

Impact of colonial rule on Indian society

Social background of Indian nationalism

During early part of the 19th-century i.e. first phase of Nationalist movement the Nationalist consciousness was awakened by reformist leaders like Rajaram Mohan Roy and Dayanand Saraswati. They glorified the values of liberty, fraternity and equality. They wanted absolute reforms in traditional Orthodox family of India by imbibing the values of British culture/value/ideology. Cultural awakening was the foundation to nationalism.

During the second phase i.e. 1885 to 1908 Congress was founded. It led to the rise of liberals and growth of Congress played an important role in the progress of nationalism. Some educated Indians considered themselves the spokesman of the masses and asked Britishers for more liberal attitude towards Indians.

The third phase i.e. 1905 to 1918 people started asserting their right for independence to free themselves from the clutches of British by adopting spiritualised nationalism. Inculcating the spirit of nationalism were leaders like Lal Bal Pal, Bankim Chandra but the extremist lost faith in moderates and went for violent revolution. Tranquillised and highly spiritual nationalism evolved during this period. By 1980 industries got its momentum and a number of Indian got exposure to Western world because of want supplies during the world War. Many industries benefited from trade monopolies act and the world trade.

The fourth stage i.e. 1918 to 1934 is considered to be the period where extremist glorified cultural past and also the role of Gandhi came into prominence. The support of bourgeois and middle-class gave momentum to the national movement. Movements by the peasant class for example Champaran, Kheda etc created ripple in Indian. All the above factors resulted into mass mobilisation wherein demand for independence grew stronger by every passing day and it became impossible for the British to ignore this demand any further.

By the fifth stage i.e. 1934 to 1937 the ideology of nationalism greatly spiritualised the masses and literate or illiterate, rural or urban, men or women all segments of the society raised their voice in tandem demanding independence once and for all. Nationalism reached every section of the society.

Though India got its independence but Indians are still enslaved. There is still a distinction between supra and sub citizens. External colonialism is replaced by internal colonialism. Partha Chatterjee

writes that people and nationalism has nothing to do with each other. For the people were used for different bargain and for the interest by the elite class.

Theosophical Society developed the idea that there is not only the similarity between the language of India (Sanskrit) and other languages but India is the mother of all cultures. Vivekananda wrote that Indian culture is a culture which could find tranquillity and peace and could find the solutions to all the problems of the world. Rajaram Mohan Roy alleged that Indian culture got injected by dogmas and believes and underwent degradation and therefore it is time to welcome the British and modernise India.

Rightist belief that Sanskritik culture and Brahmi script unified the diverse population across territory. Dayanand Saraswati known as Martin Luther king of India was highly influential in putting forward a rightist approach which is still prevalent to this day. Nehru had faith in the lost cousin theory and he implicitly put it in terms of India's progress by adopting a Western model of development with a socialist tinge.

Gandhiji used the concept of universalism to unite the diverse sections of India. He realised that the uses of religion and caste is necessary as much as the modern ideas to make participation universal and equal. Though as a matter of fact he believed that the confusion between caste and Varna has led to the former becoming a reason of discontentment among various sections of the society. Gandhiji wanted a unified Indian nationalism and not Hindu - Muslim nationalism. Time and again he tried its best to bring the diverse religion, caste and communities on a single platform to create a united India based on love, respect and brotherhood among people belonging to all sections of the society.

In the present scenario grassroot development is the need of the hour therefore decentralised movements coming from below is mobilising people to satisfy their needs and promote common man's interest and accommodation within the larger spectrum of Indian nationalism.

Modernisation of Indian tradition

Introduction

Initially theological thought evolved propounded by Saint Augustine. Gradually scientific discoveries took place leading to different branches of natural sciences which were non-emotive in character which started questioning religion.

The 15th to 17th century period saw evolution of new discipline of literature - Hobbs, Locke, Montesquieu. This led to the emergence of new social order based on rationality. European modernity is a kind of ideology coming out of renaissance and scientific discoveries.

When we speak about European modernity to take into consideration empiricism, rationality and objectivity. These values in character are empirical in nature which started questioning theological. Spirituality, more or less nature of religion were questioned by secular values through religious reforms. Spirit of science influenced the philosophers and researchers of the time. Secularism was the most important foundation to European modernity. One of the important agendas of European modernity was separation of state from the clutches of church.

