WORLD WARS

The two wars were caused by a variety of factors. The beginning of the century witnessed the division of the world into major international forces based on distinct ideologies. These forces were well equipped with the weapons of modern welfare. In the initial decades of the 20th century they competed with each other for a domination of the entire world. Since their conflicts and rivalries could not be resolved through any peaceful mechanism, they resulted in the outbreak of the two world wars.

The damage caused by this war had no precedent in history. In the earlier wars, the civilian populations were not generally involved and the casualties were generally confined to the warring armies. The war which began in 1914 was a total war in which all the resources of the warring states were mobilized. It affected the economy of the entire world the casualties suffered by the civilian population from bombing of the civilian areas and the famines and epidemics, caused by the war far exceeded those suffered by the armies. The battles of the war were fought in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Pacific. Because of the unprecedented extent of its spread and its total nature, it is known as the First World War.

THE WARRING NATIONS IN THE WORLD WARS

The theatre for the First World War was located in the Balkans which was then a region of competing nationalisms and ethnic conflicts. Briefly the drama of the First World War unfolded in the following manner:

Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia on 28th July 1914

德国 declared a war on Russia, Belgium and France in 3rd August 1914.

Austria-Hungary attacked Russia on 6th August

France and Britain declared war on Austria-Hungary on 12th August

German violation of Belgium neutrality gave the British a convenient excuse to enter the war on the side of France and Russia. British world-wide interests made the war a global conflict, drawing into it the dominions of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the greatest British colonial possession, India; and later the United States, because of close British links with it. Italy, diplomatically aligned with Austria and Germany since the Triple Alliance of 1882, declared its neutrality at the start of the war. It was avidly pursued by France and Britain. In May 1915, the Italian government succumbed to Allied temptations and declared war on Austria-Hungary in pursuit of territorial expansion.
The imperialist conquest of Asia and Africa was accompanied with conflicts between the imperialist countries. Sometimes the imperialists were able to come to ‘peaceful settlements’ and agree to divide a part of Asia or Africa among themselves without resorting to the use of force against each other. At other times their rivalries created situations of war. Wars were generally avoided at that time because the possibilities of further conquest were still there. By the end of the 19th century, however, the situation had changed. Most of Asia and Africa had already been divided up and further conquests could take place only by dispossessing some imperialist country of its colonies.

The efforts to establish colonies, Protectorates and spheres of influences in various parts of the world also resulted in bad blood among nations. Germany tried to capture markets which were already under the control of Britain; that led to bitterness between the two countries. Another important factor that fanned the flames of rivalry and enmity was tariff restrictions. Every country preferred exports but not imports. Thus there were tariff wars between the various countries. It resulted in the worsening of the relations between the nations. Both Britain and France were alarmed at the expansion of German manufactures as they considered it a serious threat to their position.

Italy, which after her unification had become almost an equal of France in power, coveted Tripoli in North Africa which was under the Ottoman Empire. She had already occupied Eritrea and Somaliland. France wanted to claim Morocco to her conquests in Africa. Russia had her ambitions in India and territories of the Ottoman Empire including Constantinople, the Far East and elsewhere. The Russian plans clashed with the interests and ambitions of Britain, Germany and Austria. Japan which had also become an imperialist power had ambition in the Far East and was on way to fulfilling them. She defeated Russia in 1904. Britain was involved in a conflict with all other imperialist countries because she had already acquired a vast empire which was to be defended.

Conflicts within Europe

The Balkan countries had been under the rule of Ottoman Turks. However, in the 19th century, the Ottoman rule had begun to collapse. The Russian Czars hoped that these areas would come under their control. They encouraged a movement called the Pan-Slav movement. Other major European powers were alarmed at the growth of Russian influence in the Balkans. Corresponding to the Pan-Slav movement, there was a Pan German movement which aimed at the expansion of Germany all over central Europe and in the Balkans. Italy claimed certain areas which were under Austrian rule.

Militarism and Formation of Alliances

The conflicts within Europe had begun to create a very tense situation. European countries began to form themselves into opposing groups. In the early part of the 20th century, most of the powerful countries in Europe started building up powerful standing armies, elaborate espionage system, strong navies. Much of the national wealth was spent to increase the strength and power. These powerful
c. An attempt was made to cripple once for all the military strength of Germany: a) The German General Staff was abolished; b) The total strength of the German army was fixed at one lakh and c) Restrictions were placed on the manufacture of armaments, munitions and the other war materials by the Germany.

d. Germany was forced to give up all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions and these were distributed among Allies. The Allies also reserved to themselves the right to retain or liquidate all property, rights and interests of the German nationals or companies abroad and the German government was required to pay compensation to them.

e. The German rivers, Elbe, Oder, Danube and Niemen were internationalized.

f. Germany had given Allssace-Lorraine to France, a large part of Posen and western Prussia to Poland and many other areas to Belgium & other countries.

g. Danzing was taken away from Germany and setup as a free city under the League of Nations, thus creating a “Polish corridor”.

h. Germany had to give up her right over the coal mines of the Saar valley. The Rhineland was demilitarized. Germany was forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications on either side of the Rhine River.

i. Complete independence & full sovereignty of Belgium, Poland & Czechoslovakia were recognized by Germany. Germany gave up her special rights and privileges in China, Egypt, Thailand, Morocco and Liberia.

