



Aspects of mass education policy from Company Raj to British Raj: 1800-1900

Dr. Radhika Mishra

Assistant Professor, Department of History, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, Bihar, India

Abstract

Education policy under British India is a matter of debate among historians but no one has really talked about implications of education on masses in India. Since British showed lot of concern in teaching masses after 1854, it is important to note what kind of education was thought for them and what ways they formed policies in that direction. In My paper I have traced the history of education from the perspective of masses. How they were understood is the area of my enquiry. I have also pointed out the complex relationship between company and missionaries and liberal ideology. Through the use of policy documents an attempt is made to understand how differential policy was adopted for education of elites and masses in India.

Keywords: education policy, liberal ideology, British Raj

Introduction

In the initial phase starting from 1813 to Macaulay's minute debate about education surrounded mainly regarding medium of instruction and agencies to provide education. With despatch of 1854 the main issues of contestations became objective of the education policy, medium of instruction, agency for the spread of education, and the method of spreading education. Thus, we find till very late government was busy in resolving the nature of education rather than the extent of its reach. After this the despatch of 1859 recognised that supply of vernacular education to the masses should be made through direct instrumentality of government. But then there was a turnaround from 1880 when private initiative and local responsibility was encouraged. The liberal agenda to expand the education to the masses appears sometimes only a way to further check the development in the field of education. The Indian education commission of 1880 has to be seen in this light. Rather than giving education to the masses, the agenda seems to provide a check to the already developed educational institutions. Statistical analysis of the expansion of education became a way through which increase in the number of students, or some kind of progress could be shown on a regular basis without any real revolutionary change in the direction.

Making of an Education policy under Company Raj

Starting from 1813, to Macaulay's minute, this period saw many debates. The debate, in this period, was focussed on the objects of educational policy, medium of instruction, the agencies for organising educational institutions and the methods to be adapted to spread education among the people. There was no discussion of teaching the masses since Company initially had no interest in intervening in the lives of the Indians. However, the missionary enterprise led to the opening of schools which focussed on teaching the lower classes, but due to their emphasis on proselytising even their attempt to school the lower classes failed. This period is interesting because British were taking responsibility of education in India at a time when Britain itself did not have any education policy.

Soon after Battle of Plassey, when Company acquired territories in India, the question regarding policy towards indigenous Indian institutions and practices was initiated as the policy of least intervention by Robert Clive. Thus, support to indigenous education system came when in 1781, Warren Hastings founded the Calcutta Madrasah and in 1792, Jonathan Duncan established Benares Sanskrit college, both promoting Indigenous culture and education. The reasons for such establishments were to provide Indian officers well-versed in Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic to assist them in governing the country, as well as the desire to cultivate the goodwill of the traditional Hindu and Muslim elites ^[1]. But, evangelicals, liberals and utilitarians opposed this encouragement to the Oriental learning. Evangelicals including Charles Grant and William Wilberforce argued for the encouragement of English education for religious reformation, while Free traders were convinced of benefits of Anglicised Indians in promoting British goods. In addition to this, Liberals were convinced of superiority of western education. However, Utilitarian like James Mill focussed on the legislation and administrative reforms rather than education as panacea for Indian society.

Before Company's active intervention in education, it was missionary enterprise in India which worked in the direction of educating the people of India. To spread Christianity, schooling was found important to have access to people and to find opportunities for preaching them as schools became the means of communication with 'different kinds of people, with children and parents ^[2]. In order to make these children read Bible, reading

became essential and establishment of vocational schools by missionaries emerged as a necessity to provide converts livelihood and status in society.

The schools provided an elementary education, accompanied by religious instruction. There arose a debate whether missionaries should only focus on Christianising the people, or educating the people. However, with the encouragement of English language as useful for government posts and ultimate recognition as superior language to get useful knowledge, missionary schools gained popularity for providing such education, but religion still played an important role^[3]. In fact as argued by Sanjay Seth, secular knowledge was introduced in these schools as an ally of evangelization. He argues that 'Western education did not prove to be as potent in spreading Christianity as had been expected, but instead led to many educated Indians being deprived of the certainties of an old world and its moral code, without any replacement for this being found^[4]. However the growth of missionary enterprise in India was slow prior to 1813 because of the hostile attitude of company towards them^[5]. While in England, missionaries tried to pressurise the government for liberal policy towards them, in India, an opposing group of officials emerged which talked about the encouragement of oriental learning. As only lower castes were attracted to conversion, upper caste Hinduism remained intact and their enterprise was limited. The major steps in the direction of education were to be taken by the government only.

