Chapter 1: 'Reasonable' Imperialism and the Manifestations of Reform: Western India in the Nineteenth Century

Reform emerges as the activating substance of English education in the various historical analyses of English education in India. A cursory look at the dictionary definition of the term 'reform' ideates a process of re-view followed by re-structuration, rather than destruction followed by re-creation; in other words, a re-ordering rather than creation of a radically new order:

> re·form *vt,vi* [VP6A, 2A] make or become better by removing or putting right what is bad or wrong/; *~ a sinner/one's character/ the world*; *~ oneself*; a *~ed man*, one who has given up his bad ways and is now living a good life. □n 1 [U] ~ing; removal of vices, imperfections, etc: *agitate for social or political ~*; *the Reform Bill of 1832*, (GB) that which extended the franchise and improved parliamentary representation. 2 [C] instance of ~; change made in order to remove imperfections:…
> (Hornby, 707)

The various meanings are governed by a shared idea of purgation of imperfections from an existing state of being to improve, that is, enhance something, rather than rejecting and replacing it. When considered in the context of change at a larger level of the social or political systems, it implies a politically moderate attitude towards change, designed to produce gradual and fractional transformation(s); allowing the whole to prevail while modifying the parts.

The idea of reform marks its organised presence in India in the form of a movement for social and religious changes initiated and propagated primarily by native intellectuals with the support of colonial officials in early nineteenth century. The beginnings of what is popularly identified as the Age of Reform in India can be traced to the 1820s. The impulse towards native reform is often traced back to the British presence in India and the concomitant introduction of Western education/ideas. Popular histories of the Age of Reform in Gujarat identify Western education as the bearer of Enlightenment reason, which was then, sought to be disseminated in the larger society by the few who accessed it.

This chapter traces reform in the context of Britain and Gujarat beginning with the early nineteenth century interventions up to the revolt of 1857 which signalled an interruption in the progress of reform and a positive attitude towards British ideas and presence that reform initiatives largely represented. It observes how the nature of reform was marked by regional specificities which guided a range of responses and attitudes to the revolt of 1857. It distinguishes between the three major urban centres of Surat-Bombay, Ahmedabad, and

Baroda, in Gujarat to map the diversity in as well as shared meanings of reform, and how they impinged upon the native social imaginary. It employs these readings to critically examine the signification(s) associated with reform and the specific relationality between the coloniser and the colonised that it attempted to structure.

In the historical imaginary of British colonisation in India, 1857 was a momentous occasion marking the first organised revolt against the British. It was an expression of discontentment of the sepoys of India with the inadequate emoluments and breach of their religious values by army administration. It remained largely restricted to the northern and central province. The history of India's anticolonial struggle by Bipan Chandra et al marks this event as the beginning of that history.[16] Its impact led to Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858 that dissolved the de facto rule over India of the East India Company which was held responsible for the revolt. It, thus, marked a moment of violent dissension that threatened to topple British powers.

However, another equally momentous event that marked the year 1857 often escapes the attention of the historian of colonisation in India (P. Rao, "Modern Education" 2).[17] 1857 marked the establishment of the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras—a definitive step towards the institutionalization of English education in India. Seventy-five years after political independence, the legacy of this moment seems to have outlived that of the revolt.

On one hand, the 1857 revolt challenged political imperialism and largely led to a breakdown of the reform movement initiated in the first half of the nineteenth century (*Government of India Act of 1858*). On the other, the establishment of universities consolidated the process of cultural imperialism. It is perplexing how the most impactful revolt against the empire and its most emphatic consolidation of empire could so neatly converge in the same moment. This convergence offers an apt instance of what Homi K. Bhabha has termed colonial 'hybridity', that is, the complex concurrence of contradictions that are contained in the moment of colonialism.

Albeit the connection between the Age of Reform and the Revolt seems unlikely, it is supported by Gautam Chakravarty who identified the 1857 Indian revolt as a defining moment influencing the trajectory of imperialism from the *Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832*

[16] See Chandra et al, *India's Struggle for Independence*.

[17] Parimala V. Rao in "Modern Education and the Revolt of 1857 in India" makes the connection between the 1857 revolt and English education, however, she focuses mainly on schools and only those concentrated in the areas worst affected by the revolt. Therefore, her evidence does not apply to the Bombay Presidency or Gujarat.

in England to the end of the nineteenth century (2-3). The revolt impressed upon "the 'popular imagination'" of the British as "among the exemplary episodes of the Long War" (Chakravarty 3) which refers to "the many military engagements of nineteenth-century Britain" (Chakravarty 1). An abiding tendency that he observes in novels themed on the revolt written over a period of "ninety years" is "a fundamental resistance in the popular imagination to anti-colonial resistance" (Chakravarty 9).

It is in this resistance that one can read the challenge to the imperial understanding of reform. Toke S. Aidt and Raphaël Franck have undertaken an intensive microhistorical analysis of the 1832 Reform Act to understand the motivations that led "the oligarchic elite to endorse democratic reform" ("Democratization" 3). While they base their argument primarily on rigorous statistical testing, they also offer insights into the prevailing popular understanding of these motivations to understand the Reform Act in its contemporary context. They identify "threats of revolution," "expressions of public opinion [in the form of reform-related protests]" and "political expedience" as the three factors motivating the final passing of the Bill in the House of Lords (Aidt and Franck, "What Motivates" 775). However, the Bill was a Whig initiative, and according to the Whig perspective, the threat of a revolution was the prime factor necessitating reform.

The same Whig liberal philosophy underlaid the approach to imperialism in India (Aspengren 46). While the British rule "posed a serious concern for the internal coherence of nineteenth-century liberal thought, it was to a high degree able to find justifications for it" (Aspengren 46). The justification for Empire was the proverbial 'White Man's Burden' as attested in the opinions of James Mill and later, his son, John Stuart Mill (Aspengren 47-50). U.S. Mehta argues that it was in the Age of Reform in India that the British political philosophy of Liberalism "found a *project*" (qtd. in Aspengren 51). Thus, while the symptoms of the Age of Reform initiated a movement for sociocultural change, its governing idea was rooted in political reform.

The Great Reform Act of 1832 extended suffrage to the growing industrial towns of England (among other reforms) to balance the dominance of the countryside in borough representation, and in response to the growing power of the working-class movement in England during the 1820s and 1830s. Essentially, it afforded a stronger role to the growing urban middle-class in the political economy. Further political underpinnings of reform can be seen in the Charter Act of 1833 which was the immediate successor of the Reform Act. The Charter Act of 1833 converted the East India Company from a commercial to an administrative entity, while also centralizing power in India with the formation of the post of

the Governor-General of India who was solely invested with civil, military, and legislative powers. It also opened up civil service positions to all Indians, thereby, generating a greater fillip to the demand for Western education in India. Chakravarty observes how, "the Reform Act of 1832 coincided with the arrival of a rationalised liberal-administrative state in India following the Charter Act of 1833, headed by a peer but run by a middle-class British bureaucracy: pious, hard-working, reformist and generally parochial and xenophobic" (3). This arrival of the reformist brigade was by no means a co-incidence.

Chakravarty views this within the larger framework of "that typically Whig view" which "configured all history as a story of progress and improvement, and in which different societies could be graded according to the stage of political, economic and institutional development they had reached" (55). Thus, "in the liberal-Radical eschatology all societies must be hitched to a rationalist spiral of progress…that hopes to *reform* when it cannot erase the local, singular and specific" (Chakravarty 56; emphasis added). This is how the contradiction between emancipation and liberation was achieved by arguing that "present subjection" was necessary for "future emancipation" (Chakravarty 56).

Henrik Chetan Aspengren avers that the 1857 rebellion summarily put an end to the Age of Reform which was driven by the objective of moral progress of the natives. He makes an aside regarding how "reformist policies were partly to blame for the uprising" and that the Proclamation of 1858 inaugurated an approach of highlighting difference rather than similarity between Indians and Europeans as the "imperative…to rule" (52). He, then, goes on to suggest that the post-1857 policy turn was towards revenue reform rather than moral reform (Aspengren 52).

However, a closer analysis of the vigour of the reform movement in England reveals that it emerged not merely out of the Whig political ideology but was perhaps addressing a certain urgency that was created by the 'threat of revolution' that significantly impressed upon the popular political imagination, and thereby, imperial policy. While, in the larger context, the threat was the growing class unrest in England in the 1820s that "generated fears that British society might disintegrate into cataclysmic class war" (Innes and Burns 45), the more immediate threat was posed by the Swing riots in England during 1830-31—"an uprising of agricultural laborers in the English countryside" who did not possess the right to vote (Aidt and Franck, "Democratization" 3). Inferring from Macaulay, Chakravarty observes that "[t]he generic liberal belief that the 'great cause of revolutions is …that, while nations move forward, constitutions stand still' led to reforming intervention in India" (57). This also explains the connections between the processes of systematization of power and constitution

of a centralized colonial government in India by the Charter Act of 1833, following in the aftermath of the 1832 Reform Act. This could have been one of the strongest reasons for the change of policy post-1857. The projected outcome of a 'reformist' policy was to avert a revolt, which was exactly what it had failed to do. It also indicated that there was something fundamentally wrong with the Company's understanding of either the native society or reform, or both.

Gujarat offers itself as an interesting case-study in this regard as, in spite of its geographical and political proximity to the epicentres of the 1857 revolt, it registered negligible reverberations of this 'mutiny'. It, thus, constitutes a rich site to study the process of the containment of resistance and consolidation of empire.

Reform and the Region

Histories of Gujarat largely identify the establishment of British dominance in the region with the decline of the Peshwa rule in 1818, as the point of commencement of the 'modern' age in the region.[18] In *Arvachin Gujaratnu Rekhadarshan, Vol. 1* (1936), Hiralal T. Parekh outlines the reasons why this is the more accurate periodization compared to histories that identify the period of Muslim domination with the beginning of the modern period. Parekh argues that Govindbhai Desai's *Gujaratno Arvachin Itihas* (1898) which adopts the aforementioned erroneous periodization draws on the Gazetteers of the Bombay Presidency, and Alexander Kinloch Forbes' *Ras Mala* (1856). However, none of the volumes of either of these sources distinctly use the term "modern" to name any historical division (Parekh 3-4).[19] Parekh further argues that Desai does not clarify why he incorporates the Muslim period within the modern age, though a potential reason could be a similar incorporation adopted by the Bharatvarshiya Arvachin Itihas Parishad in its 1935 proceedings at Pune, where it was adopted for wholly different reasons (Parekh 4). He insists that it would be more appropriate to identify the period from Muslim domination to the rise of British power as the Middle Ages, owing to the difference between the prevailing mindset as well as social structures of the Middle and Modern Ages respectively (Parekh 4). Neera Desai offers a similar differentiation albeit using a different line of investigation. Parekh scaffolds his argument by drawing parallels between the dominant traits of the society of Gujarat and Europe during the same period—also identified as Middle Ages in Europe—besides adoption of similar

[18] Besides the histories discussed in this section, this periodization also occurs in Vijay Singh Chavda's *Modern Gujarat*.

