

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-4, ISSUE-4

SOCIO-POLITICAL SITUATION IN INDIA AT THE END OF THE 19TH CENTURY - THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Khalikulova Umida Rustamovna

TATU Samarqand branch umidaxalikulova93@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Late 19th - early 20th century. The socio-political situation in India was dire. The economic situation was extremely difficult, the standard of living of the population was lower than that of other countries. At that time, India mainly specialized in agriculture, and the majority of the population lived in villages and engaged in farming. Due to the lack of systematic work in agriculture, the lifestyle of the farmers working on the land was miserable. The industry was also served by the British government. There are some differences in India during this period literacy and only upper class people could read and write. These factors also created certain problems for the development of India. But the enlightenment that started in India led to the country's independence.

Keywords: India, England, national minority, social status, politics, economy, agriculture, caste, tax system, administration.

INTRODUCTION

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the British colonial empire of India (legally the Indian Empire), which included the present-day Republic of India, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, and the People's Republic of Bangladesh, was spread over an area of more than 4.2 million square kilometers with a population of 283 million people. (for comparison: the area of Great Britain was 240 thousand square kilometers, the population was 38 million people).

India was a backward country in the early 20th century. He came to this time with a heavy burden of enormous socio-economic problems: the poverty of a large part of the population, prolonged famine and mass epidemics, and even a large part of the population was reduced (1891-1901 and 1911-1921).), the average life expectancy was very short, 23 years. This was mainly the result of his colonial policy. In India, the rural population is the majority (about 90%). Urban residents were mostly concentrated in small towns (5,000-50,000).

LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

In the process of research, the objectivity of scientific knowledge, the processes in India in the 19th and 20th centuries were revealed objectively. Logic, the socio-political situation in India was studied in terms of logical consistency. Systematics, the relationship between Great Britain and India was systematically analyzed.

The economic life of the country was mainly determined by traditions, the division of society into castes and religions. A semi-subsistence economy prevailed in the village, and semi-feudal relations were formed.

RESULTS

Indian agriculture at that time was characterized by the Indians themselves as a completely stagnant economy. Agriculture had three main systems of land ownership and taxation by the British. The first is a permanent tax (permanent zamindar) (Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, the northern part of the Madras region), according to which large landowners (zamindars) from the Brahmin

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-4, ISSUE-4

and merchant castes received the right to land. They had to pay a land tax, which was levied continuously at the end of the 18th century, during which the rent reached 90 percent. The second - in the second half of the 19th century, temporary zamindari was introduced (United Provinces, Central Provinces, Punjab). Accordingly, the land tax was revised every 20-40 years, and the rights of large landowners began to be given to smaller landowners. If the land in the village belongs to many owners, then as a community they have assumed not only individual, but also collective responsibility for paying taxes. A third system - rayatwari - was introduced in the provinces of Madras and Bombay from the 1850s. He gave ownership rights to small landowners - raiyatams ("protected tenants"). However, many of them did not work on the land themselves, but rented it out.

Most of the villagers did not have their own farms. These were mainly the lower castes and tribes who were socially and economically subordinated to their masters, but in fact laborers or enslaved workers, together with their families, numbered more than 50 million in 1901. Almost all landless laborers, tenants, and many small landowners were indebted to usurers. Remnants of feudal relations in the villages - arbitrary rent collection, free labor of tenants, clearing of waste land and pastures, collection of fees for the use of water from lakes, as well as the performance of lower caste duties. compulsory works continued.

