

CHAPTER - II :

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND PERSPECTIVE :

THE EVOLUTION OF CENTRE-STATE  
RELATIONS IN EDUCATION (1813-1950)

=====

- 2.1 Introduction
  - 2.2 The Momentous Decision
  - 2.3 Introduction of Centralisation in Education
  - 2.4 Foundation of the Administrative Structure  
of Education
  - 2.5 Beginning of a Trend Towards Decentralisation
  - 2.6 Developments in Financial Devolution
  - 2.7 Development of Federal Functions
  - 2.8 Conclusion
- Notes and References

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, an attempt will be made to trace the evolution of Centre-State relations in education in India from the beginning of the acceptance of the responsibility for education of the Indian people by the British Government in 1813 till the end of the British rule and upto 1950 when the era of educational planning began in post-independence India.

## 2.2 THE MOMENTOUS DECISION

The year 1813 may be considered an important landmark in modern Indian history, for, it was in that year that the British Raj first accepted education as a state responsibility. When the charter of the East India Company came up for renewal, a clause was incorporated in it which made it lawful for The Governor General in Council to spend a specified amount of money on education out of the funds of the company. The clause read :

"It shall be lawful for the Governor General-in-Council to direct that out of any surplus which may remain of the rents, revenues, and profits arising from the said territorial acquisitions, after

defraying the expenses of the military, civil and commercial establishment and paying the interest of the debt, in manner hereinafter provided a sum of not less than one lac of rupees in each year shall be set apart and applied to the revival and improvement of literature and the encouragement of the learned natives of India, and for the introduction and promotion of a knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories in India".<sup>1</sup>

The significance of the clause does not lie in the material benefits it brought to education in India; such benefits were patently meagre. Its importance lies in the fact that it was this clause, that ultimately paved the way to the momentous decision of the British Raj, twenty two years hence, to introduce English education in this country. This decision constituted 'one of a series of acts which collectively opened the doors of the West to the East'.<sup>2</sup>

The educational clause of the Charter Act of 1813 may, in retrospect, appear 'faint, grudging and inadequate'.<sup>3</sup> But, it also marked a turning point in another respect which is closer to our present interest. The East India Company uptill now had not paid any attention to education. The interest of the company lay primarily in consolidating and extending the political power it had gained. Diffused

efforts of individual officials of the company did indeed lead to the establishment of educational institutions here and there,<sup>4</sup> but there was no commitment of policy on the part of the Raj to the support of education. The Charter Act of 1813 made this commitment and in doing so, set the ground for the beginnings of educational administration in India.<sup>5</sup> The provision in the Act was followed up, though belatedly, with the establishment of a General Committee of Public Instruction in Bengal (1823), another in Madras (1826) and a Board of Education in Bombay. The functions of the two Committees and the Board varied with the presidency; and, their effectiveness depended considerably on the interest shown by the Governors Presiding over their destiny. In other words, although the Pitts' India Act of 1784 had substantially increased the limited authority, and the Governor-General had been initially vested with by the Regulating Act of 1773, he did little to control or direct the educational policies of other parts of the British territory in India. The provinces and the presidencies had considerable freedom to go their own way and in their own way they invariably went in matters of education. Thus, 'education' during this period was in effect a 'provincial' matter, 'subject only to the distant coordinating authority of the Court of Directors in England'.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.3 INTRODUCTION OF CENTRALISATION IN EDUCATION

The next definitive period in the history of Centre-Province relations in education during the Raj starts in 1833. In that year the Charter was again revised. The new Charter ushered in a highly centralised system of government. The Government of India Act of 1833, defined the new role of the Company's chief executive in India and provided that 'the superintendence, direction, and control of the civil and military government of all the said territories and revenues in India shall be and is hereby vested in the Governor-General and Counsellors, to be styled "The Governor-General of India in Council".<sup>7</sup> The Governor-General in Council was generally empowered to 'make laws and regulations for repealing, amending, or altering any laws or regulations whatever now in force or hereafter to be in force in the said territories or any part thereof, and to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all courts of justice, whether established by his Majesty's Charters or otherwise, and the jurisdictions thereof, and for all places and things whatsoever within and throughout the whole and every part of the said territories, and for all servants of the said company within the dominions of princes and states in alliance with the said company...<sup>8</sup>

