

Internal Conflict Within Caste Movement and The Development of The Capitalist and Working Class in the Colonial Agrarian Structure of the 20th Century India : A Study

Saroj Mahata

State Aided College Teacher, Department of History, Gourav Guin Memorial College, C.K.Road, Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal, India, Sar83mahata@gmail.com.

Abstract:

Indian society is a pluralistic society. Since the establishment of Colonial rule Indian social structure with the Colonial state relationships flow through tensions. The character of the Colonial state was mainly repressive and Oppressive. The goal of this state was Indians establishing authority over society, land expropriation of revenue and forest resources and mineral resources and to secure the foundations of British rule. That is British Government maintained political and military authority keeping and procuring raw materials from India selling British products. As a result of colonialism Indian since the end of the eighteenth century the society is disturbed in many ways. Eighteenth century and under the influence of colonialism in the nineteenth century Adivasi tribal entities, caste, class status multiple changes occur. Why this change? How did various classes develop in colonial India? The aim of this study is to understand what happened.

Keywords: Colonial States, Society, Tribe, Class, Community, Aboriginal Criminal Groups, Lower Castes Movement.

Introduction:

Indian society with the Colonial state since the establishment of Colonial rule in India structural relations flow through various tensions. The character of the Colonial state was basically: Repressive and oppressive. The main objective of this was to establish its authority over Indian society, to absorb land revenue and forest resources and minerals and to secure the basis of British rule in India. In a word, to maintain the political and military authority of the British Government in India, to collect raw materials from India and to sell British products in India. Indian society was not familiar with such economic policies and political repression during the pre- British or Mughal Period. In fact, the Indian society suffered in many ways from the end of the eighteenth century due to the impact of colonialism. In this context it is necessary to remember that the impact of colonialism fell on such section of the Indian society one by one. The reason for this was that Indian society was a Plural Society. The influence of colonialism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries brought about several important changes in the status of indigenous tribal entities, castes, and classes.

Objectives :

The main objectives of this research paper are:-

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 06 August 2024

Received in revised form
16 August 2024

Accepted 31 August 2024

Citation: Mahata. S., (2024)

“Internal Conflict Within Caste Movement and The Development of The Capitalist and Working Class in the Colonial Agrarian Structure of the 20th Century India : A Study”, *Pen and Prosperity*, Vol. 1, Issue. 1, September 2024.

- i) British colonial policy towards Indian Aborigines- Tribes.
- ii) Changes in the Indian Caste system during the colonial period.
- iii) Lower caste movements and various internal conflicts in Indian Caste Movements.
- iv) Development of various classes and Communities in colonial India.

Methodology:- The study is supported by secondary data. Given the nature of the current research, secondary sources have to be used to gather material of this exploratory and descriptive paper. Secondary data was gathered from academic working papers currently in progress, books, Journals, newspapers, research projects and websites run by the Indian government.

Discussion:-

During the Mughal Period, there was a distance between the tribal people's and the Mughal state. Although the Mughal state sought to absorb forest resources, it never reached the scale of the British. The biggest reason for this was the colonial nature of the British state, a kind of utilitarian and positivist political philosophy that worked behind every action and policy formulation of the British state. In this philosophy, Indian society was considered uncivilized and undeveloped. Its change is essential. Under the influence of the European enlightenment, this type of upper class mentality was born in England and Europe. This mentality and philosophy worked behind the adoption of various policies by the British in India. The British Government felt it was justified to interfere in the social and communal life of the tribals. For example, the British Government had no control over the para- tribes Mymensingh until the mid- nineteenth century. Between 1822- 1869, attempts were made to integrate this so- called "Uncivilized" para – tribe into the Civilized state structure through various legislative and military campaigns. The British Government was reluctant to integrate India's many diverse tribal people's and their diverse customs and cultural activities and independence into the British state structure. Out of this, " Discomfort" was born the " colonial epistemology" and the census system. While discussing the census or "Census", Bernard S, Chon commented, "The history of the Indian census must be seen in the total context of the efforts of the British colonial government to collect systematic information about many aspects of Indian society and economy" . The colonial British Government did not the work of identifying each section of the Indian society and collecting data through census. Knowing information facilitates governance.

