UNIT 31 THE GROWTH OF INDIAN CAPITALISM, THE CAPITALIST CLASS AND THE FREEDOM STRUGGLE
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31.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit you will get to know about the:

- growth of the Indian Capitalist Class in the context of colonialism and the colonial economy,
- attitude of the Indian Capitalists as a class towards colonialism,
- attitude of the Indian Capitalists towards the mass movements and the left, and
- relationship between the Capitalist Class and the Indian National Congress.

31.1 INTRODUCTION

The Indian National Movement was, in its initial stages during the second half of the nineteenth century, mainly confined to the educated middle classes. However, in course of time, it began to expand its social base and gradually other classes and sections of society began to join it. The nature of the role played by various classes and social groups and the timing of their joining the national struggle varied. In this unit, we will discuss the role of the Indian capitalist class in the freedom struggle.

The modern capitalist class began to emerge in India in the second half of the nineteenth century. Till about World War I, there were few Indian capitalists and the size of their investments was also not substantial. Moreover, they were as yet largely dependent on the colonial government’s support. At this stage of development, it was hardly possible for the Indian capitalists as a class to take an open confrontationist position with regard to the colonial state. The capitalists stayed away from the Swadeshi Movement of 1905-1908. At the time of the Non-Cooperation Movement (1920-22), while many traders participated in the movement, several eminent capitalists like Purshottamdas Thakurdas actually opposed the movement. Subsequently, however, the capitalists’ position changed. There were many Indian capitalists who extended their support to the freedom struggle.
### 31.2 GROWTH OF INDIAN ECONOMY AND INDIAN CAPITALIST CLASS

The emerging political position of Indian capitalists was connected with the nature and extent of the growth of the Indian economy.

The developments in the Indian economy during the colonial period, especially in the twentieth century, were significantly different from the experience of most other colonial countries and largely explain the position of Indian capitalists class vis-a-vis imperialism. Let us briefly outline these developments:

i) Soon after the beginning of the twentieth century, the Indian economy entered a process of rapid import substitution. During the two World Wars, as also in the course of world depression of the 1930s, the grip of imperialism over the India economy became comparatively weaker and the process of growth of Indian industry, largely the indigenous manufactures substituting foreign imports, gained a large impetus. More importantly, the growth in indigenous industry that occurred in this period was derived largely from the resources of independent Indian capital. In other words, the Indian capitalists grew with an independent capital base and not as junior partners of foreign capital.

ii) Increase in indigenous industrial growth since World War I was reflected in a definite reversal of the typical colonial pattern of foreign trade under which the colony imported manufactured goods and exported agricultural raw materials. Between 1914 and 1945, the proportion of manufactured goods in India's total imports declined considerably, while the proportion in total exports increased. Conversely, the proportion of raw materials in India's total exports declined and the proportion of capital goods (as opposed to consumer goods) in total imports increased. Also, the dependence of Indian economy on the colonial type of international trade, began to show a decline while the growth of internal trade took some rapid strides.

iii) The hold of foreign capital which in any case was not as large in India, as in some other colonial countries, and was not very significant in domestic industry began to decline during this period. Foreign capital inflow into the Indian economy fell off after a spurt in the early 1920s. On the other hand, repayments of foreign debt and repatriation of existing foreign investments (partially through the take over of foreign companies by Indian capitalists) started increasing, especially since the 1930s. As a result from about 1935, there was a new outflow of foreign capital from India. In fact, during the World War II, India ceased to be a debtor country. On the contrary, by the end of the War, Britain owed India a whopping sterling balance equivalent to nearly Rs. 1500/- crores. This meant that India was not dependent on the London money market any longer as it did not need foreign borrowing.

iv) During the post-World War I period, in the course of the processes discussed above, the Indian capitalist class was able to grow rapidly. It was able to do so through:

- constant economic and political struggle, and
- by taking full advantages of the crisis faced by British imperialism especially during the two wars and the great depression.