**EFFECTS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR**

Many of the seeds of World War-II in Europe were sown by the Treaty of Versailles that ended World War-I. In its final form, the Treaty placed full blame for the war on Germany and Austria-Hungary as well as exacted harsh financial reparations and led to territorial dismemberment. The treaty caused resentment and a deep mistrust of their new government, the Weimar Republic. The need to pay war reparations, coupled with the instability of the government, contributed to massive hyperinflation which crippled the German economy. This situation was made worse by the onset of the Great Depression. The return of annexed colonies and other terms of treaty were seemed harsh and humiliating by the Germans who could not accept it.

Rise of Fascism and Nazism (discussed in detail elsewhere)

In 1922, Benito Mussolini and the Fascist Party rose to power in Italy. Believing in a strong central government and strict control of industry and the people, Fascism was a reaction to the perceived failure of free market economics and a deep fear of communism. Highly militaristic, Fascism also was driven by a sense of belligerent nationalism that encouraged conflict as a means of social improvement. By 1935, Mussolini was able to make himself the dictator of Italy and transformed the country into a police state.

In Germany, Fascism was embraced by the National Socialist German Workers Party, also known as the Nazis. Swiftly rising to power in the late 1920s, the Nazis and their charismatic leader, Adolf Hitler, followed the central tenets of Fascism while also advocating for the racial purity of the German people and additional German Lebensraum (living space). Playing on the economic distress in Weimar Germany and backed by their "Brown Shirts" militia, the Nazis became a political force.
In 1935, in clear violation of the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler ordered the **remilitarization of Germany**, including the **reactivation of the Luftwaffe** (air force). As the German army grew through conscription, the other European powers voiced minimal protest as they were more concerned with enforcing the economic aspects of the treaty. In a move that tacitly endorsed Hitler's violation of the treaty, Great Britain signed the **Anglo-German Naval Agreement**, which allowed Germany to build a fleet one third the size of the Royal Navy and ended British naval operations in the Baltic. Hitler further violated the treaty by ordering the **reoccupation of the Rhineland** by the German Army.

Not wanting to become involved in another major war, **Britain and France avoided intervening** and sought a resolution, with little success, through the League of Nations. Emboldened by Great Britain and France's reaction to the Rhineland, Hitler began to move forward with a plan to **unite all German-speaking peoples** under one "Greater German" regime. Again operating in violation of the Treaty of Versailles, German troops crossed the border to enforce **annexation of Austria**. A month later the Nazis held a **plebiscite** and received 99.73% of the vote. International reaction was again mild, with Great Britain and France issuing protests, but still showing that they were unwilling to take military action.

**Other Effects**

The period after the war saw the war saw the beginning of the end of the European supremacy in the world. Economically and militarily, Europe was surpassed by the **United States** which emerged from the war as a world power. The Soviet Union was also to soon come up as a major world power. The period after the war also saw the **strengthening of the freedom movements** in Asia and Africa. The weakening of Europe and the rise of the Soviet Union which declared her support to the struggles for national independence contributed to the growing strength of these struggles. The Allied propaganda during the war to **defend democracy**, and the participation of Asian and African soldier in the battles in Europe also helped in arousing the peoples of Asia and Africa.

The European countries had utilized the **resources of their colonies** in the war. The **forced recruitment** of soldiers and labourers for war, and the exploitation of resources of the colonies for war by the imperialist countries had created resentment among the people of the colonies. The population of the colonial countries had been nurtured on the myth that the peoples of Asia and Africa were **inferior to the Europeans**. The **role played by the soldiers** from Asia and Africa in winning the war for one group of nations of Europe against another shattered this myth. Many Asian leaders had supported the war effort in the hope that, once the war was over, their countries would be given freedom. These hopes were, however, belied. While the European nations won the **right to self-determination**, colonial rule and exploitation continued in the countries of Asia and Africa.

**CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES**

The treaty was concluded between the Allies and Germany. The Germans had expected the peace terms to be based on the Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson. But they were cheated. The peace settlement was a “**Carthagian Peace**”. It was
21-Demands (1916): Japan served these demands on China, one of which was meant to eliminate all competition to Japan in Manchuria. She was, however, obliged to accept the Open Door Policy in the case of China, including Manchuria, at the Washington Conference of 1921-22.

After some minor incidents in Manchuria in 1931, Japan used them as an excuse to occupy the whole region. She created the new state of Manchukuo in 1932. When the League of Nations, on the appeal of China, objected to the Japanese sections, she withdrew from the League. This occupation revealed the weakness of League. In the home front, it relegated political parties in Japan to the background and strengthened the hold of the militarists. These developments caused alarm among the Western Powers that brought them together against Japan. It strengthened Japanese due to systematic exploitation of Manchuria by Japan.

