



Montagu-Chelmsford Report and Govt of India Act 1919 explained

Description

The period following World War I marked a significant juncture in India's constitutional history, characterised by escalating nationalist demands and a perceived shift in British policy. The Indian National Congress, invigorated by the war and the promise of self-determination, intensified its call for greater self-governance. It was against this backdrop of political ferment and growing aspirations that the British government initiated a process of constitutional reforms, culminating in a significant report and a subsequent legislative act.

This quest for reform aimed to address the long-standing demands of [Indian political leaders](#) while attempting to maintain British paramountcy. The process involved a thorough review of the existing administrative structure and a consideration of potential pathways towards increased Indian participation in governance. The outcome of these deliberations would fundamentally alter the relationship between India and the British Crown, setting a crucial precedent for future constitutional developments.

Introduction to Montagu-Chelmsford Report

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report, officially known as the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, was published in 1918. It was the result of a comprehensive review undertaken by Edwin Montagu, the [Secretary of State for India](#), and Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy of India, between 1917 and 1918. Their objective was to ascertain the extent to which self-governing institutions could be introduced in India. The report served as the foundational document for the subsequent Government of India Act of 1919. It proposed a system of diarchy in the provinces and made recommendations for changes at the central level, all aimed at the gradual development of self-governing institutions.

Why new reforms were needed in India

Several factors contributed to the imperative for new reforms in India during this period. The existing constitutional framework, established by the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909, had largely failed to satisfy

Indian political aspirations, particularly regarding genuine self-governance.

Growing Indian Nationalism

The early 20th century witnessed a rapid acceleration of Indian nationalist sentiment. Movements like the Home Rule League, led by figures such as Annie Besant and Bal Gangadhar Tilak, gained considerable traction, mobilising public opinion and demanding substantial constitutional changes. The Indian National Congress, through its various sessions, consistently articulated the need for greater Indian control over domestic affairs.

Impact of World War I

India's significant contribution to the British war effort during World War I—in terms of manpower, resources, and financial aid—created an expectation among Indian leaders that these sacrifices would be rewarded with greater political concessions. British pronouncements during the war, particularly regarding the principle of self-determination, further fuelled these expectations. Indian leaders saw this as an opportune moment to press for their demands.

Limitations of Morley-Minto Reforms

The Morley-Minto Reforms, while introducing elements of Indian representation in legislative councils, did not introduce any form of responsible government. The councils remained advisory bodies, and real power continued to rest with the British executive. This limitation became increasingly apparent and unsatisfactory to Indian political opinion, which sought more substantive participation in the decision-making process. The reforms had expanded the scope for discussion but not for control, which was a key point of discontent.

The British Government's August 1917 Declaration

A crucial development that directly led to the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the subsequent Act was the declaration made by Edwin Montagu in the British House of Commons on August 20, 1917. This statement, often referred to as the 'August Declaration', outlined the new policy of the British government towards India.

Montagu declared that the policy was 'that of increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire.' This declaration was significant because it explicitly acknowledged responsible government as the ultimate goal of British policy in India. It marked a departure from previous policies that had been ambiguous about the ultimate political destiny of India. The declaration prompted Montagu's visit to India in late 1917 to consult with Lord Chelmsford and various Indian political leaders, leading to the detailed report that followed.

Key aims of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms

The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, as embodied in the Government of India Act 1919, were designed with several specific aims, primarily to address the growing demand for self-governance while maintaining British control.

Progressive Realisation of Responsible Government

The primary aim was to initiate the process of introducing ‘responsible government’ in India, albeit gradually. This meant that certain functions of government would be transferred to elected Indian representatives, who would be answerable to the legislative councils. This was a significant step away from the purely bureaucratic administration that had prevailed.

Introduction of Diarchy in Provinces

A central feature of the reforms was the introduction of diarchy (dual rule) in the provincial governments. This system divided provincial subjects into two categories:

- **Transferred Subjects:** These included areas like education, health, local self-government, and public works. They were administered by the Governor with the aid of ministers who were chosen from among the elected members of the provincial legislative council and were responsible to the council.
- **Reserved Subjects:** These included crucial areas like finance, law and order, irrigation, and land revenue. They remained under the direct control of the Governor and his executive council, who were not responsible to the legislative council.

