CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This thesis is concerned with the socio-historical process of the development of nationalist consciousness in Goa and seeks to understand the role of Tristao de Braganza-Cunha (1891-1958), popularly acknowledged as the Father of Goan Nationalism, in this process.

Undoubtedly, Goa is today considered a part of India. However, reputed studies of Indian nationalism fail to examine or even to make a mention of nationalism in Goa or any of the other pockets of India earlier subject to the rule of imperialist powers other than Great Britain. I consider this an omission because the manner in which nationalism developed in these territories is distinctive and cannot be understood as part of the general process of nationalism that developed in the rest of the sub-continent.

This process was tardy and tortuous, corroborated by the fact that although the colonization of India began with the Portuguese, they were the last of the European colonisers to depart.¹

¹Subsequently referred to as Braganza-Cunha.

²The Portuguese captured the island of Goa as early as 25 November 1510, even before Babar, founder of the Mughal dynasty, conquered Delhi on 21 April 1526. They were driven out by the Indian Army only in 1961, 450 years later. In contrast, the British annexation of India began as late as 1757, after their victory in the Battle of Plassey, and ended within 200 years, in 1947. Thus the combined period of rule of the Mughal empire, the Maratha Empire and the British empire over the rest of India is shorter than the period of Portuguese rule over parts of Goa.
Nationalism in Goa and the nature of Braganza Cunha’s nationalist discourse -- which although born out of his programmatic response to the prevailing socio-political situation, represents the only cogent discourse of nationalism in Goa -- are the issues discussed in this work. At the outset it is appropriate to start with the discussion on the discourse of ‘nationalism’, as it is central to the thesis.

**Nationalism - A Problematic Discourse**

The process of the emergence and disintegration of nations throughout the world in recent times is becoming increasingly complex and has given rise to various interpretations of nationalism. On account of this, there is no universally acceptable definition of nationalism, while there is consensus among a large cross section of thinkers that nationalism is a problematic discourse.¹

Nationalism emerged in the west in the eighteenth century and, as has been pointed out by Louis Synder, was characterized by the following factors:

* It was against the medieval policy of the Church and the State.
* It was opposed to the divine rights of the monarchy.
* It reflected the desire of Europeans to be governed by their own kind.
* It denounced the historical structure of the privileged classes.
* The movements implied a common cultural heritage [Synder 1968].

By the nineteenth century the ‘Triumph of Nationality’ had been achieved and around a dozen nation states created [Davies 1968:482].

¹Homi Bhabha has referred to the nation as ‘one of the major structures of ideological ambivalence within the cultural representation of modernity’ [1990:4].
The nationalist struggles that emerged in the non-western world in the twentieth century were markedly different from the earlier nationalist struggles, as they were directed towards ending colonial domination.

Probably because they emerged from the west, many of the earlier discourses of nationalism distinctly displayed what Anthony Smith calls a 'Eurocentric' standpoint while looking upon these latter anti-colonial struggles [Smith 1983:xil]. Such discourses tended to view the developed western world as superior to the non-western world and made little or no attempt to understand the aspirations of those who participated in these movements.¹

Nationalist movements which emerged in response to colonialism belong to the history of the greater part of the world. In recognition of this fact, in the last two decades the understanding of nationalism has advanced considerably and there has been a conscious attempt to transcend the Eurocentric bias that marked earlier discourses of nationalism. I have in mind particularly the discourses of Hugh Seton-Watson, Benedict Anderson, E J Hobsbawm and Paul Brass. The discussion of nationalism in Goa has been informed by these and other scholars.

As compared to the earlier classifications of 'western' and 'non-western' or 'eastern' nationalisms, and 'good' and 'evil' nationalisms, Seton-Watson has attempted a more neutral classification, differentiating between 'old' and 'new' nations; the 'new nations' being the nations that were formed from 1789 onwards.