The initial objective of the British education policy was to spread western knowledge and encourage the study of English language and literature. Public education in India began with the Charter Act of 1813 which sought to accept the responsibility for the education of Indians, to incur some expenditure for the fulfilment of this object, and to admit missionaries to its dominions for spreading Western 'light and knowledge.' Section 43 of Charter Act of 1813 is very crucial. It granted an amount of one lac rupees annually for the revival and improvement of literature and the encouragement of learned Indians and for the introduction and promotion of knowledge of the sciences among the people.

The Act defined the objects of the educational policy but it did not discuss the ways to achieve them. Moreover, it was clear in its agenda that it sought to encourage learning only amongst the learned. The question of teaching the other social groups who fall beyond the ambit of 'learned classes' was not raised. Yet significance of the Charter Act of 1813 is not less. According to some scholars, with it, 'education of the Indian people was included within the duties of the Company; a comparatively large amount was annually secured for educational activities; and missionaries began to land in India in large numbers and establish English schools, thereby laying the foundation of the modern educational system^[6].

In England, state did not participate in the education at all till 1833. In Indian context, when company in 1813 was still only concerned with the profit making and when state in England itself did not pay much attention to the education of the people, the expectation that masses in India would be their focus is a fallacy. Thus, we find, in the beginning, the government was focussed on the nature of education rather than its expansion. However, it is important to note that this period opened the debate on nature of education that is what to teach rather than how to teach.

After 1813 Act, a conflict between two ideas relating with the spread of education arose. One of these, which was represented by missionaries and Macaulay, advocated spread of western culture over traditional forms of knowledge and desired to create a class of persons who could be 'Indians in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect'. The other school of thought believed a synthesis of the Eastern and Western cultures. This school was represented by Hastings and Minto. Due to this Orientalist and Occidental controversy the funds allocated in 1813 remained unspent. That is the reason why the recommendations of the Charter Act 1813 were delayed until 1823 when the Governor General in Council appointed a General Committee of Public Instruction for the Bengal Presidency to look after the development of education in British India. It appears that in the beginning the object of the policy was to find a middle ground to please both the evangelicals and the orientalist^[7].

Even though nothing much was done by the British for mass education during this period, but the debates surrounding 1813 Act and missionaries attempts towards education shows that this period is crucial for initiating a debate among many groups regarding education of the people in India.

The Despatch of 1854 and policy for educating the masses

We see that extending education to the masses was the aim of nearly every public policy which came after despatch of 1854. The despatch of 1854 is seen as the Magna Carta of education as, for the first time it laid down the principle on which to follow future education policy. As early as 1854, the primary aim of government becomes to educate the masses. Yet till 1900, after 50 years still we see the demand for the lack of same. The causes for failure to give education to these masses in these years are many. The reasons given for that are failure to introduce compulsory education, transfer of primary education to the control of local bodies; and neglect of indigenous schools^[8]. These drawbacks of the education policy definitely exist but it is important to emphasise that the entire idea of the kind of education that the British were seeking to give to the masses was very problematic. I argue that the failure to impart education to the masses lay in various other reasons also. Firstly, British intervened in the field of education with a stereotyped idea of poor, who according to them were not fit for the modern education. Though with time and with invention of new technologies of rule, the colonial administration came to differentiate among different masses, yet there also they were mistaken in choosing particular peoples for particular occupations. Moreover, sometimes on the basis of claiming to understand their needs, British colonial officials were providing a limited or restricted education, i.e., only education till certain

extent or manual training. Secondly, the idea of giving education to the masses was relegated to providing them with primary education. That meant, creating a different zone for them even within schooling. In it was included that only schools catering to primary education should be opened to them and that they should not be in a school which provides secondary education because that might lead them to aspire for higher education. Due to several reasons, these two aims determined the education policy till 1900. Thirdly, the masses in India were always compared with the masses of England but never the same policies were made. However, despite all this, the first-time despatch of 1854 talked about mass education.