[19] All translations and paraphrases from Gujarati sources are mine, except where otherwise indicated.

periodization by other contemporary historians as well as the Mumbai Sahitya Sansad (6-7). Desai, on the other hand, identifies the rise of modernity with contact with an industrial society, that is, the post-industrial revolution British society (9). Both Parekh and Desai view the nineteenth century as the modern age in Britain. However, Parekh identifies the transition as initiated by the French revolution (7), while for Desai it is the industrial revolution (123) in Europe. Thus, for Parekh, modernity seems to be brought upon primarily by a revolution in ideas, while for Desai, by a revolution in systems. Thus, Parekh ascribes a more agentive and intentional role to the British in the complex changes occurring in the native society in the nineteenth century.

He identifies a nearly messianic advent of the religious reformer Sahajananda Swami, on one hand, and rise of the new system of education (read Western education) on the other, as leading to the "deliverance" of the native population from the dark times of misrule, internecine fights among rulers, disorder in law and administration, and a general feeling of distrust and fear regarding self-preservation (Parekh 9-11).

That the new systems being developed by the British became the yardstick of native self-definition is attested to by the endorsement of Ranchhoddas Girdhardas—who played a key role in the initial efforts at the Company-endorsed native education initiatives—as the father of education in Gujarat (Parekh 220).

The chain of causality between reform, education, and the role of Western influence is obfuscated by the lack of explanation regarding the exact nature of the relationship between the three in most histories of either reform or education. Histories of reform presume (Western) education of the reformers as the source of 'enlightened' ideas leading to reform, while histories of education often identify the 'enlightened' climate created by reformist efforts as propelling modern/new education. Thus, it seems a defensible compromise to conclude that the advent of the reform movement and modern education were parallel and interrelated.

Negotiating Reason: Colonial Policy in Western India

The Scottish Influence

The Company officials governing social policies impacting reform and education in Western India in the early nineteenth century were primarily Scotsmen—from Mountstuart Elphinstone (1779-1859)—who was the first Governor of Bombay after the annexation of Deccan into the Presidency following the fall of the Peshwas—to Francis Warden (1774-1853), John Malcolm (1769-1833), and Robert Grant (1779-1838).

This was not unorthodox as a strong Scottish presence in India and other Asian colonies resulted from the political exigencies created in the wake of the Union of England and Scotland in 1707. "Poverty, nationalistic feelings and resentment at what appeared a sell-out in 1707 were simmering" throughout Scotland, besides the threat of "Jacobite sentiment" gaining ground, which led Prime Minister Walpole to commence a system of favouring Scotsmen for appointment in the East India Company to consolidate the idea of a Great Britain (McGilvary 17). This system of patronage continued up to the 1830s, surviving several changes in power by fulfilling varying ends in exchange—from extending electoral support to the Whigs to sustaining a vast network of international trade, and the "Scottish elite and bourgeois classes" penetrated the ranks of administrative, mercantile, and military presence of the Company (McGilvary 26).

Thus, while the liberal Utilitarian philosophy was on the ascendant in the English/British parliament in the nineteenth century, Company officials negotiating important decisions in the Indian empire were influenced more strongly by their Scottish origins. The individual policies of these Scotsmen were shaped by three factors:

(1) Personal national-cultural origins and social background
(2) Impact of Scottish Enlightenment ideas
(3) Complexities of consolidating the empire in a foreign society

As the Scottish Reformation endeavoured to override historical precedent and aristocracy in defining the new society, education received an impetus as the channel through which a population that could create and sustain systems based on reason could be honed. Thus, post-reformation Scotland developed a robust system of learning at all levels. This system ensured that "schools at all levels were linked with each other and with the universities" (P. Rao 58). Besides, the quality of learning in schools equipped students for the universities, of which Scotland boasted four—in Edinburgh, St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. Parimala V. Rao contrasts this system with education in England which continued to remain class-ridden because of which "Scots were able to rise in the hierarchy of the East India Company because they were better educated than the English cadets and copiers" ("Class, Identity and Empire" 58).

For the same reason, Scots came under the influence of the ideas of Scottish Enlightenment which were widely disseminated in the universities, by some of its chief intellectuals and advocates. For instance, John Malcolm, "while on leave in Britain during the winter of 1794-5", is known to have "attended lectures at Edinburgh University" with a view to "remedy some of the inadequacies in his education" (McLaren 471).

The Scottish Enlightenment was a manifestation of the larger intellectual movement sweeping Europe, led by Scotsmen, and continuing from roughly the 1720s to the closing decades of the eighteenth century. Some of the most representative works of the Scottish Enlightenment include Francis Hutcheson's *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* (1725), David Hume's *A Treatise of Human Nature (1739-40), and Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations (1776).* While this intellectual movement did not represent a unified perspective, the diverse ideas shared a common ground in being shaped by the distinct political, economic, and social conditions of Scotland.

Thomas Munro (1761-1827) and Mountstuart Elphinstone were two such beneficiaries of the patronage system, who played a key role in the development of Company rule in India in early nineteenth century. Thomas Munro, the son of a merchant from Glasgow, and educated at the University of Glasgow, joined the Company in 1779 as a cadet. He went on to serve in several important military campaigns in the Madras Presidency, besides also fulfilling crucial administrative roles including the introduction of the ryotwari system which revolutionized the traditional system of land revenue in the region. He was appointed the governor of Madras in 1819. Munro's administration became one of the chief inspirations for Elphinstone when the latter was assigned the crucial office of commissioner of settlement of the Deccan territories after the defeat of Peshwas by the British at the close of 1817. [20]

The important task that lay before Elphinstone was the consolidation of popular support for the new British authority and weeding out any existing Peshwa loyalists that may foster a rebellion. He followed the policy of appeasement of local sentiments on one hand, and intolerance for rebellious forces, while treading gingerly where the pulse of native sentiment was unpredictable. On appointing Robertson as Provisional Collector and Magistrate of Poona on 26th February 1818, Elphinstone advised him on judicial matters to "endeavour to enforce the existing laws and customs, unless where they are clearly repugnant to reason and natural equity" (Choksey qtd. in Ballhatchet 15). He also restricted himself to very minor modifications in systems of revenue and religious patronage.

Such insistence on maintaining the existing order could be viewed as a Scottish stance. Before the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1813, a Select Committee of the House of Commons invited Samuel Davis to make a comparative analysis of the systems of governance of Bengal and Madras. Bengal was then under the Cornwallis government "with

[20] Elphinstone often consulted with Munro on matters of policy, and even studied the latter's writings (Ballhatchet 27, 55).

its separation of powers, its…Regulations, and its general reliance upon English ideas and methods" (Ballhatchet 53). The analysis, issued in 1812 as the well-known Fifth Report, "criticised the Cornwallis system in Bengal, and praised its rival, the system worked out by Munro in Madras with the aim of using Indian methods as far as possible" (Ballhatchet 54). Thus, Munro, through his national origins as well as approach contrary to Cornwallis' English methods, put a Scottish stamp on the approach of retention and gradual modification of Indian systems in the process of consolidating the British presence.

The origin of this approach could be traced back to one of David Hume's "First Principles of Government" which was consent (qtd. in McLaren 471). Hume argued that any government depended upon the (good) opinion of "the ruler's power base" (McLaren 471).[21] Thus, expansion of the power base could only be achieved by creating consent for the ruler. For Munro, this consent was manifested in creation of the ryotwari system and placing power in the hands of the peasants as against the landlords. On the other hand, once the Deccan was annexed to the Bombay Presidency on 1st November 1819, and Elphinstone made the governor of Bombay, he is known to have allowed the continuation of the *bhagadari* system of revenue rather than introducing the ryotwari system in the Gujarati province, as the former seemed to be generating better results in that part of the presidency.

This period overlaps with what has been identified as the founding period of the Second British Empire from 1780 to 1830 (McLaren 469). Several scholars such as C.A. Bayly, Douglas M. Peers, Burton Stein, and Linda Colley, have observed features of despotism, militarism, and authoritarianism in the empire's approach to governance during this period.[22] However, Martha McLaren argues that the historical writings of Munro, Elphinstone, and Elphinstone's successor as governor of Bombay—John Malcolm, which couch their "analysis of Asian systems of government and their prescriptions for the British government", relate a different story (469). They draw their models of governance not from any Western or Asian form of absolutist rule, but "the state-building policies of the rulers of early modern Europe, as interpreted by the Scottish historians, David Hume and William Robertson" (McLaren 470). They anticipated that the civil society in India would progress just as it had in Europe under the aforementioned governments. In his *Account of the Kingdom of Caubul*, Elphinstone observes how Ahmad Shah is able to generate acceptance for an authoritarian form of government in a clan accustomed to more liberal rule "by *non-interference in their internal affairs* and by sharing the spoils of war" (McLaren 474;

[21] Also see Oz-Salzberger 159.
[22] See McLaren for a detailed discussion of the views of these scholars.

emphasis added). Sharing the spoils of war, in Elphinstone's case, could well have meant incorporating the elite classes who had lost their authority and prestige with the change in regime, within the British system of administration.

Non-interference in internal affairs was reflected not only in the approach to refrain from religious matters but also in in the legal system where a shastri and maulvi were instituted to deal especially with criminal matters as per existing customs and precedence. This approach aligned itself with the legal precedent of the eighteenth-century Scottish lawyer, Lord Kames, that "the law of a country is in perfection when it corresponds to the manners of the people, their circumstances, their government" (qtd. in McLaren 488).

These ideas were symptomatic of a larger influence on the Scottish Enlightenment drawn from the Continent. Fania Oz-Salzberger considers Montesquieu's *De L'Esprit des lois* (1748) one of the most significant influences on Scottish political thought (170). Particularly influential was Montesquieu's idea of *ésprit,* which was interpreted by Hume as meaning that "the laws have, or ought to have, a constant reference to the constitution of governments, the climate, the religion, the commerce, the situation of each society" (qtd. in Oz-Salzberger 171). However, this was not to infer that any society should be left to its own existing systems and traditions. Hume advocated replacement of Montesquieu's "theory of political right" with "a politics of interest where both sentiment and justice are accounted for" (Oz-Salzberger 171). Interest here meant larger social interest in the service of which justice and ethical obligation must be oriented.

