CURZON'S UNIVERSITY REFORM

Lord George Nathaniel Curzon entered the Indian Civil Service as the Governor-General of British India. At that time, the eastern experiment of educating the people through foreign medium had been going on for nearly seventy years. Pondering upon the struggles, the errors, the achievements, the hope, of so many years of English education in India, Curzon declared that if he could frame 'a good education policy, it would not be a bad session's work'. In pursuance of the policy of the Indian Council, Lord Curzon sought to reorganize the educational system and to effectively control the educational institutions of the country. Within three months of his coming to India as the Governor-General and Viceroy of India, Curzon's attention with the Calcutta University began in March 1899 when he came to know that the university had frustrated the central Government's attempt to introduce William Lee-Warrier's Citzer of India as a text book. As per the clause of the Acts of incorporation establishing universities in India, the senates alone enjoyed the powers of prescribing text books in affiliated colleges and since they were independent of government control, they enjoyed it and often took delight in slighting and thwarting the proposals put forward to them by
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Lord George Nathaniel Curzon come to India as the 24th Governor-General of British India. At that time, the unique experiment of educating the people through foreign medium had been going on for nearly seventy years. Pondering upon the struggles, the ambitions, the achievements, the errors, the hopes of so many years of English Education in India, Curzon declared that if he could frame a good education policy, it would not be a bad seasons work. In pursuance of his policy of thoroughness and efficiency, Lord Curzon sought to reorganize the educational system and to effectively control the educational institutions of the country. Within three months of his coming to India as the Governor-General and Viceroy of India. Curzon's confrontation with the Calcutta University began in March 1899 when he came to know that the university had frustrated the Bengal Government's attempt to introduce William Lee-Warner's Citizen of India as a text book. As per the clause of the Acts of incorporation establishing universities in India, the senates alone enjoyed the power of prescribing text books in affiliated colleges and since they were independent to government control, they enjoyed it and often took delight in slighting and thwarting the proposals put forward to them by
Calcutta University "alone in India, is independent of the local
government and its delight is to slight and thwart it" were correct, "it
would seem to be in need of your reforming hand." However, more
information was needed before the idea of reform could be mooted.
Curzon consulted Sir Stafford Northcote and Lord Northbrook both of
whom were then in England besides consulting Woodbrun. The
consultation of Northbrook was particularly useful because he, as
Charles Wood's secretary drafted that celebrated Education Despatch of
1854\(^8\) which provided for the setting up of the first three Universities of
Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. He also asked his secretary, Luson as
well as Fraser, a member of his Council, to make elaborate comments on
Cotton's *Quinquennial Review of the Progress of Education from 1892-93 to
1896-97* and when they were ready, he made some observation on their
comments which provided the basis for the issue on 28 October 1899 the
resolution of the Government of India on Education identifying the
areas where government control was necessary.\(^9\) However, he did not
follow it up by other administrative acts and orders since he did not
consider the moment opportune for it. Heavily occupied with the
famine and the frontier problems, he had no other alternative but to
move slowly in the field of education. As a matter of fact, he had been a
firm believer in the familiar axiom about going slow. He knew that "the
prudent" general reconnoitered his country before he delivered the
final assault. It was time now for surveying the field of university education in India as far as Curzon was concerned.

Curzon agreed and towards the end of August 1900, he appointed Raleigh as the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University. Raleigh like Curzon, was an undergraduate and a graduate of Balliol College, Oxford, under Professor Jowett and later became a Fellow of All souls under Sir William Anson.

By 23 February 1901 his scheme was ready, when he recorded an extremely long minute on the subject, revealing his tremendous capabilities for hard work, for which he had a great reputation at Oxford, and for which he almost impaired his health in India just as Dalhousie had actually done before him. The main thrust of his arguments in the minute was that legislation was necessary to (a) enlarge the functions of the Indian Universities from examination to teaching, (b) regulate the number, tenure and qualifications of the fellows as well as to maintain a proper balance between Europeans and Indians, officials and non-officials, and between the various faculties or professions, (c) reconstitute the electorate by adding residential qualifications among the graduates just as the Convocation of Oxford now consisted of resident of M.A.s. or rather such graduates as were
capable of coming to the senates to vote as well as by laying down some academic or educational standard which was necessary for election to a fellowship at Oxford as a qualification for election here, (d) provide a statutory status to the syndicate which was the ral executive body of the university, (e) narrow the geographical limits/ areas of each university, (f) strengthen the law relating to the recognition and affiliation of colleges as well as withdrawal of recognition or affiliation in cases in which discipline had been relaxed and the standard too much lowered, (g) curtail power of the board of studies which prescribed text books for the colleges as well as regulate the courses of instruction of the candidate reading for the university examination and finally there was the question of revocation of the university degrees in cases where the holder had been convicted by a criminal court.12

