CHAPTER - V

EDUCATION UNDER DYNASTY CENTRE
VIE-ALVIV STATE
V. EDUCATION UNDER DIARCHY: CENTRE VS. STATE

The Government of India Act 1919 constituted the first step towards devolution of powers.1 No change was made in the Central Government.2 In the 'Provincial Governments', a provision was made for some sort of responsibility.3 Since transfer of full responsibility to the 'Provincial Governments' was considered premature, a dyarchic system of government was established.4 Although power was transferred to popular control in respect of certain subjects for which there was no money involved5

2. Ibid.
and the Governor was directed to act on the advice of his ministers, he could refuse to accept such advice, when he saw 'sufficient cause to dissent from the opinion.' He was to guide and assist his Ministers in the discharge of their duties and could overrule them and act on his own responsibility when the consequences of acquiescence to their wishes were likely to prove serious. It created a dichotomous situation. On the one hand, devolution was desired. On the other, Governor's position was made stronger.

The Act also empowered the Governor to reserve a Bill for the Consent of Governor-General in certain cases. The Provincial Governor had powers both to veto legislations and to "certify" legislations which the popular ministry wished to be adopted, if not accepted by the Legislature. These enormous powers to the Governor of a province were deliberately given by the authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. They wanted a unitary type of Government. Therefore, they were quite conscious of the biggest anomaly in dyarchy, the artificial division

6. Instrument of Instruction to the Governor or Acting Governor for the time-being of the Presidency of Ford William in Bengal, P.XXXI.
7. Ibid.
of an administration, which essentially was one. They deliberately instituted "Joint Purse" and "Joint Deliberation" to bridge the gulf and make dyarchy workable. They hoped that these 'connections' would help in making the transition to responsible Government in respect of the transferred subjects smooth and easy.\textsuperscript{11} The dyarchy only aimed at the introduction of partial responsible government in India which necessitated the demarcation of the sphere of the provincial governments and the consequent division of subjects between the provincial governments and the Central Government.\textsuperscript{12} This division was made under the Act of 1919, known as the "Devolution Rules."\textsuperscript{13} Therefore, like the Canadian Constitution, two lists of the subjects viz. list of Central Subjects and that of Provincial Subjects were drawn up. The subjects which concerned the whole of India or more than one province and necessitated uniformity in legislation were given to the Centre. They were like Defence, Foreign Affairs, Public Debt, Customs, Post and Telegraphs etc. In the list of the Provincial Subjects were placed Local Government, Public Health, Education, Agriculture etc.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11} Instrument of Instructions to the Governor or Acting Governor for the time being of the Ford William in Bengal and the Report of the Joint Select Committee, Clause 33.

\textsuperscript{12} Sikri, S.I.: Constitutional History of India 1960. P.114.

\textsuperscript{13} Subrata Sarkar, The Centre and the States, P.21.

As a result there was some relaxation of the previous control of the Centre over the provinces in administrative, legislative and financial matters. The devolution of power to the provinces, however, should not be confused with the principle of federal distribution of power.\textsuperscript{15}

Under the Act of 1919, the provinces got power by way of delegation from the Centre. The Central legislature, therefore, retained the power to legislate for the whole of India, relating to any subject.\textsuperscript{15A}

The relaxation of the Centre's control over the provinces was apparent, not real. As per the provisions of the Act, no Provincial Bill, even though assented to by the Governor, would become an Act, unless assented to also by the Governor-General.\textsuperscript{15B} The clauses of the Act were framed to retain control over the provincial governments.

The new Act was inaugurated by the Duke of Connaught on first January 1921,\textsuperscript{16} and the new legislatures came into existence in India.\textsuperscript{17} The main feature of the Act was the introduction of the principle of "Dyarchy" or double government in the provinces.\textsuperscript{18} It was a political experiment

\begin{addendum}
\item\textsuperscript{15} Sarkar, Subrata: The Centre and the States, P. 22.
\item\textsuperscript{15A} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{15B} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{16} The Indian Annual Register (1922), Vol. II, P. 113.
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calculated to meet, in some measure, the popular demand of responsible government in India. Its immediate object was to train Indians in the art of self-government preliminary to the progressive realisation of responsible government in British India, because the authors of 'Joint Report' believed that "complete responsibility for the Government could not be given immediately without inviting a break-down, and that some responsibility must be given if the scheme was to have any value."  

Under this system of government, the provincial subjects as demarcated from the Central Subjects, were divided into two parts, the "Reserved Subjects" and the "Transferred Subjects". The administration of justice, law and order and the preservation of financial stability were reserved subjects with the Governor and what were loosely called the 'nation-building' departments were transferred to the selected ministers with many reservations. The transferred subjects were consisted of the local-self government, education, agriculture, fisheries, religious endowments, medical administration etc.  