¹ A cogent example of such discourse is to be found in Hans Kohn. Differentiating between 'western' nationalism and 'non western nationalism', he asserts that while western nationalism was born out of the spirit of the enlightenment, and was rational and cosmopolitan; non western nationalism was the response of a closed authoritarian society to outside influences, and was based on glorification of the past [Synder 1968:53].
According to him, the basic difference between the 'old' and 'new' nations was that at the time of the formation of the old nations, no concept of 'nation' or 'national consciousness' existed and the leaders had no idea that they were involved in the creation of nations; whereas in the case of the new nations, the leaders were consciously engaged in nation formation. In both cases 'small, educated political elites' played a vital role.

Seton-Watson's attempt at unbiased objectivity is conscious, as is evident from his contention that: 'Most definitions have in fact been designed to prove that, in contrast to the community to which the definer belonged, some other group was not entitled to be called a nation' [1977:4]. In spite of this, his analysis of nationalist movements in India and China bears traces of a western bias. In the case of both of these countries, he contends that 'modern national movements' were superimposed on 'ancient civilizations' [1977:9].

This bias becomes more evident in his analysis of communal disharmony in India; he virtually absolves the British of any responsibility in its creation [1977:290-293] and attributes M K Gandhi to be the cause of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, with no mention of the role played by the British in it [1977:294]. This is illustrative of the fact that the task of creating an 'objective' discourse of nationalism is problematic.

Perhaps a problem in the reverse is the suspicion with which non-western

According to Seton-Watson, even the best known definition provided by Joseph Stalin -- that a nation must necessarily have the four characteristics of a common language, common territory, a common economic life and a common mental make up -- arose out of the polemic against the Jewish socialist movement, the Bund, to prove that the Jewish were not a nation [1977:5].
scholars view scholars from the west. Partha Chatterjee has started his recent treatise on nationalism with a chapter titled ‘Whose Imagined Community?’ which contains a brief critique of Anderson’s formulation of the nation as an imagined community [1994]. He questions Anderson’s assertion that nationalisms in other parts of the world had to choose their imagined community from certain models posed by Europe and the Americas, asking if that is the case ‘(W)hat do they have left to imagine?’ According to him, going by this logic, ‘Even our imaginations must remain forever colonized’ [1994:5].

However, it is incorrect to imply that Anderson’s discourse of nationalism is dominated by a notion of western superiority. While Anderson’s view of the nations that emerged towards the end of the eighteenth century, as being ‘modular’ and ‘capable of being transplanted’ in other regions [1983:4] can be taken as an indication of his western bias, this view does not dominate his discourse and does not represent its central content. For example, he also asserts: ‘Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness but by the style in which they are imagined’ [1983:6]. Moreover, he does not view nationalism’s origins in the political contest for power (see Footnote 6) but conceives of the nation as a ‘cultural artefact’ to be understood by aligning it to the cultural system which preceded it [1983:12].

His conception of the nation is that of an ‘imagined community’ whose

---

*See Chatterjee, Partha, *The Nation and its Fragments - Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*, 1994, in which he asserts that ‘nationalism’s autobiography is fundamentally flawed’ [7] because it tries to trace its origins to the contesting of the political power of the colonial rule, whereas nationalism created its own domain of sovereignty in spiritual matters before the contest of power began.*
meaning changes over time. While accepting that nationalism is created, he gives credence to the fact that for the people concerned, the feeling of communion and the image of the nation which they share is genuine.

Seton-Watson and Anderson give us important insights into different modes of nationalism but, most importantly, they demonstrate that the subjective feeling of nationalism cannot be reduced to a rigid set of objective factors. On the other hand, Paul Brass has highlighted the role of elites in the process of the formation of national identity. He succinctly shows that although different cultural practices exist among people, the nationalist imagining would not be possible unless the cultural values of the people were transformed into political resources by elites who articulated the nationalist idea [1991:15]. According to him, the basic dynamic of nationalism is elite competition [1991:13].

Hobsbawm endorses Ernest Gellner's use of the term nation to be 'primarily a principle which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent' [1992:9]. His discourse of nationalism has assumed importance in recent times as he seeks to provide insights into the process by which the idea of the nation gained popular support, although it was created from 'above' [1992:10-12]. But his approach towards the anti-imperialist movements that arose in the non-western world reflects a definite cynicism about their veracity as nationalist

---

1 Seton-Watson's statement: 'All I can say is that a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to be a nation, or behave as if they formed one' [1977:5], is echoed in the definition of the nation proposed by Anderson: 'It is an imagined community -- and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign' [1983:6].