The despatch of 1854, came with the renewal of Company's charter in 1853. At this time, as at the earlier renewals of the Charter in 1813 and 1833, a Select Committee of House of Commons held a very thorough enquiry into educational developments in India. On the basis of this enquiry, the Court of Directors sent down their Educational Despatch on 19 July 1854. The charter was the result of the opinions of three men: C.E. Trevelyan, J.C. Marshman, and Alexander Duff, a Scots missionary^[9]. Though the despatch of 1854 is linked with the name of Sir Charles Wood, but it was drafted by Marshman and Duff. Its recommendation included (a) That the indigenous schools should be incorporated in the official system of education, (b) that larger amounts should be spent on primary education, and (c) that a system of grants-in-aid should be evolved for private primary schools on which alone should Government mainly rely for the spread of education among the masses^[10]. First of all it is important to point out why despatch on education was found important. The despatch of 1854 for the first time sets out to declare that the education of the Indian people is a sacred duty of the Government as (1) because education is auxiliary to those efforts which Government have made and are making for the prevention and repression of crime. (2) because it is necessary to create a body of public servants capable of, and trustworthy in, the discharge of public duties; and (3) because education will conduce to that material prosperity and well-being of the Indian people, which will prove beneficial to both England and India^[11]. At that time in India, there was an idea that masses of India are constituted differently. The prevalence of the idea that natives of India differ within themselves led to formation of a policy which could differentiate between the different communities of people. By and large, the dispatch was in the favour of spreading European knowledge^[12] but it also gave importance to learning oriental languages to know Hindu law and philosophy. The concept of learned classes of India remained very much pertinent when it came to the expert of this knowledge. The British were aware of the higher status of those people who had this knowledge. The despatch said that "we are far from under rating the good effect which has thus been produced upon the learned classes of India, who pay hereditary veneration to these ancient languages, and whose assistance in the spread of education is so valuable from the honourable and influential position which they occupy among their fellow countrymen^[13].

So, learned classes of India became the reference point for the masses as masses came to be pointed out as 'fellow countrymen'. However, as said earlier the dispatch pays some attention to these large number of fellow men who do not belong to the learned classes. Though the major aim of the dispatch was to spread European knowledge through English language but the considerable attention had to be paid to the vernacular dialects of the country. Here the needs of the large number of masses were taken into consideration. In the Dispatch it was pointed out that - "we have always been most sensible to the importance of the use of the languages which alone are understood by the great mass of the population." Interestingly, these people were not thought of having any cultural attributes like learned classes of India who were thought as knowledgeable. These masses are rather those whose circumstances are such that they could have never learnt the foreign language.

In this way, when the education policy was formed for them, it was kept in mind that due to their circumstances, the masses of India would not be able to study the English language. So, education in the vernacular was sought as a way to give them some knowledge^[14].

In this manner, the first focus of the dispatch was to provide education in vernacular to a large number of people. The second objective of the dispatch was to emphasize further the 'useful' education for these people. So, the dispatch stated that "Our attention should now be directed to a consideration, (...) how useful and practical knowledge, suited to every station in life, may be best conveyed to the great mass of the people, *who are utterly incapable of obtaining any education worthy of the name by their own unaided efforts.*"

In terms of achieving this goal, the dispatch gives importance to the method of grant-in-aid. It says that with the gradual advance of the system of grant-in-aid, the government looked forward to a time when education entirely provided by Government would be discontinued and the management of education would be undertaken by the local bodies which were till then under the control of, and aided by, the State. In the course of article, we will see that all these ways were fraught with various complexities and were not the best ways to educate the masses; because giving only primary education would not provide them to raise their stature, the issue of vernacular was never sorted out, and third, the grant in aid failed to open schools for masses.

The beginning in the direction of mass education was just about to be made when the revolt of 1857 disrupted the policy in other direction. However, some scholars have argued that we have overemphasized the appearance of British Crown after the revolt. There are some scholars who do not believe it to be turning point leading to any significant change rather according to them the most important change came from the '*changing world context in which the British viewed India*'. After 1857, we are aware that a policy of differentiation was adopted. This policy found its ally in various English thinkers. "Maine and his followers, such as Fitz James Stephens, Sir Alfred Lyall and Lord Cromer, stressed the antiquity and the primitiveness of Indian civilisation and that of other conquered states, cautioned against the hasty imposition of western values and institutions for fear they would

undermine the stability of ‘traditional society’ and supported what became known as ‘indirect rule’ through local collaborating elites ^[15].

