

# Indian Legal and Administrative reforms during British India

**\*Mallikarjunaiah.D.M. Asst Professor, HOD Dept of History, Sri Shankar Anand Singh Govt First Grade College – Hosapete.**

## Abstract

Intense world-wide competition for markets, sources of raw materials and outlets for capital investment now began. The competition for colonies and semi-colonies became increasingly intense and bitter as areas open to fresh colonial domination became scarce. Facing a challenge to its dominant position in world capitalism from newcomers, Britain began a vigorous effort to consolidate its control over its existing empire and to extend it further. Moreover, after 1850, a very large amount of British capital was invested in railways, loans to the Government of India, and to a smaller extent in tea plantations, coal mining, jute mills, shipping, trade and banking. It was necessary that, to render this British capital secure from economic and political dangers, British rule in India be clamped down even more firmly. Consequently, there was a renewed upsurge of imperial control and imperialist ideology which was reflected in the reactionary policies of the viceroynalties of Lytton, Dufferin, Lansdowne, Elgin and, above all, Curzon. The Revolt of 1857 gave a severe jolt to the British administration in India and made its reorganization inevitable. The Government of India's structure and policies underwent significant changes in the decades following the Revolt. But more important for changes in Indian economy and government was the inauguration of a new stage of colonialism in India. The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed the spread and intensification of the Industrial Revolution. Gradually, other countries of Europe, the USA and Japan underwent industrialisation, and the manufacturing and financial supremacy of Britain in world economy came to an end.

An Act of Parliament in 1858 transferred the power to govern from the East India Company to the British Crown. While authority over India had previously been wielded by the directors of the Company and the Board of Control, now this power was to be exercised by a Secretary of State for India aided by a Council. The Secretary of State was a member of the British Cabinet and as such was responsible to Parliament. Thus the ultimate power over India remained with Parliament. Under the Act, government was to be carried on as before by the Governor-General who was also given the title of Viceroy or Crown's personal representative

*Keywords: Act of Parliament in 1858, the British administration, the Governor-General. Secretary of State.*

## Introduction

The Imperial Legislative Council possessed no real powers and should not be seen as a sort of elementary or weak parliament. It was merely an advisory body. It could not discuss any important measures, and no financial measures at all, without the previous approval of the government. It had no control over the budget. It could not discuss the actions of the administration; the members could not even ask questions about them. In other words, the Legislative Council had no control over the executive. Moreover, no bill passed by it could become an Act till it was approved by the Governor-General. On top of all this, the Secretary of State could disallow any of its Acts. Thus, the only important function of the

Legislative Council was to ditto official measures and give them the appearance of having been passed by a legislative body. In theory, the non-official Indian members were added to the Council to represent Indian views. But the Indian members of the Legislative Council were few in number and were not elected by the Indian people but nominated by the Governor-General whose choice invariably fell on princes and their ministers, big zamindars, big merchants, or retired senior government officials

In India the Act of 1858 provided that the Governor-General would have an Executive Council whose members were to act as heads of different departments and as his official advisers. The Council discussed all important matters and decided them by a majority vote; but the Governor-General had the power to override any important decision of the Council. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 enlarged the Governor-General's Council for the purpose of making laws, in which capacity it was known as the Imperial Legislative Council. The Governor-General was authorised to add to his Executive Council between six and twelve members of whom at least half had to be non-officials who could be Indian or English.

Charles Wood, the Secretary of State for India, while moving the Indian Councils Bill of 1861, said: "All experience teaches us that where a dominant race rules another, the mildest form of government is a despotism."

### **Objective:**

This paper seeks to outline the chief characteristics of British Administration in India after the 1857 revolt

### **Provincial Administration:**

Further changes in these arrangements were made in 1882. The system of giving fixed grants to the provinces was ended and, instead, a province was to get the entire income from certain sources or revenue within it and a fixed share of the income from other sources. Thus, all sources of revenue were now divided into three—general, provincial, and those to be divided between the centre and the provinces. The different measures of financial decentralisation discussed above did not really mean the beginning of genuine provincial autonomy or of Indian participation in provincial administration. They were much more in the nature of administrative reorganization whose chief aims were to keep down expenditure and increase income.