The system of land ownership introduced by the British included the collection of large amounts of taxes, as well as the promotion of agricultural products for export. In fact, the aim was to maintain a constant "perpetual" tax (to ease the pressure on the zamindar landowner), while the British government constantly increased the rent for the land. At the beginning of the twentieth century, taxes accounted for only 4 percent of the gross income of rural producers. Twenty landowners were not interested in capitalist agriculture. They preferred traditional forms of land use. Land leasing and usury were more reliable and profitable for them than capitalist production. As a result, the layer of middlemen who live off the labor of the peasants who work the land began to expand.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Indian new owners were still very weak and small. Many of its groups depended on British capital or government orders. The landlords were made up of several denominations or caste groups - Parsis, Marwari (Jains), Gujarat bania (Hindus), Muslim Bohras and Khojas. They often operated outside their ethnic-confessional territories. They dominated British commercial and banking capital in industry, including the two main centers of India - Bombay (Mumbai) and Calcutta (Kolkata). At the beginning of the 20th century, along with the creation of modern forms of economic organization - commercial firms, auction companies, banks, and then factories and plantations, the ownership classes began to grow in number.

About 4.5 million people are employed in industrial production, mainly in small enterprises. About 1 million of them were factory workers. Their work was hard, mostly manual labor for 12 or more hours a day, low wages, and dependence on contractors (employers). Caste and labor conflict prevented their union. Most of them came from villages and lived in poverty without family in the city. After several years of hard work, they would return to the village. Boys will go instead of them. This cycle is repeated from generation to generation.

By that time, 6% of India's literacy rate was 18 million people. About 500,000 of them were educated in English [7]. The modern middle class that emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century was made up of local merchants, government officials (trade and office and bank

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-4, ISSUE-4

employees), British companies, employees of municipal institutions, school and college teachers, medical workers, lawyers, judges (all, as a rule, in low positions). In India, workers were traditionally divided into those engaged in mental labor and those engaged in manual labor, which was reflected in the caste system of employees. Most of the intellectual workers were members of the upper caste, most of whom were educated in English. After the rebellion of 1857-1859, the British began recruiting English-educated Indians into civil service so that they would not support the rebels. A network of educational institutions teaching in English has begun to be created in India. In 1858, three universities were opened at once - in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. The emergence of national press and professional-business associations corresponds to this period.

The administrative system of the Indian Empire was a sovereign state - it consisted of the government, army, state apparatus, and financial institutions. However, the administration of the British government was carried out by the Minister of Indian and Burmese Affairs from London. Also, a Governor-General of India was appointed, who had almost unlimited power and had the title of Viceroy as the representative of the King of Great Britain. The officer corps is almost entirely composed of Englishmen who have passed the Indian Civil Service (HDX) examination. By the beginning of the 20th century, the number of Indians in the USSR was very small. The governors of the viceregal provinces were appointed by the government, and the governorates also had legislative advisory councils.

The Indian Empire consisted of provinces headed by governors and lieutenant governors (Bengal, Bombay, Madras, Bihar Orissa, United Provinces, Central Provinces, Punjab) as well as provinces headed by commissioners (North), West Frontier Province (NWFP), Baluchistan and Assam) entered. The center and south of the country, as well as the north, were occupied by 562 principalities (about half of the entire Indian territory with 25% of the total population of the Indian Empire). The largest of them were: Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore, Cochin, Bhopal, Gwalior, Indore, Jammu and Kashmir. The royals had separate vassal treaties with the British government, but their affairs were handled by representatives of the political department under the governor-general, with special representatives in charge of one or more small principalities.

DISCUSSION

The real basis of British colonialism was economic exploitation and racial discrimination. The development of socio-economic events in India can be judged by the dominance of foreign minorities and the indifference of the economic interests of the majority of Indians. In addition, at the beginning of the 20th century, the country was affected by famine. Tens of millions of people suffered from it. In addition, at the same time, an epidemic of cholera began, from which more than six million people died. The sad condition of the Indian people was confirmed not only by Indians, but also by many foreign researchers. American historian Will Durant said, "The appalling poverty of India is the policy of a foreign government, which cannot be justified ... There is ample evidence that British rule in India was a disaster and a crime." This is completely different from Muslim rule (the Baburis), wrote Durant. The Muslim invaders came to stay and their descendants called India their home. They spent what they received as taxes to develop handicrafts, agriculture and other fields in India, enriching literature and art. "If England had followed the same path, India would be a prosperous country today. But its current looting is totally intolerable. Britain destroys one of the greatest and gentlest nations every year."

