Chapter V
Gokhale in the Imperial Council - Educational and other Social and General Issues

Introduction – Influences and Gokhale’s educational thought

Gokhale’s work in the field of education can be divided into two parts. The first part includes his twenty years service as a life member of the Deccan Education Society (D.E.S.) from 1885 to 1904. The second part includes his promoting the cause of education as a member of the Council. Thus, a major part of his life was devoted to education proving the utmost importance that he attached to it.

Gokhale was attracted to the New English School (of D.E.S.) by the ideals and personalities of Tilak and Agarkar. The principles of selfless service and self-sacrifice projected by the founders of the Society influenced him so much that immediately after his retirement from the Society he established the Servants of India Society which resembled a missionary order much more than the D.E.S. He was however most influenced in his thoughts by Justice Ranade. It was Ranade who taught him to accept the role of educator – educating the people through memorials, through speeches (in and outside the Council) and through the press. Therefore, his outlook on education was a part of his general liberal outlook on politics, acquired through training under Ranade.

Among the western educationists, he was influenced by Dr. Wordsworth and Mr. Selby and even paid a tribute of recognition and gratitude to them in the Council. Professor Tews of Berlin who related popular education to national economic development also inspired him. Professor Tews concluded that only increased popular education could lead to increased economic activity in all branches of national production and more equal distribution of the proceeds of labour contributing to the general prosperity, social peace and the development of all the powers of the nation. Gokhale also advocated mass education for India’s economic prosperity.
The most important aspect of Gokhale’s educational thought was his belief in the State assuming the responsibility of mass education. Citing the examples of the western countries, he urged the British Government also to consider education as a State duty. This indicates his belief in the theory of welfare state and also his belief in the ineffectiveness of voluntary work in this field.

Gokhale considered all Western education as useful in India even if it was not of the highest type. So, what was important was infiltration of Western liberal ideas to modernize the Indian mind. As far as the primary education was concerned, he did not consider the differences of castes, scripts and languages as a problem in India. He merely wanted to increase the number of schools already teaching the different scripts and languages and for different communities. He therefore wanted the country’s regeneration through higher western education and socio-economic development of the poor and the backward classes through diffusion of elementary education among them.

He also attached importance to the role of educated classes in India. Though a microscopic minority, they were the brain of the country who not only thought for their ignorant countrymen but also taught them through the press. He therefore visualized the Indian politics to be exclusively a field for educated classes who were a link between the ignorant masses and the British Government. And it was because their number was so less that he urged the English educated Indians to acquire strong character and knowledge and set up a high standard of duty towards themselves. He strongly objected to the official attitude of alienating the educated classes and demanded a policy of conciliation towards them by associating them more and more with the country’s administration. He seemed to believe that since the numerical strength of educated men was less in India, these men had to rather broaden their interests than intensify any one single interest. Only when their numbers would increase, then would come the time for specialization. However, that doesn’t mean that he neglected the field of pure research for he himself founded the Ranade Institute of Economics for original research in that field.
Another important aspect of his educational thought was his complete opposition to
the student participation in political agitation, firstly because it tended to lower the dignity
and the responsible character of public life and impaired its true effectiveness, secondly
because it proved injurious to the intellectual and moral growth of the students and thirdly
because it gave the government an excuse to lay an axe at higher education.³ He however
favoured efficient political training to be imparted to the college students so as to help them
in forming sound political views and in cultivating a political sense.

The attraction of the student class towards the political teachings of the extremists
and the militant nationalists initiated Gokhale to appeal to the student class to practice
patience and restraint. However, while discouraging the students from direct political
action, he also provided them with an alternative field of action - that of humanitarian work
which needed numerous volunteers. The elevation of the depressed classes, higher
education of women, spread of technical and industrial education, co-operation,
 improvement of the economic conditions of the peasantry, promotion of closer relations
between the different communities were important works which required devoted workers.
He established the Servants of India Society which admitted capable young men and
trained them to work in various fields - political, industrial, social, educational and so on.
He thus tried to direct the youthful energies of the nation towards constructive work.

Gokhale also held some reservations on the subject of ‘national education’ as a part
of the Swadeshi programme. While he supported the extremist programme of building up
new national schools and colleges, he opposed the boycott of Government educational
institutions. He felt that building up of national institutions would require a lot of time and
money and before anything substantial was done, it was sheer madness to talk of boycotting
the then existing institutions. He therefore advocated not the destruction, but the
supplementing of the work done by Government in the field of education.⁴

As a member of the legislature, Gokhale worked for the promotion of education at
all levels and among all classes and communities through the combined participation of the
Indians and the British Government. His object was political, economic and social upliftment of Indians.

**General condition of education and its problems and Gokhale's views on it**

While the pace of educational advancement in India as compared to the other countries was slow, a great deterioration had also set in its qualitative aspect. The principle defect in the system was the fearful amount of cram that prevailed right from the first vernacular standard to the highest degree examination. The course of study at all levels was dull, mechanical and monotonous. The system of examination was also defective. The result of all this was the intellectual decadence among the educated men.

Gokhale believed that the object of all studies was two fold - acquirement of knowledge and its proper assimilation and the culture that one derived from such assimilation. He therefore was in favour of reducing cramming and of holding the exams in two or three installments so as to relieve the students.  

The British believed that the mediocrity of Indian education was due to the defective mentality of the pupils, who only had admirable memory but had no capacity to comprehend or apply. Under the recommendations of the Public Service Commission (1886-87), the government had admitted the native element to a large share in the Educational Department. Though the appointment of Indian teachers at lower salaries relieved the budget, it also lowered the standard of education. The University senates, which had earlier European preponderance, had also gradually acquired Indian character. The Indians on the other hand blamed the bad organization of the educational system as responsible for the mediocrity of education. Some believed that this was a purposeful act of the British in order to hinder the intellectual and consequently the political emancipation of Indians. The British believed that the English education that preached western ideas of liberalism, democracy, revolution etc. was responsible for the growing political unrest like the Poona murders of 1897. Hence the Government decided upon reforms in education and the result was the introduction of the Universities Bill in 1904.
Both the Government of India and the educated Indians were conscious of the underlying defects in the educational system. Hence, although the Simla Conference that met in September 1901 ‘to consider the system of education in India’ did not include any Indian and though its deliberations were kept confidential, yet Lord Curzon’s proposals therein of extending the vernacular education and technical instruction, of establishment of faculties of science and teachers training colleges and of making the Universities places of learning were welcomed by the Indians. It was believed that liberal provision of funds for encouragement of original research, the institution of a number of scholarships, an improvement in the status and mode of recruitment of the Educational Service and simplification of the examination system would follow. But soon, it was clear that the Government intended to expand its control over the higher education and dissociate the Indian element from it. The Government was alarmed at the activities of the educated classes and their capacity to influence the masses for political purpose. Hence, their aim was to discourage English and higher education by restricting the opportunities for higher education open to Indians. Therefore, when the report of the University Commission elaborating the University reform scheme was presented in June 1902, the Indians strongly objected to it. Protest meeting were held everywhere. A large and influential public meeting was held at Town Hall, Calcutta under Raja Peary Lal Mukherjee. The London India Society too condemned it and S.N. Banerjee moved for modifications in the Congress session.