AMERICAN ISOLATIONISM IN THE 1930s

During the 1930s, the combination of the Great Depression and the memory of tragic losses in World War-I contributed to pushing American public opinion and policy toward isolationism. Isolationists advocated non-involvement in European and Asian conflicts and non-entanglement in international politics. Although the United States took measures to avoid political and military conflicts across the oceans, it continued to expand economically and protect its interests in Latin America. George Washington had advocated non-involvement in European wars and politics. For much of the 19th century, the expanse of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans had made it possible for the United States to enjoy a kind of “free security” and remain largely detached from Old World conflicts.

During World War I, however, President Woodrow Wilson made a case for U.S. intervention in the conflict and a U.S. interest in maintaining a peaceful world order. Nevertheless, the American experience in that war served to bolster the arguments of isolationists; they argued that marginal U.S. interests in that conflict did not justify the number of U.S. casualties; claiming that American bankers and arms manufacturers had pushed for U.S. involvement for their own private profit. The 1934 publication of the book “Merchants of Death”, followed by the 1935 tract “War Is a Racket” served to increase popular suspicions of wartime profiteering and influence public opinion in the direction of neutrality.

The worldwide economic depression and the need for increased attention to domestic problems served to bolster the idea that the United States should isolate itself from troubling events in Europe. During the interwar period, the U.S. Government repeatedly chose non-entanglement over participation or intervention as the appropriate response to international questions. Immediately following the First World War, Congress rejected U.S. membership in the League of Nations out of concern that it would draw the United States into European conflicts. During the 1930s, the League proved ineffectual in the face of growing militarism, partly due to the U.S. decision not to participate.

The Japanese invasion of Manchuria and subsequent push to gain control over larger expanses of Northeast China in 1931 led President Herbert Hoover to establish the Stimson Doctrine, which stated that the United States would not
A high level of armed mobilisation, which hovered around 20% for most powers during the Second World War, produced a kind of social revolution in the employment of women, temporarily in the World War I and permanently in the World War II. Only Germany avoided this integration of women in the labour market for ideological reasons, as the Nazi State did not consider women worthy of employment outside their houses.

Another important aspect of war was that it was waged as a zero-sum game, i.e., as a war which could only be totally won or totally lost. Unlike the earlier wars which were fought for specific and limited objectives, world wars were waged for unconditional surrender. This was another valid reason why total war necessitated the use of all productive resources (of national as well as other allied economics). The British economy, for instance, despite the concentration of resources on arms production, was unable to cover its own demands for armaments and depended heavily on American deliveries which prided itself as being the 'arsenal of democracy'.

Use of Nuclear Weapons & Latest Warfare

The World War-II witnessed the use of modern warfare technologies including latest machine guns, tanks, sub-marines, aircrafts and more. Germany developed V1 and V2 missiles which became the precursors of modern ballistic missiles. US started the Manhattan Project to make atom bomb a practical reality. A plutonium weapon– Trinity was tested in July 1945. On 6 August 1945, a US bomber named Enola Gay flew over Hiroshima. The untested U-235 bomb nicknamed Little Boy was air-burst 1000 feet above the city to maximize destruction. It released energy equaling 15000 tons of chemical explosive T.N.T. from less than 130 pounds of Uranium. The effects were devastating– about 2/3rd of city was completely, destroyed and 140000 persons died by the end of the year. It was more miserable for those who survived. A second weapon, suppciate of plutonium-239 implosion assembly which was tested as Trinity, and nicknamed Fatman was dropped on Nagasaki on 9th August. The results were no different. Hence the total war had already perfected means of total annihilation as well as ‘safest’ possible efficient means of delivering them anywhere on the globe.

There were two vital aspects of the world wars. One, it is possible to interpret the two world wars as one long war that started around 1914, had a long period of truce in between and culminated in 1945 with decisive winners and loser. Some of the unresolved aspects of the first war (or first phase of the war) were resolved, decisively and conclusively in the second. Two, the war may have been fought primarily on European territory and had European countries as major participants (expect, of course, Japan and USA), but it was truly a global war because the major forces fighting the war were aspiring for a domination of the total world, not just Europe.

There was the triple ideological division of Europe into forces of liberal democracy (represented by Britain and France in the main), fascism (represented mainly by Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini) and the socialist world (represented by the USSR). It was precisely these three forces which
Plan guidelines to foster integration. In some ways this effort failed, as the OEEC never grew to be more than an agent of economic cooperation. Rather it was the separate European Coal and Steel Community, which notably excluded Britain that would eventually grow into the European Union. However, the OEEC served as both a testing and training ground for the structures that would later be used by the European Economic Community. The Marshall Plan, linked into the Bretton Woods system, also mandated free trade throughout the region.

After the fall of communism several proposed a "Marshall Plan for Eastern Europe" that would help revive that region. Others have proposed a Marshall Plan for Africa to help that continent. "Marshall Plan" has become a metaphor for any very large scale government program that is designed to solve a specific social problem. It is usually used when calling for federal spending to correct a perceived failure of the private sector.

ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION IN POST-WAR EUROPE

The War had damaged the economies of nearly all the European countries. The immediate task therefore war to recover the losses incurred and somehow restore the pre-war levels of economic development. The next step was to attain new level of economic prosperity. This process of economic recovery and development followed different trajectories in the liberal democratic and the socialist world.

