CHAPTER-V
Nationalism in most of the ex-colonial countries was political reaction to colonialism. As in Europe, nationalism in Asia and Africa too transformed the political configuration of the most of the countries. The Mexican revolution of 1910-1917 set the pattern for the development of nationalism in many underdeveloped countries and for their fight against foreign political intervention and economic exploitation. Nationalism tried to transform or overthrow the colonial powers in the Third World countries. It became social revolutionary movement demanding equal economic and educational opportunities for all members of the national group and the active promotion of the welfare of the socially underdeveloped classes in the Third World countries.

In comparing the liberal trends in the nationalist movements of Egypt and India, we found basic differences in the respective nationalist movements. The traditional educational system was very strong in initial stage in Egypt. The penetration of Christian missionaries was a calculated move of the British to destroy Egyptian culture. Traditional common people stirred against the British. As a result a very high proportion of leadership emerged from the traditional education in Egypt. Egyptians, instead of looking
into development and technology on their own merits, became preoccupied with the subject of foreign domination and, in turn, rejected western progress altogether, whereas Indian leadership had a very narrow social base, society was divided between the rulers and the ruled. There had been innumerable complexes in Indian society. Above all every thing was being operated by the caste hierarchy. The nationalist movement in its initial stage was to develop a national consciousness among the people against the British rule. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chand Vidya Sagar, Dayanand Saraswati, M.G. Ranade, etc. initiated social and religious reform movements which represented endeavours to remould the Indian society and religion in the spirit of the new principles of democracy and nationalism. The nationalist movement in the first two decades was an effort to bringing together the leadership from all regions of India. The western-educated elites as well as feudal landlords had prospered by collaborating with the colonial power in the initial stage of the British occupation. The circumstances however changed when the British curtailed their powers and imposed several restrictions on them. The British were naturally opposed to any resistance in organized form.

The Religion remained a dominant factor in the history of nationalist movement in Egypt. Jamal al Din-al-Afghani advocated a return to the concept of Ijtihad, which is textual exegesis on the basis of current events rather than blind acceptance of the traditional interpretations. Above
all, al-Afghani was motivated to see Islam's progress not in any individual country but in the form of "Pan-Islamism". But the idea of Pan-Islamism had been challenged by reformist leaders like Muhammad Abduh, Ahmad Lutfi al-Sayyid and Qasim Amin and this was the beginning of liberal ideology in Egypt. Abduh firmly believed that the Muslim Ummah could not become strong and prosperous again until they acquired from Europe the sciences and technology. He also believed that the Muslim countries could do this without abandoning Islam. Lutfi al Sayyid translated the works of Aristotle from the French so that Egypt's renaissance on the pattern of the West was founded. Lutfi desired to found a base for nationalist doctrine within the scope of liberal, socio-political philosophy. Lutfi was critical of Islamic laws, because they had allowed society to accept despotism as the foundation for government. The right government according to him was a constitutionalist government.

The differences between the traditional and reformist leadership continued till the Independence of Egypt in 1952. The middle class reformist leaders' opinion was that the progress could be possible only by introduction of modern science and technology. Thus foreign ideas whether in education or technology the traditionalists suspected them nonetheless those who cooperated with foreigners, they were also Muslims. It was also a fact that the weak leadership gave a chance to the traditional leaders who firmly believed that all powers come from God. Muhammad Rashid Rida headed
the Salafiyya movement which began as a vehicle for the propagation of Islamic views. Ultimately, Salafiyya provided the major opposition to secularism, not only to social but also to political reform of the 1920s and 1930s. They opposed every thought of secularism and nationalism, including the nationalist political leader Sa' al Zaghlul, the Wafd leader between 1919-1923. The Salafiyya movement provided fertile ground for Hasan al-Banna and his organization Muslim Brothers in 1928-29 which challenged the reformist liberal leaders even after Egypt was declared a Republic in 1952.

Religiousity has been a very strong force in India, but its impact was not uniform across various sections of the Indian society. A class of Indians that had been liberated from traditional social bonds, assumed the dominant role in a politically advancing country. Majority of the leaders had devoted their lives to reform religion and bring about social transformation. For example, people participated barefoot in the rallies, many of them took holy bath in Ganga to lodge protest against the Bengal partition in 1905. The Indian Muslims united in reaction against the Hindus practicing religious rituals to unite the Hindus only. The outcome of the reaction was the emergence of Indian Muslim League in 1906. The last effort to bring them together in 1916 in Lucknow Session of the Congress, failed. The political differences between the Hindus and Muslims persisted ever since.
 Increasing unemployment among the educated middle class due to the inability of the social and state apparatus to incorporate them and further economic misery among the people due to devastating epidemics and famines at the close of nineteenth century, created a favourable condition to the growth of extremist group because the Congress spoke the language of elites, like, secularism, revolution and concept of class struggle.

