The Nationalist Movement in India and the manner in which Mahatma Gandhi transformed it into one of the biggest socio-political upheavals of modern times, is one aspect of Indian history that has inspired a tremendous amount of interest and output by American scholars in the post-independence era.

Indian Nationalism is a complex event comprising various facets which cannot be comprehended through any one viewpoint. Scholars have defined and explained nationalism from a number of perspectives. However illuminating, this active debate is overwhelming in its complexity and many issues remain obscure. Though much has been published on the Indian National Movement, certain aspects had received almost no attention or a critical appraisal mainly due to the bias of the earlier imperialist writers. But attempts are now being made to correct this imbalance and a number of remarkable books have been written in recent years to meet the growing need for a clear and simple conception highlighting the salient features of the phenomenon for the sake of understanding and explaining its empirical varieties.

Scholars have put forward various theories regarding the origin and nature of Indian Nationalism.
Certain broad parameters have emerged which suggest a complex relationship between culture and polity for the study of nationalism. The subject is now increasingly viewed as a social movement and related concepts like the national sentiment are taken into consideration while studying this theme of Indian history.

As a result of this multi-disciplinary approach, nationalist movements the world over are now viewed as part of a dynamic historical process inspired by an idealized image of a unified culture and polity. This image crystallized in symbiosis with the Enlightenment interpretation of the idea of social change as cumulative progress. And so, where cultural and political unity did not exist, nationalist movements became the means to realize it. Over the last two centuries, mobilization has been inspired by primarily cultural or primarily political components. With the rise in the political power and regulatory influence of the modern state, the latter has become the main focus of nationalism in the quest for a unified societal community. The state may encourage or retard nationalist movements of one type or the other, and it may also influence modification of the goals of the movements. The ideological and philosophical approach underlying the state, its strategic position in the global community, and the degree of homogeneity and differentiation within each state and each nationalist group emerge as significant.
variables and are themes which are being increasingly examined.¹

These recent trends have greatly enriched the study of the nationalist movement in India. Historians of modern India are increasingly concerned with tracing the factors responsible for the origin of nationalism, its aims, nature, ideology, and its impact especially that of "Gandhian political strategy" on the nationalist movements in Africa, East European countries like Poland and Latin America.

One of the earliest accounts on Indian nationalism was Annie Besant's book, How India Wrought for Freedom, published in 1915. The main emphasis of the book is on tracing the history of the Indian National Congress, its role in India's constitutional struggle for freedom and the achievements and sacrifices of the Congress under the moderate leadership. This work is a highly "romanticized" account of India's glorious heritage and Besant believes "that the beginnings of national consciousness are deeply embedded in its ancient past, notably the civilization nurtured by the Aryans. The Aryan civilization is depicted as a true breeding ground of Indian nationality."²

Besant completely denies the suggestion that Indian Nationalism was "a modern phenomenon of European origin." She is of the view that the British in no way sowed the seeds of nationalism in India; at best they were only responsible for its development in this country. With the introduction of modern institutions like Western education, British rule only strengthened nationalist sentiments in India and gradually prepared the country for self-government. But at the same time British imperialism in India was highly repressive, led to the drain of wealth and the complete economic dislocation of a once "prosperous and wealthy nation."

Modern writers of nationalism in India are critical of Besant’s work on the grounds that she has explained nationalism in very vague terms and has failed to distinguish between ethnocentrism and nationalism. "At no point does Besant actually define what this phenomenon is. It is only implied that nationalism is a consciousness of unity among people, or a manifestation of patriotism, or even a sort of attachment to one’s soil, literature or religion. The crucial question whether ancient Hindus saw themselves as a nation or not is not considered." 
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Very different from Annie Besant's amateurish attempt are two penetrating early accounts of Indian nationalism by Valentine Chirol and Manabendra Nath Roy. Though writing from diametrically opposite points of view, Valentine Chirol and M.N. Roy developed very sound methodological concepts and provided a firm theoretical base for further research and publication on the Indian National Movement.

