CMC Senior Theses   CMC Student Scholarship

2020

Trickle Down Nationalism: Interactions Between Liberal Nationalism and Colonialism in the Raj and Nigeria

Aaryaman Sheoran

Claremont McKenna College

Trickle Down Nationalism:
Interactions Between Liberal Nationalism and Colonialism in the Raj and
Nigeria

submitted to
Professor Jonathan Petropoulos

by
Aaryaman Sheoran

for
Senior Thesis
Fall 2019
December 9, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my professors at Claremont, who, without exception have helped me. I have been fortunate to learn from some phenomenal professors over the last three years. I would like to thank CMC's fantastic History and Economics departments for allowing me to pursue my goals. Professor Petropoulos, since Freshman year, has been a constant source of encouragement and support, both as a professor and as my academic advisor. Taking his World War II seminar in 2016 ensured that I was going to be a History major and this thesis is in part inspired by conversations I had during his seminar on Winston Churchill. He has been a guiding light throughout my thesis-writing process and has provided immeasurable resources and time to discuss various facets about this project.

I would also like to thank all my friends at Claremont, who have taught me so much and provided both wise counsel and unending support through the last four years. Maxim Leshchinsky has generously helped both formulate my underlying ideas and has edited some very rough drafts. His work has made this study fuller.

Thanks also to my family, for always supporting me. Inayat Chaudhry encouraged me to apply to Claremont McKenna College and I have her to thank for being here today. Akshay Poonia has given me sage advice throughout my life. Lastly, I would like to thank my parents, Abha and Sanjay Sheoran. They have not only supported my education and hence enabled me to conduct this study but also encouraged me every step of the way. Thank you for believing in me.

Introduction

By far the most important political movement of the long nineteenth century was the rise of nationalism. Between the French Revolution, and the beginning of the First World War, the political geography was shaped and reshaped dramatically by nationalism, which manifested itself in the Spring of failed revolts in 1848, unifications of Italy and Germany, and pan-Slavism. Nationalism remained the vogue ideology, springing out of the rational revolution of the Enlightenment, and mobilized liberals across the continent to challenge traditional hierarchies and pillars of power. As a political force, it engaged the emerging bourgeois and proletariat classes, enabling national opinion to play a role in political decision making. The movement was championed by some brilliant statesmen like Garibaldi, Napoleon, and Bismarck, and opposed by others, like Metternich and Castlereagh. European nationalism is also, in part, to blame for causing the seminal conflicts of the following century. Therefore, has enjoyed continuous and extensive academic interest from eminent historians.

Concurrently, the European Great powers began the process of European colonialism. On a mission both to civilize the natives and open up new markets for their industrial goods, the Europeans started exploring and claiming new lands. Free trade soon gave way to imperialism, as European powers realized that they could force goods on an unwilling market more easily if they held political power, as explained by Ronald Robinson and John Gallager in their seminal work, *The Imperialism of Free Trade*, "The British interests in China are strictly commercial, or at all events only so far political as

they may be for the protection of commerce."[1] Though the text makes a clear reference to China, this policy can clearly be generalized to apply globally. Beginning with the Americas, the British, French, Spanish, Portugese, Dutch, and Belgian governments conquered territories on all inhabited continents. These European powers undoubtedly set up a global system of periphery based growth, where resources were extracted from colonies across Asia, Africa, and Latin America, while making the former dependent on the latter. This theory is explained at length by esteemed historian and sociologist, Immanuel Wallerstein, in his treatise on the world-systems theory, declaring "A set of boundary lines delineated the entities which were participants of the state system. There were various peripheral states which were exploited and a set of European states which benefitted."[2] Cash crops were extracted from Asia; mineral wealth was extracted from Africa; gold was extracted from Latin America; most perversely, the European powers also extracted slaves from Africa and Asia deep into the nineteenth century. Simultaneously, traditional power structures in these regions were undermined. European great powers extinguished historic empires across the globe, ranging from the Mughal dynasty in South Asia to the Inca civilization in Peru. Further, they deindustrialized these new territories by effectively dumping cheap manufactured goods, destabilizing local economies in the colonies, albeit allegedly in favor of Schumpeteresque creative destruction where a new, more efficient industrialized economy would emerge. These

[1] Wright, Harrison M, ed. 1961. The "New Imperialism": Analysis of Late Nineteenth-Century Expansion. Problems in European Civilization. Boston: Heath. p142
[2] Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. 1984. The Politics of the World-Economy : The States, the Movements, and the Civilizations : Essays. Studies in Modern Capitalism = Etudes Sur Le Capitalisme Moderne. Cambridge Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press. p81

effects created a power vacuum in colonial states as the new colonial elites were never fully entrenched and the traditional sources of power retreated.

The combination of nationalism and colonialism has remained understudied in academia, despite the important interaction between the two phenomena. As the long nineteenth century was followed by the short twentieth century (1914-1991), European ideas bled over into their colonial empires and began to fill the power vacuum created by colonial enterprises. Across European empires, the competing ideologies of nationalism, socialism, communism, and anarchism clashed for public support. While not mutually exclusive, indeed many ethnic nationalist movements retained socialist and communist elements, the proponents of the ideologies envisioned different futures for their nations. Ultimately, capitalist nationalism won out in most cases. History is a function of the present onto the past, as argued by Immanuel Wallerstein, "The historian invents history, in the same way the artist invents his painting. The historian's narrative of the past 'interprets' events in terms of long term continuities looking through the lens of the present."[3] Given this assumption and the fact that most post-colonial states remain under capitalistic nationalist forms of government, nationalism became the most important philosophy to analyze when examining colonial history.

The best method to understand colonial history and its effects is to observe the British Empire. Stretching across from the Carribean in the West to Hong Kong in the East and from Canada in the North to Australia in the South, the British Empire was by far the largest, most populated, and richest of any European nation. Built on the actions of military officers seeking to advance their careers and corporations pursuing untapped

---

[3] Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. 2000. The Essential Wallerstein. New York: New Press. p312

markets for imperial goods, it received unlimited support from the Crown. In the long nineteenth century, Britain, much like other European powers, stumbled into an Empire. Famously, it annexed Egypt to secure the Suez Canal pathway to India; it acquired Sudan to consolidate its hold on Egypt; it seized Uganda and Kenya to guarantee its holdings in Sudan. These secured popularity for contemporary governments and the envy of other great powers. However, the vast majority of these colonies, as one British parliamentarian put it, "hung as millstones around Britain's neck," in terms of economics and cost more resources to maintain than could be extracted from them.[4] The exceptions to this rule made the Empire a profitable venture for the UK. The two most valuable of these exceptions, British India and Nigeria were extractive colonies for the UK, where Britain gained large markets for its goods and near free raw materials for its industrial centers. The Raj was the Jewel in the Crown for the Empire and Nigeria was by far the most populous African colony. At the time of Nigeria's independence, one of six Africans was a Nigerian. Consequently, British bureaucracy was entrenched most deeply in these nations and affected Hindustani and Nigerian societies the most.

British influences included large scale economic disruption, cultural reform through 'westernizing' the population and abolishing local customs, and creating a new set of institutions to replace traditional power centers. Inevitably, these factors created a nationalist surge across both the Raj and Nigeria. These nascent nationalist crusades were marshalled by an elite who received a western education and rationally questioned the moral and cultural underpinnings of colonialism, triggering the movements, British created institutions that were infiltrated by nationalist sympathies, catalyzing the

---

[4] Beckett, I. (2013). Citizen Soldiers and the British Empire, 1837–1902. London: Routledge

movements, and surges of economic nationalism through British-developed systems, which activated the movements. As the British enabled a greater number of students from the colonies to receive an education in Britain, local elites were exposed to the enlightenment ideas of human equality and the mercantilist theories of exploitative resource capturing from the periphery. These injustices enraged the idealistic elite youth, who spread the nationalist principles back in the colonies, creating a chain reaction of moral outrage. As British institutions grew in the colonies, they evolved to develop local characteristics, until they were virtually indistinguishable from native institutions and began lending support to nationalist causes. Similarly, economic pressures through British policy created a new middle class, which was inherently more politically conscious and demanded more rights than their agrarian forebears and even awakened the slumbering plebeian masses through backbreaking taxes and poor working conditions. British participation in colonial activity was imperative to the creation of nationalist movements that later went on to found Nigeria, India, and Pakistan. In the words of Immanuel Wallerstein, "The sovereign state of India was created, mostly, by the British in the period 1750-1850. This in turn had a profound impact on [...] 1850-1950, when the single greatest influence on the period was probably that of the Indian nationalist movement."[5] The same can be said to be true of Nigeria, and of the Empire in general. When the British arrived in new lands, they rarely found a tabula rasa, but instead small dysfunctional states that they unified to build and project their power. This unified state inevitably gained political consciousness and evicted the British through a nationalist

---

[5] Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. 2000. The Essential Wallerstein. New York: New Press. p313

anti-colonial movement. In all cases, nationalism, and by extension modern national identity, trickled down from Europe into the colonies.

On August 14, 1947 the dissolution of the British Empire began in earnest. Pakistan broke off from the British India and declared independence. A day later, India shook off the chains of colonialism and ended British Raj in the subcontinent. The following decade saw the rise of decolonization in Africa, aptly summarized by British PM Harold MacMillian declaring in 1960, "the wind of change is blowing through this continent." Britain's most populous African colony, Nigeria, gained independence less than seven months after the declaration, on October 1, 1960.[6] This study seeks to examine the similarities and differences in the nationalist causes of British colonies in South Asia and West Africa, and understand the role individual 'great men of history', national institutions, and economic forces played in generating support for the nationalist movements.

---

[6] Frank Myers, "Harold Macmillan's" Winds of Change" Speech: A Case Study in the Rhetoric of Policy Change." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3.4 (2000): 555-575

Chapter 1: Elites' Education Abroad

As the British Empire expanded, so did the number of local elites from Britain's colonies who chose to pursue their higher education abroad in Great Britain. Famously, most independence activists across the Empire had received education in top British universities. Allowing local elites access to British education made it easier for the British government to run the Empire and staff indigenous people in civil service positions. However, it had the unintended consequence of exposing emerging colonial middle and upper classes to European liberal Enlightenment ideas like nationalism and representative government. These ideas were antithetical to the very nature of the British Empire, an imperial venture, and catalyzed the growth of national identity across Asia and Africa. Young elites from different parts of the Empire would be exposed to these ideas while in Great Britain and would transport them back to their native lands. When these elites became politically active, their seditious ideas spread to a vastly broader section of the local gentry, in effect creating a stream of trickle down enlightenment where nationalist ideas pioneered in Europe were flowing to colonies.