1 Gellner defines nationalism as a 'very distinctive species of patriotism, and one which becomes pervasive and dominant only under certain social conditions, which in fact prevail in the modern world, and nowhere else [1983:138]. He stresses the temporality of nationalism and points to cultural homogeneity as an important factor in defining the boundaries of the nation.
movements.

First of all, he speculates whether these movements, although influenced by western nationalist ideology, should be called nationalist [1992:105]. According to him the nationalists at the helm of these movements were only called nationalists because they adopted a western ideology excellently suited to the overthrow of foreign governments [1992:137]; he further states that they usually consisted of an 'exiguous minority of indigenous evolues' [1992:137 emphasis added].

He sees anti-imperialist movements as fitting into one of three categories: (i) those led by 'local educated elites imitating European "national self determination" (as in India)', (ii) those motivated by popular anti-western xenophobia as in China, and (iii) those spurred on by the 'natural high spirits' of the martial tribes, as in Morocco [1992:151].

This formulation has certain limitations: Firstly, it gives the impression of inhabitants of the non-western world as being incapable of rational action, or even action that is motivated by the desire to protect their own interests. Secondly, as per Gellner's definition, adopted by Hobsbawm, the anti-imperialist movements were nationalist: in that they were guided by the principle that the political and national unit should be congruent. It is generally accepted that most territorial units for which anti-imperialist movements sought to gain independence were the 'actual creations of imperial conquest' [1992:137], and often had no

---

9Evolute has been defined in the Chamber's Dictionary as 'a member of a primitive group of people who has been educated to the standards of a more advanced civilization' [Kirkpatrick 1983:437]. In the usage of this term with reference to nationalists of the non western world, a western bias is evident. It would seem more appropriate if Chatterjee's criticism of Anderson was directed at Hobsbawm.
proto-national roots. However, these frontiers became identified by the inhabitants of the territorial units as the political nation which had to be freed of colonial domination. Thirdly, Hobsbawm has failed to look at these movements with the perspective which he himself had defined as desirable, that is 'from below', understanding the aspirations of the people who participated in these movements [1992:10]. Notwithstanding this critique, Hobsbawm offers valuable insights into the development of nationalism, through his discourse.

He concedes that while nations are not 'natural' and involve a certain element of artefact, invention and 'social engineering', they arise in the context of a particular stage of technological and economic development. He thus provides a methodology that takes into account objective and subjective factors, without being reductionist or subjective.¹⁰

Moreover, in order to understand nationalism from the point of view of the aspirations of the people, he gives importance to three factors: Firstly, he states that official ideologies of states or movements cannot give any indication of what is in the minds of the people -- not even in the case of its most loyal citizens or supporters. Secondly, national identification is not necessarily superior to the remaining set of identifications which constitute the social being. Thirdly, national identification can change and shift even in short periods of time. These factors have been borne in mind while discussing the development of nationalism in Goa.

¹⁰This approach is discernible in Anderson, in his discussion of the role of the state, print capitalism and other factors in giving rise to the nationalist imagining, but tends to get overshadowed by the importance he gives to subjective factors.
The Peculiarities of Nationalism in Goa

In Goa, earlier government policies used a variety of measures to prevent any opposition to their rule. These measures ranged from extreme forms of repression and a denial of basic civil rights to Hindus, to the policy of assimilation. Using the factors of language and religion and the distribution of employment opportunities and official positions of prestige, a collaborationist elite had been formed whose interests lay in the continuance of colonial domination.

As a result of the constitutional monarchy established in Portugal in 1822, provision was made for the representation of Goa in the Cortes (the Portuguese Assembly). This gave an opportunity to the Christian elite of Goa to take part in public life. Pertinently, it also gave rise to the stirrings of nationalism among particular individuals, who questioned government policies that were detrimental to the interests of the groups that they represented.  

A more far reaching change was brought about in the political climate in Goa on account of the Republican rule established in Portugal in 1910, when the monarchy was abolished. The liberal conditions were favorable for the growth of the nationalist idea among a section of the elite. On account of this, beginnings were made by a section of the indigenous elite to contest the power of the 'external elite'. However, the effectiveness of these forces was limited by various circumstances such as the subjective state of mind of a section of the people or the objective fact of state repression as discussed in Chapter 4.

