

HOW THE BRITISH RUINED INDIA

by Dr. V.V. Bedekar, V.Y.Sardesai

ABSTRACT

This study compares the condition of India, before and after the British rule. The British rule not only changed India's fortunes, literally, but also shaped the world opinions on every aspect of India, its people, the social and religious life, particularly Hinduism. This study gives the actions and intentions of the British rulers and major policy makers, in their own words, so there should be no doubt left whatsoever about the British bias on every aspect of India.

The condition of India, its economy, its people and institutions, before the British rule is described again based mainly on foreign traveller's accounts or reputed Western sources. They show that India in no way was backward, economically or socially. **INDIA BEFORE THE BRITISH RULE HAD THE SECOND MOST POWERFUL ECONOMY IN THE WORLD** and dominated the world trade by its exports. It was India's riches that had attracted hoards of invaders for millennia before the British that made the seafarers like Columbus and Vasco De Gama seek new trade routes to it.

After the British rule, the name India was made synonymous to poverty, hunger and disease -- a country unable to feed its own, akin to what Somalia, Ethiopia are now in 1980s and 1990s. This change was not accidental, but an effect of deliberate British policies. In essence, India was impoverished first by plunder and tyranny, and then by unfair trade practices and later by economic exploitation. This lack of self rule at the critical time of 'paradigm shift' in the world economy -- the industrial revolution, resulted in India missing the Industrial revolution or being able to make adjustments for the new age. This resulted in its traditional economy being ruined, its social structure being turned upside down, and along the way, **OVER 30 MILLION INDIANS, OVER A TENTH OF INDIA'S POPULATION, DIED OF STARVATION DURING THE BRITISH RULE. MOST OF THESE 30 MILLION DEAD BELONGED TO POOR BACKWARD CASTES.**

The other field where the British did comparable damage was in the field of knowledge. British information system, books, and education system designed for perpetuation of its rule, magnified every flaw, real or imaginary, in the Indian system, manifold. At the same time, all the good in India was attributed to foreign invaders or influence. The effect of this British view of India has been so devastating, that the 30 million backward castes killed by starvation by the British exploitation are almost forgotten today, and the onus of wretched condition of Indian poor has been shifted to the upper castes, when in reality it lies somewhere else..

INTRODUCTION

During the early years of the British Rule of India, the new foreign rulers usurped power from local princes. The British followed a two-prong policy.

On economic side, plunder of wealth from the Indian territories under East India Company's rule by oppressive policies impoverished the local populations. Later, trade policies, import and export duties were designed to adversely affect India's exports, first by dumping the finished goods from Britain into India while importing only raw materials. This collapsed the Indian industry. The now impoverished cheap bonded labour was exported to other British plantations world over. The cheap resources from India were used to fuel British economy. There is no greater misfortune than to be ruled by a foreign power when an age of technological revolution is onset. India's traditional industry, denied of access for export of finished goods, and impoverished by British policies, lacked the capital to retool and compete with now technologically advanced foreign industry. The taxes collected from India financed Britain's wars for expansion of the empire.

On the social front, the British made policies that affected Indian education, history, archaeology, law and order, social structure, and religion. These were calculated, well-conceived, deliberate, well-planned, well-engineered policies with long term objectives. The essence of these was to paint a picture of India as a place without law and order, a barbaric people with no civilization or value system whatsoever (i.e in essence 'the White man's burden'). And the British in their divinely ordained duty had to teach their ways to civilize these barbarians. That formed the hypothetical basis for the subjugation of a subcontinent by the Royal Empire. After all civilized people do not dominate others; they only help them to become civilized. Also to perpetuate this 'process of civilization' British tried to create their 'mirror images' in the local population. Thus the British analysis magnified flaws, real or imaginary, in Indian society out of proportion.

INDIAN ECONOMY BEFORE THE BRITISH SUPREMACY

The India ruled by the Moslem invaders, as well as conquered by the British, was wealthy and prosperous. "The Hindu kingdoms overthrown by the Moslems, were so wealthy that Moslem historians tire of telling of the immense loot of jewels and coin captured by the invaders", describes Mount Stuart Elphinstone in 'History of India' (1916 ed). Nicolo Conti described the banks of the Ganga (ca.1420) as lined with one prosperous city after another, each well designed, rich in gardens, and orchards, silver and gold, commerce and industry. Shah Jahan's treasury was so full of that he kept two underground strong rooms, each some 150,000 cubic feet capacity, almost filled with silver and gold. British historian Vincent Smith in his 'Akbar' (Oxford, 1919 ed) writes, "Contemporary testimonies, permit no doubt that the urban population of the more important cities was well to do". Travelers described Agra and Fatehpur Sikri as each greater and richer than London!

'The World- An Illustrated History' which the PBS TV Series 'The World: A Television History' was based on, gives following information: In the year 1750, Asia with China and India's 150 million population each, was home to 70 % of world population. China and India also boasted levels of production and prosperity that astonished the Europeans.

For the Portuguese poet Luis de Camoes in 1572, India was the "land of wealth abounding"... The praise was not unwarranted. Although it is very difficult to 'measure' economic output of early modern Asia, since reliable statistics on production were rarely kept, every scrap of information that comes to light confirms a far greater scale of enterprise and profit in the East than in the West.

The output of textiles, which was also enormous. In India, the city of Kasimbazar in Bengal produced, just by itself, over 2 million pounds of raw silk annually during the 1680s, compared to the annual export of mere 250,000 pounds of silk from Europe's foremost silk producer, Sicily. The cotton weavers of Gujarat in the West India, turned out almost 3 million pieces a year FOR EXPORT ALONE, compared to the largest textile enterprise in continental Europe, the Leiden 'new drapery' produced less than 100,000 pieces of cloth per year. ASIA, NOT EUROPE, WAS THE CENTER OF WORLD INDUSTRY THROUGHOUT EARLY MODERN TIMES. It was likewise the home of the greatest states. The most powerful monarchs of their day were NOT Luis XIV or Peter the Great, but Manchu emperor Kangshi and the Moghul Aurangzeb. After the decline of the Mughal empire in 1707 the Marathas became the powerful rulers of large part of India.