The first educational conference in India which met at Simla on 2 September 1901 was attended by, besides Curzon and members of his Council, the vice-chancellors of the universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, the directos of public instruction in Bengal, Bombay and Madras, the North Western Provinces and the Pubjab, Inspector-General of Education in the Central Provinces, Principal of the Deccan College at Poona, Principal of the School of Arts in madras, Reporter on Economic Products to the Government of India
and finally Curzon's Secretary Risley. No Indian expert was invited though the conference was going to discuss "confidentially" upon a subject which concerned the Indians most. "the private ..... hole and corner character of the Conference" became a subject matter of much discussion among the Indians and so Curzon thought of opening the conference with a statement which could be communicated to the press. In it he would outline the whole of the points upon which "our system" from the top to the bottom seemed to be deficient and should indicate the line upon which, tentatively at any rate, the reform ought to proceed. "Indian is a country", Curzon wrote to Hamilton,

"Where you can do almost everything provided that you allow your critics and opponents to have their say. I shall, therefore, invite the fullest discussion on all the points to be mentioned by me.... I think it very likely that in the case of universities for the reform of which we shall almost inevitably be compelled to resort to legislation, I shall have to appoint a small preliminary commission to go round and take evidence at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay and allow the instructed M.A.s. and B.A.s. who swarm at these capitals to have their say in advance."
Curzon himself meticulously planned and drafted the *strictly confidential* agenda papers. The first subject to be taken up for discussion by the conference was obviously taken up for discussion by the conference was obviously university education. In his *strictly confidential* agenda papers, he had listed thirteen items on the subject. They included among others, scope and character of Indian Universities, Government of Indian Universities, question of academic standards, affiliation of colleges and recognition of schools, selection of text books and courses of instruction and finally, "is a commission desirable?" Curzon divided the item on the government of Indian universities into three parts. The first part related to the question of the reform of the senate, the second to that of the election of the fellows and the third to that of the composition and function of the syndicates.

As the discussions on university education advanced, it became more and more apparent to the members who took part in them that there had been "a total lack of system, an ignorance of principles, and a want of uniformity in practice, that have reduced education in India to a state almost of chaos." On 10 September the deliberations over university education were over, the delegates having passed unanimously no fewer than 45 "strictly confidential" resolutions, each one of them drafted by Curzon himself. The delegates emphatically
declared in favour of a thorough constitutional reform of the universities in India. They also recommended that the power of government in respect of affiliation, recognition and text-books should be strengthened; that a Director-General of Indian education should be appointed; that the rules for examination and degrees should be coordinated and improved, and that the institution of hostels should be encouraged and that a minimum rate of hostels should be encouraged and that a minimum rate of fees should be fixed. The conference was also in favour of the decision of Curzon to appoint a commission to examine the question of university education in all its aspects.

In a telegram to Hamilton on 13 January 1902 Curzon proposed to appoint six persons as permanent members of the commission including Raleigh who was to be the Chairman. The other five were Hewett, Pedler, Bourne, Mackichan and Syed H. Bilgrami. Bilgrami was the only Indian representative and when the appointment of the commission was made public after obtaining Hamilton's approval, the absence of a Hindu among the six permanent commissioner created a great stir since the Hindus had “the largest interest in a educational problems that were to be considered.” Surendra Nath Banerjee a dismissed member of the Indian Civil Service on filmsy grounds, who had earlier led the Civil Service Agitation in 1876-77 raised “a vigorous
protest" in the columns of the Bengalee which he himself edited against "this ostracism of the Hindu element." 22

The Indian public opinion supported Banerjee's view and Curzon had no other alternative but to send a private telegram to Hamilton seeking his approval to the nomination of Gooroodas Banerjee a former Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University and now a prominent judge of the Calcutta High Court. 23 In their job of collection of evidence from "the disgruntled M.A.s. and B.A.s.", the permanent members of the Commission were to be assisted by five local commissioners - Ashutosh Mukhopadhyaya for Bengal, Sankaran Nair for Madras, Chandavarkar for Bombay and Lewis and Bell for North Western Provinces and the Punjab respectively. 24 While announcing the appointment of the Indian Universities Commission, Curzon also made an appointment to the newly created post of the Director-General of Education discussed at the conference at Simla and later approved by Hamilton. Orange who had two first classes from Winchester and Oxford and was then working in the Department of Education as an Examiner in the White Hall was appointed to the post on the recommendation of Sadler who was first offered the post but declined to accept it. 25
The Indian Universities Commission started its work at Madras on 18 February and after examining 156 witnesses including only 63 Indians at different places, the Commission submitted its recommendations on 9 June to Curzon who in a delightful mood wrote to Northbrook, "My Universities Commission has just reported."  