The British had divided India for administrative convenience into provinces, three of which—Bengal, Madras and Bombay—were known as Presidencies. The Presidencies were administered by a Governor and his Executive Council of three, who were appointed by the Crown. The Presidency governments possessed more rights and powers than governments of other provinces which were administered by Lieutenant Governors and Chief Commissioners appointed by the Governor-General.

The provincial governments enjoyed a great deal of autonomy before 1833 when their power to pass laws was taken away and their expenditure subjected to strict central control. But experience soon showed that a vast country like India could not be efficiently administered on the principle of strict centralisation.

The evil of extreme centralisation was most obvious in the field of finance. The revenues from all over the country and from different sources were gathered at the centre and then distributed by it to the provincial governments. The central government exercised strict control over the smallest details of provincial expenditure. But this system proved quite wasteful in practice. It was not possible for the central government to supervise the efficient collection of revenues by a

provincial government or to keep adequate check over its expenditure. The authorities therefore decided to decentralize public finance.

The first step in the direction of separating central and provincial finances was taken in 1870 by Lord Mayo. The provincial governments were granted fixed sums out of central revenues for the administration of certain services like police, jails, education, medical services, and roads and were asked to administer them as they wished. Lord Mayo's scheme was enlarged in 1877 by Lord Lytton who transferred to the provinces certain other heads of expenditure like land revenue, excise, general administration, and law and justice. To meet the additional expenditure a provincial government was to get a fixed share of the income realised from that province from certain sources like stamps, excise taxes, and income tax.

In theory as well as in practice, the central government remained supreme and continued to exercise effective and detailed control over the provincial governments. This was inevitable, for both the central government and the provincial governments were completely subordinated to the Secretary of State and the British government.

#### **Local Bodies:**

Financial difficulties led the government to further decentralize administration by promoting local government through municipalities and district boards. The Industrial Revolution gradually transformed European economy and society in the nineteenth century. India's increasing contact with Europe and new modes of imperialism and economic exploitation made it necessary that some of the European advances in economy, sanitation, and education should be transplanted in India.

Moreover, the rising Indian nationalist movement demanded the introduction of modern improvements in civic life. Thus the need for education of the masses, sanitation, water supply, better roads, and other civic amenities was increasingly felt. The government could no longer afford to ignore it. But its finances were already in disorder due to heavy expenditure on the army and the railways. It could not increase its income through new taxes as the burden of the existing taxation was already very heavy on the poor and a further addition to it was likely to create discontent against the government.

On the other hand, the government did not want to tax the upper classes, especially the British civil servants, planters and traders. But the authorities felt that the people would not mind paying new taxes if they knew that their proceeds would be spent on their own welfare. It was therefore decided to transfer local services like education, health, sanitation and water supply to local bodies who would finance them through local taxes.

Many Englishmen had pressed for the formation of local bodies on another ground as well. They believed that associating Indians with the administration in some capacity or the other would prevent their becoming politically disaffected. This association could take place at the level of local bodies without in any way endangering British monopoly of power in India.

Local bodies were first formed between 1864 and 1868, but almost in every case they consisted of nominated members and were presided over by District Magistrates. They did not, therefore, represent local self-government at all. Nor did intelligent Indians accept them as such. They looked upon them as instruments for the extraction of additional taxes from the people. A step forward, though a very hesitant and inadequate one, was taken in 1882 by Lord Ripon's government. A government resolution laid down the policy of administering local affairs largely through rural and urban local bodies, a majority of whose members would be non-officials. These non-official members would be elected by the people wherever and whenever officials felt that it was possible to introduce elections.

The resolution also permitted the election of a non-official as chairperson of a local body. But the elected members were in a minority in all the district boards and in many of the municipalities. They were, moreover, elected by a small number of voters since the right to vote was severely restricted. District officials continued to act as presidents of district boards though non-officials gradually became chairpersons of municipal committees.

The government also retained the right to exercise strict control over the activities of the local bodies and suspend and supersede them at its own discretion. The result was that except in the Presidency cities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, the local bodies functioned just like departments of the government and were in no way good examples of local self-government. All the same, the politically conscious Indians welcomed Ripon's resolution and worked actively in these local bodies in the hope that in time they could be transformed into effective organs of local self-government.