Various financial policies adopted by the British colonial government also brought changes in the lives of the tribal people's. Through forest Acts, the government took the lead in breaking the long- held rights of tribals, indigenous people's over forest resources and their spiritual ties with forests(A relationship that cannot be judged only by economic Criteria). On the other hand, the commercialization of agriculture destroyed the traditional almost self- sufficient economy of the tribal tribes. The influx of outside caste Hindus and the presence of Marwari moneylenders threatened the rhythm of life tribal Adivasi. The British Government believed in private property rights. The concept of individual right to property did not exist in tribal society. They believed in communal ownership of property. But when the British Government tried to impose the concept of private property ownership on the tribal society, the conflict between the tribal tribes started with the British colonial state system. In the words of *Sumit sarkar*, "British legal conceptions of absolute private property eroded traditions of joint ownership (like the khuntkatti tenure in Chthonagpur) and sharpened tensions within tribal society",. During the Mughal Period, such conflicts between tribal tribes and the Mughal state did not exist. In this context it should be remembered that the presence and activities of Christian missionaries also created hatred towards the British Government among the tribals and tribes in many areas. In short, anti- British attitudes towards the British state and its allies started to arise in tribal society in various ways.

The great resentment that arose in the tribal Aboriginal society as a result of British colonialism and the activities of its allied Indian powers manifested itself in a series of bloody rebellions. Tribal identity or Tribal society's own sense of solidarity worked behind these revolts. These aimed at ousting the colonial state, colonial ideology and colonial rule.

Aboriginal Criminal Groups in the lens of the British Government:-

While collecting information about the Indian society and especially the tribes, the British colonial government identified several tribals groups as Criminal Tribes. The British rulers felt that Crime was the hereditary livelihood of certain tribes or tribal groups. British Government documents say " Crime is their trade and they are born to it and must commit it". These groups are identified as " Criminal tribes" by the government. In order to bring these so- called groups under government control, the government enacted the " Criminal Tribes Act of 1871; In the 1830s W. H. Sleeman was also influenced by the concept of this Criminal of this Criminal Tribe was connected with the legal framework of " rule if law" created by colonialism. During the great revolts of 1857, the British Government stepped up to suppress the low- caste nomadic tribes. In 1867, the inspector general of North West Pradesh commented in his report " it must be remembered, in dealing with the wandering predatory tribes of India, that the fraternities are of such ancient Creation, their numbers so vast, the country over which depredations spread so vast their organization so complete, and their evil such formidable dimensions, that nothing but special legislation will suffice for their suppression and conversion i.e. the British Government came to the conclusion that these nomadic tribal groups cannot be included in the legal framework without special measures or " special legislation". The result of this thought was the formulation of the " criminal Tribes Act of 1871 identified four tribal groups as "criminal Tribes" . Provisions are made in this Act to increase this number later. The government makes it mandatory to register members of these identified criminal Tribes. Their movements are also controlled. The law also calls for arresting them go outside the designated area.

Thomas R. Metcalf's research shows the government's efforts were not above Criticism. As the Punjab chief court Judges have said only if someone has committed a crime can be registered. This argument is also given that the innocent will be punished unnecessary. Not only this, it will also centralize a huge amount of power in the hands of the police, which will create huge potential for abuse. But the government did not pay much heed to this Criticism. After independence, this infamous colonial law was abolished.

Changes in the Indian Caste System during the Colonial Period:-

The Indian Caste system underwent various changes during the colonial period. In pre- colonial Indian Hindu society, occupations were largely hereditary. The highest hierarchy of the Caste system took a hereditary form. Hindu scriptures sanctioned this arrangement. The different castes of Hindu society were divided into several groups based on " Independent and Intra- clan Marriages". Auto-Multiplication was the most important in this society and since the Brahmins were possessors of auto- Multiplication, the were the highest caste in the society. Apart from the Brahmins, the Kayasthas and Vaidyas were also identified as upper castes of society. Lower caste people were considered to have no virtue. Naturally, social mobility in such a society is low or limited both horizontally and Vertically. This is not to say that Caste- based Hindu society did not change at all in the pre- colonial period. Various social and cultural changes were going on, albeit in a limited form. But it never brought any change in the basic structure of the Caste system. After the arrival of the British in India and the introduction of the colonial system, some changes in the Caste system resulted in more social mobility than before, but the abolition of the Caste system did not happen at all. Rather, the Caste system adapts to new conditions and tries to maintain its position as firmly as possible.