CONCLUSION

The history of India in the first half of the 19th century was primarily associated with the national liberation struggle of the Indian people against the British colonial rule. As a result of this struggle, the country gained independence in 1947. The Indian National Congress (INC) played a decisive role in this struggle along with other political forces. Many enlightened intellectuals took part in the country's liberation, tried to show the country's development and succeeded.

REFERENCES

1. Сдасюк Г.В. Индия. География хозяйства. М.: Мысль, 1975, с. 18-20, 32.
2. Растянный В.Г., Дерюгина И.В. Модели сельскохозяйственного роста в XX веке. Индия, Япония, США, Россия, Узбекистан, Казахстан. М.: ИВ РАН, 2004, с. 78.
3. Юрлов Ф.Н., Юрлова Е.С. История Индии. XX век. – М.: Институт востоковедения РАН, 2010. 15 с.
4. Левковский А.И. Особенности развития капитализма в Индии. М.: Восточная литература, 1963, с. 17-19; Алаев Л.Б. Индия: Национально-освободительное движение и обострение конфессиональных разногласий // История Востока. Т. 5. Восток в новейшее время: 1914-1945 гг. Р.Г. Ланда (отв. ред). М.: Вост. лит., с. 307-311; Thorner Daniel. Land and Labour in India. New Delhi: Asia Publishing House, 1974, p. 109.
5. Павлов В.И. Формирование индийской буржуазии. М.: Изд. восточной литературы, 1958, с. 175, 278, 279.
6. Гордон Л.А. Из истории рабочего класса Индии. М., 1961, с. 127-148; Комаров Э.Н. Материальное положение промышленного пролетариата Бенгалии и некоторые вопросы его формирования // Ученые записки Института востоковедения АН СССР. Т. 5. М., 1953.
7. Юрлов Ф.Н., Юрлова Е.С. История Индии. XX век. – М.: Институт востоковедения РАН, 2010. 16 с.
8. Keith A.B., ed. Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy 1750-1921. Vol. 1, Oxford, 1922, p. 383; Metcalf T.R. The Aftermath of Revolt. India 1857-70. Princeton (New Jersey), 1964, p. 129, 133; Юрлова Т.Ф. Народное восстание 1857-1859 гг. в Индии и английское общество. М.: «Наука», 1991, с. 121, 124; Комаров Э.Н. Политическое развитие независимой Индии. Основные формы, этапы и закономерности // Индия в глобальной политике. Отв. ред. Ф.Н. Юрлов. М.: ИВ РАН, 2003, с. 186-226.
9. Алаев Л.Б. История Востока. Т. 5: Восток в новейшее время: 1914-1945 гг., с. 307-311; Белокреницкий В.Я., Москаленко В.Н. История Пакистана. XX век. М.: ИВ РАН, Крафт+, 2008, с. 27.
10. Левковский А.И. Особенности развития капитализма в Индии, с. 67.
11. Durant Will. The Case for India. Simon and Schuster. New York, 1930, p. 55.
12. Pulatov, Sh., Madalimov, T., Mullajonov, I., Qodirov, M., & Valiyev, L. (2020). Some Characteristics of Modern Indian Philosophy. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications, 2(11), 47-49.
13. Pulatov Sh.N. Sankhya-ancient Indian philosophical school. // PUSTAK BHARATI RESEARCH JOURNAL // JAN-June. ISSUE Toronto, Canada. No: 1-2, 2020.
14. Пулатов Ш.Н. Ҳиндистоннинг илк мустақиллик даври тарихининг ўрганилиши // Хорижий шарқ мамлакатлар тарихий жараёнлари ва уларни ўрганишнинг долзарб муаммолари // илмий-амалий конференцияси материаллари. Тошкент. 2020. 217-221 бет.