Valentine Chirol's *India Old and New* (London, 1921) is a sophisticated version of 'the neo-traditional theory of Indian nationalism' which rejects the optimism of the early Congress leaders that India has the potential to evolve as a nation once its society has been sufficiently modernized. Chirol claimed that "India was a mere geographical expression which could never develop into a nation in the western sense of the term; and that whatever political movements, with a pseudo-national colour, existed in India, had their roots deep in traditional, instinctively anti-western sources. The so-called national movement... was engineered by small elite groups of traditional society who had in view the particular interests of their own caste, and not the general interest of the people."^5

---

M.N. Roy, the founder of the Indian Communist Movement wrote his famous treatise *India in Transition* (Geneva, 1922) on the Indian National Movement where he has viewed it as "a process within the country's broader historical evolution."6 M.N. Roy has tried to set the Indian nationalist movement in the Marxist mould and sees it as a "particular stage in the development of the modes of production in different parts of the world."7 He has challenged Lenin's hypothesis that India was under a feudal system by putting forward a wide array of facts and figures to show that India "was already within the orbit of capitalism and was moving towards a capitalist mode of production."8 Therefore, Indian nationalism could not be too revolutionary but had to develop gradually and move towards its logical conclusion as it was nurtured by the bourgeoisie which was made up of the working class.

In his study, Roy also seeks to answer two vital questions - how did a national movement emerge in India under British imperialism? And why did it emerge only in the late nineteenth century when more than a hundred years of British rule in India had already elapsed?
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Roy's explanation to both these queries is very logical and well-reasoned. He attributes the rise of nationalism to English education which initially led to a socio-religious reform movement in India and also to the creation of a class of intellectuals trained in modern political thought. The explanation to the second question is that "the dynamic cause behind the movement was the economic revival of the native middle-class after more than a hundred years of repression."9 For M.N. Roy, political nationalism was an expression of the aspirations of the bourgeoisie and occurred despite many obstacles, because of the determination of the Indians to safeguard their interests by forcing the British to make their policies in India more beneficial for the country and its inhabitants. Roy further states that although the Nationalist Movement was dominated by the bourgeoisie, the masses would eventually breakaway from the bourgeois leadership, reorganize themselves and "secure ultimate economic and social liberation of India."10

The historiography of the Indian National Movement was vastly enriched after 1947 due to the emergence of the
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nationalist school whose main representatives were R.C. Majumdar and Tara Chand.

Though the work of the nationalist historians is quite out-dated today, it was considered to be very pioneering at one time. The nationalist historiography on the Indian freedom struggle mainly emerged due to the efforts and desire of the Government of India to have an official account of this aspect of Indian history.

In 1952 the Education Ministry set up a Board to compile a comprehensive history of the Indian freedom movement. R.C. Majumdar was appointed director of the project, but he resigned in 1955, "finding it impossible to reconcile his conscience as a scholar with the political designs of his sponsors." The Government, on the other hand felt that "Bengal loomed too large" in Majumdar's text and removed him from the project for his biased approach.

The Government then appointed Tara Chand to undertake the writing of the history of the Freedom Movement. He came out with a four-volume set entitled History of the Freedom Movement in India, published between 1961 and 1972 by the Publications Division of the Ministry.

of Information and Broadcasting. The "approach, ideology and perspective"\(^{13}\) of Tara Chand was totally diverse from that of R.C. Majumdar.

Tara Chand viewed the achievement of freedom by India as a 'unique phenomenon', a 'dialectic process' by which a civilization was transformed into a nation in three main stages. "Its first step was antithetical in so far as it amounted to the destruction of the old order. This is the argument of the process which started in the middle of the eighteenth century and culminated in the revolt of 1857. The second step is the emergence of a new order which gradually gathers momentum during the half century after 1957. The third step is one of conflict and synthesis of the spirit of the old order and the new, of the East and the West, and the coming into the world of a new individual - the Indian nation state."\(^{14}\)

R.C. Majumdar rejected the theory put forward by Tara Chand. His approach was a political narrative of how independence was attained and therefore concentrated on the "proper presentation of historical truth, on the basis of the facts already known and published, and a correct

---


interpretation of them without being influenced... by long-standing notions, conventions, or traditions."\textsuperscript{15}