The Indian capitalists resorted to import substitution in areas such as cotton textiles and steel industry and slowly took over areas like banking, jute, foreign trade, coal, tea, etc., where European capital in India had traditionally dominated. Also, they initiated some steps which accounted for the bulk of new investments made since the 1920s in industries such as sugar, cement, paper, chemicals, iron and steel. As a result, on the eve of independence, Indian enterprise had already captured about 72 per cent of the Indian market. In the financial sphere too massive advances were made by Indian capital. For example:

- While in 1914 Indian banks held about 30 per cent of the total deposits, by 1947 their share had increased to over 80 per cent.
- Indian companies grew rapidly in insurance business as well, capturing about 79 per cent of life insurance and 55 per cent of general insurance by 1945.
- The total assets of the top three Indian business houses in 1946 greatly surpassed the total assets of the top three non-Indian companies.
However, this spectacular and independent growth of Indian capitalist class, quite unusual in a colonial situation, did not occur as is often argued, as a result of a conscious policy of 'decolonisation' initiated by the colonial state. It occurred in spite of and in opposition to colonialism either when imperialism was facing a crisis or as a result of waging a constant struggle against the colonial interests. The Indian capitalists did not see their interests as tied with colonialism.

Moreover, the capitalist class, on the whole, was not tied up in a subservient position either economically or politically with pro-imperialist feudal interests in the country.

Another situation, where a colonial capitalist class may move towards collaborating with imperialism is when, it sees a threat to its existence from radical anti-capitalist or left wing popular movements in the colony. Such situations did arise in certain colonial or semi-colonial countries, where the capitalist class sought to suppress the radical movement in alliance with imperialism. We can cite the example of China. In India also, the capitalists were concerned about the growth of the left. However, whenever the Indian capitalist class felt that the threat from the left was growing, it responded not by seeking help from imperialism but by attempting to strengthen, by various means, the right wing in the national movement.

The following points then emerge from the above discussion:

i) The Indian capitalist class grew independently and in opposition to imperialism and therefore did not see the long-term class interests as being tied up with imperialism.

ii) The rapid and independent growth of Indian capitalists enabled them to feel strong enough to take anti-imperialist position.

iii) The threat of popular left movements did not lead the capitalist class to collaborate or compromise with imperialism. The issue before the capitalist class was not, whether to oppose imperialism or not, but that the path chosen to fight imperialism should not be such that it would threaten capitalism itself.

Check Your Progress 1
1. Was the growth of the Capitalist class a by-product of Colonialism?

2. What was the attitude of the Indian Capitalist class towards the threat of the left?

31.3 THE EMERGENCE OF A CLASS ORGANISATION

It was in the process of figuring out its attitude towards imperialism and the national movement that the capitalist class in India emerged as a political entity. Since the early 1920s, capitalists like G.D. Birla and Purshottamdas Thakurdas were making efforts to establish a national level organisation of Indian commercial, financial and industrial interests. The initial idea was to establish an Indian business organisation which could effectively lobby with the colonial government — a role which relatively more organised non-Indian business interests were already performing. This effort led to the formation of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) in 1927. The FICCI soon acquired a large membership which increasingly became representative of 
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Indian business interests from all over the country. Within a short period of its formation, it was recognised by the British authorities as well as the general Indian public as a body which represented the dominant opinion within the Indian capitalist class.

### 31.3.1 Role in the Economic Sphere

The capitalist leaders clearly stated that the goal of the FICCI was to become the “national guardians of trade, commerce and industry”. It was to perform in the economic sphere the function that is normally expected of a nationalist organisation. In pursuance of this goal the Indian capitalists developed a comprehensive economic critique of imperialism in all its manifestations. For example, their critique exposed the imperialist exploitation that was going on through direct appropriation of surplus in form of taxation, remittance of ‘Tribute’ or home charges in addition to the exploitation through trade, foreign investments, financial and currency manipulations and so on. The leaders of the Indian National Congress, of the eminence of Motilal Nehru and Gandhiji, often did not hesitate to seek the assistance of capitalists like Purshottamdas or G.D. Birla on complex economic matters which related to Indian interests vis-a-vis imperialism.