Economy in Capitalist Europe: Recovery and Boom

The first phase of economic recovery, from 1945 to 1947, was effected through bilaterally negotiated US loans and grants and the food aid disbursed through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA). These sufficed to avert the general collapse of the economy that industrial dislocation and poor harvest threatened. They were adequate also to raise industrial output to prewar levels. Longer-term American objectives however required first, a monetary and trading system permitting the unrestricted movement of capital and commodities, and second, a bloc of politico-military partners whose defence did not have to be permanently subsidised. But, neither of the American aims could be pursued without further economic expansion.

During the next phase of recovery, 1948-1951, European countries willing to participate in the US-sponsored recovery programme received 13 billion dollars. This was supplemented by a 1 billion dollar loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). The largest beneficiaries of this programme were Britain, France, Italy, and West Germany. It established an international body of recipient nations, the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), to which each nation submitted a national plan every 4 years. These aid-receiving nations were required, under the "counterpart" clause, to be spent in ways approved by the US. They had to agree to use the aid to finance food imports only from the US whether or not cheaper alternative sources were available.

Between 1947 and 1951, the West European economies saw the restoration of financial discipline. The following features were common: state
be captured to bring about socialism. Many groups and organisations were also formed to spread socialist ideas and organise workers. One of these was the League of the Just or Communist League which had members in many countries of Europe. Internationalism was one of its important features. It declared as its aim as the downfall of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the overthrow of the old society of middle class, based on class distinction, and the establishment of a new society without classes and without private property. It instructed Karl Marx and Frederick Engels to draft a manifesto.

**Marxian Socialism**

The Communist Manifesto first appeared in German in 1848. The influence of this document in the history of the socialist movement is without a rival. It was the work of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. They gave a new direction to socialist ideology and movement. Their philosophy is known as Marxism and it has influenced almost every field of knowledge. Their view of socialism is called scientific socialism. The Communist Manifesto stated that the aim of workers all over the world was the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. It pointed out that socialism was not merely desirable, but also inevitable. Marx analysed the working of capitalism in his famous work Das Kapital (Capital) and pointed out the characteristics that would lead to its destruction:

1. **Workers produce more ‘value’ than they get in the form of wages, the difference being appropriated by the capitalists in the form of profits.**
2. This constitutes the basis of conflict in capitalist society. Profits can be increased at the cost of workers’ wages and, therefore, the interests of workers and capitalists are irreconcilable.
3. **Economic crises** were inevitable under capitalism because of the discrepancy between the purchasing power of workers and total production. These crises would be resolved only if the private ownership of the means of production is abolished and the profit motive eliminated from the system of production. With this, production would be carried on for social good rather than for profits for a few.
4. The exploiting classes would disappear and a classless society would emerge in which there would be no difference between what was good for the individual and for society as a whole.

Marx and Engels believed that this would be accomplished by the working class which was the most revolutionary class in capitalist society. They advocated that the emancipation of the working class would emancipate the whole human race from all traces of social injustice. Around the time the Communist Manifesto was published, revolutions broke out in almost every country in Europe. These revolts aimed at the overthrow of autocratic governments, establishment of democracy and also, in countries such as Italy and Germany, at national unification. One of the major forces in these revolutions was the workers who had been inspired by ideas of socialism. The Communist League participated in these revolutions in many countries. However, all these revolutions were suppressed.

**The First International, 1864**

One of the most important events in the history of the socialist movement was the formation in 1864 of the International Working Men’s Association, or the
Redistribution of wealth, through both tax and spending policies that aim to reduce economic inequalities. Social democracies typically employ various forms of progressive taxation regarding wage and business income, wealth, inheritance, capital gains and property. On the spending side, a set of social policies typically provides free access to public services such as education, health care and child care, while subsidized access to housing, food, pharmaceutical goods, water supply, waste management and electricity is also common.

Social security schemes where workers contribute to a mandatory public insurance program. The insurance typically include monetary provisions for retirement pensions and survivor benefits, permanent and temporary disabilities, unemployment and parental leave. Unlike private insurance, governmental schemes are based on public statutes and not contracts, so that contributions and benefits may change in time and are based on solidarity among participants. Its funding is done on an ongoing basis, without direct relationship with future liabilities.

Minimum wages, employment protection and trade union recognition rights for the benefit of workers. The objectives of these policies are to guarantee living wages and help produce full employment. There are a number of different models of trade union protection which evolved, but they all guarantee the right of workers to form unions, negotiate benefits and participate in strikes. Germany, for instance, appointed union representatives at high levels in all corporations and had much less industrial strife than the UK, whose laws encouraged strikes rather than negotiation.

State capitalism

Various state capitalist economies, which consist of large commercial state enterprises that operate according to the laws of capitalism and pursue profits, have evolved in countries that have been influenced by various elected socialist political parties and their economic reforms. While these policies and reforms did not change the fundamental aspect of capitalism, and non-socialist elements within these countries supported or often implemented many of these reforms themselves, the result has been a set of economic institutions that were at least partly influenced by socialist ideology.

