In 1889, out of 1489 Hindu members of the Congress, 774 were Brahmins.³ The high offices of the Congress were largely filled by Brahmins. During the period 1886-1892, all six posts of annual chairmen of

1. Jones, I.M., Op. cit., p.445.

2. Ibid.

3. Jones, I.M., Op. cit., p.445, also see the list of delegates given as an appendix to the Report of the Indian Congress, 1889.

Reception Committee were filled by Brahmins. The joint general secretary appointed in 1889 was a Brahmin; on his death another Brahmin was appointed in 1892. Of the three standing counsels to the Congress, two were Brahmins and one was a Parsi. Two Brahmins - R.B.P. Ananda Charlu and W.C. Banerjea - became the presidents of the 1891 and 1892 Congress sessions.

The Muslims attended all the early Congress sessions, but in comparatively small numbers, their attendance averaging "less than 15 per cent of the total."¹ Had they been present in the same proportion as their numbers in the total population of British India, they should have formed about twenty two or twenty three per cent of the total of the Congress delegates.² The slow development of the Muslim western educated middle class must in part be held responsible for this poor showing, but there was also some deliberate abstention, as will be seen.

1. Philips, C.H., Op. cit., p.141.

2. Jones, I.M., Op. cit., p.434.
Working on the assumption that representation should have been proportional and using the figure of 11/49 Muslim composition of the total population of British India given by the Census Report for 1881.

The first Congress session was held at Bombay in 1885 and was attended by seventy two delegates, who "'though representatives of the highest culture of the land and fully qualified to speak as to the wants and wishes of the nation, yet appeared as volunteers in the good cause, uncommissioned, as a rule, by any constituencies, local or general, to appear on their behalf'."¹

On 5 February 1886, The Times commented on this first session of the Congress: "The whole of India was represented from Madras to Lahore, from Bombay to Calcutta. For the first time, perhaps, since the world began India as a nation met together.... Only one great race was conspicuous by its absence; the Mahomedans of India were not there."² The reaction of the Hindus to The Times comment was prompt. K. T. Telang wrote:

"Al-though it must be admitted that the Mahommedan community was not adequately

-
1. Quoted in Row. S.T.M., "The Congress", The Indian National Congress, Its Origin, History, Constitution and Objects, Op. cit., p.13.
 2. Proceedings of the Indian National Congress, 1885, Appendix B, p.153.

represented at our meeting, your remark is not al-together an accurate one. Two leading Mahomedan gentlemen did attend the Congress, viz, Mr. R.M. Sayani and Mr. A.M. Dharamsi."¹

Again, just after the first session of the Congress, The Englishman, one of the foremost Anglo-Indian newspapers, pronounced it a "Hindu Congress."² The Hindu politicians in the Congress deeply regretted this comment of the Anglo-Indian newspaper and in the Congress session of 1886, they tried to refute this accusation. Pandit Jwala Datt Joshi, a delegate of Kumaon, declared: "I only rise to say before the Congress that I am a delegate from a province where Hindus and Mahomedans live together in perfect harmony, and that I represent both communities - that both sympathize in all the work of the Congress."³ Malik Bhagawan Das, a delegate of Dera Ismail Khan district, also pointed out:

1. Proceedings of the Indian National Congress, 1885, Appendix D, p.163.

2. Quoted in The Indian Mirror, 20 December 1887.

3. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.109.

"...I see in one of the English papers,
 that they call this a Hindu Congress?
 Why Hindu? Why not Mahomedan? ... Malik
 Nebraj and I are delegates from an Association
 composed both of Hindus and Mahomedans (cheers),
 and these Hindus and Mahomedans meeting jointly
 appointed us two to represent them and they
 never troubled to think whether those men
 belonged to this faith or that faith,
 we feel that in these we are all one, all
 brethren." ¹

It should be noted that the Hindu organisers of the Congress had been at pains to seek wider Muslim support for the second session. They had sent invitations to both the Central National Mahomedan Association and the Mahomedan Literary Society asking them to join the Congress. The Mahomedan Literary Society after a meeting on the question at once telegraphed their inability to join the Congress meeting on the ground that they did not anticipate any benefit from the discussion of the "difficult and

1. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.106.

momentous questions" which were likely to occupy the deliberations of the Congress.¹ The Central National Mahomedan Association likewise declined to accept the invitation.² Ameer Ali, its Secretary, wrote that no good could result from any attempt to force the hands of the Government on such important matters as were on the Congress agenda.³ The Association thought "that the circumstances of our/^{common}country are such as suggest to all interested in its welfare a policy of confidence in the Government."⁴ They objected to the Congress demand for the introduction of the elective system in both the Provincial and Supreme Legislatures, because

1. The Pioneer, 13 July 1886.

2. The Statesman, 19 December 1886.

3. At the start, the main demands of the Congress were: the holding of simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service in India and in England; the reform of the Legislative Councils; the grant of power to the Legislative Councils for discussing all legislative measures and all financial questions including the budget; the increased employment of Indians in the public services; the separation of executive and judicial functions; the fixity and permanence of land revenue; the appointment of Indians to the executive councils of the Governors and the Viceroy etc.

4. The Statesman, 19 December 1886.

they feared that the Muslims being a minority would be outvoted by the Hindu majority in every department of the State.¹ The decision of these two important Muslim organizations was approved by other Muslim organizations. The anjuman-i-Islamia of Amritsar passed a vote of concurrence in the opinions expressed by the Central National Mahommedan Association and Mahommedan Literary Society of Calcutta.² When the Secretary of the Indian Association asked the Secretary of the Anjuman-i-Hamayyat-i-Islam of Lahore to send delegates to the National Congress, the latter declined the offer on the ground that it would not be wise for the Muslims to join the Congress, since, being mainly composed of Hindus, it was a Hindu organization.³ The Anjuman-i-Islamiya of Madras, whose more prominent members were Abdul Karim Khan Bahadur, Syed Mustafa Shaheb Albeez, Syed Abdul Ali Sahib, Mohiddeen Ansar Sahib and Syed Zinul Abideen, also passed a vote of

1. Gopal, R., Op. cit., p.76.

2. The Muslim Herald, 4 January 1887.

3. Khan, S.A., On the Present State of Indian Politics, Appendix ix, p.vii. (It was published in 1888 from Allahabad).

confidence in the opinions expressed by the Central National Mahomedan Association and Mahomedan Literary Society of Calcutta and refused to send their delegates to the Congress.¹ The Central National Mahomedan Association and these Anjumans argued that the demands of the Congress might ultimately develop into a demand for the formation of Hindu national state in which the Muslims as a minority might suffer.²

Muslim abstention was the subject of much regretful comment in the editorials of the Hindu press. The Bombay Samachar commented: "It is a misfortune that a few individual Mahomedans have disclaimed sympathy with its [Congress's] aims and objects."³ The Indu Prakash, in similar terms, expressed regret that Muslim leaders thought that no good would result from joining the Congress.⁴ The Dnyan Prakash, more critical, commented that the Muslims had been instigated by the Anglo Indians

1. Khan, S.A., Op. cit., Appendix ix, pp.v-vi.

2. Ibid.

3. The Bombay Samachar, 11 January 1887: Bom. N.N.R. 1887.

4. The Indu Prakash, 27 December 1886: Ibid.

not to take part in the National Congress.¹ However, the leading Muslim associations, unmoved by appeal or criticism, continued to press their co-religionists not to join the Congress. Syed Ahmed Khan, the most prominent Muslim figure in northern India, also added his warning voice against the Congress. At the first conference of the Mahommedan Educational Congress² held at Aligarh in 1886, he declared:

"I do not agree with those who believe that political discussions would be conducive to our national progress. I regard progress of education as the only means of national progress."³

He went on to say that he could not understand how the Congress could be a movement for all Indians while the majority of the Muslims were not in it.

1. The Dnyan Prakash, 27 December 1886, Bom. N.N.R. 1887.

2. In 1886, Syed Ahmed Khan founded the Mahommedan Educational Congress in order "to spread the highest western education among the Muslims."
Baljon, J.M.S., The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, p.43.

3. Quoted in Gopal, R., Op. cit., p.65.

With great annoyance, he declared the Congress movement to be "seditious."¹ On the eve of the Calcutta Congress session of 1886, the anti-Congress Muslim leaders asked their fellow Muslims not to attend the session and remarked: "The Hindus are ahead of us. We are lagging behind them. We will want the patronage of Government, and shall gain nothing by joining them."² This anti-Congress attitude was criticized by both the Hindu and Muslim members of the Congress. In the second session of the Congress, out of a total of 431 delegates, thirty three were Muslims.³ The majority of them came from the upper and middle classes - landholders, businessmen and lawyers.⁴

1. Zakaria, R.A., The Indian Muslims, A Political Analysis, 1885-1906, (Ph.D. Thesis, London, 1948), p.54.

2. Quoted in Source Material For A History Of The Freedom Movement In India 1885-1920, Vol.11, p.34.

3. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.8.

4. We have been able to find out the social position of twenty seven Muslim delegates out of thirty three in 1886; twelve were zemindars, three businessmen, nine lawyers, three editors of newspapers. See the list of delegates given as an appendix to the Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886.

They believed that whether Hindus or Muslims, Sikhs or Parsis, Indians were one people and their public interests were indivisible and identical.¹ The Muslim speakers at this session denounced the anti-Congress attitude of the Muslim associations as "unjustifiable and unpatriotic."² Sheikh Reza Hossain, a Congressite from Lucknow, noting that "some apparently very narrow minded men" called this Congress a "Hindu Congress", denounced this allegation.³ He argued that in every community there were some gentlemen of faultfinding tendencies and when these gentlemen found that they had no other way of justifying their stand regarding the Congress, they took upon themselves to misrepresent the objects of the Congress.⁴ He assured the Congress leaders that the Muslims had full sympathy for the Congress,

1. Nawab Reza Ali Khan Bahadur's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.51.

2. Ibid., p.9.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

and asserted that he could bring 50,000 Muslim signatures in support of his statement. He thought that no country could prosper without national unity. "We may differ in religious views," he continued, "but in our aspirations I hold that we are one. We have a common goal before us; and in every other respect, we are, in reality, one nation."¹

The Hindus also asked for further Muslim co-operation. Dr. Rajendralala Mitter, the well-known archaeologist and scholar, glorified the Muslims' position in the Congress stating that without the Muslims, the Hindus would have felt that they were at a marriage party without a bride.² After the end of the second session of the Congress, on 3 January 1887, the Charu Varta, a Hindu newspaper, triumphantly pointing to the Muslims who attended the Congress session, praised Reza Ali Khan Bahadur as the right arm of the Congress.³ The same paper remarked: "If ever

1. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.9.

2. Rajendralala Mitter's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.47.

3. The Charu Varta, 3 January 1887: Beng. N.N.R., 1887.

the wisdom of experienced men was collected anywhere, it has been at this gathering."¹

Some of the resolutions about the civil service examination passed on 30 December 1886 at the second session of the Congress further aroused the fear of the Muslims. These resolutions were:

- "1. That the open Competitive Examination be held simultaneously both in India and England.
2. That the simultaneous examinations thus held be equally open to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects.
3. That the classified list be prepared according to merit."²

The implication of these resolutions was that India would be treated as a single unit, without any distinction as to province, and that success in the examination would be decisive. On this

-
1. The Charu Varta, 3 January 1887: Op. cit.
 2. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.95.

last issue Congressmen had declared that admission to the higher services or the Legislative Councils should not be restricted to men of high birth, but should be open to able men, even of "insignificant origin." The holding of the examination in India meant, of course, that poverty would no longer be a bar to entry, as it had been while candidates had had to travel to London.

The Muslims reacted sharply to the Congress resolutions, arguing that "in the present circumstances of the country, important classes of the community are practically debarred from success in examinations designed mainly as tests of educational qualification."¹ This point they made repeatedly in their evidence to the Public Service Commission, which had been set up by resolution of the Government of India on 4 October 1886. Thus Munshi Muharram Ali Chisti, the editor of the influential Muslim newspaper of Lahore, the Rafiq-i-Hind, told the Commission on 23 December 1886 that open competition might

1. Report of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87, Vol.1, p.48.

bring into power men of the wrong type and class. This would deprive "persons of good manners and high family" of positions which they had held for generations. "Therefore", he concluded, "there should be no competitive examination, whether limited or open, for any service."¹ From the United Provinces, Syed Mahmud appeared to state his disapproval of the whole proposal as to an open competition, on the ground that "there is not sufficient homogeneity among the population."² On 7 February 1887 Nawab Munir Nawaz Jung Bahadur, an official of the Nizam of Hyderabad, in his evidence argued that open competition would shut the door of honourable employment in the face of the Muslims, who were backward in English Education.³ On 22 February Syed Husain Bilgrami, a Muslim of Lucknow, opposed competition on the grounds that

1. Proceedings of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87, Vol.V, pp.203-204.

2. Ibid., Vol.II, pp.132-33.

3. Ibid., Vol.V, p.238.

it was not a test of people's ability.¹ The same point was made by Syed Ameer Ali who declared: "I do not think that a competitive examination in the smallest degree brings out the individual capacity of any candidate for the discharge of the duties he may be called upon to perform."² He also pointed out, as others had done, that the Muslims had made less progress than other classes, and that in particular they could not expect to compete on equal terms with the Hindus who for fifty years had been taking to English education.³

The most complete statement of Muslim objections to the scheme for competitive examinations, and to Congress demands for elections to the Assemblies, was made by Syed Ahmed Khan, in a great speech at Lucknow on 28 December 1887, which developed into a warning to Muslims to have nothing to do with the Congress. He began by arguing that England, where the population was homogeneous, was a fit place

1. Proceedings of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87, Vol.VI, p.79.

2. Ibid., p.195.

3. Ibid., p.196.

for competitive examinations, but that India, inhabited by several nationalities was not. There was a marked disparity in the educational attainments of the various Indian people, with the Muslims educationally more backward than the Hindus, especially the Bengali Hindus. He therefore warned the Muslims: "... if you accept that the country should groan under the yoke of Bengali rule and its people lick the Bengali shoes, then, in the name of God jump into the train, sit down, and be off to Madras."¹ (The third session of the Congress was then taking place at Madras.). From this appeal to provincial sentiment and loyalty against the encroachment of the English-educated Bengali Brahmin and Kayasth, he went on to point the danger of Hindu dominance at an all-India level. Underlining the educational backwardness of the Muslims, and their inability to compete with the Hindus for government posts, he warned them that they would be ill-advised to join the Congress. He argued that if universal

1. Khan, S.A., Op. cit., pp.11-12.

suffrage were granted, as Congress demanded, Muslims would vote for Muslim, and Hindus for Hindu candidates. What would be the outcome?

"It is certain", he declared,

"the Hindu member will have four times as many [votes] because their population is four times as numerous. Therefore ... there will be four votes for the Hindu to every one vote for the Mahomedan. And now how can the Mahomedan guard his interests? It would be like a game of dice, in which one man had four dice and the other only one."¹

Again if the electorate was limited by imposing a property franchise, and if an annual income of Rs.5,000 were taken as the qualification for an elector, still the Muslim would suffer. The Viceroy's whole Council would consist of Hindus only - "Babu so-and-so Mitter, Babu so-and-so Ghose, Babu so-and-so Chuckrabarthy" - since the

1. Khan, S.A., Op. cit., p.12.

Hindus were wealthier than the Muslims. Such being the case, it was obviously unwise for the Muslims to seek any change in the status quo until they had prepared themselves better. As Syed Ahmed Khan put it: "My friends the Bengalis are very able; they can make every kind of progress. ... But I do not think my people so well-trained, and therefore I do not wish to run a race with them."¹ To him the Congress-Muslim clash was in reality "a civil war without arms. The object of a civil war is to determine in whose hands the rule of the country shall rest."² He believed:

"The object of the promoters of the National Congress is that the Government of India should be English in name only, and that the internal rule of the country should be entirely in their own hands. They do not publicly avow that they wish it for themselves; they speak in the name of the whole people of India; but they very well know that the Mahomedans will

1. Khan, S.A., Op. cit., p.27.

2. Ibid.

be unable to do anything, and so the rule of the country will be monopolised by them."¹

The whole tenor of his arguments was thus in favour of retaining the British connection, of keeping in the good books of the Government, and of remaining totally aloof from Congress.