Thus, the new Act made the Governor General the supreme head of the British Government in India and the several presidencies were now subordinate to his council. The unitary system of government that this meant, vested all executive, financial and legislative authority in the central government and the provinces acted only as its agents. As may easily be imagined, education, under the new dispensation, became a purely 'central' subject. Educational authority thus shifted to the centre where the responsibility for education came to be vested; and, it remained there till 1870 when Lord Mayo introduced a system of decentralisation. Administrative difficulties that inevitably arose under this highly centralised system led to occasional delegation of powers to the provinces. Any proposals from the provinces also received the attention and respect appropriate to those coming from 'the authority on the spot'. But, these hardly changed the basic character of the system and education, in spite of them, continued to be a central subject in every sense of the term.<sup>9</sup>

#### 2.4 FOUNDATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF EDUCATION

The researcher's task in the present chapter does not

call for any detailing of achievements and failures and nor indeed of educational developments in general. But, a brief reference to two significant developments during the period may be of some interest. Of these, a passing reference has already been made to the decision of the Raj, in 1935, to introduce English education in India. The negative and alienating effects of this education are fairly obvious and are well-known. Yet, the decision was momentous, for, it was to have a determinative influence on the subsequent history of the country.<sup>10</sup>

The second development might not be as sweeping and pervasive as the first in its influence, but it certainly marked a significant stage in the development of education in India. When the East India Company's Charter came up for renewal in 1853, a committee of the House of Lords undertook a thorough enquiry into the educational policy of the British Government in India. This resulted in the famous Education Despatch (1854) of Sir Charles Wood. The Despatch imposed upon the government the task of creating a properly articulated scheme of education from the primary school to the university. The document was, therefore, remarkable both for its extensive commitment of the state to education and for its comprehensiveness, covering as it did all levels of

education.<sup>11</sup> Of greater interest to students of educational administration is perhaps the fact that it laid the foundation of the administrative structure for education in substantially the form in which we found it at the time of the transfer of power.<sup>12</sup> It commended to the Government of India establishment of separate departments of education in each province, establishment of a university in each presidency town, institutions for the education of teachers, setting up of more high and middle schools, greater attention to primary education and introduction of grant-in-aid of education. That the adulatory epithet of the "Magna Charta of English education in India" that the document attracted from some quarters was not entirely unjustified is shown by the fact that, beginning with the Despatch, government subvention to education increased steadily from Rs.21.6 lakhs in 1856-57 to Rs.65.7 lakhs in 1870-71.<sup>13</sup>

## 2.5 BEGINNING OF A TREND TOWARDS DECENTRALISATION

In The survey of the relations between the Central and Provincial governments in the field of education during the Raj, one now enters a period when the country's imperceptible march towards federalism begins. By this time Dalhausie had

completed the policy of territorial acquisitions; and, by 1856, the map of British India had come to be the same as in 1947. It now became almost impossible to administer the vast Indian Empire from Calcutta, or from any other centre, for that matter. Administrative convenience and efficiency demanded decentralization.<sup>14</sup>

In the field of education itself developments were taking place that made concentration of educational authority at the Centre impractical. In the course of the decade after the Despatch of 1854, Departments of Education had started functioning in all the provinces and a system of grant-in-aid had established itself. The expansion of education that followed the Despatch also, though disappointing in retrospect and from the Indian point of view, was impressive all the same, in the colonial context.<sup>15</sup> In any case, it was large enough to make the Raj panick for a while immediately after 1857, thinking that it was the proliferation of education that had led to the events of that year.<sup>16</sup>

Political and other developments, therefore, forced the hands of the authorities in the direction of the reversal of the policy of centralisation begun with the Regulating Act 1773- the Act, it is said, that gave birth to the

'Government of India'.<sup>17</sup> A Bill embodying various measures of decentralisation was moved in the House of Commons on 6 June, 1861, by Sir Charles Wood.

At the time of the introduction of the Bill, all legislative power, it may be recalled, was vested in the Governor-General and his Council. The presidencies of Madras and Bombay had been deprived of their legislative powers in 1833, by the Charter Act of that year which we have had occasion to mention. The Act of 1861 created an enlarged legislature for the whole of India, by expanding the Council of the Governor-General. It also restored to the presidencies of Madras and Bombay legislative powers which they had enjoyed as long as they were treated as Regulation Provinces, and empowered the Governor-General to create, by proclamation, legislative councils for the erstwhile non-Regulation provinces (namely, North West Provinces and the Panjab), whenever he should deem it proper. Though the powers accorded to the governments of the presidencies and provinces by the Act were greatly restricted,<sup>18</sup> the decentralising character of the Act is obvious.