Worker Self Management

Yugoslavia pursued a socialist economy based on autogestion or worker-self management. Rather than implementing a centrally planned economy, Yugoslavia developed a market socialist system where enterprises and firms were socially owned rather than publicly owned by the state. In these organizations, the management was elected directly by the workers in each firm.

IMPACT OF SOCIALISM

Despite all the differences, socialism became one of the most widely held ideologies within a few decades after its emergence. The spread of the influence of socialist ideas and movements after the First World War was in no small measure due
that the Partition forced about **80 lakh people to migrate** across the new border. Approximately **5 to 10 lakh people were killed** in Partition related violence. Even after large scale migration of Muslims to the newly created Pakistan, the Muslim population in India accounted for 12% of the total population in 1951.

There were **competing political interests** behind these conflicts. The Muslim League was formed to protect the interests of the Muslims in colonial India. It was in the forefront of the demand for a **separate Muslim nation**. Similarly, there were organisations, which were trying to organise the Hindus in order to turn India into a **Hindu nation**. But most leaders of the national movement believed that India must treat persons of **all religions equally** and that India should not be a country that gave superior status to adherents of one faith and inferior to those who practiced another religion. **All citizens would be equal** irrespective of their religious affiliation. Being religious or a believer would not be a test of citizenship. They cherished therefore the ideal of a secular nation. This ideal was enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

Mahatma Gandhi was saddened by the **communal violence** and disheartened that the principles of ahimsa (non-violence) and Satyagraha (active but non-violent resistance) that he had lived and worked for, had failed to bind the people in troubled times. Gandhiji went on to persuade the Hindus and Muslims to give up violence. **Gandhiji’s death** had an almost magical effect on the communal situation in the country. Partition-related anger and violence suddenly subsided. The Government of India cracked down on organizations that were spreading communal hatred. **Communal politics began to lose its appeal.**

The **great danger** was that an atmosphere and the mentality generated by Partition and the riots might persist and **strengthen communal tendencies** in Indian politics. But Indian nationalism was able to withstand the test. Communalism was thereby **contained and weakened** but not eliminated, for conditions were still favourable for its growth. For communalism to be eclipsed a **consistent struggle** against communalism to instill a sense of security in the minorities, through public speeches, radio broadcasts, and speeches in parliament, private letters and epistles to chief ministers. He repeatedly declared: ‘No State can be civilized except a secular State’.

The government had to stretch itself to the maximum to **give relief to and resettle and rehabilitate** the nearly 6 million (60 lakh) **refugees** from Pakistan by 1951, the problem of the rehabilitation of the refugees from West Pakistan had been fully tackled. The task of rehabilitating and resettling **refugees from East Bengal** was made more difficult by the fact that the exodus of Hindus from East Bengal **continued for years**. While nearly all the Hindus and Sikhs from **West Pakistan** had migrated in one go in 1947, a large number of Hindus in East Bengal had stayed on there in the initial years of 1947 and 1948. But as communal riots broke out periodically in East Bengal, there was a steady stream of refugees from there year after year **till 1971**. Providing them with work and shelter and psychological assurance, therefore became a continuous and hence a **difficult task.**

Most of the **refugees from west Punjab** could occupy the **large lands and property left by the Muslim migrants** to Pakistan from Punjab, Uttar Pradesh
minority safeguards is within the purview of the state governments and therefore differs from state to state. In general, despite some progress in several states, in most of them the position of the linguistic minorities has not been satisfactory. The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has in his reports regularly noted innumerable cases of discrimination against linguistic minorities in matters of schooling, admission to technical and medical institutions and employment in the state public services because of lack of proficiency in the official language of the state.

Among the minority languages, **Urdu is a special case.** It is the largest minority tongue in India. Nearly 23 million people spoke Urdu in 1951. Urdu speakers constituted substantial percentages of the population in Uttar Pradesh (10%), Bihar (9%), Maharashtra (7%), Andhra Pradesh (8%) and Karnataka (9%). Moreover, an overwhelming majority of Muslims, India’s largest religious minority, claimed Urdu as their mother tongue. Urdu is also recognized as one of India’s national languages and is listed in the Eighth Schedule of the constitution.

While nearly all the major languages of India were also the official languages of one state or the other, **Urdu was not the official language of any state** except the small state of Jammu and Kashmir where the mother tongues were in any case Kashmiri, Dogri and Ladakhi. Consequently, Urdu did not get official support in any part of the country. On the contrary, it faced official discrimination and hostility both in U.P. and Bihar. The **U.P. government** decided early on to declare Hindi as the only official language of the state. In practice, Urdu began to be abolished in many primary schools. Its use as a medium of instruction was also increasingly limited. The U.P. government gave its main justification being that the SRC had recommended that at least 30% population in a state should speak a language before it could be made the second official or regional language.

The governments of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka were more supportive of Urdu. In Andhra, it has been recognized since 1968 as an additional language for the Telangana region. And in both the states, adequate facilities are provided for instruction through the medium of Urdu in the primary stage and for instruction in Urdu at the higher school stages. Two other aspects of Urdu’s position may be noted. First, unfortunately the question of Urdu has got entangled with the communal question. Second, despite active hostility of many and official neglect, Urdu continues not only to exist but even grow in terms of literary output, journals and newspapers and especially as the language of films and television because of its inherent vigour and cultural roots among the Indian people.