Monarchs used to consider themselves descendants of God on earth who got legitimacy from the church. Political order was ruler centric and therefore there was a need for self-assertion among the people and this led to Europe go for political modernity.

Educational transformation was essential to economic, political and value modernity. Education got liberated from Catholic domination which led to the emergence of public school, migration etc. But all these changes would not have taken place without the transformation of man.

Values are abstract standards guiding our everyday behaviour. Value transformation in Europe means values coming from different institutions like bureaucracy, political institution and concepts like equality, fraternity. These values give a kind of ethos to the people of Europe and created a sense of pride that nobody can touch them or reach them because they are superior and this sense of superiority made them rule over the whole world.

European modernity is the result of human reason, which is objective, in character and rational. This modernity is taking man away from dogmas and spiritualism. Whereas modernity in Indian context is revised and questioned. Tradition is not evolving in years but is changing with the passage of time. Nehru glorified modernity in India. The great urban - rural divide was the result of Nehruvian modernity and this led to people becoming sceptical of this term. Indian modernity is 'selective modernity' whereas European modernity is absolute in nature. Nehruvian modernity is both appreciated and condemned at the same time.

Appearance of Gandhiji was not a symbol of modernity. Gandhiji was suffering from inherent contradiction which made him Father of the nation. He had love for Hinduism but at the same time believed in equality for all. He on one hand appreciated Varna system but on the other hand he advocated Varna system should not be based on the basis of birth. He had paradoxical thoughts. A philosopher within him many a times took juxtaposition views on various beliefs. He realised the importance of women power.

Peter Berger says that modernity is a kind of cancer. Modernity throws man out of his country, his heartland and make him settle in a distant country where one is treated like an alien. Modernity has given rise to a confusion which is creating social hopelessness among the new generation.

Anthony Giddens believed that modernity has enormously gratified bourgeois capitalist interest. Modernity is doing appearance, from front it looks beautiful but from the back it is equally deadly in nature. Starting from Nehru to globalisation Indian society has reached to modernity leading to the study of modernisation of Indian tradition.

Modernity entered into India through British endeavours and Bengal Renaissance:

Bengal - Intellectual capital,

Delhi - Political capital,

Bombay - economic capital.

In Bengal the first person to jump for absolute modernity was Rajaram Mohan Roy. He believed modernity means superior culture and traditional means lower status. He is different from Dayanand Saraswati who glorified Hindu culture.

What is tradition? Are tradition and modernity engaging in dialectical relationship? Can the impact of modernity on all traditional society would be identical? Can tradition and modernity mutually share the attribute of each other? Can tradition be variable with time and space and respond to modernity differently? These are the most important questions that sociology intends to address. Therefore sociologist considers that sociology and modernism are first cousin to each other.

Modernity is not Endogenous (derived internally) concept to India, it is a European concept that has produced linear result in case of Europe starting with technology, extending to institution, ideology and values. Important aspects of modernity was so inclusive and exhaustive in Europe that it was perceived that social progress, development, growth and human happiness cannot be imagined without modernity.

Peter Worsley indicates that modernity and sociology are engaged in two distinctive forms of association. Firstly sociology is a product of modernity and secondly sociology also questions modernity. Hence both share a dynamic and dialectical relationship.

Modernity in Europe can be understood from three different stages such as:

- *celebration stage,*
- *questioning stage,*
- *rejection stage.*

The early sociology starting from St Simon to Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Karl Marx, Weber and of late Talcott Parson was engaged in celebrating modernity for different purposes. Immanuel Kant considered that modernity is the spirit of human reason. He believed that mind is liberated from dogmas, myths and superstition under the influence of modernity. Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer conceptualised the technocratic industrial society is a product of modernity where emotions, ritualism, orthodoxy are replaced by rules of law, rationality, growth, technological development and rise of inclusive society. Karl Marx believes that modernity per se cannot be conceptualised as good or bad. The major product of modernity i.e. industry is controlled by class it generates alienation therefore the instruments of modernity should be controlled and used by the state for the furtherance of equity and human happiness. Weber celebrated modernity emphasising on expansion of legal rational authority to every sphere of life and secularisation of religion, growth of cities and celebration of rationality.

Parson and Durkheim glorified modernity emphasising on technocratic form of division of labour, social integration, rise of equality and possibility of mobility. Sociologists during early 19th century were engaged in celebrating modernity for the reason that modernity evolved in Europe through a series of transformations therefore European modernity is programmed, monitored and tested and subsequently evaluated to obtain mass endorsement.