Syed Ahmed's views were soon to be criticized by the Hindu Press. On his Lucknow speech, The Indian Mirror, edited by Narendranath Sen, published from Calcutta, remarked: "We are afraid, he would never retrieve the reputation which he lost by his speech at Lucknow."² The National Guardian was more bitter: "If ever a man deliberately set about cutting his own throat, that man is the old Mahomedan of seventy years, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan of Allygarh."³ The Young Bengal called the speech of Syed Ahmed Khan "queer, foolish."⁴ The Indian Nation, edited by N. N. Ghose, published from Patna,

1. Khan, S.A., Op. cit., pp.27-28.

2. Quoted in The Pioneer, 2 February 1888.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

condemned it as "stuff and nonsense."¹ While these types of criticism were levelled against Syed Ahmed Khan, The Muslim Herald of Madras supported him: "We proudly accept the Syed as our leader and exponent - the summit and the crown of Islam"² The Muslims - mainly of upper and middle classes, Zemindars, Nawabs, Talukdars, lawyers, munsifs, teachers, merchants and clerks - of Allahabad, Madras, Amsitsar, Lahore, Ludhiana, Meerut and Oudh followed suit and in private and public meetings condemned the Congress.³

Meanwhile in order to demonstrate that the Congress did represent all communities, and in order to elicit the much sought-for Muslim support, the third Congress session had proceeded on 27 December 1887 to elect a Muslim President the prominent Bombay merchant Badruddin Tyabji. This further alarmed and irritated Syed Ahmed Khan who wrote to Tyabji on 24 January 1888 expressing his regret that he had played the leading role in the

1. Quoted in The Pioneer, 2 February 1888.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

Congress session at Madras. He went on to voice his distrust of all that Congress stood for:

"I do not understand what the words 'National Congress' mean. Is it supposed that the different castes and creeds living in India belong to (one) nation, or can become one nation, and their aims and aspirations be one and the same? I think it is quite impossible ... you regard the doings of the misnamed National Congress as beneficial to India, but I am sorry to say that I regard them as not only injurious to our own community but also to India at large."¹

On 18 February Tyabji in his several letters to the three leaders of the Muslims - Syed Ahmed Khan, Syed Ameer Ali and Nawab Abdul Latif Khan Bahadur - replied with the argument that the separation of the Muslim community from the Congress would delay the political progress of India as a whole.² This Syed Ahmed Khan countered with a

1. Quoted in Gopal, S., British Policy in India 1858-1905, p.159.

2. Gopal, S., Ibid., pp.159-160.

speech at Meerut on 14 March in which he set out once more his objections to the grant of increased political powers to Indians. To the Congress demand that members of the Legislative Council should be allowed to vote on the budget he raised the objection that this principle could only be introduced into a country in which the rulers and the ruled were of the same race and where the people had the sovereign right of deciding matters of peace and war.¹ But this principle could not be adapted to Indian conditions, for here the people had no responsibility for the expenditure of Government and were not, as in England, ready with their lives and property to discharge it.² In England, in a time of necessity, the wealth and property of every one, "from Duke to cobbler, is at the disposal of the Government," while in India, "the Government has itself to bear the responsibility of maintaining its authority, and it must, in the way that seems to it fittest, raise money for its army and for the expenses of the empire."³

1. Khan, S.A., Op. cit., p.40.

2. Ibid., p.41.

3. Ibid., p.42.

To this on 2 April Tyabji replied with a challenge, sending another open letter to the editor of The Pioneer, in which he invited the Muslims to join the Congress. He wrote:

"If you feel that there are questions affecting the whole of India which are common to you as well as to your Hindu fellow-subjects, come and discuss them at the Congress and help to advance the cause in which you are all agreed. If, on the other hand, anything is proposed which you dislike, come and oppose it, ... your opposition from within the Congress will be far more powerful and effective than from without."¹

Syed Ahmed Khan, much displeased, replied on 5 April 1888 by asking Badruddin Tyabji what plan Hindus and Muslims "should adopt for accomplishing those aims on which Hindus and Mahommedans differ. Should Mahommedans and Hindus each have their own

1. The Pioneer, 2 April 1888.

Congress for their special objects in which they differ from one another?"¹ He ended with the bitter comment that he could still remember the days of the Mutiny; in his opinion it was the Hindus who began it, while the Muslims merely joined it - but it was the latter who were ruined.²

In August 1888 Syed Ahmed Khan went beyond pleas and public arguments in his efforts to counteract the activities of the Congress, and with the help of Theodore Beck,³ the Principal of the Aligarh Oriental College, established the United Patriotic Association. The fundamental purpose of this association was to publish and circulate papers and pamphlets to show members of the British Parliament and the British people that the Congress did not represent all communities of India, and that the Muslims in general were

1. The Pioneer, 5 April 1888.

2. Ibid.

3. Theodore Beck (1859-1899): Principal of Mahommedan Aligarh Oriental College from the age of twenty-four; advocate of the Muslim cause.

opposed to its objectives.¹ Beck, who as the honorary editor of the United Patriotic Association did much of the work of publication and distribution, stated in one of his articles, "the Mohammedan leaders wish to keep their people from the whirlpool of political agitation", for the reasons "pointed out clearly" by Syed Ahmed Khan.²

In face of this mounting campaign, the Congress supporters remained persistent in their efforts to win over the Muslims. And on the eve of the fourth session of the Congress, they widely distributed leaflets and pamphlets emphasising the need for an Indian National Congress and urging people of every religion to send delegates to the Congress session. They stated that the Muslims from every part of India, excepting areas of Lower Bengal, attended the Congress session and took part in their proceedings.³ This appeal was bitterly

1. Gopal, R., Op. cit., p.68.

2. Quoted in Ibid.

3. The Indian Magazine, 1888, p.179.

opposed by the Muslim leaders like Mian Mahommed Shafi, a descendant of the Old Mian family of Lahore, and others. Mian Mahommed Shafi argued that the Muslims who joined the Congress, were men with "a lower status in society."¹ Some Muslims, in his opinion, attended the Congress "out of sheer curiosity", while others went under the influence of the Hindus; clients of Hindu lawyers or debtors of Hindu bankers.² It is difficult to agree with Mahommed Shafi in his comments upon the social class of the Congress Muslims. They probably were middle class in origin rather than members of the old aristocracy, but even so included men such as Nawab Reza Ali Khan Bahadur of Lucknow and Badruddin Tyabji, of great wealth and respectability, in their ranks.³

1. The Pioneer, 13 July 1888.

2. Ibid.

3. Tyabji's father was a wealthy merchant, having an extensive foreign trade. Tyabji's life-sketch in "Indians of To-day" series: The Pioneer, 6 September 1902.

Mian's assertion seems, therefore, rather a cheap political smear. Having derided his opponents, Mian turned to extolling those "true representatives of the Muhammedan nation of India" who refused to support Congress: Syed Ahmed Khan of the North Western Provinces, Syed Ameer Ali of Bengal, Qazi Shahib ud Deen Khan Bahadur of Bombay and Khan Bahadur Muhammad Barakat Ali of the Punjab, "... in whom all fully trust and take pride."¹ None of them had taken part in the Congress sessions. These were the men who were working for the progress of Indian Muslims and were regarded by the vast majority as their leaders. The Muslim Herald proclaimed Syed Ahmed "as our leader and exponent - the summit and crown of Islam..." Syed Ameer Ali was the founder and secretary of the Central National Mahomedan Association, which had fifty three branches throughout India, and when he spoke through it, he represented the views of Muslims of different parts of the sub-continent. The rest of Shafi's selected leaders were influential, particularly in their areas, though they had yet

1. The Pioneer, 13 July 1888.

to assume an all India importance.

Many Congress supporters sought an explanation of such Muslim antagonism outside the cultural pattern of Muslim society. Thus the Parsi edited Bombay newspaper, the Parsi Punch, claimed on 19 August 1888 that the Muslims had the backing of certain Government officials in their opposition to Congress, and illustrated the statement with a cartoon. This showed a kid, the Muslim Anjuman-i-Habib of Bombay perched on a rock labelled "Indirect official support", looking down at a Congress tiger. The caption to the cartoon read, "The kid and the tiger. A kid mounted upon a high rock bestowed all manner of abuse upon a tiger on the ground below. The tiger looking up replied, 'Do not think vain creature, that you annoy me. I regard the ill language as coming not from you, but from the place upon which you stand'."¹ Later in 1888 The Bengalee made the same charge when, commenting upon the formation of the United Patriotic Association, it remarked that the Muslims might achieve some success "backed by official influence

1. The Parsi Punch, 19 August 1888; Bom. N.N.R., 1888.

in some quarters."¹ But, at the same time, the newspaper praised those higher British officers, who had expressed "warm approval of the Congress movement."² It may be noted that there seemed to be neither Muslim nor official comment on either the cartoon or The Bengalee's remark.

The British official was criticized as a supporter of the Muslims and praised as a supporter of the Congress. It would seem however that the growth of Congress propaganda and Congress success in acquiring supporters was really beginning to arouse Government misgivings even as early as 1888. Thus late in 1888, the Government of the United Provinces refused to allot any suitable place at Allahabad for the reception of the Congress

-
1. The Bengalee, 13 October 1888.
 2. The Bengalee, in support of this statement quoted W.W. Hunter, I.C.S. who, in an article The Present Problem in India, in volume fifty four of The Contemporary Review, had declared that Congress was "an authoritative organ of political expression in India" and that it contained representatives of all classes of the Indian community."

delegates.¹ On 30 December 1888, James White, Magistrate of Benares, wrote to W.C. Bennett, Secretary to the Government, the North Western Provinces and Oudh:

"The Benares people are decidedly excited about the Congress. God knows what is in their minds. Nothing very distinct or definite, I imagine. They are being told daily that they are wronged and oppressed; that the rule of Government is cruel and hard; ... that '30 millions of people have been allowed to die of starvation'. That if the Congress succeeds, grain will be cheap and

1. The problem was solved at last by the Maharaja of Darbhanga who purchased a building and placed it at the Committee's disposal.

Mukherjee, H. and Mukherjee, U. India's Fight for Freedom; or, The Swadeshi Movement, 1905-1906, p. 11.

Income Tax remitted."¹

On 22 January 1889, H.E. Reay, Governore of Bombay, wrote to Lansdowne that the Congress was spreading agitation in rural areas.² Even more moderate comments like a parable printed in the form of a dialogue between one Moulvi Fariduddin and Rambaksh irritated some high officials.³

1. White to Benett, 30 December 1888, with enclosure to John Colvin, Pvt. Secy. to Lt. Governore, the North Western Provinces and Oudh, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, November 1888 to June 1889, L.No.115.

Colvin who, to use Lansdowne's words "has declared himself strongly on the anti-Congress side", forwarded White's letter to the Viceroy. Lansdowne thanked him without further comment. Lansdowne was eager to reach an understanding with the Congress, as he thought that some of its members represented the more advanced shades of Indian opinion.

Lansdowne to Cross, 11 December 1888, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1889, L.No.1.

Lansdowne to Colvin, 26 February 1889, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, November 1888 to June 1889, L.No.125.

2. Reay to Lansdowne, 22 January 1889, Ibid., L.No.121.
3. This parable, which was published in a pamphlet, named 'Congress Catechism', was not fictitious. Moulvi Fariduddin, M.A. B.L., pleader of the High Court, practised in the district court of Hakikatabad and Rambaksh was one of the Mukaddams of Kabakhtpur. W. Digby, Member of the National Congress, Allahabad, to Col. J.C. Ardagh, Jt. Pvt. Secy. to the Viceroy, Allahabad, 31 December 1888, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, November 1888 to June 1889, L.No.70.

The parable was the following:

"Rambaksh: But surely you don't want us to join together and fight with Sirkar? If we killed all the Europeans, how should we get along? All should be anarchy (Ghadar), as I remember when I was young. You cannot mean this.

"Moulvi Fariduddin: God forbid! This would be sin. Why should we kill the poor Europeans? Many of them are really good men; most of them mean at any rate to do right. They are ignorant no doubt of the rights of most matters concerning us; they blunder, they cause us misery; but they do it from ignorance, from an ignorance unavoidable under the system which they work on, and which, even if did they wish, they could not change without your help. Besides, though we of the new generation are growing up able to assist them and do much for the country, the whole of us put together have not yet sufficient experience and self-reliance to manage the administration entirely without their help.

Kill the Europeans? No, Rambaksh. Let us say, rather, God bless all of them (and there are many such) who feel kindly towards us in their hearts, and according to their lights, mean well towards us, and God forgive those among them (and let us hope they are not many), who dislike and despise us, and care nothing what becomes of us."¹

On 4 March 1889, Edward Watkin, M.P., informed the Under Secretary of State for India that this parable had been printed in the twelve languages of India, and circulated by the Hindus.² He asked the Under Secretary to take steps against the authors and its distributors, because he thought this article to be a seditious publication.³

The Congress leaders did their best, however, to disarm both Muslim and British criticism. In order to answer, and if possible win over Syed Ahmed Khan, and to dispel the fear that the Muslims,

1. J and P Dept., File 330, 1889; Also, Dar P.B.N., India in England, Vol.II, p.171, I.O.L. Tract.733.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

being a minority would always be helpless, the Allahabad session of the Congress altered its constitution. A resolution was passed, resolution thirteen, laying down

"That no subject shall be passed for discussion by the Subject Committee, or allowed to be discussed at any Congress by the President thereof, to the introduction of which the Hindu or Mahomedan Delegates as a body object; unanimously or nearly unanimously; and that if, after the discussion of any subject which has been admitted for discussion, it shall appear that all the Hindu or all the Mahomedan Delegates as a body are unanimously or nearly unanimously opposed to the Resolution which it is proposed to pass thereon, such Resolution shall be dropped."¹

Pandit Sham Narayan, a Lucknow delegate spelled out the implication of the resolution, pointing out that it meant that "if twelve hundred Hindu delegates assembled in this Congress to discuss any topic,

1. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1888, p.63.

or pass any resolution, and if three hundred Mahomedan delegates object to its being discussed or passed, then that topic or resolution should be dropped."¹

The leaders also took practical steps to make it easier for Muslim delegates to attend the Congress sessions. S. N. Banerjea thus related: "We sometimes paid the fares of Mahomedan delegates and offered them other facilities."² As a result, despite continued efforts by anti-Congress Muslims to dissuade their co-religionists from joining the Congress, over 200 Muslim delegates attended the Allahabad session, at which total membership was 1,248 delegates.³

In the Congress session of 1889, held at Bombay, it was also resolved to counter British criticism, by sending a deputation to England to

1. Pandit Sham Narayan's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1888, p.173.

2. Banerjea, S.N., Op. cit., p.100.

3. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1888, p.185.

to represent and explain the views of Congress on the question of political reforms. Banerjea explained that "'the political reforms' here referred to mean the beginnings of representative Government by expansion and reconstitution of the Councils."¹ Charles Bradlaugh, a member of the House of Commons, attended the Congress session of 1889. He showed open sympathy with the Indian National Congress: "For whom should I work, if not for the people? BORN OF THE PEOPLE, TRUSTED BY THE PEOPLE, I WILL DIE FOR THE PEOPLE."² The Congressmen asked him to introduce a bill in the House of Commons to enlarge Indian representation in the Supreme and Provincial Legislative Councils.

1. Banerjea, S.N., Op.cit., p.102.

2. Charles Bradlaugh's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.70.

Also, Chakkrabarty, D. and Bhattacharyya, C., Congress in Evolution, p.xxi.

The capital letters are in the Report.

The enlargement of the Legislative Councils had been a demand of the Congress ever since the second session of 1886: "Representation is our motto," Surendranath Banerjea had declared, "our watch-word, our battle-cry, the gospel of our political redemption."¹ It was also a subject likely to arouse opposition among British officials, and doubt and fear among the Muslims. When in 1889 a skeleton scheme for the reform and reconstitution of the Councils was drawn up at the fifth session of the Congress, care was taken to provide safe-guards for the minority communities. The Congress scheme provided that the Councils should consist of members not less than one-half of whom were elected, not more than one-fourth to be ex-officio members and the rest to be

1. Surendranath Banerjea's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1886, p.99. Resolutions were also passed at the third and fourth sessions of the Congress in favour of reform and enlargement of the Legislative Councils. See Reports of the Indian National Congress, 1887, Resolution 11, and 1888 Resolution 1.

nominated by Government.¹ Revenue districts were to constitute territorial units for electoral purposes and all British male subjects above twenty one years of age and possessing certain qualifications, which would be decided later, were to be entitled to the vote.² Members were to be elected by indirect elections at the rate of one per five millions of the population to the Supreme Legislative Council and of one per million of the population to the Provincial Legislative Councils. Whenever

"the Parsis, Christians, Muslims or Hindus were in a minority, the total number of that minority elected to the Provincial Legislature should not, as far as possible, bear a less proportion to the total number of members elected than the minority itself bore to the total population."³

-
1. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, Resolution 11, p.XII;
Also Ghosh, P.C., Indian National Congress, p.17;
Rao, R.M.V., A Short History of the Indian National Congress, p.23;
Pal, B.C., The Indian National Congress, p.23
I.O.L. Tract No.666.
 2. Ghosh, P.C., op. cit., p.17; Also Gopal, R., Op. cit., p.79.
 3. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, Resolution 11, p.XI.