Anquetil-Duperon, journeying thru the Maratha districts in 1760, found himself "in the midst of the simplicity and happiness of the golden age... the people were cheerful, vigorous, and in high health".

ROBERT CLIVE, the chief architect who laid the foundation of British empire in India, visiting Murshidabad IN 1759, RECKONED THAT THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF BENGAL AS EQUAL IN EXTENT, POPULATION AND WEALTH TO THE LONDON OF HIS TIME, WITH PALACES FAR GREATER THAN THOSE OF EUROPE, AND MEN RICHER THAN ANY INDIVIDUAL IN LONDON". Yet the state of Bengal was not the richest or nor the most powerful in India at the time, as Marathas were more powerful than Siraj ud-Doula and ruled larger territory. INDIA, said Clive, WAS A COUNTRY OF INEXHUSTIBLE RICHES.

Paul Kennedy in his 'The Rise and Fall of Great Powers' gives statistics on the India's manufacturing clout in 1750 CE and 1800 CE. In 1750, India's relative share of entire World's manufacturing output was 24.5% , i.e. higher than entire Europe's output of 23.2 % which included UK (a mere 1.9 %) , France, Germany, Habsburg Empire, Italian states, and Russia.

BY 1800, INDIA STILL ACCOUNTED FOR 19.7% OF TOTAL WORLD MANUFACTURING OUTPUT COMPARED TO MERE 4.3% BY U.K. Even the tea shipment in 'the Boston Tea party' in 1773, which started the American War of Independence, was exported from India!

But more importantly, all the balance of trade in favour of India was received as goods and bullion which went into the Indian economy and helped the standard of living of Indians.

A logical question at this point will be: above data indicates that India had a powerful economy, but were all the sections of society prosperous? Because the distribution of wealth within the society is equally important. Thanks to the often repeated description of Indian caste system in the West and even in India, there is a prevalent opinion that only upper castes were beneficiaries of India's riches. But were they? For his classic article, on misconceptions about pre-British India, eminent syndicated columnist and former editor of Illustrated Weekly of India, M.V.Kamath researched conditions of India before the British rule. He notes, 'Economically speaking the non-elitist castes were well off. Agricultural productivity in India was very high in the 19th century. On comparing the Indian data with that relating to British agriculture around 1804 it was found that the productivity in India, was "SEVERAL TIMES HIGHER' than in British agriculture. What surprised the British even more was the finding that: the wages of the Indian agricultural labourer in real terms were substantially higher" than those of his counterparts in Britain. And it was then remarked that if they were high around 1800 when Indian economy was on a decline, how much higher must wages have been before such decline began.

The evidence of higher crop yields in India compared to even Britain, comes from British themselves. Drill plough, crop rotation, animal husbandry and breeding were virtually unknown in the Europe in the 17th and 18th century. The average wheat yield in Britain in 1850 was 20 bushels per acre. Compared to that when a complete report on Indian wheat was ordered by the Secretary of State of Indian .. the result of Forbes Watson's examination was found most satisfactory. India was capable of growing wheat of highest quality. The average what yield was 56 bushels per acre, plus Indian farmers used to take two crops a year, resulting in yield of 112 bushels per acre per year, i.e. 5 times greater than his British counterpart! Data for 1806 of consumption of the "more prosperous", "families of medium means" and the "lowly" make even more significant reading. The consumption of pan (betel leaves) per year in a family of six among the more prosperous was 9600, among those of those of medium means 4800 and among the lowly 3600. The consumption of ghee (clarified butter) and oil was in the proportion of 3:1:1 approximately, and pulses 8:4:3. The total per capita consumption among of the more prosperous was Rs 17-3-4, among those of medium means Rs 9-2-4 and the lowly Rs 7-7-0. Economically speaking, then, there really were no "backward castes" or deprived classes.

Most of the jobs dealing with production such as weaving, dyeing, smithy, carpentry, metalwork were practically the monopoly of Shudras and what today would be described as backward castes. The brahmins were hardly in the picture. Agriculture, again, was practically the monopoly of the backward castes. Extensive Government records maintained by the British show that from 1800 onwards "a very large" proportion of the rural population enjoyed the rights of Measdars, i.e., hereditary proprietors and cultivators of land. In the district of Tanjore, for instance, in 1805 out of 62,048 meerasdars, only 17,149 were upper caste Brahmins 1,457 were Moslems.

Contemporary account by Maria Graham who visited Pune early nineteenth century gives following information: "Among the lower classes (castes) it is very common to see a man loaded with Jewels of gold and silver on his hands, feet, waist, neck, ears and nose."

ECONOMIC DESTRUCTION OF INDIA

HOW A CENTURY UNDER BRITISH RULE CHANGED INDIA

In 1800 CE, India amounted to a whopping 20% of the total world manufacturing output! But more importantly the balance of trade went into the Indian economy in the form of goods in exchange or bullion and helped Indian people's standard of living. It had second most powerful economy, the wages and productivity throughout all the sections of society were high. It had a simple, inexpensive education system suited for its needs.

But, BY THE YEAR 1900, INDIA HAD BECOME SYNONYMOUS WITH POVERTY, ITS EXPORTS ACCOUNTED FOR MERE 1.7% OF THE TOTAL WORLD TRADE, AND ... MORE THAN 30 MILLION PEOPLE (MORE THAN 10 PERCENT OF INDIA'S POPULATION) DIED OF STARVATION IN THE 82 YEARS OF BRITISH RULE.