Stages of European modernity

Modernity in Europe evolved through rise of science during 15th - 17th century that questioned theological judgement. It made an attempt to understand the truth through the application of rational mind. It indicated that using his creative faculty of mind man can make a better world possible for himself.

Religious reforms: *modernity in Europe came as a reaction to Orthodoxy of church that ultimately gave way to secular religion that glorified work, commission a profit, conceptualised this world equal to paradise and questioned the logic behind ceremonialism and ritual extravagance.*

European modernity was a search for creation of modern State driven by liberty, freedom, citizenship, balance of power, constitutionalism which were historically unknown to the people. Finally European modernity emphasises on breakdown of agriculture, feudal economy, rise of industrial foreign trade, market, a culmination of profit driven by tranquillised spirit of utilitarianism.

European modernity broke down the centuries old social, cultural, political and moral traditions giving way to the growth of technocratic, progressive, egalitarian, urbanised modern society. All the new nations of the world considered that there is no alternative to modernity because it is only modernity that can generate equality, happiness, growth and inclusiveness society. Modernity spread from Europe to other parts of the world under the influence of colonialism and imperialism. Thus all colonies of the world blindly accepted modernity to accelerate social - economic development of their society.

After First World War European modernity was questioned by a large body of scholars. They alleged that European modernity led to the acceleration of armed race amongst different modern states of the world. They were sceptical about most of the rich nations spending more money on defence than on social sectors. In so-called modern society political inequality, political intolerance was substantially expanded. Therefore questioning to modernity they indicate that morality is being used as an instrument to exploit nature and human life as well.

Peter Berger considers modernity is a global cancer. Indicating that modernity is that you voted for social homelessness, stimulating people to move from one country to another without any emotion and cultural bondage with the place they live in. Hence it leads to disillusionment, restlessness. Therefore he says social distinctions are the manifestations of modernity.

Antonio Gramsci in his theory of hegemony indicates that empirically speaking there is nothing great in modernity for which it is universally accepted but at the same time modernity as a form of ideology has no alternative and this leads to human efficacy being injected into mass mind by families, schools and rules of law and mass media from which there is no escape.

Peter Worsley consider modernity is a double edged weapon. On one hand it guarantees economic development and affluence and on the other hand it results into homelessness, disillusionment and dependency. Same view on modernity is reflected by **Anthony Giddens** in his theory of "double humanities".

European modernity is challenged and rejected in contemporary times by post modern scholars who consider modernity has killed distinction between public and private. It has resulted in the death of individual's independence. Mass media communication has invited market in the living room of man. Modern food, taste,

architecture are detached from aesthetics. Modernity has given way to governmentality, it has resulted into pathological suffering, disillusionment and hopelessness in the minds of the people. Therefore rebellion against modernity is evolving as centrality to the new social movement.

Modernity and tradition in India

Modernity in India has primarily evolved as colonial experience. The early social reformers like Rajaram Mohan Roy, Keshav Chandra Sen considered Indian tradition must be questioned and altered to bridge the gap between the high culture of Europe and low culture of India. Colonial rulers glorified the idea that they are superior technologically and racially therefore they are born rulers, inherently intelligent and progressive. The then non-European culture of East was superstitious, transcendental, hierarchical, antigrowth and unequal. They justify colonial rule indicating that only colonial rule can liberate people belonging to colonies from the stage of savagery to the stage of civilisation. Hence the early reform leaders intended to revolutionise Indian tradition by accepting the modernity in totality. These scholars went for self introspection and looked into the vices present in Indian culture and society in the form of caste system, such as child marriage, ritualism, transcendence, emotional attachment towards Sanskrit values, other worldliness and wanted to change this orientation injecting individualism, rationalism, freedom of spirit and equality.

Yogendra Singh considers that the Brahma Samaj movement was the first step towards the modernisation of Indian tradition. One can find striking difference between Brahma Samaj and Arya Samaj movement. As Arya Samaj movement wanted a synthesis between Indian culture and European culture conceptualising modernity and tradition as not contradictory to each other. Hence Indian modernity can establish a balance between the two.