It was on the basis of the recommendations of the University Commission Report that the Indian Universities Bill was introduced in the Council on 4th November 1903 by Mr. T. Raleigh (Law Member). He stated that the then existing University education had produced the ‘discontented B.As’ and a ‘great army of failed candidates’ and that this evil could be combated only by improving the methods of teaching and examination and for this the reconstitution of the senates of different Universities was essential. In pursuit of these aims, the senates were to be reformed, the number of Fellows fixed at one hundred and their period of tenure restricted to five years. However, what really enraged the Indians was
the provision that vested in the Government the right of ultimate decision on the
recognition of schools and the affiliation or disaffiliation of colleges.

In a bold and deliberate speech delivered on 18th December 1903, Gokhale
condemned the bill as a measure ‘to make the Universities virtually a Department of the
State.’ He pointed out that the bill was no remedy to cure the evils inherent in the
educational system and that the only way to convert the ‘discontented B.As’ from cold
critics into active allies of the Government was by steadily associating them with the
country’s administration. He also laid stress on the improvement in manning, money and
material as these being the three major factors for elevating the standard of University
education.

The Bill in the Select Committee

As the only representative to voice the Indian public opinion within the Select
Committee and also in the open Council, all India’s eye was directed to the young and
dynamic leadership of Gokhale. Earlier in the year he had strongly assailed the Official
Secrets Act and the Government was also fearing his attacks. Hence, the Government
armoured themselves well by nominating to the Council several Directors of Public
Instruction and prominent educationists from the different provinces to facilitate the easy
passage of the bill. A veteran educationist like Dr. Bhandarkar was purposefully pitted
against Gokhale. At the same time, it was believed that the Government had conferred the
C.I.E. on Gokhale to win him over to their side. The following letter by Gokhale to Hari
Bhau (Dixit) throws light on Gokhale’s stand on the bill, the pro-British leanings of his
colleague and also the uncompromising attitude of the Government – ‘The Select
Committee on the Universities Bill has practically twisted its deliberations and we are now
to meet on Monday next to consider the draft report. The amended bill is for all practical
purposes the same as the original one and requires to be opposed tooth and nail. Dr.
Bhandarkar supported the Government in the Select Committee most loyally and
sometimes even wanted to go further than the Government members.’
In the outspoken minute of dissent that he attached to its report, Gokhale discussed the real nature and the probable effects of the provisions of the bill and expressed that the effects of the provisions would be virtually to dissociate the Indian element from the government of the Universities in favour of the European Professors.\textsuperscript{11}

The Bill passed

The Bill came up for final discussion between 18\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} March 1904. Due to the large number of visitors that were attracted to hear the proceedings, the Council had to be held in the Durbar Hall of the Government House instead of in the Council Chamber. Around 65 amendments were proposed, mostly by Gokhale and Dr. Ashutosh Mukhopadhyaya and a few by Sri Ram Bahadur and Sayyed Muhammad. Except for two, all the other amendments were thrown out with mechanical regularity pointing out to the complete official control over the legislative matters. Inspite of the Viceroy's complaint, Gokhale took full advantage of the right of reply and tried to push forward his amendments but in vain. The utter disregard among the officials for the non-official view is clearly discernible in the debate that raged over the bill. The debate makes an interesting reading because of the several fiery arguments between Gokhale, Lord Curzon and Sir T.Raliegh.

Through the numerous amendments that Gokhale proposed, he tried to increase the number of Fellows in the Senates of the various Universities (150 instead of 50-100 in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and 100 instead of 40-75 in Punjab and Allahabad.) and extend their period of Fellowship from 5 to 10 years.\textsuperscript{12} His intention was to reduce the dominance of European Fellows and to include not only prominent but also non-academic educated and thoughtful Indians in the Senates.

He demanded the privilege of election to be conferred on Professors as a class instead of on Faculties to ensure their adequate representation in the Senates and proposed that the Chancellor should take into consideration the recommendations of Professors in making half his nominations.\textsuperscript{13} At the same time, he objected to the Statutory Guarantee
given to the Professional Element in the bill by giving half the seats in the Syndicates to them.\textsuperscript{14} He thus tried to avoid European domination in the Syndicates as well.

About franchise, he proposed a larger franchise for the Graduates - something between $1/3^{rd}$ to $1/4^{th}$ of the seats.\textsuperscript{15} He also urged for immediate introduction of election by Graduates in the Punjab and Allahabad Universities.

He strongly objected to the Chancellor's discretionary power of making additions to the list of ex-officio Fellows and of the removal of a Fellow for absence from the Senate meetings for one year. He proposed to take away these powers from the Chancellor.\textsuperscript{16} He also condemned the complete dissociation of the previous Senate from having any voice in the nomination of the first new Senates and proposed for reversal of this policy. In this regard, his demand that the Old Fellows be given a right to franchise for elections to Council and Local bodies was accepted.\textsuperscript{17}

Gokhale also protested against the appointment of the Bishops as ex-officio Fellows and that of the Director of Public Instruction as an ex-officio of the Syndicate.\textsuperscript{18} At the same time, he supported Dr. Mukhopadhyaya's amendment of creating a University Chest to which every Ordinary Fellow would contribute Rs. 50 annually, the amount thus accumulated to be spent on University works.\textsuperscript{19}

Finally, regards the affiliation of the colleges, he believed that the provisions in the bill were largely prejudicial of indigenous enterprise in the field of higher education.\textsuperscript{20} He therefore opposed Clause 21, which laid down the conditions that a College applying for affiliation had to fulfill. He opposed the Government rules with regards to the governing bodies of their colleges, the qualification of their teaching staff, their residential standards, and their financial resources. He also opposed the provision of direct affiliation by the Government because that would reduce the dignity and importance of the Senates and the Syndicates.\textsuperscript{21} He emphasized that regular college inspection by the Syndicate could be difficult and irksome and therefore proposed that it be restricted only to those colleges where efficiency was really in danger.\textsuperscript{22}
Gokhale’s ultimate aim in moving all these amendments was to relax the Government control over the Universities and to associate more Indians with its work. He did not wish the higher education in the country to be under the exclusive control of those who were not the permanent residents of the country. For the Senates and Syndicates dominated by Europeans who had only temporary interest in the land could easily abuse the powers of control conferred on them.