Paul Kennedy in his book 'The Rise and Fall of Great Powers' gives following statistics of how Indian and the British fortunes reversed between 1750 — 1900. The reversal also coincides with ascendancy of British power in India. After 1818 when British became the major power in India Indian manufacturing output rapidly declined while British increased.

Data on the Percent of India's area under British domination has been added to the tables given by Paul Kennedy. This can be used to correlate the ascent of British rule in India and its correlation to India's fortunes. In 1757 British captured Bengal (and Bihar), in 1799 they captured Mysore, in 1818 Marathas, the then largest power in India surrendered, and in 1849 British captured the Sikh kingdom of Punjab.

Table - Relative shares of World Manufacturing Output 1750 - 1900 CE (19)
(Percent of total World Output)

	1750	1800	1830	1860	1880	1900
India	24.5%	19.7%	17.6%	8.6%	2.8%	1.7%
United Kingdom	1.9%	4.3%	9.5%	19.9%	22.9%	18.5%
% Area of India under British domination (*)	<3	40	85	100	100	100

* Includes princely states under British suzerainty

During the same period per capita levels of industrialization (relative to UK in 1900 = 100 scale) is given by Paul Kennedy in the following table.

Table - Per Capita Levels of Industrialization 1750- 1900 (14)
(Relative to UK in 1900 = 100)

	1750	1800	1830	1860	1880	1900
India	7	6	6	3	2	1
United Kingdom	10	16	25	64	87	100
% Area of India under <3 British domination(*)	40	85	100	100	100	

* Includes princely states under British suzerainty / British- Indian administration

Thus per capita level of industrialization was almost the same between UK and India around 1750, i.e. before British became a factor in India. Upon the British increasingly assuming power the per capita levels increased in UK while they decreased correspondingly in India. Apparently more complete the British power hold on India; the faster was India's decline.

Is this by mere coincidence? What happened? Is this just related to industrial revolution? Or was the cost of industrial revolution and subsequent British progress deliberately passed down to India?

To be continued....

Sponsored by: WORLD ASSOCIATION FOR VEDIC STUDIES: C/O PROF. BHU DEV SHARMA. DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA. NEW ORLEANS, LA 70125, USA. TEL. B; 504/483-7463, H; TEL/FAX on request ;504/454-6348, B-FAX. 504/485-7928, bsharma@mail.xula.edu.

ABSTRACT: The History and writing of History has been important in the Hindu tradition. The Itihas (History) is found in Ramayana, Mahabharata and other Purans and Vedas. For constructing proper ancient Indian History, it is necessary to use these ancient accounts along with the latest Archeological and Historic research. This article attempts this.

The British and the Christian Missionaries, who conquered India and wrote the Indian History, have deliberately distorted the Indian History to achieve their aims of converting Hindus to Christianity and securing the British Colonial rule; by reducing the ancientness of Hindu History and thereby showing (since ideas flow from more ancient to less ancient) that every thing of value was brought to India by Europeans, so as to malign Hindus, reduce their self esteem and thereby facilitating the conversion process. One of the major distortion in this has been the Aryan Race and Invasion Theory. Some of the European "Scholars" involved in introducing the distortions were Macauley, Max Mueller and Monier Williams. Their personal letters, recently surfaced from the British Archives, clearly expose their bias. Though the modern scholars have denounced the imperialist and their designs, they have not succeeded in correcting the distortions in the Indian History- and this distorted History is still being taught not only in the West, but also in India. This article focusses on the correction of these distortions.

The time scope of this article is very wide; it starts with the creation of the Universe, 19π Billion years ago, and ends with the 1998 election. Since it is only an outline and not a text, it is naturally brief. But it provides ample references (several dozen references are listed, which in turn provide many hundreds of references) to present the background and justification for the conclusions and the information given herein.

http://members.aol.com/_ht_a/math35/myhomepage/

ORIGIN OF KNOWLEDGE

http://sivaloka.tripod.com/story_of_knowledge.htm

India has been the birthplace of science over ages. Takshashila University (in Pakistan now) was a great centre of learning where students from Iran and further west came to study. In the first millennium BC, Iran was highly Indianized and could be considered an expansion of Indian culture and civilisation. At the western fringe of it was Asia Minor, modern Turkey, which was a place of interaction between Greeks and Iranians (Turks did not live there then). In the 6th century BC, Iran expanded its borders to include Assyria, Babylon, whole of Asia Minor and major parts of Greece. Egypt also fell to Iran soon after. Thus while Iran was engaged in expansion on its western borders, its eastern part was in peace, continuously receiving Indian knowledge and religion. Zoroaster, fifth century BC, lived in the eastern reaches of Persia, not far from India, and his belief to wage war on evil, and the idea of constant struggle between good and bad, light and darkness, is believed by the scholars of history of theology, to be Indian (Upanishadic) in origin. Monotheism had reached a full development in the Upanishad literature in India, from which Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and also Akhenaton of Egypt (1350 BC) had borrowed it. Upanishadic knowledge did after the death of its only patron Akhenatan. Mithraism was another branch of Vedic religion which spread widely over Iran, South Europe and Egypt. Mithra is a Vedic God (the Sun-God). Mithras celebrated the birthday of God (Sun) on the 25th December which became adapted by the Christians as the date of birth of God (Jesus). These religions of Indian origin in Middle East, introduced the principle of righteousness and monotheism to Judaism and Christianity and thereby to Islam later. Hence the ethical monotheism, the back bone of Judaism, Christianity and Islam found its origin in Hinduism.

Apart from these, Indian wandering monks travelled the breadth and length of this whole area. From Western sources we know that in the third century BC, a big Indian community lived at Alexandria in Egypt with their Vedic sannyasins as well as Buddhist bhikshukas. Indian sea-traders also dominated the sea-trade up to the period of rise of Islam. It was under this background that the Indian religions, philosophies and science travelled to the West to enlighten it in the ancient times.