Abhijit Pathak considers that Indian intelligentsia of 19th-century accepted modernity with scepticism. This is manifested in the program, approach and ideology as well as scholars of Indian Renaissance starting from Dayanand Saraswati to Mahatma Gandhi even including Nehru.

All the other intellectuals and social reformers wanted modernity for India but without the demolition of Indian tradition and they gave importance to Anglo Sanskrit education. They wanted reforms in caste and Hinduism but indicating that all knowledge stems from Vedas thus manifesting a culturally myopic orientation.

Vivekananda, Bankim Chandra, Aurobindo Ghosh all appreciated modernity with a lot of scepticism and most of them established a connectivity between Western and Indian values. Both Bankim Chandra and Rajaram Mohan Roy glorified the teachings of Upanishad. Tilak used ritual festival as a symbol for political

unification of the people of India. Mahatma Gandhi realised that integration of divergent people of India is not possible through a political - ideological program, hence he promoted religious unity among the people to obtain freedom for India.

How modernisation has influenced the Indian tradition is discussed a sociologist in three distinctive stages.

In the first stage sociologist conceptualised that modernity is a European experience, initially introduced by colonial rulers and subsequently undertaken by independent government of India and the impact of modernity on Indian society has been either substantive or peripheral.

These ideas are articulated by MN Srinivas in his analysis of westernisation and social change in India. He considers modernisation is a value loaded concept because it is generally perceived as anything modern is necessarily good. He prefers to use westernisation as against modernisation to understand social change in India advocating 150 years of British rule has resulted into technological changes, institutional changes and value transformation in Indian society. However these changes are selective, optional than being completely wholesome. He gave the example of modern technologies like printing press, telephopnes, newspapers and other agencies of mass media to imply how they glorified traditional values without compromising their modern desirable roles. Therefore tradition and modernity are mutually coexistent and India and one can't replace outrightly the other. The Indian modernity selective, preferential and partial modernity.

According to **Yogendra Singh** most of the sociologists studying modernity in India refuse to understand the impact of modernity in various spheres of public and private life. He believes modernity is a current that comes from different quarters at one go. Therefore it is highly forceful to dismantle tradition. In his book "modernisation of Indian tradition" he writes in detail how different laws like abolition of child marriage act, abolition of Sati, Hindu marriage act, Hindu adoption and maintenance act enormously influenced the status of women in India. Women in traditional Indian society didn't have right over their family, children, property, right to divorce that has now been granted to them. Hence self-assurance to women, respect to their dignity and equality can be considered as impact of modernity in India.

With regard to technology, it has revolutionised both agrarian and industrial modes of production. It has created massive employment opportunity. Beyond caste and family lines, modernity has accelerated occupational mobility. However the benefits of these technologies have not reached to every sections of society. What it calls as variation in internalisation of modernity. Yogendra Singh considers that new technology in the sphere of production has accelerated competition between different stakeholders therefore hierarchical economic system under the influence of modernity is developing dynamic and competitive character.

With regard to political modernity he speaks of constitutional rules, citizenship, formation of political parties, acceleration of public participation in democratic process indicating that traditional domination of selective body over power has completely been demolished and different groups like peasants, factory workers, rural communities are greatly indulging in power struggle to experience mobility.

He writes in detail about education, mobility and value transformation in India indicating that traditional values are slowly disappearing or are on the verge of complete disappearance. Thus a feudalistic, caste-based rural India under the influence of modernity is transformed into competitive and dynamic modern India. This theory is supported by MS Gore and SC Dubey and others to look into series of plans, programs, introduction of independent government to justify theory of modernity as instrumental for complete social change in India.

TN Madan writes that people who accepted modernity have closed mind as compared to those who don't go for modernity and have open mind as they question modernity.

State has nothing to do with religion i.e. secularism being an important part of our preamble to the Constitution. But in India our social life is dominated and influenced by religion e.g. food also has cultural implication- whether vegetarian or non-vegetarian.

Hilferding Rudolf talks about selective modernity i.e. democratic institutions are introduced in India but they are not working as they are working in the West. Democratic institution, green revolution is the symbol of modernity but beneficiaries of modernity are going for political domination without forgetting tradition and caste. Caste is laying a foundation for the articulation of voice. Therefore Indian modernity is Indian in character wherein Andre Beteille tells that "caste old is replaced by caste new".