Though Gokhale failed to convert the official opinion to his point of view, yet he won a great praise from the Indian public opinion and the British friends of India. R.C. Dutt wrote to him saying that ‘...there are defeats which are more brilliant and more honourable than victories.... It is better to fight and fail in such a cause than not to fight at all.’ Lord Reay, who brought up the question of University Bill in the House of Lords found Gokhale’s speech most interesting and nothing less than violent. The Bill was however passed amidst great Indian protest and Gokhale regarded it as an emphatic condemnation of the educated classes of the country.

University Validation Bill

Although in the true spirit of constitutionalism, Gokhale had decided to bury his differences with the officials and in the best interests of the higher education had decided to co-operate with them to make the University Act a success, yet the very next year he found himself strongly resisting another high-handed measure of the Government. During the elections of the new Senates and Provisional Syndicates, the Chancellors of the various universities had made arbitrary use of their powers and had issued notifications, which were contrary to the Act. In Bombay, the illegal character of the notification was brought to notice yet the University authorities persisted in acting on them. The result was that several Fellows including Pherozeshah Mehta moved the High Court for redress. In Calcutta too, several illegalities were conducted. But instead of correcting these irregularities, the Government of India moved in the legislature a proposal to validate the action taken by the Universities.
Gokhale made an attempt to stop the passage of the University Validation Bill. On 10th February 1905, he moved an amendment to postpone the consideration of the bill sine die and also proposed to exclude Bombay University from the scope of the bill. But both the amendments were rejected. His opposition was based on three points. Firstly, the bill that was introduced to remedy, not any defect in the law, but a serious illegality committed in taking executive action under the law, tended to lower the dignity of the legislatures. Secondly, the bill interfered with a pending suit, which the private individuals regarded as the contempt of the Court. Thirdly, those who had protested against these illegalities had neither voted nor allowed themselves to be nominated as candidates for election. The passage of the bill would however also validate the election, which would mean disfranchising a large number of Fellows and accepting the elections made by a handful of men.

Gokhale’s speech on the occasion was unusually sharp-edged. He attacked the constitutional set up of the government as being marked by executive irresponsibility and legislative impotence. His speech was therefore bitterly resented by the officials. It, however, invited appreciation not only from his friends but also from his political adversary G.S. Khaparde.

Gokhale’s endeavours to endorse universal primary education in India

a) Resolution on primary education – 1910

Gokhale always insisted on the importance of mass education. He believed that though in individual instances primary education was not very resultant, but taken in the mass it meant for the bulk of the community a higher level of intelligence, a greater aptitude for skilled labour and a higher capacity for discriminating between right and wrong. It raised, in fact the whole tone of the life of large numbers. He thus pressed upon the Government of India to take up responsibility for the spread of free and compulsory primary education in the country. In his famous budget speech of 1906, he indicated various lines on which State action was necessary – one of them being extension of free and
primary education. He wanted the surpluses in the budget to be spent on educational advance. His suggestion was to make primary education free in all schools first and then to make it compulsory for both boys and girls throughout the country, gradually in a period of twenty years or so.\(^{28}\) The then Finance Member Mr. Baker keenly sympathized with the proposal and even issued a circular in November 1906 to the Local Governments on the subject. The local governments however found the remission of fees a sacrifice of a valuable source of income and so the question was dropped. However, Gokhale was intent to bring the question before the Council again and this he did on 18\(^{th}\) March 1910 by moving a resolution recommending, that a beginning be made in the direction of making elementary education free and compulsory and that a mixed Commission be appointed to frame definite proposals. The object of his resolution was to urge the State in India to accept the same responsibilities in regard to mass education that the Governments of most other civilized countries were already discharging.\(^ {29}\)

Taking a period of twenty-five years (i.e. from 1882 onwards), he pointed out to the utter backwardness of India as compared to the other nations as far as education was concerned. With statistical data, he proved that the percentage of school attendance was the least in India i.e. only 1.9%. Similarly, the funds for the purpose advanced only by Rs. 57 lakhs during this period whereas the increases in expenditure in other departments like military, civil and railways were in crores. He also illustrated the progress made by different countries like England, Japan, Russia and Philippines under different conditions and pointed to their better position as compared to India. He then concluded that the only solution to this problem was compulsory and free education and presented some practical proposals for the consideration of the Council. These were – to make education compulsory first in a few selected areas that is where 33% of the children were already in school, to extend compulsion first to boys and to make it free wherever it was compulsory, to appoint a separate Secretary for Education, to divide the cost of the scheme between the Government and the local bodies in the ratio of 2:1 and to make Education a divided head. He also gave a list of sources from which the finance for the scheme could be derived.\(^{30}\)
It should be noted that in 1906, Gokhale had favoured the policy of making primary education free and then gradually introducing compulsion. This was probably done in lieu of huge revenue surpluses in the budget. But 1910 was a period of financial stress and so he proposed to begin with compulsion and then proceed to abolition of fees. Thus, free and compulsory education was both integral part of his scheme. It did not matter which was achieved first.

In the debate that ensued, the Home Member took a sympathetic stand towards the question. However, Sir H. Stuart (the Home Secretary) calculated the cost of the scheme to be highly exorbitant. Mr. Chitnavis and Mr. Abdul Majid took objection to the principle of compulsion. Mr. Orange (Director General of Education) pointed out to the inability of the local bodies to provide sufficient accommodation and Mr. Quin (representative of Bombay Government) told the Council of the opposition of the villagers to education.