Although many leaders of the South Asian and Nigerian independence movements studied abroad in the UK, and a more complete study would include the experiences of all important national leaders and the broader effect of the phenomenon of local elites discovering European philosophy in England, this study will primarily focus on five of the most important national leaders for Nigeria and South Asia and use their experiences as case studies. Perhaps the most important of these leaders were Abubakar Tafawa Balewa (1912-1966), Nigeria's first Prime Minister; Olayinka Herbert Samuel

Heelas Badmus Macaulay (1864-1946), the father of Nigerian nationalism; Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1876-1948), Pakistan's first Prime Minister; Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964), India's first Prime Minister; Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948), the father of the Indian independence movement, all of whom were educated in England.

Abubakar Tafawa Balewa

Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Nigeria's first Prime Minister was clearly influenced by the European ideals of democracy and universal rights while at the University of London between 1944 and 1946. Demonstrating the importance of his education in Britain, Balewa cited his time in England on his speech in Ibadan in 1964, Nigeria's first public university, "I have always been grateful to the University of London for my education. We today have ample reasons to be grateful to the same university for the stout support and tender ministrations which have led to today's weaning ceremony."[7] Balewa continued to associate with student organizations long after finishing his education, indicating an important link between anti-colonial groups at universities and colonial independence movements. This link was cemented by his speech on colonial liberty at Trafalgar Square on December 4, 1949, hosted by the West African Students Union of Great Britain and Ireland.[8] This speech gave credibility to the Nigerian nationalist agenda and allowed Balewa to rail against colonial policies to a mainly British

[7] Balewa, Abubakar Tafawa Sir. *Nigeria Speaks: Speeches Made between 1957 and 1964*. [Ikeja]: [Longmans of Nigeria], 1964. p 170

[8] ZIK A SELECTION FROM THE SPEECHES OF NNAMDI AZIKIWE Governor-General of the Federation of Nigeria formerly President of the Nigerian Senate formerly Premier of the Eastern Region of Nigeria, p48

audience, making his pro-democracy ideals the moral force behind the independence movement. Espousing Jeffersonian and Kantian ideas of liberty in political speeches throughout his career, Balewa developed the idea of Pan-African independence movements by taking enlightenment philosophies of human rights and nationalism to their logical end in West Africa.[9]

Balewa expounded that democracy must flow down to Africa, and was not to remain the domain of European nations, given the losses African nations had suffered to protect European democracy in the twentieth century.

> "It is very significant that in the last two world wars, African peoples were inveigled into participating in the destruction of their fellow human beings on the ground that Kaiserism and Hitlerism must be destroyed in order that the world should be made safe for democracy-a political theory which seems to be the exclusive property of the good peoples of Europe and America. Today, Africa must demand democracy as well. Africa should demand it collectively and Nigeria should demand it separately."[10]

Linking together democracy and a national identity where Nigeria must be the guiding light for the continent, Balewa created a sense of unity among the Nigerian people, who originally saw themselves divided between the predominantly Muslim north and the mainly Christian south. Balewa's foreign education helped him bridge the gap between the two Nigerias.

---

[9] Hodgkin, Thomas. 1960. Nigerian Perspectives: An Historical Anthology. West African History Series. London: Oxford University Press p 361

[10] Balewa, Abubakar Tafawa Sir. *Nigeria Speaks: Speeches Made between 1957 and 1964*. [Ikeja]: [Longmans of Nigeria], 1964. p 63

Born in Bauchi state in the Northern Nigeria Protectorate, during his time at London he realized the importance of a centralized state centered around Nigeria's economic capital, Lagos, through debates within the West African Students Union of Great Britain and Ireland.[11] Consequently, he spoke against the possible partition of Nigeria and the secession of the North, arguing to the caucus of the NCNC Working Committee on May 12, 1957

> "In my opinion, the Northerners are perfectly entitled to consider whether or not they should secede from the indissoluble union which nature has formed between it and the South, but it would be calamitous to the corporate existence of the North should the clamour for secession prevail. I therefore, counsel Northern leaders to weigh the disadvantages of this dangerous course, as one who was born in the North."[12]

Balewa's education in England therefore helped create a sense of unity for the various factions in Nigeria, forming a national identity around the first Prime Minister, who catalyzed Nigerian nationalism and bridged gaps between the North and the South and Gere-Fulani tribes and Hausa-Igbo tribes. He celebrated this unity with his final speech to pre-independent Nigeria in the house of representatives on August 15, 1959, declaring,

---

[11] "Gere: Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa's Real Ethnic Group." Accessed November 2, 2019. https://web.archive.org/web/20160924071913/http://www.dailytrust.com.ng/news/notes-from-atlanta/gere-sir-abubakar-tafawa-balewa-s-real-ethnic-group/130284.html.

[12] Balewa, Abubakar Tafawa Sir. *Nigeria Speaks: Speeches Made between 1957 and 1964*. [Ikeja]: [Longmans of Nigeria], 1964. p 17

> "In other countries where the government has been changed, a minority has forced their will on their country. Here is our greatest achievement:what we have done, we have done willingly. Compromise has been substituted for force. Every group in Nigeria has sacrificed something and has given way in order to reach unanimous agreement for peace and friendship."[13]

This call for unity before the first independent election in Nigeria was critical to ensure that the four autonomous regions that had little in common in terms of language, ethnicity, or culture, could form a nation held together by democratic forces.

Jawaharlal Nehru

Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first and longest serving Prime Minister grew up in the only Indian family in a Delhi neighborhood home to British civil servants. The son of one of the most prominent lawyers in the nation, Nehru experienced the life of a young English aristocrat, going to school at Harrow and Cambridge. His time in England, from 1905 to 1912, exposed him to nationalism, where he saw the Japanese struggle against Russia an exercise in Asian revolt against global European supremacy, "Japanese victories stirred up my enthusiasm. Nationalistic ideas filled my mind. I mused of Indian freedom and Asiatic freedom from the thraldom of Europe."[14] He began to explore nationalist ideas, viewing Guiseppe Garibaldi as an idol for unifying Italy under the

---

[13] Balewa, Abubakar Tafawa Sir. *Nigeria Speaks: Speeches Made between 1957 and 1964*. [Ikeja]: [Longmans of Nigeria], 1964. p 27

[14] Om Prakash Misra; Economic Thought of Gandhi and Nehru: A Comparative Analysis. M.D. Publications. 1995 p 34

Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and expelling French and Austro-Hungarian rulers in favor

of Italian ones. He was deeply moved by the Italian nationalist movement, writing

"Visions of similar deeds in India came before, of [my] gallant fight for [Indian] freedom

and in my mind India and Italy got strangely mixed together."[15] His education also

exposed him to Fabian socialist concepts, which blended together with his nationalism to

form a core identity for the Indian independence movement. He was even a part of the

Indian student group at Cambridge, Majlis, and often spoke about the need for a national

home-rule movement. Nehru fully acknowledged that his nationalist ideas came from his

education abroad, arguing in Allahabad Court in 1922 on the eve of his second

imprisonment

> "Less than ten years ago I returned from England after a long stay there. Had
>
> imbibed most of the prejudices of Harrow and Cambridge and in my likes and
>
> dislikes I was perhaps more an Eglishman than an Indian. I looked upon the world
>
> almost from an Englishman's standpoint. I was as much prejudiced in favor of the
>
> English and England as it was possible for an Indian to be because my English
>
> education exposed me to the ideals I strive towards now.[16]

This awakening nationalism, combined with his father's position as the president of the

Indian National Congress, the principal political group in the British Raj, allowed him to

successfully create a national movement centered around *Swaraj*, self-government, which

will be explored later in this study. The *Swaraj* movement developed the idea of a

national consciousness past the intelligentsia of the Raj and widened the Congress' base

---

[15] Misra, p35

[16] Brecher, Michael. 1959. Nehru: A Political Biography. London: Oxford University Press. p50

from elite Anglophiles to include the middle and working classes.[17] The inclusion of local middle and working class leaders definitively changed how subjects of the Raj saw themselves. British India had few nationwide institutions and being a part of the Congress allowed for local leaders to meet each other from different parts of the subcontinent, creating a unifying sense of being Indian, rather than from a specific region or caste. The Congress, under Nehru's influence, became a big tent party for Indian independence, bridging religious, ethnic, and cultural gaps, creating a unified front for Indian nationalism. Muhammed Ali Jinnah, who later founded Pakistan was a card carrying member of the Congress until 1920.

Nehru bolstered this emerging sense of national identity through his writings and speeches, where he repeatedly called for a united, centralized India. In 1942, he published a collection of his writings, titled "United India", declaring a nationalist mission to unite the subcontinent's different identities. He claimed

> "The growth of the powerful national movement in India, represented by the congress, has demonstrated the political unity of India. This voluntary organization, commanding the willing allegiance of millions, has played a great role in fixing the idea of Indian unity in the minds of our masses. The British gave political unity to India. It is a unity of common subjection, but it will give rise to the unity of common nationalism."[18]

Demonstrating a clear nationalist agenda, Nehru tried to disseminate his opinions past the upper middle class, convinced that an independent India required broad support from the

---

[17] Brecher, p73

[18] Nehru, Jawaharlal, and V. K Krishna Menon. 1941. The Unity of India : Collected Writings 1937-1940. London: L. Drummond.p24

public to prevent it devolving into a collection of squabbling principalities. As a prominent member of Congress, Nehru began engaging with the masses, giving speeches for his nationalist cause across the subcontinent. He asserted

> "Our provincial governments are very busy. Our ministers work hard and late and wear themselves out. And yet, the sands run out and this mad world rushes on. The people's problems, your problems, multiply and Indians perish. The basic problems of India relate to the peasantry and the industrial workers. The Congress has already begun to tackle this. Executive orders have been passed by congress, not by provincial governments, that have brought some temporary relief to the masses."[19]

Nehru's speeches in the 1920s and the early 1930s often railed against provincial governments led by princes and minor kings, who sought to keep power by decrying Congres' nationalist democratic agenda in favor of royal rule legitimized by the divine right of kings. Nehru saw these arguments as similar to the liberal nationalist and convervative royalist debates that plagued Europe in the previous century and was able to convince the majority of Indians to side with his pluralist nationalist message, as evidenced by Independent India's first election, where the Congress won power in every state.

