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This study compares the liberal trends in the nationalist movements of Egypt and India which focuses on the nature of Egyptian and Indian nationalist movements, the characteristics and role of leadership, the tactics adopted by them in order to mobilize the masses, constitutional developments, and divisions within these movements in terms of sub-nationalism, caste, religion etc.

The study covers a period extending from 1882 in Egypt when the first nationalist movement was launched against the colonial powers until 1953 when Egypt achieved independence. In case of India the relevant period is 1885-1947 when first organized movement was launched under the banner of the Indian National Congress to the independence of India. This is not a study of chronological events; rather it is a conceptual study.

Liberalism puts emphasis on the freedom of individuals to control their own destinies. The state was thought to exist to protect individuals from coercion by other individuals or groups and to widen the range within which individual can exercise their freedom. In political terms, liberalism expressed itself as a reaction against authoritarian regimes. Liberals emphasise to limit the rights of hereditary rulers, establish parliamentary institutions, extend the franchise, and guarantee civil liberties. They regard
such measures both as an expression of essential political freedoms and as a means of bringing about economic reforms.¹

The liberalism that developed in England and Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was, at that time, a unique occurrence, resulting from the convergence of social and political tendencies peculiar to a specific time and environment. The Renaissance and the Reformation were important in fostering liberalism, especially through contribution they made to individualism. Political changes, especially during and after the Reformation, contributed ultimately to the rise of liberalism.²

Liberalism, in historical perspective, was the culmination of several broad social political trends. It involved a change in the scope of individual aspirations and perhaps more important, in the people who had them. Prior to the nineteenth century these aspirations were restricted to an elite of birth and wealth. Social environment, individual aspiration, and consciousness of capacity combined to produce, in the nineteenth century, a widely shared and politically potent liberal faith.

Liberalism, both as a doctrine and as a political


programme, developed most fully in England between the Glorious Revolution (1688) and the Reform Act of 1867. Liberalism in England first took the form of a demand for religious liberties and toleration, constitutionalism and political rights. The Revolution of 1688, the first "liberal revolution" in history, consolidated and gave definite constitutional form to the liberal gains of that century. Liberalism was first a limited appeal for a constitutional guarantees and individuals rights. It became a positive theory of economic and political organization and political programme with broad national appeal extending to many groups and classes. 3

European liberalism remained fragmented and sectarian. Consequently, one species of European liberalism was decidedly aristocratic, supporting not only liberty but also the inequitable privileges of localities, corporations, and social and religious groups. Montesquieu and Benjamin constant afford good illustrations of aristocratic liberalism in political theory. The Restoration and the July Monarchy in France and the revolt of 1848 in Germany are historic tragedies of this divided heritage of European liberalism. The philosophy in France and German liberals such as Goethe and Herder adopted the goals of individualism, widened

liberty, and a rational code of laws. The reform of civil and administrative institutions for liberal ends took precedence over the liberal method. Later, when economic liberalism was both possible and widely adopted -- for instance, in the French Third Republic and in unified Italy -- that policy served less fully the original liberal objectives of expanding liberty and equalizing opportunity. 4

At the early stage, in Europe, liberalism failed because it was weak and divided. This is not to say that liberalism was not a vitally needed political and doctrinal element of European society: it was. But liberalism had to appeal to a radically changed world, one in which democracy or republicanism, nationalism, and socialism were the popular gospels. Later, liberalism -- especially in Britain and the United States, but to some extent almost everywhere in the modern world -- has emphasized the positive rather than the negative aspect of liberty. Modern liberalism tends necessarily, therefore, to be closely associated not only with social reforms but with democracy and popular participation. Certainly, modern liberalism invokes the coercive power of the state.

European liberalism's incursion into the Third World countries accelerated the process of decline of medievalism in Egypt and India. It weakened the age-old shackles of

4. Ibid, pp.143-146.
feudalism. European liberalism highly influenced the Third World countries because majority of the leaders were western educated. The European imperialism did not flourish in Egypt as much as it made a solid base in India. The Egyptians imbibed the idea of liberty, fraternity and justice from Europe, and particularly from France where this idea was popularized by the French Revolution whereas in India it was drawn from the British. Egypt and India used the three principles of liberalism as the chief instrument of their national struggle against colonial powers.