### **Chances in the Army:**

The Indian army was carefully reorganized after 1858, most of all to prevent the recurrence of another revolt. The rulers had seen that their bayonets were the only secure foundation of their rule. Several steps were taken to minimise, if not completely eliminate, the capacity of Indian soldiers to revolt. First, the domination of the army by its European branch was carefully guaranteed. The proportion of Europeans to Indians in the army was raised and fixed at one to two in the Bengal army and two to five in the Madras and Bombay armies. Further, the European troops were kept in key geographical and military positions. The crucial branches of the army like artillery and, later in the twentieth century, tanks and armoured corps were put exclusively in European hands.

The older policy of excluding Indians from the officer corps was strictly maintained. Till 1914 no Indian could rise higher than the rank of a subedar. Second, the organisation of the Indian section of the army was based on the policy of 'balance and counterpoise' or 'divide and rule' so as to prevent its chance of uniting again in an anti-British uprising. Discrimination on the basis of caste, region and religion was practiced in recruitment to the army.

A fiction was created that Indians consisted of 'martial' and 'non-martial' classes. Soldiers from Awadh, Bihar, central India, and south India, who had first helped the British conquer India but had later taken part in the Revolt of 1857, were declared to be non-martial. They were no longer taken in the army on a large scale. On the other hand, Punjabis, Gurkhas, and Pathans who had assisted in the suppression of the Revolt, were declared to be martial and were recruited in large numbers. By 1875, half of the British Indian army was recruited from Punjab. In addition, Indian regiments were made up of a mixture of various castes and groups which were so placed as to balance each other. Communal, caste, tribal and regional loyalties were encouraged among the soldiers so that the sentiment of nationalism would not grow among them. For example, caste and communal companies were introduced in most regiments.

Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India, wrote to the Viceroy Canning in 1861:

I never wish to see again a great army, very much the same in its feelings and prejudices and connections, confident in its strength, and so disposed to rise in rebellion together. If one regiment mutinies, I should like to have the next regiment so alien that it would be ready to fire into it. Thus the Indian army remained a purely mercenary force.

Moreover, every effort was made to keep it separated from the life and thoughts of the rest of the population. It was isolated from nation-alist ideas by every possible means. Newspapers, journals and nationalist publications were prevented from reaching the soldiers. But, all such efforts failed in the long run and sections of the Indian army played an important role in India's struggle for freedom. The Indian army became in time a very costly military machine. In 1904 it absorbed nearly 52 per cent of the Indian revenues. This was because it served more than one purpose. India, being the most prized colonial possession of the time, had to be constantly defended from the competing imperialisms of Russia, France and Germany. This led to a big increase in the size of the Indian army. Second, the Indian troops were not maintained for India's defence alone. The Indian army was the chief instrument for the expansion and consolidation of British power and possessions in Asia and Africa. Lastly, the British section of the army served as an army of occupation. It was the ultimate guarantee of the British hold over the country. Its cost had, however, to be met by Indian revenues; it was in fact a very heavy burden on them.

### **Public Services:**

We have seen that Indians had little control over the Government of India. They were not permitted to play any part in the making of laws or in determining administrative policies. In addition, they were excluded from the bureaucracy which put these policies into practice.

All positions of power and responsibility in the administration were occupied by the members of the Indian Civil Service who were recruited through an annual open competitive examination, held in London. Indians could also appear for this examination. Satyendranath Tagore, brother of Rabindranath Tagore, was the first Indian to do so successfully in 1863. Almost every year thereafter one or two Indians joined the coveted ranks of the Civil Service, but their number was

negligible compared with that of the English entrants. In practice, the doors of the Civil Service remained barred to Indians for they suffered from numerous handicaps. The competitive examination was held in faraway London. It was conducted through the medium of the alien English language. It was based on Classical Greek and Latin learning which could be acquired only after a prolonged and costly course of studies in England.