In his reply, Gokhale urged that the differences of opinion all the more necessitated the appointment of a Commission for inquiry into the state of things. However, the Government having promised that his scheme would be examined, Gokhale withdrew his resolution.

b) Mobilization of public opinion and further exertions in the Council

During the year that followed, the question was kept to the forefront by the Indian press. The Indian National Congress at its Allahabad session and the Muslim League at its Nagpur session in December 1910, passed resolutions in favour of free and compulsory primary education thus further strengthening the cause and giving it an all India character.

The official response also seemed favourable. Gokhale's proposal for a separate Secretary and eventually a separate Member for Education was met by establishing a full-fledged Department of Education with Sir Harcourt Butler in charge of it, and the Under Secretary of State for India, E.S. Montague, declared in July 1910 in the House of Commons that one of the objects of the creation of the new department was to spread
education throughout India. Lord Hardinge in his reply to the deputation led by Sir. W. Wedderburn, the 1910 Congress President, promised to deal with the educational problem most earnestly. In 1911, a non-recurring grant of one million sterling was announced for the purpose.

Encouraged by the favourable response, Gokhale prepared the ground for introduction of his bill on this subject. In his resolution on public expenditure moved on 25th January 1911, he urged for greater economy so that funds could be made available for the great expansion of educational effort that the country was looking forward to. He wanted to explore all the alternatives before resorting to additional taxation for educational purpose. On 7th March 1911, he opposed Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haque’s motion that aimed at remitting the fees payable in Primary schools. He stated that though he was personally in favour of free primary education, in lieu of opposition to it from Local Governments, he did not mind making it compulsory first. He thus tried to placate the Government in order to win their support for his own scheme which he was to present soon. Similarly on 21st March, he moved an amendment to clause 23 of the Indian Factories Bill making it obligatory on every factory owner, employing more than 20 children, to maintain an elementary school and provide them with free and compulsory instruction. Even though there was no compulsory law in India, he urged for this special provision on grounds of justice and humanity. However, inspite of the philanthropic solicitude which the supporters of the bill professed for the mill hand, they could not bring themselves to support Gokhale’s amendment. Mr. Dadabhoy and Mr. Madge opposed the motion and the Government merely stated that the matter would be kept prominently in view of the local governments. Finally, Gokhale withdrew his motion, as his object of presenting the Council of his own views on the subject had been attained. Through these three recommendations, he prepared the ground for the presentation of a revolutionary scheme for the extension of primary education in India.
c) **Elementary Education Bill**

On 16\(^{th}\) March 1911, Gokhale introduced the bill to make better provision for the extension of elementary education throughout India. The object of the bill was to provide for the gradual introduction of the principle of compulsion into the elementary education system of the country. It was based largely on the Irish Education Act of 1892 and the English Education Acts of 1870 and 1876.

In his speech, Gokhale put forward a vigorous demand for mass education in India urging the Government of India to take the entire responsibility for it like the other civilized nations. Whether it was the extent of literacy among the population, or the proportion of those actually at school, whether it was the system of education adopted or the amount of money expended on primary education, India, he pointed out, was far behind not only U.S.A, Australia and European countries but also lagging behind Asian countries like Japan, Philippines, Ceylon and even the State of Baroda within the borders of India itself. This comparative study supported by statistics indicate elaborate research undertaken for the purpose and adds credence to his arguments.

Education, which had been on voluntary basis in India, had not made much advance and so he stressed that only a resort to compulsion could ensure general diffusion of education. He therefore appealed that a beginning at least be made in that direction, the aim being to cover the whole field in about twenty years.

As regards the main provisions of the bill, firstly it was a purely permissive bill, merely proposing to empower Municipalities and District Boards, under certain circumstances, to introduce compulsion, in the first instance, in case of boys, and later, when the time was ripe, in the case of girls. In order to avoid any rash or injudicious action on the part of the Local bodies certain safeguards were suggested like – (a) the Government could make rule regards the extent to which education had to be already diffused in its area. Gokhale proposed this limit to be of 33%. (b) The local bodies, in order to come under the bill had to acquire previous sanction of the Local Government concerned.
Secondly, the period of compulsion was fixed at four years i.e. from 6 to 10 years of age (in other countries, it was six years). Thirdly, the bill made ample provision for exemption from compulsory attendance on reasonable grounds like sickness, domestic necessity, seasonal needs of agriculture and long-distanced schools. Fourthly, in order to combat the opposition of the Local Governments, the bill provided for gratuitous instruction only in the case of those children whose parents were very poor not earning more than Rs. 10/ month, all above that line being required to pay or not in the discretion of the Local Body. Fifthly, the bill provided for the creation of special school attendance committees to ensure the attendance at school including penal clauses against the defaulters. The penal provisions were however light. Sixthly, to ensure the fulfillment of the object of the bill, the employment of child labour below the age of ten was prohibited and penalty provided for any infringement of the provision. Lastly, the cost of the scheme was to be divided between the Local Government and the Local Body concerned, it being assumed that the Supreme Government would provide additional resources to the Local Government to enable it to defray its share, the Local Body on its side empowered to levy a special Education Rate, if necessary, to meet its share of expenditure. Gokhale was of the opinion that at least 2/3rd of the new expenditure should be borne by the State.

The attitude of the Government towards the bill seemed cautious but friendly and Mr. Butler promised allotment of more money for education. Though the principle of the bill was accepted by all, yet some members like Dadabhoy, Raja of Burdwan, Syed Shams-ul-Huda and Sasoon David objected to certain provisions of it. There were mainly three objections – (1) the District Boards with official influences would introduce compulsion even where people were not prepared for it, (2) the cess proposed to be levied would fall hard on the poor people and (3) the provision of extension of compulsion to girls. Gokhale however silenced his critics by stating that while the Local Government would have full control over the arbitrary exercise of power by the local bodies, the inclusion of girls within the scope of the bill was only a future undertaking.