Subaltern(lower in Position are Rank) descent to modernity offered non-Brahmins in South India to go against hierarchical order of Brahmins. BR Ambedkar indicated that modernity should be universalistic in character. Its benefit should not be pocketed by few people therefore reservation is essential for unprotected people for a long period of time. Modernity should be accessible to marginalised sections of the society. He further says that modernity is a matter of choice that people should go for.

Dr Ambedkar said that in the caste system one doesn't have a choice. To make modernity influential in India one should be allowed to choose his own caste. He did not want modernity to be free from vims of religion. He was allergic to Hinduism and Christianity but he too wanted religion - Gandhiji wanted Hinduism and Ambedkar wanted Buddhism. They both wanted tradition and modernity juxtaposition but how,

it differed. Dr Ambedkar believed that since the benefits of modernity is not reaching the marginalised section they have the right to rebel.

Feminist view on modernity points out that women are twisted between official and domestic demands. More we're going for modernity more are the women becoming victims of it. Sexual harassment and exploitation at place of work, unequal pay for equal work has tilted the benefits of modernity strongly towards their male counterpart.

Protests and Social Reform movements during the colonial period

Introduction

Protest is largely used as a concept in political science and sociology to explain the people's desire for change. Protests may or may not bring forward qualitative change but it offers a sense of satisfaction, a form of meaning and symbolic gratification to the common man in any civil society.

Protest is not incidental or accidental. Protests are driven by interest, ideology. When protest is driven by ideology, it becomes sustainable and offer foundation to social movements. Liberal sociologists consider protest as multidimensional because it can be economic, political, cultural and social.

Protest should be discussed in terms of durability, impact on larger society and degree of participation of the people. Its effectiveness can also be evaluated by the way it is organised, its durability and finally ideological support and resource mobilisation for its continuity. Ramchandra Guha considers protest is manifested in different forms like Pradarshan, Rasta Roko, Jal Samadhi, Fast unto Death (recent Anna Hazare's protest), Gherao etc. Depending upon the intensity of problems addressed, people manifest different forms of protest. Sociologically speaking protest is a symbolic manifestation of People's Power who are dissatisfied with the policies, programmes and symbolic form of cultural domination introduced either by dominant class or by the state. Protest is foundation to social change therefore study of social protest indicates dynamics, inherent contradictions present in social life.

In colonial India a series of social reform programmes was initiated by Indian intelligentsia to inject universalistic, egalitarian, humanistic element into Hindu society that was fragmented by caste systems and Brahminic orthodoxy. Hierarchical Hindu social systems, legitimisation of inequality on the basis of caste and gender are the reasons for which internal reforms became essential. Hindu reform programme was driven by two distinctive criteria:

Firstly to promote unity among all sections of Hindus who were divided on the basis of sectarian identities. Therefore worshipping different kinds of gods and engaging into conflicts and that is producing opportunities for other religious communities to dominate one over the other in Indian society. Therefore unity among Hindus is essential for the survival of Hindu culture and tradition.

Secondly In order to prove that Indian culture is equal, accommodative, liberal, reflexive, dynamic like Western culture Hinduism must have to abandon ritual orthodoxy and ceremonialism. It is further

believed that for the sustainability of Indian society people belonging to different religious faith must have to come together evolving a sense of brotherhood to promote unity among the people of India.

Driven by these twin ideology, two parallel systems of reforms were introduced in India. One was initiated by Arya Samaj movement and subsequently taken up by Theosophical Society-which advocated 'Suddhi movement' and the other which was initiated by Brahmo Samaj led by Rajaram Mohan Roy and subsequently taken by Ramakrishna Mission.

Arya Samaj movement wanted to eliminate attributes of polytheism, ritualism, Brahminic supremacy, sectarian division which persisted in Hindu culture germinating pathological elements resulting into intra-cultural conflict. It believed that no other religious text except Vedas should be considered sacred. It spoke about unity of faith among all Hindus asking them to abandon caste system, pilgrims visit, untouchability and glorify idea of purity of soul and promote fraternity.

Arya Samaj emphasised that once Varna was greatly based upon its qualities and capabilities than on the basis of birth. This movement fascinated a large body of Shudras in case of North India to go for Sanskritisation and challenge Brahminic monopoly. The rise of Jats in North India can be attributed to the impact of Arya Samaj movement. This movement was supported by Lala Lajpat Rai and other nationalist leaders who believed that tranquillised Hinduism can unify the people of India who can offer resistance to colonial power.