This precise formulation of a possible reform of the Legislative Councils led to a discussion which revealed that even Muslims within Congress could not escape thinking, and fearing, communally. Lala Lajpat Rai, the social reformer and staunch Congress supporter, criticizing Syed Ahmed Khan's past opposition to Congress, expressed the hope that the scheme would fulfil the wishes of Syed Ahmed Khan, who, in 1864, looked hopefully forward to the time when the Legislative Councils of India would include representatives from every district and division.¹ Hume went on to argue that Indians were Indians, and that there should

-
1. Lala Lajpat Rai's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.19.

Lala Lajpat Rai referred to the speech delivered by Syed Ahmed Khan in a meeting of the Scientific Society of Aligarh at Gazipur on 9 January 1864. Syed Ahmed Khan appreciated that several fellow countrymen were members of the Legislative Council of India, associated with the Viceroy and High dignitaries in the formation of laws for the well being of the people. He added: "The appointment of natives to the Supreme Council was a memorable incident in the history of India. The day is not far distant I trust, and when it does come, you will remember my words, when that Council will be composed of representatives from every division or district and that thus the laws which it will pass will be laws enacted by the feeling of the entire country." Quoted in Graham, G.F.I., Op. cit, p.57.

be no sections, majority and minority.¹ Commenting on this point, Hardeoram N. Haridas of Bombay said:

"We do not want sectional differences in the Legislature; we do not want a Legislature for Parsees separately, for Hindus separately, for Jews separately, for Mahomedans or for Christians separately."²

This gave rise to a controversy among the Muslim members of the Congress; some did not support Hardeoram, while others did. Munshi Hidayet Rasul, a Muslim of Oudh, proposed that, although the Hindus formed a majority of the Indian population, the number of Hindu and Muslim members in a council should be equal, since thereby the position of the Muslims might be better safeguarded.³ Hamid Ali Khan, a barrister of Oudh, opposed him, arguing that no such question as 'Hindu or Mohammedans' should be raised.⁴ Wahid Ali Rizwi, a Muslim of the North Western Provinces, thereupon said "in

1. Hume's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.25.

2. Hardeoram N. Haridas's Speech: Ibid., p.26.

3. Munshi Hidayet Rasul's Speech: Ibid., p.27.

4. Syed Hamid Ali Khan's Speech, Ibid., pp.28-29.

an excited tone" that the number of Muslims in the Councils should be three times more than the Hindus.¹ Shaikh Cumroodin Furrukhai of Bombay agreed with Munshi Hidayet Rasul and argued that the Muslims, because of their educational backwardness, would not at present be able to compete with other Indians; hence he asked the Congress: "... give the advantage of more members than we are entitled to as a matter of proportional calculation."² Hidayet Buksh of Dacca strongly opposed the view of Munshi Hidayet Rasul.³ Syed Mir Uddin Ahmed Balkhi of Bihar also disagreed with Wahid Ali Rizwi and Munshi Hidayet Rasul, doing so on the ground of common unity among the Indians. He argued:

We have assembled here for one common object, and that object is a secular and not a

1. Wahid Ali Rizwi's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.29; Also quoted in Gopal, R., Op. cit., p.80.
2. Shaikh Cumroodin Furrukhi's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.32.
3. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.32. Hidayet Buksh spoke in Urdu. It was stated in the Report of the Congress that Hidayet Buksh had failed to supply either a copy of his speech or a translation thereof and hence the report of his speech could not be given there having been no reporters for vernacular speeches.

religious one. We, standing here on a common political platform, appeal to the British nation's sense of justice to permit us, their Indian fellow-subjects, to enjoy something of the rights and privileges which have made them what they are. On such an occasion Mahomedans cannot call themselves Mahomedans; nor Hindus, Hindus; but rather, FORGETTING ALL DIFFERENCES OF CREED, CASTE, AND COLOUR, WE SHOULD CALL OURSELVES INDIANS."¹

Munshi Nasiruddin Ahmed of Benares regretted the amendment of Hidayet Rasul.² The Muslim delegates of Madras and Punjab did not deliver any speech on it. Thus, when the amendment was put before the Muslim delegates, it was lost by seven votes; while sixteen voted in favour of the amendment, twenty three opposed it; and the rest of the Muslim delegates abstained from voting on the ground, as many of them explained later on, that "they could not vote for what they felt to be unreasonable,

1. Syed Mir Uddin Ahmed Balkhi's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.30. The capital letters are in the Report.

2. Munshi Nasiruddin Ahmed's Speech: Ibid., p.31.

neither did they like to oppose what was so vehemently urged by several of their co-religionists."¹ The amendment was also negatived by the overwhelming majority of the Congress.² As a result the scheme was passed as originally proposed.

These claims of Muslims in Congress about Council representation did indicate that they were not unanimous in their support for the programme of the Congress and that they were eager to secure some safeguards for their co-religionists because of their backwardness in western education.

1. Munshi Nasiruddin Ahmed's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1889, p.31.

2. Ibid.

The scheme was opposed more forthrightly by the Muslims outside the Congress. In early April 1890, Syed Ahmed Khan helped by Theodore Beck, presented a memorial signed by some 40,000 Muslims - Zamindars, nawabs, talukdars, teachers, merchants, clerks - through Richard Temple, a Conservative Member to the House of Commons, disapproving of the introduction of an elective system in India. The principle of election, they stated, would place them in an almost intolerable subjection to classes actively hostile to their welfare.

Early in 1886, Dufferin had recorded his views about the Congress movement that there were "a considerable number who are both able and sensible, upon whose loyal co-operation one

1. The Sanjivani, 1 June 1890: Beng. N.N.R. 1890.

On 28 March 1892, speaking in the Parliament on the Indian Councils Act (1861) Amendment Bill, Richard Temple reminded the House that the Muslims were "actually opposed to such a system. I have myself submitted representations on their behalf, and have promised to watch their interest in reference to this Bill."

Richard Temple's Speech on 28 March 1892: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (Fourth Series), 28 March 1892 - 2 May 1892, Vol. 111, p.102.

could undoubtedly rely."¹ He admitted that the objects of the Congress were "neither very dangerous nor very extravagant."² He wanted to examine carefully and seriously the demands of the Congress movement. After two years, in November 1888, he sent home proposals regarding the introduction of a representative element into the Indian Government.³ He described his plan as "a plan for the enlargement of our provincial councils, for the enhancement of their status, the multiplication of their functions, the partial introduction into them of the elective principle, and the liberalisation of their general character as political institutions."⁴ Lansdowne⁵, who had succeeded Dufferin on 10

1. Quoted in Lyall, S.A., The Life of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, Vol, 11, p.152.

2. Ibid., p.151.

3. Ibid., p.152.

4. Dodwell, H.H., The Cambridge History of India, Vol. VI, p.542.

5. Henry Charles Keith Petty-Fitzmaurice, fifth Marquis of Lansdowne (1845-1927): Under-Secretary for War, 1872-4; Under-Secretary for India, 1880; Governor-General of Canada, 1883-8; Viceroy of India, 1888-94; Secretary of State for War, 1895-1900; Foreign Secretary, 1900-5.

December 1888, supported his recommendation.

He felt that Muslims would suffer little disadvantage under the scheme, and thought such reforms would rather do good by establishing that the Government were not adopting an attitude of uncompromising opposition even to the demands for more representative institutions.¹ On 1 January 1889, he wrote to Cross², then Secretary of State for India, that a timely concession of this kind would take "a great deal of the wind out of the sails of the Congress, whereas, if the reform is delayed too long, it will be assuredly regarded as having been extorted from us."³

However, both Cross and Salisbury, the Prime Minister, were unwilling to introduce any system of election, though ready to allow the membership of all the Councils to be increased on the

1. Lansdowne to Cross, 11 December 1888, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1888, L.No.I.

2. Richard Assheton, first Viscount Cross (1823-1914): Home Secretary 1874-80; Secretary of State for India, 1886-92; Lord Privy Seal, 1895-1900.

3. Lansdowne to Cross, 11 December 1888, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1888, L.No.I.

initiative of the Governments concerned.¹ Cross wrote to Lansdowne on 18 January 1889: "My difficulty and Lord Salisbury's lies in the principle of election. I do not see where the constituency is to be. The ryot cannot be represented, ...whose sole protector is the British Government. Nor would the Mahomedan for a moment consent to be outvoted by the Hindoo. It is the justice of British rule which contents them."² Lansdowne, however, continued to urge the introduction of the elective principle for the Provincial Councils. On 12 February 1889 he wrote to Cross that there was no reason why elections should not be introduced for Provincial Councils.³ It seemed to him the only way of securing in these Councils a certain number of members who would reflect public opinion with knowledge and authority. Municipal Corporations, he argued, whose members were elected by the rate

1. Gopal, S., British Policy in India 1858-1905, p.182.

2. Cross to Lansdowne, 18 January 1889, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1889, L.No.10.

3. Lansdowne to Cross, 12 February 1889, Ibid., L.No.12.

payers, could serve as constituencies for the Provincial Councils, which would then, while not representative in the fullest sense, express the opinions of different sections of the community.

However, on 12 February 1890, Charles Bradlaugh drafted a bill to amend the Indian Councils Act of 1861 and to a certain extent to meet the Congress demands.¹

-
1. Indian Councils Amendment Bill, 12 February 1890: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (Third Series), 11 February 1890-4 March 1890, vol. 341, p.173.
- The Indian Councils Act of 1861 enlarged the Governor General's Council for the purpose of making laws by addition of not less than six and not more than twelve members, of whom not less than half were to be non-officials. These non-official additional members might be drawn from both Europeans and Indians. All additional members were to be nominated by the Governor General for two years. The Act restored to the Governments of Bombay and Madras the power of making laws and regulations by the addition of not less than four nor more than eight additional members, nominated by the Governors, of whom at least half were to be non-official members. The Act authorised the Governor General in Council to create similar Legislative Councils in Bengal, the North Western Provinces and Oudh and the Punjab. The Bengal Legislative Council, which was established in 1862, consisted of the Lieutenant Governor and twelve nominated additional members. In the North Western Provinces and Oudh, the Legislative Council was created in 1886 with nine Councillors, of whom one-third was to be non-official. The Punjab Legislative Council was established in 1898. Under the Indian Councils Act of 1861, the Provincial Legislative Councils were "expressly forbidden to transact any business except the consideration and enactment of Legislative measures, or to entertain any motion except a motion for leave to introduce a Bill or having reference to a Bill actually introduced." Thus, they only assembled for discussion of the immediate legislation which was presented before them.
- Report on the Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918. P.P. 1918, vol. 8, Paper No. Cd.9109, pp.53-54.

The purpose of the bill was to reconstitute the Council of the Governor General of India, and the Legislative Councils of Provincial Governors "by enlarging their member, constituting them on a partially elective basis, and increasing their powers."¹ On 21 February 1890 the bill was first introduced by Cross into the House of Lords.² Salisbury, in his speech on 6 March 1890 in the House of Lords, argued that it would be unwise to introduce elective principles in India which contained two "bitterly hostile sections" - Hindus and Muslims.³ He pointed out:

"We do not know how the Mahommedan and Hindoo populations if placed face to face with each other in elective representative Government would view each other; but we know, at all events, that one of the heaviest responsibilities and severest duties of the Government of India is to prevent the outbreak of hostilities

-
1. Indian Councils Amendment Bill, 12 February 1890: Op. cit, p.173.
 2. Indian Councils Amendment Bill, 21 February 1890: Ibid, p.862.
 3. Salisbury's Speech on 6 March 1890: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (Third Series), 5 March 1890-26 March 1890, vol. 342, p.99.

caused by the profound differences between those two communities - differences in race traditions, history and creed."¹

He therefore earnestly urged upon the House not to make "so great a change without the most careful and circumspect examination of all the difficulties and dangers which surround it, not to slip into this great innovation, as it were, accidentally."² He told the House:

"But if we are to do it, if it has to be done, let us do it systematically, counting the cost, examining all the details, and taking care that the machinery to be provided shall effect the purpose of giving representation not to accidentally constituted Bodies, not to small sections of the people here and there, but to the living strength and vital forces of the whole community of India."³

1. Salisbury's Speech on 6 March 1890: Op. cit.

2. Ibid., p.100.

3. Ibid.

Northbrook¹ deprecated any approach to the British system, that is, the Congress demand for the allotment of representation in proportion to population in India. He stated: "India is a long way from having what is called a responsible Government, namely, an Administration composed of men who possess a majority in the Representative assembly."² One of the difficulties of forming "anything like representative Bodies" in India, he argued, was the existence of various religious groups there.³ He also mentioned that the Congress demand for representation had displeased the Indian Muslims.⁴ Then he suggested the amendment of that portion of the bill in which the method of partial election was proposed. The amending clause was as follows:

"The Governor General in Council may from time to time with the approval of the Secretary of

-
1. Baring, Thomas George, first Earl of Northbrook (1826-1904): Under-Secretary in India Office, 1859-64; at War Office, 1861 and 1868; at Home Office, 1864; Secretary to the Admiralty, 1866; Governor General of India, 1872-6; special Commissioner to Egypt, 1884; opposed Home Rule, 1886; and tariff reform, 1903.
 2. Northbrook's Speech on 6 March 1890: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (Third Series) 5 March 1890-26 March 1890, vol. 342, p.64.
 3. Ibid., p.69.
 4. Ibid.

State in Council make such regulations as to the conditions under which such nominations (that is nomination of additional Members), or any of them, shall be made by the Governor General, Governors and the Lieutenant Governors respectively, and shall prescribe the manner in which such regulations should be carried into effect."¹

But the bill was not passed either in 1890 or in 1891 due to the pressure of other domestic legislation. On 15 February 1892, when the bill was again introduced in the House of Lords, Kimberley emphasized the importance of the above mentioned clause. He thus explained:

"... I myself believe that under that clause it will be open to the Governor General to make arrangements by which certain persons may be presented to him, having been chosen by election, if the Governor General should find that such a system can properly be established."²

-
1. Quoted in Curzon's Speech on 28 March 1892: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (Fourth Series), 28 March 1892-2 May 1892, vol. 111, p.63.
 2. Kimberley's Speech on 15 February 1892: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (Fourth Series), 9 February 1892-3 March 1892, vol. I, pp.414-415.