It is also relevant to clarify here that the central dogma of Hinduism is knowledge. It believes that knowledge of truth is the ultimate goal of life. Hinduism encourages its followers to seek out the truth. Hinduism also recognises that although there is only one absolute truth, because of limitations of human sense organs and mind, truth may be conceived differently by different individuals under different circumstances. Therefore

tolerance for differing opinions was preached. Tolerance for difference of opinion is the first requirement for growth of knowledge in any society. The sages said knowledge is relative. Thus Hinduism gave the theory of Relativity for the first time and also tried to formulate a unified field theory in the field of Physics, in the form of the theory of Brahman for the first time. Law of cause and effect was doctinated, excluding Divine Will out of the chain of cause and effects and karma, not the fate was responsible for what people got in their lives. The doctrine of Karma making people responsible for their acts and denial of the doctrine of divine will and fate were the first seeds of modern attitude and scientific temper. Truth was considered a subject of investigation, not of belief. Every cause has an effect and this effect becomes a cause or another effect. The Universe (samsara) is but total of the complex system of causes and effects flowing in time. Hindu religion encouraged people to know and experience God rather than to believe Him. Because of this investigative temper, India was ahead of all other nations in science and mathematics till her subjugation by Muslim conquest in the 12th century. On the other hand, Jewish religion was based on the faith that only their God is real and all others false. Hence it was not only belief in one God but it was also a belief in correctness of only one religion. Christians also adopted the same attitude and Islam also asserted the same. Fighting the nonbeliever was considered a prime duty of the believers. The words of the God as revealed to the Prophet is final and anything contradicting them has to be destroyed. This gave the concept of heresy.

PYTHAGORAS: A GREAT HINDU GENIUS

History of knowledge in Europe starts with Pythagoras. Pythagoras, in the 6th century BC was the first European(Greek) who brought Indian knowledge and mathematics to Greece in an organised way. He was the first European to convert completely to Hinduism also. Pythagoras was born around 560 BC, on Samos an island not far from the coast of the Asia Minor .His mother was probably a native of Samos but his father was probably a Phoenician. His life history was recorded from oral traditions a couple of centuries after his death, and even that information has survived only in fragments. After studying the very best available in his country (music and gymnastics) he set out for more. He went to Egypt which had already received Indian Geometry through its contact with Indians as well as with Indo-Iranians and had then scholars teaching geometry and a bit of astrology. During his stay in Egypt, Egypt was invaded by Iran and he was brought to Iran as a captive , where he stayed at Babylon and other cities. Babylon was no more a Semitic city by that time, and it had been thoroughly Indo-Iranized in language, religion and knowledge at least a century earlier, when the Medes and the Persians thoroughly overran the country of Babylon, and it was now a part of Persian Empire and culturally a part of Indo-Iran. Probably, Pythagoras went to the Punjab and thence to the Himalayas as well. It thoroughly changed his life style and thinking. He permanently rejected the long Greek robes, and adopted trousers turning away from Ionian culture and identifying himself strongly with the East. Before Pythagoras, trousers were not known to Europe. Woollen trousers were worn by Indians living at high altitudes in the Himalayas, like people of Nepal, Laddakh, Tibet, Kashmir etc. (The statue of Indian king Kanishka, found in Afghanistan, is wearing a long double-breasted coat and trousers). Variants of trousers like pyjamas and shalwar were worn in the northern plains of Indo-Iran. The costume which Pythagoras introduced into the Europe

was going to become the ethnic costume of the West!! Having lived twenty years in the east, he returned to Europe and settled in Croton, a Greek speaking town of South Italy. He formed an order of ascetics devoted to develop a sense of community with the help of religious injunctions and instructions. This was aimed to give the members a real insight into the concordant nature of universe. He preached that the world, like human society, was held together by the orderly arrangement of its parts, and it then became their clear duty to cultivate order in their own lives. He was now acting as an ambassador of Hinduism to the West.

Pythagorians believed in transmigration of life through different life forms. His contemporary poet Xenophanes writes: „Pythagoras was once passing by when a man was beating a dog .He took pity on the animal and said, Stop it; Indeed it is the soul of a friend of mine; I recognised it when I heard its voice. Pythagoras was even able to recall the details of his own previous incarnations. Pythagoras preached the essential unity and kinship of all forms of life which is the fundamental principle of Hinduism (and also of other later Indian religions. He preached non-violence and banned killing and eating animals in his order of ascetics. He was a firm believer in Karmic law and preached immortality of existence. The human body is temporary ,therefore one must purify the soul by abstaining from bodily pleasure. By these means soul would ultimately win release from the wheel of becoming and realise its true divine status. Pythagoreans believed that anyone who downgraded his life by immoral and impure acts will be born as animal in his next life. A particular type of sayings, he named akousmata (things heard) which were probably Greek translation of the shruti (Sk. Things heard). In his brotherhood, members were of two kinds. Acousmatics would visit him and seek guidance on how to lead a simple ,non-violent and virtuous way of life. Others called Mathematikoi lived inside the math (monastery) and studied the nature of reality more deeply. From mathematik is derived the word mathematics. Pythagorians studied and further developed the science of mathematics and philosophy which was brought to them from India by their great Guru.

The reaction started by Pythagoras resulted in a boom of scholarship in Greece and finally we find authorities like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Heraclides, Eratosthenes, Archimedes, Euclid etc. During this whole period transfer of knowledge from India to Greece was never interrupted. This may be assumed from the fact that whatever theory was given in India e.g. atomic theory, theory of micro-organism, theory of non-dualism, Brahman, atman, the five elements (the Greeks accepted only four, and did not include space), medicine, the three doshas or whatever; it appears in Greek translation soon after. It was a good thing. A living and growing civilisation is always ready to find out and assimilate whatever valuable it notices in other civilisations.