### 31.3.2 Role in the Political Sphere

The role of the FICCI, however, was not to be limited to making an economic critique of imperialism and fighting for the economic demands of the capitalist class in particular and of the nation as a whole in general. The leaders of the capitalist class clearly saw the necessity of effective intervention in politics. Purshottamdas Thakurdas, President of FICCI, declared at its second annual session in 1928: “We can no more separate our politics from our economics”. Involvement in politics for the capitalists meant allying with the Indian National Movement. As Purshottamdas said in the 1928 FICCI session, “Indian Commerce and Industry are intimately associated with and are indeed, an integral part of the national movement — growing with its growth and strengthening with its strength”. A transformation could be seen in Purshottamdas for he had earlier opposed the Non-Cooperation Movement. Clearly, the capitalists realised that even their economic aims could be achieved only by fighting for a change in the existing political system of colonial domination. G.D. Birla expressed this understanding in 1930:

> “It is impossible in the present ... political condition of our country to convert the government to our views. ... the only solution ... lies in every Indian businessman strengthening the hands of those who are fighting for the freedom of our country”.

But, at the same time Birla was conscious enough to tell the British Government that he had never financed the Civil Disobedience Movement.

**Check Your Progress 2**

1. What was the initial objective behind the formation of the FICCI?

2. What role did the FICCI play in the economic sphere?

---

### 31.4 NATURE OF ANTI-IMPERIALISM: THE CONSTITUTIONAL PATH

The capitalist class was concerned as to what kind of national struggle was to be supported.
by them. The capitalists, while determining their attitude towards the British were, always in favour of not completely abandoning the constitutional path and the negotiating table. They supported constitutional forms of struggle and were not in favour of agitation and civil disobedience. There were several reasons for the capitalist class adopting this attitude:

i) Fears of a Mass Movement
First, the capitalists feared that mass civil disobedience, especially if it was prolonged, could lead to the radicalisation of the masses and instead of just putting pressure against imperialism it could begin to threaten capitalism itself. As Lalji Naranji a leader of the Indian Merchant’s Chamber, Bombay, clearly stated in 1930, “Private property”, itself could be threatened by a mass movement and “disregard for authority” created by it could produce “disastrous after-effects” for the “government of Swaraj”. Not wishing the anti-imperialist movement to turn anti-capitalist, the capitalists always tried to bring back the national movement to a phase of constitutional opposition. Another reason why the capitalists could not afford to support a prolonged and all out opposition to the colonial government, was that in their normal day to day business they needed a minimum cooperation of the government. And, as we all know that at this time it, was the colonial Government. This dependence on the existing government for immediate needs, combined with the fact that mass agitation disrupted normal business, led the capitalists to shy away from any kind of mass action even under the aegis of the Indian National Congress.

ii) Constitutional Forums
The capitalists considered that a total or prolonged boycott of all constitutional avenues such as councils and legislatures or the negotiations like the Round Table Conferences was a “suicidal policy”. They felt that if the nationalist forces completely abandoned these forums then with the help of loyalist elements the government could easily get such policies or measures passed in these forums which would seriously affect Indian economic development. This again was linked with their own interests. Thus, keeping this in mind the capitalists not only supported but at times actually participated in the various forums offered by the colonial Government. For example, some of them even joined the Viceroy’s Executive Council. In fact they wanted to extract to their benefit whatever reforms that were possible within the system.

In certain cases the capitalists did not support participation in constitutional bodies unconditionally. G.D. Birla and Purshottamdas made it clear that they were to “participate on (their) own terms”, with “no compromise on fundamentals”. It was on this ground, for example, that the proposals of constitutional reforms put forward by the Joint Parliamentary Committee in 1934 were rejected by the FICCI as being “reactionary”.

Moreover, the capitalists generally refused to negotiate with the British government on constitutional or economic questions without the participation of, or at least the approval of, the leading organisations of the national movement. In 1930, for example, the FICCI advised its members to boycott the Round Table Conference saying that “... no conference ... convened for the purpose of discussing the problem of Indian constitutional advance can come to a solution .... unless such a conference is attended by Mahatma Gandhi, as a free man, or has at least his approval”. Thus many leading capitalists boycotted the first Round Table Conference but attended the second along with Gandhi. When the Congress was absent for the third Round Table Conference, Purshottamdas attended in his individual capacity. But he made it clear that the conference could not settle the constitutional problems in Gandhi’s absence. The capitalists had clearly realised, that no progress could be made to safeguard their interests, unless support of the Congress was secured. Ambalal Sarabhai a prominent capitalist of Ahmedabad summed up this situation in 1929 when he said, “minus the support of the Congress the government will not listen to you”.