Curzon never wanted to make the recommendations of the Indian Universities Commission public just as he had earlier prevented the proceedings of the Conference at Simla from becoming public. However, a local newspaper got hold of a copy of the report "probably through the agency of some clerk" and began "publishing a series of daily denunciations of the Government or rather of myself, for having rung the death-knell of higher education in India."  "You are certain to be attacked", consoled Hamilton, 

"if you attempt to in any way purify university education and to free it from its existing excrescences. The Babu believes that one of the main objects for which British rule was established in India was to enable him to get university degree; and any attempt to heighten the standard is sure to meet with violent abuse. But I have been so long the subject of almost universal abuse and
misrepresentation by the Indian press, that I am compelled to attach little importance to what they say.”

A fortnight after Hamilton had despatched his letter to Curzon from London, Curzon wrote to Sir Henry Cotton on 31 August, “The Bengalis are denouncing me like fury because the University Commission has reported in a sense that they dislike. They seem to think that I both dominated the enquiry and wrote the Report. What a strange people! They take the heart of one.” Ten days later, he wrote to Hamilton, “the Town Hall and the Senate Hall of the university have been packed with shouting and perspiring graduates, and my name has been loudly hissed as the author of the doom of higher education.”

The State Paper on Indian education was issued on 11 March 1904 and the Indian Universities Bill was passed despite stiff resistance at every passage of the Bill offered by G.K. Gokhale and Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya and became an Act on 21 March 1904 marking the end of “a long and arduous struggle conducted for five years in the face of every discouragement and of bitter opposition.” The Indian University Act brought about radical changes into the five existing universities at Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Lahore and Allahabad. The act was based on the recommendations of the Commission amongst there were an
enlargement of the functions of the university, reduction in the size of
the university senate, introduction of the principles of election;
statutory recognition of the syndicates where university teachers were
to be given an adequate representation; stricter conditions for the
application of Colleges to a university, definition of the territorial limits
of the university; provision for an annual grant of Rs. 5 lakhs to the five
universities and finally powers to government to make additions and
alterations while approving to regulations passed by the Senate. Two
days after the Bill had been passed, Curzon, privately sent an identical
letter to the Governors of Bombay and Madras and the Lt. Governors of
the North-Western Provinces and Bengal: “The Universities Bill is now
passed into Law; and the various Chancellors of the Universities will
before long be called upon to take action under it.” Next day he wrote
to Dodley in a very relaxed mood and heaving a sigh of great relief:
“Here I have had the stiffest session on record and have carried the
Universities Bill, which was my child.”

Curzon’s university reform represents a climax in the official
attitude against the spread of higher education which had been
developing ever since the mid-fifties of the nineteenth century. This
seems a paradox, for, we are too familiar with the efforts made by the
English officials for the spread of higher education in the first half of the
nineteenth century. By higher education here we mean Western education and though Charles Grant's ideas of introducing it in India to reform the Indian society of its various evils like sati, infanticide, purdah and polygamy as well as to bring the Indians and the English officials closer together were strongly resisted by the East India Company in 1793 partly because of its reluctance to interfere with the Indian society and partly because of the proneness of the age to subversion, they were successfully revived later by Maculay and the government order that followed Maculay's minute of February 1835 not only made English the official language in British India replacing Persian but also banned any further expenditure on Oriental education in future. The change in the situation could be explained partly by the ideas of utilitarianism carried by the young English officials to India and partly by the emergence of an enlightened body of Indians headed by Raja ram Mohan Roy. These young Indians saw in the introduction of English education an opportunity to employment in various British establishments, official as well as non-official, that were then emerging in metropolitan cities, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras as well as up country in British India. Though the officials of the East India Company. Writers and Cadets as they were then called, were always recruited in London, there was always the demand for local hands to assist them in the administration of the growing British establishments.
The East India Company authorized the Indian administration to make local appointments for the very lowly paid jobs and those young men who had knowledge of the English language, not necessarily of the English literature always, came handy for such appointments. The number of colleges in the metropolitan cities of British India imparting Western education, many of which like the Hindu School of 1817 which became the Presidency College in 1853 when Dalhousie reformed it, grew out of schools teaching alphabet along with “Shakespeare, the Calculus, Smith’s Wealth of Nations, and the Ramayana” under the same roof was not large and so was the number of the students who attended them. Students taught in these colleges could easily be absorbed in the services of the East India Company and other British establishments. They were docile, submissive and active participants in the British administration and because of the opportunities offered by the English education, there was a great demand for it particularly in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras which led F.J. Mouat, Secretary to the Council of Education in Bengal to actually submit a plan for university education in India in 1845. These groups of Indians formed the nucleus of the Indian middle classes. They were not critics but admirers of the British administration. So when the revolt of the sepoys swept the Indian Sky in 1857, they remained quiet and silent spectators to it. They had actually become a class of people very much after the vision of
Macaulay in 1935: “a class of persons Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and intellect.”