During the colonial, the traditional Indian society changed due to various reasons. The introduction of a cash economy into the Rural agrarian structure and the establishment of private rights over land weakened the traditional caste- based land revenue system to some extent. A new type of Civic economy was born during

the British period, the basis of which was never based on caste. The foundation of this new economy was professional education and skills such as English. English Education is based on colonial clerks. It is true that English Education was dominated by upper castes like Kayasthas or Vaidyas, but it is also true that English Education was never caste based. In a word, the spread of English Education on the one hand, and the birth of some new colonial scholarship on the other hand, loosened the caste- based social structure of the eighteenth century and gave rise to social mobility. Merit- based occupations instead of caste- based occupations become increasingly important in nineteenth century Indian society.

Hitesh Ranjan Sanyal's research on the transformation of the caste system in British colonial India is important. According to him, the destruction of native industries and degradation of agricultural system was the norm during British rule had weakened the foundations of Indian social order. Reciprocity between pre-colonial castes there was dependence, which actually gave rise to a sense of mutual security and belonging to everyone in a caste- based social structure position indicated. It almost completely collapsed during the colonial period. As a result of the process of De-industrialization, artisans, weavers deviated from their traditional occupations and flocked to agriculture. British in many respects under the pressure of land revenue policy, the peasants were forced to take refuge in the industrial economy of the city. The sense of village life had nothing to do with the slums or slums of the city. Indian Caste system migration from villages to cities played a very important role in the erosion. That is caste system, concerts associated with the caste system such a purity, impurity etc. are irrelevant in the new social structure, had become the lower caste people are also in many fields to strengthen their position in this changing context organized to organize and move towards movement. There is no doubt that the British the primary benefits of the role were absorbed by the upper castes like the Brahmins, Kayasthas and Vaidyas, while the lower castes the groups, however, which not willing to be left behind were various lower castes organized in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries evident from the movement of groups. Organized with the aim of gaining social status and government favors. The movements sustained the changing caste system on the one hand and the British colonial government on the other " Divine and Rule Policy" prepares the field of application. But in this context it is also necessary to remember this the upper castes were no less responsible for creating the situation.

Movements of Lower Castes:-

Notable among the organized lower caste movements in India in the nineteenth and Twentieth countries was the Namashudra movement organized between 1872 and 1947. **Shekhar Banerjee** discussed various aspects and complexities of this movement. Namashudras mainly lived in Bakharganj, Faridpur, Dhaka, Mymensingh, Jessie and khulna districts of East Bengal. Among the Bengali Hindus, the Namashudras were at the bottom of the society, commonly known as Chandals. As a result of various types of social injustice, distance between upper caste and Namashudras started to be created. In 1872-73, the first Namashudras movement started in Faridpur, Bakharganj, region. But this movement did not succeed. This failure gave birth to the sect of Satuya Dharma. The religious Guru of this new sect was Sri Guru Chand Thakur. The social movement of Namashudras spread rapidly around this Satuya religious community. Bengal Namashudra Association was formed in 1912 A.D.

Shekhar Banerjee has shown that as the movement progressed, two clear divisions developed within it. The upper tier belonged to the Nobility. The lower stratum was mainly the peasant community. However, as a result of the move of Namashudras, the government used the term Namashudra instead of **Chandal** in the 1911 census. They started using various socio- cultural honorific or Symbols of the above castes. They started demanding separate opportunities in education and government Jobs from the colonial government. In the 1820s and 1930s, they were given some privileges. But the lack of representation of the Namashudras in the representative institutions created resentment among them.

The Namashudras were Skeptical about the Nationalist movement and always kept a distance. The biggest reason for this was that while the Namashudras considered British rule superior to the pre- British rule, the Nationalist leadership aimed to end British rule. This example why the Namashudras kept a distance from all Nationalist movements from the Swadeshi Movement to the Quit India movement of 1942.

At the bottom of the Namashudra movement were the peasants. They wanted freedom from the exploitation of upper caste landlords. For this, sometimes they sided with the government against the Nationalists, sometimes the Namashudra farmers joined hands with the Muslim farmers and protested against the upper caste landlords. Again, to maintain the unity of their community, they went into fierce conflict with the Muslims, as happened in the areas of Jessore, Khulna, Bakharganj etc. in 1911, 1923-25 and 1938.