Thus, the capitalists were in favour of a constitutional approach and methodology due to two reasons:

a) They could check the Left by strengthening the Right wing.
b) They could show it to the government that they were in no way a threat to the continuity of British rule. For example, Purshottamdas declared in December 1942, that “the various demands put forward by the commercial community did not and could not aim at the liquidation of the British Empire”.

It was the faith in constitutionalism that G.D. Birla involved himself during 1935-37 with Gandhi regarding the question of elections and forming of ministries.
(iii) Attitude to Mass Movements
However, at times they felt a mass movement necessary in order to extract crucial concessions for their class or the country. Here we can cite the comment made by G.D. Birla in January 1931 about the ongoing Civil Disobedience Movement. He said: “there could be no doubt that what we are being offered at present is entirely due to Gandhiji...if we are to achieve what we desire, the present movement should not be allowed to slacken.”

(iv) Dangers of a Prolonged Mass Movement
Yet they would not like the mass movement to continue for long. They would attempt for a compromise that could lead to the withdrawal of the movement. Often they offered their services as intermediaries between the government and the Congress in the negotiations for peace. The best example for this was the negotiations before the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in March 1931. But here the threat of continuing, or launching the mass movement, again was used as a bargaining point. As G.D. Birla, put it in January 1931, the capitalists in their “anxiety for peace” were not willing to surrender of “reduce (their) demands”. They, he continued, should have “two objectives: one that we should jump in at the most opportune time to try for a conciliation and the other is that we should not do anything which might weaken the hands of the (i.e., the national movement), through whose efforts we have arrived at this stage”. In other words, through the capitalists argued for peace or conciliation they did not want to either at the cost of surrendering basic national demands or of weakening the national movement as a whole.

The capitalists, even when they had serious reservations about the continuance or launching of a mass civil disobedience movement, never supported the colonial government in repressing it. On the contrary, they repeatedly pressurised the government to stop repression, remove the ban on the Congress and the press, release political prisoners and stop arbitrary rule through ordinances. There was no change in the attitude even when the national movement was at the pitch of its non-constitutional mass phase. The fear of the mass movement becoming too radical or the fact that it involved losses in day to day business did not lead the capitalist class as a whole, to either supporting the government in repressing it or even openly condoning or dissociating from it.

Check Your Progress 3
1 The Capitalists used the Constitutional Forums:
   i) in their individual capacity
   ii) while negotiating the Congress
   iii) by consciously keeping the support of the Congress in their mind
   iv) none of the above.

2 The capitalists favoured
   i) prolonged mass movements
   ii) their position of intermediaries between the Congress and the Government in getting early reconciliations to stop prolonged mass movement
   iii) total absence of mass movements
   iv) none of the above.

31.5 CONGRESS AND THE CAPITALISTS
You would like to know about the relationship between the Indian National Congress and Capitalists. Generally speaking the relationship is analysed from two viewpoints:

i) The Congress was deeply influenced by the Capitalists who used it to serve their own class interests. This viewpoint centred on the thesis that the capitalists, by using the funds at their disposal, pressurised the Congress into fighting for their own demands like:
   • a lower Rupee-sterling ratio
   • tariff protection to Indian Industries, and
   • reservation of coastal traffic to Indian shipping, etc.

Besides this the capitalists influenced the political decisions of the Congress like the withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1931; selections of Congress candidates in elections particularly in 1937; crushing the working class movement
during late 1930s financing the right wing, etc. A major reason for their support to Gandhi was their firm belief that “he alone could check a class war” in this country. And Gandhi on the other hand, sided with the capitalists. Hence Congress was a Capitalistic organisation by nature.

ii) The second point of view is based on the assumption that the Congress was not at all influenced by the capitalists rather it dictated its own terms.