This situation started changing since the mid-fifties of the nineteenth century and the starting point of this change may be said to have been marked by the establishment of the three universities at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in 1857. Henceforth colleges became an integral part of the university system in India and they could admit such students as had passed the entrance or matriculation examination held by the universities to which they were affiliated and impart instruction according to such courses only as had been prescribed by the universities. Contrary to Canning’s expectation in 1857, that the universities in India would become “an aristocratic institution” which could be mainly attended by the children of “the nobility and upper classes of India”, they became “popular institution” attended largely by the children of the new middle classes that had been emerging ever since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Because of the material advantages of holding university degrees, a very large number of those of those who passed the matriculation sought admission to these universities. The number of colleges which was 27 in 1857 rose to 55 in 1873 and that of students rose from 2,193 in 1857 to 4,499 in 1873. In 1881 the corresponding figures the corresponding figures were 85 and
7,582 respectively. The number of students who succeeded in their examinations in the years which followed the establishment of universities was also considerable. Between 1857 and 1873, for example, the number of successful candidates from matriculation onwards was 12,392 at Calcutta, 5,502 at Madras and 2,703 at Bambay. The annual output of the recipients of the bachelors degree also increased with the growing years since 1857 and there were 175 graduates by 1870, 404 by 1880 and finally 470 by 1884. Failures of the "First Arts" Examination in 1870 were 570, in 1880, 1,110 and in 1884, 1,289. The figures for the class of persons educated in English could be obtained by tallying for 1857 through 1884 the total number of successful candidates for 1857 through 1884 the total number of successful candidates for 1857 for First Arts and B.A. diplomas and degrees and adding it to the successful final candidates. Henry Maine estimated five time 5,000 B.A., M.A. for 1853 through 1883 or 25,000 out of an estimated population of 25,000,000.

Having received a good secondary school education upto the level of matriculation and having attended a university, these men were certainly very educated compared to the illiterate town-dwellers or village riots. They themselves were very much aware of this difference. What was the prospect open to the large number of students who were thus able to receive higher education? For one thing, a career in the
India Civil Service was virtually never open to talent, though the principle had been asserted time and again in the Charter Act of 1833 and the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 after the Mutiny. Some avenues like army and politics were closed altogether. In those days, agriculture offered no temptation to an educated person and neither did manufacturing and commerce for the latter were almost impossible without skill, capital and equality in terms of competition with European businessmen.

As a matter of fact, the very nature of the course with their "unique and disproportionate attention" to literature and philosophy, compared with physical and cognate branches of practical instruction tended to limit the choice of a career to either the service of government or similar employment. "What else can he do but qualify himself", lamented a Calcutta Newspaper, "or, if he is father, train his son for the public service or one of the learned professions?" In theory, the covenanted civil service was open to the Indians since 1853 but in practice difficulties stood in their way - the early upper age limit for the examination, the content of the syllabus, the expense of going to London where the examination was held, the Hindu prejudice against crossing the "blackwater", and the official reluctance of the British to admit Indians into this vital service. The educated Indians could only
avail themselves of the posts at the lower level of the uncovenanted service. The educated Indians could only avail themselves of the posts at the lower level of the uncovenanted service which continued to remain open to them. Here the salaries were very poor, prospects for promotions negligible and conditions of service very bad.