**THE CHALLENGE OF LEFT**

In the early post-independence period, the government was faced with another challenge; this time from the left. The Communists Party of India (CPI) proclaimed the beginning of a general revolution in India in February 1948, declaring the Nehru government of being an agent of imperialist and semi-feudal forces. It initiated militant mass movements in various areas, the most prominent being the attempt to organize a railway strike all over the country in March 1949. It also continued the armed struggle in the Telangana area of the Hyderabad state begun earlier against the Nizam.
Nehru was appalled, but though he was highly critical of the policy and activities of the CPI, he **resisted banning it** till he felt that there was enough proof of its violent activities. Even then he permitted the **banning of the CPI only in West Bengal and Madras** where it was most active. Being in agreement with the basic socio-economic objectives of the Communists, he believed that the best way to combat their politics and violent activities was to **remove the discontent of the people** through economic and other reformist measures. Even so, as soon as the CPI gave up its programme of waging armed struggle, including in Telangana, and declared its **intention to join the parliamentary democratic process**, Nehru saw to it that the CPI was legalized everywhere and its leaders and cadres released. It was also allowed to participate in the general elections of 1951-52.

**NEHRU AND PATEL**

Patel was undoubtedly the main leader of the Congress **right wing**. But his rightist stance has often been grossly misinterpreted. Like Nehru, he fully shared the **basic values of the national movement**: commitment to democracy and civil liberties, secularism, independent economic development, social reform and a pro-poor orientation. He stood for the **abolition of landlordism** but through payment of compensation. A staunch opponent of communalism, he was fully committed to **secularism**. He was also utterly **intolerant of nepotism and corruption**. Patel’s conservatism, however, found expression with regard to the questions of class and socialism. Before 1947, he had **opposed the Socialists and the Communists**.

After 1947, he argued successfully for **stimulus to private enterprise** and the incorporation of the **right of property** as a fundamental right in the constitution. Thus, the right-wing stance of Patel was basically a matter of social ideology. Patel and Nehru had **temperamental as well as ideological differences**. After 1947, policy differences on several questions cropped up between them. The two differed on the **role and authority to be handled** and the relations with Pakistan. Nehru opposed, though unsuccessuflly, Patel’s view that the right to property should be included among the Fundamental Rights in the constitution.

Yet, the two **continued to stick and pull together** and there was no final parting of ways. This was because what united them was more significant and of abiding value than what divided them. Also, they **complemented each other** in many ways: one was a great organizer and able administrator, the other commanded immense mass support and had a wide social and developmental perspective. Throughout Patel remained Nehru’s loyal colleague, assuring him of complete support for his policies.
A major difficulty in implementing the zamindari abolition acts was the absence of adequate land records. Nevertheless, by end of 1950s the process of land reform involving abolition of intermediaries (the zamindars of British India, and jagirdars of the princely states now merged with independent India) can be said to have been completed. Considering that the entire process occurred in a democratic framework, it was completed in a remarkably short period. The abolition of zamindari meant that about 20 million erstwhile tenants now became landowners. The compensation actually paid to the zamindars once their estates were acquired was generally small and varied from state to state depending upon the strength of the peasant movement and consequent class balance between the landlords and the tenants and the ideological composition of the Congress leadership.

Weaknesses in Zamindari Abolition

There were, however, certain important weaknesses in the manner in which some of the clauses relating to zamindari abolition were implemented in various parts of the country. For example, in Uttar Pradesh, the zamindars were permitted to retain lands that were declared to be under their ‘personal cultivation’ making it possible for not only those who tilled the soil, but also those who supervised the land personally or did so through a relative, or provided capital and credit to the land, to call themselves a cultivator. To begin with there was no limit on the size of the lands that could be declared to be under the ‘personal cultivation’ of the zamindar. The result in actual practice, however, was that even zamindars who were absentee landowners could now end up retaining large tracts of land.

Further, in many areas, the zamindars in order to declare under ‘personal cultivation’ as large a proportion of their lands as possible often resorted to large-scale eviction of tenants, mainly the less secure small tenants. Many of the zamindars moved towards progressive capitalist farming in these areas, as this was indeed one of the objectives of land reform. The landlords used every possible method of parliamentary obstruction in the legislatures. Even after the laws were enacted the landlords used the judicial system to defer the implementation of the laws. While the big landlords, who lost the bulk of their lands, were the chief losers, the main beneficiaries of zamindari abolition were the occupancy tenants or the upper tenants, who had direct leases from the zamindar, and who now became landowners.

TENANCY REFORMS

Tenancy reforms had three basic objectives. First, it was to guarantee security of tenure to the tenants who had cultivated a piece of land continuously for a fixed number of years. Second, it was to seek the reduction of rents paid by tenants to a ‘fair’ level; which was generally considered to range between one-fourth and one-sixth of the value of the gross produce of the leased land. The third objective was that the tenant gains the right to acquire ownership of the lands he cultivated, subject to certain restrictions. While attempting to improve the condition of the tenants, tenancy legislation in India, by and large, sought to maintain a balance between the interest of the landowner, particularly the small landowner, and the tenant.