Arya Samajists accelerated Suddhi movement in different parts of the country and encouraged the converts to revert back into the fold of Hindu community. The glorification of Hindu culture is a symbolic idiom to public mobilisation which offered foundation to the nationalist movement in India. Theosophical society driven by ideology of Max Muller perceived that Hindu cultural tradition is both unique and ancient. The leaders of the society glorified the cosmic teachings of Bhagwat Gita, Vedas, Upanishads and indicated Hindu theological doctrine are analytical and logical and therefore it could offer a solution to all the problems of the world.

Liberal cultural movement(Brahmo Samaj: Brahmo Samaj movement) was much more dynamic and inclusive as against Arya Samaj movement. It believed that India cannot get away from ignorance, poverty, social discrimination and inequality without multiple forms of reform introduced from different areas of life. It emphasised on women empowerment, liberal education, secular values and challenged the caste system, Brahminic orthodoxy and Hindu religion in totality.

It borrowed ideas from Upanishads and explain the teachings of Upanishads from a rationalistic perspective. One finds out a strong correspondence between the teachings of Brahma Samaj and Ramakrishna Mission as Ramakrishna Mission speaks about:

- *unity of God,*
- *Universality of truth,*
- *secular ideals,*
- *fraternity among people belonging to different religious faith.*

It did not have any political agenda like fighting war against British. It emphasised on creation of missionaries and provided a platform for glorification of religious tolerance, missionaries activities. It opened up schools and colleges in different parts of the country and indicated salvation can be obtained only to knowledge.

In conclusion all these three movements were initiated by upper-class, upper caste Indians to bring reforms in Hindu society preaching that there shouldn't be hierarchical social order and that society can be transformed into egalitarian system driven by the principle of unity, harmony and equality.

Many scholars indicated that early reform movements could not achieve considerable success because most of the movements were initiated by upper-class, middle-class youth who did not have influence over the mass psychology in a big way, most of the teachings of this movement were highly abstract and philosophical which common man failed to understand.

As a reaction to these movements parallel movements were initiated by subaltern groups who glorified the idea that the reform movements are intending to re-establish Brahminic, Sanskritic domination over the masses at large.

Ghanshyam Shah makes a distinction between culture and class movement indicating reform movements wanted to bring change within system whereas peasant movement wanted to bring change off the system.

Yogendra Singh considers that early reforms programme largely explained India's quest for modernity abandoning its association with the long Orthodox cultural tradition. Therefore modernity in India primarily enter through Indian Renaissance involving upper caste and upper-class.

Subaltern Reform movements

Desire for change in colonial India was not just an upper caste, middle-class aspiration rather the temptation for change to rebellion and protest was glorified in southern India and Maharashtra in the form of **Self-respect Movement, SNDP Movement, Satya Shodak Samaj Movement**.

Jyotiba Phule laid the foundation of Satya Shodak Samaj movement in Maharashtra which glorified the ideology that indigenous rulers of India belong to Shudra community. Their land was full of prosperity, harmony and unity. However, with the advent of Aryans into North India and subsequently their conquest over the other parts of the country injected caste systems into traditional egalitarian society. Caste identity, variation in occupations based upon caste divided the Shudras who were historically equal. The Shudras in their own soil, forgetting their own culture started fighting war with each other.

Thus people started evaluating their status with reference to Brahminic ideas, practices and the concept of Paap- Punya, ritualism was introduced in the society as a result masses were deprived of their economic, political, civil rights. Jyotiba Phule wanted all the non-Brahmins of West India to develop a newfound identity of Bahujan and stand unified together against Hindu culture, Brahminic orthodoxy and ceremonialism. He gave a new identity to all the non-Brahmins of Maharashtra as Marathas. Therefore the rise of Maratha consciousness as against Brahminic consciousness is a manifestation of subaltern cultural protest.

Self-respect movement in South India was initiated by Ramasamy Naicker. This movement encourage unity among all the non-Brahmins of South India indicating that South Indian culture is ancient, unique and endogenous. Caste is pathological element introduced into egalitarian sort Indian society. He equated the position of non-Brahmins with that of blacks in the West and encourage the non-Brahmins to go for education, small family names and stay away from spiritual activities and commit oneself to intensive economic activities. He asked people to glorify their self-identity rather than to be tempted by Sanskritisation and added reservation in provincial assemblies on the basis of caste.