----- End of Forwarded Message

HOW THE BRITISH RUINED INDIA

By Dr. V.V. Bedekar, V.Y.Sardesai

HOW THE INDIAN INDUSTRY AND TRADE WAS DESTROYED

A indirect consequence of the British rule in India was economic exploitation of the country. The huge drain of wealth from Bengal, the destruction of its industry, and

gradually increasing land revenue had disastrous consequences. Armed with the political authority, the British rulers deliberately fostered the growth of British trade and commerce at the cost of the Indian trade. This, combined with the impoverishment of the cultivators, brought down one of the richest countries in the whole world to the level of the poorest. The other channels of foreign trade with India like the French, the Dutch, the Portuguese and the Americans were driven out by vicissitudes of war. Solely the British now controlled the Indian trade with rest of the world.

The Indian trade was ruined through restrictive trade practices. During the early stages of Industrial revolution, Indian goods then exceedingly competitive were levied 70 to 80 % duties. Even later, the machine made British goods enjoyed 10 to 27 percent duty advantage over Indian goods manufactured by traditional means. As the Indian finished goods became less and less competitive, the policies slowly made India an agricultural colony, and the exports of raw goods feeding the British Empire, rose as finished goods exports fell. Impoverished masses from the Indian industrial centres rushed to villages to agriculture. The landowners were already heavily taxed far in excess of previous foreign rulers. Then the British changed the law, and allowed the new 'capital holders' to own the land in India. The British bought lands for plantations, which were manned by Indian slave labour. Thus even the agricultural export profits benefited only the British plantation owners, and not the starving labourers. Let us look at the details of how this was done. It was a deliberate policy of the Board of Directors of the East India Company, since 1769. In the early nineteenth century the duty on Muslin and Calico was more than 27 and 71 percent ad valorem, respectively. Even then, British manufacturers were unable to compete with Indian Manufacturers; hence Britain prohibited the import of Calico cloths. Heavy protective duties -- 70 and 80 percent, respectively- were imposed on the Indian silk and cotton goods in England. These ruined those industries in India, while British goods were imported into India at nominal duty. The British historian of India, Wilson observes - : „It was stated in evidence IN 1813 that COTTON AND SILK GOODS OF INDIA UPTO THE PERIOD COULD BE SOLD FOR A PROFIT IN BRITISH MARKETS AT A PRICE OF 50 TO 60 PERCENT LOWER THAN THOSE FABRICATED IN ENGLAND... Without the 70 and 80 percent duty on the value of Indian textiles, the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have been stopped in their outset, and could scarcely have been again set in motion, EVEN BY THE POWER OF STEAM. THEY (THE PAISLEY AND MANCHESTER TEXTILE INDUSTRIES) WERE CREATED BY THE SACRIFICE OF THE INDIAN MANUFACTURERS.%
(21)

So much for modern industrialization being inherently better and more productive than traditional Indian methods!

This process continued even later. Parliamentary inquiry report of 1840, states that while the British cotton and silk goods were imported into India at a duty of 3.5 per cent and woollen goods at 2 percent, Indian goods imported into Britain had a duty of 10 percent for cotton, 20 percent for silk and 30 percent for woollen goods. (22)

Net result was that by the middle of nineteenth century Indian exports of cotton and silk practically ceased. When British goods flooded Indian market and threatened wholesale destruction of Indian manufacturers, the East India Company that ruled India, did NOT take any step to prevent the catastrophe.

· From 1803 to 1813, Bengal piece goods export to Britain dropped from S.R. 6.6 million to 2 million.

· From 1818 to 1836, the export of twist from Britain to India rose in the proportion of 1 to 5200. From 1824 to 1837, the export of British muslins to India rose from 6 million yards to 64 million yards (i.e. by more than 10 times). Similarly, between 1814 and 1835, British cotton manufacturers' exports rose from less than 1 million yards to 51 million yards (i.e. more than 50 times). In the same period, Indian cotton exports to Britain, fell from 1.25 million pieces to 0.3 million pieces and by 1844 to 0.063 million pieces (i.e. by a factor of 20). In the same period value of British imports into India rose from Pound sterling 26,000 to 400,000 (i.e. by a factor of 15). (22)

By 1850, India, which had for centuries exported cotton goods to the whole world, was importing one-fourth of all British cotton exports. In any technology revolution, old methods must make way for the new ones. But during the industrial revolution, which was taking place in Britain, the resulting ruin of the millions of artisans and weavers in India was not accompanied by the growth of new forms of industry in India. The old populous towns like Dacca, Surat and Murshidabad (which Clive in 1757 had described as 'extensive, populous, and rich as the city of London') and the like were in a few years rendered desolate under the 'Pax Britannica'. The population of Dacca, the Manchester of India, decreased from 150,000 to 30,000! In 1890, Sir Henry Cotton wrote, 'less than a hundred years ago, the whole commerce of Dacca was estimated at ten million rupees and its population at 200,000. In 1787 Dacca's muslin exports to England amounted to 3 million rupees; in 1817 they had ceased altogether. The arts of spinning and weaving have now become extinct. FAMILIES WHICH WERE FORMERLY IN A STATE OF AFFLUENCE HAVE BEEN DRIVEN TO DESERT TOWNS AND BETAKE THEMSELVES TO THE VILLAGES FOR LIVELYHOOD ... This decadence has occurred not in Dacca only, but in all districts. NOT A YEAR PASSES IN WHICH THE COMMISSIONERS AND DISTRICT OFFICERS DO NOT BRING TO THE NOTICE OF THE GOVERNMENT THAT MANUFACTURING CLASSES IN ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTRY ARE BECOMING IMPOVERISHED. (22)

The Governor -General reported in 1834-5: 'The misery hardly finds a parallel in the history of commerce. The bones of the cotton weavers are bleaching the plains of India'.