The two differed vehemently over the nature of the Revolt of 1857. While Tara Chand called it a national revolt, the last attempt of the old order to recover its departed glory, R.C. Majumdar called it the first great and direct challenge to British rule in India which is neither the "first nor national, nor a war of independence." They both also differed in their analysis of the communal problem. Majumdar believed that Hindus and Muslims constituted two separate nations, while to Tara Chand they represented a composite culture, but fell prey to the divide-and-rule tactics of the British.\textsuperscript{16} Both historians were at variance in their treatment of the nationalist leaders who dominated the freedom struggle, especially Gandhi. Tara Chand put a halo around Gandhi and found his role revolutionary. To R.C. Majumdar Gandhi was "politically invalid," a "failure" who bungled the communal issue. Majumdar was critical of Gandhi and even Nehru and said that their contribution was not much but "a regular propaganda has been kept up to preserve untarnished the halo of glory


which contemporaries, in their first flush of enthusiasm, put round their heads."17

The nationalist historians constructed their hypothesis on incomplete, secondary sources and tended to "underplay the inner contradictions of Indian society both in terms of class and caste... there was (also) a constant struggle between different social, ideological perspectives for hegemony over the movement"18 as the interests of all sections of society were not taken care of. This aspect too has been ignored in their works.

The main factors for the emergence and spread of the National Movement are ascribed to education which led to an awakening in the form of socio-religious reform movements, and the exploitative nature of colonialism in India. Gradually the freedom struggle became a popular mass movement which involved millions of people fighting for liberation from foreign yoke. But the major drawback of the nationalist historiography is that it neglected the "study of the differential role of different social classes and of the actual processes of mass mobilization and organization. Their major failure has been an inability to grasp the class aspects of Indian society (and the implication this had for


the National Movement), even while legitimately underlining the unity of all Indians in their struggle against imperialism."^{19}

The Marxist school was the next to emerge and its foundations for the study of the national movement have been attributed to Rajani Plame Dutt’s *India Today* (London, 1940) and A.R. Desai’s *Social Background of Indian Nationalism* (Bombay, 1948).

Rajani Palme Dutt was the first historian to systematically apply Marxian theory to the study of Indian nationalism. In *India Today*, Dutt has undertaken a detailed analysis of the nature and consequences of British rule, which according to him, eventually led to the emergence of the freedom struggle. His work is even today considered to be an outstanding example of the Marxist interpretation which opened up fresh areas for enquiry on Colonialism and Imperialism. Dutt was not only critical of British exploitation of India but also in his treatment of Indian leaders, especially Gandhi. He found Gandhi too conservative, who betrayed the peasants and workers "by resorting to non-violent means - a convenient tool serving the class interest."^{20} Dutt called the partition of India

---


"as unnatural bourgeoise compromise with Imperialism, which brought great evil to India."  

India, according to Dutt, attained independence not because of Gandhi or the Indian National Congress, but due to the emergence of new world forces and Britain's vulnerable military position after World War-II.

A.R. Desai's pioneering work, *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, adopted a sociological approach and applied the principle of Historical Materialism to the study of Indian Nationalism. The aim was to "understand the social transformation that took place in Indian society during British period." Desai contended that nationalism could not have emerged in the pre-British feudal Indian society. British rule led to "a qualitative structural transformation" of Indian society mainly through the introduction of modern capitalist economic modes. "As a reaction to the new web of politico-economic and socio-cultural relations which were being created by British policies, various movements - religious, intellectual, social, cultural, economic and political - emerged in India. The quality, functions, forms and techniques of these movements were different and new compared to those movements .
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which Indian society experienced during pre-British period... The reactions and movements being basically against the British rule, manifested themselves into a National Movement and a national awakening." The contribution of Marxist historians is important as it provided valuable insights into the nexus that existed between economic change and Indian nationalism.