Since men were not often employed outside their own provinces, less than two thousands posts were available in the uncovenanted executive and judicial branches in Bengal, Bombay and Madras, for the graduates of the universities in these areas. Not all of them were given to the educated; in Bombay and in Madras less than half of the uncovenanted civilians had qualifications in the new education while in the North Western Provinces and in the Punjab most of these posts went to those who could not boast of any qualifications at all.\(^{44}\) the creation of nine departments of education by 1879 as per the provision of the Education Despatch of 1854 and the gradual development of a graded Indian educational service to man these departments and the colleges under them opened new vistas for employment in the British India – but the post in this uncovenanted service were not normally open to the educated Indians but to the European with qualifications from British universities, particularly from Oxford and Cambridge. In the whole of British India while there were only five educated Indians
serving this uncovenanted service, the number of Europeans serving it was 95 by 1979.45

The paucity of suitable opening in the public service naturally compelled many to turn to independent professions such as teaching, law, journalism and medicine. Unlike the government servants who were inhibited by their dependence on the goodwill of the government which employed them, in these professions they had greater opportunity to take part in public life. By the end of the 1870s, there was hardly any important town in India which did not posses a sprinkling of teachers, lawyers, journalists and physicians who took a very lively interest in the social, political, economical and religious questions of the day. It was this group of people who later formed the backbone of the Indian National Congress and because of their complaints against the government they were often distrusted and ridiculed by the European officials and the English press.

It is thus obvious that the moderate difficulties of the 1850s in finding a suitable employment by the educated Indians, had become a major problem in the 1870s. A year before the establishment of the universities in India, *The Friend of India*, had warned of the problem: "Native education had gone so far that it has become one of the most
serious problems of the day. What to do with our educated men. Since 1857 when the higher education in India started expanding by leaps and bounds, the problem also became aggravated. By 1877 it reached such dimensions that Sir Richard Temple, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, did not hesitate to record a minute on it.

The incidence of unemployment among the educated Indians made them discontented with the British Raj which not only gave them no relief or sympathy but even excluded them from higher posts in the army, education and the civil service. They saw the grand spectacle of thousands of foreigners being given precedence in appointments to all the best places under the administration. In the press and on the platform, the professionals joined the educated unemployed in waging an acrimonious war of criticism on the Government of India as responsible for the prevailing unemployment. The attack against the government was on two ground; first, the system of education provided by the government and second, its failure to employ those who had been trained by it. In 1882, the very year which saw the appointment of an education commission, Dadabhai Naoroji, wrote to the Secretary of State for India on the subject of unemployment among the educated Indians:
"The thousands that are being sent out by the universities every year find themselves in a most anomalous position. There is no place for them in their motherland. They may beg in the streets, or break stones in roads for aught the rulers seem to care for their natural rights, position and duties in their own country. They may perish or do what they like or can, but scores of Europeans must go from this country to take up what belongs to them, and that in spite of every profession for years and years past and upto the present day, of English statesman, that they must govern India for India's good, by the words of the August Sovereign herself."  

Next year, the contributor to the Indian Spectator brought out more clearly the differences between the prospect of an educated Indian and that of an Englishman:

"How many university graduates go without work? The luckiest of them is often too glad to begin life as a Mamlatdar's clerk. Now look at his English contemporary. The very first appointment he holds is that of Assistant Judge or Collector. What a difference when both had worked equally hard! The native graduate knows his importance; he feels his neglect all the
more bitterly. He has the power to do harm, and may exercise that power. The uneducated does not feel neglect, he can get some work or other which he is not too proud. Not so that educated youth. He knows his marketable value and when neglected, he frets and fumes”

The publication of this resolution was the signal for an agitation in Bengal which was unprecedented in intensity and magnitude. Without government assistance most of the Indian High Schools and Colleges which mostly drew their students from the middle and lower income groups and depended for their existence on the grants-in-aid system, would have to close down. The Bengali Press raised the cry of “higher education in danger” and in view of the agitation carried out by the British Indian Association at Calcutta and in the mofussil, the government withdrew the resolution and assured the public by denying that it had any intention of stopping its assistance to higher education. All the while, the English - language press owned and managed by the Europeans, severely criticized the government’s policy of supporting higher education. It pointed to the existence of a reaction against it among the Englishmen in India and in Great Britain including those who had earlier supported the spread of English education in India. The press openly said that the time would soon come when the Government
of India would have to revise its policy respecting the education in English for Indians.