There are no prizes for guessing which castes or class the weavers and artisans belonged to! The Brahmins as per the caste system were priestly class involved mainly in religion or education. So the impoverishment of the so-called backward castes took place under the British.

Similar effect, though to a lesser extent, was produced on other industries. The Indian iron smelting industry was practically stamped out by cheap imported iron and steel with range of the railways.

The ruin of Indian industry and commerce was followed by another disastrous result. When the manufacturing towns and centres were laid waste, their populations were driven to crowd and overcrowd the villages. With overcrowding of villages, the old village economy, the union of agriculture and domestic industry collapsed.

„ The millions of ruined artisans and craftsmen, spinners, weavers, potters, tanners, smelters, smiths, alike from the towns and from villages, had no alternative save to crowd into agriculture. In this way India was forcibly transformed from being a country of combined agriculture and manufacturers into an agricultural colony of British manufacturing capitalism.‰ (22)

Once again you do not have to be a rocket scientist to figure out which castes or class these artisans, craftsmen, weavers, potters, tanners, smelters, smiths belonged to. They were definitely NOT the upper class Brahmins or the Zamindars or landlords! AND THE ECONOMIC RUIN OF THE BACKWARD CASTES WAS THE RESULT OF EXPLOITATION BY THE BRITISH RULE! Yet

most Western thinkers as well as the leftist Indians lay the blame for the economic ruin of backward castes on the Brahmins and caste system of Hindus! The logic behind this is bewildering. Because during the most of the 18th century when Marathas dominated large parts of India, she had the second largest industrial output in the world. Most of the Maratha chieftains and princes like Gaekwads, Holkars, themselves belonged to backward castes.

The British thereafter steadily pursued a policy to make India the agricultural colony of British capitalism, supplying raw materials and buying the finished / manufactured goods.

Montgomery Martin said in the Parliamentary enquiry of 1840: „India is as much a manufacturing country as an agricultural.. She is a manufacturing country; her manufacturers of various descriptions have existed for ages and have never been able to be competed with by any nation wherever fair play has been given to them... To reduce her now to an agricultural country would be an injustice to India‰. (22) But the real British attitude throughout the British rule is seen in the words of Mr. Cope in the same 1840 enquiry: „ I CERTAINLY PITY THE EAST INDIAN LABORER, BUT AT THE SAME TIME I HAVE A GREATER FEELING FOR MY OW FAMILY THAN OF THE EAST INDIAN LABORER’S FAMILY; I THINK IT IS WRONG TO SACRIFICE COMFORTS OF MY FAMILY FOR THE SAKE THE EAST INDIAN LABORER BECAUSE HIS CONDITION HAPPENS TO BE WORSE THAN MINE‰.

As a result of the latter British policies of making India into agricultural colony, the exports of raw goods increased to Britain while as seen above the Indian exports of finished goods decreased.

From 1813, raw cotton exports from India rose from 9 million pounds weight to 32 million pounds in 1833 and to 88 million pounds in 1844. Sheep’s wool exports from India increased from 3700 pounds weight in 1833 to 2.7 million in 1844 and linseed from 2,100 bushels in 1833 to 237,000 bushels in 1844 (22).

Similarly, in terms of currency value of export of raw cotton from India to Britain increased from 5.6 million Pound Sterlings in 1860, to 37.5 million Pound Sterlings in 1865 (i.e. by factor of 7 in mere 6 years).

However even the exports of raw goods did not benefit native Indians. Because the change in the 1835 land holdings settlement had opened floodgates to British plantation owners. British owned tea, coffee, indigo and cotton plantations. Not surprisingly Lipton, Brooke Bond are British companies known for tea. These plantations were manned with desperate Indian ‘Coolies’ were hired as bonded labourers. These bonded labourers had

very few rights. Hence the system amounted to legalized slavery. So desperate were the masses of millions of labourers and artisans that millions chose willingly to plantation life of a coolie not only in India but also in Africa, Caribbean, South America, Fiji. The net result is today Indians have the second largest Diaspora around the world!

References

21. P.Kennedy, 'The Rise and Fall of The Great Powers', Random House, New York, 1987, p.149
22. The History And The Culture of The Indian People, Vol. 9, British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance., Part 1, R.C.Majumdar (ed.), Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay 1963, pp.413 -416.

----- End of Forwarded Message

HOW THE BRITISH RUINED INDIA

By Dr. V.V. Bedekar, V.Y.Sardesai

ROLE OF MISSIONARIES

As stated before, Lord Macaulay had no knowledge of Sanskrit or Pali or Ardhamagadhi, the languages of the ancient Hindu scriptures and epics, and Buddhist scriptures, nor did he know Arabic or Urdu. Nonetheless Macaulay smugly argued, “[All the historical information from all the books in Sanskrit language is less valuable than what may be found in the most paltry abridgements used at preparatory schools in England.](#)” (48,49)

Such was Macaulay’s contempt for Indian literature!. Macaulay’s motives behind his educational policy were not only political. Because above statement by Macaulay hardly seems to be a mere opinion of an individual, particularly when the policies of the East India Company are looked into.