## 2.6 DEVELOPMENTS IN FINANCIAL DEVOLUTION

The 1861 Act did not give the attention it deserved to the question of financial arrangements. These arrangements continued to be centralised, which, therefore, were not in keeping with 'the legislative' and administrative decentralisation that had set in. It took another decade before the situation was rectified by Lord Mayo who, in 1870, introduced a system of financial decentralisation. The Government of India Resolution of December 14 that year made over to the provincial governments for administration several departments, including education, with a fixed grant and certain sources of revenue to support them. This devolution of authority was, according to the Resolution, based on the principle that as far as possible, the obligation to find the funds necessary for administrative improvements should rest upon the authority whose immediate duty it is to devise such measures'.

Obviously enough, the Government of India Resolution of 1870 did not go far enough in financial devolution. But, the Resolution constituted the first important step in the direction of financial federation. Speaking of the Resolution, Prof. K.T. Shah has said :

"Not a radical change in the principle of government, this nevertheless made a considerable and welcome step forward. Once taken, there was no going back on the principle of decentralisation; and it was only a question of time when it would be metamorphosed into a principle of federalism".<sup>20</sup>

During 1870 to 1921 further faltering steps of financial devolution were taken to help the provinces meet the growing expenditure of departments made over to them. In 1877 Lord Lytton transferred to the provinces stamp duties, alcoholic excises and income tax collected in the provinces. The Government of India Resolution of 1912 divided further sources of revenue between the Government of India and the provinces. But, the financial system still remained essentially unitary in character.<sup>21</sup> A proposal for provincial taxation even now required the sanction of the Government of India, the approval of the Secretary of State and the assent of the Finance Department before it could be considered by the provincial government. There was similarly strict control and supervision by the Central Government on provincial expenditure.<sup>22</sup>

The above facts have a bearing on the position of education as a 'provincial subject' that it became in 1870.

The Government of India continued to have large powers over education. Financially, its approval was required to all expenditure above a certain level, and to the overall educational budget of the provinces. Administratively, the sanction of the Government of India was needed to all posts above a given salary. This administrative control was further tightened with the creation of the Indian Educational Service in 1896 when all important posts in the educational departments of the provinces were placed under its charge. Also, both the Central and Provincial Legislatures had concurrent powers to legislate on educational matters. It was because of this concurrent jurisdiction, as Naik rightly points out, that the Government of India could pass the Indian Universities Act (1904) and could also legislate for the establishment of several universities during this period - Punjab (1882), Allahabad (1897), Benares (1915), Patna (1917), Aligarh (1920) and Dacca (1920).<sup>23</sup> It was also because of this that Gopal Krishna Gokhale was able, in 1911, to introduce his ill-fated but historical private bill on primary education, modelled on the Compulsory Education Acts of England of 1870 and 1876 and on the Irish Education Act of 1892, in the central legislature. The effect of all this was to make education, pro tanto, take on the character of

a 'concurrent' rather than a 'provincial' subject during the period.<sup>24</sup>

The interest of the Government of India in education during the period was, however, both uneven and ambivalent. It may be recalled that the Despatch of 1854, while initiating a system of grant-in-aid, had looked forward to a time when the government would no longer have to maintain a system of education. Five years later, in 1859 and again in 1864 the Secretary of State reaffirmed the position that the aim of the system of grant-in-aid was to stimulate private initiative in education. The recommendations of the Hunter Commission, in 1881-82, further strengthened this line of argument. In its resolution appointing the Commission the government itself had said that it would :

"Offer every encouragement to native gentlemen to come forward and aid, even more extensively than before, in the establishment of schools opened on grants-in-aid system. It is chiefly in this way that the native community will be able to secure that freedom and autonomy of education which is an essential condition of any sound and complete system. It is not, in the opinion of the Governor-General in Council a healthy symptom that all the youth of the country should be cast, as it were,

in the same government education mould. Rather it is desirable that each section of the people should be in a position to secure that description of education which is most consonant to its feelings and suited to its wants."<sup>25</sup>