I view this idea as aligned with the stadial approach to history in Scottish Enlightenment thought, which viewed development of the society as progressing in stages (Robertson 4). Elphinstone believed that the native society was yet not at that stage where it was ready for English modes of governance to be grafted onto it. He finds a fitting example in Akbar's approach to revenue reforms designed to "rebuild an administrative system disrupted by a long period of disorder", thereby, involving an effort to systematize existing institutions and making gradual modifications to eventually lead to progress (McLaren 478). On the other hand, he draws a warning from the consequences of "Aurangzeb's 'harsh and illiberal' rule – the collapse of the Mogul Empire – …to westernizing reformers" (McLaren 480).

Thus, while there was a tendency to co-opt the native society into the homogenous linear time of Western modernity, where progress was inevitable culminating in a society based on reason, the approach to achievement of this goal was different in the English and

Scottish perspectives.[23] English rationalism attempted to impose a rationalism and modernity on the native systems, reflected in the criticism by Whig historians of "Hume's *History of England*…[as] a Tory defence of despotism" (McLaren 477). However, "for Scottish historians…the despotic regimes of early modern Europe had been a necessary political stage through which states passed on their passage from feudalism to limited monarchy" (McLaren 477).

Elphinstone endeavoured to bring about such progressive change in native society by creating a reconfiguring politics of interest. He endeavoured to alternative participation in and alliances with the British government by limiting unfair revenue practices, systematizing administrative and legal processes, and incentivizing association with the Company either by attaching traditional marks of honour with official posts, increasing remuneration, or privileging claims of a certain group. His objective was to create a gradual shift to "[a]ttachment, based on common interest not filial deference" (McLaren 482). He, further, persevered to ensure that the British government furnished such common interest for as many groups as possible. Ultimately, this common interest of the society that Hume identifies as the goal of justice, is modified in the context of imperialism, to converge into the goal of empire-building. This larger concern is reflected in the militaristic tendencies of Munro, Elphinstone, and Malcolm.

Douglas M. Peers observes an "ideology of militarism" coming to "a peak in British India in the 1820s" (qtd. in McLaren 481). While all the three men in question did advocate the fortification of the military resources of the Company, this was with a view to maintain order, given that change of regime was still underway in many territories, especially in Western India. This approach also indicates the fundamental goal of the approaches to government of Munro, Elphinstone, and Malcolm, which was not to replace despotism with political liberty for the native societies. The goal was "the progressive authoritarianism of early modern Europe, as represented by Hume and Robertson, an authoritarianism tempered by freedom of opportunity rather than democratic institutions" (McLaren 484). Such progressive authoritarianism required the right balance of a protective civil administration with an aggressive militarism.

The Rise of English Utilitarianism

Despite the impact of the distinct Scottish contours of Enlightenment reason in shaping regional colonial policies, the growing influence of English rationalism could not be entirely

[23] For grounds for rejection of "late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century prescriptions for progress" based on Britain's experience as a commercial society, see McLaren 485.

overridden. In 1814, the government in England instructed the Bengal, Madras and later, in 1815, the Bombay governments "to modify their judicial systems in accordance with Munro's principles" (Ballhatchet 56). However, there were those in the administration who held the Cornwallis approach in higher esteem including those who had worked under the system as well as those who had no first-hand experience of working on the Indian territory and, thus, held an idealistic approach. This climate was influenced by the rise of utilitarianism in turn.

Early Utilitarians were referred to as Benthamites owing to their intellectual debt to the singular contribution of this English philosopher in systematizing reform based on the principle of utility. One of the chief proponents of utilitarianism, James Mill, joined the East India House in 1819 as Assistant Examiner in the Revenue Department, alongside Strachey, who had worked in the judicial department of the Cornwallis government in India, now appointed as Assistant Examiner in the Judicial Department. Together, they sent the works of Bentham to Elphinstone, who already possessed them since the previous year through William Erskine and through a request Elphinstone made himself to John Adam in Calcutta (Ballhatchet 58-59). However, the difference was that Elphinstone read Bentham alongside Adam Smith, Montesquieu, and others. Thus, he employed Bentham's ideas selectively. The Benthamite influence can be observed in his initiatives as the governor of Bombay including the building of panopticons in Bombay and the codification of regulations. However, Bentham stood for the rejection of customary institutions. To sum up, Elphinstone's policy was based on the principle of temperance developed on:

(a) A balance between Scottish Enlightenment and English utilitarianism
(b) A balance between despotism and liberty
(c) A balance between introduction of new systems and retention of customary systems

Thus, while Elphinstone agreed that a society based on reason was the aspiration and goal in true Enlightenment tradition, his idea of reason was negotiated out of principled rationalism and pragmatic reasonableness. I argue that this is how reason refracted in the context of empire. Further, it was this political-intellectual approach that contextualized early policy regarding Western education in western India, with the Bombay Presidency at its centre.

Reform and Education in Bombay

Elphinstone's model was a model of collaboration between opposite strains of thought and policy. It is instantiated in his early efforts at developing a system of education in Bombay

which resolved the question of whether intervention in education should be governmental or non-governmental. The Native School and School Book Society was formed in 1825 under the suggestion of Elphinstone to improve the standard and system of native education in the vernacular. To promote it, he suggested that the government be entrusted with the task of supporting infrastructure—establishment of village schools and financially supporting the printing of books in vernacular. the Society would also oversee management of the system—training teachers for the schools as well as supervising the printing and distribution of the books.

Elphinstone's Society has often been perceived as mired in a rivalry with the proposal of an English school in Bombay that was strongly promoted by Francis Warden. The foundation of such a school "for the teaching of the English language and of history, geography and "the popular branches of science" through the medium of English was proposed by Elphinstone himself (Ballhatchet 419). However, Elphinstone promoted this as a school for the upper classes, while Warden was in favour of mixing of classes, castes, and religions. Elphinstone advocated education in the vernacular for the rest of the native population, whereas Warden proposed education in English for all.

Parimala V. Rao in "Class, Identity and Empire: Scotsmen and Indian Education in the Nineteenth Century" (2016) has argued that such differences in approach were due to the differences in social background of the actors in question. She draws a distinction between the policies of the aristocratic Scotsmen and those who were commoners who had benefitted from the liberal nature of the Scottish education system. The latter were, thereby, from their own experience, advocates of egalitarian and liberal modern education in India. In the latter group, she includes Charles Grant, Thomas Munro, and John Malcolm, among others. In the group of aristocrats, she includes Governor General Minto, Frederick Adams, and Mountstuart Elphinstone, among others.

However, this argument seems contentious for two reasons. The first reason is that while there are observable differences in the democratic potential of reforms between Munro/Malcolm (?) and Elphinstone, Malcolm seems to have pursued rather than changed the policy of Elphinstone. The two were also known to work in tandem in the settlement of the Deccan territories. Secondly, while Elphinstone's status-quoist approach may have been covertly shaped by his own position as an aristocrat, it was equally influenced by his experience as a commissioner in the Deccan territory, specifically overseeing the transition from the dominance of Peshwas, who belonged to the highly conservative, tradition-bound, and distinction-ridden community of *Kokanastha* brahmins—the brahmins belonging to the

South Konkan region in Maharashtra. Thus, his privileging of the brahmin community in the Poona Sanskrit College, as well as other upper classes who had traditionally held power in other educational institutions and administrative positions, appears more as a decision in the interest of empire, rather than structured by the class position of the coloniser. This argument gains further ground when one considers that Francis Warden had spent his entire career in the city of Bombay, and thereby, his approach was shaped by his exposure to the culture of the metropolitan which contrasted highly with the provincial territories. Further, Warden drew upon the model of the college in Calcutta.

Further, even in terms of his approach to English education, Elphinstone followed the same gradualist and collaborationist model of temperance. He did not intend to make the English school exclusive for the upper classes but suggested that "when the School became more extended…a separate class should be instituted for the lower castes" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 419). His ultimate vision was a mixed model whereby "the same means of instruction to the lower orders be afforded as at Madras, and the same encouragement held out to the higher branches of learning as in Bengal" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 436). Before Elphinstone left his post as a governor following stiff opposition by Warden to his education policies, "he proposed a college for "the higher branches of the native literature, combined with European sciences" (Ballhatchet 436).

Thus, while the goal of education was similar for different colonial officials, their approaches differed. Parimala V. Rao considers Charles Grant to be "the first to recommend the introduction of modern education through English as a medium of instruction" ("Class, Identity, and Empire" 61). However, the polemic *Observations* based on which Grant promoted his argument focused on the need for moral improvement in the 'Asiatic subjects of Great Britain'. Thus, his recommendations were inserted as the 'Pious' Clause in the Charter of 1813 which opened the route for missionary influx in India. Similarly, Elphinstone averred in 1819 that education was the only way "to improve the morals of the people" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 403). He bolstered his position by arguing how the Romans' intervention in education of their subjects "left them a kind of moral Empire long after their physical power was destroyed" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 402). Further, both viewed the spread of Christianity through such knowledge as the crucial mode that could bring about moral improvement. However, their approaches differed.

Writing to Captain Irvine in 1819, Elphinstone sounded a note of caution against an "attempt to convert them [the natives] by forcing our Doctrines upon them before they are prepared to receive them" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 400). The doctrine was more important than

the language. At the same time, Elphinstone had an additional purpose in promoting vernacular education for the lower classes which he believed would help them understand the revenue and administrative reforms introduced by the British and help them see their own interests converging with the British (Ballhatchet 404-5). Such was the complex 'politics of interest' negotiated by Elphinstone.

It can be seen that in western India in the early nineteenth century, Elphinstone played a key role in setting up a role for education that would retain class-distinction, while bringing about a gradual change in morals. This, for him, did not mean immediately purging the native morality of the 'corruption' that colonialists believed had encrusted over the years, but gradually replacing it with a Western morality. The Christian influence was inserted within this larger rubric of morality, following Hume's insertion of utility within moral philosophy that considered "all acts that are morally praiseworthy" (P. Rao 60) as "conducive to the happiness of mankind" (qtd. in P. Rao 60). It is in this context that the first most influential (in western India) institution for higher education was established in Bombay in 1835 named the Elphinstone Native Education Institution, that later became part of the Elphinstone College designed as "a distinctly modern, Anglicist-oriented institution" (Tschurenev 272). It was an institution primarily created to produce teachers for government schools, and officers for largely mid-level and lower-level positions in the government.