The liberal leadership had the belief in and commitment to a set of methods and policies that have as their common aim greater freedom for individuals. The liberal leaders stressed upon three principles; the free expression of individual personality; a belief in men's ability to make that expression valuable to themselves and to society; and the third, the upholding of those institutions and policies that protect and foster both free expression and confidence in that freedom. The liberal leadership have stressed upon two primary themes. One was the dislike for arbitrary authority, complemented by the aim of replacing that authority by other forms of social practices. A second theme is the free expression of individual personality.5

The principal proponent of liberal thought in Britain

were Adam Smith, Herbert Spencer, and J.S. Mill. Inspite of differences amongst liberal theorists over the exact interpretation of liberty, all assumed that coherent theory of freedom existed and it was possible to maximize an equal set of harmonious coexisting liberties for all members of society. 6

The liberal leadership always advocated for equality, freedom, order, security, and a few other widely acceptable public goods. Liberals have often been considered non-conformists, secularists, sceptics, and even anti-religious. In place of traditional authority they have supported the authority of reason and of demonstrated, rather than revealed, truth. The liberals have stressed also the desirability of impersonal social and political controls; the rule of law and the market. The liberal leadership have usually been individualists and pluralists and have supported local and group liberties and the methods of consent and persuasion. 7

The liberal trend is an adoption of the autonomy of the individual from authority but pertained to his political


and civil rights under a government of law based on the consent of the governed. The liberal trend is formidable to constitutional changes and legal or administrative reforms tending in the direction of freedom or Democracy. The liberal leaders placed a great emphasis on a greater share for the native people in running the government of their country in all its branches - civil, military, judiciary, administrative, executive and legislative. Attainment of a national self-government autonomous in all its internal affairs, including the economic policy was the goal of the liberal leaders of Egypt and India. They adopted the method of constitutional agitation, and believed not in pressure but in persuasion. The liberal states rest solely on those beliefs about the good shared by all its citizens.

Egypt was in many ways very different from India and yet there were numerous parallels and common features in the two countries. We have compared the similarities and differences of the two nationalist movements. Egypt had never been geographically and culturally one country but four - an African country, a Mediterranean country, an Arab country,

an Islamic country since the seventh century A.D. The country had always struggled for her identity. Egypt was ruled for some time by the Turks, Ottomans and the British. The British governed through their representative and were the last rulers of the country.

Egypt was a Joint Protectorate of Britain and France whereas India was a British colony. The British had been for a comparatively short period in Egypt, however, they had ruled for more than three centuries over India.

The British controlled Egypt through Khadives (Governor) who was later known as Sultan whereas they established a direct rule on India. The leadership in Egypt was sharply divided into two blocs on the issue of strategy to be adopted against the colonial power. One section had a very liberal attitude and was ready to make any change even in religious matter, if necessary, to get independence whereas the other was very traditional in its feelings. The latter always searched the solution of every problem within religious framework. On the other hand, Indian society was a conglomeration of many castes, it was also divided on regional and religious lines. In spite of the presence of the liberal and traditional leadership in India, everybody had only one motive and that was the independence of the country.

The nationalist movement of Egypt was guided by three principles, as religious nationalism (the assertion that all who adhered to the same religion should form a single polit-
ical community) territorial patriotism (a sense of Community with all who shared the same defined piece of land rooted in love for that land itself) and ethnic or linguistic nationalism (based on the idea that the same language constitute a single nation and should form an independent political unit). In India too Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chand Vidyasagar, Dayanand Saraswati, etc. led a religious reform movement but it was entirely different from that of Egypt. The religious movement in India was to preserve religious sanctity and to check the fast growing influence of Christianity. On territorial nationalism Indian perspective was entirely different. There had been several movements in every part of India but they were guided by central leadership, and the notion behind the nationalist movement was to get rid of the British rule in India. On the third and last point i.e. ethnic and linguistic nationalism, the Indian leadership never thought of independence based on ethnicity and language. On the contrary, the main objective of Indian nationalist movement was to strengthen federal character of the country.