An important intellectual impetus to the historiography of Indian Nationalism came from the imperialist or Cambridge historians led by Anil Seal. His book, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism: Competition and Collaboration in the Later Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1968), "describes a process of collaboration between the imperialist rulers and specific educated elites in India, in which the elites decided that their best interests required at least some degree of opposition to foreign rule." Anil Seal has presented a challenging, though somewhat controversial thesis of Indian nationalism as it evolved in the late nineteenth century. The Cambridge historians lay emphasis on "two main arguments" : First, "Indian politics were an inter-connected system working at several levels; and government had much to do with the
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linking of those levels." Second, "imperialism built a system which interlocked its rule in locality, province, and nation; nationalism emerged as a matching structure of politics. Indian politics have to be studied at each and every level; none of them can be a complete field of study on its own."25

According to Seal, the national movement was never such an important all-India force, nor did Indians really aspire for independence from British rule. Indians were, on the contrary, mainly concerned with their group interests at the local level in the early stages of nationalism. The rise of nationalistic fervour has been attributed to western education which made rapid strides in the Presidencies of Bengal, Bombay and Madras. These areas therefore developed faster and moved considerably ahead of other provinces, which in turn led to a growing disparity between the educated elite and the unlettered masses. This made any unity at the all-India level a distant dream.

But the educated elites from the three Presidencies decided to cooperate at an all-India and form associations to defend their primacy.26 This search for allies, both


vertically and horizontally, led to the formation of political organizations at the national level. These associations soon turned anti-British when educated Indians discovered that imperialism was in fact hindering their progress and prosperity in their own country. Consequently, a demand emerged for the expulsion of the British from India. But the politics of these nationalists reflected their continuing concern with local, and not national issues; "their involvement in nationalism represented no more than a new device to preserve the interest of their prescriptive group... the ideology of Indian Nationalism had little to do with its professed claims of freedom for the people or the advancement of common welfare." Therefore, the Cambridge historians were critical in their treatment of Indian politicians who were generally considered to be "inconsistent collaborators" of imperialism. The writings of Anil Seal have had a profound impact upon other historians who worked with him at Cambridge.

Judith Brown is best-known for her comprehensive biographical accounts of Gandhi contained in her books Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics, 1915-22 (Cambridge, 1972); Gandhi and Civil Disobedience: The Mahatma in Indian Politics, 1928-34 (Cambridge, 1977), and 27. Ibid., p.40.
more recently, *Gandhi: Prisoner of Hope* (New Haven, 1990). Besides, she has also written a well-received general book on Indian history - *Modern India: The Origins of an Asian Democracy* (Delhi, 1984). She is more magnanimous in her treatment of Indian history and the nationalist leaders than the other members of the Cambridge cluster. Being less dogmatic, she is at variance with the official Cambridge view of Indian nationalism that it was "inspired by the British: The matrix was British; the leadership was English-speaking and English-trained; the issues were founded by them; and even the foundation of the Congress itself was inspired by the British."28

Brown views the rise of nationalism as a purely Indian phenomenon and has systematically examined the nationalist organization from the top down. The focus of her study is the political career of Mahatma Gandhi and not his personality or saintliness. She has investigated Gandhi's political role in "linking locality, province, and nation"; and how he was able to bring various provinces "together into a fabric of integrated national politics."29 Judith Brown states that Gandhi gained political eminence and
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control of the Congress not due to his charismatic appeal but through intermediaries or sub-contractors who were influential in certain areas or segments. It was this alliance of several elites with Gandhi as the common intermediary that gave rise to nationalism in India.

In her latest book, Gandhi: Prisoner of Hope, Judith Brown has put forward the argument that the nationalist movement in India would have reached its goal even without Gandhi as "far deeper economic and political forces than the leadership of one man were at work loosening the links between Britain and India." She nonetheless views the attainment of independence by India as a landmark in world history because to her, "India reflects many of the forces which have created this world: for example, it was the first non-white nation to emerge from colonial control, and its independence from Britain in 1947 undermined the whole fabric of the British empire which had dominated world affairs in the preceding decades."30

The Indian national movement has been examined from diverse historiographic perspectives. Of all the historiographic schools, the Marxist interpretation was considered to be the most relevant and gained wide popularity amongst Indian historians. But from the 1960s a

number of works on Indian nationalism by professional historians trained in American universities have appeared. These works generally challenge the Marxian interpretation of modern Indian history. The American historians do not view India as a single unit and instead concentrate on analyzing Indian nationalism in the different regions and provinces. They offer a "social interpretation in terms of 'neo-traditionalism', which assigned the central role in politicization to the sharpening of pre-existing social rivalries in traditional India, on account of the institutional opportunities of upward social mobility offered by British rule. These rivalries were said to follow the lines drawn by region, language, religion and caste."31 The important institutional opportunities to be identified were English education and legislative franchise. According to these historians, the "interlocking" of older social rivalries and new institutional opportunities determined the path of Indian political development.32