While the functions of the two halves of the government were clearly demarcated; it was considered inadvisable to provide separate sources of revenue. The allocation of expenditure was to be a matter of agreement.

between the two sides, the Governor acting as the arbiter in cases of difference of opinion. All taxation measures or proposals for raising money by borrowing, were to be considered by the whole Government, but a decision was to be arrived at by that part of the Government in which the proposal originated.\(^{22}\) Thus, from the very beginning of the Act, the seeds of the Central Paramounty was sown on the soil of transferred subjects.\(^ {23}\)

Education too became a provincial and transferred subject in charge of a minister.\(^ {24}\) There arose considerable opposition to the transfer of the entire control of education to Indians and that several difficulties were put forward. The Anglo-Indians and Europeans feared that their interests would not be safe in the hands of Indian ministers and claimed that the subject of "Anglo-Indians and Europeans" should be treated as central or reserved.\(^ {26}\)

On education, the opinions of the provincial governments were also greatly divided. The Bengal government desired to reserve collegiate and European education.

---


24. This item was renumbered at 5 by notification No. 519-V, dated 2 January 1923, see gazette of India, extra-ordinary (1923), P.43.


the United Provinces government recommended the transfer of the whole subject of education, even though the official committee which advised that governments were divided in their opinion, the Punjab government reserved its opinion regarding the transfer of higher education, the Government of Bihar and Orissa strongly opposed the transfer of secondary, technical and collegiate education, the Chief Commissioner of Assam opposed the transfer of collegiate education, the Madras government opposed the transfer of the education department as a whole. Consequently, the Government of India put the following viewpoint:

"We consider that there is a compelling case for the transfer of primary education. It is that part of the field which will give the fullest and freest play to responsibility at once; it will be most responsive to patriotic effort; and it will be the nursery for the broad and enlightened electorate on which the future depends. The labour of bringing primary education up to a reasonable standard, the need for almost unlimited development, the difficulties of gradually making it free and then compulsory, these and its many other problems constitute a task which will be enough, and more than enough, to occupy all the energy and ingenuity of ministers for years to come . . . . . we may say at once

27. Nurullah and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India (1800-1944), P.184.
that in our minds there is an equally compelling case for retaining secondary and university education in the hands of the official and more experienced half of the provincial governments. India stands to-day in a critical position; and her immediate future, apart from her slower political growth, depends upon the solution of social, economic and industrial problems to which a good system of secondary education is the chief key. If we handed it over at this juncture to untried hands, we should be guilty of grave dereliction of duty."\textsuperscript{28}

But Parliament eventually decided to accept the recommendations of Mr. Feetham's Committee on Education, and the whole of the education department\textsuperscript{*} was transferred to Indian ministers subject to the following reservations:*

The Benaras Hindu University, Aligarh Muslim University\textsuperscript{29}, the Calcutta University\textsuperscript{30} and such other new Universities as may be declared to be all India by the Governor-General in Council, were excluded on the ground that these institutions were of all India character and had better be dealt with by the Government of India itself.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{28} Despatch on the Functions Committee's Report, Para 104.

\textsuperscript{*} Parliament eventually decided, on the recommendation of Mr. Feetham's Committee, to transfer education as a whole, including universities, to ministers responsible to electorates, with the temporary exception of Calcutta.

\textsuperscript{29} These words were inserted by notification No. 11-3, dated 10 February 1912, See gazette of India 1921, pt. i, p.216.

\textsuperscript{30} Misra, Atamanand: Educational Finance in India, P.177.

\textsuperscript{31} Nurullah and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India (1800-1944).
Colleges for Indian Chiefs and educational institutions maintained by the Governor-General in Council for the benefit of members of His Majesty's Forces or other public servants or their children were also excluded on the ground that these institutions ought to be under the direct control of the Government of India, and the education of Anglo-Indian and Europeans was maintained as a provincial but a reserved subject.

The authority to legislate on the following subjects was reserved for the Central legislature, mainly with a view to enabling the Government of India to take suitable action on the report of the Calcutta University Commission.

(a) Questions affecting the jurisdiction of any university outside its province;

(b) Questions regarding the establishment, constitution and functions of new universities; and

(c) Questions regarding the Calcutta University and the reorganisation of secondary education in Bengal.

These directives created a queer position by treating education "partly all India, partly reserved, partly transferred

34. This item was omitted by Notification No. 290/25/27, dated 28 April 1926 (Gazette of India 1926), pt. I, P.517 and the items renumbered.
35. This clause was added in Notification No. 519-V, dated 2 January 1923, see gazette of India, extra ordinary (1923), P.43.
As a corollary to this decision, it was also decided that the Government of India should have no control over education in the provinces. Thus came about what the Hartog Committee had rightly described as the 'divorce' of the Government of India from education. As could easily be imagined, the results were far from happy. The Central Government interest in education disappeared almost completely after 1921. The stimulating conferences and committees which discussed educational problems of the country became a thing of the past. The only interest that the Central Government showed was in the education of the directly administered areas of North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, Delhi, Ajmer-Merwara, Coorg and Bangalore, of which Coorg was dropped out on the appointment of its Lieutenant Governor.