As far back as 1792 Sir Charles Grant maintained that the most important object of English education was to impart the knowledge of Christian religion; for “[thence they would be instructed in the nature and perfection of the one true God](#)”. (50)

Yet the Christian missionaries were not allowed to enter into the territories of the East India Company. This changed in 1813 when the Charter of the East India Company was renewed. Despite the opposition from the Directors of the Company, the British Parliament insisted on inserting a clause in the charter, giving Christian missionaries full freedom to settle and work in India. Soon thereafter there was a great influx of missionaries into India. (51)

The missionaries opened schools and hospitals, etc, but one of the primary purposes was to westernize native people in every aspect of life. [J.N.Furquhar](#), writes following about

the Christian missionaries in India during the early decades of 19th century: “Then it was not long before the wiser (!) men both in the Missions and in the (British) Government began to see that, for the immeasurable task to be accomplished, IT WAS MOST NECESSARY THAT MISSIONS SHOULD TAKE ADVANTAGE OF ADVANCING POLICY OF THE (British) GOVERNMENT AND THAT (British) GOVERNMENT SHOULD USE MISSIONS AS CIVILISING ALLY. For the sake of ‘progress’ of India, cooperation was indispensable.

Thus in the span of mere two decades after the British had eclipsed the native Marathas as the dominant power in India, education policies and missionary goals were working together to ‘civilise the barbaric natives’.

That the main object of these missionaries was to use these schools as means of preaching Christianity will be clear from the following passage in the proceedings of one of these schools: - “Some others, now engaged in the degrading and polluting worship of idols, shall be brought to the knowledge of the true God and Jesus Christ”. (52)

The Bible was introduced not only in missionary institutions but also in Government schools and colleges. Some schools, mainly supported by the Government, were actually run by clergymen on strictly Christian basis. All the evils and abuses of native religions, real and fancied were painted in the most lurid colour, while the blessings of Christianity were described in glowing phrases, and the salvation offered in attractive form before the youthful pupils in their most impressionable age. Filthy abuse of Hindu gods and goddesses formed the main plank of the public teaching and propaganda of the Christian missionaries. Syed Ahamad says that the civil and military officers helped the missionaries. The latter openly preached in mosques and temples and abused other religions, accompanied by policemen. (53)

Farquhar describes the results of the new educational policy in following words: “The new educational policy of the Government created during these years the modern class of India. These are men who think and speak English habitually, who are proud of their citizenship in the British Empire, who are devoted to English literature and whose intellectual life is almost entirely formed by the thought of the West. Large numbers of them enter government services, while the rest practice law, medicine or teaching, or take to journalism or business. We must also note that the powerful excitement which has sufficed to create the religious movements we have to deal with, is almost confined to those who have had an English education” (54)

Farquhar’s description of English educated Indians around 1850 CE. A graphic description of the Indians educated under Macaulay’s education system, around early 20th century is described by Anand K. Coomarswamy in 1908. He writes: “SPEAK TO THE ORDINARY GRADUATE OF AN INDIAN UNIVERSITY, or a student from Ceylon, of the ideals of Mahabharat - he will hasten to display his knowledge of Shakespear; talk to him of (Indian) religious philosophy - you find that he is an atheist of the crude type in Europe a generation ago, and that not only has he no religion, but is lacking in philosophy as the average Englishman; talk to him of Indian music - he will produce you a

gramophone or harmonium, and inflict upon you one or both; talk to him of Indian dress or jewellery - he will tell you that they are uncivilised and barbaric; talk to him of Indian art - it is news to him that such a thing exists; ask him to translate for you a letter written in his own mother tongue he does not know it. HE IS INDEED A STRANGER IN HIS OWN LAND.” (55)

In modern Indian parlance, the term for such Indians is “COCONUT” - just like the coconut they are brown on the outside but are white on the inside. Thus the British education system in India was designed and implemented to produce coconut Indians. The remarkable results described above however were not achieved by fair means. Macaulay already mentions ‘artificial encouragements’ undertaken to create absurd history, absurd sciences and absurd theology’. Prominent missionaries in Calcutta, Benares and Serampore also manipulated the syllabus of their educational institutions for this purpose.

William Carey (1767-1837 CE), William Hodge Mill (1792 - 1853 CE) and John Muir (1810-1882) are some pioneer missionaries in this field of educational manipulation. All these three Oriental scholars were acclaimed Sanskrit scholars, who have done some original work in translating Christian scriptures and theology into Sanskrit and vice versa.

William Carey, an English Baptist Missionary who founded the Serampore College in 1818 CE. It was Carey’s ambition to turn Semaphore into “Christian Benares”. The syllabus of the college of course was framed with the above object in view. Richard Fox Young writes following about Carey: “In order to understand what he (Carey) wanted to do with India’s sacred language, one must note that Carey had two reasons for being interested in its utilization for evangelism. First, he saw Sanskrit as a stabilizing force upon the unsettled dialects amidst which he worked. Second, he was intransigently opposed to Brahminical privileges, one of which was hegemony over Sanskrit.” (56)

Young further writes: “His intentions were also avowedly aggressive. According to his plans, Hindu literature could be placed in disadvantageous juxtaposition with the Gospel, a task which would be done effectively only by evangelists acquainted with the original sources of both religions.” (57)

But how? The Sanskrit language which forms the principal ‘mother language of Indo-Germanic languages, has over 500 root words, far in excess of English. To take an example, there are 64 different words for water. Not surprisingly, Hindu religious literature has upto 7 meanings operating AT THE SAME TIME. Thus same text can be interpreted at a lower level as well as philosophically lofty level, with many intermediate levels in between. With such bewildering possibilities it is easy for a clever manipulator to convince some, particularly the non-experts by repeating only the lowest possible meaning. Carey himself makes his own intentions clear in following words: “TO GAIN THE EAR OF THOSE WHO ARE THUS DECEIVED IT IS NECESSARY FOR THEM TO BELIEVE (wrongly) THAT THE SPEAKER HAS A SUPERIOR KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUBJECT. IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES KNOWLEDGE OF SANSKRIT IS VALUABLE. AS THE PERSON IS THUS MISLED, perhaps a Brahmin, DEEM THIS

THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF KNOWLEDGE. IF THE ADVOCATE OF TRUTH BE DEFICIENT THEREIN, HE LABORS AGAINST THE HILL, PRESUMPTION IS ALTOGETHER AGAINST HIM.” (58)

Bishop’s College, Calcutta was founded in 1820 CE by the Society for the Propagation of Gospel (London). William Hodge Mill was appointed its Principal. W.H.Mill and H.H.Wilson have composed evangelical tracts in Sanskrit. According to Mill’s view point, Hinduism consisted of ‘Sublime precepts of spiritual abstractions’ overlaid with ‘monstrous and demoralising legends’. Raja Ram Mohan Roy and other Indian critics of traditional Hinduism shared these very views.