---

[19] Nehru, p147

Olayinka Herbert Samuel Heelas Badmus Macaulay

Herbert Samuel Macaulay, the father of Nigerian nationalism, spent four years abroad in England between 1890 and 1894, spent studying civil engineering at the University of Plymouth and music at Trinity College, London. Born into a family of Nigerian socialites, Macaulay had a moderate outlook on colonialism and admired British rule in Lagos. While in Britain, however, Macaulay joined the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines' Protection Society, where he was exposed to both nationalist and Pan-Africanism ideas. While the two schools of thought seem antipodal, Pan-Africanism played a key role in the development of African nationalism in Nigeria as the idea of an 'African people', helped unify people who had been previously divided by tribal cleavages. Macaulay helped merge the two schools, organizing discussions in London about how national identity in African colonies could only exist through the Pan-Africanism idea of unity against colonial empires.[20] Contending that the British Colony and Protectorate of Nigeria was too tribally diverse for national identity to take root organically, Macaulay set forth creating a Nigerian identity by himself, based on the principles he studied at Anti-Slavery and Aborigines' Protection Society.[21]

On his return to Lagos, Macaulay found a deeply divided city arranged into four political groups: British rulers who lived in the posh Marina district, the Saros and other slave descendants who lived to the west, the Brazilians who lived behind the whites in the Portuguese Town and the real Lagosians, the masses of indigenous Yoruba people,

---

[20] Zik, p58-59
[21] Zik, p58-59

disliked and generally ignored by their privileged neighbours.[22] Macaulay, abhorred at the divisions even among the African communities, pledged to form an alliance between the groups against British colonialism. Through Macaulay's concerted efforts, he made progress towards convincing the Saros and Brazilians to contemplate making common cause with their Yoruba cousins. This change sparked the rise of a unity around a Nigerian identity in the South, as politically inactive working class Yoruba community joined the middle classes in asking for political reform like governmental representation for Africans.

Buoyed by his success in Lagos, Macaulay began travelling to the North to convince the Gere and Fulani tribes to support the Igbo tribe's proposal of African representation in the British Civil Service in Nigeria in the South. Still supporting British rule in Nigeria, Macaulay wanted to first create the image of a unified people, and later work towards self government, a nationalist idea shared by colonial leaders across the Empire. Acknowledging diversity, while propagating a national message, he proclaimed in 1937,

> "We are still many people of many religions: a great number of us are Moslems; many are Christians, many follow other religions. We have yet to combine the various elements in our national life into a single whole. We have yet to find the unity that is essential if racial and religious suspicions are to give way to kindliness, tolerance, and respect for each others way of life. We seek unity, but not uniformity. Yet, we have symbols that unify us. The crown is such a symbol.

---

[22] Fasinro, H. A. B. Political and Cultural Perspectives of Lagos. Lagos, 2004 p33

It is a symbol of unity to which all people are drawn when controversy and bitterness threaten to destroy the life of the community."[23]

Promoting peace between the various factions in Nigeria, Macaulay personally carried the idea of nationalism into Nigeria and demanded that tribal chiefs and leaders ascribe to his beliefs of a Nigerian people, creating a platform for future Nigerian leaders like Balewa, Azikiwe, and Bello to spread a pro-independence message to a Nigeria much less fractured by internal strife.

Muhammad Ali Jinnah

Muhammed Ali Jinnah, the founder and first Prime Minister of Pakistan, was perhaps most successful of the nationalist leaders in achieving his goals. While Macaulay and Balewa promulgated nationalist Pan-Africanism and Nehru and Gandhi promoted a brand of nationalism diluted by pluralist secularism, Jinnah concentrated his nationalist ideology on Muslim statehood. While studying abroad at Lincoln's Inn between 1895 and 1906, one of the four Inns of Court in London, he discovered a passion for liberal politics and was enamoured by Indian nationalist leaders like Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and Dadabhai Naoroji.[24] Jinnah, convinced by their nationalist message, wrote in his diary "I happened to meet several important English Liberals with whose help I came to understand the doctrine of Liberalism. I grasped that Liberalism, which became part of my life and thrilled me very much. Liberalism at the time for me meant nationalism."[25]

---

[23] Tamuno, Tekena N, and Tekena N Tam. Herbert Macaulay, Nigerian Patriot. London: Heinemann, 1975. p291
[24] Bolitho, Hector. Jinnah : Creator of Pakistan. 1st ed. London: John Murray, 1954. p4
[25] Bolitho, p8

Obsessed with Indian nationalism, Jinnah traveled back to the subcontinent and joined both the Congress and the Muslim League. He began his political career as a moderate advocating for home rule rather than independence; the *Khilafat* affair, beginning in 1919, created a schism between Jinnah and Gandhi. As Gandhi's prominence and support for the *Swaraj* movement in the nationalist circles rose, Jinnah resigned from the Congress and devoted all his political energy to the All India Muslim League. Upon leaving the party, he was convinced that the Congress was only superficially secular and that Muslims in a Congress dominated India would be persecuted. While contemporary leaders decried Jinnah's move as communalist politicking, his fears were not unfounded. A small minority of Hindu nationalists in the Congress had demanded that upon independence the slaughter of cows be prohibited and that Hindi, written in the Sanskrit script, rather than Hindustani, which could be written in Sanskrit or Urdu, be declared as India's national language, sidelining Muslim agitation within the Indian National Congress.[26] Further, the 1937 All India constituent election underlined Muslim political vulnerability. The Hindu dominated Congress had won in a landslide and didn't need a partership with Muslim League to form the national government, effectively locking Muslims out of power. Jinnah's political ideology took a drastic turn, and he began developing a new nationalism, centered around religious identity. Pursuing the idea to its logical end, Jinnah began demanding for a Muslim majority state partitioned off from India. As permanent president of the Mulsim League, Jinnah had considerable influence over the Muslims in India, and slowly began to

---

[26]Ali, Chaudhri Muhammad. 1967. The Emergence of Pakistan. New York: Columbia University Press., p29

convince important local leaders to his demands for a partitioned state. He achieved

success through his nationalist messaging, and made public speeches in Muslim

dominated areas in both Punjab and Bengal.[27] Although Jinnah began as the lone voice

for a separate Pakistan, he was able to create a strong grassroots movement of Muslim

nationalism by the mid 1930s; prominent Muslim leaders like Sir Muhammed Iqbal and

Chaudhary Rahmat Ali supported Jinnah's proposals for an Islamic state. By 1939,

Jinnah's nationalism resembled contemporary Zionism and he often told visitors "I am a

Moslem, not an Indian. The Moslems are a nation, just like the Poles or the Germans."[28]

Although not a supporter of Zionism, Jinnah had viewed the Israeli experiment in

Palestine with interest since his time in London and clearly wanted to emulate Jewish

success under British tutelage. Jinnah's nationalism conflicted with Nehru and Gandhi's

nationalism, who saw independent India as a secular state affording equal rights to

Hindus, Muslims, Christians, and Parsis. The ensuing conflict between the two ideologies

continued until independence, when ultimately Jinnah's acerbic 'identity nationalism'

won out and British India was partitioned between West Pakistan, India, and East

Pakistan.

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, the figure associated most closely with the

Indian nationalist movement and arguably the country as a whole, began his political

---

[27] Bolitho. p121

[28] Jinnah, Mahomed Ali. Mahomed Ali Jinnah, an Ambassador of Unity: His Speeches & Writings 1912-1917. Madras: Ganesh, 1918. 1918. p114

career as an Indian nationalist leader in South Africa, where he demanded better working conditions for Indian laborers. Before moving to South Africa, Gandhi had spent three years between 1888 and 1891 in England. Gandhi had graduated with a degree in law from University College London, where, like his contemporary nationalists, he began to explore nationalism and the British enlightenment. He was enamoured with the enlightenment thinkers he studied, ranging from John Beltham to Thoreau.[29] Especially prejudiced towards Thoureau, remarking "Thoreau furnished me through his essay on the Duty of Civil Disobedience. I believed I would find the great philosophy to live my life by at the end of the book."[30] This penchant for British philosophers stayed with Gandhi, who quoted John Stuart Mill and herbert Spencer in his seminal work, *What is Swaraj?*[31] Eventually, he gravitated towards Indian nationalists in London, beginning with Narayan Hemchandra. Hemchandra influenced Gandhi's understanding of the subcontinent and convinced him of universal human equality, which would form the basis of the Mahatma's dual policies of *Ahimsa* (non-violence) and *Satyagraha* (non-cooperation).

Moving back to India in 1915, Gandhi's nationalism had an immediate transformative effect on the Congress, which had previously remained an Anglicized community of upper class, high caste moderates advocating for increased autonomy within the Empire. Within five years of returning to India, the Mahatma was the president of the Congress, which had officially changed its policy to demanding *Swaraj,*

---

[29] Gandhi, Mahatma, and Mahadev H Desai. An Autobiography : The Story of My Experiments with Truth. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993. p107

[30] Sharma, Bishan Sarup. Gandhi As a Political Thinker. Allahabad: Indian Press, 1956. p9

[31] Gandhi, M. (1997). Gandhi: 'Hind Swaraj' and Other Writings (Cambridge Texts in Modern Politics) (A. Parel, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p28-29

or self rule. Gandhi, much like Nehru, helped expand the Congress' base and include middle and working class members to construct a national consciousness. Gandhi, however, went further than Nehru and advocated for Indian nationalism by demolishing the divisions within twentieth century Indian society. Gandhi advocated for the rights of women and lower castes, particularly the untouchable classes, who had been persecuted in Hindu society for centuries. Gandhi also coupled Indian nationalism with self sufficiency and supported local cottage industries, which formed the backbone of his non-cooperation movement by providing an economic base to his supporters.