Besides this, the Central Government remained directly and financially responsible for education in certain minor Administrations, such as the Governor General was 'Rector' of six universities (other than universities centrally administered) in British India in which capacity he possessed the right of visitation. His sanction was required for

41. Progress of Education in India 1922-27, P.17.
the recognition of the equivalence of degrees and
of examinations qualifying for admission to Dacca,
Lucknow, Rangoon, Delhi, Benares and Aligarh Univers-
ities. In addition the Centre controlled the legislation
for the incorporation of new universities.\textsuperscript{43}

The Government of India, therefore, did little
beyond the clearing house function and issued the annual
and quinquennial reviews of the progress of education
in India.\textsuperscript{44}

"This divorce of Government of India had been
unfortunate. Education was essentially a national service
and the Central Government could not completely absolve
itself of responsibility for the education of the people."\textsuperscript{45}
The Hartog Committee was of the opinion that steps should
be taken to consider anew the relation of the Central
Government with this subject.\textsuperscript{46} It suggested that the
Government of India should serve as a centre of educational
experience of the different provinces.\textsuperscript{47} It regarded
the duties of the Central Government as going beyond that.
It could not accept the view that it should be entirely
relieved of all responsibility for the attainment of
universal primary education.\textsuperscript{48} It might be that some of
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the provinces, in spite of all efforts, would be unable to provide the funds necessary for that purpose and the Government of India should, therefore, be constitutionally enabled to make good such financial deficiencies in the interests of India as a whole.\textsuperscript{49}

After passing of the Act of 1919 the divorce of the Government of India from education was welcomed in some quarters in the provinces and there was a manifestation of strong provincial feelings. It did not, however, take the provincial governments long to realise that this was a mistake and that something had to be done to create a national agency and machinery for the development of education.

The need for such central agencies as the Central Advisory Board and the Bureau of Education was realised for the benefit of the provinces. It became only possible when the intense feeling of provincial independence, which was engendered by the reforms, had abated.\textsuperscript{50}

The Central Advisory Board of Education was established in 1921.\textsuperscript{51} The Educational Commissioner with the Government of India was the Chairman of the 'Board' which included two Vice-Chancellors of Indian Universities, two Principals of Colleges under private management, four Directors of Public

\textsuperscript{49} Hartog Interim Report, Ibid. P. 346.
\textsuperscript{50} 8th Quinquennial Review of Education 1917-22, Para 44, P.28.
\textsuperscript{51} Naik, J.P.: Educational Planning in India, P.128.
Instruction and four non-officials interested, but not immediately engaged in education. The Central Advisory Board assisted the Governor-General in the exercise of his functions as visitor. It also gave advice on questions of educational policy and practice referred to it either by the Central Government or provincial governments. Except giving advice through the 'Board', the Government of India, became almost isolated from the educational activities of the provinces. It was precluded from spending their own revenue upon any provincial subject. The system of Imperial grants for education was discontinued. Deprived of these 'Imperial doles' for education the provinces had to rely on their own resources as far as the expenditure on education was concerned. With the discontinuance of Imperial grants, it was not possible for the Government of India to influence the educational policy of provincial governments. The control of the Central Government over provincial governments in the matter of education was practically negligible. In every province, the Governor with his minister of education was responsible for the educational affairs of the province. The minister for education was nominated by the Governor of the province among the elected members of the local

52. Progress of Education in India 1922-27, P.15.
55. Ibid, P.15.
legislative council. Therefore, Minister was not responsible to the Government of India but to the electorate of the province. He was assisted by a senior and experienced educational officer called the 'Director of Public Instruction', who tendered detailed professional advice on matters of educational policy and administration. There were the Indian Educational, the Provincial and the subordinate services, the former being recruited mainly from England and the two latter in India.

The Indian ministers took keen interest in educational development, as a result of which large funds as could be made available were spent on new schemes. The local bodies too had to raise their contributions because the responsibility of primary education devolved on them. Therefore, what was lost from the discontinuance of imperial grants was to a measure made up by the enhanced contribution from private and public sources.

Education, therefore, became a direct responsibility of Indian Ministers in the provinces. They had the desire to develop education, but they had to face a number of difficulties. Though education was a transferred subject, yet finance was a reserved subject under the control of English Councillors.

60. Ibid, P.182.
No scheme of education could be implemented without the cooperation of the Councillors. They were always reluctant to give the required amount of money to the provinces under Indian Ministers. As a result of it, the schemes of education were often left unfinished.

Dyarchy also created an ill-feeling between Indian Ministers of education and the I.E.S. Officers, whose services were controlled by the Secretary of State for India. These officers regarded themselves as more experienced than the Indian Ministers and therefore, they attached no importance to their educational schemes and did not carry out their instructions.