The Egyptian nation carried on the battle to find constitutional stability, alongwith a second battle for sovereignty and self-government. One aspect of this was the struggle for autonomy in financial matters and beyond that for an increase in individual and national incomes and a lifting up of cultural and social standard. Ibrahim, Abbas
I, Mohammad Said and Ismail adopted policies which plunged Egypt deeper and deeper into debt and allowed foreigners more and more say in the running of the country. Said gave responsibility to build the Suez Canal to a French engineer Ferdinand de Lesseps which could connect the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. The Canal had been built with French and Egyptian money. The British were also looking for a proper time to intervene in Suez Canal so that they could get the shortest route to India. Ismail's financial irregularity in 1875 in Egypt gave this opportunity to the British government under Benjamin Disraeli to purchase Egyptian share. That is how Britain's interest in Egypt strengthened.

Ismail loaded Egypt with ruinous debts. If he had no compunction in squeezing the last piastre from the peasant, he was still prepared to spend a great deal on development. New parts of Cairo were built, railways, roads, bridges, telegraphs and postal services were brought to the country, and education improved. His desires and wild tastes were exploited by others and despite his contributions to the development of Egypt his debts insured his subjection to Europe and eventually to Britain.

Modern means of transport, railways, telegraphs, postal services, modern education were the essential requirements to compete with European countries. Egyptian economy did not permit to introduce these development measures. Mohammad Ismail's desire to compete with the British plunged Egypt
into economic crisis. As a result Egypt was looking towards the French and the British help. In 1876 Ismail ran out of means of raising money and postponed payment on his debts. A European Debt Commission was imposed to attempt to safeguard foreign interests -- the beginning of intervention of Egyptian affairs which finally led to occupation. The Commission's authority was soon strengthened by the appointment of two controllers, a British and a Frenchman, who established what came to be known as the Dual Control. They acquired such wide economic and financial powers that their regime had been called a 'veiled colonial administration'.

In India the revolt of 1857 was the result of the accumulated discontent among the various strata of the society who suffered by the British political conquest, by the new economic forces and measures brought into operation by that conquest, and by the various social innovations introduced in the country by the British government.

The annexationist policy of the British, especially of Lord Dalhousie, which brought about the liquidation of a number of Indian feudal states, the new land revenue system which brought the mass of the Indian peasantry to acute economic misery, and a large scale ruination of millions of Indian artisans and handicraftmen as a result of the influx of the machine made goods of the British industries in the Indian markets, were the principal cause of revolt which expressed the profound discontent of sections of these
social layers. The political and economic discontent of the Indian people which had been gathering steadily, especially after 1870, almost threatened to reach an explosive point in 1883. A disastrous famine swept over the country at the close of the century resulting in great economic distress. India was also damaged by bubonic plague of a varulenta type which took a heavy toll of life. These events undermined the British rule in the eye of the people. The emergence of the Indian National Congress representing the people of India against the colonial power was a liberal outcome of this discontent.

The Egyptian nationalist movement was a history of military revolt. The first nationalist movement was itself a military revolt, followed by the 1919 military revolution, the 1936 revolution and the 1952 military revolt when Colonel Gamel Abdel Naser captured the power and Egypt was declared a Republic. On the contrary Indian nationalist movement was fought only by the civilians. There had been extremist activities in India during the nationalist movement but they were marginalized by the people themselves. Over all the Indian nationalist movement was peaceful.

**METHODOLOGY**

The methodology followed in this study is historical, analytical and descriptive. It is mainly based on primary sources, like, writings and speeches of Egyptian and Indian leaders, archival materials available in Arabic, French and
English languages and from other individual Governments documents, reports and publications. Data is also collected from report, statements, research work, unpublished documents and reports in the international organizations related to the field. The study also relies upon the secondary source materials such as books, articles, journals and newspapers.

Microfilms, where it was necessary, have been utilized to complete the chapters.

The researcher has also attended various seminars, meetings and conferences organized in India and by international organizations to obtain first hand data and information related to Egyptian and Indian nationalist movement.