The bill was before the people for a year and received tremendous response from all over India. While the majority of the Indian press backed the bill, even the major Anglo-
Indian newspapers like the Times of India – Bombay, Indian Daily News-Calcutta and Madras Times of Madras supported it. Numerous public meetings were held in favour of the bill and both the Indian National Congress and the Moslem League extended their support. Privately, Gokhale received several letters (some supporting the bill and some offering suggestions) from friends and advisors like S. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, V.S. Ramaswami, L.A. Govindaraghava Aiyar, M. Ramachandra Rao, T.V. Sheshagiri Iyer, Rangacharry, K.K. Menon, D.E. Wacha, Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy, Sardar Harnam Singh Ahluwalia, K.C. Mudliar, G.V. Joshi and so on. Besides, public opinion was mobilized by several of his associates like A. Basu in Bengal, Sachchidananda Sinha in Bihar and Orissa and Bhupendranath Basu in England. Elementary Education Leagues were established in various towns and Gokhale himself undertook a tour of India. A vigorous attempt was made to propagate the bill in England and H.E.A. Cotton promised all help. Sir William Wedderburn carried the work in the British Committee of the Congress. Bhupendranath Basu, in his trip to England brought up the bill privately before several members of Parliament and influential men like Lord Reay, Lord Courtney and others. A deputation headed by Lord Courtney and consisting of Mr. Basu, Sir John Gardine, Raja Naushad Ali Khan, Mr. Fredrick Harrison and Wedderburn waited on the Secretary of State, Lord Crewe and presented to him a well-signed memorial in support of the bill. The Secretary of State expressed his ‘warm sympathy’ for the proposals.

Though a large public opinion was in favour of the bill, there were some who opposed it too. Some high caste Hindus objected to studying together with the lower castes whereas certain Zamindars and planters did not want to spend on education at all. The Arya Samaj considered the bill as laying ‘an axe at the roots of several Gurukulas’ established by it and thought it expedient to ‘plough its furrows alone’. In Bengal, influential leaders like S.N. Banerjee, Motilal Ghose and Pradyot Kumar Tagore opposed the bill. In Bombay, Pherozeshah Mehta too opposed it. The main objections of the non-officials were to the levy of special educational rate and to the levy of fees from parents whose income was not below Rs. 10 a month. However, the non-official opponents did not exceed 5% of the total opinion.
As far as the local bodies were concerned, most of those consulted by the Provincial Governments, expressed themselves in favour of the measure. Among the Presidency Municipalities, Calcutta and Madras fully supported, Rangoon declined to express an opinion and Bombay though supporting the principle of the bill could not approve of the initiative in this direction being left to local bodies for it expected the cost for the scheme to come out of the Imperial Funds. Among the 234 official opinions received, 90 were in favour out of which 39 were Indians and 51 English officials. Most of the European officials who opposed did so on the ground that the education had to be extended voluntarily before being made compulsory.

The major opposition to the bill came from the Local Governments. Their opinion was that – (1) the spread of mass education involved a danger to the British rule, (2) that the time was not ripe for compulsion, (3) that it was undesirable to further extend the existing low quality of primary education, (4) that the estimates of the cost of the scheme was too large and (5) that the scheme would result in financial inequality and injustice.

The objections raised by the Muslims were that the Government was not in favour of the bill, that the provisions of the bill could be used to compel Muslim children to learn non-Muslim languages and that the persons concerned with enforcing compulsory attendance would trouble Muslims in various ways as these persons would in general be Hindus.

On 18th March 1912, Gokhale referred the bill to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Syed Ali Imam, Sir. Harcourt Butler, Mr. Mazharul Haque, Nawab Saiyid Muhammad, Bhupendranath Basu, Pandit Madanmohan Malaviya, Mr. Gates, Sir James Meston, R.N. Mudholkar, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Carr, Mr. Arthur, Mian Muhamad Shafi and Gokhale himself.

On the occasion, Gokhale once again urged the necessity of making a beginning in introducing compulsion so that the public mind would get familiarized with the idea. It would thus help in setting up a system of universal education in the country in full
He tried to thwart away the various objections to the bill but in vain. The Government adamantly stood against compulsion. Sir. H. Butler found the bill impractical, immature and involving enormous expenditure.

He found the work difficult in India with different castes, races and social evils like untouchability. However, he promised generous additions to the recurring grant for education.

The debate that ensued on the motion, witnessed heated arguments between the supporters and opponents of the bill. Mr. Haque asked Mr. Huda and Mr. Shafi to resign their seats in the Council for not representing the Muslim view on the educational question.

Malik Sahib and Abdul Majid’s views that education would enlighten the peasants and that they would then demand more wages met with strong opposition from the Mr. Bhurgri. Gokhale took to task Mr. Chitnavis and Dadabhoy for siding with the Government at the last moment. The Indians who opposed the bill were Dadabhoy, Chitnavis, Abdul Majid, Bahadur of Burdwan, Malik Umar Hyat Khan, Muhamad Shafi and Raja of Partabgarh.

On vote, the motion was lost by 13 votes to 38. But Sir Fleetwood Wilson’s illustration of an Indian juggler sowing a mango seed in a flower pot and in an extraordinarily brief space of time converting it into a mango tree with wholesome fruits and comparing Gokhale with him seemed to come true. The seed of primary education sowed by Gokhale in 1910 resolution had assumed the form of a tree with wholesome fruits in the form of this bill. Though the bill was rejected, it created awareness among the people. It educated the public opinion on the necessity of universal primary education. Gokhale was undaunted by its defeat. He asserted that the bill, thrown out ‘would come back again and again, till on the stepping stones of its dead selves, a measure would ultimately rise which would spread the light of knowledge throughout the land.’

c) Resolution on primary education - 1913

In February 1913, he once again moved a resolution asking the Government to publish its programme regarding the extension of primary education as incorporated in the
Resolution on that subject issued that year. He wanted to bind the Government down to fixed financial allotments and to a fixed period for the completion of this programme. Sir Harcourt Butler's reply however confirmed that there was no definite finance behind the scheme. It was doubted that the vital claims of education would be subordinated to the less important demands of the Civil Service for increased salaries and pensions as per the recommendations of the Public Service Commission and of the increase in military expenditure as per the recommendations of the Nicholson Committee. The official view was well portrayed in the report of The Times of India - 'In educational matters Mr. Gokhale is trying to spur a horse which is 'all out'. The Government of India are providing money faster than it can be spent. The Local Governments are opening schools as fast as they can be staffed. More is impossible. And as for compulsion, when there are schools wanting scholars, in lieu of scholars wanting schools, we shall be ripe for it.'

His resolution was negatived by 19 votes to 37 – Malik Umar Hayat Khan and Sardar Daljit Singh, both from Punjab, abstained from voting.