This position was anomalous and led to a good deal of animus on both sides. On the one hand, it was alleged that the Indian Educational Service Officers did not sympathise with the ideas of reconstruction that were being put forward by non-official Indian opinion. Therefore, it was difficult to carry out a policy with which the Chief executive officers were not in sympathy and that the privileges granted to the I.E.S. even amounted to curtailment of the responsibility of the Indian Ministers to their legislatures. On the other hand, the officials complained of frequent variations in policy and of interference with the day to day executive work of the

64. Nurullaha and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India (1800-1944), P.189.
administration. It was difficult to make any generalised statement on the subject, as the position must have largely varied from province to province and must have greatly depended upon the 'personal equation' between the parties concerned. But it might be definitely stated that the experiment did not succeed well and the necessity of harmony between the ministers and the executive came to be greatly felt.

The question was further considered by the Royal Commission on the Superior Civil Services in India which recommended that "for the purpose of provincial governments, no further recruitment should be made to the all India Services which operate in transferred fields. The personnel required for these branches of administration should in future be recruited by provincial governments." This recommendation was accepted by the Government and the recruitment to the Indian Educational Service was stopped. The Royal Commission further recommended in regard to the question of the future recruitment of Europeans that "it would rest entirely with the provincial governments to determine the number of Europeans who might in future be recruited. In this matter the discretion of provincial governments must be unfettered but it was hoped that Ministers on the one hand would still seek to obtain the

65. Nurullah and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India (1900-1944), P.189.
cooperation of Europeans in these technical departments and that qualified Europeans, on the other hand might be no less willing to take services under the provincial Governments than they were in the past to take services under the Secretary of State."\(^68\) This action was tantamount to the acceptance of the principle that the Ministers must have full control over the services. The privileges granted to the existing members were, however, continued on the ground that it would be unfair to them to place their services entirely under the control of the Ministers.\(^69\)

Henceforth, the Provincial Educational Services which were in course of reorganisation would eventually function under provincial control as the senior educational services in the provinces.\(^70\) The Hartog Committee was in favour of increasing the strength and power of the Provincial Educational Services for maintaining effective control over education in the provinces. It stated:

"We have not suggested, nor do we suggest, that the responsibility of Ministers in the provinces should be reduced. On the contrary, we are of opinion that they have been reduced too much already by a devolution on local bodies which has taken the control of primary education to

---

68. Royal Commission Report (Extract), Para,7.
69. Syed and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India, P.190.
a large extent out of their hands, with unfortunate results. The relations between provincial governments and local bodies demand further consideration and adjustment ... The Director of Public Instructions have been loyal and enthusiastic, but they are grappling with immense responsibilities without sufficient support. The headquarters staffs of provinces should be largely increased, so that important schemes of development may be considered with greater care and the ordinary work of education supervised more effectively. An increase in the inspecting staffs should lead to economy and not to extravagance. The reconstitution of the provincial educational services can suffer no further delay. 71

In pursuance of this Report, the provincial governments increased the strength of the P.E.S. Officers and reconstituted them. It did not mean that the 'Provincial Governments' became autonomous in the affairs of education. Section 45 of the Act of 1919 put restraint on them. It stated:

"Every local government shall obey the orders of the Governor-General in Council, and keep him constantly and diligently informed of its proceedings and of all matters which ought, in its opinion, to be reported to him, or as to which he requires information, and is under

71. Hartog Committee Report, P. 347.
his superintendence, direction, and control in all matters relating to the Government of its provinces."  

Section 45 of the Act, which had armed the Central Government with the powers of superintendentship could not be executed because of the retrenchment of 1923, as recommended by the "Incheape Committee." Following were the Post effects regarding education: (i) the Education Department of the Government of India lost its independent existence and was amalgamated with other departments, (ii) the Central Advisory Board of Education was dissolved, (iii) the Central Bureau of Education was closed down; (iv) the Educational Commissioner was called upon to take up secretariat duties, some of them non-educational in character and as superintendent of education in Delhi and in Ajmer-Merwara; (v) the Indian Educational Service was abolished and (vi) the few powers of legislation reserved under the Act of 1919 were not exercised. The Central agencies of education that gave good promise of useful work were closed or amalgamated to save only a few thousands of rupees. Retrenchment proved a bitter stroke on the relations of the Centre and the provinces. Henceforth, for a period of twelve years, the Central Government took divorce from the educational activities of the provinces.

72B. Naik, J.P.: Educational Planning in India, p. 127.  
In spite of the retrenchment the provincial governments drew up schemes and programmes for the expansion of primary education and provided additional funds. Consequently primary education expanded very rapidly between 1922 and 1927. The following table would explicit it*:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1921-22</th>
<th>1926-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Primary School</td>
<td>1,55,017</td>
<td>1,84,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of pupils in Primary School</td>
<td>61,09,752</td>
<td>80,17,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expenditure on Primary Education (Direct)</td>
<td>4,94,69,000</td>
<td>6,75,14,802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the words of John Sargent, "Probably at no period in India's history has there been a livelier interest in and concern for the future of education than at the present moment." The increase in the numbers of primary schools in the United Provinces and the Punjab was the direct result of the adoption of the States, definite programmes for the expansion of primary education in rural areas. The adoption of such programmes was advocated by

* Ibid. P.211.
the Government of India in a circular.* The Centre explained that in the new situation caused by the introduction of the Constitutional reforms and the consequent complete separation of Imperial and Provincial finances, it would no longer be possible for the Central Government to assist provinces as it had done in the past, with special grants for the spread of education. But the Government of India took the opportunity of emphasizing the peculiar importance of primary education at the present time and suggested the preparation of detailed schemes of educational advance.74A As a result of this encouragement from the Centre, the provinces expanded primary education with greater zeal.