However, that time for the revision of its policy towards English education did not come until the end of the 1870s when movement in many parts of India grew up about the reduction from 21 to 19 the maximum age at which the Indian Civil Service Examination could be taken by the candidates. This lowering of the age-limit by Lord Salisbury in 1876 was primarily aimed to make it more difficult for Indians to come and compete at London. As early as 1866 educated Indians had opposed the reduction of the maximum age limit from 22 to 21 because they thought it was injurious to Indian aspirants; the further reduction from 21 to 19 was even more unacceptable to them. They looked upon it as a manoeuvre on the part of the Government of India, to thwart the ambition of Indians to enter the civil service. Under the leadership of Surendra Nath Banerjee, they decided to organise a national protest which would invoke the Charter Act of 1853 and Queen’s Proclamation of 1858 in which the rights of the Indians for service in the administration, irrespective of class, creed, caste and colour had been proclaimed. On 24 March 1877, a public meeting was held at the Albert Hall, Calcutta, and a Committee consisting of the representative of educated section of the Indian community in Calcutta
was appointed to draw up a memorial drawing attention to the principles and pledges contained in the Charter Act of 1833 and the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 and to forward it to Parliament. Surendra Nath Banarjee was assigned the task of traveling all over the country in order to gain support for the memorial. In April 1879, Lal Mohan Ghose was asked by the Indian Association to go to Great Britain as its representative to lay before the British public the grievances of the Indian people regarding access to appointments in the civil service and other questions as well.\textsuperscript{49} This agitation which was supported by educated Indians throughout the country was organized and conducted with such care and in such a constitutional manner that it drew admiration from the Europeans also. "the really remarkable feature of the whole movement", wrote the \textit{times of India} on 24 December 1877, "is the moderation, the good sense, and political tact which have distinguished it form first to last ... A race that can conduct a political campaign with such ability has already won half the battle."\textsuperscript{50} The option and gradual extension of Western methods of agitation and organization acquired through universities by the educated Indians posed a "real danger to our rule in India", as Hamilton pointed out decades later to Curzon.\textsuperscript{51}
The commotion in Indian public opinion gave pause to the Government of India and induced it to consider the revision of its policy towards the education of Indians in the present system. "The Present System", wrote the Rev. James Johnston in *our Educational Policy in India* in 1880, "is raising a number of discontented and disloyal subjects." Against this battleground, a liberal Viceroy, Lord Ripon took the most bold step of appointing the first education commission in 1882 - called the Hunter Commission - to review the whole field of primary and secondary education in India. Its President - Sir William Hunter, thought that the governmentally supported education was producing a revolt among the educated Indians against three principles which represented "the deepest wants of human nature - the principle of contentment." On the recommendations of the Commission, the Government of India, withdrew from activity in higher education, nominally as a measure of economy and it encouraged private enterprise in the field. It directed the local governments to close down or hand over to "a suitable agency, public or private", control over some of the mofussil government colleges while deciding to continue financially supporting the Presidency colleges "on which the higher education of the country mainly depends." A stronger reason for the withdrawal was more political than economic. Lord Ripon in his convocation address at the University of Bombay in 1884 intimated -
rather sympathetically to the Indian cause; "... that it is little short of folly that we should throw open to increasing number of the rich stores of Western Learning; that we should inspire them with European ideas and bring them into the closest contact with English thought, and that then we should as it were, pay no heed to the growth of those aspirations which we have ourselves created, and the pride of those ambitions we have ourselves called forth."  

However, as the Government of India diminished its role in higher education, Indians became more active; higher education instead of declining went of expanding every year. In 1881, for example, the number of colleges was 85, in 1886 it became 110 and in 1893 it rose to 156. Similarly, the number of students in these colleges rose from 7,582 in 1881 to 10,538 in 1886 and 18,571 in 1893. Thus, within that decade following the withdrawal of governmental support for higher education, the number of colleges almost doubled, that of college students nearly trebled. The number of secondary schools also rose but not the same extent. It rose, for example from 4,122 in 1881 to 5,097 in 1893, i.e., nearly 25 percent in twelve year, while the number of secondary schools students, increased form 222,000 to 511,000 during same period.  

Within this same period, despite the desire of the Government of India
to reduce its role in higher education, a university was established at Lahore in 1882 and the other at Allahabad in 1887 though obviously to reduce the burden on the Calcutta University but mainly because of the demand of these places for more higher education including Oriental.