In addition, the maximum age for entry into the Civil Service was gradually reduced from twenty-three in 1859 to nineteen in 1878. If a young Indian of twenty-three found it difficult to succeed in the Civil Service competition, the Indian of nineteen found it almost impossible to do so. In other departments of administration—police, public works, medicine, posts and telegraphs, forests, engineering, customs and, later, railways—the superior and highly paid posts were likewise reserved for British citizens. This preponderance of Europeans in all strategic posts was not accidental. The rulers of India believed it to be an essential condition for the maintenance of British supremacy in India. Thus Lord Kimberley, Secretary of State, laid down in 1893 that “it is indispensable that an adequate number of the members of the Civil Service shall always be Europeans;” and the Viceroy, Lord Lansdowne, stressed “the absolute necessity of keeping the government of this widespread empire in European hands, if that empire is to be maintained.”

Under Indian pressure the different administrative services were gradually Indianised after 1918; but the positions of control and authority were still kept in British hands. Also, the people soon discovered that Indianisation of these services had not put any part of political power in their hands. The Indians in these services functioned as agents of British rule and loyally served Britain’s imperial purposes.

The Revolt of 1857 led the British to reverse their policy towards the Indian States. Before 1857, they had availed themselves of every opportunity to annex princely states. This policy was now abandoned. Most of the Indian princes had not only remained loyal to the British but had actively aided the latter in suppressing the Revolt. As Lord Canning, the Viceroy, put it, they had acted as “breakwaters in the storm”. Their loyalty was now rewarded with the announcement that their right to adopt heirs would be respected and the integrity of their territories guaranteed against future annexation. Moreover, the experience of the Revolt had convinced the British authorities that the princely states could serve as useful allies and supporters in case of popular opposition or revolt. Canning wrote in 1860:

It was long ago said by Sir John Malcolm that if we made All India into Zillah’s (districts), it was not in the nature of things that our Empire should last 50 years: But that if we could keep up a number of Native States without political power, but as royal instruments, we should exist in India as long as our naval supremacy was maintained. Of the substantial truth of this opinion I have no doubt; and the recent events have made it more deserving of our attention than ever. It was, therefore, decided to use the princely states as firm props of British rule in India. As the British historian R.E. Roberts remarked: “to preserve them as a bulwark of the empire has ever since been a principle of British policy.”

Their perpetuation was, however, only one aspect of the British policy towards the princely states. The other was their complete subordination to the British authorities. While even before the Revolt of 1857 the British had in practice interfered in the internal affairs of these states, in theory they had been considered as subsidiary but sovereign powers. This position was now entirely changed. As the price of their continued existence, the princes were made to acknowledge Britain as the paramount power. In 1876, Queen Victoria assumed the title of the Empress of India to emphasise British sovereignty over the entire Indian subcontinent.

Lord Curzon later made it clear that the princes ruled their states merely as agents of the British Crown. The princes accepted this subordinate position and willingly became junior partners in the empire because they were assured of their continued existence as rulers of their states. As the paramount power, the British claimed the right to supervise the internal government of the princely states. They not only interfered in the day-to-day administration through the Residents but insisted on appointing and dismissing ministers and other high officials. Sometimes the rulers themselves were removed or deprived of their powers.

One motive for such interference as provided by the British was their desire to give these states a modern administration so that their integration with British India would be complete. This integration and the consequent interference were also encouraged by the development of all-India railways, postal and telegraph systems, currency, and a common economic life. Another motive for interference was provided by the growth of popular democratic and nationalist movements in many of the states. On the one hand, the British authorities helped the rulers suppress these movements; on the other, they tried to eliminate the most serious of administrative abuses in these states.

### **Administrative Policies:**

British attitude towards India and, consequently, their policies in the subcontinent changed for the worse after the Revolt of 1857. While before 1857 they had tried, however half-heartedly and hesitatingly, to modernize India, they now consciously began to follow reactionary policies. As the historian Percival Spear has put it, “the Indian Government’s honeymoon with progress was over.” We have seen above how the organs of administrative control in India and in England, the Indian army and the civil service were reorganized to exclude Indians from an effective share in administration. Previously at least lip-service had been paid to the idea that the British were ‘training’ and ‘preparing’ the Indians for self-government and would eventually transfer political power to their hands.