But soon retrenchment and financial stringency of 1927 checked this reckless and impetuous multiplication of primary schools."75 The Central Provinces report for 1927-32, found consolation that "inefficient schools had been removed from the struggle ... ... several schools with comparatively small enrolment had been closed."76 The Bihar and Orissa Report for 1927-32 stated that in the earlier years of the quinquennium, "many boards and individuals opened schools more rapidly than was prudent and added that the effects of retrenchment were salutary

* Govt.of India Circular No.750 Edn. dated 2nd September,1918.

74A Progress of Education in India 1917-1922,Vol.I. Para 185, p.103.

75. Progress of Education in India, 1927-32, P.4.

76. Ibid, P.42.
as it led to the disappearance of unaided institutions."77
In Bombay, the primary schools were increased by a meagre
797 in five years (127-32), an event on which the Educational
Commissioner with the Government of India felt and called
upon to observe that "it was doubtful whether, with its
deprecated finances, this province could afford to multiply
its primary schools at so rapid a pace, especially when
other aspects of education needed prior attention.78 On
this subject Dr. Pavate, Director of Public Instruction, Bombay
(Later on Governor of Punjab) stated:-

"The main problem, of course, is primary education.
Dr. Pananjpe had the primary education Act passed in his
time with good motives, but finance was a reserved subject
and government would not sanction any additional funds for
the expansion of education. We have been dragging on without
any aim or objective and at this rate, we shall not achieve
literacy even after 150 years. All our schemes have founded
on the rock of finance and here we are doing just nothing.
Of course, we have sufficient work in the office and that
work is mostly in the nature of settling either the quarrels
of the schools or school Boards or informing the managements
of schools that in the 'present financial stringency' the
requests made by them for additional grants cannot be complied
with. Sir, even since I have joined the Department, we have
been freely using these blessed words, "financial stringency"

77. Progress of Education in India, 1927-32, P.51.
78. Ibid, P.128.
and I do not know when we shall have sufficient funds for educating our people. A large number of secondary schools are carrying on without any financial aid from Government and the teachers are working on miserable salaries." 79

Not only, Bombay State had pitiable and miserable condition of primary education, even the Madras State witnessed the decrease in the number of primary schools and the Director of Public Instruction observed that "the policy of expansion which was in full swing between 1920 and 1927, countenanced the establishment of a large number of inefficient, uneconomic and superfluous schools which proved worse than useless. This policy of expansion had led to the recent reaction in favour of concentration and elimination which had partly responsible for the reduction in the number of elementary schools." 80 In spite of such difficulties, Assam passed a primary education act providing for the introduction of compulsion in all local areas and the scope of compulsory education was enlarged by new enactments in four other provinces. But a very few schemes for the development of primary education worked in the provinces. The main cause was the meagre finance 81 and lack

79. Dr. Pavate called on Shri B.G. Kher, Chief Minister and Education Minister of Bombay, 'Memoirs of an Educational Administrator 1966', Pp.137-138.
of interest of the Central Government. The provincial governments wanted to spread primary education but for want of Centre's guidance and help, they became unable to execute the schemes. Hartog Committee also supported the cause of the provinces and it wanted that Centre should share some responsibility. The Report stated:

"We are of opinion that the divorce of the Government of India from education has been unfortunate, and, holding as we do, that education is essentially a national service, we are of opinion that steps should be taken to consider anew the relation of the Central Government with this subject. We have suggested that the Government of India should serve as a Centre of educational information for the whole of India and as a means of coordinating the educational experience of different provinces. But we regard the duties of the Central Government as going beyond that. We cannot accept the viewpoint that it should be entirely relieved of all responsibility for the attainment of universal primary education. It may be that some of the provinces, in spite of all efforts, will be unable to provide the funds necessary for that purpose, and the Government of India should, therefore, be constitutionally enabled to make good such financial deficiencies in the interests of India as a whole."

82. Hartog Committee Report (1929), P.346.
Hartog Committee, thus gave directions to the Central Government for assuming more powers over the educational affairs of the country, so that provinces could expand education.