---

1See the discussion on Bernardo Peres da Silva, elected to the Cortes in 1833 and Francisco Luís Gomes, elected in 1860, in the section on The Genesis of the Nationalist Idea in Chapter 3.
Nationalism in Goa is distinct from the general process of nationalism in India because of the nature of Portuguese colonialism, which differed considerably from British colonial rule over the sub-continent.

As it had no proto-national roots¹², the frontiers of 'Goa' can be said to have been defined by the Portuguese. Portuguese colonial rule was different from British colonial rule because of its policy of 'official nationalism'¹³, which was evident in the attempt at bringing about an identification among the colonized people with Portugal, as Portuguese citizens, through the process of lusitanisation.¹⁴

While the British attempted to create a class of people who were British in their 'manners, morals and intellect', the Portuguese in their lusitanisation process attempted to imbue the people with a new language, a new religious belief, a change in the diet and in the manner of dress, especially in the 'Old Conquests' of Goa (areas annexed by the Portuguese between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries). This led to a profound mental miscigenation and reflected an attempt

---

¹²According to Hobshawn, the most decisive criterion of proto-nationalism is the consciousness of belonging to a lasting political entity, which he terms 'the historical nation' [1992:73]. By and large he contends that proto-national identifiers in the western nations helped to strengthen nationalist movements, whereas they served to create divisions among the people in the anti-imperial movements in the colonies, which were not historical nations, but 'the creations of imperial conquest' [137].

¹³The term 'official nationalism' has been used by Benedict Anderson to refer to the process of nationalism which emanates from the state and which serves the interests of the state [1980:159]. The official nationalisms tried to stretch 'the short tight skin of the nation over the gigantic body of the empire' [86]. Through the process of lusitanisation the Portuguese attempted to make their colonial subjects identify Portugal as their motherland.

¹⁴This term is derived from 'Lusitania', the Roman name for the western part of the Iberian Peninsula, roughly made up of Portugal and Extremadura [New Age Encyclopedia, 1982. Vol 11:137].
to imbue the people with the consciousness that they were Portuguese.¹⁵

Smith, while examining Portuguese colonialism in Africa, contrasts the 'static kind of paternal system' it favored to the 'educational ideology' of the British [1983:29], a description that can well be applied to the Portuguese colonial rule over Goa.

The Portuguese did not initiate any industry in Goa, unlike the British in India. Consequently, till the mid-twentieth century there was no evidence of a rising industrial bourgeois class; local enterprise being mainly restricted to trading. Official education was confined to a minuscule Christian elite, which had been quite successfully lusitanised by the Portuguese. Hindus were denied access to Portuguese education till 1910. These factors delayed the formation of an elite committed to Goa's independence from Portugal.

The nationalist response that emerged in Goa was not homogenous. This is because the educated elites were divided in their response to Portuguese rule. Even the opponents of Portuguese rule did not share a common image of liberated Goa. A section wished to protect 'Goan identity' and sought to create an independent Goa, autonomous of India, whereas the more dominant section wished to bring about the 're-integration' of Goa with India. But one of the reasons which curtailed the popularity of this demand was that in the course of the long tenure of colonial rule a feeling of being distinct from other Indians had developed among a section of Goans, compounded by the fact that there was no primordial affinity binding the people of Goa to the neighboring regions.

¹⁵This has been discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.
Another position taken by a section of the elite was that Goa was a part of Portugal.

The roots of the plurality of these nationalist imaginings is to be found in the policies of the Portuguese, which were at times discriminatory and at other times favorable to different sections of the educated elite.

This necessarily affected the nature of nationalism in Goa and explains the delay in the development of nationalist consciousness in Goa.¹⁶

**The Concept of Goan Nationalism**

As such, when references are made to 'Goan nationalism', as in the case of the reference to Braganza-Cunha as the *Father of Goan Nationalism*, the struggle for Goa's re-integration with India is implied. However, it is to be noted that in referring to the struggle for independence in the rest of the sub-continent, it would be out of place to talk of 'Telugu nationalism' or 'Punjabi nationalism'. But I would like to show that the use of this term is not accidental and has entered our language owing to certain circumstances. A brief glimpse at history will help in understanding the genesis of the concept of Goan nationalism.