After 1858, we see that with the transfer of power to the crown, the interest in making education policy had declined. The Secretary of State for India, who was the new officer in place of the Court of Directors as well as the President of the Board of Control became the most effective authority and he wrote the educational Despatch of 1859. The interest that was taken in the field of education after 1854 included in 1855, the appointment of a Central Committee to plan the universities; in 1857, the Indian Universities were established by Acts of the Central Executive Council and from 1865-66 to 1870-71, the Government of India held, through special officers, detailed surveys of education in India.

Despatch of 1859 and Education for masses becomes State’s Responsibility

Educational dispatch of 1859 also known as Lord Stanley’s Dispatch came as a result of the transfer of power to the British crown which necessitated the review of existing policies in education ^[16]. It called for an examination of educational condition in India and alleges that promotion of western education is one of the reasons for the outbreak of the revolt ^[17]. After 1854, which had announced the policy for the masses, it was necessary to chalk out how the schools for masses will come into force. It was asked who is going to establish schools for the people? Is it the private effort by people themselves which would bear the fruit of education for them? Or is it the government which would directly handle the situation by establishing its own schools? There comes an understanding that elite people of native community would never establish any school for the masses. Masses themselves may never enter into schools established by the private efforts. In addition to this their condition would not allow them to go for study at all because they are required to work in the fields. In that condition how could it be ensured that they would study?

In 1859, after the revolt, the British Government, now represented by a Secretary of State, sent this Despatch in continuation of that of 1854. This despatch seems to have reversed the recommendation of Despatch of 1854. It argued that local rates should be levied for educational purposes, and that mass education could only be spread with the Government efforts and thus more and more Government schools need to be opened. Perhaps the most important announcement in the long document was that grants-in-aid had failed to produce a system of primary schools. Dispatch of 1859 cited Mr. Pratt of Bengal presidency who said that grant-in-rule may be inappropriate for a country like India where the value of education is not felt by the mass of the people ^[18]. While talking about the establishment of schools by local efforts the dispatch supports Mr. Pratt’s conclusion:

The poorest classes do not want schools at all, because they are too poor to pay schooling-fees and subscriptions, and because the labor of the children is required to enable them to live. The middle and upper classes will make no sort of sacrifice for the establishment of any but English schools. Yet the rules in force presume the highest appreciation of education, because based on the supposition that the people everywhere pay not only schooling-fees, but subscriptions for schools. In fact, we expect the peasantry and shopkeepers of Bengal to make sacrifices for education which the same classes in England refuse to make ^[19].

Hence, it appears that in order to escape from any unpopularity of the Government and to ensure that masses of the country read under the direct tutelage of the government, even in education, divide and rule policy was adopted. By now there was also an understanding that there exists a divide even among the people. The interests of lower classes and upper classes are different. Thus, on the one hand, it was necessary to keep elite classes happy but on the other hand, government could not lose its complete touch with the masses. In order to ensure that both of the classes are being addressed, dispatch of 1859 argued for the grant-in-aid for the higher institution and made provision for the direct government role in education of the masses.

It said,

The grant-in-aid system, as hitherto in force, is unsuited to the supply of Vernacular Education to the masses of the population; and it appears to them, so far as they have been able to form an opinion, that the means of elementary education should be provided by the direct instrumentality of the officers of Government ^[20].

It was felt that there was definitely great advantage promoting spirit of self-reliance in the native community. The government argued that its responsibility was to give primary education to the population and if any individual or class wanted more education than that then it was their own responsibility and not the government’s ^[21]. In such a way, it was wrong to assume that government would provide education beyond elementary. What this elementary class meant became clear with the coming up of Indian education commission. Before discussing about the Indian education commission and its views on primary education, we need to look at the general trend in the period concerned.

In order to meet the financial demands of elementary education, it was argued to levy an education rate from which the cost of all schools throughout the country should be defrayed.