Northbrook agreed with Kimberley but he preferred to describe this object as "representation" rather than "election".¹ Commenting on this Salisbury remarked: "... we should look at that representation as necessarily confined, or even specially assigned, to municipal bodies."² On 28 March 1892, Curzon,³ the Under Secretary of State for India, conducted this bill in the House of Commons following Kimberley's line. "Under this Act", he clarified, "it would be in the power of the Viceroy to invite Representative Bodies in India to elect or select or delegate representatives of themselves and of their opinions to be nominated to those Houses, and thus by slow degrees, by tentative measures, and in a matter like this measures cannot be otherwise than tentative, we may perhaps approximate

-
1. Northbrook's Speech on 15 February 1892: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, (Fourth Series), 9 February 1892-3 March 1892, vol. I, pp.416-423.
 2. Salisbury's Speech on 15 February 1892: Ibid., p.417.
 3. George Nathaniel, first Marquis Curzon of Kedleston (1859-1925): Under-Secretary for India, 1891-2; Viceroy of India, 1898-1905; Lord President of the Council and member of the War Cabinet, 1916-18; Foreign Secretary, 1919-24.

in some way to the ideal" - the elective principle.¹ Eventually the Commons approved of the bill. On 26 May 1892 the bill was passed by the House of Lords and it became the well known Act of 1892.² The Act increased the number of additional members in the Governor-General's Council, that is, the number of members added to the executive council when it went into legislative session, from a maximum of twelve to a maximum of sixteen, and that in the Governors' Councils from a maximum of eight to a maximum of twenty.³ Of the ten non-official additional members in the Governor General's Council, four were to be chosen by the non-official members of the Governors' Councils in Madras, Bombay, Bengal and the North Western Provinces and Oudh, that is, one from each province, and the remaining seats were reserved for the appointments of experts on special subjects of legislation. The

-
1. Curzon's speech on 28 March 1892: Op. cit., p.64.
 2. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (Fourth Series), 3 May 1892-26 May 1892, vol. IV, p.1930.
 3. Mehrotra, S.R., Op. cit., p.29; Also, Dodwell, H.H., Op. cit., p.546; Report on the Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918, Op. cit., pp.61-62.

municipalities, district boards, chambers of commerce, trading associations, and senates of universities were allowed to make recommendations for eight seats in the Provincial Legislative Councils.¹ The Provincial Councils, though not the Governor General's Council, were empowered to discuss the budget and raise administrative questions, though not to vote on them.²

After the Act was passed, Lansdowne wrote on 31 May 1892 to Cross: "I do not see how we are to provide for the representation of the Mahomedans except by special nominations in their favour. It might be possible, in certain cases, to allow a Mahomedan Society, or organisation, to recommend

1. The exact clause was the following:
 "'Where corporations have been established with definite powers upon a recognised administrative basis, or where associations have been formed upon a substantial community of legitimate interests, professional, commercial or territorial, the Governor General and the Local Governors might find convenience and advantage in consulting from time to time such bodies, and in entertaining at their discretion an expression of their views and recommendations with regard to the selection of members in whose qualifications they might be disposed to confide."
 Quoted in Report on the Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918. Op. cit., p.60.

2. Ibid.
 Also, Mehrotra, S.R., Op. cit., p.28; Gopal, S., British Policy in India 1858-1905, p.185.

a Member."¹ But after a month, on 5 July 1892, 140
he informed him: "As to minorities, and especially
Mahomedan minorities, nomination pure and simple,
without a previous recommendation from a constituency
of any kind, will, of course, be the best safeguard."²
In his correspondence with Crosthwaite,³ Lieutenant
Governor of the North Western Provinces and Oudh,
he gave his opinion on 29 June 1893: "The Mahomedans
all over India will, I suspect, have to depend upon
Government nominations, if they are to have their
share of the seats."⁴

The Congressmen, though they accepted the
Indian Councils Act of 1892 "in a loyal spirit",
expressed their regret that the Act itself did not,
in set terms, concede to the people "the right of
electing their own representatives to the Council."⁵
The Congress delegates in the eighth Congress
session, held on 28 December 1892 in Allahabad,

-
1. Lansdowne to Cross, 31 May 1892, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, January to December 1892, L.No.26.
 2. Lansdowne to Cross, 5 July 1892, Ibid., L.No.31.
 3. Crosthwaite, Sir Charles Hanks Todd (1835-1915): Entered India civil service, 1857; C.S.I. and Chief Commissioner of Burma, 1887; K.C.S.I., 1888, Lieutenant Governor of North Western Provinces and Oudh, 1892-5; on Council of India, 1895-1905.
 4. Lansdowne to Crosthwaite, 29 June 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, January to June 1893, L.No. 369.
 5. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1892, Resolution No.I, p.1.

resolved that the Government should do "adequate justice to the people of this country" by allowing a real living representation of the people of India.¹ In support of this resolution, Rai Bahadur Ananda Charlu in his speech on 29 December 1892 demanded that all persons must unquestionably possess the franchise as "an individual or personal franchise."² "Anything short of it", he remarked, "will be a perfect farce, if not a sham, and an unjustifiable injustice to the vast majority."³ Surendranath Banerjea in his speech on the same day declared that the Indian Councils Act did not come up to their expectation.⁴ "Year after year", he stated,

"we have been recording resolutions praying for the introduction of the representative element in the Councils.... But what do we

-
1. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1892, Resolution No.I, p.1.
 2. Rai Bahadur Ananda Charlu's Speech on 29 December 1892: Ibid., p.27.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Surendranath Banerjea's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1892, p.29.

find has been done? As a matter of fact the representative element has not been recognized in the Act, but a clause has been inserted, which is known as "the Kimberley Clause", and which provides for selection, but not the election, of representative members from various bodies."¹

The Hindu Press expressed much the same sort of reaction. The Kerala Patrika of Madras on 18 February 1893 wrote that although the Act was unsatisfactory, it was a useful achievement of the Congress.² The Hitechchhu of Ahmedabad on 23 March 1893 called the Act "an incomplete measure in itself" and observed:

"It is to be regretted that the loyal subjects of the British Crown have been given so late a right which they deserved long ago, and that too in such a parsimonious manner."³

-
1. Surendranath Banerjea's Speech: Report of the Indian National Congress, 1892, p.29.
 2. The Kerala Patrika, 18 February 1893: Madras N.N.R. 1893.
 3. The Hitechchhu of Ahmedabad, 23 March 1893: Bom. N.N.R. 1893.
The editor of this weekly newspaper was a Decanni Hindu.

The Phoenix described the Act on 29 March 1893 as the little gift "so sparingly and grudgingly doled out by the viceroy."¹ On 30 March 1893, the Gujrat Darpan regarded the Act as an inadequate measure and warned the people that "the battles for our right to a thorough representation on the Councils have not ended."²

For the anti-Congress Muslims the only point of satisfaction was Her Majesty's Government's refusal to introduce any kind of parliamentary system in British India. The Musalman of India wrote on 8 January 1893 that the Government should have a close regard to the interests of the Muslim minority.³ It must be remembered, the paper continued, that the Act itself did not go so far as to concede to the Indians the privilege of electing their own representatives for the Councils. It urged the Government to take care that "any rules framed by it do not operate to make the Hindu

-
1. The Phoenix, 29 March 1893: Bom. N.N.R. 1893. It was published in English from Bombay. The editor was a Hindu of Bengal.
 2. The Gujrat Darpan, 30 March 1893: Ibid. The editor was Gujrati Hindu. It was a bi-weekly newspaper, published from Surat.
 3. The Musalman of India, 8 January 1893: Bom.N.N.R. 1893. This was a weekly newspaper, published in English from Bombay.

still more predominant in the country", warning that "if the Hindus get the upper hand in the Councils,.... it must bring the whole Indian administration into disrepute."¹

But soon the Muslims realised that notwithstanding the language of the Act, the Viceroy and the various Governors were succumbing to pressure from the Congress, and, in practice nominating to their Councils "the same leaders, whom the Muslims had denounced as sedition mongers."² Commenting on the constitution of the Bengal Legislative Council in 1893 on the basis of the Indian Council Act, The Moslem Chronicle, one of the prominent Muslim newspapers, wrote later on 9 May 1895 that out of 8 members thus appointed, while 5 were Hindus, only one was a Muslim.³ The same newspaper remarked:

"We unhesitatingly say that the so-called representative system that has been found out for the regeneration of India is an one

1. The Musalman of India, 8 January 1893: Bom. N.N.R. 1893.

2. Zakaria, R.A., Op. cit., p.150.

3. The Moslem Chronicle, 9 May 1895. They were Surendranath Banerjea, Lal Mohan Ghose, the Maharajas of Natore and Darbhanga, W.C. Banerjea and Moulvi Serajul Islam.

sided representative system which would make the Babu paramount power in the realm and drive the Muhammadans to despair for their own improvement and generation."¹

The Indian Council Act of 1892 made the Muslim leaders realize, more than ever before, that unless the Muslims were well guarded by the Government, they might be swept away by the rising tide of the Congress movement. After this Act, the relations between these two communities became more tense. Gradually the number of Muslim delegates in the Congress started falling. Whereas the Congress session of 1894 was attended by 24 Muslims that of 1895 was attended by only 19.²

1. The Moslem Chronicle, 9 May 1895.

2. Report of the Indian National Congress, 1894, p.14;
Ibid., 1895, p.15.

The total number of delegates in 1894 was 1200 and in 1895, 1584.

Chapter III

Hindus and Muslims, although they had lived side by side for centuries, were conscious that they belonged to separate communities, following two different religions. "The Hindus and Muslims", wrote Theodore Morison, "who inhabit one village, one town, or one district belong to two separate nations more distinct and spiritually further assunder than two European nations."¹ Thus, he pointed out, though France and Germany were to Europeans "the standard example of enemy nations", yet a young Frenchman might go to Germany for business or study, live with a German family, share their meals and go with them to the same place of worship. But no Muslim could live with a Hindu family on such terms.² On this point, Abdur Rahim further commented:

"Any of us Indian Moslems, travelling, for instance, in Afganistan, Persia, Central Asia,

1. Morison, S.T., 'Muhammadan Movements', Political India 1832-1932, edited by J. Cumming, p.103.

2. Ibid.

among Chinese Moslems, Arabs and Turks, would be at once made at home and would not find anything to which we are not accustomed. On the contrary in India we find ourselves in all social matters total aliens when we cross the street and enter that part of the town where our fellow Hindu townsmen live!"¹

Nevertheless, as has been seen in the previous chapter, Hindus and Muslims could live and work together amicably despite these social and religious differences if they chose to do so. However, the feeling that the Hindus and the Muslims belonged to separate communities seemed to grow stronger in the late 1880's when the anti-Muslim activities of some Hindus, particularly of the Arya Samaj, began to increase. The Arya Samaj, founded at Lahore in 1875 by Swami Dayananda Saraswati² (1827-1883) to reform Hindu society, gradually became anti-Muslim

1. Morison, S.T., Op. cit., p.7.

2. Dayananda Saraswati (1827-1883): Religious and social reformer; known as the Mahatma; founder of the Arya Samaj.

in its preaching.¹ Its supporters claimed that India was their country and that the Muslims were intruding outsiders. For such foreign religions as Islam and Christianity tolerance was out of the question; they must be extirpated.² They criticised the traditions of Islam and the Quran.³ Dayananda, for instance, commenting on a Sura of the Quran (S_I.1,2) which runs "Praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures, the Compassionate, the most merciful," commented that if the Muslim God had been the protector of all creatures, and the dispenser of forgiveness and mercy to all, He would not have commanded the Muslims to kill the people of other religions and lower animals.⁴

The Arya Samaj also started the Gaurakhshini movement, a movement for the protection and

1. The motto of Swami Dayananda Saraswati's reform was "Back to the Vedas. The Vedas are a revelation from God and are the books of true knowledge."
Banerji, D.N., Indian Nation Builders, p.85; Also Singh, C., The Life of Swami Dayananda Saraswati, p.86.
2. Rai, L.L., The Arya Samaj, p.220; Also Panikkar, K.M., 'The Psychology of the Hindu-Muslim riots', The Contemporary Review, February 1927, Vol.131, p.232.
3. Prasad, D., An English Translation of the Satyarth Prakash, pp.494-539.
4. Bharadwaja, C., Light of Truth or an English Translation of the Satyarth Prakash, pp.613-614.

preservation of the cow. The supporters of this movement started their work in 1886 in Ghazipur, a district of the North Western Provinces,¹ where the Hindus were in a vast majority.² From the town of Ghazipur, the movement spread over the whole of the district, and also into the adjoining districts of Ballia and Azamgarh. As the cow holds a special and revered place in the Hindu mind, the movement had great religious appeal, and it was soon taken up in many other areas of India. It was directed towards the absolute prohibition of the slaughter of cows for any purpose. Thus the Indian Spectator, a Bombay Hindu newspaper, called the slaughter of cattle a suicidal practice.³ The Poona Vaibhav asserted, "we love cows more than our mothers."⁴ The Samaya, a Hindu newspaper of Bengal, emphasizing the agricultural importance of cows, declared that famines were caused by the shortage of cows and consequent lack of milk and butter.⁵

-
1. P.P., 1893-94, Vol.LXIII, Paper No.538, p.54.
 2. Hunter, W.W., Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol.II, p.359.
 3. The Indian Spectator, 10 April 1887: Bom.N.N.R. 1887.
 4. The Poona Vaibhav, 7 August 1887: Ibid.
 5. The Samaya, 6 January 1888: Beng.N.N.R. 1888.

The movement was not, of course, directed only at the Hindu community. To the Muslim beef has always been a lawful, and in India acceptably cheap food, while the cow was also one of the animals which was an acceptable - halal or lawful - sacrifice in the religious ceremonies during the Bakra-Id festival. Hindu demands that cow slaughter be banned in India were thus an attack upon Muslim domestic and religious habits. As Smyth, the Deputy Commissioner, Delhi, reported, the Muslims necessarily saw the Hindu Cow Protection movement as one by which Hindus used their wealth, education and influence to promote their own religion while imposing restrictions on the religious practices of the Muslims.¹ This was attempted both directly, through appeals to Hindu Zamindars to use their power and influence in the countryside to prevent the slaughter of cattle and by an increase in anti-Muslim propoganda by the Arya Samaj in the towns, and by the creation of Hindu Cow-Protection societies which could seek to influence Government.²

1. G. Smyth to Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi, 27 October 1886, L.No. 286, J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887, Vol.211.

2. The Bangavasi, 12 November 1887: Beng.N.N.R. 1887; The Rast Goftar, 19 February 1888: Ibid., 1888.

By the 1890's the movement had become sufficiently wide spread and had led to such an increase in communal ill-feeling as to force Government to take serious notice of it. From the North Western Provinces and Oudh, Crosthwaite reported in July 1893 that the Brahmins, Zamindars, Marwaris and upper and middle class Hindus were freely supporting and organising the cow protection societies: "I believe most, if not all, of the prominent Hindu zemindars are taking part in the cow-protection agitation."¹ In August he told Lansdowne that the movement had seriously alarmed the Muslims, who killed cattle for food as well as in the observance of religious practices: "They all accuse the Congress", he said. He pointed out that whereas Congress in the past could be described as a microscopic minority, by means of "the 'cow' cry they can get all Hindoodom at their back."² In a further letter he stated:

-
1. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 1 July 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 6.
 2. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 18 August 1893, Ibid., L.No. 139.