The Elphinstone Institution and Early Reformers

Mridula Ramanna studies the profiles of the students "who successfully completed the Arts and Science courses at the Elphinstone Institution between 1827 and 1857" and concludes that majority of them were absorbed in the government machinery either in administrative or judicial positions, or in the educational institutions ("Profiles of English" 716). According to Achyut Yagnik and Suchitra Sheth, it was through the "early generation of 'native' officers…that British rule and western values penetrated the cities and towns of Gujarat"; they further add that it was "[a] few of these officers [that] emerged as pioneers of the social reform movement" (69). In fact, it was not only the native officers, but native individuals implicated/involved in the growing institutional network of the Company that impelled the reform movement.

Some of the first graduates from the Elphinstone Institution are also remembered as the earliest reformers in western India. The foremost among these was Bal Gangadhar Shastri Jambhekar (1812-1846) who took up a position as native secretary of the Native School Book and School Society, and went on to study at the Elphinstone Institution, following which he built his career as a translator, editor of *The Bombay Durpan* established in 1832, and as

Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy at the Elphinstone College (Inamdar 321). Jambhekar was an admirer of Elphinstone. He made the journey from a poor financial background to being a leading figure in social changes, by taking advantage of the institutional provisions created by Elphinstone. He was a champion of "[s]cientific and liberal education" and "new methods of administration" ushered in by the British (Inamdar 323). He used his periodical to check corruption and other malpractices in the government. He promoted the reading of history amongst people and considered Enlightenment inevitable for the progress of a country like India. He also preferred the liberal rule of the British government over that of the East India Company, though maintaining certain reservations about the *laissez-faire* utilitarian principle.

Dadoba Pandurang (1814-1882), studying in school under a scholarship offered by the Native Education Society, became one of the first Elphinstonians when the school was renamed as the Elphinstone Institution. He worked there as an assistant teacher in 1830, before becoming an assistant teacher in the first government school established in Surat in 1840, and the acting Superintendent of Vernacular Schools and acting Director of the Normal Class (which was instituted to train teachers for government schools) in 1846. One of his most notable contributions was preparing a grammar of the Marathi language in 1836 which was then continually revised, abridged, and updated over the years.

Soon to become one of the leading Parsi reformers in the country, Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917) also undertook his primary education at the first indigenous school set up by the Native Education Society in Bombay. He was selected by Bal Shastri Jambhekar for a new college class being instituted in Bombay under the aegis of the Elphinstone College.

Mridula Ramanna[24] profiles the social background of the educated in Bombay city from 1824 to 1858 to report that English education was opted for primarily by Parsis and upper-caste Hindus. Vernacular education was more popular than English education. The upper class of Bombay did not take to government sponsored English education like they did in Bengal owing to the former region's financial stability. Thus, the incentive for English education was utilitarian. It was opted only by those who sought the competitive job opportunities in government services or those who wished to diverge from traditional occupations. This also explains why while the elites did not prefer English education themselves, they provided ample patronage for the poor of their own caste/communities to

[24] Ramanna, Mridula. "Social Background of the Educated in Bombay City: 1824-58." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1989, pp. 203-205, 207-211.

seek higher education and professions. This was also the motivation to seek college education in many cases—to avail the stipends that could financially support the stipendiary's family. Thereby the section from which English educated individuals was largely middle class and upper caste Hindu, or Parsi.

In other words, the section of the population in the Bombay presidency, availing the benefits of British education initiatives (which were largely non-governmental in this phase owing to scepticism regarding direct intervention in native systems) was part of the section whose role was being redrawn in the new systems and occupations being created by the British presence. In many ways, they were the direct beneficiaries of Elphinstone's vision and initiatives—the Native Education Society, the Native School and School Book Society, or the Elphinstone College instituted at his retirement. At the same time, the course that the Elphinstone College took in the years to come, fittingly represents the waning influence of the temperate and collaborationist tone to change that was the hallmark of Mountstuart Elphinstone.

J. V. Naik considers "three seniors of Dadabhai Naoroji at the Elphinstone Institution: Bhaskar Pandurang Tarkhadkar (1816-47), Govind Vitthal Kunte alias Bhau Mahajan (1815-90) and Ramkrishna Vishwanath (?)" to be the first band of radical intellectuals in western India to criticize British rule in strong and bold terms, and establish themselves as forerunners of Naoroji's economic drain theory (4428). All three were Jambhekar's students at Elphinstone, however they did not share Jambhekar's conviction that "reform…grows from within, on evolutionary lines, conforming as far as possible to the best in the Hindu shastras and tradition"—a conviction in part influenced by the positive perception of British rule established through the figure of Mountstuart Elphinstone (Naik 4428). These three were among the most outspoken members of a secret society that was formed in the 1840s "to discuss the evil effects of British rule and also to fight social obscurantism [*sic*] on revolutionary lines" (Naik 4428). They were critical of social customs like the practice of *sati*, infanticide, and caste discrimination, but they were louder critics of the political manipulation of India and wrongful economic exploitation in its wake. Naik believes that the position of these three intellectuals "significantly differed from their better known contemporaries" (4428) in asserting that "there cannot be anything altruistic about colonial rule" (4429); yet the public social interventions of those positioned in the institutional network of the British—specifically the Elphinstone Institution—reflect a radical tenor, if not as radical as Tarkhadkar, Mahajan, and Vishwanath.

It is important to note that it was the same group that formed the first bunch of actors who came to be associated with the idea of *reform* and assumed the distinct identity of a *reformer*. Naoroji Furdunji founded the Students' Literary and Scientific Society in 1845 alongside Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917), Bhau Daji Lad (1824-1874), Jagannath Shankarsheth (1803-1865), Vishwanath Mandlik (1833-1899), and Sorabji Shapurji Bengali (1831-1893), with Professor Patton as the President. Soon, the society branched into a Marathi organ and a Gujarati organ both named Dnyan Prasarak Mandali in 1848. The debates conducted in the society meetings were also published in the Gujarati journal *Dnyan Prasarak*. The directionality of the flow of ideas from the English to the Marathi and Gujarati branches of the society is indicative of the intellectual approach adopted, that is, the transfer of reformist British/Western ideas and institutions to native society. This view finds support in the approach of the first political association in the Bombay Presidency called the Bombay Association, established in 1852 by the young reformers, with the support of some British friends. Naoroji's maiden political speech delivered to this association draws a distinction between the practices of Company officials and the principles of British governance: "It induced a general belief among the Indian politicians of the day that…officials on the spot might turn a deaf ear to the representations of the people, but the liberty-loving people of England would…willingly listen" (Masani 55).

Elphinstone, in petitioning the British government for financial aid to non-missionary private institutions for imparting (western) education to natives states argued that education was the remedy for the ignorance and superstition that currently prevailed in the country (qtd. in Parekh 219-220). His reasoning easily echoes Grant's *Observations*. On the other hand, the challenge was for the natives to agree with such intervention. Veena Naregal observes that "the discourse on native education cleared a space by audaciously casting its intended addressees as 'wanting' and 'inferior'…a strategy that was quickly internalised by *native reformist discourse*" (72; emphasis added). She adds that "both Elphinstone and his successor John Malcolm realised it would be difficult to achieve the ideological objectives of the education project without simultaneously advancing plans to create a *standardised cultural order* within native society" (74; emphasis added). Reform emerges as the enabling discourse for western education, with a goal to inscribe the colonial gaze in the assessment/perception of native society, and reform initiatives function to standardise such assessment. This is how Naregal's phrase "ideological affinity with state power" may be understood (90).

Reform and Education in Surat

Reform initiatives in Surat ran parallel with Bombay owing to the geographical and cultural proximity between the two. Durgaram Manchharam Dave (1809-1876) is known to be one of the pioneering reformers in Surat. He was a student of the first batch of the Normal Class in 1825 in Bombay, where he came in contact with Dadoba Pandurang—brother of Dr. Atmaram Pandurang, founder of the Prarthana Samaj in Bombay, as well as Bhaskar Pandurang Tarkhadkar. R. L. Raval claims that this experience transformed Durgaram's thinking, and "[h]e soon *reasoned* himself out of the several superstitious beliefs and caste usages then prevalent, such as the existence of ghosts and their exorcism by means of incantations, the evils of early marriages and the bar against re-marriage of high caste Hindu widows" (99; emphasis added). It was also after this that he joined a local school as a teacher which earned him the popular honorific of *Mehtaji* meaning a schoolteacher in Gujarat. This was the name by which he came to be known later. In 1839, Durgaram joined the Teachers' Training Class in Bombay, where he came in contact with Dadoba Pandurang again, and soon the latter came to Surat as a teacher in the first English school established at Surat in 1842. This alliance gave an impetus, clarity, and direction to Durgaram's reform efforts, and the two alongside Dalpatram Master, Dinmanishankar, and Damodardas Sheth, initiated a reform group that culminated in the formation of the Manav Dharma Sabha on 22nd June 1844. The qualifier *Manav* in the name of the association referred to both humanitarian principles as well as was derived from *Manu Smriti*—the author of the Hindu dharma shastras that Durgaram adhered to. The Sabha focused on exposing the erroneous practices in all religions and advocated the need for a universal religion. A strong awareness of the disadvantages of British rule can be found in the Sabha proceedings, which finds an exceptional expression in the meeting convened to oppose the salt tax imposed by the government against which a big demonstration was staged on 29 August 1844. To those who criticized such mass demonstrations and advocated writing petitions to the government, "Durgaram immediately replied by saying that a petition was all right when a ruler consulted to some extent the ruled, but when that is not done, it was the duty of the ruled to oppose such measures and even 'punish' the ruler. If need be, the ruler should be replaced" (Chavda 181). Such a radical tone reflected the Bombay/Elphinstonian brand of reform. Rather, it is noteworthy that the above response to the critics of mass demonstration has been alternatively attributed to Dadoba Pandurang in other histories. This reveals the intimate influence of the Bombay reform culture on this early reform initiative in Gujarat.