Further, there was dispatch of 23rd January 1864 which reiterated from the dispatch of 1854

What had not before been stated so explicitly, that one of the objects of that Dispatch was the increase, where necessary, of the number of Government colleges and schools. Despatch also brings to the notice that while

Wood's dispatch talked about that Government should withdraw, wherever possible, the direct maintenance of the school, it also said that in any such withdrawal 'attention must necessarily be given to local circumstances', and that, 'her majesty's government are unwilling that a Government school should be given up in any place where the inhabitants show a marked desire that it should be maintained, or where there is a manifest disinclination on the part of the people, to send their children to the private schools of the neighbourhood ^[22].

The missionaries, in particular, did not like the policy of state withdrawal and argued that the government policy is not in favor of private institutions. The missionaries therefore criticized government both in India and England, demanding, on the basis of statements made in the Despatch of 1854, that the Government colleges and schools should either be closed or transferred to private enterprise. The Indian Education commission of 1882 felt that the demand of state taking the responsibility of education arises from the belief that state should take the responsibility of giving education to its community as it represents the community and many civilizations show that it was the state which took the responsibility of higher education. However, the commission was not in the favour of state controlling the education system. Doctrine of state-withdrawal as enunciated by the Wood's Despatch was considered sound by it. It recommended "Government should not only curtail the expansion of its institutions, but should also withdraw from direct enterprise as soon as a suitable agency, public or private, became available to carry on the work.

Hunter Commission

Before going into the history of the education commission, the developments leading up to the commission needs to be charted out. From 1854-1880, it was argued that attention of the Government should be devoted more to primary than to higher education and that the active measures of Government should be directed towards the education of the masses. In spite of various declarations, the progress of primary education continued to be slow. The reasons, as explained by various scholars, are failure to introduce compulsory education, transfer of primary education to the control of local bodies, and neglect of the indigenous schools.

Despatch of 1854 did not talk about compulsory education. Even in England, at that time, there was no such provision. But it was eventually introduced in Britain under the Acts of 1870, 1876 and 1880. Hence, the Indian Education Commission (1882-83) could have raised the issue as several Indian witnesses before it did make a demand for compulsory education. But it chose to remain silent. Even an Indian Prince, Maharajah Sayajirao Gaekwar of Baroda, introduced compulsory education in one division of his State, as an experimental measure, in 1893-94. By this time, some Indian leaders were also demanding compulsory primary education. But the colonial state cleverly argued that being a foreign power, it cannot compel Indians, like native princes, to send their children to their schools ^[23].

The control over primary education was transferred to local boards in 1884. It was inspired by the Elementary Education Acts of England, 1870 and 1876. Moreover, this was a logical step in the policy of state withdrawal from direct educational enterprise which was first declared in 1854 and confirmed in 1882-83. Private societies, missionaries or Indians, were not prepared to take the entire burden of financing the primary schools on a large scale, at this time. Also, perhaps the idea of collaborating with the Indian elite made room for granting them some form of *self-government*. It was decided that local bodies would be established and Indians would be given local *self-government* and that primary education would be transferred to these bodies. Primary education hence became a *local* subject since 1884.

Success of this system depended on various factors such as availability of adequate resources. However, due funds were not allocated to the local bodies to spend on education despite transfer of responsibility to the local boards.

Naik and Nurullah point out,

At least liberal grants-in-aid ought to have been given to local bodies. Even this was not done and Government grant, it was laid down, *was not to exceed* one-third of the total expenditure. Moreover, the proper guidance or training that the officials were expected to give to Indians in the management of local bodies did not generally become available. On the whole, therefore, it may be concluded that the conditions laid down by Lord Ripon for the successful working of the experiment of local self-government were never fulfilled, and that primary education was transferred to organizations who had no adequate resources of their own and who were given absolutely inadequate grant-in-aid. It is to this failure to work out the experiment properly, rather than to any intrinsic error in the proposal itself, that we must attribute the adverse effect which the transfer to local control ultimately produced upon the expansion of primary education ^[24].