According to this view point:

i) A programme of economic nationalism with demands for protection, fiscal and monetary autonomy vis-a-vis imperialism did not benefit the capitalist class alone. These were national demands for independent economic development. Anyone who was anti-imperialist, whether a capitalist or not, had to fight for these demands. In fact the socialists and communists in India also fought for these demands. Besides, the doctrine of economic nationalism was developed by the early nationalists in India several decades before the Indian capitalist organised themselves politically, and began to fight for these demands. As a matter of fact when these demands were first raised in the nineteenth century, the capitalists class had barely come into existence and it did not come out in support of them. Clearly, the Congress did not have to be bought, manipulated or pressurised by the capitalists to put forward these demands.

ii) Secondly, the Congress dependence on the funds from businessmen, was not the determining factor as far as the policy decisions were concerned. Nor was the financial dependence on capitalists so strong as to effect its policies. The overwhelming majority of Congressmen maintained themselves on their own account and the day to day agitations were carried out with the voluntary hospitality and support of the common people and the funds raised through membership fees and small donations. Even during the constitutional phase, when the Congress went in for elections, its dependence on the capitalists for funds was not such as to make it dependent on them. In reply to a query from Linlithgow, the Viceroy: “whether the Congress can for long continue an existence divorced from the Gandhian moneybags”, the Director of Intelligence Bureau submitted the following very significant report in March 1939:

“Congress has ... very important substitutes for regular finance. The ‘appeal to patriotism’ saves a lot of cash expenditures ... Both for normal Congress activities and for election purposes, the moneybags (capitalists) are less important than the Gandhian superstition and the powerful influence of Congress ministries in office. With these influences to support them, local Congress organisations can command so much support from the public that they are in a position to fight elections without much money”.

This is not to say that the Congress did not need or accept funds from the capitalists, especially during the constitutional phases. However, through these funds the capitalist class was not in any basic way able to influence the policy and ideology of the Congress along lines which was not acceptable to it independently.

The attitude of the Congress leaders, even those who were supposed to be close to the capitalists, is very revealing in this context. Gandhiji, as early as February, 1922, while welcoming and even appealing for support from merchants and milliowners made it very clear that:

whether they do so or not, the country’s march to freedom cannot be made to depend on any corporation or groups of men. This is a mass manifestation. The masses are moving rapidly towards deliverance and they must move whether with the aid of the organised capital or without. This must therefore be a movement independent of capital and yet not antagonistic to it. Only if capital came to the aid of the masses, it would redound to the credit of the capitalists and hasten the advent of the happy day.

Similarly, Motilal Nehru who, in the Swarajist phase, was in close contact with Bombay and Ahmedabad capitalists and accepted significant sums of money from them for political work, had no hesitation in severely castigating them in 1928 when he felt that they were trying to retreat from their erstwhile commitments. He said,

the Congress should welcome this change in the attitude of the mill owners. An alliance between the Congress and capitalists who are bent on profiting by the sufferings of the nation is an impossible one. The more suitable field of work for the Congress is among the workers and not the owners of the mills. But I was misled by
the patriotic talk of some of my personal friends among the mill owners. Mahatmaji never believed in an alliance with the latter, and I have now told him that he was right and I was wrong.

The message was clear. The capitalists had to behave if the Congress was to work with them. Whether they did so or not, the Congress would go ahead with its work relying on the support of other classes.
But this did not mean that the Congress did not want their financial support. On many occasions it took donations. For example Dalmia contributed substantially for election funds in 1937 and the constructive programme was always financed by Birla.

31.6 CAPITALISTS’ VIEW OF THE CONGRESS

How did the Indian Capitalists view the Indian National Congress? In fact the Congress was never perceived by them as their own class party. J.K. Mehta of the Indian Merchants Chamber put it as a party, “with room in it for all shades of political opinion and economic views”. But at the same time, the Capitalists tried to ensure that the national movement did not get radicalised, i.e., come under the influence of socialists or communists. With this perspective they strengthened the right wing in the Congress. For example G.D. Birla wrote to Purshottamdas (3rd August, 1934):

Vallabhbhai, Rajaji and Rajendra Babu are all fighting communism and socialism. It is therefore, necessary that some of us who represent the healthy Capitalism should help Gandhi as far as possible and work with a common object.

In fact Birla and Thakurdas had earlier opposed the suggestion of Dorabji Tata for forming a political party of the Capitalists. This was because they felt that the Congress itself could take care of their interests provided the right wing dominated in the Congress. The Gandhian principle of trusteeship (Unit 13) suited them well for it discouraged anti-capitalist struggle.

31.6.1 Approaching the Congress

Interestingly, the capitalist themselves showed remarkable maturity in never seeing the Congress as their class party or even as a party amenable only to their influence. They fully recognised that the Congress was a multi-class popular movement “with room in it” as J.K. Mehta of the Indian Merchants’ Chamber put it, “for all shades of political opinion and economic views”. Which shade or which class perspective would exercise greater weight within the Congress, remained an open question and was partially linked to the political maturity and farsightedness of each class.