The absentee landowners’ right of resumption of land for ‘personal cultivation’, as well as the tenants’ right to acquire the lands they cultivated, was
that of reducing rents to a ‘fair’ level, almost impossible to achieve. The market condition, for example, the adverse land-man ratio that developed in India during colonial rule, led to high rents. Further, the Green Revolution which started in some parts of India in the late 1960s aggravated the problems, with land values and rentals rising further and reaching, for example, in parts of Punjab, rates as high as 70%.

As for the third objective of tenancy legislation in India, that is, the acquisition of ownership rights by tenants, this too was achieved only partially. Abolition of zamindari led to about 20 million tenants, the superior occupancy tenants, becoming landowners and many absentee zamindars actually turning to direct cultivation in the lands ‘resumed’ for ‘personal’ cultivation. In the ryotwari areas nearly half the tenants, for example, in Bombay and Gujarat became landowners. Further, about half of the lands from which tenants were evicted were used by the landowners for direct cultivation, that is, they were not leased out again in a concealed manner. Also, a very substantial number of inferior tenants in former ryotwari areas got occupancy rights.

LAND CEILINGS

A major plank of the land reform effort in India was the imposition of ceilings on the size of landholdings, with the objective of making land distribution more equitable. On this question, however, societal consensus was weak, if not non-existent, and that was reflected in the extreme difficulty in implementing this programme with even a reasonable degree of success. In 1946, a Committee headed by Jawaharlal Nehru had recommended that the maximum size of holdings should be fixed. The surplus land over such a maximum should be acquired and placed at the disposal of the village cooperatives. Similarly, the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee, chaired by J.C. Kumarappa in 1949, also recommended a ceiling on landholding which was to be 3 times the size of an economic holding.

There was no immediate programme of implementing ceilings. In 1959 Nagpur Session of Congress passed a resolution stating that in order to remove uncertainty regarding land reforms and give stability to the farmer, ceilings should be fixed on existing and future holdings and legislation to this effect should be completed in all States by the end of 1959. Further, the land declared surplus, that is, above ceiling limits, was to vest in the panchayats and be managed through cooperatives consisting of landless labourers. Nagpur Resolution contributed considerably towards consolidation of right-wing forces both in the rural and urban sectors of the country.

N.G. Ranga and C. Rajagopalachari alarmed at the moves towards land ceilings and threats of compulsory cooperativisation. The campaigners and beneficiaries of zamindari abolition, the tenants who had now become landowners, also ranged themselves against the next step in land reform, an attempt at redistribution of land-ownership through imposition of land ceilings. States had to formulate and implement legislation. Most states passed the enabling legislation by the end of 1961.

Weaknesses in Land Ceiling Legislation

The long delay, as well as the nature of the legislation, ensured that the ceilings would have a much muted impact, releasing little surplus land for
the ceiling laws was that it **discouraged concentration of landownership** beyond the ceiling level.

In the long run, the **high population growth** and the **rapid subdivision** of large holdings over several generations led automatically to little land remaining over the ceiling limits. Except in certain small pockets in the country, very large landholdings of the semi-feudal type are now **things of the past**. However, any further attempt at land redistribution through lowering of ceilings does not appear to be **politically feasible** or even economically viable. Perhaps the **only viable programme** left for the landless was the one which has been to some extent taken up in recent years, of **distributing homestead lands** or even just home sites, ensuring the payment of minimum wages, as well as providing security of tenure and fair rents to sharecroppers and tenants.

**Bhoodan Movement**

Bhoodan was an **attempt at land reform**, at bringing about **land redistribution** through a movement. Eminent Gandhian constructive worker Acharaya Vinoba Bhave organized an all-India federation of constructive workers, the Sarovodaya Samaj, which was to take up the task of a non-violent social transformation in the country. He and his followers were to do **padayatra** (foot walk) to **persuade the larger landowners** to donate at least 1/6th of their lands as Bhoodan or ‘land-gift’ for **distribution** among the landless and the land poor. The target was to get as donation 50 million acres, which was one-sixth of the 300 million acres of cultivable land in India.

In the initial years, the movement achieved a considerable degree of success, receiving over 4 million acres of land as donation. However a substantial part of the land donated was **unfit for cultivation** or under litigation. Towards the end of 1955, the movement took a new form, that of **Gramdan or ‘donation of village’**. Again taking off from the Gandhian notion that all land belonged to ‘Gopal’ or God, in Gramdan villages the movement declared that all land was **owned collectively or equally**, as it did not belong to any one individual. The movement started in **Orissa** and was most successful there.

By the end of 1960 there were more than **4,500 Gramdan villages** out of which around 2000 were in Orissa. By the 1960s the Bhoodan/ Gramdan movement had **lost its élan** despite its considerable initial promise. Its **creative potential** essentially remained unutilized. A proper assessment of the movement particularly its potential is still to be made. It has been too easily dismissed as not only ‘Utopian’ but also as being reactionary, class collaborationist and **aimed at preventing class struggle**. Its purpose was to **serve as a brake** on the revolutionary struggle of the peasants’.