The Commission in its report urged the government once again gradually to withdraw from the direct support and management of education, especially secondary and higher education. During the years immediately following the Commission's report, therefore, the government of India 'seemed to be busy divesting itself of power and control, and limiting its financial commitment to education'.<sup>26</sup>

## 2.7 DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL FUNCTIONS

With the turn of the century, the pendulum swung on the other direction. In December 1898 Curzon landed in Bombay as the twenty-fourth Governor-General of British India. Curzon, 'the one masterful figure' to whom the nation was constantly to turn for the coming 'seven long years now in admiration, now in astonishment, more often in anger and pain',<sup>27</sup> declared that if he could frame 'a good education policy, it would not be a bad season's work'.<sup>28</sup> He was convinced that the system of education in India under the Raj

had become 'strangely deficient in Central authority and government control'. The doctrine of state withdrawal from education was soon forsaken and there followed a determined effort to regain for the Government of India a commanding position in the direction of educational policy.<sup>29</sup> In 1900, the Secretary of State urged on the Government of India the need for continuing government control and guidance of higher education. Financial support by the Central Government to education was increased. A post of Director General of Education was created at the Centre to advise the government on educational matters.<sup>30</sup> In a resolution in 1900, the Government of India declared that 'it cannot divest itself of the responsibility that attaches both to its interests and its pre-rogatives. If it is to lend the resources of the State to the support of certain schools, it cannot abrogate its right to a powerful voice in the determination of the course which is thus imparted'. This position was re-asserted in less strident terms in another resolution in March, 1904.<sup>31</sup> In 1910, a separate Department of Education was created in the Government of India.<sup>32</sup>

The significance of this period for a student of Centre-State relations in education, however, lies in the fact that, in between its waverings in policy, the Government of

India managed to identify for itself roles that, in the course of the country's march towards a federal polity, were to develop as full-fledged federal functions in education - ~~functions such as collection and dissemination~~ of information, coordination and grant-in-aid.

The first recognition of the 'clearing house function' (collection and dissemination of information) can perhaps be traced back to the recommendation of the Indian Education Commission (1882) that the Government of India should bring out quinquennial reviews on the progress of education in India. Later, at the turn of the century, in his address to the Simla Conference of Directors of Public Instruction in India (1901),<sup>33</sup> Curzon, putting in a strong plea for the creation of the post of a Director-General of Education with the Government of India, said in part :

"Let me point to another anomaly. Under the system of decentralisation that has necessarily and, on the whole, rightly been pursued, we have little idea of what is happening in the provinces, until, once every five years, a gentleman comes round, writes for the Government of India the quinquennial Review, makes all sorts of discoveries of which we know nothing and discloses shortcomings which in hot haste we then proceed to redress".<sup>34</sup> (Emphasis added)

The first Quinquennial Review of education had been published as early as 1886-87. But, with the creation of the post of Director-General of Education and the separation of Education from Home making it an independent department and the establishment, in 1915, of a Central Bureau of Education, collection of information from the provinces and their dissemination was firmly set on its way of becoming a continuous process.

The coordinating function of the Central Government was also recognised during this period. Curzon, in his Simla speech had made a reference to this function also.

"It is for consideration", he said, "whether such an official in India as I have suggested (Director-General of Education) should, from time to time, summon a representative Committee or Conference, as to keep in touch with the local jurisdictions, and to harmonise our policy as a whole".  
(Emphasis added).

Curzon, while making these remarks, was in fact addressing the first conference of the kind he had in mind. This started a regular practice of convening such conferences for taking a periodical review of educational developments in the country. One such conference was held at Allahabad in

1911 and another in 1917. But, with the need for greater coordination, the in-adequacy of this arrangement was realised and, in 1920, the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) was brought into being, with the primary view of 'keeping touch with local jurisdictions' and assisting the provincial governments with expert advice.