From the 1930s, the Namashudra leadership become increasingly involved in constitutional politics and distanced itself from the peasantry in a reverse process. The Krishak Praja Party, led by Fazlul Haque, began to organize the Muslim and Namashudra peasants of East Bengal during this period. Till 1937, the Namashudra movement was running parallel to the mainstream of nationalist politics in Bengal. After Guru Chand's death in 1937 and the efforts of Subhash Chandra and Sarat Bose, the distance between the congress and the Namashudra leadership decreased. On the other hand, from the middle of 1937, the Bengal provincial Farmers Sabha started organizing farmers(most of whom were Namashudras) in districts like Khulna, Bakharganj, Faridpur etc. This process intensified after the Bengal provincial peasant Conference was held at Rangpur in June 1942 and the lifting of the ban on the Communist Party in July. As a result of this, in 1947, Namashudra farmers joined the Tebhaga movement in large numbers in districts like Faridpur, Khulna, Jessore etc. The leaders on the floor of the Namashudra movement were however indifferent about the role of this " Class" of the Namashudra farmers. The " class" of peasants was indifferent to the role. Shekhar rightly concluded that a process of division had began in the Namashudra movement overriding ethnic and group identity. Within this caste-based movement, classism become evident in the consciousness of the Namashudra peasants through various tensions. On the other hand, top leadership is encouraged to stay within the circle of institutional politics. The emergence of class entities and the development of the peasant movement definitely characterize of contemporary period of change. Gail Omvet's research on Maharashtra shows that the caste movement in Maharashtra also had two distinct strands. The first section is relatively conservative and ruled by the affluent section of the lower castes. This conservative section believed in the legitimacy of the British Government and after the **Monte- Chelmsford** Reforms in 1919 formed a conservative and British Loyalist political party called the "**Non- Brahman Association**". The other part was much more extremist and movement- oriented. This radical section formed the "**Satyasodhak Samaj**". They were guided by class ideology. According to them, the society is divided two parts- on one side the majority **Bahujan Samaj** who are exploited in various ways, and on the other side the majority Sethji Bhatji i.e merchants with the Gandhian Nationalist movement. Kunbis and Marathi were the base of Brahmin caste movement in Western India, Vellal and Dravidian Sattvas were the base in South India. **Bernard Cohn's Study** of Eastern United Provinces shows that the "**Chamars**"(mainly Marginal peasants and landless from labourers) took refining the relations tenets of the **Shivnarayana** group and continued to observe various rites of Brahmanical culture. In Kerala, the lower caste people called **Ejava** started questioning Brahmanism in various ways from the beginning of the 20th century. One of their demands was to get the right to enter the temple. Various forms of Sanskritization process can be seen among caste groups like **Nadars** of South Tamil Nadu, Pallis of North Tamil Nadu, Mahars of Maharashtra. From the 1930s and especially from the 1840s, a large part of the lower caste radical movements were influenced by left-wing ideology. For example, **Sahajananda** first **congress society** party and later the Communist Party of India. Nana Patil, one of the leaders of Satyasodhak movement in Satra, become one of the Communist leaders of Maharashtra. Early Tamil Communists such as Singaravelu and P Jibanandhan was associated with the caste movement in the 1930s.

Two general conclusions can be drawn from the discussion here about the caste system and its changes in nineteenth and Twentieth century Indian society. i). The Condition of the Indian castes, especially the lower castes, was by no means fixed, immobile, unchanging. The impact of colonialism on the one hand, and the development of their own protestant identity and consciousness changed both the internal and external status of the castes. In other words, every moment the caste- based power relations were changing, the struggle of the lower castes to assert their rights was changing the power relations with the upper castes and the colonial state. In this sense, the caste Hindu groups and colonial state were also changing themselves along with the change in power relations. That is, it is a long-term struggle that has gone through many ups and downs. ii). Partha Chatterjee shows(Consciousness of caste and lower caste) that working people are constantly finding forms in their “common sense”, through cultural means, in such a community. The function of politics is to develop these functions, qualities within the people. Not to import any “ scientific thinking” from outside. That is, through the development of internal qualities the politics of resistance creates its own language. This statement and argument of **Pratha Chattdoes** not explain why in the 1930s and 1940s of the 20th century, the development of class consciousness and left- wing ideology spread gradually in the lower caste movement in India. Infact, it is not only a question of the development of internal common sense, but more importantly of the specific historical background and ideology associated with this question. The question is whether left- wing ideology is “scientific thought” borrowed from Europe, but more importantly, whether left- wing thought can explain the Indian lower- caste movements of the 1930s and 1940s. An empirical analysis of the various movements of the Indian laser castes shows that class consciousness arose from the middle of the caste movement, behind which the movement led by the Communist Party played a major role. So the left ideology here is not something taken from outside, rather it was able to explain the question of the material position of castes and their transformation. And because he was able to explain, the development of development of class consciousness out of the caste movement was successful.