This school of historians denies any basic change in the structure of the economy under British rule. Nor do they accept the Marxian argument that modernization in India was possible only after the break-up of the "traditional
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corporate structures." India, according to them, was always a progressive society undergoing constant transformation from traditionalism to modernism. Some of the renowned American historians to write extensively on the Indian National Movement are Bruce T. McCully, J.T. Sunderland, Donald M. Brown, and John R. McLane. Though there was a qualitative change after 1960 in American historiography on Indian nationalism, some notable books on this theme were written much before that.

One of the earliest Americans to wrote on Indian Nationalism during the first quarter of the twentieth century was Reverend J.T. Sunderland. He write two books, *India, America and World Brotherhood*, (Madras, 1924), and *India in Bondage*, (Calcutta,1928). Both his works depict his deep compassion for India, Indians and the cause of Indian independence. J.T. Sunderland was closely associated with Lala Lajpat Rai from 1914 to 1919 during the latter's stay in the United States. He was greatly admired by Lala Lajpat Rai and Rabindranath Tagore for his sympathetic understanding of the Indian problem.

For his part, Sunderland claims to "have been a constant student of Indian history, literature, religious faiths and political conditions" all his adult life, being "actuated by the desire to do something... to give India and America a little better knowledge of each other, and to
bring them into a little closer sympathy..." While writing on India's great struggle for freedom and nationhood, Sunderland is harsh and critical of British imperialism, but at the same time does not want to be misunderstood as an enemy of Great Britain. He writes purely from a humanitarian point of view and in order to inculcate feelings of world-wide brotherhood amongst the different countries of the world.

Sunderland's second book, *India in Bondage*, highlights India's contribution to ancient scientific and technological developments, her civilization, architecture, literature and the great cultural heritage. The writer feels that a country with such a rich tradition should be free from the imperial yoke. Through his writings he hoped to win American support for the Indian nationalist struggle, which was the result of British imperialism and racial arrogance.

In 1940, Bruce T. McCully, a research scholar working for a degree in an American university published a monograph entitled, *English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism*. It is a work of intrinsic merit and McCully has given a perceptive account of English education as an instrument of social change and the birth of nationalism. The author views nationalism as a global

phenomenon and in this study seeks to examine the problem of causation of nationalism in India.

Bruce T. McCully has made out a strong case in favour of English education as the agency through which nationalism came to India and writes, "national feeling did not germinate of its own accord in the soil of India; rather it was an exotic growth implanted by foreign hands and influences. Without the existence of the British regime and the element of foreign domination implicit in that system, the beginnings of Indian nationalism would be difficult to envisage." 34

McCully sketches briefly, but very systematically the spread of Western education in the different regions of India as a result of which about 5,000 people received degrees between 1857 and 1885, and another 50,000 matriculated. Though a miniscule proportion of the population, this educated minority now sought gainful employment either in the government or the "liberal professions." Widening perspective and understanding due to modern education also gave rise to "resentments and aspirations" among this class of people which in turn "led to the germination of the seed of nationalism in India." 35

The resentment of the educated Indians was largely due to economic factors. Avenues for suitable employment in agriculture, military service and industry were sorely limited. The higher echelons of the civil service were also closed to them for all practical purposes. Another cause for discontentment was due to exposure to western cultural influences which led to an aping of western ideas, beliefs, customs and eating habits and eventual alienation of the educated from the rest of the society. Matters were further precipitated when this educated minority "began attacking venerated traditions in the name of reform and progress" leading to a cultural conflict. "Social tension born from cultural alienation, coupled with economic distress, were the activating factors which led the educated to experiment with nationalism."36

McCully reiterated that the English language and education were the integrating and motivating forces of the nationalist movement. Before the advent of the British there was no real nationalism in India. What existed "was a form of Hindu patriotism which manifested itself in parochial loyalties, a fond attachment to the natal spot, an interest in the local affairs of the village, a sentimental attachment to the ancestral religion and manners."37 The
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ideology of the Indian nationalists was inspired by European culture and ideas like liberty, freedom and they sought to imitate the "Young Italy" of Mazzini and the Irish nationalists.