The view was now openly put forward that because of their inherent social and cultural defects the Indians were unfit to rule themselves and that they must be ruled by Britain for an indefinite period. This reactionary policy was reflected in many fields.

**Divide and Rule:**

The British had conquered India by taking advantage of the disunity among the Indian powers and by playing them against one another. After 1858 they continued to follow this policy of divide and rule by turning the princes against the people, province against province, caste against caste, group against group and, above all, Hindus against Muslims. The unity displayed by Hindus and Muslims during the Revolt of 1857 had disturbed the foreign rulers. They were determined to break this unity so as to weaken the rising nationalist movement. In fact, they missed no opportunity to do so. Immediately after the Revolt they repressed Muslims, confiscated their lands and property on a large scale, and declared Hindus to be their favorites.

After 1870 this policy was reversed and an attempt was made to turn upper- class and middle-class Muslims against the nationalist movement. The government cleverly used the attractions of government service to create a split along religious lines among the educated Indians. Because of industrial and commercial backwardness and the near-absence of social services, educated Indians depended almost entirely on government service for employment.

There were few other openings for them. This led to keen competition among them for the available government posts. The government utilised this competition to fan provincial and communal rivalry and hatred. It promised official favours on a communal basis in return for loyalty and so played educated Muslims against educated Hindus.

**Hostility to Educated Indians:**

The Government of India had actively encouraged modern education after 1833. The Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were started in 1857 and higher education spread rapidly thereafter. Many British officials commended the refusal of educated Indians to participate in the Revolt of 1857. But this favourable official attitude towards educated Indians soon changed because some of them had begun to use their recently acquired modern knowledge to analyse the imperialistic character of British rule and to put forward demands for Indian participation in administration.

The officials became actively hostile to higher education and to educated Indians when the latter began to organise a nationalist movement among the people and founded the Indian National Congress in 1885. The officials now took active steps to curtail higher education. They sneered at the educated Indians whom they commonly referred to as babus. Thus, the British turned against that group of Indians who had imbibed modern western knowledge and who stood for progress along modern lines. Such progress was, however, opposed to the basic interests and policies of British imperialism in India. The official opposition to educated Indians and higher education shows that British rule in India had already exhausted whatever potentialities for progress it originally possessed.



### **Attitude towards the Zamindars**

While being hostile to the forward- looking educated Indians, the British now turned for friendship to the most reactionary group of Indians, the princes, zamindars and landlords. We have already examined above the changed policy towards the princes and the official attempt to use them as a dam against the rise of popular and nationalist movements. The zamindars and landlords too were placated in the same manner. For example, the lands of most of the talukdars of Awadh were restored to them. The zamindars and landlords were now hailed as the traditional and 'natural' leaders of the Indian people. Their interests and privileges were protected. They were secured in the possession of their land at the cost of the peasants and were utilised as counterweights against the nationalist-minded intelligentsia.

The Viceroy Lord Lytton openly declared in 1876 that "the Crown of England should henceforth be identified with the hopes, the aspirations, the sympathies and interests of a powerful native aristocracy." The zamindars and landlords in return recognised that their position was closely bound up with the maintenance of British rule and became its firm supporters.

### **Attitude towards Social Reforms**

As a part of the policy of alliance with the conservative classes, the British abandoned their previous policy of helping the social reformers. They believed that their measures of social reform, such as the abolition of the custom of sati and permission to widows to remarry, had been a major cause of the Revolt of 1857. They, therefore, gradually began to side with orthodox opinion and stopped their support to the reformers. Thus, as Jawaharlal Nehru has put it in the Discovery of India, "Because of this natural alliance of the British power with the reactionaries in India, it became the guardian and upholder of many an evil custom and practice, which it otherwise condemned."

In fact, the British were in this respect on the horns of a dilemma. If they favoured social reform and passed laws to this effect, the orthodox Indians opposed them and declared that a government of foreigners had no right to interfere in the internal social affairs of Indians. On the other hand, if they did not pass such laws, they helped perpetuate social evils and were condemned by socially-progressive Indians. It may, however, be noted that the British did not always remain neutral on social questions.