Another function of the Central Government to be recognised during this period and has now, in the federal context, become almost crucial to centre-state relations in education,<sup>35</sup> was that of financial assistance to the provinces. A reference has already been made to the financial decentralisation initiated by Mayo.<sup>36</sup> Mayo's reforms were only the beginning. Political and administrative necessity forced the hands of the government in the direction of further financial decentralisation. A series of measures were, therefore, introduced between 1870 and the first decade of the twentieth century so that, by the end of that decade, a system of 'Central', 'Provincial' and 'Divided' revenues had come into existence. But, simultaneous with financial decentralisation, a process of administrative decentralisation also had been going on and as a result, the financial commitments of the provinces had grown considerably. The growing demands of the educational juggernaut were exacting,

and within the rather inelastic source of provincial revenues, the provinces found it difficult to meet them entirely on their own. The Government of India, therefore, started the practice of central subvention to educational developments in the provinces. Happily, the period of the first two decades of the twentieth century was one of financial buoyancy and with large surpluses in the central fisc, the central government found it easy to share the financial burden of educational expansion in the provinces.<sup>37</sup>

But, the most important function that the central government 'discovered' for itself and almost relentlessly pursued during the latter part of this period was what Naik rather euphemistically calls 'policy-making'.<sup>38</sup> Curzon's viceroyalty marks the beginning and perhaps also the high water-mark of the pursuit of the function. The researcher had occasion to refer to the importance Curzon attached to education in India. Among the ten questions to which the viceroy wanted to give immediate attention, education was only second in importance.<sup>39</sup> And, as soon as he looked about him, he needed, in his own words, 'but little investigation to show... that there was something rotten in the state of Denmark. For years education in India had been muddling along with no one to look after it at headquarters or to observe its

symptoms'.<sup>40</sup> Thus, as it has already <sup>been</sup> seen, Curzon formally abandoned the prevailing doctrine that the State should not interfere in education and inaugurated a period of state intervention and active 'policy-making', resulting in a system almost controlled by the government at the centre. It is not necessary here to go into the political motivations behind this interesting change in the educational policy of the Raj<sup>41</sup>. For our purposes, it need only be pointed out that in reasserting 'that responsibility which there had been a tendency to abdicate',<sup>42</sup> it made the central government the supreme policy-maker in education.

(a) The Government/Act of 1919  
of India

The Government of India Act of 1919 makes the next turning point in centre-province relations in education during the Raj. The Act provided for two lists of subjects—central and provincial. The principle underlying this division was that matters in regard to which uniformity in legislation was necessary or desirable for the whole of India or, more than one province should be regarded as central while others in which only a particular province was interested, should be treated as provincial. Education, with the following exceptions, then became, under the Act, a

provincial subject.<sup>43</sup>

- (i) The Benaras Hindu University and such other new universities as may be declared to be all-India by the Governor-General-in-Council.
- (ii) Colleges for Indian chiefs and educational institutions maintained by the Governor-General-in-Council for the benefit of members of His Majesty's forces or other public servants or their children.

The authority to legislate on the following subjects was also reserved by the Act for the central legislature, mainly with a view to leave the Government of India free to take suitable action on the report of the Calcutta University Commission:

- (i) Questions regarding the establishment, constitution and functions of new universities.
- (ii) Questions affecting the jurisdiction of any University outside its province.
- (iii) Questions regarding the Calcutta University and the reorganisation of secondary education in Bengal (for a period of five years).

The designation of education as a provincial subject by the Act of 1919 did not materially change the constitu-

tional position, for, education had been a provincial responsibility for nearly half a century now. What did make such a change was another provision in the Act. The Act did not only provide for a central and a provincial list of subjects; it also introduced the system generally known as 'dyarchy' and divided the provincial subjects themselves into two categories: the 'reserved' and the 'transferred'.<sup>44</sup> The reserved subjects were to be administered by the Governor with the help of the Executive Council and the transferred subjects, with the help of a minister or ministers. While the members of the Executive Council were nominated by the Governor, the ministers were chosen by him from amongst the members of the legislature. The guiding principle in the division of the provincial subjects into 'reserved' and 'transferred' was :

"to include in the transferred list those departments which offered most opportunity for local knowledge and social service, those in which Indians have shown themselves to be keenly interested, those in which mistakes which may occur, though serious, would not be irremediable and those which stand most in need of development".<sup>45</sup>

Predictably enough, education, under the provisions of the Act, was placed in the transferred list, with the

exception of the education of Anglo-Indians and Europeans which was made a 'reserved' subject.