Durgaram, like the Bombay reformers, was implicated within the institutional network of western education. He was a teacher to later reformers like Narmad (1833-1886) and Navalram Laxmiram Pandya (1836-1888); while Mahipatram Rupram Nilkanth (1829-1891) and Nandshankar Mehta (1835-1905) grew up in Surat when Durgaram's initiatives were impacting the society. The approach of these reformers was honed by their experience of a western education that built an aspiration towards reason. Mr. Henry Green, Principal of the Surat English School, appreciated that Durgaram "without having the knowledge of the English language thought rationally without any fear" (Raval 103). Thus, reason founded on the principles of English rationalism allowed a criticism of Company rule and a demand for western education in *useful* subjects in the same breath. Extrapolating Naregal's comment regarding western education, one can argue that it created a *rational* demand for the ideological domination of the British, constituting what Ashis Nandy terms "'official' dissent" (xii). Nandy defines colonialism in terms of its "psychological contours" structured by "codes" and a "culture" shared by "the rulers and the ruled" (2-3). The "psychological rewards and punishments, to accept new social norms and cognitive categories" result in certain unconscious psychological effects which constitute the culture's "style of managing dissent" (Nandy 3). In other words, a culture is constituted "in which the ruled are constantly tempted to fight their rulers within the psychological limits set by the latter" (Nandy 3). Specifically, in this context, official dissent is a category that helps to understand how the content of the coloniser is rejected, while his precepts are accepted.

Reform and Education in Ahmedabad

As mentioned earlier, Ahmedabad came under British rule as a result of a treaty between the Gaekwads (of Baroda) and the British in 1817. The city of Ahmedabad "became the headquarters of the district of the same name in the northern division of the Bombay presidency" (Shah 53). John Andrew Dunlop "was the first British collector of Ahmedabad" who adopted an Elphinstonian approach of caution "in bringing about change because he respected traditions as long as they did not interfere with British policies" (Shah 53). An example of this is in the involvement of "the traditional urban elite—businessmen and officials such as the *nagarseth* and the *kazi*" in performing "equally important civil tasks in the framework of the new local government" (Shah 58). One such *nagarseth*—Hemabhai Vakhatchand—was instrumental in intimating British officials about blockage of the Indore-Mhow road that brought mail to Ahmedabad by mutineers of the 1857 revolt, four days before communication from "the government despatch agency" (Shah 61). The reigning

perception of the British in Ahmedabad was of being a "*Dayalu Sarkar*"[25] meaning kind or benevolent government (Shah 61). One of the most important reasons for this perception was the systematisation of infrastructure and trade fillip brought about by the British. The rise of English education in Ahmedabad is a related development. Kunjlata Shah observes that "Ahmedabad's initial indifference to English education faded from the mid-1840s" as "people of the city realised the importance of the English language and western education for administrative and business purposes" (83).

The Forbes-Dalpatram Alliance

Alexander Kinloch Forbes (1821-1865), another Scotsman and admirer of Mountstuart Elphinstone set into motion a trajectory of reform different from the Bombay-Surat continuum in the emerging commercial capital city of Gujarat—Ahmedabad. Alexander Kinloch Forbes was appointed in the civil services of Bombay on 30 December 1842 and arrived in India in 1843. He set foot in Ahmedabad in November 1846 as an Assistant Judge. Influenced in school life by the works of William Jones and garnering an interest in the history and literature of the region, he sought the assistance of a person who could guide him discover local knowledges. Bholanath Sarabhai (1822-1886), the founder of Prarthana Samaj in Ahmedabad, introduced him to Dalpatram Dahyabhai (1820-1898), a Brahmin from Vadnagar. With Dalpatram's assistance, he was introduced to the manuscripts in Old Gujarati using which he acquainted himself with the history and literature of Gujarat.

Rao Sahib Vishvanath Narayan Mandlik characterized Forbes as "… a true statesman of the Mountstuart Elphinstone type" (qtd. in D. Mehta 29). Mansukhram Tripathi refers to Forbes as "*Malcolm-panthi* (following Malcolm's approach)" (25). Tripathi goes on to remark that if India had ten officers like Malcolm and Forbes, the 1857 rebellion would not have taken place (26). Tripathi avers that the moderate approach towards change adopted by Malcolm and Forbes would have been successful in preventing a revolution. In other words, Tripathi effectively indicates that the kind of 'reform' initiated by these statesmen could forestall 'revolution'. Such understanding of reform echoes its ties with the trajectory of the term in the colonizer's home country.

Joanna Innes and Arthur Burns observe that the French Revolution broke the building momentum of parliamentary reform in England by generating "a reaction against reform and reformers of all kinds" (13). The Spanish revolt against Napoleon eased the misgivings to

[25] This phrase was used by Edalji Dosabhai in his historical work *Gujarat no Itihas* (1850), but also appears in the periodical *Buddhiprakash*, the leading organ of reform in Gujarat and owned by the Gujarat Vernacular Society since 1854.

some extent. However, a large section of the British population was also not in favour of such kind of a violent reaction. Thus, a new perspective emerged whereby it was believed that "[w]hat was needed instead,…, was some middle way between reaction and revolution. Within that middle way, there might be scope for reform" (Innes and Burns 14). The laying out of reform as a middle path was done by Edmund Burke in 1790, however, it was "not until the 1820s and 1830s" that the "contrast became formulaic, both in Britain and in Europe" (Innes and Burns 15). Besides, even during "the relative social and political calm of the early and mid-1820s…the sense that British society was in the grip of…moral and cultural crisis remained" (Innes and Burns 39). Politicians on the left and right both had to deal with strategies of responding to change, and "the answer…had to lie in the forging of some form of new moral order: society had either to be remoralized, or moralized in new ways, to survive the challenges of the age" (Innes and Burns 40).

Thus, while in many ways, there was an effort to replicate the renaissance in the Indian context as the process that would culminate logically in an enlightened native society built on the principles of reason and progress, the strategies and policies adopted for ideological consolidation of the empire revealed contemporary anxieties of the British which revolved around the changing significations and fortunes of 'reform'. The Bombay-Surat continuum reflected the impact of the liberal-utilitarian voices in the West, in their demand for institutional reform. These reflected the changing trend in the 1830s which suggested "that reform was operating to rehabilitate the notion that *government* – rather than charity or voluntary effort – should be the source of public benefits" (Innes and Burns 54). On the other hand, conservatives like Forbes placed greater faith in non-governmental efforts in inducing reform as a moral force, rather than institutional restructuring.

Gujarat Vernacular Society

In 1848, alongside Colonel Fulljames, Colonel Wallace, and Reverend Peritus, Forbes established the Gujarat Vernacular Society (GVS) with a view to promote vernacular language and literature. Soon, the Society initiated establishment of libraries, a weekly newspaper, as well as the periodical *Buddhiprakash*. Dalpatram remained a permanent associate in the efforts to bring about a cohesive change in the region. Forbes specially requested Dalpatram to give up his government job and join the GVS full-time as a Secretary 1855 onwards, even at a lower salary. Dalpatram held this post until his retirement. It was through this alliance between Forbes and Dalpatram that the ideological apparatus of reform in the form of institutional networks (schools, libraries), communication channels (associations, elite-non-elite alliances), print cultures (journal, newspaper, advertisement)

were fortified and sustained successfully enough to make GVS outlive other reform associations and institutions that developed during this early reform period. Although the stated goal of the GVS publicised at the time of its establishment was "the promotion and growth of the regional language in Gujarat" through translation from English into Gujarati and vice versa, as well as printing of available books and manuscripts (Raval 181), the public initiatives undertaken by the GVS reveal its chief contribution to be an organ of reform in the region.

Naregal, argues that "[t]he ability of colonial power to reproduce and disseminate the authority of Western norms and notions of culture, communicative exchange, and cognition impels us to think of translation as absolutely endemic to the construction of colonial discourse, and by implication to the very processes that underlie the creation of a colonial intelligentsia" (103). I propose that in the Forbes-Dalpatram alliance, one can observe the translation of geographical-ideological-cultural units of the West or Britain and Gujarat respectively. Dalpatram was possibly one of the only reformers in the region who had never received education through a colonial establishment and hence it is arguable that his adoption, adaptation and understanding of Western ideas was almost exclusively through his interaction with Forbes.

Dalpatram's *Bhut Nibandh* (1849)

In the discussion that follows, I shall analyse this process in material practice through an essay written by Dalpatram in for a competition organized by GVS, which not only won the competition but was so deeply appreciated by Forbes that he translated the same essay from Gujarati into English. The essay in Gujarati was popular enough to have multiple reprints running in thousands of copies, as well as further translations into Urdu and Marathi languages.

In 1849, the organizing committee of the GVS advertised an essay competition on the subject: (a) causes of the belief of being possesses by ghosts, (b) remedies to exorcise such ghosts. For its very first essay competition, the GVS chose a topic concerning the existence of superstitions in the region—a subject of high currency among reformers.[26] It is not merely by a possibility of ideological alliance with the enlightened Britisher or the opportunity to participate in the emerging modernity that such a competition motivated the native population to espouse reform. The prize for the winning essay was announced as 150 rupees at a time when Dalpatram's monthly salary as an Asst. Secretary was 20 rupees per month. Such heavy

[26] In 1844, Durgaram Mehta pasted an advertisement on public buildings in Surat inviting magicians/*tantriks* to prove the existence of ghosts to win a prize of twenty rupees. This led to huge public outcry.

incentivization betrays the intensity of government efforts towards building a reformist culture.

Naregal observes that "[t]he construction of colonial power was founded on the ability of the bourgeois imagination to posit a direct relation between the Western enlightenment and non-Western ways of life" (103). Translation not only represents but elicits this imagination, as the potential to posit the two languages in a symmetrical relationship is a precondition for the transfer of signification from one to another. The case of Forbes' translation of Dalpatram's essay illustrates this process in reverse. Forbes' translation is an attempt to set up a comparison that allows him to establish the current state of native society with pre-Enlightenment western society. The foreword to the translation attests to this: "[i]t is not very long ago since we experienced in its full effect, in Great Britain itself, the practical results of superstitious opinions not very different in character from those which form the subject of the present Essay" (Forbes xii), following it up with "[i]n Guzerat the evil is in actual daily operation" (Forbes xiii).

Forbes' adds a subtitle to Dalparam's title in his essay, namely, "An Essay Descriptive of the Demonology and Other Popular Superstitions of Gujarat". Identification of the beliefs around ghosts and spirits in Gujarat with the idea of demonology betrays Forbes attempt at calibrating the local culture to identify with western cultural-conceptual categories and creating a foundation for a comparative evaluation of the two cultures. What results is a reduction of polysemy surrounding the term *bhut* in the native understanding. The foreword of the essay in Gujarati by Dalpatram begins with a *shloka*—a prayer to Lord Shiva who is described as "*bhutānām patayé*" (3). Clearly, the meaning of the root *bhut* in this phrase is 'all living beings'. However, the English translation does not translate this *shloka* and, thus, not only eliminates this wider understanding of *bhut* as a being with a spirit/soul[27] but equates it with the study of demons in the west that are beings identified as non-human specifically possessing negative/evil intentions. The very structure of the essay topic imposes such a structure upon the writer regarding the beliefs surrounding possession by evil spirits—origins of beliefs, truth-value of beliefs, and means to expel such spirits. What ensues is a categorical rational analysis of the idea of possessing spirits akin to the area of study called demonology.