By supporting the status quo they indirectly gave protection to existing social evils. Moreover, by encouraging casteism and communalism for political purposes, they actively encouraged social fragmentation and backwardness.

### **Extreme Backwardness of Social Services**

While social services like education, sanitation and public health, water supply, and rural roads made rapid progress in Europe during the nineteenth century, in India they remained at an extremely backward level. The Government of India spent most of its large income on the army and wars and the administrative services, and starved the social services. For example, in 1886, of its total net revenue of nearly Rs 47 crore the Government of India spent nearly Rs 19.41 crore on the army and Rs 17 crore on civil administration, but less than Rs 2 crore on education, medicine, and public health and only Rs 65 lakh on irrigation.

The few halting steps that were taken in the direction of providing services like sanitation, water supply and public health were usually confined to urban areas, and that too to the so-called civil lines or British or modern parts of the cities. They mainly served the Europeans and a handful of upper-class Indians who lived in the European part of the cities.

**Labour Legislation:**The condition of workers in modern factories and plantations in the nineteenth century was miserable. They had to work between 12 and 16 hours a day and there was no weekly day of rest. Women and children worked the same long hours as men. The wages were extremely low, ranging from Rs 4 to Rs 20 per month. The factories were overcrowded, badly lighted and aired, and completely unhygienic. Work on machines was hazardous, and accidents very common.

The Government of India, which was generally pro-capitalist, took some half-hearted and totally inadequate steps to mitigate the sorry state of affairs in the modern factories, many of which were owned by Indians. In this it was only in part moved by humanitarian considerations. The manufacturers of Britain put constant pressure on it to pass factory laws. They were afraid that cheap labour would enable Indian manufacturers to outsell them in the Indian market. The first Indian Factory Act was passed in 1881. The Act dealt primarily with the problem of child labour.

It laid down that children between 7 years and 12 years of age would not work for more than 9 hours a day. Children would also get four holidays in a month. The Act also provided for the proper fencing off of dangerous machinery. The second Indian Factories Act was passed in 1891. It provided for a weekly holiday for all workers. Working hours for women were fixed at 11 hours per day, whereas daily hours of work for children were reduced to 7. Hours of work for men were still left unregulated.

Neither of these two Acts applied to British-owned tea and coffee plantations. On the contrary, the government gave every help to the foreign planters to exploit their workers in a most ruthless manner. Most of the tea plantations were situated in Assam which was very thinly populated and had an unhealthy climate. Labour to work in these plantations had therefore to be brought from outside. The planters would not attract workers from outside by paying high wages. Instead they used coercion and fraud to recruit them and then keep them as virtual slaves on the plantations. The Government of India gave planters full help and passed penal laws in 1863, 1865, 1870, 1873 and 1882 to enable them to do so. Once a labourer had signed a contract to go and work in a plantation, he could not refuse to do so. Any breach of contract by a labourer was a criminal offence, the planter also having the power to arrest him.

Better labour laws were, however, passed in the twentieth century under the pressure of the rising trade union movement. Still, the condition of the Indian working class remained extremely depressed and deplorable. The average worker lived below the margin of subsistence. Summing up the condition of the Indian workers under British rule, Prof. Jurgen Kuczynski, the well-known German economic historian, wrote in 1938: "Underfed, housed like animals, without light and air and water, the Indian industrial worker is one of the most exploited of all in the world of industrial capitalism."