The expansion of higher education in India in the decades following the report of the Hunter Commission was accompanied by an aggravation of the problem of unemployment among Indians educated in English. A district officer in Bihar suggested in 1882 that establishment of technical schools could alleviate unemployment and the consequent discontent: “Unless technical schools are provided as outlets, the mere scholastic element will breed political discontent.” In any case, the senior technical and jute mills, coal mines and iron foundries were recruited from Great Britain; the government, therefore, did not anticipate any improvement in the near future. There would have to be a long period of industrial development before there could be any opportunities for the employment of Indians with technical training. In a resolution of 18 June 1888 the government declared: “In India at the present time the application of capital to industry has not been developed to the extent which in European countries has rendered the establishment of technical schools on a large scale an essential requisite of success. But the extension of railways, the introduction of
mills and factories, the expansion of external trade and the large intercourse with foreign markets, ought in time to lead to the same results in India as in other countries, and create a demand for skilled labour and for educated foremen, supervisors and managers. It may be conceded that the effect of these various influences on an Asiatic people is very gradual, and that it would be premature to establish technical schools on such a scale as in European countries and thereby aggravate the present difficulties by adding to the educated unemployed a new class of professional men for whom here is no commercial demand”

The growing unemployment among young Indians, who had been educated in English and their disaffection for the Government of India which they held responsible for their plight, intensified nationalistic sentiments. They developed a collective consciousness of themselves, feeling solidarity with each other by reference to their common plight and the common objects of their grievance, they began to write letters to English dailies and to meet in associations to demand rights for educated Indians, especially those of representation and employment. In 1885, when the Indians National Congress, which Hume saw as a safety valve to the growing discontent with the alien rule, was formed, it adopted “wider employment of our people in the public service”, as one of “the three important questions” constituting
“the chief planks in the Congress platform.” Hardly any annual session of the Indian National Congress took place without discussing the subject of the employment of Indians educated in English and passing resolution on it. In 1885, at the first session of the Indian National Congress at Bombay, Dadabhai Naoroji speaking in support of the fourth resolution of the Congress holding simultaneous examination of the civil service in England and in India in accordance with the views of the India Office Committee of 1860 observed: "It is the most important key to our material and moral advancement. All our political reforms will benefit us but very little indeed if this reform of all reforms is not made. It is the question of poverty or prosperity. It is the question of life and death to India. It is the question of questions." The Aitchison Commission which met next year to report on the state of the public services in India rejected the demand for simultaneous examination in England for India for the Indian Civil Service but it proposed a scheme for doing "full justice to the claims of natives of India for higher employment in the public service." It recommended that the Indian Civil Service should be *corps de elite* with its numbers limited to what was necessary to fill the chief administrative appointment of the Government of India and by transferring a corresponding number of appointments to local governments which were to be separately recruited in each province. The later service, known as the Provincial
Civil Service, should include 108 posts hitherto reserved for the Indian Civil Service and also the higher posts held by the unconvenanted service were, however, to be relegated to a Subordinate Civil Service.

In 1889, 56 percent of the total appointments which numbered 25,370 and which were paid salaries of at least Rs. 75 a month were held by the Indians, while only 14 percent of the appointments carrying salaries of Rs. 1,000 upwards “fall to our lot”, said Surendra Nath Banerjee in commenting on these statistics, “although the country is ours, the money is ours and the bulk of the population is ours.” At the 16th meeting of the Indian National Congress in 1900, Surendra Nath Banerjee quoted figures for Bengal to show how the Government of Indian was not acting consistently with the various pledges and principles made in the Charter Act to 1833 and the Queen’s Proclamation of 18589 regarding the employment of Indian’s in the public service. He pointed out that the Indian’s share in the higher grades in the Survey and Customs Department, Forest Department and the Postal Department was nil, while out of 77 appointments in the higher grades in the Opium Department only 8, 2, 4 and 5 were held by the Indians respectively. “if you look at the statistics connected with these Departments”, Banerjee observed:
"You will find that the higher offices, the bulk of the higher offices - I should not be guilty of the smallest exaggeration if I say that at least 90 percent of the higher offices - are filled by Europeans and Anglo-Indians ...... Imperialists, somebody says. They may be Imperialists or not but at any rate. These Departments constitute the close preserve, the absolute monopoly of these gentlemen. We are excluded. And why? Because of our race, our colour is our disqualification"\(^{59}\)

While the "discontented B.A.s. and M.A.s." must have shared Banerjee's views of the appointment of Indians to the Indian Civil Service and Lesser Services, some of them were becoming advocates or a more militant nationalism. The latter became adherents of the new generation of leaders like B.G. Tilak, Lajpat Rai and Bepin Chandra Pal, more "extremist" than the previous leadership. In Bengal, the extremist challenge began with Aurobindo's fierce attack on the Congress in 1893.\(^{60}\)