The stimulus to popular enthusiasm in matters educational, which had accompanied their transfer to popular control, was by no means confined to the primary stages.83 There had been of late an increasing realisation among the Provincial authorities that secondary education in India, although quantitatively more satisfactory than primary education, had qualitatively certain serious defects.84 Secondary education in particular was still of poor standard and badly regulated. The proposals of the Sadler Commission's Report regarding the separation of secondary education from university education, the erection of the former into a self-contained system, and the confining of each to its proper sphere were carried out in several Indian provinces. Thereafter the provincial governments made great expansion in schools and pupils,85 but the Central Government withdrew from the sphere of secondary education. A 'Resolution'* was moved in the Legislative Assembly that 'atleast one model high school for girls, with a suitable boarding house attached, should be started in each province and a special Imperial grant-in-aid

83. Chablani & Joshi: Reading in Indian Constitution and Administration. P.606 (Hindustan Electric Printing Works, Delhi, 1925).
84. Ibid, P.606.
85. Syed and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India. P. 293.
* Resolution of February 1921, moved in Legislative Assembly.
be sanctioned for this object. This resolution was rejected by the Central Government on the ground that it had 'concerned with a transferred subject under the control of ministers in the provinces.' Inspite of this indifference of the Central Government towards the development of secondary education, the provinces furthered the cause of secondary education.

The total number of educational institutions increased to 2,55,709 with 1,41,46,038 pupils during dyarchy, showing an increase of 22.8 per cent in institutions and 68.8 per cent in enrolment. There was only a small increase in institutions as compared with the previous period, (when education was under the Central Government Control) but government reports were satisfied that "the development of better schools outpaced the elimination of weaker and inefficient schools." It was really a victory for the Central Government 'view of qualitative reform which had dominated the scene before the advent of dyarchy.' The Central Government was not a silent spectator, it was influencing the secondary education by reviewing the general progress of the country's education and providing expert advice on secondary educational problems.

86. Memorandum on the Progress of Education in British India between 1916 and 1926. P.90.
87. Ibid, P.90.
89. Ibid, P.313.
91. Syed and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India, P.284.
91A. Ibid, P.286.
The period of sixteen years of dyarchy was marked as of great advance in the University education. An Inter-University Board for the purpose of coordinating the courses of study in India and in securing uniformity in their recognition abroad, was constituted in 1924. Five new universities were incorporated. The Delhi University was established for the Centrally administered province of Delhi and the Nagpur University for the Central Provinces and Berar. The Andhra University was established for the Telugu-speaking areas of the Madras Presidency. The Agra University was incorporated as an affiliating university for the United Provinces, Central India and Gwalior. Chidambaram University in Madras Presidency was established as unitary teaching and residential body.

The Central Government transferred the control of the Calcutta University from the Government of India to the Government of Bengal and made the Governor of Bengal the Chancellor of the University. The Constitution of the University of Madras was considerably modified by the Amending Acts of 1923 and 1929, that of Bombay University by the act of 1928 and that of the Patna University by the Act of 1932. The motion for the introducing of legislation in order to place the universities of India on a more

---

92. Syed & Naik: A Student's History of Education in India, P.286.
94. Memorandum on the Progress of Education in British India between 1916 and 1926, P.90.
95. Syed and Naik: A Student's History of Education in India, P.287.
democratic basis by reducing the nominated members was rejected by the Central Government. It suggested that legislation of this nature demanded initiation by the provincial governments, being education was a transferred subject. Provincial Governments, therefore, under the Ministers of Education, commanded full control over the University education, with the exception of certain 'All India' Sectarian Institutions, but soon "a first rate financial crisis was developed, in which not only the new developmental schemes, but even the existing ones were in danger of being completely scrapped." Provincial governments became helpless in this branch of education too and looked for help to the Centre.

As a consequence of severe financial stringency, retrenchment in education was carried out almost in a State of panic in all the provinces. The proposals for new expenditure were shelved, the existing expenditure was drastically curtailed. Education like other nation building departments had suffered through financial disabilities. Once again, therefore, the Central Government was approached to share the responsibility of higher education. The Central Government helped the provincial governments with grants-in-aid. The increase

97. Chablani, H.L.: Reading in Indian Constitution and Administration, P.606.
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in the subsidies led the Central Government to influence the educational affairs of the provincial governments pertaining to higher education.

Not-withstanding this, during dyarchy, "all provincial legislatures had shown increasing interest in the educational problems of their provinces; the State and progress of education had been exhaustively discussed during the passage of bills, during budget debates and during the debates on educational resolutions, while a fairly large number of questions asked at question time pertained to education. The greater publicity which had of late years been given to the details of educational policy and administration and non-official opinions expressed through the activities of the local legislatures had, had considerable effect on the shaping of the educational policy during this period."\(^\text{101}\) The new Council in Bihar and Crissa, had during the first year of its existence discussed no less than seventeen resolutions on educational topics.\(^\text{101A}\) In Madras, the legislative council had debated such subjects as mass education and compulsion, the state of Muhammadan education and the education of the depressed classes, the need for new colleges and for more universities, an increase in scholarship and in free remissions, the pay and status of teachers and departmental education officers.\(^\text{102}\)

\(^{101}\) Ninth Quinquennial Review of Education, P.23.