Gandhi's success in disseminating his nationalist message was unprecedented and the non-cooperation and *Khilafat* movements were the first nationalist events to have popular support among rural and working class Indians. By 1918, Gandhi was seen as responsible for the political awakening of the Indian peasantry by the British.[32] Gandhi's prominence and his calls for a united Indian people enabled local nationalist events to gain international prominence, exemplified by the uproar around the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. In 1919 General Reginald Dyer's decision to shoot at a peaceful gathering in Amritsar, killing over 400 unarmed men, women, and children after blocking off all exits from the park was almost standard British colonial policy. However, Gandhi's nationalist message had stirred a charged political climate; the massacre provoked outrage across the Raj and galvanized the Congress into demanding full independence. Gandhi cemented his influence on the political awakening of India through a series of speeches in rural areas

---

[32] Wagner, Kim A. Amritsar, 1919 : An Empire of Fear & the Making of a Massacre. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019. P59

centered on a pluralistic national identity, delivered in Hindi, a first for the Congress.
Gandhi declared

> "India cannot cease to be one nation because people belonging to different
> religions live in it. The introduction of foreigners does not necessarily destroy the
> nation, they merge in it. A country is one nation only when such a condition
> obtains in it. That country must have a faculty for assimilation. India has ever
> been such a country. In reality, there are as many religions as there are
> individuals, but those who are conscious of the spirit of nationality do not
> interfere with one another's religion. If they do, they are not fit to be considered a
> nation. If the Hindus believe that India should be peopled only by Hindus, they
> are living in dreamland. The Hindus, the Mahomedans, the Parsees and the
> Christians who have made India their country are fellow countrymen, and they
> will have to live in unity if only for their own interest. In no part of the world are
> one nationality and one religion synonymous terms: nor has it ever been so in
> India."[33]

Gandhi's nationlist ideology dominated the Congress party until independence and most
Congress leaders, Nehru included, subscribed wholly to multicultural nationalism,
eventually creating a secular nation which welcomed both Hindu and Muslim citizens.
Consequently, the importance of Gandhi's effect on the Indian nationalist and
independence movements cannot be overstated. Working closely with Nehru, Gandhi

---

[33] Gandhi: 'Hind Swaraj' and Other Writings, p53

created a pluralistic nationalist ideology that pervaded Congress ranks for over thirty

years and engineered the political awakening of over 20% of the global population.

Summary

Education abroad created a shared experience for nationalists, who believed it to

be their duty to transmit Enlightenment philosophies of nationalism and liberty to their

homeland. Armed with observations of the obvious flaws in the moral arguments behind

colonialism and with clear proof of the economic failings of the paternalistic state, the

nationalists began creating a wave of dissent against the ruling British. Together, they

created systems of dissemination of Enlightenment philosophy that notably extended

beyond their own circles. After being quoted in *Hind Swaraj* by Gandhi, Mazazini's *The

Duties of Man* saw a notable uptick in sales in India and was even quoted at meetings of

both the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League.[34] Notably, most nationalists

admired the same European nationalists in the generation that preceded them.

Ideologically pure political nationalists like Guiseppe Garibaldi and Camillo Cavour were

far more popular than cultural nationalists like Voltaire and Goete or pragmatic

politicians like Napoleon III or Bismarck with Balewa, Nehru, and Jinnah. Though the

training abroad of prominent leaders was largely similar all five nationalist leaders

promoted widely different strains of nationalism; Balewa developed a national identity

for political security, Macauley propagated Pan-African nationalism, Jinnah supported

religious security, Nehru and Gandhi mixed political nationalism and Indian identities.

---

[34] Low, D. A. 1988. The Indian National Congress : Centenary Hindsights. Delhi: Oxford University Press. p3

However, the goals of the nationalists remained similar. Each tried to create an

opposition to colonial rule and establish unity in regions that had before British

intervention never been united. Nationalism was a tool used by all five leaders to develop

a national identity for Nigeria, India, and Pakistan to ensure a cohesive state after

independence.

Chapter 2: National Institutions

As the Empire expanded to encompass half a billion people at its height in 1913, the British left a visible impact on the regions they conquered. They created national institutions in both Nigeria and the Raj with the dual purposes of fulfilling the Empire's alleged holy mission to anglicize and civilize the natives and more cynically for helping administer the Empire. By and large, these institutions mirrored those in England when they were first created. However, local influences soon crept into some of these institutions, creating a mixed institution, part British, part colonial, that was a symbol of early nationalism throughout the Empire. Notably, the University of Ibadan was to mirror the great universities in England, Oxford and Cambridge, while the postal services in India were to rival those of Royal Mail. These institutions were the glue that held together fledgling identities of Nigerinaness, Indianness, and Pakistaniness during the nationalist movements, despite being British in origin. Across Africa and Asia, as British institutions seeped into colonial life, they centered national movements around them.

Despite differences in nationalist movements in South Asia and West Africa, the national institutions in both regions display some strands of similarity. Across the Empire, the British developed railways, telegraphs, and postal services to bridge Westminster to the Empire, universities and courts of law to train indigenous subjects to help govern the Empire, and heavy industries to defend the Empire. This study will evaluate the value of these institutions to national movements across the Raj and Nigeria, studying communication systems designed by the British, education systems in school curriculums created by the British, and industrialization policies devised by the British.

British India

The British Raj in India, taking over from the British East India Company in 1858, ruled India directly for almost a century. During this period, British influence pervaded through the colony, affecting not only the nascent industries like shipping, textile, tea, and healthcare but also the vastly more consequential transportation, civil services, and education industries. Eager to defend the territory it gained as it absorbed more of India into the informal Empire, the Crown began working on linking the major cities of the subcontinent through roads. By the 1880s, the British had paved a highway linking Calcutta in the East to Lahore in the West. This road network was expanded rapidly, with almost 9,000 miles of hard road being laid between 1858 and 1868, more than in Britain during the same duration.[35] Consequently, as road networks expanded, so did the demand for cars and lorries that used these roads. With the rise of the automobile in the early twentieth century, motorcycles and motor cars were gaining roadshare in large cities. During the Empire's economic peak in 1913, the "imports of motor cars rose from some 3,000 to a post war five year average of 8000, and to over 20,000 in 1928. This was complemented by the rise of motor bus imports, which rose to over 15,000 in 1937."[36] These road networks fostered trade across the nation, with businesses in Lahore trading goods with markets in Madras and materials with suppliers in Bombay. Together, these emerging businesses established national supply networks that helped create not only large indegenous enterprises like Tata Sons and Birla Corporation but also a

---

[35] Khan, Yasmin. 2007. The Great Partition : The Making of India and Pakistan. New Haven Conn.: Yale University Press, p 146
[36] Khan, p 152

burgeoning small trader class in most cities. These national networks forged transregional

ties that created a national identity. As greater number of middle class businessmen

joined trader associations spanning the Raj, regional divisions that separated the

subcontinent since the days of the Mughal Empires dissipated in the face of economic

incentives to secure more profitable markets. In turn, this change created an economically

unified Indian class of *baniyas*, or traders.[37] This tradesmen class was the first to respond

to the Indian National Congress' demands for greater political consciousness in the early

twentieth century, as the Indian middle class demanded more representative government

and eventually independence.

 Taking advantage of a faster road network, the mail services across India rapidly

developed. The investment benefited the postal services, which had been operated by the

British since the 1837 Post Office Act, as the British Mail could provide letters and

packages to parts of the Indian interior faster, promoting both commerce and personal

correspondence. Following the success of British Mail, the Empire introduced telegraph

lines. The British developed the telegraph network with zeal, realizing the vastness of the

potential market. An early proponent of the telegraph in India, Charles Adley wrote,

> "India possesses a commercial basis capable of employing the telegraph to an
>
> extent at least proportionately equal in capacity and efficiency to the lines in
>
> civilised countries, and that telegraph need not stand in such a remarkably
>
> anomalous position. There is nothing whatever, neither theoretically nor
>
> practically, to prevent India from enjoying one of the best-worked and most
>
> remunerative systems of telegraphs in the world. India, in truth, demands what it

---

[37] Misra, p 137

has not got: it demands a comprehensive and reliable system of mercantile

telegraphs for the general service of the community at large."[38]

Insisting upon the expansion of the telegraph further. He also commented on the

fanatical devotion of the British to the telegraph system, writing in response to an

accident,

> "The engineer, upon taking charge, wanted to carefully examine the state of
> affairs. In relation to this, six months' grace and a fair field were demanded, in
> order to carry out the necessary improvements, and instil discipline into the
> establishment. This was granted. Of course, like a new broom, an attempt was
> made to sweep everything very clean all at once; the instruments must be altered,
> the batteries changed, the line insulated from end to end, the office arrangements
> improved, rules and regulations introduced, some system in the working be
> adopted; in fact, a complete and thorough reform was substituted immediately."[39]

This new technology was vital in creating a national identity. In 1855, the Indian

Telegraph Department opened to the public for transmitting private messages, and the

demand for near-instantaneous communication skyrocketed. Nationalists coordinated

their actions across the subcontinent. Telegraph systems were used by both sides during

the Indian Rebellion of 1857, but were vital to the Indian cause. The revolutionaries used

captured telegraph towers in Delhi to organize insurrections in Cawnpore, Lucknow, and

Jhelum, directing Punjabi, Mughal, and Awadhi rebels, creating a broad based rebellion

against British rule. The revolt helped create a narrative of national unity, cementing the

---

[38] Adley, Charles C. The Story of the Telegraph in India. London, 1866. p78
[39] Adley, p61

idea of a super-regional India. The telegraph also helped create a national identity outside of its role in India's First War of Independence, when telegraph lines connecting Agra, Calcutta, Peshawar, and Delhi were planted in the 1860s, linking together India's largest cities.[40]

Although the road networks and telegraph helped foster a national identity in the Raj, the communication system that had the greatest impact on national identities in South Asia were undoubtedly the railways. Much like in Germany, the development of a rail network unified small principalities into a large consolidated state. As the eminent Manitoba historian, Ian Kerr declared, "The Indian nation was founded with the construction of the first railway. Railways had come to possess India and make her hugeness graspable."[41] The railway created nationalism in India not only through its activity, but also through its construction. In the Political Economy of the Raj, B.R. Tomlinson of the School of Oriental and African Studies in the University of London, alleged that over 200 Million Pounds Sterling were invested in the Indian Railways before 1914, making it the single largest investment within any colony across the globe in the long nineteenth century.[42] The construction of the railway network was the first large scale capitalist enterprise developed to benefit the subcontinent, and introduced rural labor to the idea of economic independence from their feudal lord, subverting local identities in favor of a national one. Explaining that railway-capitalism was instrumental in establishing this identity, Kerr continues

---

[40] Khan, p157

[41] Kerr, Ian J. 1995. Building the Railways of the Raj, 1850-1900. Delhi: Oxford University Press. p3

[42] Charlesworth, Neil. 1980. "Book Review: The Political Economy of the Raj, 1914-47. the Economics of Decolonization in India." The Economic History Review 33 (1): p4

"In true Victorian capitalist fashion, often in the Indian case the British salaried

engineers of the railway companies functioned like contractors since they got the

work done through subcontractors, most of whom were Indian labourers freed

from their *rajahs* or *nawabs*. These workers, over time, realized the importance of

their labour, and demanded greater rights and better conditions. When these were

not met, the workers collectively took action, uniting track layers from Madras,

Calcutta, and Agra, creating a nationalist movement like the Congress."[43]

These fears of railway strikes leading inciting nationalist sentiments were commonly

echoed among the ruling British class, with the Times of London, in 1909, decrying

"The spread of the nationalist propaganda among the natives employees of the

railway services, which leads to anarchy and undermines British rule. These

employees even create 'Nationalist' schools in Bengal, which are spawning-beds

of virulent disaffection within the railway services. The lessons of the now annual

railway strikes have apparently left no lasting impression, one learns with some

astonishment."[44]

The vast undertaking of the construction of the railway clearly created nationalist

movements among workers who were otherwise removed from nationalist politics.