Teachers had stirred at massive level in Egypt. They were faithful towards their religion and culture. British intervention in religious affairs and educational matters was the main reason of teacher's revolt against the colonial powers whereas the proportion of teachers' participation in Indian nationalist movement was comparatively low because of their lower middle class background. Teachers bore dual responsibilities as to feed their family, and extended the possible contributions in the nationalist movement of India.

In this study we found that the forces of change in Egypt and India were the foreign importation at the time when foreign powers were encroaching in real sense. The Islam had been, from the beginning, for more involvement in the politico-social 'order. On the contrary, only 'upper caste' leadership was recognized in Indian nationalist movement. Rest had been marginalized.

The most striking characteristic of the period under study, was the failure of liberal leadership because of their jorganized philosophies as the theory of liberalism,
democracy, class struggle and the concept of revolution. The common masses were not educationally upto that standard who could understand their philosophy. The leadership was least bothered to upgrade educational standard of the people, as a result the liberal leaders were never recognised among the masses. The liberal leadership wanted to achieve Independence but not at the cost of their sacrifice. Their priority was to maintain their position first and then Independence of the country. Their ideology to acquire independence in several phases gave opportunity to prolong the colonial power in Egypt and India and common masses had never been associated with these leaders and they branded them as a collaborators of the British.

The Swadeshi and Boycott movement was launched by the Congress in India whereas Huda Sharawi had given a call to Boycott British goods in Egypt. The Boycott and Swadeshi movement served the interests of industrialists who financially supported it. The Communists of Egypt were all European who discouraged the emergence of any strong Communist movement in Egypt. In the absence of Communist movement, there had been hardly any trade union movement in Egypt. On the contrary socialist and communist groups initiated an independent political and trade union movement in India based on doctrine of class struggle.

The British sent Milner Commission to Egypt to take some steps to meet the Egyptian demands. Similar to Milner Commission, the British had appointed Simon Commission to
enquire about the possibility to give relaxation to Indians but both the Commissions were boycotted at the mass level. It was a time when Congress changed her objectives from Swaraj to Independence.

We found that the British unilaterally declared Egyptian Independence with four reserved points on 28 February 1922. The Wafd Party held power for only nineteen months during the three decades after 1922 mainly because the British Government and the Palace interfered in the government affairs, each trying to ensure that its interests were assured. When the Wafd acted independently, either or both tried to force it out of power. From 1930 onwards Egypt was under a dictatorial control from the palace.

These were the years of the great economic slump all over the world, and Egypt suffered greatly owing to the fall in cotton prices. The nationalist movement after the 1930s was restricted to the upper and middle classes. The post-war economic crisis, the disillusionment about the government promises, and the increased repression by the state had seriously affected the people including the peasantry and the working classes and they were in a state of great ferment. The British were opposed by the nationalist unrest against the perpetuation of alien rule. The leaders refused to act as the instrument of an indirect Imperial Control and embarrassed the British by making declarations about independence. The success of local politicians in rallying mass support created a dangerous scene against cooperation with
the agencies of British power in Egypt and India. Civil disobedience in India, disorder and non-cooperation in Egypt, and an open insurrection were endorsed by the majority of the population. Resistance to the exercise of British influence in Egypt and India seemed to confirm the existence of a new fragility in the structure of British world power. Imperialism as it was known in the nineteenth century was no longer possible, remarked Leonard Wolf in 1928. The old type imperial rule was dying in India and decomposing in Egypt, declared Hertzel.

A number of democratic revolutions in European countries and the socialist revolution in Russia had deeply stirred the consciousness among Egyptian and Indian people. The Russian Revolution recognized the self-determination in Egypt and India. Simultaneously Russia supported Egypt and India to stop British growth. The British had lost her economic prosperity and she was not in a position to maintain colonial countries. As a result the British initiated dialogue with a view to eventual independence of Egypt and India. The Swadeshi movement in India and boycott of British goods from Egyptian and Indian markets boosted the native industrialists. It was a time when industrial bourgeoisie began to exert powerful influence in determining the programmes, policies, strategies, tactics, and forms of struggle in liberating their country.

The Indian Communists initiated independent political and trade union movement of the working class based on the
doctrine of class struggle. Indian leadership formed trade unions in more or less every sector to challenge factory owners. The weekly holidays to the workers, working hours, and other benefits were an outcome of strong trade unions in India. Contrary, in absence of independent trade unions the labour force did not join the main stream of the nationalist movement. Whereas 20 per cent Egyptian Communist leaders were foreigners who supported British rule in Egypt. The Communist group gradually became Egyptianized during the World War II. Before the Russo-Turkish Trade Company in Egypt was headed by an American citizen Ignaz Semenyuk. Another trade agency which called itself 'Textilimport' was founded in Alexandria by Alexei Vasiliev and Augo Rudoff the German Communists.