It is through his leadership the people forgetting inter-caste differences unified and seized state power from 1920 onwards under the banner of Dravidian movement. During this movement anti-Brahminic, anti Sanskritic, anti Hindu and anti-North Indian sentiments got momentum. This movement cannot be considered as secessionist movement because it was a Protest against an alien culture enforced upon the indigenous community. When GS Ghurye considers this movement as secessionist MS Rao call this movement as reactionary reflexive movement.

SNDP Movement was initiated by Narayanan Guru who was a great admirer of Gandhiji. He initiated protest against the Brahmin in Kerala, asking the non-Brahmins and non-Nair caste to stand unified.

He ran parallel schools and temples for lower caste in which priests and teachers were belonging to lower caste origin. He indicated that Brahminic supremacy is a product of the access to education, Association with your occupation. If non-Brahmins follow this secular standard then they will be never subdued to Brahmins.

The subaltern movement offered foundation to Dr Ambedkar to search for justice and equality for the Dalits in India. Ambedkar rejected Manu Smriti, he was unhappy with the reform movement initiated by Gandhiji. He instituted Jat-Pat-Todak Samaj and believed that one cannot get justice and equality staying within the framework of caste and Hinduism. Hence he encouraged conversion into the fold of Buddhism. He believed that historic discrimination associated with them cannot be addressed by social reforms. Hence he suggested constitutional guarantee for freedom, liberty and equality for the Dalit community in India.

In conclusion it can be advocated that reform programmes in India was initiated from two sectors: upper caste initiated reforms to make Hindu culture and Indian society more inclusive, egalitarian and accommodative;

the subaltern group conceptualised these reforms as a strategy to re-enslave the marginalised groups in a big way. Therefore rejecting these reforms they went for organised protests against caste and Hinduism and wanted distinctive and equalitarian identity for themselves.

Social reforms indicate inherent dialectics present in colonial period where different stakeholders of the society like middle-class, upper caste, Dalits and backward classes had different vision about social change in India.

Peasants Movements

From 1857 to 1920 a series of peasant movement came into prominence in agrarian India. Peasant movements advocate offered a sense of integration among the people cutting across their religious caste and language. Most of the peasant movements came as a reaction to:

- *Growth of absentee landlordism,*
- *the presence of large body of unauthorised zamindars,*
- *forced eviction of peasantry from the land on the grounds of non-payment of revenues,*
- *land tenure system introduced by the British,,*
- *high interest rates imposed on the peasants on seasonal loans,*
- *no improvement in conditions of agriculture,*
- *brutality of police and private army of landlords,*
- *no effective measures to protect patients from natural calamities.*

The plight of peasants were universally same throughout India but their conditions, locations and identities were different therefore all the movements e.g. Eka Movement, Moplah Rebellion, Kheda Satyagrah offered a platform for the rise of endogenous leadership who spoke in the language about common problems of the people. This led to integration of people of India and it manifested in the form of protest against the exploitative colonial policies.

Peasants movements offered foundation to the rise of Kisan Sabha, that started operating from every village, encouraged people to come out of their home, discuss their common plights, evolved strategies so as to address to their sufferings and exploitation.

By 1930s Kisan Sabha movement made an all India presence in different parts of the country under the banner of "All India Kisan Sabha". The members of the Sabha started burning tax records, attacked police, engaged in war with the private army of landlords compelling them to restructure tax rules to the advantage of peasantry. Kisan Sabha offered a platform for the coalition between different groups of Indian population. As a result coordination was established between landlord, intelligentsia and Indian masses which provided a solid platform for Nationalist Movement in India.

Peasant protest was not just confined to the heartlands of the country rather Birsa Munda movement, Santhal rebellion, Koel Uprising got a momentum in central part of tribal India. A R Desai rightly points out that Peasant Movement in India broke down the regional, linguistic and tribal-caste division among the people of India injecting into them a common class consciousness. Colonial land revenue policy driven by capitalist interest reduced Indian peasants worse than proletariats in comparison to capitalist Britain. As a result deposed landlords, poor peasants, middle-class youths in one tone and spirit glorified the idea of Indian nationalism.

Thus protest and movement in India had a historic impact on the rise of modern India indicating that exploitation, poverty as a form of one's experience can override the distinction among people which was historically glorified in terms of caste and culture.