John Muir came to Calcutta around 1827-28 CE. He was a firm believer in Christianity and its propagation and was also a Sanskrit scholar. He served the East India Company in various administrative departments in North-West Frontier Province. He later worked in the Sanskrit department of the famous Benares College (1844-45 CE).

Richard Fox Young writes: “**MUIR’S MANIPULATION OF THE PHILOSOPHY CURRICULUM AIMED AT DEPRIVING THE ‘Darsanas’ (The SIX different SCHOOLS OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY known as Darshan) OF ALL THE VESTIGES OF REVELATION. This he attempted to do by forcing Pundits to abandon their (traditional) way of teaching...**” (59)

Similarly, Sanskrit Scholars in Bombay and Madras presidencies and other parts of India were venturing into education activity with a firm belief, overtly and covertly, for propagation of Christianity in India.

There was every encouragement in England for a proselytising attitude in India. A chairman of the court of directors of the East India Company said, in the House of Commons: “**Providence has entrusted the extensive empire of Hindustan to England in order that the banner of Christ should wave triumphant from one end of India to the other. Everyone must exert all his strength that THERE MAY BE DILATORINESS ON ANY ACCOUNT IN CONTINUING THE GRAND WORK OF MAKING ALL INDIANS CHRISTIANS**”. The Company had its own ‘Ecclesiastical Establishment’ paid for out of Company revenue, all Church of England except two ministers of the Church of Scotland. There was a bishop at the three presidency capital, senior of which the Bishop of Calcutta, dated from the India Act of 1813. **IN THE EAST INDIA COMPANY’S SENIORITY LIST, THEY (THE BISHOPS AT CALCUTTA, MADRAS, BOMBAY) TOOK PRECEDENCE OVER THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF.** (60)

Thus the missionaries played a supporting role to the British administrators.

References

48. Stanley Wolpert, op.cit, p.215

49. The History And The Culture of The Indian People, British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance., Part 2, R.C.Majumdar (ed.) Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay 1963, p.36

50. The History And The Culture of The Indian People, British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance., Part 1, R.C.Majumdar (ed.) Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay 1963, p.418
51. J.N.Farquhar, Modern Religious Movements in India, first published in UK in 1914, Indian reprint ed, Munshiram Manoharlal Publ., New Delhi, 1967
52. Calcutta Journal, March 11, 1822
53. The History And The Culture of The Indian People, British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance., Part 1, R.C.Majumdar (ed.) Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1963, p.419
54. J.N. Farquhar, op.cit, p.21
55. Anand K. Coomarswamy, in Modern Review, Calcutta, Vol.4, Oct.1908, p.338
56. Richard Fox Young, Resistant Hinduism: Sanskrit Sources on Anti-Christian Apologetics in Early Nineteenth-Century India, Publ. The De Nobili Research Library, Vienna,1981, p.33
57. Richard Fox Young, op.cit, p.35
58. William Carey, On Encouraging the Cultivation of Sanskrit among the Natives of India, 1822, F.I.Quarterly 2-131-37
59. Richard Fox Young, op.cit, p.53
60. Brian Gardner, The East India Company-A History, The McCall Publ. Co. New York, 1971, p.251.

ROLE OF ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

Another important role in the British Scheme was played by [Lord William Bentinck](#). He introduced English as the official language of administration or court language in India. His intentions behind this were very clear as can be seen in the letter dated July 29, 1830 by the Court of Directors to him:

The letter says : “ .. **FROM THE MEDITATED CHANGE IN THE LANGUAGE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS INCLUDING JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS, YOU ANTICIPATE SEVERAL COLLATERAL ADVANTAGES, THE PRINCIPAL OF WHICH IS, THAT THE JUDGE, OR OTHER EUROPEAN OFFICER, BEING THOROUGHLY ACQUAINTED WITH THE LANGUAGE IN WHICH THE PROCEEDINGS ARE HELD (i.e. English), WILL BE, AND APPEAR TO BE, LESS DEPENDENT UPON THE NATIVES BY WHOM HE IS SURROUNDED AND THOSE NATIVES WILL IN CONSEQUENCE, ENJOY FEWER OPPORTUNITIES ...** “

Thus the interests of millions of Indians were sacrificed for the convenience and profit of a few Englishmen. The appearance of British superiority became more important than reality. Even today, less than 10 percent of the Indian population speaks or understands English. Just imagine plight of the millions left at the ‘mercy’ of ‘benevolent’ British! [Will the justice be served in unbiased manner if the defendant cannot even understand the language s/he is being tried in, or if the plaintiff cannot even plead his case?](#) The principal drawback of this policy was that it denied the native languages any say and

thwarted their development. Not surprisingly, the English educated Indians vying for government jobs could not even speak or understand their own mother tongue!

STATUS OF MISSIONARY EDUCATION IN INDIA TODAY

What is the status of the Missionary education in India now? Christians, though forming only 2.4 percent of Indian population, control over 20 % of all private education institutes in India today. In the state of Andhra Pradesh they control 50 % of private educational institutes today. Similarly, another not so surprising statistics is that the Christian Church is the largest private property holder in India. With the politically explosive issue of reservation of jobs and seats in educational institutions for 'Dalit' Christians the church plans to control even the job market in years to come.

Concluded...