Donald Mackenzie Brown has contributed two books to the historiography of the Indian National Movement. These books are: The White Umbrella - Indian Political Thought from Manu to Gandhi (Los Angeles, 1964) and, The Nationalist Movement - Indian Political Thought from Ranade to Bhave (Los Angeles, 1965), and are designed to provide the western reader with a concise survey of the landmarks of Hindu political ideas and traditions.

The White Umbrella... begins with a survey of the nature of Ancient Indian Political Thought and Part One of the book contains the teachings of Manu and Kautilya. Part Two deals with Modern Political Thought of Vivekananda, Tagore, Aurobindo and Gandhi and how their philosophy shaped the nature of the freedom struggle in India.

Donald M. Brown's second book, The Nationalist Movement... begins by tracing the impact of the west on a "dormant" Indian society with its "caste system, the joint family, and the self-governing village as the most characteristic aspects of Hindu life." He has asserted
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that India learnt of the modern ideas of democracy and socialism due to interaction with the west. The British, according to him, did not sow the seeds of communalism in India, and the beginnings of Hindu-Muslim discord have been traced back to the tenth century A.D. The volume comprises of the teachings of Nehru, S. Radhakrishnan, Gandhi, J.P. Narayan and Tilak, amongst others.

Of the more recent American historians to write about the Indian nationalist struggle, the name of John R. McLane has left an indelible mark on the historiography of the freedom movement in India. The Political Awakening in India, (New Jersey, 1970), which he edited, was widely acclaimed. It consists of thirty-seven essays selected from an impressive variety of sources depicting a rare vitality and freshness of approach and style.

According to McLane, in a heterogenous society like India, with its caste, class, regional and communal loyalties, national unity and independence were possible only due to the Congress and Gandhi's dynamic leadership. Through the selections included in this volume, McLane aspired to examine two important themes of the political style and technique, "consisting of discrete, deferential requests to the ruling authority by individual supplicants for favour or for modifications of administrative policies" and "mass communication, organization of formal parties,
ideological indoctrination, elections, and civil disobedience" by which freedom was won.

In the first section, "The Nineteenth Century Foundations of Indian Politics," the writings of a motley of Indian elite like Ram Mohun Roy, Tagore, Sayyid Ahmad Khan etc. are included. These people talk of Indian nationality even though there is no unity of purpose among them. The second section "Nationalism in Transition," traces the emergence of cultural nationalism and its political manifestations—terrorism and civil disobedience. The other sections focus on the problems of communalism, untouchables, peasant groups, Dravidian cultural and political separatist movements, all of which were major obstacles in the way of national unity.

In his next major venture, Indian Nationalism and the Early Congress (New Jersey, 1977), McLane's study is confined to just one institution, the Indian National Congress, during its first twenty years and how it shaped the course of nationalism in these two decades. He is full of praise for the early Congress leaders and wrote that the "Indian founders of the Congress were impressed by the nobility of a nationalist vision of subordinating the interests of self, family, and caste to the interests of an

Indian nation." The vision of the Congressmen "was potent, sincerely held and widely shared." However, McLane readily concedes that there were certain cracks in the early Congress leadership. A lot of their time and energies were taken up by a National idealism. They were also elitist in their attitude and in the early years the "Congress was reflecting only a small segment of nationalist sentiment." McLane has given serious attention to the growth of communalism for which, he has placed the blame squarely on the Hindu majority for launching an agitation for cow protection and Hindu martial revival. The partition of Bengal in 1905 is seen as an important landmark in the nationalist struggle as it stimulated the formation of the Muslim League, led to a split between the Moderate and Extremist wings of the Congress at Surat and a growing political awareness amongst thousands of previously uninvolved Indians.