British colonial rule over the rest of India began in 1757, by which time parts of Goa had been under Portuguese colonial rule for over two centuries. In 1885, the Indian National Congress (INC) was founded in British India by a Britisher, A O Hume. There is much controversy regarding the origins and the intent of

¹⁶For a fuller discussion on nationalism in Goa, see Chapter 3.
the INC. Whatever the truth behind the formation of the Congress may be, the fact is that it became the leading organization of the Indian nationalist movement and continued to dominate the political mainstream even after India attained independence from the British.

In Goa, there were sporadic uprisings against the Portuguese, such as the Conspiracy of the Pintos in 1787 and the revolts of the Rancs at various intervals from 1852 onwards, but no enduring organization emerged till the end of the second decade of the twentieth century.

In 1928, Braganza-Cunha established the Goa Congress Committee (GCC). This was affiliated to the INC at its Calcutta session in the same year.

The affiliation of the GCC to the INC represented the effort of the nationalists in Goa to link the struggle of the people of Goa with the Indian nationalist struggle. This could have been a turning point in the history of the nationalist movement in Goa and could have served as a means for Goans to express their solidarity with India's nationalist struggle and vice versa.

However, in 1934, the Congress adopted a new constitution which made no provision for the affiliation of Congress committees outside British India.18

---

17 According to the standpoint of Lala Lajpatrai and other extremists, it was created in keeping with the British governmental policy to safeguard its regime against the rising forces of popular unrest. This "safety-valve" theory found articulation in R.P. Dutt's *India Today* [1947] and is broadly accepted by the Indian left. Bipin Chandra has challenged this thesis, attempting to show how Indian leaders of the Congress hoped to use Hume as a 'lightning conductor' to generate a political awakening in India [1991:81].

18 The Congress Working Committee meeting in Bombay held in June 1934 approved of the new constitution, which provided for the formation of Provincial Congress Committees and spelt out the provinces concerned [Zaidi 1980:400]. At a meeting of the Congress Working Committee held at Wardha in July 1935, a resolution was passed stating: 'The Congress has not other power under existing circumstances, although the people of India, whether under the British, the Princes or any other power are geographically and historically one and indivisible...In the heat of the controversy, the limitation of the Congress is often forgotten. Indeed, any other policy will defeat the common purpose' [Sitaramayya 1946:605,606].
Consequently, the GCC was derecognized. This act of derecognition by the INC further contributed to distinguishing the position of Goa from the rest of India.

The long history of Portuguese rule over Goa -- during the course of which it had effected a profound cultural and religious penetration -- had already resulted in distinguishing the position of Goa from the rest of India. But a distinguishing blow was delivered at the hands of the INC, when it frustrated the attempts of nationalists in Goa to forge a link with the Indian national movement.

Consequently, the concept of ‘Goan nationalism’ originated on account of Goa being under the hegemony of Portuguese colonialism, which was distinct from British colonial rule over the rest of the sub-continent. But Indian nationalism as represented by the INC (and, after 1947, the Indian government) aided in the edification of this concept.

Scholars, in failing to acknowledge nationalism in Goa as a distinctive part of the process of Indian nationalism have helped to reify this concept even further.

The guiding objective of the dominant trend in Goa’s anti-colonial struggle was not the creation of Goa as a nation-state, but its integration with what was considered the mother nation, India. Most of the proponents of Goa’s freedom, including Braganza-Cunha, considered themselves as Indian nationalists. They were vehemently opposed to those who conceived of an independent Goa, autonomous of India. Consequently, I prefer to use the term ‘nationalism in Goa’ although it is a more cumbersome term than ‘Goan nationalism’. Similarly I have referred to the struggle in Goa as a ‘freedom struggle’ or ‘the nationalist
struggle in Goa’ rather than the ‘Goan nationalist struggle’. The proponents of the freedom struggle have been referred to as freedom fighters or as nationalists of Goa, and not as Goan nationalists.