The Indian Railways, originally the institution most associated with british

dominance in the region, continued its turn towards nationalism as it began operating

across the subcontinent. As the number of operational tracks rose, so did the number of

---

[43] Kerr, p11

[44] (FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.). "The Unrest In India." Times, 1 Feb. 1909, p.
10. The Times Digital Archive,

indegenous workers employed by the industry. This in turn created a national network of railways employees, connected through regular travel from Calcutta to Karachi and Delhi to Madras. These workers, striking often, created a proto-nationalist socialist movement in the institution, forming a parallel nationalism to the Congress or Gandhi's non-cooperation. The railway system's importance to the Indian nationalist sentiment is best exemplified by the 1922 workers' strike, which at its peak, the East Indian Railway (EIR) strike of 1922, affected more than 1,500 kilometres of rail and involved tens of thousands of workers. Demanding better treatment and the resignation of a high-ranking official, the strikers expounded nationalist slogans and railed against colonial presence in the Raj. Though the strike began in the United Provinces, a week later "stations in Punjab, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa had joined, which caused the Home Department to declare, on 19 February, that the strike had become 'general on the EIR.'"[45] The breakdown of British power in the face of the strike, which lasted months, signalled a weakness of the colonial state to workers as well as nationalists, who began seeing the railways as a tool of nationalism, instead of one of British suzerainty.

The railways also helped the emerging middle class flourish. In 1911, the *Times of London* announced "The huge and growing systems of railways has been the real cause of much of the existing prosperity in the country. As the system grows, so does wealth in the region surrounding the new lines,"[46] which further grew the Indian National Congres' traditional supporter base of upper middle class traders, who now had new

---

[45] Indian Economic: 'Pet ke waaste': Rights, resistance and the East Indian Railway Strike, 1922.
[46] FROM A CORRESPONDENT. "British Control Of India." *Times*, 24 May 1911, p. 35. *The Times Digital Archive*,

connections to their counterparts across the subcontinent. The railways multiplied the 'road revolution' in nationalist politics, expanding the number of *baniyas,* and by extension nationalists across India.

The British further helped create the class of nationalists by establishing schools and universities across the subcontinent. These schools, often teaching Western philosophy, politics, and history, exposed the Raj's upper classes to nationalism and liberty. Cadres of young students, educated in enlightenment ideas, surmised that colonialism was inherently immoral and that the subjugation of the natives must stop. The British were clearly surprised by the development of trickle down nationalism, with Stanley Reed, a British educator in India writing in the *Times* in 1930,

> "The strongest movement in India today is the tremendous movement of the nationalists for equal status in the eyes of the world. It is a basic force: strong, universal, and almost overwhelming. It has sprung from the seeds we sowed almost a century ago when we decided that higher education in India should be in the English language and students were taught English thinking. The impact of our educational system on India has been deep. They are convinced that there must be an increasing control of Indian polity by Indians themselves."[47]

The British set up the first institutions of higher learning in India with the dual goals of training civil servants to help administer the region and allegedly civilizing the natives. The leaders of these institutions decried traditional Hindu and Muslim education and focused primairly on imparting British Englightment ideals on upper and middle class

---

[47] "Indian Nationalism." *Times*, July 9, 1930, 11. *The Times Digital Archive*

students and were deeply British institutions, under the influence of Thomas Babington

Macaulay, the first Chairman of the General Committee of Public Instruction of India.

Eventually, these universities evolved from institutions that simply guided students into

nationalism to places that became the center of the independence movement, loudly

proclaiming the nationalist cause. This evolution is best exemplified by the university

strikes during the civil disobedience movement, where students educated in British style

schools and universities played a key role. Philip Altbach of Boston University asserted

> "Beginning in 1930, many of the activities calculated to impair British
>
> administration in India were carried out by students. Colleges were closed,
>
> agitations launched, and illegal publications distributed. Hundreds of students and
>
> university professors boycotted their educational duties and were sent to jail.
>
> While the struggle died down after almost a year, the student movement
>
> continued its activity, and the All India Students' Federation was organized in
>
> 1936 to provide a unified voice for the student movement. From the beginning,
>
> the AISF was strongly nationalist and radical in its political views, all of which
>
> were borrowed from philosophers they read about in their universities.
>
> Communists, socialists, and Gandhians worked harmoniously within the AISF
>
> and provincial affiliates were organized in all parts of India. The annual AISF
>
> conferences, held at the same time as the sessions of the Indian National
>
> Congress, attracted upwards of 3,000 delegates and the top Congress leaders
>
> addressed students radicalized by British education."[48]

---

[48] Altbach, Philip G. "The Transformation of the Indian Student Movement." *Asian Survey* 6, no. 8 (1966): 448-60. doi:10.2307/2642471. P4

The nationalism in student politics continued, with universities eventually even supporting demonstrations on campus and providing funds to nationalist student groups. Student participation in the movement grew as a result of institutionally British universities defecting to the nationalist cause.

> "By 1938, the Indian colleges were highly politicized. When the adult Congress leadership was arrested, the students took over much of the leadership of the struggle and acted as a liaison between underground leaders and the movement. Student groups published illegal newspapers, and even operated a clandestine radio station. The 1942 struggle was the apex of the student movement in India, involving for the first time, a majority of the students. Thousands were jailed, even when their universities supported them. The militancy of the 1942 movement was retained, if on a reduced scale, until the end of the Independence struggle. The nationalist student movement had achieved substantial influence on the campus."

Across the Raj, British institutions were moulded to suit nationalist causes, until the apparatus of the state itself became a nationalist symbol, creating a sense of unity among people across the subcontinent.

Nigeria

In Nigeria, much like in the Raj, the national institutions, beacons of colonial power, were infiltrated and eventually overwhelmed by nationalist independence movements, which co-opted the institutions' regional visibility to establish a national identity. By uniting the tribes of modern-day Nigeria under one colony, the British

created a national identity through early nation building. British institutions in Nigeria established internal peace and security between the hostile tribes, developed a communication network and transportation grid, imposed systematic and universal taxation, and forced a single currency upon everyone in the country.[49] These institutions had generally preceded British acquisition of Nigeria as a Crown Colony in 1861. Coastal groups in Nigeria had interacted with colonial European powers for at least three hundred years before 1860, the latter of which had begun developing a small presence in Lagos.

The foremost of these early European institutions was the British Niger Company, which essentially functioned as the Nigerian equivalent of the early East India Company. As the company began expanding further into Nigeria to gain better access to trading hubs and begin mining operations, it created a network of roads linking the coast to the interior. Here, much like in the Raj, the roads connected what had previously been disunited tribes. Most importantly, Highway A1, the road linking the homelands of the Fulani in the North and the Igbo in the South created a communication link between the two most populous tribes, which gave Nigeria its first four presidents. The road was also used extensively by merchants, who now had a much safer way of getting between the mineral rich North and Lagos, creating greater cultural ties between the regions.[50] The A1 allowed Northern traders to visit Lagos regularly, enabling the development of a Northern middle class, which was more politically active and identified more with the British idea of Nigeria than with their tribal loyalties. This new middle class formed the spine of the political movement that later elected Balewa as Nigeria's first Prime

---

[49] Coleman, James Smoot. 1958. Nigeria: Background to Nationalism. Berkeley: University of California Press p63
[50] Coleman. p128

Minister, as a wider selection of Nigeria's varied peoples had emerged to compete with the traditional closed aristocracy. This artery of communication in colonial Nigeria was also vital during the 1910s, as the global depression hit Nigeria. For the first time, tribes relocated to around the newly built road, with thousands of Yoruba and Igbo moving North, bridging cultural gaps that had existed for centuries.[51] The road was so successful in forging Nigerian nationalism that in 1920 the National Congress of British West Africa was founded beside the highway and cited that the A1 had

> "Led to the unification of different tribes of Nigeria by adopting and encouraging means which have fostered better understanding and cooperation between the tribes so they may have come to a common ideal; complete autonomy for Nigeria within the British Empire and economic opportunities equal to those enjoyed by foreigners who travel on the A1"[52]

The road network eventually expanded to other parts of Nigeria as British influence grew, creating a national institution most Nigerians could identify as a foreign import that had helped create nationalism.

Nigerian nationalism, ironically, was also catalyzed through the British army, which had originally ended many tribes' independence by invading the coast and then registering Nigeria as a crown colony. By 1930, the British created an informal bar against any Nigerian serving in senior posts in the administration which would in any way put them in a position of directly governing their fellow man. Consequently, the Nigerian gentry interested in administration found themselves in the British army. The

---

[51] Falola, Toyin. 1999. The History of Nigeria. Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press. p82
[52] Crowder, Michael. 1978. The Story of Nigeria. 4Th ed., rev. London: Faber p208

Empire had a perennial shortage of qualified subalterns, and Nigerians educated abroad in England fit this role perfectly.[53] Nigerian soldiers and officers fought to defend and expand the size of the British Empire until the 1950s, working beside their fellow Nigerians. The distinction of tribe and social ranking was lost upon taking the red coat, as the British forced all Nigerians to serve in the same regiment. Within the army, many of nationalists often held meetings together to debate colonial policy, co-opting the British army as a vehicle of Nigerian nationalism. After retiring, many veterans chose to discard their tribal allegiances in favor of a nationalist one, creating a new class of Nigerian nationalists. This class remained a vocal but small community until the breakout of the Second World War, which was a watershed moment for Nigerian nationalism. According to Arikpo Okoi, Nigeria's fourth foreign minister who participated in the war effort,

> "Many Nigerians enlisted in the West African Frontier Force and participated in the campaigns in North and East Africa and in Burma and India. Service overseas broadened the political outlook of many of the troops; but more particularly, war propaganda of the Western democracies stimulated discussion about self determination. During the critical years of the war Nigeria assumed an important strategic position for the Western allies; it was the base from which thousands of European and American servicemen reached the Middle East. Therefore, Nigerians came into contact with thousands of foreigners and had access to the publications of the Army Bureau of Current Affairs and the Fabian Society, all of

---

[53] Crowder p219

which extolled the virtues of parliamentary democracy and the principle of self

determination. This was not lost on the Nigerian mind."[54]

Fighting alongside other Nigerians abroad changed the way most soldiers perceived their

own identities. Nigerian troops stopped seeing themselves as parts of tribes, and instead

as men of the same country, creating a unified force of nationalists who campaigned for

independence after the war, trained by the most British institution of all. More

importantly, exposure to British and American men, propaganda, and virtues were critical

to the growth of the Nigerian nationalist movement, as the hypocrisies of self-

determination and colonialism became clearer. According to Okoi, the exposure to

British troops during the war raised the number of people with nationalist sympathies in

Nigeria several fold, as different religions and tribes came together to defeat the Nazi war

machine.[55] The British army therefore unwittingly created a wave of support for the

nationalist cause.