Development of Classes in Colonial India:-

Class Development in Colonial India can also be discussed in this context. In the Marxist view, class is primarily linked to economic activity. More specifically related to the means of production and the relations of production. For example, in slave society there were two main classes- **Slave owners and Slaves**. Feudal Lords and Serfs in Feudal Society. Industrial owners or Capitalists and Industrial workers in a Capitalist Society.

From the experience of western Europe, it has been seen that the Capitalist social system is born through the breakdown of the Feudal social structure, and according to Robert Brenner, class structure has an important role in this transition. If we review the history of India, it can be seen that it does not match the experience of the development of capitalism in western Europe. There were two main reasons behind this, i). Indian society is a caste-based social structure, which was not the case in western Europe. ii). The course of development of Indian society during the Mughal Period was Fundamentally influenced by colonialism in the eighteenth century; which was not the case in western Europe. The influence of colonialism introduced Fundamental changes in Indian agricultural structure and land during the Mughal Period, the process of industrialization began, albeit to a very limited extent, and port- centric kanbi patidars, Reddys in Madras, Sambad mails in Maharashtra, etc, are examples of such rich farmers. From this discussion we can conclude that the welfare of the colonial land revenue policy during the British period in the agrarian society.

New classes developed and class discrimination continued to increase. The internal polarization of agrarian society grew at a rapid which increasing poverty for the majority of many rural societies, while increasing prosperity for a small number of farmers.

The new type of urban economy that developed during the British period saw the development of at least three new classes : the middle class, the working class and the boundaries capitalist class. The birth and development of the middle class is entirely linked to colonial Modernity. They are the English educated

class of India. Brahmins, Kayasthas and Vaidyas received early English Education due to low caste mobility. Historical B.B. According to Mishra, the development of the middle class followed the British rule. On the other hand, Christopher Bailey's research shows that in the eighteenth century, the bureaucratic class, merchants, etc. Settled in the cities of North India and prepared the initial field for development as a well-organized class. Through economic and political corporation with the British power, they gradually developed into a Middle class. In this sense there is no separation between the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century, the transition from the pre-colonial era to the colonial era is a history of continuous continuity. Bailey, in his study of Allahabad, tries to prove that "Allahabad's English-educated middle-class lawyers and other educated native leaders were in fact only favored spokesmen of the Shethiya class, patronage ties are stronger here than caste or language unity. D.A. Washbrook found similar patronage relationships in his study of the Madras presidency.

This commentary on the development and role of the middle class had to face many questions. The 19th century middle class was never the 18th century Hindu alms or gentry. The middle class of the 19th century was simultaneously critical of conservative Hindu society and British colonialism. Behind this was the revaluation of native traditions on the one hand, and the assimilation of the benefits of western education on the other.

In 1887 the number of English educated people in India was approximately 298,000. In 1907 this number rose to 505,000. Not only Bengali but English language newspapers continued to increase in number and circulation. The English educated class mastered the new vocations that arose under the benevolence of colonial rule. The greatest identity of the middle class was to constantly question its surroundings social, economic, political. Behind this effort of the middle class worked constant self-criticism and presenting a holistic view of the country and the times. The development of the middle class does not mean merely the spread of English Education, but the growth of class consciousness among the middle classes. In Kolkata, Bombay, Poona, Madras, everywhere the English educated middle class came forward to build socio-religious reforms and organizations. Even the economic critique against colonialism was presented by the middle class. In fact, from 1860 onwards the educated Indian middle class lost hope in British rule. Economic nationalism among the middle classes was born out of this class.