"The Hindus are in a very intractable frame of mind They have persuaded themselves that they are entirely in the right that the Mahommedans gave the provocation, and that the Government is dealing unjustly by them . . . The Mahommedans expect us to protect them in the free exercise of their rights, and they will resent bitterly anything resembling a surrender to the Hindus. By making any concession to the latter, we shall alienate the Musalmans without conciliating the Hindus."¹

The movement was the more alarming because those who organised it could bring such social pressure to bear. The Government of the North Western Provinces, reporting on the vigorous propaganda carried on there for some years, noted not only the large number of devout Hindus who made contributions to such societies, but also their attempts to dissuade Hindus from selling cows to any person likely to slaughter them. Such dissuasion was reinforced by the threat of heavy social penalties on those who

1. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 17 October 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 394.

refused to conform. The Brahmins took a large part in the organisation of Cow Protection societies, and were ready to use their religious authority over other caste Hindus. As Crosthwaite observed:

"The strange thing is that these societies should be able to arrogate to themselves the power of turning men out of caste for acts which are not caste-offences. For example, for a Hindu to sell a cow to a Musalman is not a caste offence..... but here we have the whole social and religious power of caste brought to bear to prevent men from doing, or to compel them to do, (e.g. subscribe to the societies), acts unconnected with their caste-rules."¹

The societies reinforced such pressure with lurid appeals to the emotions. Crosthwaite, reporting to the Viceroy on an article in The Advocate, an English paper edited by Thomas Blaney from Bombay, entitled, "The persecution of Hindu Missionaries", explained that the missionaries in question was

1. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 5 September 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 206.

an emissary of the cow societies sent to preach in Bahraitch in Oudh. "To illustrate his lecture", Crosthwaite explained,

"he had a picture which I have seen, and which has been widely distributed. It represents the sacred cow with a calf and Hindu milkmaid. On the left a fearful creature with a sort of boar's head and a drawn sword rushing up to kill the cow, and on the right a Brahmin warning him off. The figure on the left was called in the copy I saw "The Kali Yag", or "Black Age", the period of misery and misfortune which the Hindus are going through at present."¹

As Crosthwaite said, later in September, such propaganda and preaching necessarily "excited the fanatical feelings of the Hindus to a pitch of frenzy."² That frenzy was often turned against the Muslims - "the first symptoms of the movement

-
1. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 5 September 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 206.
 2. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 26 September 1893, Ibid.,

were attacks on Mahomedans, who had purchased cattle at fairs, and were driving them along the roads."¹

From Bombay, Bengal and the Punjab, similar reports upon the Cow Protection movement flowed in. MacDonnell² in Bengal reinforced the picture given by Crosthwaite of the financial support being given by the middle class; "so far as I can ascertain", he reported to Lansdowne, "the movement is supported pecuniarily by the rich Hindus, and especially by the Marwari bankers. These Marwaris are all Jains..., and religiously opposed to the taking of all life."³ Fitzpatrick,⁴ the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab,

-
1. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 17 October 1893, 26 September 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No.394.
 2. Antony Patrick MacDonnell (1844-1925): Statesman; joined the Indian Civil Service in Lower Bengal, 1865; Acting Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, 1893; Member of the Supreme Council, 1893-5; Lieutenant Governor of the North Western Provinces, 1895-1901; Member of the Council of India, 1902; K.C.S.I., 1893; G.C.S.I., 1897; and retired from Indian service, 1901; Permanent Under Secretary of State, Ireland, 1902-8; created baron, 1908.
 3. MacDonnell to Lansdowne, 8 September 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.Np.220.
 4. Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick (1837-1920): Judge of the Punjab Chief Court, 1876-7; Secretary to the Government of India in the Legislative Department, 1885; K.C.S.I., 1890; Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, 1892-7; Member of the Council of India since 1897.

noted the role of the wandering Hindu ascetics, "swamis, sannyasis", who, operating from a well organised centre at Benares, made a strong appeal to popular passion.¹ From Bombay, where the Poona Go-Rakshaka Mandali or Cow Preservation Society had been established by Bal Gangadhar Tilak in November 1889, the story was much the same.² Another society, the Gaupalan Upadeshak Mandali (Advisory body for cow maintainance) was founded in Bombay in this period by Lakshmidas Khimji, which published a newspaper called the Gau Upadeshak (The cow preacher). Most of the societies members were Brahmins.³ Governor Harris,⁴ reporting in August 1893 after his

-
1. Fitzpatrick to Lansdowne, 21 August 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No.157.
 2. Wolpert, S.A., Tilak and Gokhale; revolution and reform in the making of modern India, p.43.
 3. R.H. Vincent, Acting Commissioner of Police, Bombay, to G.C. Whitworth, Acting Secy. to Govt., Bombay, 9 October 1893. P.P., 1893-94, Vol. LXVIII, Paper No.538, p.54.
 4. Harris, George Robert Canning, fourth Baron Harris (1851-1932): Cricketer and administrator; Under Secretary for India, 1885-6; for war, 1886-9; Governor of Bombay, 1890-95; G.C.I.E., 1890; G.C.S.I., 1895; C.B., 1918.

investigation of riots in Bombay, noted that such societies "have not been in existence for much more than eight years, and have become obtrusively active only very recently; and undoubtedly the Mahomedans have been annoyed; and alarm amongst the lowest and least educated of that excitable race undoubtedly engendered."¹

By 1893, therefore, the Government of India had to report to the Secretary of State that cow protection societies by that date existed in most provinces of India, "especially in the eastern portions of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, in the contiguous province of Bihar and in the Central Provinces."² These societies published newspapers to give the widest publicity to the movement - the Go Sewak, which was regularly published from Benares, the Godharma Prakash (The spreading of the cow religion), monthly from

1. Quoted in Wolpert, S.A., Op. cit., p.66.

2. Govt. of India to Secy. of State, 27 December 1893, L.No.84.
P.P., 1893-94, Vol. LXIII, Paper No.538, p.60.

Farrukhabad in the North Western Provinces, besides a stream of pamphlets, leaflets and placards of an inflammatory nature, which were distributed throughout the country. One example cited was the play, in Hindi, called Bharat Dim Dima Natak, published at Lucknow and sold at many railway bookstalls. Another was a picture, "of a kind calculated to appeal strongly to the religious sentiments of the people", which showed a cow in the act of being slaughtered by three Muslim butchers. This was entitled, "The Present State".

As the Government summed up:

"The serious features are the systematic form which the propaganda has taken, the wide influence exercised by the preachers and emissaries who spread it, the drastic powers of compulsion over the people which it has assumed, the riots and excesses to which it has occasionally led, and the large sums of money realized by subscriptions which are practically compulsory on all Hindus."¹

The Gaurakhshini movement had thus developed into a powerful Hindu agitation, largely directed against the Muslims, and generating further ill-feeling between the two communities.

1. Govt. of India to Secy. of State, 27 December 1893, L.No.84. Op. cit., p.61.

Communal riots also took place during the processions of Daserra,¹ Ramlila,² and Muharram.³ The first two were Hindu festivals and the last was a solemn festival of the Muslims to commemorate "one of the most mournful incidents in their sacred history."⁴ The trouble started when the festivals

1. Daserra is a popular festival in honour of the goddess Durga. In Bengal, and West and South India, it is exclusively appropriated to her worship, and is celebrated for nine days in Aswin - September and October. Wilson, H.H., A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, and Useful Words Occurring in Official Documents, p.127.
2. Ramlila is a dramatic re-enactment of the adventures of Rama, performed publicly in the month of Aswin in some places of India. Ibid., p.436.
3. Muharram is the first month of the Muslims year and one of the sacred months of Islam. War is unlawful in this month. Among the Shias this month is held in peculiar veneration; being the month in which Hasan and Husain, the sons of Ali, were killed; their deaths are the subject of public mourning during the first ten days, when fasting and self denial are also enjoined. Ibid., p.350; Also, Gibb, H.A.R., and Kramers, J.H. Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam, p.409.
4. Chief Secy. to Govt., N.W.P. and Oudh, to Secy. Govt. of India, 9 July 1887, L.No. 763, Jand P Dept., File 1575, 1887, vol. 211.

of the two communities fell at the same season, and when one party desired to lead a procession past places of worship belonging to the other or looked upon festive celebrations as an offence during its own season of mourning.¹

Further, the communication facilities such as the extension of railways, the introduction of the telegraph system and the press helped to spread the news of the riots quickly.² Fitzpatrick remarked it must be obvious to anyone who had observed the progress of events for some years past that "what would have been formerly a comparatively small and passing quarrel is now-a-days blown out by writers in the press... and is kept going for a long time, and perpetually recurred to after it has died out."³ "Worse still", he added, "what would formerly have been a merely local affair, now-a-days becomes within a week the affair of all India."⁴ It may be noted that the

1. Govt. of India to Secy. of State, 27 December 1893, L.No. 84. Op. cit., p.58.

2. Ibid.

3. Fitzpatrick to Lansdowne, 14 August 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 119.

4. Ibid.

number of native newspapers; in various parts of India had increased from 179 in 1876 to 290 in 1892,¹ and the percentage of literacy had also increased.² So it was likely that the news of riots spread widely.

1. This figure is worked out on the basis of newspapers recorded in the native newspaper reports of the major provinces of India - Bengal, Bombay, Madras and North Western Provinces.

2.

	Population		Distribution percent.		Percentage of Variation
	1881	1891	1881	1891	
<u>Males</u> Learning and Literate	10,526,283	13,416,398	9.05	10.42	27.45
<u>Females</u> Learning and Literate	432,475	589,256	0.39	0.48	36.25

Census Report of India, 1891.

P.P., 1893-94, Vol. LXIV, C.7181, p.531.

So far we have been discussing the growth of communal disharmony and the issues round which conflict occurred, in general terms. It is time now to consider the actual out-breaks of communal violence and to study their evolving pattern. From 1876 to 1880, so far as can be ascertained, there were no recorded riots. But in 1881, a minor riot took place between the Hindus and the Muslims of Multan district of the Punjab, due to the carelessness of a Muslim butcher. The slaughter of cows was permitted only in slaughter houses, which were built in a secluded area. Nobody was allowed to bring beef openly into the town, although Muslims were permitted to bring it into their houses privately. These rules were in accordance with the orders given by the Board of Administration of the Punjab on 25 April 1849, and since then they had been in force in the province.¹ In 1881, the Hindus complained to C.A. Roe, Deputy Commissioner of Multan, that a Muslim butcher had carried beef in an open basket through the Chauk Bazar which was

1. D.G. Barkley, Offg. Commissioner and Superintendent, Multan Div., to Offg. Secy. to Govt., Punjab, Multan, 29 April 1881, L.No. 386, J and P Dept. File 1947, 1881, Vol. 58.

mainly inhabited by the Hindus.¹ The Deputy Commissioner thereupon ordered all butchers to carry beef by another route which was mainly inhabited by the Muslims.² Later on, in September 1881, the Muslim butchers asked the Deputy Commissioner to cancel his restriction.³ The Deputy Commissioner subsequently withdrew the order which required them to follow a particular route for the conveyance of beef. The Muslim butchers were now allowed to carry beef by any route they chose, so long as the beef was completely covered up, so that it might not offend the Hindus. This withdrawal of restrictions provoked Hindu opposition.⁴ They expressed their anger by closing their shops which in turn annoyed the

1. Roe to W.M. Young, Secy. to Govt., Punjab, 20 September 1881, L.No. A., J and P Dept., File 1947, 1881, Vol. 58.

In Multan district, as a whole, the Muslims formed more than 76% of the population, the Hindus more than 18%.

Hunter, W.W., Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. vi, p.449.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

Muslims.¹ A riot began on 20 September 1881. Nobody was killed, but many people were badly hurt; forty two Hindus and fifty four Muslims were arrested.² One hundred more were arrested the following day.³ Two Muslim mosques and seven Hindu temples were set on fire, and damage to private houses was estimated roughly at Rs.100,000.⁴

After 1885, however, the Hindus and the Muslims quarrelled over the slaughter of cows in several parts of India. Some of the quarrels turned into serious riots. Riots took place mostly in the Punjab and its surrounding provinces, and they occurred mainly in towns. In the Punjab previous to annexation, cow slaughter had been a

1. Roe to Offg. Commissioner and Superintendent, Multan, 24 September 1881, L.No. 678, J and P Dept, File 1947, 1881, Vol. 58.

The Hindu panchayat asked the Hindus to close their shops. The panchayat was composed of thirteen influential Hindus - Raises, Chowdhuries, Mahalladars and lawyers, chosen by the Hindus of Multan. This was a religious watch committee.

2. W.M. Young, Secy. to Govt. of Punjab, to Offg. Secy. to Govt. of India, 24 September 1881, L.No. 322 S, J and P Dept., File 1947, 1881, Vol. 58.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

capital offence, and it had been severely repressed and had led to many executions.¹ When that province was taken under British rule in January 1849, it was ordered by the Board of Administration under the authority of Dalhousie² that while the Muslims should not be prevented from slaughtering cows as the Qur'an did not forbid them to do so, this was to be rendered "as little offensive as possible to the prejudices of the Hindu population."³ The Muslims were thus permitted to kill cows, greatly to the dislike of the Hindus. This was the more offensive to the Sikhs and Hindus, because it followed a period when their sovereign power had enabled them to curb Muslim freedom of worship.

1. Govt. of India to Secy. of State, 27 December 1893, L.No. 84. Op. cit.

2. Ramsay, Sir James Andrew Brown, tenth Earl and first Marquis of Dalhousie (1812-1860): Educated at Harrow and Christ Church Oxford; B.A., 1833; conservative M.P., Haddingtonshire, 1837; entered the House of Lords as second Baron Dalhousie, 1838; president of the board of trade, 1845; Governor General of India, 12 January 1848 - 28 February 1856; returned to England, 1856.

3. Govt. of India to Secy. of State, 27 December 1893, L.No. 84. Op. cit., p.58.

Riots, however, occurred, as mentioned, mainly in towns. It was in towns where the houses of Hindus and Muslims were more intermixed, that the cow-sacrifice was liable to cause much offence to Hindus. Again, when processions to celebrate religious festivals coincided in time, the wish to use the most spacious and important route through the town often led rival religious parties to clash with one another or to erupt into riots. Moreover, people were less interdependent in towns than in villages and this might partly account for the riots taking place in towns. Again it was in the towns that the communities were most formally organized into anjumans, sabhas and panchayats, and where they could therefore organize demonstrations among the literate, easily assembled inhabitants. The Arya Samaj, who organized the opposition to cow slaughter which remained at the root of almost all riots, were also strongly established in the northern towns. It will be seen that riots appear to have occurred equally readily where Hindus or where Muslims formed a majority - in Delhi, a Hindu, or in Ludhiana a

Muslim majority town.¹

According to the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, the origin of the religious animosity between the Hindus and the Muslims of the city could be traced back to the Bakra-Id festival of 1882. The disturbance arose when a maulvi (religious leader) purchased a cow for sacrifice. The Hindus offered him much more than its price and asked him not to sacrifice it. The maulvi refused to give up the cow. Again in 1883, about twenty five to thirty cows were sacrificed which embittered the feelings of the Hindus of Delhi. In 1884, about 170 cows were sacrificed. In 1885, Jackson, District Superintendent of Police, Delhi, who had continued throughout to try to bring about a reconciliation, asked both groups to settle their disputes amicably.² The Hindus wanted the Muslims to reduce

1. In the town of Delhi, where there were 95,485 Hindus, the Muslims numbered 72,519; in the town of Ludhiana, the Muslims were 29,045 and the Hindus 12,969 only.
Table No. XX. Census Report of India, 1881, Punjab, Vol. 13, p.1.

2. G. Smyth, Deputy Commissioner, Delhi, to Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi Div., Delhi, 27 October 1886, L.No. 286, J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887, Vol. 211.

the number of their cow-sacrifices. Rai Bahadur Ram Kishan Das,¹ the representative of local Hindus, offered not to carry their Ramlila procession through the town on the last three days of the Muslim Muharram festival, if the Muslims agreed - first, never under any circumstance to sacrifice cows in the streets or inside the city, or at any place other than the slaughter house; secondly, to refrain from purchasing cattle in the streets or inside the city; and thirdly to refrain from keeping any cattle intended for sacrifice in their houses inside the city, and from bringing such cattle into the city or leading them through the streets. During those three days, the Hindus promised to celebrate their festival only between the Ajmere and Turkman gates, two of the ten main gates of Delhi, though they would enter the town in full procession. This offer showed a spirit of conciliation on their part. The prevention of cow-sacrifices at the Bakra-Id seemed a matter of more importance to the Hindus

1. Rai Bahadur Ram Kishan Das, Katri by caste, was an honorary magistrate. He was the wealthiest man in the city. District Gazetteer of Delhi, 1883-84 p.79.

than the celebration of the Ramlila. Unfortunately, as Smyth the Deputy Commissioner noted, "In dealing with the Muhammadans of Delhi, there is always the difficulty that they have no recognized leaders, and there is no guarantee that any arrangement will be respected unless it is signed by all chaudhris of traders and the leading mohalladars."¹ Several Muslims including Mirza Suleman Shah,² President of the Anjuman-i-Islamia of Delhi, accepted the offer. But the agreement failed to satisfy all the Muslims. Many, particularly the lower classes, considered that their religious rights had been taken from them: they would not be allowed to carry their Muharram procession between the Ajmere and Turkman gates, an area with many old mosques and shrines, while the Hindus would be allowed to use the area for their Ramlila celebrations and carry their procession through the whole city.

-
1. Smyth to Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi Div., Delhi, 27 October 1886, L.No. 286, Op. cit.
 2. Mirza Suleman Shah was descended from emperor Furrukshere. He was one of the influential Muslims of Delhi. District Gazetteer of Delhi, 1883-84, p.77.

Despite their dissatisfaction, there was no disturbance in 1885, but next year they completely disregarded the settlement by sacrificing more than 500 cows during Bakra-Id. A further source of conflict was that while the Muslims had been refused permission to take their Muharram procession down the famous Chaudni Chauk, the Hindus were allowed to use it for Ramlila which followed Id on 5 and 6 October. In consequence the Muslims interfered with the Ramlila procession, and the police failed to clear the routes. Hatchell, District Superintendent of police, was among those wounded in the numerous clashes.¹ The disturbances were renewed on a more extensive scale the next day. The Hindus threw stones at the tazias and turned a pig into the Jama Masjid. On 7 and 8 October 1886, troops were called into the town. However, during the riot, only two or three people were killed and seventeen were injured.² The Muslims destroyed a Hindu temple breaking the idols into

1. F.A. Hatchell, Sion, House, Powis Square, Bayswater, London, to Horace Walpole, Under Secy. of State, 10 October 1886, J and P Dept., File 1566, 1886, Vol. 185.