It is, however, worthy of note that, in spite of all these handicaps the local bodies did substantial service to the cause of primary education. 'Their contribution to primary education rose from Rs. 24.9 lakhs in 1881-82 to Rs. 46.1 lakhs in 1901-2, while Government contribution increased, during the same period, from Rs. 16.77 lakhs to Rs. 16.92 lakhs only. This liberality of the local bodies saved the situation considerably. But it was only an *immediate* gain. The resources of the local bodies were so inelastic and limited that they could have never hoped to introduce compulsory primary education or even to have brought about any very large expansion of schools. They gave an initial push and tided somehow over hard times when Government funds were scanty. But with that, their contribution to the cause came practically to an end, while their continuing to be mainly responsible for primary education led to *ultimate* disadvantages and held up all major lines of progress ^[25].

There is one more crucial reason behind failure of primary education which is that the indigenous schools were completely ignored and were not given any financial help. The arrogance of the British completely destroyed these indigenous institutions and the former completely failed to replace them with their own institutions. For instance, in Punjab we see that Dr. G.W. Leitner, one time Principal of Government College, Lahore, and for some time acting Director of Public Instruction in the Punjab prepared voluminous survey of indigenous education in Punjab where he discussed the history of interaction between English and Panjabi education system. He argued that British failed to preserve the original education system of Punjab, which was destroyed and not revived.

At any rate, Leitner's researches showed that at the time of the annexation of the Punjab the lowest computation gave "3,30,000 pupils in the schools of the various denominations who were acquainted with reading, writing and some method of computation", against "little more than 1,90,000" pupils in 1882 ^[26].

Here, I would like to argue that although Naik and Nurullah has pointed out the policy failures of primary education, they have not paid much attention to the issue of ideological position which guaranteed the failure of primary education. The very nature of primary education conceptualized in the Indian Education Commission was in itself problematic as they showed clear class prejudice when they recommended primary education for masses and higher for the elite. Also, even within primary education, they wanted 'useful' education for them which would make them workers, not citizens.

There is a need to remember that nowhere in India, a uniform policy was adopted. However, the kind of policies that were adopted provided a certain kind of view about the differences among people which was always kept in mind whenever looking at particular schools. After the dispatch of 1854, on the lines of rules and regulation laid down by it, there developed different types of schools in India for masses. Also, there developed different systems of education in the provinces to which we will come later.

The kind of development of schools was result of the Government's idea of primary education. The definition of primary according to the Despatch of 1854 is "consisting of so much knowledge, at least of reading and writing, and of the simple rules of arithmetic and of land measurement, as would enable each man to look after his own rights." From the various references made to the subject, it is apparent that the character of primary education as understood by the Court of Directors was to be determined by the practical needs both of an agricultural and of an urban community, and that the course was to include reading and writing with elementary arithmetic and mensuration.

In India, diversity persisted and the way schools developed, they surpassed the standard set in the Despatch for that school. An attempt at securing uniformity was made in 1879, when the Government of India for the first time promulgated a definition of primary education for the whole Empire. Primary schools were defined as those "in which pupils are under instruction from the earliest stage up to the standard at which secondary instruction begins; this instruction being marked by an examination to be called the upper primary examination".

Such a definition tried to impose a certain kind of uniformity on provinces. Thus, Hunter commission recommends: "that primary education be regarded as the instruction of the masses through the vernacular in such subjects as will best fit them for their position in life, and be not necessarily regarded as a portion of instruction leading up to the University ^[27]."

This definition of primary education helped to define that it was not meant to be same for everyone from lower class to upper class. While in the former's case, primary education was thought as complete in itself, it meant primary stage of higher instruction for the latter. It is very important to trace meaning of the term because it is the way the masses were also understood. Though the emphasis on primary education might change but the meaning of primary education did not change. Even in Indian Education policy resolution of 1904 the definition of Primary education did not change much. It was said that the "Primary education is the instruction of the masses, through the vernacular, in such subjects as will best stimulate their intelligence and fit them for their position in life ^[28]."

In actuality, Hunter Commission is full of contradictions in a way because on the one hand it says that 'while every branch of education can justly claim the fostering care of the state, it is desirable, in the present circumstances of the country, to declare the elementary education of the masses, its provisions, extensions, and improvement to be that part of the education system, to which the strenuous efforts of the State should be directed in a still larger measure than heretofore', on the other hand, it recommended the complete withdrawal of Government from direct enterprise and the transfer of all primary schools to the control of local self-government bodies such as municipalities and district boards. Thus, it made the Government free from all responsibility. With regard to secondary schools and colleges too, the Commission was of the opinion that the Government should withdraw as early as possible from the direct management of secondary and higher education.