The idea of creating a typology or hierarchy of spirits was not new to Hindu practices. The first section of Dalpatram's essay investigating the origins of the idea of *bhut* relates the typologies available in Hindu and Jain scriptures. However, the larger part of the chapter,

[27] This may have been an extrapolation of the allied meaning of *bhut* as referring to the five elements out of which all forms of life are created.

then, traces the origins of popular beliefs or superstitions regarding possession of spirits. The term 'demonology' is a misnomer in both senses—with regard to reduction of the idea of *bhut* to a ghost, as well as implying that Dalpatram's essay consisted in a scriptural-scholarly analysis of the idea of evil spirits in Gujarat. The essay verges more on an anthropological record of the contemporary practices or beliefs. The chief inspiration underlying such reduction/modification is revealed at the end of *Bhut Nibandh* when Dalpatram recommends that a sensible person who wishes to be rid of superstitious beliefs should "read such books as this and reflect upon them—to educate himself, and examine for himself" (Forbes 95). This suggestion is followed in the original by a recommendation of Walter Scott's *Witchcraft and Demonology* (1830)—a suggestion removed from the translation. The source of this reference is clear, as is the inspiration behind Forbes having such an essay prepared in the Gujarati language. It is no surprise that Dalpatram's essay resembles Scott's in terms of content as well as structure.

Wherever Dalpatram mentions a practice, term, or category that is locally widely understood, which the western reader is unlikely to understand, Forbes supplements the information in his translation. For example, Forbes offers a detailed description of the ingredients using which various lump offerings or *pind*-s are created for the *tripindi shraddha* ceremony. He provides a detailed reference of the Dundiā and Tapa branches of Jain practitioners including anecdotes of how the two criticize the flaws in their respective philosophical approaches (Forbes 48-49). He translates the Jain *Navkāra mantra* and compares it to the Gayatri mantra of the Vedas (Forbes 50).

Further comparisons bolster the equation of eastern concepts with western categories. Describing the possibilities of a deceased person becoming a spirit in the Hindu shastras, Dalpatram reports that it is believed that if the ceremonies of the twelfth day post death are not performed, the deceased remains a *pret*. To this, Forbes adds a footnote: "The opinion that the happiness of the spirits of deceased persons is affected by the neglect of friends in regard to the performance of their funeral rites, is not confined to India", and mentions a similar belief being reported in Brand's *Popular Antiquities*, further calling it "remains of a very old piece of heathen superstition" (5 un). Further, the "Bhuwar-lok, wherein…unclean spirits dwell" is compared, using a footnote, to a belief among Jews and Christians that "the air or sub-celestial regions were inhabited by the evil spirits" (Forbes 7). Where Dalpatram concludes that, "[t]hey only who are afraid of Bhuts are tormented with them. Of this fact I have seen and heard much, so that the relation would be endless. I have also heard stories of persons who did not believe in Bhuts and therefore escaped annoyance", Forbes attaches a

footnote confirming this conviction by quoting Bishop Hall referring to Satan: "all his charms and spells are ineffectual without the faith of the user, of the receiver" (39). The term "*bhoḷā*" in the original (or its variants) which would most accurately mean "innocent" is translated variously as either "weak" (Forbes 3, 15, 16) or "silly" (Forbes 11, 13). The modification is understood better when read in the context of Forbes' earlier definition of superstition as "*weakness* attended with uneasiness and dread, and productive of confusion and horror" (xii). Thus, absence of knowledge is translated as absence of strength (possibly meaning conviction in the Lord) or absence of rationality (indicated by the term 'silly'[28]).

At times, the comparison is made to support existing biases. Relating the story of women tying rags to a particular tree found in deserted regions, Dalpatram comments that, "women, not being at all educated, are more superstitious than men and fear Bhuts proportionally" (Forbes 20). To this, Forbes adds a footnote quoting King James' explanation for "women being more superstitious", for "that sex is frailer than man is" evidenced by "the serpent's deceiving of Eve" (20). In a strange reversal,[29] while Dalpatram attributes the superstitious belief to a social condition, Forbes attributes it to the inherent nature of women.

The Foreword also reveals that the addressee of the English translation is the British population, indicating the larger context within which the reform debates were taking place. The Foreword mentions that parts of the original draft of the essay in Gujarati submitted for the competition which were considered "likely to be offensive to Hindu prejudices" enough to debar circulation, were omitted or edited in the published version (Forbes xiv). However, Forbes seems to have edited the translation equally to suit British sensibilities. One of the indicators of the moral code of Britain during this time is that all references to sexual organs or activities in the original essay have been completely omitted or severely modified in the translation. As the movement for parliamentary reform gained ground in Britain, the East India Company came under intense criticism, and calls for its dissolution intensified. Events in the colony, thereby, remained constantly interconnected with shifts at home (in the metropole), and supporters of different positions and policies rallied support for their rationales regarding colonial policies. Forbes translation of the *Bhut Nibandh* must be understood within this context, as his attempt to persuade the politics at home regarding his view of the native society and effective strategies for consolidation of empire.

[28] The term 'silly' in Scottish usage up to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries also meant 'innocent'. However, this usage seems to be largely in the religious context indicated by use of this adjective for lambs and sheep ("silly").

[29] Strange owing to the insistent equation of 'rationality' with the West in/through the criticism of 'Indian' superstitions.

Forbes betrays this context in the very first line of the foreword to the translation that criticises those who garnered the contrary perspective: “They who, in estimating the means available for the mental improvement of the people of India, neglect everything which is not either immediately or derivatively Anglican, narrow their sphere of endeavour very unnecessarily” (vii). He argues that “the task of leading the people of Hindustan to mental exertion, is not exclusively the task of either Englishmen or the élèves of English educational institutions” and that it would be a rather more persuasive and effective route to “employ the talent which exists among themselves, whether that talent has been disciplined by an English training or whether it has not” (Forbes xi).

Dalpatram’s essay proves that such English training was not entirely necessary when sufficient interaction with one who represented English ideas and principles was available. Dalpatram dispels the superstitions surrounding *bhuts* by arguing for a clearly empiricist approach to knowledge. In story/section 14/15, Dalpatram relates a popular story about a witch in a certain village and remarks, “I have been told these stories by respectable people; but without seeing myself what occurred, and examining the cause, I cannot believe” (Forbes 23). The motivation of his belief is stated in the section that immediately follows: “I have heard that in other countries the belief in Bhuts existed, but that it was abandoned on examination, and that therefore no one in those countries fears Bhuts now” (Forbes 23). Dalpatram uses the term “*vilāyat*” in the original, hence it is uncertain whether he meant other countries or specifically the West (24). However, the confusion is dispelled when the first reason Dalpatram cites for the decline in number of ghosts is that “the English government have benevolently founded schools, and given great impulse to education. They have published accounts of different countries, and maps of them, so that people can now attain knowledge without travelling from home” (Forbes 88). Thus, Dalpatram’s motivation in writing the essay is that “people will be induced, by reading this book, to make examination, and the truth will quickly be discovered, and superstitions regarding Bhuts, &c, be demolished” (Forbes 23). However, the purported authority of the book based on its empiricist approach is undercut on close examination when Dalpatram himself relates tales that he has only heard from someone else. The authority, therefore, seems to stem from the endorsement of the coloniser rather than the content being the reporting of thoroughly investigated stories. Authenticity, thus, is derived from the domain of power rather than from truth-value.

While, thus influenced by English principles, Dalpatram does not denigrate the shastras. He makes a clear distinction between real *bhuts* as described in the shastras and

counterfeit *bhuts* that are the result of popular imagination and rumours (Forbes 11). It is difficult to ascertain whether this approach was an influence of Forbes' own moderate and collaborationist approach, or issued out of Dalpatram's position outside the sphere of English educational institutions. The influence of Forbes' approach reflects Deepak Mehta's appreciation that Dalpatram "has cleverly carved out a middle path for himself. He neither denounces or rejects the superstitions related to ghosts, spirits, witches, etc. nor does he subscribe to belief in these superstitions" (47).

Reform in Baroda

On the other hand, in another prominent centre of Gujarat that fell in the non-British territory—the native state of Baroda, a corruption scandal erupted that allows the reading of a different emergent aspect of reform.

The territories of Baroda stretched across different provinces of Gujarat covering territories in the Rewakantha, Kathiawad, and Saurashtra. Further, it was the biggest seat of Maratha power in the region—the chief adversaries of the British in the Deccan. Thus, it was politically and strategically a force to reckon with in the lucrative region of Gujarat. The history of British and Gaekwad relations is long, complex, and chequered.

The Gaekwads entered Gujarat as deputies of the Peshwa, annexing territories and collecting revenue in the name of the Maratha power. However, over a long and convoluted history of changing rulers, internal conflicts, and competing claims, the Peshwa-Gaekwad alliance turned adversarial. The British viewed an opportunity in the conflict and brought a third dynamic to the relationship by entering it in the form of mediators. This mediation became a tool to stake rights of intervention in the future course of Peshwa-Gaekwad transactions and wield considerable control over the biggest native state in the region. Baroda became a British Residency, and the British remained an ambivalent force in the state—at once defenders of and assailants on the sovereignty of Baroda.

The challenges created by this complexity became a matter of public discussion in the early 1850s as a corruption scandal from Baroda, on being published in *The Daily News*, erupted in the public domain and became a matter of grave discussion in the British parliament leading to the removal of Lt. Colonel James Outram who was the British Resident in the Baroda state from May 1847 to 1851.

In September 1845, the head of the house of one of the biggest banks of Baroda—Hurree Bhugtee—died, survived by two widows. The elder widow Mahaluxmeebaee already possessed a son three years of age. The younger widow Joitabaee was enceinte at the time of

her husband's death, delivering the child in December. The younger widow delivered a son who was named the successor, as the son of the elder widow was deemed unfit. The house of Hurree Bhugtee wielded considerable power not only over the natives but also over the native government that reeled under the financial duress caused by excessive donations to the Peshwa for patronage to the throne, as well as drain on the treasury caused by consistent security threats and the need to maintain several troops. Thus, the lucrative seat of power of Hurree Bhugtee made the deceased head's family the victim of an intense power play and conspiracies engineered by the accountant Baba Nafra and his associates.