Curzon himself fully subscribed to this view. Five weeks after landing at Calcutta, while delivering the Calcutta University Convocation Address as its Chancellor on 11 February 1899, he observed that he knew, "that our system of higher education in India is
a failure; that it has sacrificed the formation of character upon the alter of cram; and that the Indian University turn out only a discontented horde of office seekers, whom we have educated for places which are not in existence for them to fill.”61 Since it was now too late to undo Macaulay’s or Bentick’s decisions to offer English education India, the best could be done at the moment was to devise means to restrict its disadvantages. One of the means could have been to divert the attention of the young Indians from Western Education to Oriental Education which Annie Besant’s Hindu College in Banaras Proposed to Impart now “by undertaking the task of giving religious and moral education on Hindu lines to its youths.”62 Hamilton was willing to “encourage” Besant’s scheme of education. As he wrote to Curzon in connection with Besant’s Hindu College, “I think the real danger to our rule in Indian, not now but say 50 years hence, is the gradual adoption and extension of Western agitation and organization; and if we could break the Hindu party into two sections holding widely different views, we should, by such a division, strengthen our position against the subtle and continuous attack which the spread of education make upon our present system of Government.”63 Another means would be, as had been unsuccessfully done by the government before in the 1870s and in 1882, to give more attention to education at the lower levels and less to higher education. Anything, Hamilton remarked rather gloomily, would be better than
expansion of purely literary education, "joy of Babu and anglicized Brahmin which "produces a wholesale mass of discontented individuals who, if they cannot find government employment spend their time in abusing the government which has educated them."\(^{64}\)

It is a pity that Curzon’s university reform has never been studied in the context of the developments affecting the interests of th British raj in the decades that immediately preceded it. This is not to say that the universities in India were free from defects and that they did not need any reform though one may feel alike agreeing with the observation made by the Indian Universities Commission in one of its introductory paragraphs in the Report that "we are not disposed to confirm the sweeping condemnation which as sometimes been passed upon our University system."\(^{65}\) They did need reform because as we have already seen they suffered from the limitations of the University of London which acted as a model to them in 1857. In the peculiar Indian conditions such limitations assumed gigantic proportion as to invite attention of all those authorities directly concerned with the state of higher education in the country. So when in 1898 when a Royal Commission was appointed under Lord Davey and the London University became a teaching university after the recommendations of the Davey Commission had been approved by the British Parliament,
The question of modifying the character of the universities in India became a question of time. It is indeed an interesting coincidence that the person appointed to head the Government of India immediately after the Royal Commission to report on the London University was a person very much concerned with University education. "I will not conceal from you" Curzon told the young graduates of the Calcutta University in his first Convocation Address on 11 February 1899 as its chancellor, "that I am a University Man to the core of my being .... I have been an undergraduate of a university, a Bachelor of Arts, a Master of Arts, a fellow of a college and a Member of Convocation. But a Chancellor I have never been until today." Unfortunately, "the University Man" in Curzon was completely dominated by "the Political Man" in his person and he manoeuvred the university reform in such a way as to give top priority to safeguarding British Interests in India.

The Indian Intelligentsia could easily see in his attempt to control higher - education in the country an attempt to stop the development of those historical forces associated with the spread of Western education which had contributed to their progress. As Surendra Nath Banerjee observed in his Presidential Address at the Ahmedabad Session of the India National Congress on 23 December 1902 that higher education "lies at the root of all our progress. It is the mainspring, the motive
power, the germinal source of all those forces which make for progress ...

It is English education which has overcome the barriers of race, religion and language, has dissipated the prejudices and misunderstandings of ages and has created those unifying influences which find a living expression in this vast, this stupendous, this majestic organisation of the National Congress. Could this educated community submit to the curtailment of this boon .... So the restriction of its beneficent area?” it may be asked if the British administration felt towards the end of the nineteenth century that the universities in India were breeding “fighting cocks” as Curzon described the educated Indians at the Conference of Simla in September 1901, threatening British interests in Indian, why did they not abolish them altogether instead of attempting to bring them under government control? Here again abolition of the universities would have gone against their interests, for the British in India always needed a Bilgrami, a Khan, a Bose, a Bhandarkar or host of petty officials trained through these universities to help them prop up their administration in the country.

The aim of Indian University Commission and Indian Universities Act was to control, recognize and stabilize higher education Lord Curzon in spite of his good intensions, could not win the confidence and faith of the Indians. The public opinion condemned
his policy of State Control over education. It is, however, true that Lord Curzon's schemes of introducing improvement in Indian education created a new awakening and inspiration in educational field.
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