**Western and Vernacular education**

Gokhale strongly advocated the promotion of western education in India and was even ready to compromise on its qualitative aspect. He believed that not just the highest but all western education was valuable and useful to India for the greatest work of western education at that stage was not so much the encouragement of learning as the liberation of the Indian mind from the thralldom of old-world ideas and the assimilation of all that was highest and best in life and thought and character of the West. He therefore appealed to the Government to appoint expert teachers from England, even on higher salary level and also urged the Government to improve the standard of equipment and efficiency of their institutions. At the same time, he also demanded the training of Indians abroad so that they could slowly replace the former.

Gokhale also supported the introduction of Vernaculars in the University curriculum. According to him, the best solution to this question was the creation of a
separate Vernacular University conferring degree. He thus strived to promote both the western and vernacular education in India so as to enable the students to imbibe the best aspects of both.

Female Education

Gokhale contented that the effects of the evil combination of 'enforced ignorance and overdone religion' in case of Indian women could be solved only by the spread of education among them. As a corollary to female education, he advocated the raising of the marriageable age of the Hindu girls. He supported not only primary but also secondary and higher education of girls. However, he refused to support the movement for the creation of a women's medical service corresponding to the Indian Medical Service for India because he felt that as in all other services the Superior Grade would be filled by European women and only the inferior grades left to the Indian women, inspite of their capacity to fill the higher grades.

Inspite of his leanings towards female education, he kept the girls out of the scope of his bill on elementary education. This was not only because of the limitations of the period but also because at the initial stage of his scheme of compulsory elementary education, he wanted to work along the line of least resistance. Therefore, he proposed that the female education be promoted on a voluntary basis and compulsion be extended to them only when the time was ripe for it and the bill took powers for that time when it came under section 17. However, many members opposed even this moderate clause.

Technical Education

Technical knowledge was a necessary requirement for both industrial and agricultural progress. Gokhale took up this question several times in the Council. In 1903, he came up with a novel plan of sending a deputation of competent Englishmen and Indians to those advanced countries where their Government were encouraging technical
instruction and study the question on the spot. Thus, a workable scheme for technical advancement could be drawn up and the huge revenue surpluses could be utilized for it. In 1906, he proposed the establishment of at least one large fully equipped Technological Institute at some central place, with branches in the different Provinces. In 1908, he further elaborated the above scheme, urging the Government to release from its purse half a million sterling for initial equipments and about Rs. 5 lakhs per year for the maintenance charges of such an Institute.

On 23rd March 1910, he supported R. N. Mudholkar’s resolution, which recommended the establishment of a Polytechnic College in India for the spread of higher technical instruction. Gokhale elaborated three major principles in regards to technical education. Firstly, that the technical education had got to be spread from top to bottom. Secondly, that there had to be some kind of co-ordination to avoid duplication of efforts in the different provinces and thirdly that the advance in technical education could be made only if there was a wide diffusion of general education in the country.

For the spread of agricultural and industrial education among the farmers, Gokhale proposed in 1911 to utilize the half of Famine Relief Grant for that purpose. Such education, he believed could help the agriculturists to better resist and tide over the effects of a famine. His resolution was however rejected by the Government.

Financial Aspect

Though the officials sympathized with Gokhale’s proposals for educational advancement, yet they always projected the lack of finances as an excuse for postponing the implementation of any workable programme in that direction. However, Gokhale had a solution to this too and at various times he advocated various sources from which funds could be acquired or created for education. It should be noted that so intense was his desire to see India educated that he was ready to resort to any solution – from retrenchment to taxation. In 1902, he suggested reduction in the overgrown military expenditure and employment of more Indians in the public service so that money could be made available
for education. In 1903 he urged for the expenditure of revenue surpluses on education and suggested that Education instead of being a Provincial Charge be made an Imperial Charge so that it would receive the same attention that the Army Services and Railway expansion received at the hands of the Government. He pointed out that if the burden of money for the educational schemes was distributed over a number of years, the task would not be difficult. But the Government turned a deaf ear to all his proposals and this evoked a retort even from the usually disposed Gokhale. He remarked in 1908- ‘My Lord, I repeat the money is there or can be found without difficulty. Only the will has to be there....’

In 1911, on his resolution on Opium Fund, Gokhale recommended the devotion of opium surpluses to education and other welfare schemes. In the same year, he demanded reduction in public expenditure- both Civil and Military and the money thus released to be spent on education. In 1912, he recommended the creation of Special Provincial Reserves to be expended on education and other welfare schemes. In 1910, he proposed to compensate for the expenditure on education by increasing the excise duty from 5% to 7½ %, by levying of export duty on jute and on several other commodities and by an increase in salt tax by 8 annas, a tax which he had himself advocated all through to be reduced. This indicates his intensity for educational advance in the country. Since the Government was reluctant to accept any of these proposals, he finally resorted to the last alternative – that of taxation which he proposed to be levied by the local bodies in his bill on elementary education.

Though the Government’s response to his demands was slow, yet it slowly relaxed the hold over its purse. In 1902, Rs. 40 lakhs was granted for education, in 1905 Rs. 35 lakhs provided for primary education, in 1906 Rs 2 ½ lakhs provided for technical education, and in 1911 one million sterling of non-recurring grant was devoted for primary education. Gokhale urged that such large non-recurring grants had to be supplemented by recurring grants so that the money could be usefully spent. Therefore, in 1912, the Government announced an additional grant of Rs. 125 lakhs for education of which Rs. 60 lakhs was to be recurring. It can be seen from the above figures that Gokhale’s constant
demands resulted in increased allotments for education, although his demand for free primary education was not fulfilled.

Socio-religious issues

As far as socio-religious questions of the period were concerned, Gokhale was sympathetic towards the social reform cause firstly because of the liberal western education that he received and secondly because of the influence over him of the two pioneers of social reform movement – Gopal Ganesh Agarkar and Justice M.G.Ranade. However, he kept himself away from any direct participation in the social reform movement firstly because as a full-fledged political worker he could not devote much time to social cause and secondly because he believed that an unfortunate circumstance in his private life - that of his second marriage - could be raked up against him and that could adversely affect the cause of social reform. But though he never took a prominent part in matters of social reform, he always acted according to his convictions. Thus, at a time when there was a strong taboo against foreign travel, he traveled abroad several times. He educated his own daughters and concluded their marriages at a late age. He also supported co-education in Fergusson College and helped in the admission of the first female student to it. He also opposed caste distinctions and urged for the amelioration of the depressed classes.