The educational arrangements in the Government of India Act, 1919, led to two broad results. Firstly, education became a highly fragmented subject of administration.<sup>46</sup> It was partly all-India, partly reserved, partly transferred with limitations and partly transferred without limitations'.<sup>47</sup> Secondly, it led to what the Hartog Committee (1929) has rightly described as the 'divorce' of the Government of India from education. The Central government almost made a volte face on the 'federal functions' that it had developed during the earlier period. The Central Advisory Board of Education was dismantled; the Central Bureau of Education was closed down; recruitment to the Indian Education Service was discontinued; and finally, the Department of Education was deprived of its independent existence. Most important of all, financial support for education from the centre to the provinces dwindled to a nothing. The only function that was suffered to survive to some extent was the 'clearing house' function and the quinquennial reports on the progress of education, happily, continued to be published.<sup>48</sup>

The stage of history we now enter upon constitutes the epilogue, as it were, to the British Raj in India and,

the prologue to the period with which the substantive part of this study is concerned.

(b) The Government of India Act, 1935

The non-cooperation movement and the growing strength of the struggle for freedom ended the plan of the British for the progressive award of responsible government to India in a fiasco.<sup>49</sup> This resulted in the Simon Commission Report and finally the Government of India Act, 1935. The Act which proposed a limited federation, installed provincial autonomy (though restricted by the large powers vested in the governor) and made the provincial governments practically independent of the Government of India.

The division of legislative power in the 1935 Act was similar to the one in the Indian Constitution. It also, like the latter, provided for three legislative lists - the federal, the provincial and the concurrent. As far as education was concerned, there was no concurrent jurisdiction; education figured only in the federal and provincial lists. The division of legislative jurisdiction in education was as follows :<sup>50</sup>

List I: Federal Legislative List

- II. The Imperial Library, the Indian Museum, the Imperial War Museum, the Victoria Memorial, and any similar institution controlled or financed by the Federation.
12. Federal agencies and institutes for the following purposes, that is to say, for research, for professional or technical training, or for promotion of special studies.
13. The Benaras Hindu University and the Aligarh Muslim University.

List II : Provincial Legislative List

10. Libraries, museums and other similar institutions controlled or financed by the Province.
17. Education.<sup>51</sup>

As can be seen from the above, the Government of India Act, 1955, put an end to the distinction between 'reserved' and 'transferred' subjects. With this the fragmentation of education was also largely rectified.

But, as it would happen, the Second World War intervened and the federal scheme envisaged in the Government of India Act did not fructify till 1947. During this period of twelve

years between 1935 and 1947, however, there was a revival in Central interest in education. The Central Advisory Board of Education was resuscitated in 1935 and with this the 'coordinating' function of the central government was resumed with some vigour. The Board addressed itself to the study and discussion of a wide variety of educational issues; it formulated and presented before the nation, on the verge of freedom, the long-term plan of educational reconstruction generally known as the Report on Post-War Education Development in India (1944).<sup>52</sup> The reconstituted Central Bureau of Education also became active and brought out a large number of publications on various educational problems of the country.

## 2.8 CONCLUSION

The first few years of independence was a period of anxiety and struggle. The aftermath of partition was vast misery. The amelioration of this itself was a task that took all the energy and attention of the nascent government at the centre. Then there were other, equally challenging political, economic and administrative problems. As a result, education could not, during the years between 1946-47 and 1950-51, get the attention it deserved or the attention the

government wanted to give it. One of the first acts of the government in the field of education, however, was the creation, in 1947 of a Ministry of Education and Scientific Research. This was followed by the appointment of a high-power Education Commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. Radhakrishnan, in 1948. This was noticeable enough that the new government at the centre accorded high priority to education and intended to play no mean role in its future development.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Clause 43, East India Company Act, 1813. <sup>See</sup> B.D. Bhatt and J.C. Aggarwal, Educational Documents in India (1913-1968), 1969, New Delhi, Arya Book Depot, p.1.
2. Aparna Basu, The Growth of Education and Political Development in India, 1898-1920, 1974, Bombay, Oxford University Press, p.1. Macaulay's famous Minute, which formed the basis of the decision in favour of English education, was dated 2nd February, 1835.
3. Raja Roy Singh, "Educational Administration in India" Administrative Reforms Since Independence, Supplement to Indian Journal of Public Administration, No.3, Vol.IX, July-September, 1963, p.220.
4. The Calcutta Madrassah and the Banaras Sanskrit College are two prominent examples of such individual enterprise. The former was founded by Warren Hastings and the latter by Jonathan Duncan, the Resident at Banaras. For the motivations behind the establishment of the institutions, see Syed Nurullah and J.P. Naik, A History of Education in India, 1951 (Second edition), Bombay, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 56-59.
5. Raja Roy Singh, loc. cit.
6. J.P. Naik, "The Role of the Government of India in Education", Educational Studies and Investigations, Vol.I, 1962, New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training, p.2.
7. Section XXXIX of the Government of India Act, 1833.
8. Clause XIII of the Government of India Act, 1833.