Another colonial institution that predated British rule in Nigeria was the

missionary education network and pro-Christian foundations. Through their extensive

evangelical activity and long monopoly in the field of education, Christian missionaries

played a critical role in the rise of Nationalism in Nigeria. According to renowned

Stanford sociologist James Coleman, "Unlike traders, they did not limit their endeavors

to port towns, rail or river lines, or commercial centers; rather they undertook to penetrate

the most remote areas in the interior."[56] In doing so they exposed the Nigerian people to a

---

[54] Arikpo, Okoi. 1967. The Development of Modern Nigeria. Penguin African Library, 21.
Harmondsworth: Penguin. p60
[55] Arikpo, p61
[56] Coleman. p91

sort of proto-nationalism. British missionaries, by far the most numerous of all who went to Nigeria, initiated and accelerated the rate of social change, and disorganized traditional African societies. These endeavors were a precursor to any modern nationalist movement. The missionaries stimulated racial and political consciousness, which directly fed into the nationalist movement that grew out of Lagos. The Christian institutions, by virtue of converting a sizeable portion of Nigeria's population, weakened the power that traditional tribal chiefs held, laying the foundations of nationalism. Missionaries spread a message that was equal parts Christian, European, and subliminally anti-colonialist. Nationalists used the Christian doctrine of human equality and the old religious ideal of the brotherhood of man, which inherently challenged the ethical implications of colonialism and the government's predisposition to white superiority. The so-called white man's burden ultimately undermined the basis of colonial rule and gave rise to nationalist movements in Nigeria.

Nigerian nationalists were also often connected to the missionary institutions through education. For almost a century, the only Western education available in the colony was through missionary schools. As Victor Murrary declared, "To all intents and purposes the school is the Church. The two are one and the village teacher is also the village evangelist."[57] The schools, which taught exclusively in English, undermined the local languages, thereby crushing tribal differences. English served as a way for people from different tribes to communicate, a bond of decisive importance in a pan-Nigerian nationalist movement. The schools also helped construct a modern Nigerian persona who

---

[57] Murray, A. Victor. 1967. The School in the Bush: A Critical Study of the Theory and Practice of Native Education in Africa. 2d ed. New York: Barnes & Noble. p65

was predisposed in favor of a new national identity, rather than old tribal ones, as Nigerians who were educated in English had access to a new world of literature and ideas which awakened nationalist passions. Western education, which also taught science, civics, and mathematics, facilitated the formation of a new middle class in urban Nigeria, which acted as the keystone for the nationalist movement. The social mobility promised by a British education allowed for historically oppressed tribes to achieve middle class status within a generation; Nnamdi Azikiwe, Nigeria's first president, was a generation removed from slavery. This social mobility encouraged even more nationalists, who saw the missionary schools as a way to combat the dual evils of tribal factionalism and colonialism. Universities in Nigeria also acted as a hotbed for nationalist movements, with Yaba university, Nigeria's first university acting as the headquarters for the Union of Students of Nigeria, a politically active nationalist group that later yielded the nation a prime minister, Ernest Shonekan. Victor Murray summarizes the importance of education on nationalism in Nigeria,

> "Western education did not merely facilitate the emergence of a separate class; it endowed the individuals in that class with the knowledge and skills the ambitions and aspirations that allowed them to challenge the Nigerian colonial government and ultimately to wrest control over the central political power from it. By the latter achievement the Western educated elements placed themselves above the traditional African authorities in the new political system. Thus, within the short span of two generations, Western education made possible a nearly complete reversal in the status of Nigerian political leaders."[58]

---

[58] Coleman, p115

Western education, therefore, had a profound impact on nationalism in Nigeria. By the 1940s, this effect was magnified by the presence of African teachers who had infiltrated the missionary schools, which enabled a far broader reaching nationalist education system to develop a Nigerian identity.

Summary

Nationalists co-opted different institutions across the Raj and Nigeria. In the raj, the British relied on communication links to bridge vast geographic expanses. Given the sheer size of the Indian subcontinent and the presence of both early capitalists and a small middle class, these communication links proved to be the most important catalyst for the national movements. Once nationalists from Madras, Lahore, Bombay, Delhi and Calcutta could converse, plan, and organize their actions, they disregarded their regional differences and together conjured a national identity, formalized by the Indian National Congress. All other national institutions served only to broaden this base, both in terms increasing the number of middle class advocates for nationalism, and in terms of expanding the geography these nationalists came from. The most important of these communication networks was the railway, which strengthened the nationalist network simply by virtue of its gigantic size. Western education, as mentioned previously, simply expanded the base from which nationalists could recruit. As the number of western universities rose, so did the availability of education, first to those of fewer financial means and later to those from outside the major metropolises of the subcontinent. While

producing more politically conscious students, the universities also helped radicalize nationalists like Bhagat Singh, Chandrashekar Azad, and Shivaram Rajguru, all of whom were executed for the attempted assassination of the Viceroy. Conversely, in Nigeria, the leading role in the nationalist movement was played by the Wester education system, which predated direct British rule. A larger percentage of the Nigerian population attained Western education, and by extension had exposure to British Enlightenment ideas. These ideas dogmatically opposed the subjugation of Africans by the British, and the Nigerian wage-earning class saw through colonial hypocrisies, cementing the nationalist movement. Further, Nigeria witnessed greater social upheaval as a result of its prominence in the Second World War, because of a greater percentage of the Nigerian youth serving in the war effort and was more influenced by the increased number of American and British soldiers passing through, which melded together broader Nigerian society by opening the doors of the Nigerian nationalist movement to veterans. Improved communications, much like in India, also played a part in uniting the nation by bridging cultural gaps, but played a more supporting role than for Indian nationalists. However, some similarities between the national institutions catalyzing the nationalist movements stick out. Education played a decisive role in demolishing traditional barriers to nationalism in both regions.

These British institutions, as a whole, have been by far the most resilient faces of imperialism. In part due to their early conversion to the nationalist cause, country-wide institutions have proven sticky in both Nigeria and India. Notably, the Indian Railways are among the largest in the world and ferry the second most passengers every year, and all seventeen British universities in Nigeria remain reputed centers of learning. According

to eminent historian Daniel R. Headrick, who often conflated innovation, institutions, and technology, "The technological means the imperialists used to create these states, however, have left a deeper imprint than the ideas that motivated them. In their brief domination, Europeans passed onto the peoples of Africa and Asia their fascination with technology. That has been the true legacy of imperialism."[59] These innovations, ranging from telegraph cables to paved roads, brought together communities, filled in cultural gaps, and tore away at the artificial edifices impeding the creation of a national identity in both Nigeria and the Raj.

---

[59] Headrick, Daniel R. 1981. The Tools of Empire : Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Oxford University Press. p209-10

Chapter 3: Economic Nationalism

European colonialism was in part an extension of the industrial revolution. New technological developments made exploration and military conquest of African and Asian civilizations possible; new economic ideas like laissez-faire capitalism created a middle class that demanded luxuries found in Africa and Asia; new industries forged cheap consumer products that required foreign markets. As the industrial revolution and colonialism progressed, new ideas of capitalism, socialism, and communism flowed from Europe into its Empires. The Raj and Nigeria, Britain's two most important colonies, were especially receptive. As industrial development in both colonies continued, they grew more urbanized. At the same time, a bourgeois middle class emerged. This middle class was politically conscious, predisposed in favor of nationalism, and demanded greater self-government.

As a result of trickle down industrialization, cities like Calcutta and Lagos saw their populations skyrocket and towns sprouted up along railways and major roadworks. Expanding trade, both within colonies, and with Europe, led to the development of new ports. These events catalyzed the evolution of an urban proletariat while undercutting the traditional agrarian lifestyles that afforded little social mobility. New heavy industries like mining, metallurgy, and manufacturing demanded labor and offered higher wages and job security than subsistence agriculture. This proletariat, although less politically active, called for improved living conditions, higher wages, and higher workplace safety. These demands often contained anti-elite undercurrents, which were effectively channeled by colonial nationalists into anti-British movements. Through populist social

messaging, nationalists like Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Hugh Clifford devised a national

identity linking the bourgeois and the proletariat in both Nigeria and India.

Simultaneously, British policy towards the peasantry in the Raj and Nigeria

pushed agrarian societies towards the nationalists. As British imperial power grew, it

faced regular protests from the peasantry against excessive land revenue charges, the

recurrence of famines, regressive urban and municipal taxation, and discriminatory tariffs

for British-made commodities.[60] Subsistence farmers across the Empire believed that

British rule had targeted them particularly harshly and that their path to economic

security lay with the populist nationalists.[61] This sentiment, propagated in India by

Subhash Chandra Bose and Lal Bahadur Shashtri and in Nigeria by Ahamadu Bello and

Eyo Ita, created a tidal wave of rural support for the nationalist movements, which had

traditionally been supported exclusively by the urban middle classes in both nations.[62]

Despite some obvious differences in the economic nationalism observed in

Nigeria and British India, there are similarities in that the British played a critical part in

creating both these groups, through policies that permitted rural depopulation into urban

centers, education schemes that trained skilled workers, and increased communication

that enabled petty traders to flourish. Importantly, it was brutal repression of both groups

in the Raj and Nigeria that radicalized originally moderate protestors into revolutionaries

who supported the nationalist movements.