In the Imperial Council, not many bills of socio-religious importance were discussed. The Anand Marriage Bill that was introduced by Tikka Sahib of Nabha, to give legal sanction to a marriage ceremony common among the Sikhs called Anand, was of a non-controversial nature and was passed in 1909. Gokhale did not participate in its debate. The other few instances discussed ahead in the chapter clearly indicate the progressive views held by Gokhale.

Special Marriage Amendment Bill

The above bill was moved by Babu Bhupendranath Basu and was originally drafted to facilitate the Brahmo marriages by enabling the Brahmos to marry under the Act,
without repudiating Hinduism. However, if accepted, it would also enable all kinds of mixed marriages. It labeled marriage as a civil contract, enforced monogamy and affirmed divorce if necessary. On 26th February 1912 when Basu moved for the bill to be referred to a Select Committee, his motion was opposed tooth and nail by both Hindu and Muslim orthodoxy. Among those who opposed were Syed Ali Imam, Madanmohan Malaviya, G. M. Chitnavis, Muhammad Shafi and Malik Umar Hayat Khan among others. The Hindus objected to divorce, the Muslims to monogamy and both along with the Parsees objected to inter-marriages as they felt that it could make the law of succession much complicated.

However, members like Dadabhoy, Schchidananda Sinha, Mazharul Haque, R. N Mudholkar, V.D. Thackersay, M.A. Jinnah, Raja of Dighapatia, Mr. Bhurgri and Gokhale supported the bill. Though Gokhale agreed that the bill was much in advance of the time, he envisaged that 'with the spread of higher education among Indian women, with late marriages coming more and more into vogue – and late marriage must lead to choice marriages i.e. to free choice by the marrying parties – with these things coming, with the dignity of the individual freedom realized better and better, and last but not the least, with the steady fusion of different creeds and different races, which is bound to take place under the stress of our growing nationality, ... the day cannot be far distant when a measure like the one before us will find its way to the Statute-book.' Gokhale’s views indicates his support to the cause of emancipation of women, and also elucidate his progressive views supporting not only civil and inter-caste marriage but also inter-religion and inter-racial marriages.

The Government declared that they would support a socio-religious bill either if it was supported by a majority of the people professing that faith or if the bill touched any humanitarian aspect. Since Basu’s bill did not fulfill any of these conditions, the Government opposed it. The motion was thus defeated – 43 voting against it and only 11 voting for it.
The Musalman Wakf Validating Bill

Mr. M. A. Jinnah introduced this bill on 17th March 1911 in order to define the rights of the Muslim subjects of His Majesty to make settlements of property by way of wakf in favour of their families and descendants. In 1894, the Privy Council had invalidated testamentary gifts of Muslim property left in tax-free ‘wakfs’ (i.e. trusts) for ultimate reversion to religious charity. Jinnah called for legislative reversal of that decision. Thus, the object of the bill was to produce the Muslim law in conformity with the texts and in accordance with the wishes of the Muslim community. The motion was supported by all the Muslim and Hindu members. Gokhale confessed that he had no knowledge of the Muslim law nor would he in anyway be affected by it but he supported the motion on the general ground that the question concerned the Muslim community only and that it should be allowed an opportunity to express its views on the subject. He also stated that the Government should not stand in the way of the community unless there was something in the proposal that was repugnant to the notions of right, justice or humanity. Two years later, the bill was passed and it became the first non-officially sponsored Act in the British Indian history.

Indentured labour and the racial question

Gokhale’s resolution to prohibit the recruitment of indentured labour to Natal was a retaliatory measure against the anti-Asiatic policy of the South African government but his resolution recommending the abolition of the indentured labour altogether was a reaction against the general social and racial disabilities confronting the Indians in the British Empire. His main objection to the system was its bordering on the servile. Though not actual slavery, it was not far from it. The contract between the indentured labour and the employer was not a free contract and it included the right of private arrest, compulsory bondage for a period of five years and harsh punishments for trivial faults. The system had come into existence to take the place of slave labour after the abolition of slavery in 1834. The utter inequality, appalling human misery, frightful immorality and ultimate national degradation caused by the system was strongly objected to by Gokhale. He found the
system to be monstrous, iniquitous in itself, based on fraud and maintained by force, wholly opposed to modern sentiments of justice and humanity and a grave blot on the civilization of any country that tolerated it. 

During his South African tour, Gokhale was astonished at the strength and intensity of the colour prejudice that existed there. Wherever the system of indenture existed, the Indians were only known as coolies, no matter what their position was. It should be noted that Gokhale himself had been a victim of racial prejudice twice. He therefore highlighted the Indian degradation and demanded equality in the Council. He asked three questions of vital importance. First, what was the status of the Indians in the British Empire? Second, what was the extent of the responsibility of the Imperial Government to ensure to the Indians just and human and equal treatment in the Empire? Lastly, how far were the self-governing colonies of the Empire bound by its cardinal principles –whether they were to participate in its privileges only and not bear their share of its disadvantages? He thus highlighted not only the iniquitous position of Indians racially but also their inferior political status to the self governing colonies.

The Depressed classes and the Elementary Education Bill

The only question of social reform on which Gokhale spoke publicly was on the condition of the depressed classes. At the Dharwar Social Conference in April 1903 and again at the National Social Conference in December 1908 at Madras he urged for their elevation. During the latter, he cited the example of the elevation of a class called Jeeta in Japan corresponding to the depressed classes in India. He also laid a great stress on the education of this class as the only solution to their elevation.

Gokhale urged for the amelioration of this class from the standpoint of justice, humanity and national self-interest. He observed that it was not possible to realize the national aspiration if large number of the countrymen remained sunk in ignorance, barbarism and degradation. His scheme of compulsory elementary education was therefore the first practical step towards their amelioration. The principle of compulsion would open
the avenues of education to all and would automatically fizzle out the conservative opposition to the education of the lower classes. That would then promote equality of man and dignity of man as man in the country. The backward communities therefore largely supported his bill.