With the intention of holding the de facto reins of the firm in his hands with the timid elder widow and her weak child as the de jure heads, Baba Nafra called the legitimacy of Joitabaee's son into question in 1847 and claimed to possess an unattested will appointing Nafra the manager of the bank and trustee of the family's interests. The Bombay government asked Outram to produce a report on this case immediately on joining in May 1847 allowing only a month's time for preparation. With insufficient time for a detailed investigation, Outram depended on the advice of the Native Agent Nursoo Punt who was colluding with Nafra. However, Outram soon traced hints of corrupt practices within a cabal involving employees at the court and other actors in the state. Ill health forced Outram to leave for Egypt from September 1848 to early 1850. Captain French, who assumed charge as the Acting Resident during this period, paid no heed to Outram's warnings regarding the Native Agent, and several intrigues took place that successfully evaded any inquiry or charges proven against the wrongful delegitimization of Joitabaee's claim, as well as the death of her child while in Nafra's custody. Immediately on resuming his charge in Baroda, Outram reopened the investigation leading to a series of complex parallel intrigues, trials, and exchanges between the Resident and the Bombay government, which surprisingly led to Outram's removal from the post of Resident at Baroda by the end of 1851. The matter was reported in the Blue Books of Baroda wherefrom certain sections were published in the *Daily News* in 1852. Lestock Reid, former Member of Council of the Bombay government, whose name pointedly appears in one aspect of the intrigues as the recipient of bribes from Baroda, wrote a letter to the editor of the journal in 1853, disparaging Outram for apparent slander of officials of the Bombay government. In turn, Outram wrote a monograph exposing the fallacies in Reid's argument and defending his rationale for writing the report. The stir and division of opinion created by the claims and counterclaims led John Chapman to write a chronological statement of events and analysis of the entire matter with a view to lay out

clearly what remained misarranged in the official documents owing to what he suspected was "a desire to conceal in confusion that which feared the light" (iv).

The bulk of discussion, analyses, and vindications, written and published with regard to this issue reveal it to be a topic of anxiety for the British. Analysing Chapman's purportedly balanced account reveals the bases and transformations in the colonial discourse at this historical juncture. It also establishes the significance of this episode for a study of reform.

Of Political 'Morality' and Reform: Baroda vs Bombay

Ronald Kroeze et al have observed that "in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, accusations and debates about corruption served to *initiate reform* or, simply, as a pretext to undermine old structures" (2; emphasis added). Thus, corruption, especially that thriving in traditional regimes or societies, was structured in a binary antithetical relationship with 'modern reform'. Homi K. Bhabha, analysing how "the Other Question" is negotiated in the dynamics of colonialism, avers that colonial discourse is "crucial to the binding of *a range of differences* and discriminations that inform the discursive and political practices of racial and cultural hierarchization" (96; emphasis added). Establishing the range of differences requires the fixing of each representation in the antithetical equation. Such "fixity" uses the "stereotype" as its "major discursive strategy" (Bhabha 94). The corruption scandal, however, presents an instance not only of the conflict between the Self and Other as mutually exclusive entities, but the conflict that emerges out of encountering the Other in the Self; encountering corruption in the powerful echelons of the Bombay government—the representative of the British.

Bhabha remarks on the "problematic of seeing/being seen" as crucial to an understanding of the effect of colonial power (109). While he discusses the "*scopic drive*" in the context of the colonizer's constitution of the stereotype of the colonized (109), I use it to engage with strategies used to structure the gaze of the colonized which necessitate that the colonizer be *seen* in a specific way. This is the argument and anxiety on which Chapman's defense of Outram pivots. This also becomes the strategy through which a disavowal of the Other in the Self is undertaken.

Outram repeatedly defends his reports on corrupt transactions between officers in the Bombay government and certain parties in Baroda on the grounds that the objective was to expose the *impression* that was being developed among the natives that the British government could be manipulated through corruption. When L.R. Reid defends himself against the apparent slander on his integrity brought about by Outram's reports, his fear or

accusation is found uncalled for by both Outram and Chapman for the problem Outram reported was not whether corruption existed but whether natives *believed* it did. It was the perception rather than the reality that was the matter of graver concern. On 15th May 1850, the Government of Bombay issued a circular asking officers "to ascertain whether there existed…a general *belief*…that improper designs could be promoted…by obtaining the secret and corrupt favour of men in power at that seat of Government" (Chapman 6; emphasis added). This focus of the issue is reiterated throughout the 173 pages of discussion on all aspects and developments, to the point of overstatement: "[t]he subject of investigation was the *belief* in the corruptibility of Government, not the fact of Government having ever been or the probability of its being, corrupted: and this was the true view of the matter" (Chapman 9).

Bhabha draws on Metz to point out that in order to be effective, the scopic drive must establish "*active consent"*, that is, the "illusion" that the object surveyed is willing to be surveyed (qtd. in Bhabha 109). This form of "real as mythical" consent is the "*ambivalence*" on which the stereotype turns" (Bhabha 109) and allows for the object surveyed to be at once different and yet entirely knowable, that is, "gives knowledge of difference and simultaneously disavows or masks it" (Bhabha 110).

Chapman's remarks on the native people, culture, and government illuminate this process of formation of the stereotype. One of the chief discursive strategies Chapman uses to establish the distance and difference between the British and the native is to highlight the untranslatability of the term for corruption or malpractice in the native languages. His narrative opens with a definition of the *foreign* term *khutput*: ""KHUTPUT" is a word employed in some of the languages of India to denote active, toilsome, vexatious business; it is conventionally and most frequently used in the sense of endeavouring to accomplish private purposes by means of corrupt and hidden interest; chiefly bribery is understood" (Chapman 5). He immediately follows this up by identifying the image with universal reality: "[u]nder the native Governments of India the practice of Khutput was universal and shameless. Where there is no universal standard of morality, whether of authority or usage, and no constitutional security against wrong, the resort of men with purposes to accomplish in which the Government is concerned must commonly be to underhand arts" (Chapman 5). Thus, immediately after *khutput* is established to be a practice not easily scrutable to the colonizer, it's difference is disavowed by an assertive statement on the motivations and compulsions underlying such practices. In the very next line, this scenario of *khutput* becomes entirely knowable as it is co-opted within the narrative of Enlightenment progress: "[i]n a less advanced state of our own national morality and polity it was with us as it is now

with them" (Chapman 5). [30] Thus, in the first four consecutive statements, Chapman illustrates how the stereotype is located within "the Lacanian schema of the Imaginary" thus making it "an arrested, fetishistic mode of representation" (Bhabha 109-10) using which colonial discourse is constructed.

In order to be successfully signified, "the stereotype requires…a continual and repetitive chain of other stereotypes" (Bhabha 110). Chapman continues to portray the native political-cultural space as inscrutable to the rational mind of the principled and moral British coloniser. Regarding the establishment of a Panchayat to try the dispute between Joitabaee and Baba Nafra, Chapman remarks in a footnote that, "[i]t is *difficult to convey by English terms* a just idea of native Indian judicial institutions and procedure. Judges, secured in their independence by being made irremovable during good behaviour, are *unknown* in the native system" (30; emphasis added). His "statements of truth" continue in the context of one Soorujram (who had helped with reporting of a channel of bribery to an official in Bombay) being ill under doubt of being persecuted by witchcraft by the engineers of intrigue at Baroda. Chapman avers that "[a] firm belief in the power of witchcraft is sufficient to produce all the injurious physical effects on the natives of India, which are ascribed to the incantations themselves…persons…by pretending this power, seldom resort to stronger means…than such as deal with the imagination. But when Europeans are to be operated on…frequent small doses of secret poison are employed" (97).

Bhabha proposes the concept of "stereotype-as-suture" to recognize "the *ambivalence*" underlying the "role of fetishistic identification, in the construction of discriminatory knowledges that depend on the 'presence of difference'" which involves "a process of splitting and multiple/contradictory belief at the point of enunciation and subjectification" (115). The identification of corruption illustrates this process.

At one point in the sequence of events at Baroda, it is argued that the Bombay government's favoured Native Agent Nursoo Punt had no complaints of corruption against him in his twenty-five years of service in the Deccan, thus, it was unlikely for him to indulge in such practices at Baroda. Chapman suspects that if the absence of blame was due to the fact that his victims were afraid to stand up to his position of power, "we need not a more vivid illustration of one of the great evils of Oriental rule, which it ought to be our earnest ambition to remedy" (38). Thus, corruption as an abuse or misuse of power is identified as a

[30] See Moisés Prieto's discussion in the context of Latin America for how the understanding of corruption in former colonies was influenced by Enlightenment rationalism that "linked the absence of corruption to (an idea of of) progress and vice versa" (Kroeze et al 10).

hallmark of not a region or a nation but an entire culture through the use of the qualifier 'Oriental'. However, the history of the rise of British power in Baroda state is an example of the abuse of power itself.

Internal conflicts existed amongst the various branches of the Gaekwad family who had laid claim in territories in Gujarat in the name of the Peshwa. In order to win his claim, Anandrao Gaekwad allowed the British to interpose which gave apparent powers devoid of any checks to the Gaekwad. However, Chavda observes that "[i]n reality, the concept of autocracy of the ruler in Baroda was almost robbed of its real content…By the Subsidiary alliance made by the Dewan, Raoji Appaji's Convention as read with the Treaty of Baroda of 29th July 1802, the British were granted vast and ill-defined powers…It gave them power to follow closely the Baroda administration and…strict control over its finances" (134). The *bahandhari* system was a matter of particular consternation, which gave a British guarantee to persons and/or institutions so that they could call upon British interposition in any matter concerning them. The firm of Hurree Bhugtee held such a guarantee against the price when it was called upon to pay advances to the Arab mercenary soldiers in absence of pay from the prince. However, the guarantee continued even after the Arab mercenaries were no longer in service of the Gaekwad. Chapman justifies this clear violation of sovereignty thus: "…in truth, the Gaekwar practically gained much more of sovereignty than he lost…the fundamental idea of Oriental sovereignty, that of property, not of office, was by no means violated in principle, but only diminished in the amount of its practical result...The change…to the permanent and regular interference of the British, was, on the whole, a great gain to the Gaekwar at that time" (103-4). In another case, Colonel Outram discovered certain documents which revealed a plot hatched by the Gaekwad's minister to bribe him with fifty thousand rupees and Mr. Malet with ten thousand rupees for the abolition of the Guzerat Irregular Horse regiment which the State of Baroda was bound to maintain by treaty with the British and which cost three lakh rupees per annum. Another intrigue in 1843, called the Dackjee Dadajee intrigue, was undertaken with the same intention. Chapman reasons that the abolition of this would not be a benevolent act as the money saved in the treasury would not translate into tax relief for native subjects. It would offer the amount for "any purposes in which the prince, or minister, or minister's party, might choose to spend it, amongst which purposes the public advantage would stand little chance of attention, and a reduction of taxation would not be admitted at all" (Chapman 95). He further adds that maintaining extra arms would ensure security of the citizens which means they could freely participate in economic activities. Thus, manoeuvres to shore finances for their own ends by certain native

beneficiaries amounted to corruption, but manoeuvres to do the same in the interest of the British amounted to an act of benevolence.