The scholar had also interviewed the area specialists in School of Oriental and African Studies Library, University of London; Public Record Office; The British Library; The Royal Institute of International Affairs; Institute of Historical Research; .De Montfort University; University of Bristol; Edinburgh University; University of Durhum during his recent visit to London between November 1995 to January 1996.

**HYPOTHESIS**

1. The British made their first target to Egyptian and Indian cities because they were the main trading centres in pre-British period. With the emergence of capitalist econo-
my, the British policy towards Egyptian and Indian trade and other business gradually changed. Now they constantly destroyed these centres by pumping British goods.

2. Most of the leaders in Egypt and India were western educated. They were familiar with the three pillars of liberalism, i.e. liberty fraternity and equality existed in western countries. So they wanted to introduce a western lifestyle in their respective countries so that native people may compete with the west.

3. Liberal leadership believed in cooperation, persuasion and freedom within the British constitutional framework, they always kept away from the confrontationist policy of the extremist groups of Egypt and India.

4. The mobilization process in the initial stage was initiated by the Egyptian officials in the British army in Egypt. The officials were not familiar with the problems of the people of the country. The unfamiliarity didn't pull the mass support. As a result the British army suppressed the military revolt in Egypt whereas this process was begun by the civilians in India. The leadership got full cooperation from the masses and they opposed the British rule in the form of an organization.

5. The British rule left rural Egypt largely untouched, except for taxation and the acquisition of estates whereas the British equally penetrated in rural and urban areas in India.
6. The withdrawal of Civil Disobedience Movement at a time when it had became a mass movement was a wrong decision of Gandhiji. His decision was a major set back to the Indian nationalist movement when many of the leaders in particular and masses in general found dissociated from the movement. Gandhiji announced Individual Civil Disobedience as an alternative to the previous one which did not revive the spirit of the movement.

7. The Press played a very important role to oppose British colonial power in Egypt and India. It united the masses and build up a strong public opinion against the imperial forces. Press was representing the country at a time when political parties did not emerge in Egypt. The Press created an atmosphere to stand against the common enemy i.e. the British irrespective of their ideological differences.

8. There was a major difference at a point of time when the majority of leaders who challenged the British colonial power in Egypt were from Syria, Iran, Arab, Turkey and Albania. However, the Indian leadership was quite capable to challenge the British colonial power. Octavian A. Hume and Annie Besant (though they were the British origin) had contributed to the Indian nationalist movement in the initial stage but their contribution in India was not important as much as their role in Egypt.

9. The majority of leaders who challenged the British
colonial rule in Egypt and India were mainly of middle class family background.

10. The Egyptian nationalist movement was stirred by religious zeal. The Egyptian leadership stresses ottoman unity against the imperial intervention whereas Indian nationalist movement had a secular character, social and religious organizations had been in India but their role in the movement was insignificant, they had been formed to combat the British expansion of Christianity.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The present study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I deals with an overview of Egyptian and Indian nationalist movement in which, issues (theoretical, historical, social and economic) like structure of society of Egypt and India, interest of colonial power, Role of Syrian leaders before and after the British occupation, situations after World War II, role of the middle class in the nationalist movement, division in congress leadership and international pressure for independence to Egypt and India etc. are discussed.

Chapter II examines the socio-economic characteristics of national leadership, their educational background, occupational background, rural or urban origins, religious affiliation, regional participation, their class background.

Chapter III analyses the nature and characteristics of political mobilization, the methods adopted by the leaders to mobilize the masses, the role of modern education, the
press, political and administrative unification, modern means of transport and the rise of new social classes.

Chapter IV discusses the division within the nationalist movement, division in Muslim-Copts Leadership, division within the society, ideological difference caused the emergence of several parties in Egypt and India, division in the nationalist movement on the question of leadership, partition of Bengal and Swadeshi Movement, Congress leadership and Muslim dissatisfaction, division in Congress and the emergence of Indian Liberal Federation, Hindu Mahasabha and Muslim League, formation of Swaraj Party, Gandhiji-Dr. B.R. Ambedkar an ideological division on Dalit question and demand for Pakistan.

Chapter V takes a note of conclusion by summing up the findings of earlier chapters along with the recommendations of the study.