**Temperance**

Gokhale was a total prohibitionist and considered the Government support as responsible for the existence of drink evil in India. He therefore opposed the official policy of making the intoxicants dearer and instead favoured making them scarcer. His opposition to the Bombay Abkari Act has already been discussed in Chapter II. In 1904 budget speech, he again took up this matter and cited the increasing liquor consumption especially among the lower classes and the wild aboriginal tribes and strongly condemned the official intension of earning increased excise revenue through this policy. In 1910 he welcomed the enhanced taxation on liquors and tobacco and again in 1911 opposed the reduction of duties on imported tobacco. As a practical remedy to this evil, he suggested local option that is before any new shop was set up, local opinion had to be referred to and their objections taken into consideration. He demanded a legislative action to reduce liquor consumption.

Even outside the Council, Gokhale worked intensely for the cause of temperance. He was the President of Poona Temperance Association in 1908 when picketing of liquor shops was undertaken. He also strongly condemned the Government’s policy in this regard during his tours to England addressing the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association several times. He called the question a ‘political question’ and urged the State to follow a policy of total prohibition. In a deputation at India Office on July 18th 1912, Gokhale placed before the Secretary of State, Lord Crewe, the view of Indian temperance reformers with special reference to the question of the reduction of licenses and the limitation of the hours of sale, the extension and strengthening of the Excise Advisory Committees, the abolition of the auction system and the removal of the licensing function from the control of the Revenue Department.
The exercise of the right of interpellation

Gokhale made ample use of his right of interpellation and asked several questions of administrative importance and also highlighted individual instances of grievances. He thus advocated the Indian cause efficiently by exercising this right.

His questions brought to light the ambiguous working of several departments and the inferior status of the Indians employed therein. For example, on 10th March 1905, he demanded the correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State regarding Mr. Robertson's Report on the administration and working of Indian Railways but was refused. Similarly his demand for a list of all new appointments carrying a salary of Rs. 5000 and upwards a year since 1892, which would clearly indicate the absence of Indians from all higher posts was also refused. In 1911-12, several times he brought to the notice the delay regards the scheme for re-organization of the Provincial Engineers of the Public Works Department and the discontent caused thereof but received no satisfactory reply. However, on 1st November 1907 he elicited an important statement from the Government regarding the oft-demanded reform of separation of Judicial and Executive functions. Sir Harvey Adamson replied that a definite scheme on experimental basis in a few selected districts was under consideration.

Between 1910 and 1912, he took up the problems of the Medical Department. On 18th March 1910, he highlighted the considerable dissatisfaction that existed among the Indians regarding the system of filling medical appointments in India. He condemned the monopoly of the officers of Indian Medical Service (IMS) in all senior teaching and hospital staff on the ground that on retirement they carried out of the country all the knowledge and experience acquired by them making the Indian medical profession poor. He therefore demanded opportunities to be given even to the properly qualified non-official Medical men to fill up these posts. He did not give up the fight and again on 26th February 1912 made similar inquires and also asked as to why men of IMS appointed for research work were permitted to undertake private practice. Finally, the Government
closed the matter by declaring that the senior clinical professorships were not open to candidates outside the ranks of IMS. 103

Regarding the military department, he made inquiries about the posting of the four newly appointed Indian members of the Cadet Crops and of any possibility of their being entrusted with regimental duties in the Indian Army. The reply to the second part of his question was in negation.104 On 26th February 1912, he inquired about the advancement regarding the formation of Civil Military Department. 105

Gokhale also took up questions of general public welfare. On 13th March 1903, he cited the problems of the famine orphans and urged the Government to give effect to the recommendations of Famine Commission in that regard.106 On 24th January 1911, he made inquiries regarding the availability of filtered water supply and efficient drainage works.107 In 1906, he demanded the appointment of an Indian to represent the legitimate interest of the people of Central Provinces. 108 He also catered to the needs of the Council members by pointing out the difficulties that the members would face if the Imperial records were removed from Calcutta to Simla instead of to Delhi. 109

Besides, Gokhale also brought to Government’s notice individual instances of grievances and asked for relief. For example, on 19th March 1902, citing the case of Kazi Zeanuddin Ahmed vs. The King Emperor, he urged the Government to consider the opinion expressed by Mr. Justice Amir Ali in his dissenting judgement, of amending Section 154 of the Indian Penal Code so as to free Zamindars from liability for the criminal acts of their agents especially when such acts were found to have been done without their knowledge.110 On 28th March 1906, he made a strong appeal to take action against Major Cowie, the Cantonment Magistrate, for harassing Lala Sheokarn Das, a wealthy banker and house proprietor in Jullundar Cantonment, by forcing him at a short notice to remove his smallpox infected grandson, even when special arrangements and special permission for treating the boy at home had been arranged.111 In 1909, he cited the memorial sent by Babu Ashwinikumar Dutt’s wife, urging the Government for her husband’s liberty because of his serious illness and probed into the time period of restraint of the nine Bengal deportees.112
Similarly he also urged for early release of Lala Lajpat Rai (discussed in Chapter III). In addition, on the question of education and the ill- treatment of Indians in South Africa, he asked several questions thereby stressing the urgency and immediate consideration of these subjects.

Conclusion

Education was on the top in Gokhale's list of constructive programme. His speeches on the subject are most intense and indicate his deep desire to see India educated. In the Council, he dealt with all aspects of the subject right from western education to vernacular instruction, technical and agricultural education, female education, and higher education and mass education. He opposed the University Bill because it tended to make the Universities the tools of the State.

Although Gokhale opposed government control over higher education, he supported government intervention in matters of elementary education. This was so because primary education being in its infant stage required State support for its faster progress. Through his bill on elementary education, he intended to raise the whole tone of life of the Indians and unite them on a common platform. Though the bill was rejected, it created a general awareness for the spread of mass education among the people. By his constant endeavours, Gokhale made it a national question of prime importance. It thus became a major agenda in the post-independence period also.

Gokhale was a supporter of both free and compulsory primary education. However, both his master Justice Ranade (in 1882) and his disciple M.K.Gandhi (1937-Wardha Scheme) considered the conditions in India not ripe for compulsion. In this, Gokhale differed from them. He laid great stress on compulsion as the only way to acquire complete literacy. His views require due consideration when even today India is not 100% literate.

Gokhale's social thought centered around the principles of right, justice, humanity and national self-respect. It was on this basis that he demanded the elevation of depressed
classes, emancipation of women, racial equality and total prohibition. He also effectively brought up several questions of political, economic and social importance by exercising the right of interpellation. He thus succeeded in making an articulate demand for the social and educational advancement of India.
Chapter – V

Gokhale in the Imperial Council- Educational and other Social and General Issues
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