2. Ibid.

pieces.¹ "The recent religious riots", commented The Times of London "appear to have left a considerable feeling of bitterness behind. The Hindu cloth merchants of that city have united to refuse to sell to or hold any dealings with the Muhamedans, and the symptoms of boycotting and conspiracy are spreading to other trades."²

In Hoshiarpur, a district of the Punjab, tension between the Hindus and the Muslims started in 1885 when several Muslims sacrificed four cows in public places, and a riot started in which one Muslim was beaten to death by Hindu villagers.³ At Hariana in Hoshiarpur, on the Bakra-Id day, 1885, a gazi sacrificed a cow in a public place. A Hindu Jat killed the gazi on the spot.⁴ Two maulvis were also dismissed by the Government for sacrificing cows in a public place. These incidents

-
1. W.M. Young, Secy. to Govt., Punjab, to Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi Div., Lahore, 8 January 1887, L.No. 52, J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887, Vol. 211;
Also The Delhi Gazette, 6, 7 and 9 October 1886, and The Pioneer, 6 October 1886.
 2. The Times, 29 November 1886.
 3. The Aftab-i-Hind, 26 September 1885: N.W.P.N.N.R., 1885; Also, The Mittra Vilas, 28 September 1885: Ibid.
 4. The Ghamkhar-i-Hind, 10 October 1885: Ibid.

embittered the Muslims against the Hindus. However, on 9 October 1886, the Muslims while carrying a Muharram procession through the town of Hoshiarpur, encountered a Hindu brahmani bull procession, and the Muslims thought that the Hindus were deliberately trying to obstruct their Muharram procession.¹ Consequently, a riot followed in which both sides freely used sticks and stones. Shops in the immediate vicinity were looted. The police force was overpowered for a time and the town was demoralised for the next two days during which reprisals were taken by both sides. Many people were wounded and one Brahmin was killed when trying to lock his shop.² Another man died, when the police were compelled to open fire on the mob.³ To maintain the peace, a military detachment patrolled the street for some days. However,

-
1. In Hoshiarpur town, while the Muslims were 10,641, the Hindus were 9,968. Table No. XX, Census Report of India, 1881, Punjab, Vol. 13, p.2.
 2. Col. G. Gordon Young, Commissioner and Superintendent, Jullunder Div., to Secy. to Govt., Punjab, Jullunder, 19 November 1886, L.No. 3562, J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887; Vol. 211.
 3. Ibid.

though the immediate cause of the Hoshiarpur riot was a clash between brahmini bull and tazia processions, the tension between the Hindus and the Muslims had been aroused by cow-sacrifices since 1885. The procession was an excuse for the expression of hostility which both the communities were harbouring after each other.

Tension between the two communities also ran high at Ludhiana, and other places in the Punjab. The cause of the Ludhiana riot was again cow-sacrifice. At Ludhiana in 1886, a few days before the Bakra-Id, some Hindus petitioned G.E. Wakefield, Deputy Commissioner, that the Muslims were intending to sacrifice a cow in every masjid of the town on the Bakra-Id day.¹ On 10 September 1886, several Hindus met the Deputy Commissioner and showed him beef to prove that the rumour was not without foundation. The Muslims considered this an unreasonable interference in their religious rites and some attacked the Hindus in the main street. In an inquiry Reid, the District Superintendent of Police, found that Hindus had been beaten severely.²

1. Wakefield to Commissioner and Superintendent, Jullundar Div., 21 February 1887, L.No. ,
J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887, Vol. 211.

2. Ibid.

The riot continued for four hours. The Hindus were reported to have begun the riot.

In 1887, a quarrel took place between the Hindus and the Muslims in Dholka, the chief town of the Sub division of the same name in Ahmedabad district, Gujarat, after the Muslims had slaughtered a cow in the market on Bakra-Id day.¹ The Dholka police had failed to take precautionary measures beforehand, and wide spread rioting ensued, but no deaths were reported.² There seems to be no evidence as to why the Dholka Muslims chose to act so provocatively.

In 1889, a serious riot took place in Rohtak in the Punjab.³ Though the riot occurred during a Muslim procession, the real cause was still the cow-sacrifice.⁴ On Bakra-Id day, 8 August 1889, a

1. The Hitichchhu of Ahmedabad, 8 September 1887: Bom. N.N.R., 1887.

2. Ibid.

3. In the town of Rohtak, the Hindus numbered 8,180, the Muslims 6,929. Table No. XX, Census Report of India, 1881, Punjab, Vol. 13.

4. Lansdowne to Queen Empress, 21 September 1889, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Queen in England, 1888 to 1894, L.No. 16.

Muslim washerman sacrificed a cow in front of his house. The Hindus were provoked. The Deputy Commissioner ordered the carcass of the animal to be removed to the slaughter house. Tension mounted during the next few days and many closed their shops in fear. A temporary reconciliation was attempted on 4 September, but on the following day, while the Hindus were carrying their God in what was known as the Jal hulni procession, the Muslims threw what was thought to be an ox tail on the procession, which promptly broke up leaving the thakurjee on the road. As a precautionary measure, the Muharram procession which was due the next day was postponed by the District Magistrate. However, the day after, the Muharram procession took place, and, despite a police guard, a number of Hindu Jats attacked the procession. One man was killed by a blow from a lathi and thirteen people were wounded by sword cuts.¹ Seventy three were arrested for rioting, of whom thirty five were

1. H.C. Fanshawe, Junior Secy. to Govt., Punjab and its dependencies, to A.P. MacDonell, Secy. to Govt. of India, Lahore, 7 February 1890, L.No. 167, J and P Dept., File 822, 1890, Vol. 277.

sentenced to short terms of imprisonment.¹

Afterward, the atmosphere became more tense.

For some time the Hindus kept their shops closed.²

This riot led to "a certain amount of tension and excitement in other places."³ Many people left the town and its internal business came to a standstill. The situation was controlled by reinforcements of police from Delhi.

As in other provinces, so in Bengal, the two communities came into open hostility on the question of cow slaughter. In the 1890's there were several disturbances in Bengal, with Muslim villages defying the orders of their Hindu zamindars by sacrificing cattle. In Darbhanga a serious threat of rioting after the killing of a cow was only averted by the prompt action of the

-
1. H.C. Fanshawe, Junior Secy. to Govt., Punjab and its dependencies, to A.P. MacDonell, Secy. to Govt. of India, Lahore, 7 February 1890, L.No. 167, J and P Dept., File 822, 1890, Vol. 277.
 2. Col. L.J.H. Grey, Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi Div., to Offg. Secy. to Govt., Punjab, Delhi, 2 December 1889, L.No. 503 A.H.M., J and P Dept., File 822, 1890, Vol. 277.
 3. Lansdowne to Cross, 23 September 1889, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1889, L.No. 53.

district magistrate. The Hindu press then took up the question. On 24 August 1890 the Dainik-O-Samachar Chandrika complained that the Muslims were deliberately provoking the Hindus by sacrificing cows in public,¹ and three days later the Hindu Ranjika repeated the charge of open hostility,² as did the Surabhi-o-Pataka on 29 August.³ However, at Darbhanga, the twelve or so persons arrested by the magistrate were Hindus. The Muslim press then replied with counter charges that the Muslims had been most unjustly oppressed in Darbhanga, and that various powerful Hindu zamindars of Bengal had prohibited their Muslim ryots from slaughtering cows.⁴ The Muslim paper, the Sudhakar, which made these allegations, also declared that the zamindars were mercilessly torturing their Muslim ryots.⁵

-
1. The Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika, 24 August 1890: Beng. N.N.R. 1890.
 2. The Hindu Ranjika, 27 August 1890: Ibid.
 3. The Surabhi-o-Pataka, 29 August 1890: Ibid.
 4. The names of some oppressive zamindars: the Raja of Bhawal of Dacca district, the Hindu Babus of Bhagyakul, the zamindars of Bikrampore of Dacca district, the zamindars of Kagmari, Muktagacha and other places of Mymensingh districts, the Babus of Narail sub-division in Jessore district, the zamindars of Putia, Rajshahi. The Sudhakar, 29 August 1890: Beng. N.N.R. 1890.
 5. Ibid.

Another Muslim paper, the Ahmadi specifically complained that Babu Hemchandra, the zamindar of Kagmari, and Rani Hementa Kumari of Putia were persecuting their Muslim ryots for having sacrificed cows, and that as a result many Muslim ryots were leaving their homes and taking refuge elsewhere.¹

In 1891, there was a serious riot in Gaya in Bihar.² On the Bakra-Id day, July 1891, several Muslims of Mubarpure in Shahebgani attempted to sacrifice cows in front of a Brahmin's house. The Brahmin, Maina Pandit, informed the police.³ At the request of the Deputy Commissioner, the Muslims did not sacrifice the cows, but in spite of this, the anger of the Hindus was not appeased and some Hindus incited their co-religionists to attack the Muslims. A riot ensued. It lasted from about half past five in the afternoon to eight o'clock in the evening. The Muslims, who

-
1. The Ahmadi, 30 November 1890: Beng. N.N.R. 1890.
 2. In the town of Gaya in Bihar, the Hindus were 63,046, the Muslims were 17,147. Table V, Census Report of India, 1891, Bengal, Pt. I, Vol. 3, p.30.
 3. The Samaya, 7 August 1891: Beng. N.N.R. 1891.

were few in number, were beaten by the Hindus. Flushed with success, the Hindus attacked and looted the houses of some respectable Muslims; and broke down the masjid minarets. Complete anarchy reigned in the town for over four hours. The police arrested twenty two people.¹ One person died and seventeen men were sent to hospital in a dangerous condition.² The next day the Hindus again appeared, but this time the Muslim repulsed them. There was a rumour that the Hindu police officers secretly assisted the Hindus and the Hindu Deputy Magistrate was not easily found when information of the riot was brought to him.³ The Magistrate, it was alleged, purposely delayed prompt action to quell the disturbance. It is difficult to say how far these rumours were true, but even The Hindi Bangavasi remarked that the Gaya disturbance was mainly due to the police failing to discharge their duties.⁴

1. The Sanjivani, 7 August 1891: Beng. N.N.R. 1891.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. The Hindi Bangavasi, 3 August 1891: Beng. N.N.R. 1891.

Besides cow-killing, the concurrence of the Hindu festival of Durga Puja and Muharram caused riots in many parts of India.¹ A disturbance took place in Etawah, a Hindu majority district of the North Western Provinces, in 1886.² At the end of 1885, Fisher, the then Magistrate, attempted to bring about an agreement between the two communities regarding the processions of Durga Puja and Muharram. He adopted a Muslim proposal that if the Hindus would abstain from music and shouting while the Muslim procession was in progress, the Muslims would not interfere in any way with the Hindu procession. This measure aggrieved the Hindus as they were prevented from playing music. Consequently, they refused to take out their procession in 1885. They appealed to the Commissioner of Agra Division for the harmonious settlement of the differences during the following years. In 1886, the Commissioner of

-
1. The Annual Register, Journal, 1885, Vol.127, p.324.
 2. In Etawah town, while the Hindus were 23,552, the Muslims were 10,289. Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1881-82 to 1890-91. P.P., 1892, Vol.LXXXVI, C.6736.

Agra Division after consulting the Magistrate of Etawah removed the restrictions that had been placed upon the Hindus.¹ This created an unfavourable reaction among the Muslims. From 21 September to 30 September 1886, a large body of 2,000 Muslims gathered at the spot where Hindu music was to be played.² Although armed with lathies, the Commissioner of Agra Division reported: "They were not at first, as it seems to me, prepared to use violence."³ They hoped to procure by tumult the cancellation of the orders to which they objected. The failure of their object led them to attack the Hindu procession.⁴ But little violence occurred, no Hindu was struck, no shop was looted, and the crowd was more heated than openly violent.⁵

In 1886, a collision between the Hindus and

-
1. J. Woodburn, Chief Secy. to Govt., N.W.P. and Oudh, to Commissioner, Agra Div., Lucknow, 10 November 1886, L.No. 1142-III-784, J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887, Vol.211.
 2. Commissioner, Agra Div., to Chief Secy. to Govt., N.W.P. and Oudh, 3 November 1886, L.No. 545-XIII-13, Ibid.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid.

the Muslims took place at Alapur, a small town in the Budaun district in the United Provinces. Two men were killed, before the police could intervene.¹

In the town of Ambala, in September 1886, a Hindu-Muslim riot seemed imminent because of the coincidence of the Muslim Id and Hindu Bawan Dawadsi festivals.² The Mandi (temple), from where Hindu processions were to start, was immediately in front of an old and venerated Muslim shrine - the Lakki Shah tomb - at which a large number of Muslims assembled for prayer; before the Id day, on 9 September 1886, the Muslims gathered there to offer prayer and they were roasting beef for food and flying religious

-
1. J. Woodburn, Chief Secy. to Govt., N.W.P. and Oudh, to Offg. Secy. to Govt. of India, 15 November 1886, L.No. 1143-III-784, J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887, Vol.211.
 2. W.M. Young, Secy. to Govt., Punjab, to Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi Div., Lahore, 8 January 1887, L.No.51, Ibid.
Ambala is a district of the Punjab. In Ambala town, while the Hindus were 34,522, the Muslims were 27,115. Table No.XX, Census Report of India, 1881, Punjab, Vol.13, p.2.

flags.¹ The Hindus, on the other hand, assembled in the Mandi for worship and to take out a procession. In order to prevent a riot A. R. Bulman, Deputy Commissioner, asked the Hindus to change their procession route, particularly to avoid the Phatranka Bazar Street, which was entirely inhabited by the Muslims; moreover, near Phatranka Bazar was a Muslim shrine, Shah Jiwan's tomb, where on every Thursday there was always an assemblage of Muslims.² The Hindus did not accept the order with grace. On 10 September 1886, the Muslims celebrated their Id festival and carried beef in carts and baskets through the public road. This wounded the feelings of the Hindus.³ About 2,000 Hindus assembled near the temple to take action against the Muslims.⁴ This time a

1. The Hindu residents of Ambala city to Lt. Governor, Punjab, 19 September 1886, J and P Dept., File 1575, 1887, Vol.211.

2. Bulman to Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi Div., 28 October 1886, L.No. 950, Ibid.

3. The Sanjivani, 2 October 1886: Beng. N.N.R., 1886.

4. Ibid.

riot appeared unavoidable. The Deputy Commissioner, considering such a large gathering of Hindus to be an unlawful assembly, ordered them to disperse. The order was not obeyed.¹ As a result, the Deputy Commissioner arrested some fifty Hindus, and, because the routes of the rival processions were carefully prescribed beforehand by the Deputy Commissioner, no collision actually occurred, though many rich inhabitants were taken into custody.²

In 1888, at the town of Pathardi in the Ahmedabad district in Gujarat, Hindu and Muslim religious festivals fell by coincidence on the same date.³ The Hindus did all in their power to obstruct the Muslim procession from passing along the route which it had followed in former years and for this purpose placed a number of large

1. Bulman to Commissioner and Superintendent, Delhi Div., 28 October 1886, L.No. 950, Op. cit.

2. Ibid.

3. In Pathardi Hindus were 85.2%, while the Muslims were 9.8% of the population. Census Report of India, 1881, Bombay, Vol.4, p.44.

stones on the route.¹ On the stones they wrote that these were the places sacred to their own religion, which would be defiled, if the procession of Muslims passed along them.²

In 1889, during the festival of Phudol³ and Muharram, there occurred a serious quarrel between the Hindus and the Muslims at Thorn, a town of ^{fahsil} Rewari in the district of Gurgaon in the Punjab.⁴

The main occasions for communal riots were provided by cow-sacrifice at the Bakra-Id festival and by the taking out of religious processions by the two communities. Once hostile feelings had been aroused, however, other events served to spark off communal violence. Thus a communal riot took place on the eve of 1885 at Maliyapuram town

1. R.H. Vincent, Acting Commissioner of Police, Bombay, to G.C. Whitworth, Acting Secy. to Govt., Bombay, 9 September 1893. P.P. 1893-94, Vol.LXIII, Paper No. 538, p.26.