A landmark study on Indian nationalism which also established the credentials of Stanley Wolpert as a scholar of repute is his pioneering work, *Tilak and Gokhale: Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India* (Berkeley and Los Angles, 1962). In this volume, Wolpert has
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highlighted the contribution of the Congress under the leadership of the moderates to the cause of Indian Independence. Without detracting from the role of Gandhi and Nehru, the author has focused "on the lives and ideas of their greatest predecessors," Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Gopal Krishna Gokhale, who "bequeathed a rich legacy" to the country and "prepared the ground on which the edifice of the Republic of India has been erected...."42 Infact, Wolpert emphatically states that Tilak and Gokhale "rightly deserve an honored place in history as makers of Modern India...."43

Other outstanding books on this theme of Indian history continue to be written. Congress and Indian Nationalism: The Pre-Independence Phase, edited by Richard Sisson and Stanley Wolpert (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988) consists of seventeen chapters on issues of ideology, mass participation, and class and caste mobilizations at different times and regions before 1947. The nationalist ideology receives special attention in this volume in an essay by John R. McLane. He writes that western education and exposure to liberal ideology, made it possible for the early Congress leaders to have a unified nationalist vision. But unfortunately their secular vision came into conflict
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with Hindu revivalist movements which enjoyed mass appeal. As a result of this conflict and opposition from the independently emerging class, caste and religious forces, the Congress leadership tried to overcome this obstacle and use these to the benefit of a Congress-led and inspired nationalism. For example, the Congress was constantly trying to evolve a policy to woo the peasantry to its side. The Congress also endeavoured to strengthen its rural base by acting as an arbiter between various rival groups in the countryside.

Issues of ideology, the social basis of Congress nationalism and Hindu-Muslim tensions which led to the rise of communalism are the prominent themes discussed in *Indian National Congress and Indian Society, 1885-1985: Ideology, Social Structure, and Political Dominance* edited by Paul R. Brass and Francis Robinson (Delhi, 1987).

Another remarkable work on the Indian National Movement is *Brothers Against the Raj: A Biography of Sarat and Subhas Chandra Bose*, (Penguin edition, 1990), by Leonard A Gordon. The author developed an interest in India during his student days at Harvard and undertook a detailed study of Indian civilization for a course on comparative societies during 1959-60. From Harvard, Gordon, went to Chicago which boasted of an excellent and well-equipped South Asia Center. Here he worked under the supervision of Edward C. Dimock,
Jr., the undisputed Bengal specialist as a result of which he decided to concentrate on the role of Bengal in India's struggle for freedom and also attempt to analyze the complicated relationship between Gandhi and the Bengalis. More especially, Gordon was drawn towards examining the "ambivalent relationship" between the leader of Indian nationalism and Subhas Chandra Bose, which culminated in *Brothers Against the Raj: A Biography of Sarat and Subhas Chandra Bose*.

In this volume, Gordon has approached his subject from a sympathetic but objective viewpoint and states that Subhas Chandra Bose was genuinely opposed to racism and collaborated with Germany not due to any fascist leanings, but due to a genuine desire to oust the British from India.

For Robert I. Crane the rise of nationalism in India is to be seen in the "development of a strong, articulate regional consciousness" beginning with Maharashtra and soon spreading to other areas. "The process was linked causally and by 'feedback' mechanisms to the growth of modern nationalism in British India... One of the major issue in the growth of Indian nationalism was the matter of linkage between Indian nationalism and various sub-nationalisms, including regional nationalisms."44
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Crane highlights the role of the vernacular press in the development of nationalism in Bengal in his essay, "The Development of Nationalism in India in the Late Nineteenth Century: The Bengal Press and Associations in the Diffusion of Nationalism" included in *Region and Nation in India*, edited by Paul Wallace (Delhi, 1985). Religion, according to Crane, is another important factor creating political awareness especially amongst the minority communities.

The debate on the historiography of the Indian Nationalist Movement is very alive and an ongoing one. A survey of recent writings indicates a growing interest in geographic regions and within this framework the focus has generally been on some definite aspect of society - for example, the activities of those who controlled the centres of political power. The modern researchers are successfully trying to "weave a complex web of explanations bringing together economic forces, institutional opportunities and government impulses in their proper sphere."45

---
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