9. J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.3.
10. Of Macaulay, the moving spirit behind this decision, Panikkar wrote: "If one were asked to name three Englishmen from the pre-mutiny period, who are likely to be remembered in Indian history,... the choice is not likely to fall on the governors-general, commanders, or administrators whose names now loom large in Anglo-Indian textbooks but on Edmund Burke, William Jones and Macaulay". K.M. Panikkar, A Survey of Indian History, 1963, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, p.209.
11. Raja Roy Singh, op.cit., p.221.
12. Ibid. The Education Commission (1964-66) has gone to the extend of saying <sup>that the Despatch laid the foundation for the entire</sup> system of present-day education. See Report of the Education Commission, 1964-66, Ministry of Education, Government of India, p.109.
13. Atmanand Misra, Financing of Education in India, 1967, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, p.184. One is here reminded of a more modern instance of this kind, though the political context is not comparable. The Ashby Commission Report on education in Nigeria (1960), by asking for more money for education, did actually get more money for Nigeria, education. See C.E. Beeby, The Quality of Education in Developing Countries, 1966, Cambridge (Massachusetts), Harvard University Press, p.22.
14. B.M. Sharma, The Republic of India, 1966, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, p.15.
15. The figures of expenditure on 'direction' 'inspection', and 'instruction' given in the report prepared for the secretary of State in 1864, ten years after the despatch of Charles Wood, will give some idea of educational expansion during the period. See Selections from Educational Records

of Government of India, Vol.I, p.37. See also, Ram Gopal, British Rule in India: An Assessment, c.1963, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, p.221, for figures cited in a statement presented to the House of Lords in 1852.

16. In 1858, Lord Ellenborough in his Despatch (dated 28th April) tried to reverse the policies laid down by the Despatch of 1854 on the ground that they had led to the events of 1857. Fortunately, better counsels prevailed and Ellenborough's recommendations were not acted upon. (See Syed Nurullah and J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.24.) There were also other occasions of such panick. In 1897, two British officers were murdered in Poona. Bombay was promptly asked by London to make a thorough enquiry to ascertain whether the educational facilities in the province was responsible for this. If so, it was time to review a system which had allowed 'such perversion of its beneficent purpose'. (Despatch from Secretary of State to Bombay, No.19, Edn., dated 16.12.1897, cited by Aparna Basu, op.cit., p.10.)
17. J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.2.
18. For a brief enumeration of these restrictive provisions, See Arthur Berriedale Keith, A Constitutional History of India, 1961( reprint), Allahabad, Central Book Depot, p.174.
20. K.T. Sha, Federal Finance in India, 1929, p.87.
21. K. Venkataraman, States' Finances in India, 1968, London, George Allen and Unwin, p.271
22. D.M. Desai: Compulsory Primary Education in India, 1951 Bombay, Indian Institute of Education, 1951, p.237.
23. The only university established during this period by an Act of a provincial legislature was Lucknow (1920).

24. See J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.3.
25. Indian Education Commission, Report, 1883-4, Vol.I, p.451.
26. Raja Roy Singh, op.cit., p.224. The considerations behind this could not be (not entirely, in any case) the ones mentioned in the government resolution appointing the Hunter Commission, nor those of economy. There is ample evidence to show that from the time of Lord Dufferin onwards the Raj had begun to see a direct link between English education and the nascent nationalism. On this, see Aparna Basu, op.cit., pp.8-9.
27. Gokhale in his presidential address to the Benares Congress (1905), Gokhale's Speeches, Madras, Natesan & Co., pp.807-808.
28. In letter to Godley, dated 1.5.1901. cited by Aparna Basu, op.cit., p.6.
29. Naik seems to imply that personality factors were entirely responsible for the change when he says in this context:

"The interest shown by the Government of India in education ... depended mostly upon the personalities of the governor-Generals(sic) - a Repon or a Curzon could make education look almost like a 'central subject' while, at other times, it became almost a 'provincial subject'". (J.P.Naik, op.cit., p.3). This would perhaps be an over-simplification. Available evidence shows that the India Office had by then come to the conclusion that it was too late now to go back on Macaulay's decision to introduce English education and that the best that could be done in the situation was to tighten control over the 'educational juggernaut'(See Aparna Basu, op.cit., p.10-11) Personality factors could have played a role in the zeal with which this policy was carried out.