\(^{102}\) Ninth Quinquennial Review of Education, P.23.
In financial matters freedom given to provincial legislatures was very much limited because the control of the Governor-General in Council circumscribed the freedom of the Governor who was compelled to control closely the action of the ministers. Later events showed that "this form of financial administration did not help the cause of the transferred subjects,"¹⁰³ especially the education. The finances of the provinces were very much crippled on account of the large contribution to the Central Government; particularly, the industrial provinces were hit-hard as the revenue from income tax was a central subject. The crippling of provincial finances reacted most unfavourably on education.¹⁰⁴

Under such circumstances, the provincial governments endeavoured and increased their expenditure on education. The provincial expenditure on education during 1926 and 1937* was 36.68 crores, whereas the total expenditure on education from other sources viz. local funds, municipal funds, fees etc., was 79.83 crores. "The provincial subvention was 46.4 per cent of the total expenditure as against 40.5 per cent in the previous periods. As there was no Imperial grants given by the Central Government during this period, the whole share came from provincial coffers. During the period 1922-37, the total expenditure on education increased by Rs.968 lakhs but provincial contribution rose by Rs.334 lakhs

¹⁰⁴. Ibid, P.178.
* See Appendix III & IV.
only. The ratio between the increase of the total and provincial expenditure on education was approximately 3:1. This ratio of the two increases was 18:1 during the period 1902-22 and 7:1 during 1881-1902 which shows that the increase in provincial contribution was six times of the previous period and double of the period 1881-1902.\textsuperscript{105}

This was a welcome feature of the finances and shows how the popular ministers during the dyarchy took interest in the education of their countrymen.

Although, provincial governments, under the control of popular ministers made great strides in education yet provincialisation had not removed the need for some form of coordinating, advisory and informative central agency. "It had not even removed the necessity for the Education Department of the Government of India to keep itself aloof from the details of educational progress in the provinces."\textsuperscript{106}

The Educational Review stated that "it was probable that the need for such central agencies as the Central Advisory Board and the Bureau of Education abled to collate for the benefit of the provinces educational experience, derived from the whole of India would be more fully realised when the intense feeling of provincial independence which was engendered by the 'Reforms'\* had abated."\textsuperscript{107}.

\textsuperscript{105} Misra, Atamanand: Educational Finance in India, Pp.194-95.
\textsuperscript{106} Progress of Education in India 1922-27, P.20.
\textsuperscript{107} Montford Reforms of 1919.
In the absence of coordinating authority, the Government of India had become almost completely isolated from educational activities in India, with the exception of those in certain directly administered areas. "The isolation of the Government of India from provincial governments and of provincial governments from one another in the field of education was making its ill-effects felt, so that there were recently signs which indicated that opinion in favour of cooperation and mutual assistance was gaining ground."\textsuperscript{108}

With the ceasing of Central Advisory Board of Education, there remained no coordinating agency which could give an all India outlook to problems of all India importance, such as, free and compulsory primary education, the education of girls, the education of special classes or communities, the provision of trained teachers, the control and financing of mass education and the position of educational services. "All these problems which were being dealt with in divergent manners in the provinces presented some common features and some common difficulties; yet under the present system there was no all India agency even to give information to the authorities in one part on what was being done in other parts of India."\textsuperscript{109}

How anomalous the position had become, was revealed by the debates which had been held during the period of dyarchy in the Central legislatures. These legislatures had discussed the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{108.} Nineth Quinquennial Review of Education in India, Para 36, P.20.
\textsuperscript{109.} Ibid. P.21.
\end{flushright}
introduction of free and compulsory education, women's education, moral instruction, technical education, medical education, the education of the depressed classes and the education of Europeans and Anglo-Indians. Therefore, the demand for improvements in the educational system in all its aspects had been repeatedly voiced in the Central legislatures, but the Government of India, with its education department, had been unable to give any lead to India as a whole in educational matters of all India importance except by drawing the attention of provincial governments to the debates which had been held in the Central legislatures and by the example of its control over the comparatively small areas under its direct control. Commenting on the need for maintaining future relations with the provinces, the Educational Report for Punjab stated:-

"One of the main objects of 'Reforms' was the substitution of the direct and personal control of the Minister (who was responsible to the Legislative Council) for the distant and official control hither to exercised by the Government of India. This change has been beneficial, except in one respect. There is a growing danger of an exaggerated form of 'provincialism' in education, which, if not checked at the out-set, may have disastrous results. No Indian province can live unto itself, Universities of the modern type transcend provincial limits. Indian scholars, proceeding overseas, carrying with them the reputation of

India in the world of learning. There is also a number of vexed questions on which an all India and not a provincial solution is sought. On all such questions a decision by a single province may gravely embarrass other provinces. The question also arises whether India is tending in the direction of United States of America or of the disunited states of Europe. The development (or not) of an Indian policy of education will have much to do with the answer to this momentous question. There is thus a grave need for some Central body which can discuss matters without interfering unduly with the autonomy of the provinces.  