However, some very **significant aspects** of the Bhoodan movement need to be noted. First, the very fact that it was one of the very few attempts after independence to bring about **land reform through a movement** and not through government legislation from the top is in itself very significant. Second, the **potential of the movement** was enormous, based as it was on the **idea of trusteeship** or that all land belonged to God. If the landlords failed to behave as trustees or as ‘equal’ sharers...
Large numbers of zamindars and jagirdars who were formerly absentee landlords now took to modern capitalist farming in the lands that they could retain for personal cultivation. Similarly, the tenants and sharecroppers who either got ownership rights or security of tenure were now prepared to make far greater investment and improvements in their lands. The landless, who received ceiling-surplus or Bhoodan lands or previously unoccupied government land distributed in anti-poverty programmes, were ready to put in their best into lands which they could now, typically for the first time, call their own.

However, the problem of the landless or the near landless, constituting nearly half the agricultural population has persisted. The high rate of population growth and the inability of the industrialization process to absorb a greater proportion of the agricultural population have made it difficult to deal with this situation. The effort at cooperative joint farming failed as one way of solving the problems of rural poverty, inequity and landlessness. Yet, independent India did succeed in essentially rooting out feudal elements from Indian agriculture and put the colonial agrarian structure that it inherited on the path of progressive, owner cultivator-based capitalist agricultural development; a development the benefits of which trickled down to the poorer sections of the peasantry and to some extent even to agricultural labourers.

GREEN REVOLUTION

India had been facing food shortages since the mid-1950s and in the mid-1960s. Agricultural growth had begun to stagnate in the 1950s. The massive jump in population growth rates after independence, at about 2.2 per cent annum from about 1 per cent in the previous half century, the slow but steady rise in per capita income, and the huge outlay towards planned industrialization, put long-term pressures on Indian agriculture. The controversial agreements made by India to import food from the US under the PL-480 scheme started in 1956. Given this scenario, economic self-reliance and particularly food self-sufficiency became the top priority.

Critical inputs like high-yield variety (HYV) seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides, agricultural machinery including tractors, pump-sets, etc., soil-testing facilities, agricultural education programmes and institutional credit were concentrated on areas which had assured irrigation and other natural and institutional advantages. Some 32 million acres of land, about 10 per cent of the total cultivated area, was, thus, initially chosen for receiving the package programme benefits on top priority. The Agricultural Prices Commission was set up and efforts were made to see that the farmer was assured a market at sustained remunerative prices. Between 1967-68 and 1970-71 foodgrain production rose by 35%. By 1980s, not only was India self-sufficient in food with buffer food stocks of over 30 million tonnes, but it was even exporting food to pay back earlier loans or as loans to food deficit countries.

However, doubts about the New Agricultural Strategy began to be expressed from the very early stages of its implementation. One persistent argument had been early stages of its implementation. One persistent argument had been that by concentrating resources on the regions that already had certain advantages the Green Revolution strategy was further accentuating regional inequality. Clearly, the solution to such fears lay in spreading the Green Revolution further and not opposing it per
CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT

Questions Asked

- Why did Gandhi launch the Salt Satyagraha in 1930 and with what results?
- In what way did the CDM affect the different provinces of India? How did it foster peasant movement in India? (250 words)
- Why did Mahatma Gandhi launch CDM? Analyse the intensity of movement in different parts of India? (150 words)
- Analyze Mahatma Gandhi’s main demands presented to Irwin. How did salt emerge as the central issue for launching the Satyagraha?
- We must be able to answer:
  - Gandhiji’s main demands to Irwin – Analyze
  - Why CDM
  - How salt became central issue
  - Its effect in different provinces
  - How peasants movement was a result of CDM
  - What results of CDM

WHY CDM

British heralded a new era of “Modern India”, in which saw the process of geographical unification, nation building and sense of political consciousness among masses. This mass consciousness manifested itself in the form of a spontaneous, organized and non-violent Civil Disobedience Movement.

The idea of Civil Disobedience was always there in the mind of Gandhiji, the 1929 Lahore Resolution of Poorna Swaraj, “full and total independence” provided the immediate spark. The background was prepared by:

1. **1919 reforms** were the shortest lasting reforms and had failed to bring any significant change for the Indians.
2. Failure of **Simon Commission** to fulfill demand of Dominion status of INC. Racial discrimination in the Simon Commission as no Indian Representative was taken.
3. **Swarajists** proved that there were no real powers delegated to them. The 1919 reforms were a retrograde step of the government.
5. Gandhiji traveled extensively the villages during 1929 to prepare people for direct political action.
6. 1929 – CWC organized programme of **foreign cloth boycott** and its public burning.
7. Refusal of Lord Irwin to **Eleven Demands** of Mahatma Gandhi.
8. Spurt generated in the masses by revolutionary activities of **HSRA**.
9. The deteriorating **socio-economic condition of the masses** especially of the peasants and the great depression of early 1930s provided the spurt to the movement. Widespread unemployment infused anger among the Indian youth.

The spark was more because of the rise of left and induction of new blood in the Congress during this period. This differentiated CDM from all earlier movements.