These are conscious usages which I hope will compel future discourses of Indian nationalism to consider under their scope the development of nationalism in Goa and other pockets of India which were ruled by imperialist powers other than Britain.

**Approach to Understanding the Nationalist Discourse of Braganza-Cunha**

Braganza Cunha’s nationalist discourse emerged as a result of his response to the socio-political events of the time. The cogency of his discourse rests on the fact that in attempting to create a programme of action for Goa’s freedom, he presents a definite view of the history of Goa and attempts to understand the situation in Goa, examining the economic and socio-political conditions of the time.

Chatterjee’s study of the intellectual modes of nationalist thought [1986], particularly his depiction of ‘the world conquering western thought’ and the response of Indian nationalists confronted by it, contains certain important insights. His attempt at establishing the ‘autonomy’ of discourse and his refusal to judge nationalist discourse from a western standpoint make his methodology particularly relevant for the purposes of this study.

Various aspects of Braganza Cunha’s nationalist thought have been examined.
Special attention has been paid to his thesis, *The Denationalization of Goans*, in which his perception of colonialism as a social and cultural as well as a political and economic phenomenon has been highlighted. 'Denationalisation' as conceived of by Braganza-Cunha referred to the socio-cultural process by which Goans had lost a sense of their Indianness and had become mentally enslaved to the Portuguese.

The analysis of Braganza Cunha's thought has been informed by Chatterjee's formulation that nationalist thought is not a simple derivative from modern western thought. It is selective of what it takes from the west and results in the creation of a discourse that is different [1986]. It has been pointed out that while Braganza Cunha's analysis of the world economic situation was informed by Lenin's thesis of imperialism, he did not endorse the Marxist methods of revolution. Instead, the methods he advocated for Goa's freedom were influenced by Gandhi, while his aim was to recover Goa's 'Indian' past and to 'restore' Goa to India. Thus, I have attempted to show that his discourse was heterogenous in nature.

The view of his discourse being heterogenous has been influenced by Sudipta Kaviraj's characterization of the discourse of M N Roy as being heteronomous [Pantham 1986]. Kaviraj arrives at this characterization by dividing nationalist thought into two general responses of affirmation and negation with reference to colonialism and the nationalists' own culture.

He argues that while Roy was uncompromisingly anti-colonial in his politics, both in his earlier conception of proletarian revolution and in his later
formulation of 'radical humanism' he was influenced by the west. Consequently, a response of affirmation of western intellectual modes of thinking is discernable, resulting in the heteronomy of his discourse.

The discourse of Braganza-Cunha was derived in part from the west, but in his mode of thought shades of affirmation and negation of Indian culture and western thought are discernable. Rather than transpose western culture on Goa, his concern was with recovering Goa's 'Indian' cultural heritage. He thus sought to create a history for Goa in order to justify her integration with the Indian nation, which was necessarily based on an affirmation of indigenous traditions. However, in his analysis of the global conditions prevailing, he was influenced by Lenin, indicating an affirmation of a western intellectual mode of thought.

Thus, diverse trends of thought are discernable in his formulations, without the logic of a particular mode of thought dominating his discourse. In his writings, traces of Leninist thought, the Gandhian concepts of satyagraha and non-violence, and western notions of rationality and freedom are assembled to form a different discourse with its own logic.

A Note on Sources
All available writings of Braganza-Cunha have been examined. Primary sources such as newspaper reports, journals and first hand accounts of the freedom struggle were consulted, in addition to numerous secondary sources.

Interviews were conducted with surviving participants of the freedom struggle, some of whom had interacted with Braganza-Cunha in the course of the struggle.
and of people who were personally acquainted with him during his lifetime. These interviews have given me valuable insights into the peculiarities of the nationalist struggle in Goa and the role played by Braganza-Cunha in this struggle.

I am aware that in examining the nature of nationalism in Goa from a sociological point of view and in attempting to evaluate the role played by Braganza-Cunha in this process, I am treading on unexplored territory. This work does not pose to present a complete understanding of nationalism in Goa. On the contrary, it aspires to pave the way for a richer understanding of nationalism in Goa.