We found that the Indian national movement gained a broad mass base after 1920s. In this phase Mr. Gand emerged as a popular leader. The Congress which was representing only bourgeois section of Indian society became a mass organization due to his efforts largely. Mr. Gandhi played a dominant role in Indian politics from 1920s to the Independence of India in 1947. His leadership was challenged several times after 1930's by very prominent leaders of India because he refused to associate himself with any movement launched by other leaders. This indicated that he was not willing to accept anybody else as a leader. Instead he came out with new ideas and philosophies of his own. Ultimately they were marginalised. In this study we found
that Gandhiji was a staunch supporter of Varna System. Simultaneously, he was fighting for the eradication of untouchability. Untouchability could not be wiped out without breaking caste system. It was a byproduct of varna system. As a matter of fact he failed in his untouchability eradication programme.

Civil Disobedience had become very popular among the masses. Every section of Indian society directly or indirectly associated itself with the movement. This was a time when a multi-dimensional leadership emerged in Indian Politics. Gandhiji thought that this leadership might challenge his personality. With this fear he withdrew Civil Disobedience. The withdrawal was not only criticised but also it was treated as a betrayal to the leaders. Gandhiji used Civil Disobedience as a weapon to kill the emerging leaders who were getting prominence in India. Vithalbhai Patel and Subhas Chandra Bose opposed Gandhi's decision in these words: "The latest action of Mr. Gandhi in suspending Civil Disobedience is a confession of failure... We are clearly of the opinion that Mr. Gandhi as a political leader has failed." The leftist leadership criticised the agreement and called it a compromise, a deviation from the objective of independence for which the struggle was started. Jawaharlal Nehru said that "Gandhiji was a person who never allowed anybody to speak. The withdrawal mounted a pressure to such
marginalized every leader, so much so that his opponents also recognised his leadership. As a result he was an influential leader till the independence of India in 1947.

We have assessed, educational, regional, occupational, urban-rural origin, class and religious background as a part of characteristics of leadership of Egypt and India.

Foreigners were dominant in business in Egypt. They strengthened colonial power in Egypt. The business class did not participate in the nationalist movement whereas Indian businessmen were badly affected with the British policy, and they openly supported to the nationalist cause of India.

The leadership came from middle and upper middle classes and they were mostly sons of landowners, farmers and civil servants. As far as their occupation was concerned, most of them have fathers who were civil servants, professionals, military officers or traders and shopkeepers. In this study we found that the proportion of leaders who had been doctor in arts, sciences and commerce was higher in Egypt than India. On contrary, the proportion of leaders who had legal degree was high in India. The leadership was not serious about modern code of conduct posed by the West because Egypt was governed by Islamic rule i.e. Sharia. The leadership opted higher education because they wanted to be free from dependency of colonial educational institutions.

The academicians of Egypt were the product of the West and more particularly of France. They were highly influenced by Western life style and culture. There had been hardly any
information found about the academician's support to the nationalist movement of Egypt. Whereas 13 per cent academicians gave a lead to the nationalist movement of India. The academicians refused to accept any bribe at the cost of India's independence. As a result the British imposed censorship on freedom of expression, and reduced the number of higher educational institutions.

The proportion (26 per cent) of leaders who opted politics as their profession in India was almost double than proportion of Egyptian leaders (15 per cent). Besides some other professionals like social workers, journalists diplomats had contributed to the liberation movement in their respective countries.

The Egyptian leadership was drawn from various countries such as Afghanistan, Tunisia and Iran. Therefore the leadership was more dependent on North African Countries rather than the native leaders of Egypt to challenge the colonial powers. As a result the leadership did not get support from common people. They also favoured Ottoman unity against the British intervention. Whereas Indian leadership formed regional organizations in every part of the country to channelize the people from all over India under the guidance of central leadership which presented the case of independence before the British. At the same time the leadership mustered massive support from abroad in favour of their demand.

In our study we found that the modern means of trans-
port helped to unite the people living in far-flung areas of Egypt and India, and the people came in direct touch with the central leadership. The transport was used as an important means to mobilize support inside and outside the country against the colonial powers.

We have traced that the Egyptian leadership was divided between tradition and modernity. It was further divided on the practice of Islam. The radical leaders favoured for reformed Islam whereas liberal leadership stressed to reduce religious interference. A section of leadership led by Mustafa Kamil was deeply stirred by the Pan-Islamic ideology whereas Ahmad Lulfi al Sayyid stressed for popular sovereignty and this group opposed the idea of Pan-Islamism. The feelings of castes, regions and religions were deep rooted in Indian leadership. The communal feeling among the Indian leadership played dominant role and after 1930's the upper caste communalism was challenged by lower section of Indian society.