---

[60] Goswami, Manu. "From Swadeshi to Swaraj: Nation, Economy, Territory in Colonial South Asia, 1870 to 1907." Comparative Studies in Society and History 40, no. 4 (1998): 615 doi:10.1017/S0010417598001674

[61] Goswami, p 615

[62] Kidambi, Prashant. "Nationalism and the City in Colonial India: Bombay, c. 1890-1940." Journal of Urban History 38, no. 5 (September 2012): 950–67. doi:10.1177/0096144212449145.

British India

Britain's economic record in the Raj was mixed; despite the growth of the urban middle class, the development of capitalism in India inevitably led to 'creative destruction,' or large scale de-industrialization of the textile industry. These economic growing pains were worsened by colonial drain, as Britain sought to extract more resources from India than it invested. The duality of British rule was most clear to the residents of the great presidency capitals of Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. English-educated Indians in these cities were the first to promote the idea of an Indian national identity and remained the most vocal supporters of the nationalist movement until India's independence in 1947. The nationalists in these cities saw Britain's influence as crucial to devising a pan-Indian identity. After all, the British had effectively created the Indian middle class.[63] According to India's foremost expert on the Raj, Bipin Chandra,

> "For most moderate nationalists, British influence held for a great promise. The
> British had united India under a modern centralized administration. They had
> spread modern education and through it the medium of Western democratic
> thought and enlightenment. They had introduced freedom of speech and the press
> and social liberty. In the realm of economics, it was the prospect of rapid
> industrial development that attracted them. Western science and technique and
> economic organization and the example of vigorous European enterprise, they
> hoped, would reclaim the country from the slough of economic backwardness and

---

[63] Kidambi, p 955

stagnation. The railways, roads and canals, the link with the flourishing markets

of the world and the foreign commercial industrial and plantation enterprises

would prepare for a great industrial revolution. But perhaps most of all, the

British had begun the process of the welding of the people of India into one

common nationality. The consequent growth all over the country of the feeling of

belonging to one common entity had been the result of British rule."[64]

Proving that the contemporary Hindustanis in the Raj believed that the British were

critical in forging an Indian national identity

However, British rule proved less than ideal for the Raj's economic development.

The crown exported essential food supplies, diverted taxes away from railway

construction, and waged ceaseless wars of expansion. Ultimately, the middle class

intelligentsia across the Raj agreed that British colonialism was draining India of its

wealth, not by errors of judgement but by design. This realization strengthened the

extremist natioanlist bloc within the Congress. This new bloc took upon itself to marshall

and mould the educated population of the Raj into a nationalist cadre, uniting the Raj to

bolster economic welfare. This policy was championed by the Lal-Bal-Pal axis that

dominated the Congress between 1906 and 1918, their faith in the 'conscience of

England' shattered. The very existence of the triumvirate demonstrates the importance of

British policies in uniting the Raj's middle class, albeit in opposition: Lala Lajpat Rai

was a banker from the Northern state of Punjab (present-day Pakistan), Bal Gangadhar

Tilak was a mathematics teacher from the Western state of Maharashtra (present-day

---

[64] Chandra, Bipan. 1966. The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India: Economic Policies of Indian National Leadership, 1880-1905. New Delhi: People's Pub. House. p737

India), and Bipin Chandra Pal was a professor of literature from the Eastern state of Bengal (present-day Bangladesh). By the mid-1920s, British India's middle class was strongly nationalist and demanded autonomy, if not independence, as a group.[65]

The next group in India to embrace nationalism were the agrarian peasants that made up the majority of the population. Most nationalist demands by the middle class were ultimately designed to help the rural peasantry. Boycotting foreign clothes in favor of traditional homespun tunics, advocating protectionist tariffs on beet sugar, and supporting the falling rupee were all popular nationalist demands geared toward assisting rural communities at the expense of a higher economic cost to the middle class. However, the Raj's peasantry remained by and large politically inactive until the emergence of Mahatma Gandhi as the leader of the nationalist movement, who made the congress more accessible to rural communities. After the *Khilafat* movement brought Gandhi fame, he convinced the Congress to energize rural communities by mobilizing western educated men involved in commercial agriculture. This social stratum, previously ignored by the Congress, was rapidly mobilized. Many leading individuals from the dominant peasant communities began to look to the Congress as the appropriate vehicle for their rising political aspirations.[66] To ensure continued support of the peasantry for the national struggle, the peasant question became an integral part of the Congress's national platform. Inflexible tax rates, collection in kind, mandatory exports of food crops, and compulsory substitutions of grains with cash crops had oppressed about 90% of the Raj's population without giving them a voice for dissent. Worse still, the global depression of

---

[65] Chandra.p741
[66] Low, p102

1929 hit Indian agriculture especially hard; prices of agriculture produce fell sharply. Between 1929 and 1932, prices fell by 50% but the tax rate and cost of living did not fall correspondingly.[67] British repression of any dissent were severe--farmers who could not afford to pay taxes were jailed and protestors were regularly beaten or shot. Lala Lajpat Rai, one of India's foremost independence activists was beaten to death during a protest.[68] Peasant support for the natioanlist movement continued until independence, with eminent historian Shive Kumar asserting

> "The growth of the peasant movement had great significance for the rise of nationalism in India. The peasantry moved on to organization forms of participation in the nationalist movement for self government under the leadership of the nationalist bourgeois. The peasantry participated rather actively in the Non-Cooperation and Civil Disobedience campaigns conducted by the Congress and gave Gandhi a loyal core of supporters. The peasant movement was in part even accelerated through British action, when an All-India Conference of Peasant Workers held at Madras was shut down by British police forces amidst violence."[69]

Clearly, the Congress saw a tsunami of support from the peasantry, which was crippled by British policies. The nationalist movement also received some support from the growing proletariat. However, the size of this class in India before its independence was

[67] Kumar, Shive. 1980. Peasantry and the Indian National Movement : 1919-1933. Anu History Series, 3. Meerut Cantt: Anu Prakashan. p142
[68] Friend, Corinne. 1977. "Yashpal: Fighter for Freedom -- Writer for Justice." Journal of South Asian Literature 13 (1-4): 65–90.
[69] Kumar, p198

miniscule, with less than 0.5% of the population self identifying as industrial workers.[70]

Therefore, the class' political leanings, albeit nationalist, do not merit much discussion.

Economic nationalism in the Raj, therefore, played a key part in weaving together groups with different identities into a mesh of nationalists who supported the Congress. As a direct result of British policies that affected the middle class and rural peasantry, the British unwittingly created a pathway to success for nationalist groups.

Nigeria

Nigeria's experience with economic nationalism was dissimilar to that of India's. In Nigeria, the promise of British administration generating national wealth was fulfilled. Consequently, Western economic ideals and forces were not impressed upon an unwilling population. Rather, Nigerians welcomed British economic influence. The institutions the British created in terms of communication, standardized currency, and the ensuing peace, were all welcomed by both major tribes in Nigeria, the Hausa-Fulani and the Igbo. Moreover, European imports were valued by nationalists as goalposts for Nigerian products in terms of their utility, attractiveness, and prestige. Perhaps the most telling example of Nigerians readily accepting European style capitalism came from the illiterate Nigerian laborers who were impressed by the British government to construct Nigerian railroads in exchange for paper money. The laborers allegedly prized their new currency and its buying power more than their traditional currencies.[71] This incident exemplifies British-led economic nationalism in Nigeria, as it focused primarily on the urban

---

[70] Low, p130
[71] Coleman, p64

proletariat. As the British encouraged the use of paper money, the Nigerian population

moved into cities where this new currency could be earned. In the middle third of the

twentieth century, Nigeria witnessed a dramatic shift into wage employment. By 1938,

the number of people employed for wages had numbered around 150,000. However, by

1951, that number had doubled.[72] These workers, especially skilled workers and clerks

employed in the transport, trade, and mining industries provided the backbone of the

Nigerian nationalist movement.[73] Through promoting wage jobs, the British government

created a self actualizing cycle, where full time salaried employees flocked to urban

centers, which created more jobs, which in turn raised demand for more full time

employees. This cycle helped foster a sense of national identity both by removing

geographic bonds to traditional tribal cultures and by forcing individuals from different

tribes to live together in large cities, producing a shared national culture. This process of

nationalism through physical separation was accelerated by seasonal and migrant

workers, who returned to their villages with new ideas, tastes, and habits. These ideals

then seeped into rural areas, causing the creative destruction of traditional communities in

favor of a new national Nigerian community.[74]

     The British influence on cities also helped create a middle class nationalist

movement. As the middle class gained access to European luxuries, consumer goods, and

leisure activities like cinemas, the middle class realized the gap between the comforts

available in European quarters in Nigerian cities and those found in the provinces. The

middle class, in order to argue its case, exposed itself further to enlightenment ideas of

---

[72] Coleman, p68
[73] Coleman, p71
[74] Crowder, p215

human equality, which in turn fueled a nationalist movement that demanded equality between economically similar individuals across racial lines. The most obvious instance of British and Nigerian inequality creating a middle class nationalist movement was exemplified by Herbert Samuel Macaulay's protests in Lagos surrounding different standards of utilities afforded to British, Portugese, Brazilian, and African neighborhoods.[75] Closely linked to the middle class, the Nigerian student organizations were one of the main instruments in arousing the new spirit of nationalism. The most important of these organizations, the West African Students' Union, was actually formed in London, under the aegis of the University of London and was open only to students who could afford a British education, eventually maturing into a vessel of ardent nationalism for the upper and middle class in the urban areas. [76]

Nigerian nationalism was also supported by rural elites, who saw their position threatened. As British industrial machines rolled in, their hegemony on rubber and palm oil production was jeopardized. Joining the nationalist fold out of fear for their financial status, Nigerian tribes in the West sought to protect their interests by supporting the idea of a unified nation that would be strong enough to both expel British tax collectors and repel any foreign competition.[77]

British policies, therefore, incentivized hopeful wage earners, idealist bourgeois, and cynical rural elites to band together. These groups, collectively, created a new national identity for Nigeria that superseded their traditional loyalties.

---

[75] Coleman, p73
[76] Crowder, p218
[77] Arikpo, p61

Summary

The spirit of economic nationalism in the Raj and Nigeria was entirely dissimilar. Indian nationalism was championed by an urbane middle class elite, which was supported by a broad based mandate of agrarian British India. Its appeal largely came from opposition to British rule on the basis of economic hardships fostered upon the poorest in the nation. It enjoyed no support from the urban working classes. It instead faced active opposition from traditional elite landowners, who sought to negotiate deals with the British that favored their historic rights and undermine populist nationalism.