31.6.2 Capitalists Strategy to Contain the Left

It is with this understanding that the capitalists moulded their politics, to try to ensure that the national movement did not get too radicalised, i.e., it did not come under the dominating influence of the socialists or communists. However, as pointed out earlier, the capitalists did not respond to the growing threat of the left in Indian by allying themselves with imperialism. For example, in 1928, they refused to support the colonial government in passing the Public Safety Bill which was intended to contain the communists, on the ground that such a Bill would result in an attack on the national movement. The fact that the capitalists did not abandon the side of nationalism, even when threatened by the left tendency within the national movement, went a long way in maintaining the influence of the capitalist perspective within the movement.

Instead of abandoning the side of nationalism, the capitalists evolved a complex strategy to combat the left in the nationalist stream. As a part of their strategy, they gave support to the right wing of the national movement, and did extensive political and ideological propaganda, arguing for rapid economic growth, equitable distribution, partial nationalisation, land reforms and schemes for worker’s welfare. By formulating what FICCI President, G.L. Mehta called “a consistent programme of reforms (as the) most effective remedy against social upheavals”. They sought to combat the influence of the left on the national movement.

It needs to be reiterated, however, that the capitalists’ attempt to contain the national movement within bourgeois limits did not involve any compromise with imperialism. They remained anti-imperialist, though, their goal was to evolve or support a strategy of overthrowing imperialism, which would simultaneously ensure the maintenance of the capitalist system.
Check Your Progress

1. It may be said that
   i) the capitalists were not financing the Congress in anyway.
   ii) the capitalists were completely financing the Congress.
   iii) the capitalists were financing the Congress but the extent to which this determined
       the Congress’s political decision is a matter of controversy.
   iv) none of the above.

2. One of the most effective strategies the capitalists evolved to contain the left in the
   national movement was to
   i) strengthen the ultra left
   ii) dissociate themselves from the Congress main stream
   iii) remain within the Congress and strengthen the right wing
   iv) none of the above.

31.7 LET US SUM UP

In this unit you got to know:
- about the emergence of Indian Capitalism in the concrete conditions of the space
  created by declining hold of foreign capital, import substitution forced by war, and
  changes in foreign trade. This took place because of an internal crisis in imperialism
  weakened by the World War and the 1930s depression.
- about how, even then, the Indian Capitalists had to struggle against colonial policies to
  establish themselves.
- about how the organisation of the Indian Capitalists as a class under the Federation of
  Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (FICCI), helped to define in a concrete
  manner how economically and politically imperialism was affecting its growth.
- it was the result of this clearest critique of colonialism that decided the Indian
  Capitalists’ strategy in the national movement,
- that this strategy was marked by
  i) a realisation of the danger and the necessity of the mass movements to their
     interest,
  ii) a need to counter the potential of the left, and
  iii) a need to constantly orient the multi-class platform that the Congress was, towards
     its class interests.

31.8 KEY WORDS

Import substitution: An economic policy which asks for manufacturing those goods
which were previously brought from abroad, to be produced within the country itself. This
policy normally helps the growth of national indigenous industries.

Compradors: Those Capitalists whose enterprise is completely subordinate to foreign
capital.

Feudal interest: Interests whose dominant means of subsistence is control over land and
its tillers.

Relative autonomy of the national movement: a term which indicates that the national
movement was not linked to any dominant class interests, though it contained within it
interests and hopes of all classes.

31.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1
1. See Sub-sec. 31.2.5. Your answer should cover (i) the nature of Indian Capitalists
   opposition to Colonialism and (ii) the weakening of British Imperialism.
2 See Sub-sec. 31.2.7. Your answer should include (i) the capitalists' attitude towards the growth of left and (ii) the strength of the left.

Check Your Progress 2
1 See Section 31.3, the first para. Your answer should include the efforts of Indian business to build a national organisation to lobby for their interests.
2 See Sub-sec. 31.3.1. Your answer should include (i) its role of a national guardian of trade and industry (ii) its role in developing a critique of imperialism.

Check Your Progress 3
1 (iii) 2 (ii) ✓

Check Your Progress 4
1 (iii) 2 (iii) ✓