2. Ibid.

3. Phuldol is a religious festival of the Hindus.

4. In 1881, in Gurgaon district of the Punjab, while the Hindus numbered 499,373, the Muslims were 242,548.

in Malabar district of Madras on the question of false apostasy.¹ The alleged cause of the riot was that a Hindu Ramen became Muslim in order to marry a Muslim woman. After the marriage, he reverted to Hinduism, thus exciting the Moplas.² On the night of 26 December 1884, the Moplas attacked the Hindus, set their houses on fire and marched on to the house of a rich Brahmin, whom they murdered. They tried to enter the temple at Munjeri but by this time the troops had arrived.³ Five rioters were killed and seven arrested.

Again, in 1889, another riot occurred in a tribal area of Dera Ghazi Khan, a district of the Punjab. This was over the conversion of a Hindu to Islam. The local Muslims celebrated the conversion with great rejoicings and took the convert in procession. The Hindus were provoked. They "rose up by hundreds, armed with sticks

1. The Pioneer, 5 January 1885.

2. The name Mopla or Mappilla connoted the low class Muslims of the west coast. They might often be met on the roads and coffee plantations of Mysore. Ibid.;
Also, Census Report of Madras, 1871, Vol.7, pp.173-174.

3. Ibid.

and clubs."¹ The Muslims suffered heavily in the incident, mainly because there were large concentrations of Hindus in this area, although the district was predominantly Muslim.

The Times commented that these rival communities would very soon involve India "in civil war."²

Further, a serious riot occurred in Calcutta on 16 May 1891.³ The cause was a decree of the court. On 30 April 1891, a certain Suresh Chandra obtained from the court of Radha Krishna Sen, the Subordinate Judge of Alipore, a decree for the eviction of Aliar Khan, the Muslim owner of the Nilkaripara mosque in the suburban section of Ooltadingha.⁴ The Muslims had used this mosque for fourteen years.⁵ The decree-holder wanted to

-
1. The Times, 24 June 1889.
 2. Ibid.
 3. In Calcutta town, the Hindus were 444,845, while the Muslims were 203,173. Table V, Census Report of India, 1891, Bengal, Part I, Vol.3, p.26.
 4. John Edgar, Chief Secy. to Govt., Bengal, to Secy. to Govt. of India, Darjeeling, 23 May 1891, J and P Dept., File 1019, 1891, Vol.302.
 5. Commissioner of Police, Calcutta, to Pvt. Secy. to Viceroy, Telegram, 19 May 1891, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, January to June 1891, L.No. 530.

demolish the mosque. The owner of the mosque appealed for help to resist demolition.¹ The Muslims were infuriated. Some 2,000 Muslims, armed with lathies, suddenly assembled there at noon. The Bengal Police Superintendent and Muslim Inspectors were dangerously wounded with lathies.² One hundred and twelve men were arrested and thirty others were injured. The brother of the owner of the mosque, Amir Ali and one Indian constable died. C.A. Elliott,³ Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, wrote to the Viceroy: "The Calcutta riot is a fresh instance of the latent religious excitement of the country,

-
1. Commissioner of Police, Calcutta, to Pvt. Secy. to Viceroy, Telegram, 19 May 1891, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, January to June 1891, L.No. 530.
 2. Commissioner of Police, Calcutta, to Chief Secy. to Govt., Bengal, Telegram, 16 May 1891, J and P Dept., File 1019, 1891, Vol.302.
 3. Elliott, Sir Charles Alfred (1835-1911): Joined the East India Company, 1856; Assistant Commissioner in Oudh till 1863; Secretary to Government of N.W.P., 1870-77; Chief Commissioner of Assam, 1881; Chairman of committee of inquiry into Indian public expenditure, 1886; C.S.I., 1878; K.C.S.I., 1887; Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, 1890-95; retired, 1895; served on London School board, 1897-1900, and on education committee of London County Council, 1904-6.

ready to burst into a flame."¹ The Muslim press held the Subordinate Judge responsible for this riot. The Raisul Akhbari Murshidabad of Murshidabad found fault with the judgment of the Alipore Court, for, the paper commented, "no Court of law has the power to order the demolition of a masjid."² The Sudhakar of Calcutta defended the Muslims thus: "Mussulmans look upon their religion as their one true treasure on earth, and they do not mind sacrificing even their lives for its sake."³ The Urdu Guide and Darussaltanat, another Muslim newspaper of Calcutta, put the blame on the Subordinate Judge of Alipore: "The whole guilt of the affair ought to be laid upon the Subordinate Judge . . . , whose judgment brought about the disaster."⁴

The frequency of the riots caused great anxiety to the Government. The Queen anxiously

-
1. Elliott to Lansdowne, 21 May 1891, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with persons in India, January to June 1891, L.No. 538.
 2. The Raisul Akhbari Murshidabad, 1st June 1891; Beng. N.N.R. 1891.
 3. The Sudhakar, 5 June 1891: Ibid.
 4. The Urdu Guide and Darussaltanat, 19 June 1891: Ibid.

asked Her Viceroy:

"It would really be well if the Viceroy took, or rather caused to be taken, some extra measure to prevent this painful quarrelling, ... Could not the Viceroy arrange that the Hindus held no feast during the 13 days of the Muharrum? This would avoid all fighting and enable the Mahomedans to carry on their religious festival in peace. If this is impossible, perhaps the Viceroy would give strict orders to prevent the Mahomedans and Hindoos from interfering with one another, so that perfect justice is shown to both. But the former course would be for the best. The Queen-Empress would be glad if the Viceroy gave the subject his earnest attention, as these religious quarrels and fightings are really very serious."¹

The Viceroy, replying to the Queen, assured her that he had given his full attention to the "occasional outbreaks of hostility between

1. Queen to Lansdowne, Osborne, 18 July 1889, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Queen, 1888-94, L.No. 11.

Mahomedans and Hindus", and to the effects of the Gaurakhshini movement. Nevertheless collisions did occur. He promised that ".... With regard to the religious feasts, the dates of which it would be impossible to alter, and which coincide with the Moharram, every precaution will be taken to avoid collisions, and this will be done with perfect justice, as between the Mahomedans and Hindus."¹ As riots occurred frequently in the Punjab, the Government of India sanctioned on 15 July 1890 under Section 43 of the Punjab Laws Act, 1872, the issuing of certain rules for the regulation of the slaughter of kine and the sale of beef in the Punjab.² This was in accordance with the spirit of the existing practice allowing the slaughter of cows and the sale of beef in secluded areas. The slaughter of cows and the sale of beef might not take place

1. Lansdowne to Queen Empress, 16 August 1889, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Queen, 1888-94, L.No. 13.

2. C.J. Lyall, Offg. Secy. to Govt. of India, to Chief Secy. to Govt., Punjab, 10 July 1890, I.H.P.P., July 1890, Vol.3651, Prog. No. 335.

except under conditions prescribed by the Local Government.¹ In the rules prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor, cows should not be slaughtered in any town or on town lands, except in a place licensed for such purposes.² The license must be a written one granted by the Deputy Commissioner. Beef should not be hawked about or exposed for sale; the public slaughter-houses or shops, for the purpose, must be licensed; persons violating these rules, should be punished with six months imprisonment or with a fine of up to 300 rupees. After this, there seemed to occur no riot in the Punjab during the period under review.

However, while writing to Kimberley, the then Secretary of State for India, about the Gaurakhshini movement, Lansdowne commented that this movement was widespread, and it was organized

1. For details see I.H.P.P., July 1890, Vol.3651, Prog. No. 335.

2. The word "town" and "town lands" meant respectively all municipalities, cantonments and civil stations, also all markets which were within either the boundaries or the municipal limits of any town.

by men who wished to increase "our difficulties".¹
 The Viceroy had already received the opinions of the Government officials on the Gaurakhshini movement. On 21 June 1893, Crosthwaite wrote to Lansdowne: "The influence of these Cow Protection Associations is spreading and causing friction, and I believe there are few Hindus who do not sympathise with this movement."² Again, after a month, he informed Lansdowne that the anti-cow killing agitation was "alive and strong. ... These Gaurakhshini Sabhas are distinctly seditious societies in my opinion."³ On 24 June 1893, MacDonnell in Bengal also informed Lansdowne that the anti-kine killing movement had assumed "considerable magnitude, and needs attention."⁴

-
1. Lansdowne to Kimberley, 15 August 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1893, L.No. 50.
 2. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 21 June 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, January to June 1893, L.No. 629.
 3. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 20 July 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 35.
 4. MacDonnell to Lansdowne, 24 June 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, January to June 1893, L.No. 639.

On 4 August 1893, he again commented on the cow-killing agitation and emphasized the need to check it.¹ He thought that it was best to deal with it through the zamindars, keeping the police as much as possible in the background.² He argued that the feeling of intense animosity, which the cow-killing agitation excited, affected the individual members of the police as well as the strata of society from which they were drawn, and hence the police could not be trusted to act impartially.³ He referred to a disturbance in Bihar, which, he thought, would not have occurred "except for the misconduct of a Mahomedan Magistrate."⁴ He however did not mention the name and place of the Magistrate nor did he explain what that "misconduct" was. On 20 August 1893, Harris suggested to the Viceroy that in the interests of peace the Government should appeal to the Hindus, telling them

1. MacDonnell to Lansdowne, 4 August 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 86.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

"Of course, you may preach your own doctrine amongst your own people as much as you please, or amongst other creeds if you so do it as to be tolerated; but if you do it in such a way as to irritate or alarm others, and thereby cause a risk of the peace being broken, the police will move you on'." ¹

Crosthwaite urged upon the Viceroy that some control might advantageously be exercised on the circulation of false reports by newspapers. ² He reported to Lansdowne that the Morning Post, an English paper, edited by Englishmen at Allahabad, had recently published two false stories: one that the Muslims in Cawnpore threw a cow's head into a Hindu temple; the other that a Hindu judge in Budaon had been hacked to pieces by Muslims, because he had decided some dispute about a mosque against them. ³

-
1. Harris to Lansdowne, 20 August 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 154.
 2. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 5 September 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 206.
 3. Ibid. This newspaper is not available here.

He informed the Viceroy that both stories were erroneous and that these types of publication at that particular time were calculated to cause fear to the public.¹ He also mentioned that the editor could not be touched unless he could be proved to have "known the stories to be false", which was almost impossible to prove. Hence he suggested to the Viceroy that "This part of the law might be made more stringent with advantage."² Again, after one and a half months, he wrote to Lansdowne that these riots might be stopped, if the Government asked the upper classes, whom he believed to be the organisers of cow-protection societies, to consider the danger of such societies preaching in a way calculated to excite the fanaticism of the lower classes, and to cause hostility between the followers of different religions.³ Discussing the weakness of the police

1. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 5 September 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 206.

2. Ibid.

3. Crosthwaite to Lansdowne, 17 October 1893, Ibid., L.No. 394.

force, Lansdowne wrote to Crosthwaite:

"Our real weakness seems to lie in the scarcity and inexperience of our officers, and in the smallness of the force which we are able to put into the field at short notice when these troubles declare themselves without warning."¹

However, Lansdowne did not act at once to strengthen the law or reinforce the police. Instead he wrote to Kimberley, then Secretary of State, to ask whether, to prevent further riots, he should call the attention of the other Local Governments to section 43 of the Punjab Laws Act of 1872, regulating the slaughtering of cattle.² He added: "My own impression is that, unless there is a recrudescence of the riots, which I do not expect, it will be better not to attempt any special legislation."³

-
1. Lansdowne to Crosthwaite, 24 August 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with Persons in India, July 1893 to January 1894, L.No. 126.
 2. Lansdowne to Kimberley, 29 September 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1893, L.No. 61.
 3. Lansdowne to Kimberley, 18 October 1893, Ibid., L.No. 64A.

Kimberley wrote: "... unless there is a recrudescence of the riots, it is better not to have recourse to special legislation. Such legislation implies alarm, and should not be resorted to, unless there is absolute necessity."¹

On the same day while Kimberley was writing to Lansdowne, Lansdowne tried the effect of an appeal to the good will of the two major communities. To the Muslims, he said:

"Do you, in the exercise of your religious duties, take thought for the susceptibilities of your Hindu fellow-country men, perform your religious rites, but perform them reverently, unobtrusively and in such a manner as not to wound the feelings of your Hindu neighbours."²

At the same time, he advised the Hindus:

"By all means organise your Societies for protecting cattle from ill-treatment, spare no pains to secure that they shall be treated

-
1. Kimberley to Lansdowne, 10 November 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1893, L.No. 69.
 2. Speeches by the Marquis of Lansdowne, Viceroy and Governor General of India 1891-1894, Vol.11, p.605.

humanely and protected against the horrors of a lingering death when they are old and worn out; but, on the other hand, do not allow your Sabhas to be converted into Associations for organising the intimidation of your neighbours, and for spreading the poison of class hatred throughout your peaceful and industrious villages."¹

He appealed to the editors and proprietors of newspapers "whether British or vernacular, whether written for Hindu, or Muhamedan, or English readers, to show a calm and temperate spirit, both in their comments upon these disputes, and in their published descriptions of the facts."² Kimberley highly appreciated this speech of the Viceroy, because the Viceroy spoke so firmly and at the same time, in friendly and judicious terms on the Gaurakshini

1. Speeches by the Marquis of Lansdowne, op. cit., p.605.

2. Ibid., p.604.

movement.¹ He hoped that this speech might produce a good effect.² He fully agreed with Lansdowne that Government ought to avoid any sensational legislation at that moment; "the remedy would be worse than the disease", he commented.³

Thus it can be seen that most of the riots occurred during religious festivals. These riots took place mainly in the towns as the villagers were less affected by communal antagonism; their chief pre-occupations were "the timely arrival and seasonal distribution of the annual rains, the tillage of their fields, the gathering of their harvests, their dealings with their landlords and their money-lenders."⁴ Religious festivals were

-
1. Kimberley to Lansdowne, 17 November 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, 1893, L.No. 71.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Kimberley to Lansdowne, 24 November 1893, Ibid., L.No. 72.
 4. Mcpherson, S.H., 'The Origin and Growth of Communal Antagonism, especially between Hindus and Muslims, and the Communal award' - Political India 1832-1932, edited by J. Cumming, p.119.

their recreations. If these occasionally led to strife and bloodshed, normal relations were resumed as soon as "the lava glow of passion subsides."¹ The town people were more communal than the villagers, for life was more complicated in the town. In town, temple and mosques were closer together. There was more danger of collision in the narrow streets. Moreover, there was in the towns a larger admixture of the rowdy turbulent elements which loved disorder for its own sake and whenever a riot occurred, the situation was worsened by their presence.²

This brief record of communal conflicts, in which only the most prominent incidents have been mentioned, creates a dark page in Indian history. But the record would often have been blacker if the areas of disturbance and the extent of the casualties had not been closely limited by the united efforts of the magistracy and the police.³ Throughout these

1. Mcpherson, S.H., Op. cit., p.118.

2. Ibid., p.118.

3. Ibid.

troubles, the work of law enforcement officers
won the highest praise.

Conclusion

It can be seen that Hindus and Muslims in the period down to 1885 were able on many occasions to work in harmony and jointly to bring pressure to bear upon the Government of India for the relief of grievances felt by all Indians in common; they worked together to help the people during the Bombay famine in 1876; they urged the Government to repeal the Arms Act and the Vernacular Press Act, and argued for removing the difference of powers between the European and Indian judges and ^{against} ~~for~~ lowering the age-limit for the Indian civil service examinations. Nevertheless, the growth of specifically Muslim organisations, and the reservations Muslims expressed about an undiluted application of the principle of election to Local Self Government reveal that inter-communal harmony and co-operation was precariously based. In the next decade various forces were to destroy that harmony and weaken if not preclude co-operation.