Similar views were expressed in the Assam report. It stated: "With the transfer of educational control from the central to the local government, education in the province tended to lose the advantage which it drew from the submission of its larger schemes to an authority commanding a wider outlook. Such benefits however as accrued from the relationship have been preserved for the provinces by the Constitution of a Central advisory board under the charge of the Educational Commissioner with the Government of India. The proceedings of the board have hitherto been stimulating and helpful. They keep the department in touch with effort and success in other provinces and may serve to correct the natural tendency of a small province in isolation from its neighbours to pass from the provincial to the parochial and respond too readily to local impulses."


The present absence of any exchange of inter-provincial ideas and the lack of knowledge on the part of one province of what was happening in another province had been well illustrated by the necessity which had arisen of sending educational experts or committees from one province to another in order to appreciate the methods which had been adopted in attacking particular problems. Therefore, the provincial governments and the Government of India felt the necessity of convening educational conferences for exchange of views between educationists from the distant parts of the country. The Conference of Indian Universities in 1924 was the first attempt at joint deliberation since the dyarchy and it was followed by a conference of educational administrators in India in January 1927. On this subject the Quinquennial Report stated that there was an actually danger that certain educational activities and experiments in the provinces would overlap to an unnecessary extent. This had been illustrated by the rapid movement towards the opening of new types of universities during recent years. The Governor-General of India was the visitor, with inspectorial rights, of a large number of universities in India, and yet the Government of India had no coordinating authority to consider the needs of University development in India. The Universities of Benares, Aligarh and Delhi were Central subjects, dealt with by the Government of India, and yet they had many divergent features. There was no obvious coordination between them in either out-look or
purpose, while the two former universities, varying in type, had arisen, were influenced more by the educational policy of that area than by that of any other area or Government of India. The Education Department of the Government of India could not under present arrangements keep in touch with educational movements all over India, but "there was every indication that, inspite of the provincialisation of education, provincial governments would welcome information and considered opinion emanating from a Central coordinating agency." It became, therefore, possible to revise the earlier decision and the Government of India revived the Central Advisory Board of Education in 1935; the Central Bureau of Education was also revived, on a recommendation made by the Central Advisory Board of Education, in 1937.

The revival of the Central Advisory Board of Education and Bureau of Education, thus paved the way for the Central Government to influence the educational schemes of the provinces. Therefore, under dyarchy "Education" was a transferred subject but the Central Government had reserved some powers by which, it could influence the policies of the State Governments.

Dyarchy was not constituted on the principles of full-fledged dualism. While there was a clear demarcation of the subjects to be dealt with by the two halves of the Government, there was no corresponding division of revenues or sources of revenue to meet expenditure. The annual budget was drawn up jointly, and if fresh funds were required it was the responsibility of that part of the Government that initiated it. A 'joint purse system', as it was termed, had been introduced in preference to 'a separate purse' system, and finance was thus a matter of common concern. There was also a common civil service and a common legislature, with so much in common; it would not have been possible to run the two halves of the Government as if they were wholly separate, self-sufficient entities. This was the position within the provinces. The Reserved Subjects were given preference to transferred subjects. Besides, this, the Government of India had enormous powers over the Provincial Governments. Therefore, the constitutional structure of India, under the new reforms, remained basically unitary and centralized with Governor-General in Council as the Key-stone of the whole constitutional edifice. This view that dyarchy was a step towards decentralisation of powers proved not true, rather it was a move to consolidate the powers for dominating the provincial governments.
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In the beginning, the reform proposals were received quite well. When the question came up before the full session of the Indian National Congress at Amritsar, Gandhiji argued against the extremist stand for rejection of the proposals. He said:-

"If I get a sour leaf, I reject it and I don't take it. But if I get a loaf which is not enough, which has not sufficient condiments in it, I shall use it, I shall add condiments to it and take a bit... The king emperor has extended a hand of fellowship. Do not reject the advance. The Indian Culture demands trust and full trust, and if you are sufficiently manly, we shall not be afraid of the future." 120

Consequently, the Congress passed a resolution promising to cooperate, with the working of reforms to secure the early establishment of full responsible government121 in the provinces, but it failed to satisfy the urge and aspirations of the 'Nationalists' in India. The Simon Commission Report exposed the Unitary and Centralised System of "Dyarchy" by which the provinces were in practice dependent on the Centre.122

Dyarchy, no doubt, worked for over a period of sixteen years, but it worked creakily.123 According to the
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Minority Report of the Reforms Enquiry Committee, the new system operated in a spirit of reasonableness during first three years and there prevailed a spirit of harmony, good-will and cooperation between the legislature and the executive. After 1924, the new constitution proved unsatisfactory and unworkable. The constitutional breakdown in Bengal and Central Provinces demonstrated that the system had fallen short of the expectations of its authors and was also incapable of yielding better results in future. Consequently, Dyarchy was abolished in 1937, giving place to 'Provincial Autonomy'.