Besides this, Hunter Commission also mentions the category of poor classes in India. It is argued that a poor law is unknown in India. In every caste not excluding Brahmans cases of great poverty exist. 'But as the caste descends in the social scale, the instances of poverty increase, and the well to do are less able to render aid to the poorer members of their class.' The best remedy is perhaps to relax the rule which requires that education, even in schools which are not entirely supported by but only aided by the state, should not be purely gratuitous. Hunter commission therefore recommends that in all board schools, a certain proportion of pupils be admissible as free students on the ground of poverty; and in the case of special schools established for the benefit of the poorer classes, a general or larger exemption from payment of fees be allowed under proper authority for special reasons. There may be schools which specially undertake the education of the poor, and which, under the

operation of the above rule, will be unable to charge fees, and must thus depend upon charitable assistance and grants from the State. The grants which they may earn under the result system will be very small, and their case seems to deserve special encouragement. It therefore recommended that assistance be given to schools and orphanages in which poor children are taught reading, writing, and counting, with or without manual work ^[29]. Naik and Nurullah argue,

Between 1854 and 1902, therefore, it may be said that the doctrine of State-withdrawal from direct educational enterprise remained, on paper, as the official policy of Government but almost a dead letter in practice. It succeeded in checking effectively a rapid multiplication of educational institutions directly conducted by the Department. This result was, in a way, inevitable on account of the general financial stringency that prevailed in this period. All that the Doctrine of State-withdrawal did, therefore, was to cloak the inability of Government to expand its educational activities as a noble administrative policy wherein direct state enterprise was deliberately controlled in order that private enterprise might have "room to expand" ^[30].

In fact, the recommendations of the Hunter Commission are also reflected in the recommendation of Newcastle commission in England. It was believed that state control of education would lead to levelling of social distinctions. "The men of the time believed that for practical purposes classes should remain distinct and their educational institutions separate. The point is made very clearly in the reports both of the Newcastle Commission on popular education (1861) and of the Taunton Commission on the endowed schools (1868). The Newcastle Commission commented on the tendency of competitive examinations for minor government appointments to teach people to 'value education as a means of rising to a higher station in life'. This, they accepted, was in many cases a reasonable ambition: 'but the main object of promoters of education must be to teach the people to value it as a source of morality, enjoyment, and comfort, in the station in which the great masses of them are necessarily destined to remain.' The Taunton Commissioners were anxious to use endowments to enable poor boys to carry on their education, but they pointed out the strong objection to a preparatory education common to all classes, in that parents of a higher class disliked their children associating with others of a lower class and being taught by men, whom they regarded as their social inferiors. Private schools and the newer and more ambitious proprietary schools all depended to some extent on the social distinctions which the schools were powerless to ignore and to which indeed they often owed their very existence. Many inferior private schools survived, the commissioners argued, because of 'the unwillingness of many of the tradesmen and others just above the manual labourers to send their sons to the National or British school. Rather than let their children mix with the class beneath them in a large well-fitted room where they would be taught by a thoroughly competent master, they will send them to an inferior teacher in a miserable room, and pay twice or four times as much ^[31]. In India, the British strengthened these class and caste divisions. Whatever existed on paper, this kind of social differentiation on the ground shows the reactionary nature of colonial state and had long term political implications for India.

Conclusion

Thus, in this article, I have argued that in England, the modern education system in a way helped to break the feudal structure of the British society and helped in the production of working class which could meet the demands of industry. While in India, due to the limited industrialisation and colonial exploitation, there was no need of the labour force. The economic and cultural division already existent in the Indian society was further sharpened by the introduction of colonial education with its limited objectives and half-baked initiatives. It created a new cultural division in the form of an illiterate and uncultured poor, who was already economically deprived, that led to the creation of inequality in the society at a new level.