On the contrary, Chapman's treatment of glaring examples of corruption in the Bombay government reveal a different attitude. Regarding the matter of Joitabaee's petitions to the government being underrepresented, Chapman considers them "very imperfectly, if not carelessly, transmitted" (36). He describes Colonel Outram's pursuance of the case of Joitabaee even after receiving the initial verdict as motivated to "prevent the *possible* errors of his own superiors" (70; emphasis added). It is possible that Chapman's careful choice of words was influenced by the prevailing tension between the Court of Directors and the Bombay government, especially as the latter cited Outram's use of inappropriate language and tone in his report towards the Bombay government as the ground to consider him unfit for service.

However, it must be noticed that a sharp distinction is drawn between the government of Bombay and the British government as a larger entity in Chapman's assessment. Bhabha quotes Fanon in describing strategies of objectification: "this behaviour [of the colonizer] betrays a determination to objectify, to confine…Phrases such as 'I know them', 'that's the way they are', show this maximum objectification successfully achieved …There is on the one hand a culture in which qualities of dynamism, of growth, of depth can be recognised. As against this, [in colonial cultures] we find characteristics, curiosities, things, never a structure" (qtd. in Bhabha 119-120). This explains the larger strategy of establishing a distinction between Bombay and London. However, the particular strategies can also be seen to work in reverse. Cases of corruption in Bombay are considered instances or isolated cases, which are not representative of the system whereas, instances of corruption in the native administration are taken to be emblematic of the larger system.

Thus, when repeated defence, mitigation of punishments, and overall collusion with the instigators of *khutput* by the Bombay government is reported by Colonel Outram in detail, Chapman concludes that it revealed "how great was the apparent reason the people at Baroda had to believe that British justice had been *hoodwinked* by Khutput" (102; emphasis added). This is symptomatic of how "corruption came to be increasingly "investigated" and re-described as a financial disorder, whereby the British were presented as "supine" and "passive"" while "the investigations often sought to incriminate Indians and their relationships with these officers" (Kroeze et al 10).

In context of a dispute over Gorajee Pol of which Baba Nafra attempted to extract a larger revenue by misrepresentation of the official agreement, Chapman writes that it "affords

an example, on a small scale, of the *régime* which prevails over much of India under native governments. The contrast of the case with the condition and practice of Government in England will supply an approximate mode of estimating the principles from and towards which India is changing under British rule" (78).

Thus, intrigues and power play attempted by the British to retain their authority over territories are contained by the logic of imperialism and viewed in military terms. By contrast, intrigues by native actors to create centres of power are viewed in terms of 'corruption' as per the changing definition of the term towards the end of the eighteenth century, when in came to mean 'the misuse of public office'.

At the same time, the documents surrounding this corruption scandal represent that corruption was yet not being viewed in entirely institutional/administrative terms or as emerging out of larger forces such as how overseas trade, imperial politics, and economics worked. For, if it was so, the British government could be clearly adjudged as corrupt owing to the misuse of office by its officials.

What spelled the difference between the corrupt identity of the native state and upheld the incorruptibility of the British government was the moral question. The Bombay government only represented an exception and not the rule, for it was an example of the failure to put into practice the morally upright principles of government enshrined in the British crown. However, the practices of native groups testified to an inherent corruption, in principle, in the native system of government which did not contain any principles or system of government, at least not such as were recognized in the vocabulary of the modern rational enlightened coloniser.[31] Thus, the coloniser is non-corrupt because his system is moral, and the system of the colonised is corrupt because the native is immoral. As Bhabha puts it, "[t]he colonized population is…deemed to be both the cause and effect of the system, imprisoned in the circle of interpretation" (119).

Chapman repeatedly couches his discussion on corruption in terms of moral transgression: "*improper* designs" (6), "belief in the *easiness of our virtue*" (9), 'official *purity* of fellow countrymen" (142). At the beginning of the discussion itself, Chapman vindicates Outram's actions by proclaiming that "[t]he rule of Britain in India is founded on *moral influence*…We rule simply because the natives of India believe they can trust us better than they can trust one another. Whatever injures the confidence of the natives in the

[31] Vijay Singh Chavda notes that Colonel Alexander Walker, the first British Resident of Baroda in 1802, had noted the presence of certain customs or canons which constituted checks in the conduct of the ruler (134).

integrity, impartiality, and good faith of our Government, weakens in the same degree the foundation of our rule" (5-6; emphasis added).

The debate on corruption can be understood in terms of Ashis Nandy's broad argument in *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism* (1983) the about how colonialism makes certain traits of a culture dominant. The common trait of corruption is considered an aberration for British culture but understood a fundamental principle of another, which becomes possible through the differential of reform. Corruption was a marker of an older order not aligned with the idea of an Enlightened modern society, resulting in its 'othering' in the location of the colony. This othering undergirds the fundamental difference between the coloniser and the colonised, generating rationale for reform of the latter. Administration was also defined in terms of its 'character' foregrounding the discourse on the morality of the functionaries of administrative systems. Thus, the discourse of moral reform gained ground even within the political-administrative domain.

Conclusion

Reform in the early phase of British domination in western India in the nineteenth century generated politically conservative attitude equally shaped by the Scottish background of the early administrators. The nature of political structures both in the metropole and the colony was less centralised allowing a broad spectrum of actions and approaches to the restructuring of native society in the frameworks of modernity.

However, as the domain of reform engaged more significantly with colonial education, its fundamental assumption of difference governed by a lack, and the consequent need for improvement, came to be institutionalised in colonial systems. Thus, a specific reformist impulse could be analysed in those located in the institutional networks of western/English education.

The idea of a gap structuring reform assumed not only a spatial difference in the location of modernity in one civilisational direction (west) and lack of it in the east, but also a temporal gap in the 'belated' adoption of modernity in all civilisations through the agency of the west, that also identified the agency and hegemony of the coloniser in defining modernity and the nature of reform. Thus, the conceptual structure that the term reform generated specific relations of power and constituted modernity as a pedagogic project that had to be interpreted by one to the other. This idea of interpretation was as much grounded in the idea of catechism as it is in the Enlightenment delimiting of the concept of knowledge.

At the same time, the terminology of reform allowed a disavowal of its structural principle of difference by assuming a smooth movement between the past and present, tradition and modernity, etc. and masking the asymmetry between nature of the west and the east.

In this aspect, it indicated an impulse to co-opt the native society within the teleology of western modernity through a linear progression across stages. This required a comparative methodology that used translation and historiography as its twin tools. While translation established a syntagmatic structure of comparison in space, historiography founded the grounds for a paradigmatic comparison across time. However, the framework of comparison presupposes that the grounds or parameters of comparing the two entities in question be the same, in other words, bases of recognition of the Self in the Other should be common. This led to epistemic violence effected through an imposition of western conceptual categories on native phenomenon through the subject position for the coloniser implicated in the interpretation of reform in the context of empire.

I argue that reform functioned as one of the principal categories that instrumentalized such violence in the first half of the nineteenth century. However, it was not a phenomenon of the colonies but posited at the transactions between the metropole and the colony. As a material practice, the contours of reform were shaped both by the anxieties surrounding reform and consolidation of power in the metropole. At the same time, different colonial actors interpreted and implemented it using different approaches in turn constituted by their personal circumstances, geographical-cultural surroundings, and nature of interaction with the British.

The agentive role of the coloniser in the pedagogic project of modernity was justified by the rhetoric of native immorality. Thus, in this phase of colonialism, reform signified moral purification more than institutional restructuring. The idea of morality manifested itself in the domains of both social morality and personal morality.

Forbes' translation of the *Bhut Nibandh* engages with the question of social morality and posits the possibility of the spread of Enlightenment rationality and English principles through the medium of vernacular languages, and thus poses a challenge to the proponents of education in English in rather disparaging terms: "[t]hey [the Anglicists] would import our English language, manners, and character, to be retailed to the public of India like a batch of Birmingham wares" (vii).

In the specific context of Gujarat, the Forbes-Dalpatram alliance created a climate for growing confidence in a regional identity and the quality of the vernaculars. Forbes traced the

ancestry of modern Gujarati to older regional variants rather than Sanskrit, thus contributing to an assertive sub-nationalism. Thus, while through Forbes' mediation and the peculiar position of the Gaekwad, a singularly positive outlook towards the British presence developed in the important urban centres of Gujarat, the position towards English language was antagonistic.

The corruption scandal in Baroda engages with question of personal reform. In the administrative domain, challenges involved in the transfer of systems from pre-colonial to colonial structures and the negotiation of traditional power groups in the process were turned into a justification for the drawbacks of natives of their systems. This, in turn, bolstered the perceived need for reform, couched in the need to educate the natives.

The discourse of both social reform, and personal reform intersected with the question of race in the context of empire as it tended to paradoxically conflate what it wished to change as an inherent quality of the natives. Further, as the progressive westerner had positioned himself ahead in the teleology of modernity, the difference between the two would always persist.

The discussion on the *Bhut Nibandh* highlights the function of translation as a metaphor for the temporal gap in the idea of modernity, and thus the slippages in the act of transfer, also showcase modernity as différance—that which will always come later and cannot be achieved. The discussion on the corruption scandal represents the changes in interpretation of an idea generated by spatial location of that which is interpreted.

This chapter discussed the imbrication of reform and education in colonial Gujarat in specific historical conditions that led to the conservative-ambivalent attitude towards the revolt of 1857. The next chapter examines whether and how it shifted towards the turn of the century.

Reform, in the final analysis, emerges as marked by diverse manifestations—both in terms of the regional differences in the nature of reform movements, and the range of meanings that the term invoked, from a conceptual frameworks, to political attitudes, to material practices. Reform also represents how language could be structured with the logic of coloniality.