The British policy to project one section against another, namely the Hindus and Muslims, created a permanent rivalry between the two sections of Indian society. In similar pattern they created a division between the Muslims and Christian Copts in Egypt.

The liberal leadership could not become popular among the common people, because of their complicated, jargonized philosophy of secularism, Marxism, class struggle which was not understood by the common people. All this required a
good academic knowledge which was not available in Egypt and India whereas traditional leadership spoke a language of the masses. As a result they got recognition by the general people. British used the Muslim against the Hindus as a tools to divide the spirit of nationalist movement.

The leadership was sharply divided in 1920's on the question of communal representation. Mr. Gandhi had accepted proportional representation to the Muslims in Legislative Assemblies where Muslims constitute majority vote. On the same pattern Dr. B.R. Ambedkar wanted proportional representation to the 'untouchables', Gandhiji not only opposed the demand but also sat on fast unto death. As a result both the leaders reached to an agreement in the form of 'Poona Pact' in 1932. The division in leadership came up in 1938 when Subhas Chandra Bose defeated P. Sitaramayya in Congress Presidential election. Gandhiji considered it as his personal defeat, he himself and Congress executive committee resigned to mount pressure on Bose. In reaction to Mr. Gandhi's act, Subhas Chandra Bose resigned from Presidency and formed Forward Block.

The Wafd Party presented Egyptian case for independence in Paris Peace Conference, Wafd's demand was not only denied but protectorate over Egypt was declared. Adli Pasha, Ali Sharawi, Hafiz Afifi etc. spread a news that the Wafd had collaborated with the British. In protest they formed Liberal Constitutionalist Party.

The projection of Russian policy of self-determination
and the dissolution of old Empire put the British under pressure to introduce the reform as division of portfolios between British and Indian ministers. The leadership was divided due to a personal gratitude in India. Individualism had influenced everybody. Political rivalry in regards to strengthened base was another important cause of division in leadership. On the contrary lack of coordination and misunderstanding was an important factor for the division in leadership in Egypt and India.

We found that there was a sharp division among leadership on the modality of independent Egypt. The majority of leaders were in favour to accept four conditions posed by the British in the name of reserved point. In the opinion of other leaders, it would be suicidal for Egypt, if they accept the British conditions, whereas Indian leadership was divided on the question of status of India after Independence. Mr. Gandhi was for dominion status whereas Subhas Chandra Bose demanded that nothing less than "complete independence" should be the Congress immediate goal.

We have assessed that the Wafd Party in Egypt and the Indian National Congress in India had been formed to serve the interests of the elites of Egyptian and Indian society. Wafd as well as Congress didn't touch social issues. The Congress had been open for common people after 1920 whereas the entry of common masses was restricted in the Wafd. There had been a sharp division in leadership on the question of representation to the common people in Wafd Party. Dissatis-
fied leaders, Aziz Mirham, Mansur Fahmi, Husayn Haykal and others prepared the ground for mass upsurge against the Wafd. Jawaharlal Nehru, Minoo Masani supported Congress socialist party in retaliation to the withdrawal of civil disobedience by Gandhiji.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is found that the historians rarely studied the national movements' impact on the socio-economic conditions of Egypt and India, whereas majority of them have made the study of socio-economic impact on nationalist movement. The economy of Egypt and India, in whatever form, was transformed into capitalist ones during the nationalist movements. The working class and the owners of the factory joined hand with the nationalist leaders against the British penetration. As a result, the productions in these factories reached at the verge of collapse. The internationally admired muslin, cotton and silk of the native countries received a severe economic loss.

The feudal character of economy of Egypt and India was broken. As a result social tention amongst the society increased. The gap widened between the rulers and the ruled. The communal and regional feelings became stronger. There had been several incidences of caste violence after the abolition of feudalism in India, because feudal landlords were pressurised for distribution of their accumulated property. A large section of Indian society, namely, Scheduled Castes and Tribes had not been recognized by the dominant
caste leaders and even to some extent by Indian historians also. Though their contribution could not be ignored in Indian nationalist movement. Indian historians have projected a biased history of dalit which is in fact not true. Brotherhood may be strengthened by extending adequate respect to every section of Indian society.

There have been a large number of leaders, about whom enough study had not been made so far. They have been sidelined either by biased nature of the historians or they were not considered important enough, though they sacrificed their lives for the freedom of the country. Indian historians have paid their attention to leaders who emerged from ruling elite families. There is a need for a proper and impartial study of Indian history. So that the contribution of every leader irrespective of his caste, community be recognized in Indian history.