## Conclusion

In 1858, the British Crown assumed sovereignty over India from the East India Company and Parliament enacted the first statute for the governance of India under the direct rule of the British government ---the Government of India Act, 1858. By this Act, the powers of the crown were to be exercised by the Secretary of State of India – who was assisted by a council of 15 members (known as the council of India). The Secretary of State was made responsible to the British parliament and he governed India through the Governor General assisted by an Executive Council which consisted of high officials of the Government. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 introduced a grain of popular element in the Governor General Executive council. In the year 1892, Indians found their way in the Provincial Legislative Councils through the Indian Councils Act 1892. Thereafter Indian Council Act, 1909 or Morley-Minto Act envisaged a separate electorate for Muslims. Government of India Act, 1919 Or Montague-Chelmsford Reforms introduced Dyarchy system in the provinces. The Provincial subjects of administration were to be divided into 2 categories: Transferred and Reserved. The Transferred subjects were to be administered by the Governor with the aid of ministers responsible to the Legislative Council. The Governor and the Executive Council were to administer the reserved subjects without any responsibility to the legislature. Later Government of India Act, 1935 provided for the establishment of All-India Federation consisting of the British Provinces and the Princely States. The joining of Princely States was voluntary and as a result the federation did not come into existence. Dyarchy was introduced at the Centre (E.g., Department of Foreign Affairs and Defence were reserved for the Governor General). Provincial autonomy replaced Dyarchy in provinces. They were granted separate legal identify. Finally the Indian Independence Act, 1947 was the legislation passed by the British Parliament that officially approved the independence of India and the partition of India. Passed in June 1947, the Act basically stipulated that: \*The British Raj of India shall be terminated on the midnight of August 15th, 1947 \*An independent dominion of India shall be created out of the United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bombay Presidency, Madras Presidency, the Carnatic, East Punjab, West Bengal, Assam and the Northeast Frontier Agency. The territories of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and the Lakshadweep Islands are also turned over to the Indian Dominion. \*An independent dominion of Pakistan shall be created out of the provinces of West Punjab, East Bengal, Baluchistan and Sindh. \*That all Indian princely states shall be released from their official commitments and treaty relationships with the British Empire, and will be free to join either dominion. \*Both Dominions will be completely self-governing in their internal affairs, foreign affairs and national security, but the King of England will continue to be their head of state, represented by the Governor-General of India and a new Governor-General of Pakistan. Both Dominions shall convene their Constituent Assemblies and write their respective constitutions.

## References

1. Andrews, C.F. (2017). India and the Simon Report. Routledge reprint of 1930 first edition. p. 11. ISBN 9781315444987.
2. Moor-Gilbert, Bart. Writing India, 1757–1990: The Literature of British India (1996) on fiction written in English
3. Mukherjee, Soumyen. "Origins of Indian Nationalism: Some Questions on the Historiography of Modern India." Sydney Studies in Society and Culture 13 (2014). online

4. Parkash, Jai. "Major trends of historiography of revolutionary movement in India-Phase II." (PhD dissertation, Maharshi Dayanand University, 2013). online
5. Philips, Cyril H. ed. *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon* (1961), reviews the older scholarship
6. Stern, Philip J (2009). "History and Historiography of the English East India Company: Past, Present, and Future". *History Compass*. 7 (4): 1146–80. doi:10.1111/j.1478-0542.2009.00617.x.
7. Whitehead, Clive (2005). "The historiography of British imperial education policy, Part I: India". *History of Education*. 34 (3): 315–329. doi:10.1080/00467600500065340.
8. Winks, Robin, ed. *Historiography* (1999) vol. 5 in William Roger Louis, eds. *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, chapters 11–15, online
9. Winks, Robin W. *The Historiography of the British Empire-Commonwealth: Trends, Interpretations and Resources* (1966); this book is by a different set of authors from the previous 1999 entry online
10. Young, Richard Fox, ed., *Indian Christian Historiography from Below, from Above, and in Between India and the Indianness of Christianity: Essays on Understanding—Historical, Theological, and Bibliographical—in Honor of Robert Eric Frykenberg* (2009)
11. Durant, Will (2011, reprint). *The case for India*. New York, N.Y: Simon and Schuster.
12. Ellis, Catriona (2009). "Education for All: Reassessing the Historiography of Education in Colonial India". *History Compass*. 7 (2): 363–75. doi:10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00564.x.
13. Gilmartin, David (2015). "The Historiography of India's Partition: Between Civilization and Modernity". *The Journal of Asian Studies*. 74 (1): 23–41. doi:10.1017/s0021911814001685.
14. Major, Andrea (2011). "Tall tales and true: India, historiography and British imperial imaginings". *Contemporary South Asia*. 19 (3): 331–32. doi:10.1080/09584935.2011.594257.
15. Mantena, Rama Sundari. *The Origins of Modern Historiography in India: Antiquarianism and Philology* (2012)