Conversely, Nigerian nationalism was driven primarily by an urban working class that benefited tremendously from British investment in Nigeria and developed as a consequence of British imposed Western identities that cleaved through traditional society. It commanded lukewarm support from the middle class, which was principally ambivalent to nationalism until exposed to true inequality. The nationalist movement commanded some respect with cynical landowners, who supported the movement not out of genuine aspiration for a national identity but instead as an insurance policy against a financial shock to their fiefdoms.

Conclusion

British colonialism is closely linked with nationalism for Nigeria, India and Pakistan. As the three nations experienced colonialism, they also benefited from nationalist ideas trickling down from Europe. These ideas seeped into the minds of the elite who were educated abroad, burrowed deep into the national institutions of the colonies, and crept into the hearts of all those affected by the economic turbulence that the British presence created. From the very beginning, British imperialism's two main goals were conflicting; Britain could not elevate the Hindustani and Nigerian communities while simultaneously draining their lands of all valuable resources. The only way to pursue their so-called mission of civilizing the natives was to abandon the idea of exploitative peripheral extraction and the only way to ensure economic dominance was to force the indegenous peoples into abject servitude with no hope of social and cultural mobility. The two goals could not be indefinitely pursued concurrently, and one had to be foregone in favor of the other if the Empire was to survive. As the British eschewed neither ambition, *Pax Britannica* inevitably doomed to expire. However, as the British continued to unceasingly pursue state-building to strengthen their position, this policy also ensured that their successor states were more resilient to intra-national strife and enjoyed a single national identity. According to Oxford historian and later Ghanian Prime Minister, Kofi Abrefa Busia,

> "The history of British rule has shown that imperialism itself creates conditions
> and evokes reactions that give birth to nationalism and a desire for independence.
> Britain, has, through its laws and administration, as well as through trade,

education, and Christianity, developed new concepts of freedom and nationhood among the people who have come under their rule. They have brought together different tribes and chiefdoms into a single colony and provided them with the unifying framework of a common imperial administration. This has made possible the birth of a spirit of nationality that embraces communities wider than a single tribe or chiefdom."[78]

Therefore, British action, albeit unintentionally, helped create national identities where previously none had existed. The modern day states of India and Nigeria had never historically existed in their present forms until they were colonized by the British and their territories had been delineated.

---

[78] Goldin Marcovich, Gabriela, and Rahul Markovits. 2019. "Editing the First Journal of World History: Global History from inside the Kitchen." Journal of Global History 14 (2). Cambridge University Press: 157–78. doi:10.1017/S1740022819000019.

Bibliography

ADLEY, Charles C. *The Story of the Telegraph in India.* E. & F.N. Spon: London, 1866.

Ali, Chaudhri Muhammad. *The Emergence of Pakistan.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Altbach, Philip G. "The Transformation of the Indian Student Movement." *Asian Survey* 6, no. 8 (1966): 448–60.

Azikiwe, Nnamdi. *ZIK A SELECTION FROM THE SPEECHES OF NNAMDI AZIKIWE Governor-General of the Federation of Nigeria Formerly President of the Nigerian Senate Formerly Premier of the Eastern Region of Nigeria*. CUP Archive, n.d.

Beckett, Ian F. W. *Citizen Soldiers and the British Empire, 1837–1902*. Routledge, 2015. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315655475.

Blau, Judith, and Immanuel Wallerstein. "The Essential Wallerstein." *Contemporary Sociology* 29, no. 6 (November 2000): 819. https://doi.org/10.2307/2654090.

Bolitho, Hector. *Jinnah: Creator of Pakistan*. 1st ed. London: John Murray, 1954.

Brecher, Michael. *Nehru: A Political Biography*. Beacon Press, 1962.

Chandra, Bipan. *The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India; Economic Policies of Indian National Leadership, 1880-1905.* New Delhi: People's Pub. House, 1966.

Charlesworth, Neil. "Book Review: The Political Economy of the Raj, 1914-47. The Economics of Decolonization in India." *The Economic History Review* 33, no. 1 (1980): 157–58.

Coleman, James Smoot. *Nigeria: Background to Nationalism.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958.

Crowder, Michael. *The Story of Nigeria*. 4th ed., rev. London: Faber, 1978.

Falola, Toyin. *The History of Nigeria*. 1 online resource (xviii, 269 pages) : maps vols. Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations, 1096-2905. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999. http://ebooks.abc-clio.com/?isbn=9780313032400.

Fasinro, H. A. B. *Political and Cultural Perspectives of Lagos*. [Lagos?]: [publisher not identified], 2004.

Friend, Corinne. "YASHPAL: FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM -- WRITER FOR JUSTICE." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 13, no. 1–4 (1977): 65–90.

(FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.). "The Unrest In India." *The Times*, February 1, 1909. The Times Digital Archive.

Gandhi, M. K., and Anthony J. Parel. *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*. Cambridge Texts in Modern Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Gandhi Mahatma, and Mahadev H. Desai. *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993. http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/description/hm031/93019758.html.

"Gere: Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa's Real Ethnic Group." Accessed December 8, 2019. https://web.archive.org/web/20160924071913/http://www.dailytrust.com.ng/news/notes-from-atlanta/gere-sir-abubakar-tafawa-balewa-s-real-ethnic-group/130284.html.

Goldin Marcovich, Gabriela, and Rahul Markovits. "Editing the First Journal of World History: Global History from inside the Kitchen." *Journal of Global History* 14,

no. 2 (2019): 157–78. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022819000019.

Goswami, Manu. "From Swadeshi to Swaraj: Nation, Economy, Territory in Colonial South Asia, 1870 to 1907." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40, no. 4 (October 1998): 609–36. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417598001674.

Headrick, Daniel R. *The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

———. "The Tools of Imperialism: Technology and the Expansion of European Colonial Empires in the Nineteenth Century." *The Journal of Modern History* 51, no. 2 (1979): 231–63.

Hodgkin, Thomas Lionel. *Nigerian Perspectives: An Historical Anthology*. Oxford University Press, 1975.

Jinnah, Mahomed Ali. *Mahomed Ali Jinnah, an Ambassador of Unity His Speeches & Writings 1912-1917.* 1 online resource (324 pages) portrait vols. Madras: Ganesh, 1918. http://catalog.hathitrust.org/api/volumes/oclc/68178944.html.

Kerr, Ian J. *Building the Railways of the Raj, 1850-1900*. Delhi ; Oxford University Press, 1995. http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0635/95906270-d.html.

Khan, Yasmin. *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan*. New Haven [Conn.] ; Yale University Press, 2007. http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0711/2007006713.html.

Kumar, Shive. *Peasantry and the Indian National Movement: 1919-1933*. Anu History Series 3. Meerut Cantt: Anu Prakashan, 1980.

Low, D. A. *The Indian National Congress: Centenary Hindsights*. Delhi ; Oxford University Press, 1988.

Misra, Om Prakash. *Economic Thought of Gandhi and Nehru : A Comparative Analysis*.

    New Delhi: M.D. Publications, 1995.

Murray, A. Victor. *The School in the Bush; a Critical Study of the Theory and Practice of*

    Native Education in Africa. 2d ed. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1967.

Myers, Frank. "Harold Macmillan's 'Winds of Change' Speech: A Case Study in the

    Rhetoric of Policy Change." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3, no. 4 (December 1,

    2000): 555–75. https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2000.0012.

"Nationalism and the City in Colonial India: Bombay, c. 1890-1940 - Prashant Kidambi,

    2012." Accessed December 8, 2019.

    https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0096144212449145.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. *The Unity of India; Collected Writings, 1937-1940.* New York: John

    Day, 1942. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/007121459.

Sharma, Bishan Sarup. *Gandhi as a Political Thinker.* Allahabad: Indian Press, 1956.

Sir Balewa, Abubakar Tafawa. *Nigeria Speaks; Speeches Made between 1957 and 1964.*

    Selected and Introduced by Sam Epelle. Foreword by T.O.S. Benson. 1st Edition.

    edition. [Ikeja Longmans of Nigeria], 1964.

Tamuno, Tekena N., and Tekena N. Tam. *Herbert Macaulay, Nigerian Patriot*. London:

    Heinemann, 1975.

"The Times Digital Archive - Document." Accessed December 8, 2019. https://gdc-gale-

    com.ccl.idm.oclc.org/gdc/artemis/NewspapersDetailsPage/NewspapersDetailsWi

    ndow?disableHighlighting=false&displayGroupName=DVI-

    Newspapers&docIndex=2&source=fullList&prodId=TTDA&mode=view&limiter

    =%28DA+119110101+-+119111231%29+AND+GS+%22News%22&display-

query=OQE+British+Control+Of+India&contentModules=&action=e&sortBy=&
windowstate=normal&currPage=1&dviSelectedPage=&scanId=&query=OQE+Br
itish+Control+India&search_within_results=&p=TTDA&catId=&u=claremont_m
ain&displayGroups=&documentId=GALE%7CCS587660472&activityType=Bas
icSearch&failOverType=&commentary=.

"The Times Digital Archive - Document." Accessed December 8, 2019. https://gdc-gale-

com.ccl.idm.oclc.org/gdc/artemis/NewspapersDetailsPage/NewspapersDetailsWi

ndow?disableHighlighting=false&displayGroupName=DVI-

Newspapers&docIndex=1&source=&prodId=TTDA&mode=view&limiter=DA+

119300709&display-

query=OQE+Indian+Nationalism&contentModules=&action=e&sortBy=&windo

wstate=normal&currPage=1&dviSelectedPage=11&scanId=&query=OQE+India

n+Nationalism&search_within_results=&p=TTDA&catId=&u=claremont_main&

displayGroups=&documentId=GALE%7CCS186327785&activityType=Advance

dSearch&failOverType=&commentary=.

Wagner, Kim A. *Amritsar, 1919: An Empire of Fear & the Making of a Massacre*. 1

online resource : illustrations, maps. vols. New Haven: Yale University Press,

2019.

http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=n

labk&AN=2029016.

———. *Amritsar, 1919: An Empire of Fear & the Making of a Massacre*. 1 online

resource : illustrations, maps. vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=n

labk&AN=2029016.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Politics of the World-Economy: The States, the Movements and the Civilizations*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Webb, Silas. "*Pet Ke Waaste'* : Rights, Resistance and the East Indian Railway Strike, 1922." *The Indian Economic & Social History Review* 51, no. 1 (January 2014): 71–94. https://doi.org/10.1177/0019464613515554.