30. The post was later abolished, but was revived in 1915 under the new designation of Educational Commissioner.
31. For the resolution, see B.D. Bhatt and J.C. Aggarwal, op.cit., pp.24-25.
32. Education so far had been one of the responsibilities of the Home Department.
33. Incidentally the conference was not a purely official one, for, one of the invitees to the conference was a non-official, Dr. Miller of the Madras Christian College, No Indian educationist, however, was invited which created a great deal of resentment among educated Indians.
34. Lord Curzon in India, Vol.II, p.55 cited by J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.4.
35. We shall have occasion to study this at some length in a later chapter. See Chapter VI, "Centre-State Financial Relations in Education", passim.
36. See 11, ante
37. For the nature of these early central grants to the provinces for educational purposes, see J.P. Naik, op.cit., pp.5-6.
38. Ibid, p.6.
39. Aparna Basu, op.cit., p.6.
40. Raleigh, T. (Ed.) Lord Curzon in India - Selections of His Speeches Vol.II, 1906, London, p.68.
41. For an analysis of these political motivations, see Syed Nurullah and J.P. Naik, op.cit., pp.439-40; and Aparna Basu, op.cit., pp.8-11.
42. Curzon in one of his speeches.Cited by Aparna Basu, op.cit., p.11.

43. Some historians of education have lamented the decision to make education a provincial subject on the ground that it was based on 'political' rather than 'educational' considerations (see J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.6). This is argumentum ad hominum in so far as its appeal is to the prejudice of the professional educationist against 'politics'. In fact, all questions regarding education at this level of consideration are, in the ultimate analysis, political questions. Interestingly enough, even the questions that Naik himself suggests as the ones that should have been raised at the time of taking the decision, are so obviously political (see J.P. Naik, loc.cit.)
44. Keith Considers this, along with the provision for two lists of subjects, 'the essential novelty' of the Act. See Arthur Berriedale Keith, op.cit., p.247.
45. Montague-Chemsford Report, para 238. Cited by J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.6.
46. This was also the case with many other transferred departments. The ministers incharge of these departments openly lamented this situation. See K.V.D. Mahajan, British Rule in India and After, 1969, Delhi, S. Chand and Co., pp.356-57.
47. Government of India Act, 1919. Cited by Atmanand Misra, op.cit., p.77.
48. The almost complete withdrawal of the Government of India from educationa looks strange after the vigorous policy of central control and direction followed during the preceding period. It is beyond our brief here to go into the factors motivating the change. But, it would be too simple an explanation to say, as Naik by implication does (See J.P. Naik, op.cit., p.6) that the Raj all upon a sudden decided to

consider education 'not really very important'. An adequate explanation will have to be sought in the exigencies arising out of the high degree of political mobilization during the period between 1901 and 1920 (For this, see A.R. Desai, Social Background of Indian Nationalism, 1966 (Fourth Edition), Bombay, Popular Prakashan, p.149) The logic of the change in policy seems to be: If education cannot be controlled, it can very well be starved. And, starve it did, thanks to the precipitate decrease in central subvention and the 'joint purse' system in the provinces (For the latter, see Arthur Berriedale Keith, op.cit., pp.247-248; and V.D.Mahajan, op.cit., pp.358-359).

49. K. Santhanam, Union-State Relations in India, 1963  
Bombay, Asia Publishing House, p.3.
50. Arthur Berriedale, op.cit., pp.365-373.
51. This obviously is a residual provision, comprehending, as it does, all educational matters other than those mentioned in the Federal List.
52. Also called the 'Sargent Report' after Sir John Sargent, the then Educational Advisor to the Government of India. Nationalist opinion was generally averse to the report, mainly on the score that it postulated a forty-year period for the universalisation of education at the first level. Events after independence has shown that the report had erred only on the side of optimism. The authors of the report, however, had no notion of the compulsions of the tremendous task of development that lay ahead of freedom from foreign domination.