The appearance of revivalist Hindu religious organizations such as the Arya Samaj, founded by Swami Dayananda to reform Hindu society, came in the

middle years of our period to destroy existing communal harmony. By its stress upon the Hinduness of India, and the alien nature of Islam and Christianity, and therefore of Muslims and Christians, the Arya Samaj made for a growth of communal self-consciousness, and of hostility between Hindus and Muslims. In the political field slow but appreciable movement towards self-rule for India brought to the surface inherent political conflict between the Muslim and Hindu communities. The foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885, and its success in capturing the imagination of the Indian middle classes and in securing the attention of the British Government in India was particularly important in this respect. The Congress had a majority of Hindus in its membership, and their demand for the introduction of a representative system of government was a demand for majority rule, which of necessity would be a Hindu majority in India as a whole. Nevertheless the Hindu leaders of the Congress movement believed that without continued Muslim co-operation they could not achieve the success they wished for. They therefore emphasized Indian unity and stressed that Hindus and Muslims were "all one, all brethren". As Surendranath

Banerjea has shown they took practical steps to ensure Muslim co-operation: as he writes in his A Nation in Making: "We were straining every nerve to secure the co-operation of our Mohamedan fellow-countrymen in this great national work. We sometimes paid the fares of Mohamedan delegates and offered them other facilities."¹ They also sought to encourage Muslim co-operation by electing distinguished Muslims such as Badruddin Tyabji to high office in their annual sessions, and to still Muslim fears by writing safeguards for communal interests into the Congress constitution.

Despite these efforts by Hindu leaders in Congress, the Muslims in the main were not induced to attend its sessions and share in its work in numbers commensurate with the size of the Muslim community. Muslims like Syed Ahmed Khan and Mian Mohamed Shafi betrayed alarm at the growth of the Congress, and in public argument with such Muslim members of the Congress organisation as Tyabji and Sayani, argued that Muslims and Hindus often had divergent interests, and that to join Congress in pressing for the elective principle and

1. Banerjea, S.N., Op. cit., p.100.

increased self-government would mean for the Muslim submission to Hindu dominance. Conscious of the comparative poverty and educational backwardness of the Muslim community, leaders such as Syed Ahmed Khan successfully urged Muslims to keep out of the Congress.

Their arguments were reinforced by a growth of popular Muslim alarm and anger at the anti-Muslim preachings of the Arya Samaj and at the Gaurakhshini movement which it started. This Cow Protection movement rapidly spread across all North India, playing upon Hindu veneration of the cow, in order to create antagonism to the Muslims who slaughtered cattle for food and in fulfilling their religious duties. The Gaurakhshini movement thus served to heighten communal self-consciousness among both Hindus and Muslims and to increase ill will between them. The tension between the communities found expression in and was also further heightened by the series of inter-communal riots in the years following 1885 which frequently occurred during the religious festivals and processions of the rival communities. Such festivals - the Durga Puja and

Ramlila processions of the Hindus and the Muharram processions of the Muslims - were always moments of religious fervour, they now became moments of communal antagonism.

The Provincial and Supreme Governments became increasingly concerned by this rise in communal temper. However, the comment of Dr. Lethbridge, a member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council to Kimberley on the Gaurakhshini troubles: "...this movement makes all combination of the Hindus and Mahomedans impossible",¹ suggests that Government was not unaware of the possible political advantage to them of Hindu Muslim antipathy. Nevertheless the Government was not deterred from taking a definite step in 1892 towards an enlargement of Indian participation in government and an advance, hesitant and concealed, towards the introduction of the elective principle. The Muslims already aroused by conflict with the Hindus in social and religious matters, and alarmed by the growth of the Indian National Congress, now recognised as a body to be reckoned with even by the Imperial Parliament, could

1. Kimberley to Lansdowne, 25 August 1893, Lansdowne Papers, Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, January 1893 to January 1894, L.No.53.

not but react by further closing their ranks. It would not be very long before they were driven to found the Muslim League to voice their separatist political demands.

BibliographyA. Private PapersAT THE BRITISH MUSEUM1. Lansdowne PapersCorrespondence with the Queen in England,Year

1889 I.S.420/12

Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India,Years

1888 I.S.420/14

1889 "

1893 "

Correspondence with Persons in India,

	<u>Years</u>	
January to June	1889	I.S.420/16
January to June	1891	"
January to June	1893	"
July 1893 to January	1894	"

January to June 1891 "

January to June 1893 "

July 1893 to January 1894 "

Speeches by the Marquis of Lansdowne, Viceroy andGovernor General of India, 1891-1894,

Vol.11 I.S.420/17

2. Ripon PapersCorrespondence with the Secretary of State for India,Years

1880 I.S.290/5

1881 "

Telegrams to and from the Secretary of State for India,
1880-84, Vol.I. I.S.290/6

Correspondence with Persons in India,

	<u>Years</u>	
January to June	1881	I.S.290/8
January to June	1882	"
July to December	1882	"
January to June	1884	"
July to December	1884	"

AT THE INDIA OFFICE LIBRARY

3. Lytton Papers

Papers connected with the Indian Arms Act (xi of 1878),
Mss. Eur. E.218.

B. OFFICIAL RECORDS AT THE INDIA OFFICE LIBRARY, LONDON.

1. INDIAN HOME PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS.

1890

Vol. 3651.

2. INDIAN LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS.

1878

Vol. 1208.

1883

Vol. 2093.

3. JUDICIAL AND PUBLIC DEPARTMENT PAPERS.

1881

File 1947, Vol. 58.

1886

File 1566, Vol. 185.

1887

File 1575, Vol. 211.

1889

File 330, Vol. 245.

1890

File 822, Vol. 277.

1891

File 1019, Vol. 302.

C. HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Vol. 341, (Third Series), 11 February-4 March 1890.

Vol. 342, " , 5 March-26 March 1890.

Vol. I, (Fourth Series), 9 February-3 March 1892.

Vol. III, " , 28 March-2 May 1892.

D. PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS

- Parl. Paper, 1876, Vol.XXII, Paper No.C.1587: Twentieth Report of her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners together with Appendices.
- Parl. Paper, 1878, Vol.LVII, Paper No.C-2040: Copy of Correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India on the subject of Act No.IX of 1878, for the better control of publications in Oriental languages.
- Parl. Paper, 1878, Vol.LVII, Paper No.C-2078: Copy of the proceedings of the Council of India relating to the Vernacular Press Act.
- Parl. Paper, 1880, Vol.LIII, Paper No.402, Sess.2: Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material progress and condition of India 1878-9.
- Parl. Paper, 1883, Vol.LI, Paper No.93-1: Correspondence between the Secretary of State for India in Council, the Government of India, and the various Local Governments, on the proposed Measures for the Extension of Local Government in India.
- Parl. Paper, 1884, Vol.60, Paper No.3877: Report of the Proceedings of a Public meeting of Indian Inhabitants of Bombay, 1883.

- Parl. Paper, 1884-85, Vol.LVIII, Paper No.C.4580:
Correspondence between the Government
of India and the Secretary of State for
India relating to the age at which
candidates for civil service of India
are admitted for competition in England.
- Parl. Paper, 1888, Vol.XLVIII, Paper No.C.5327: Report
of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87.
- Parl. Paper, 1892, Vol.LXXXVI, Paper No.C.6736: Statistical
Abstract relating to British India from
1881-1882 to 1890-91.
- Parl. Paper, 1893-94, Vol.LXIII, Paper No.538; Despatch,
Reports relating to the recent conflicts
between Hindus and Mahammadans in India,
and particularly to the causes which led
to them.
- Parl. Paper, 1893-94, Vol.LXIV, Paper No.7181: Census
Report of India, 1891.
- Parl. Paper, 1918, Vol.8, Paper No.Cd.9109: Report on
the Indian Constitutional Reforms.

E. GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Administrative Report of the Government of Bengal,
1874-75.

Census of India, 1881, Vol. 1.

Census of Madras, 1871, Vol. 7.

Census of North Western Provinces and Oudh, 1881,
Vol. 12.

Census of Punjab, 1881, Vol. 13.

Proceedings of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87,
Vol. II, V, VI, Calcutta, 1887.

Report of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87, Vol. I,
Calcutta, 1887.

Selections from the Records of the Government of India
in the Public Works Department, 1886, No. 205, Home
Department serial No. 2, Calcutta, 1886.

F. NATIVE NEWSPAPER REPORTS

Bengal Native Newspaper Reports, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1890,
1891.

Bombay Native Newspaper Reports, 1887, 1888, 1893.

Madras Native Newspaper Reports, 1893.

North Western Provinces Native Newspaper Reports, 1885.

G. RULES, REPORTS, MEMORIALS AND PETITIONS OF VARIOUS ASSOCIATIONS

Memorial to the Right Honourable Lord Stanley, Secretary of State for India, 1854. Madras, 1859, B.M.

Minute of the Proceedings of the Bombay Association, Bombay, 1852, B.M.

Petition to the Imperial Parliament from the Members of the Madras Native Association and Other Native Inhabitants of Madras Presidency, Madras, 1852, B.M.

Petition to Parliament from the Members of the Bombay Association, and other native inhabitants of the Bombay Presidency, relative to the British-Indian Government. Bombay, 1852, B.M.

Proceedings of the Muhammadan Literary Society, Calcutta, 1871. B.M.

Prospectus of Bengal Social Sciences Association, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1867. B.M.

Report of the Central National Muhammadan Association, 1882-1885. B.M.

Report of the Indian National Congress, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1892. B.M.

Rules of the Bombay Association, Bombay, 1852. B.M.

Second Report of the British Indian Association, Calcutta, 1854. I.O.L.

Transactions of Bengal Social Science Association,
Vol. 1-7, Calcutta, 1867-78. B.M.

H. TRACTS

Dar, P.B.N., India in England, Vol. II, Lucknow, 1889,
I.O.L., Tract 733.

Khan, S.A., On the Present State of Indian Politics,
Allahabad, 1888, I.O.L., Tract 733.

Pal, B.C., The Indian National Congress, Lahore,
1887, I.O.L., Tract. 666.

I. GAZETTEER

Gazetteer of Delhi District, 1883-84, Calcutta.

J. NEWSPAPERS

The Aligarh Institute Gazette, Aligarh, 1877, 1878.

The Bengalee, Calcutta, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1880, 1885,
1888, 1891.

The Civil and Military Gazette, Lahore, 1891.

The Delhi Gazette, Delhi, 1886.

The Hindoo Patriot, Calcutta, 1877, 1878, 1882.

The Pioneer, Allahabad, 1878, 1885, 1886, 1888, 1902.

The Statesman, Calcutta, 1886, 1891.

The Times of London, 1886, 1889.

K. PERIODICALS

The Annual Register, (New Series), London, 1885, Vol. 127.

The Contemporary Review, London, 1888, Vol. 54,
1927, Vol. 131,
1931, Vol. 139.

The Indian Magazine, London, 1888.

Islamic Culture, Hyderabad, 1931, Vol. V,
1944, Vol. XVIII.

The Nineteenth Century, London, 1882, August, Vol. 12.

L. PRINTED WORKS

Bagal, J.C., History of the Indian Association 1876-1951,
Calcutta, 1953.

- Baljon, J.M.S., The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Leiden, 1949.
- Banerjea, S.N., A Nation in Making, Calcutta, 1925, (first ed.), Calcutta, 1963 (second ed.).
- Banerji, D.N., India's Nation Builders, London, 1919.
- Bharadwaja, C., Light of Truth or An English Translation of the Satyarth Prakash, Lahore, 1927, (third ed.).
- Bradley-Birt, F.B., Twelve Men of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century, Calcutta, 1910.
- Buckland, C.E., Bengal Under the Lieutenant Governors, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1901.
- " " Dictionary of Indian Biography, London, 1906.
- Chakrabarty, D., and
Bhattacharyya, C., Congress in Evolution, Calcutta, 1935.
- Cotton, H.J.S., New India or India in Transition, London, 1885, (first ed.).
- Cummings, J. (ed.), Political India 1832-1932, Oxford, 1932.
- Dawood, N.J., The Koran, Middlesex, 1956.
- Gibb, H.A.R., and
others Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam, Leiden. E.J. Brill, 1953.
- Gopal, R., Indian Muslims, A Political History 1858-1947, London, 1959.

- Gopal, S., The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon 1880-1884, Oxford, 1953.
- " " British Policy in India 1858-1905, Cambridge, 1965.
- Ghosh, P.C., The Development of the Indian National Congress 1892-1909, Calcutta, 1960.
- Graham, G.F.I., The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, K.G.S.I., London, 1908.
- Heimsath, C.H., Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, Princeton, 1964.
- Houtsma, M.Th., and others Encyclopaedia of Islam, Vol. IV, London, 1934.
- Hunter, W.W., The Earl of Mayo, Oxford, 1891.
- " " Imperial Gazetteer of India, 9 Vols., London, 1881, (first ed.).
- Lyall, S.A., The Life of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, 2 Vols., London, 1905.
- Manshardt, C., The Hindu-Muslim Problem in India, London, 1938.
- Mazumdar, A.C., Indian National Evolution, Madras, 1917, (second ed.).
- Mehrotra, S.R., India and the Commonwealth 1885-1929, London, 1965.

- Mukherjee, H., and U, India's Fight for Freedom or the Swadeshi movement, 1905-1906, Calcutta, 1958.
- Palit, R.C. (ed.), Speeches of Babu Surendranath Banerjea 1876-80, Vol. I., Calcutta, 1894.
- Prasad, D., An English Translation of the Satyarth Prakash, Lahore, 1908.
- Rai, L.L., The Arya Samaj, London, 1915.
- Rao, R.M.V., A Short history of the Indian National Congress, Delhi, 1959.
- Roy, N.C., The Civil Service in India, Calcutta, 1958.
- Singh, C., The Life of Swami Dayananda Saraswati, Lahore, 1903.
- Smith, G., The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, 2 Vols., Oxford, 1961.
- Tinker, H.R., The Foundations of Local Self Government in India, Pakistan and Burma, London, 1954.
- Wedderburn, S.W., Allan Octavian Hume, C.B., "Father of the Indian National Congress" 1829 to 1912, London, 1913, (first ed.).

- Wilson, H.H., A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue terms and Useful Words occurring in Official Documents, London, 1855.
- Wolpert, S.A., Tilak and Gokhale: Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India. Berkeley, 1962.

M. LONDON UNIVERSITY THESES (UNPUBLISHED)

- Jones, I.M., The origin and development to 1892 of the Indian National Congress, M.A., 1947.
- Khatun, L., Some Aspects of The Social History of Bengal with special reference to the Muslims, 1854-1884, M.A., 1955.
- Zakaria, R.A., The Indian Muslims, 1885-1906: A Political Analysis, Ph.D., 1948.

Appendix

List of Native owned vernacular newspapers. These are only available in Government extracts.

Bengal

No. Name of Newspapers	Places of Publication	Edition	Circulation
<u>Bengali</u>			
1. Ahmedi	Tangail, Mymensingh	Fortnightly	600
2. Bangavasi	Calcutta	Weekly	20,000
3. Charu Varta	Sherepore, Mymensingh	Do	400
4. Chattle Gazette	Calcutta	Do	-
5. Dainik-o- Samachar Chandrika	Ditto	Daily	1000
6. Hindu Ranjika	Rajshahi	Weekly	212
7. Sahachar	Calcutta	Do	800-1000
8. Samaya	Ditto	Do	3000
9. Sanjivani	Ditto	Do	4000
10. Sudhakar	Ditto	Do	3100
11. Surabhi-o- Pataka	Ditto	Do	-
<u>Hindi</u>			
12. Behar Bandhu	Bankipur	Weekly	500
13. Hindi Bangavasi	Calcutta	Do	-

No.	Name of Newspapers	Places of Publication	Edition	Circulation
<u>Urdu</u>				
14.	Murshidabad Akhbari	Murshidabad	Weekly	-
15.	Urdu Guide and Darussaltanat	Calcutta	Do	340
<u>Bombay</u>				
<u>Anglo-Gujarati</u>				
1.	Hitichchhu	Ahmedabad	Weekly	550
<u>Anglo-Marathi</u>				
2.	Dnyanondaya	Poona	Bi-weekly	500
3.	Dnyan Prakash	Bombay	Weekly	400
4.	Indu Prakash	Ditto	Do	925
<u>Gujarati</u>				
5.	Bombay Samachar	Bombay	Daily	1340
6.	Parsi Punch	Ditto	Weekly	225
7.	Rast Goftar	Ditto	Do	1786
<u>Marathi</u>				
8.	Poona Vaibhav	Poona	Do	1250

No. Name of Newspapers	Places of Publication	Edition	Circulation
<u>Madras</u>			
<u>Malayalam</u>			
1. Kerala Patrika	Calcut, Madras	Weekly	900
<u>North Western Provinces</u>			
<u>Hindi</u>			
1. Mittra Vilas	Lahore	Weekly	270
<u>Urdu-English</u>			
2. Gham-Khwar-i-Hind	Ditto	Do	300
<u>Urdu</u>			
3. Aftabi-i-Hind	Jullunder	Do	150