References

1. Basu, *Essays in the History of Indian Education* (New Delhi: Concept Publishing Co., 1982, 2.
2. Naik JP, Nurullah S. *A Student's History of Education in India, 1800-1973*. (Bombay: Macmillan, 1951), 39.
3. However the problem occurred as no one wanted any other knowledge. 'The native youths do not come to it to obtain religious or Christian instruction, nor is that the object for which their parents send them there. What they are seeking is that education which is best to qualify them for earning a future livelihood; and they only do not refuse to take at the same time the instruction which you offer them, or rather, which you make an express condition of their receiving, in order to get the secular education which they want' Sanjay Seth, "Secular Enlightenment and Christian Conversion: Missionaries and Education in Colonial India," in *Education and Social Change in South Asia* eds. Krishna Kumar and Joachim Oestle held (Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2007, 32.
4. Seth, "Secular Enlightenment and Christian Conversion," 39.
5. In fact, Naik and Nurullah goes on to argue that 'between 1793 and 1813, the Company did not ordinarily issue a permit to any missionary to work within its territories, expelled several missionaries as soon as they became active and tried to convert people, put every obstacle possible in the way of the missionaries, and did not give any assistance even to mission schools.' Naik and Nurullah, *A Student's History of Education*, 47.

6. Naik, Nurullah. A Student's History of Education, 57.
7. Richey JA, Selections from Educational records part ii, 1840=1859, (Bureau of Education, Calcutta Superintendent Government Printing, 1923, 4.
8. Naik, Nurullah, A Student's History of Education, 1951.
9. Hugh Tinker, The Foundations of Local Self-Government in India, Pakistan and Burma, (Lalani Publishing house, 1954, 154.
10. Naik, Nurullah. A Student's History of Education, 210.
11. Despatch, dated the 19th July 1854, from the Court of Directors to the Governor General. Bureau of Education, India Selections from Educational records part ii, 1840=1859, in Richey, Selections from Educational records, 12.
12. The education that we desire to see extended in India is that which has for its object the diffusion of the improved arts, science, philosophy and literature of Europe; in short of European knowledge.
13. Despatch, dated the, in Richey, Selections from Educational records, 1854, 366.
14. Despatch, dated the, in Richey, Selections from Educational records, 1854, 367.
15. Peter J. Cain, "Character, 'Ordered Liberty', and the Mission to Civilise: British Moral Justification of Empire, 1870–1914," The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 2012:40(4):557-578.
16. Lord Ellenborough had raised several doubts regarding the dispatch of *viz.*, necessity of direct official attempts for mass education, encouragement of the education of women, grants-in-aid to mission schools etc. and recommended that the Downward filtration theory to be continued, Naik and Nurullah, A Student's History of Education in India, 1854, 154.
17. Educational dispatch, No. 4, dated India Office, London, 7th April 1859, from the Secretary of State for India. Bureau of Education, India Selections from Educational records part ii, 1840-1859, in J.A Richey, Selections from Educational records part ii, 1840-1859, (Bureau of Education, Calcutta Superintendent Government Printing, 1923, 426.
18. Educational dispatch, No. 4, dated India Office, London, 7th April 1859, from the Secretary of State for India. Bureau of Education, India Selections from Educational records part ii, 1840-1859, in J.A Richey, Selections from Educational records, 440.
19. Educational dispatch, No. 4, dated India Office, London, 7th April 1859, from the Secretary of State for India. Bureau of Education, India Selections from Educational records part ii, 1840-1859, in J.A Richey, Selections from Educational records, 440.
20. Naik and Nurullah, A Student's History of Education, 211.
21. Educational dispatch, No. 4, dated India Office, London, from the Secretary of State for India. Bureau of Education, India Selections from Educational records part ii, 1840-1859, in J.A Richey, Selections from Educational records, 1859, 446.
22. Report of the Indian Education Commission, (Calcutta: Government of India Press, 1883), 1882-83, 346.
23. Naik and Nurullah, A Student's History of Education, 230.
24. Naik and Nurullah, A Student's History of Education, 232.
25. Naik and Nurullah, A Student's History of Education, 232-33.
26. Dharampal, The Beautiful Tree: Indigenous Indian Education in the Eighteenth Century, edition is published as part of a special collection of Dharampal's writings, (Mapusa: Other India Press, 2000), 50.
27. Report of the Indian Education Commission, 81.
28. Indian Educational Policy, being a resolution issued by the Governor General in Council on the 11th March 1904 (Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent, Government Printing, India, 1904), 14.
29. Report of the Indian Education Commission, 150.
30. Naik and Nurullah, A Student's History of Education, 259.
31. John Roach, Public Examinations in England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 1850-1900, 41-42.