Apart from the middle class, two new classes emerged from the second half of the 19th century. One is the capitalist class, the other is the working class. **Tirthankar Roy** divides the process of industrialization in India into four periods- 1). 1850-1914 2). 1914-1920. 3)1920-1939 4). 1939-47. The process of industrialization gave birth to both the class of industrialists and workers in modern India. The most notable of the early industries were textiles, followed by jute and engineering industries. Most notably, Indian industrialists were generally born from the Marwari, Gujrati and Chettiar clans. They raise capital by acting as agents of ordinary British companies or English merchants. This capital is latter invested in industry. A number of new Indian industrial groups develop after the First World War. Notable Indian industrialist groups during the British period are Tata, Birla, Singhanian, Sriram, Moftal, Goenka etc.

Along with the development of the industrial class, the development of the working class was one of the major features of the socio-economic history of the 19th- 20th century. As a result of the British land revenue policy and De-Industrialization, a large section of the rural population was displaced and worked as industrial workers in the cities in search of livelihood. As a result, various elements of rural culture came to the working class neighborhoods of the city. The Condition of workers was also very bad. Between 1860 and 1890 there no increase in the wages of workers at all, and subsequently wages did not rise at the same rate as the rise in food prices in 1890-95. The presence of Chieftains in labour owner relations intensified labor exploitation. The Condition of Bagicha or miners was also very miserable. In 1931 the Royal Commission of labor commented that during the Factory Commissions inquiry in 1908, workers in most textile mills were working up to 15 hours a day. The situation was similar in other industries. Women and

child labourers were brutally employed. But their wages much lower than male workers. The Indian Factories Act was enacted in 1881 to change this intolerable situation. This Act prohibits employment of children under 7 years of age in factories. Children aged 7 to 12 years are scheduled to work for 9 hours a day.

But this law could not change the condition of the workers. The Report of the Factory labor Commission of 1908 showed that the exploitation of children continued in the some ruthless manner. Even the 1931 report of the Royal commission on labor in India showed that the condition of the workers had not improved at all. Among textile mill workers in Bombay, the highest mine was an average monthly salary of Rs- 37. The average monthly salary of unskilled workers was 20 taka, the average monthly salary of female workers was 17 taka. The workers quarters were, in a word, extremely wretched. Workers had no social security. Naturally, the workers quickly organized protests against this system. Workers in industrial areas like Ahmedabad, Bombay, Sholapur, Jamshedpur, Calcutta, Nagpur, Madras, Coimbatore went on frequent strikes. As a result of this process, the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) was formed in 1920. AITUC's first Arab Rail Snake was formed in 1920 by Nationalist leader Lala Lajpat Roy. Motilal Nehru and Vithalbai Patel were on its stage. Generally speaking the formation of Trade unions means the rise of working class consciousness.

Some recent studies have questioned the “ class” consciousness of the Indian working class in various ways. As **Dipesh Chakraborty** has shown, community sense and consciousness were much more active than class among the jute workers of Bengal. Various elements of the pre- capitalist rural life can be seen in the life of the workers which hindered the development of class consciousness. This tension needs to be kept in mind when reading the history of the development of the Indian working class as a “**Class**”.

Conclusion :-

The Development of Indian society in the 19th and 20th centuries Indian social system developed through the tensions of community, Caste and Class within a very complex Colonial economic and political structure. The nineteenth and Twentieth countries saw fundamental changes in the social structure. But this process did not always happen independently. Colonial powers influenced these processes in various ways for their own imperial interests. This complexity needs to be keeping mind while reading the history of modern India. It is also important to remember that it was through these complex tensions that Indians gave birth to Anti-Colonialist political commentary. Analysis of this political commentary is also important.

References:-

- Bandyopadhyay, S(1997). Caste, Protest and Identity in Colonial India: The Namashudras of Bengal, 1872- 1947, New Delhi, Oxford University press.
- Bandyopadhyay, S(2011). Caste, Culture and Hegemony: Social Dominance in Colonial Bengal, London, Sage Publication Inc.
- Bandyopadhyay, S(2004). From Plasseyto Partition : A History of Modern India, New Delhi, Orient Longman.
- Bandyopadhyay, S(1990). Caste, Politics and The Raj: Bengal 1872-1937, New Delhi, South Asia Books.
- Sarkar, S(1982).Modern India 1885-1947, New Delhi, Pearson.
- Bayly, S(1999). Caste, Society and Politics in India from the 18th century to the Modern Age. New York, Cambridge University press.
- Bose,S(1993). Peasant Labour and Colonial Capital: Rural Bengal Since 1770,New York, Cambridge University press.
- Chakraborty, D(2000).Rethinking Working Class History Bengal 1890 to 1940, London, Princeton University press.