The purpose of diarchy was to provide Indians with experience in administration and to gradually expand their powers. However, the division of subjects often led to operational difficulties and conflicts between the two parts of the government.

Expansion of Provincial Legislative Councils

The reforms significantly expanded the size of the provincial legislative councils. A majority of members in these councils were now to be elected. This increased Indian representation and provided a larger platform for Indian politicians to voice their concerns and participate in legislative processes. The franchise was also somewhat broadened, though it remained limited to a small percentage of the population based on property and educational qualifications.

Reforms at the Central Level

At the central government level, the reforms introduced a bicameral legislature, consisting of the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State. While the central legislature was given more powers, it did not introduce responsible government. The Viceroy and his Executive Council remained largely accountable to the British Parliament, not to the Indian legislature. However, Indian representation in the Viceroy’s Executive Council was increased. This structure was designed to give Indians a greater voice in central policy-making without ceding ultimate control.

How the 1919 Act shaped India’s path to independence

The Government of India Act 1919, born from the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, played a critical role in shaping India's journey towards independence, acting as both a catalyst for future demands and a framework for constitutional evolution.

First Step Towards Self-Government

The Act represented the first concrete step by the British government towards granting self-government to Indians. The introduction of diarchy, despite its limitations, allowed Indian ministers to gain practical experience in governing specific departments. This experience was invaluable for future leaders. It instilled a sense of confidence and provided a testing ground for indigenous administrative capabilities.

Increased Political Awareness and Participation

The expansion of the franchise and the increased number of elected seats in both provincial and central legislatures meant a greater number of Indians participated in the political process, either as voters or as elected representatives. This fostered political consciousness among the masses and strengthened the demand for further constitutional reforms. The legislative councils became important forums for debate and articulation of nationalist views.

Foundation for Future Reforms

The principles laid down in the 1919 Act, particularly the idea of responsible government, became the benchmark for future constitutional changes. Indian leaders critically analysed its shortcomings, such as the limitations of diarchy and the lack of responsible government at the centre, and used these points to press for more comprehensive reforms in subsequent decades. The Act established a precedent for a more structured and gradual transfer of power.

Deepened Demands for Swaraj

While the Act aimed to appease nationalist sentiments, it ultimately fell short of fully satisfying Indian aspirations for Swaraj (self-rule). Many Indian leaders viewed the reforms as insufficient and criticised the retention of significant powers by the British, particularly in reserved subjects and at the centre. This dissatisfaction strengthened the nationalist movement, pushing it towards demanding complete independence rather than just responsible government within the British Empire. This point needs attention: the limited nature of the reforms paradoxically intensified the push for full freedom.

Experience with Representative Institutions

The Act provided Indians with direct experience in working within a parliamentary framework, participating in elections, forming governments (even if partial), and engaging in legislative debates. This exposure was crucial in preparing India for a democratic future post-independence. It taught leaders about the intricacies of governance and political negotiation.

UPSC Perspective

Prelims focus

For the UPSC Prelims examination, understanding the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the Government of India Act 1919 requires attention to specific factual details. Important dates, such as the August 20, 1917 Declaration and the passing of the 1919 Act, are frequently asked. Key terms like 'responsible government' and 'diarchy' must be understood in their specific context within these reforms. Familiarity with the names of the report (Montagu-Chelmsford) and the subsequent Act (Government of India Act 1919) is also essential. Questions might also touch upon the division of subjects into 'reserved' and 'transferred' at the provincial level.

- August 20, 1917: Montagu's Declaration
- 1918: Montagu-Chelmsford Report published
- 1919: Government of India Act enacted
- Key terms: Diarchy, Responsible Government, Reserved Subjects, Transferred Subjects
- Names: Edwin Montagu (Secretary of State), Lord Chelmsford (Viceroy)

Mains focus

For the UPSC Mains examination, the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the Act of 1919 are crucial for understanding constitutional development in [British India](#). The reforms should be analysed in the broader context of the evolving demands of the Indian National Congress, which had significantly intensified its call for self-rule. The impact of World War I on Indian nationalism, particularly how it bolstered demands for political concessions, forms a significant analytical aspect. Finally, understanding the shifts in British policy, moving from a purely administrative approach to a stated goal of 'responsible government,' and the inherent contradictions in this policy, is vital for comprehensive answers. The Act's successes and failures in appeasing Indian political aspirations and its role in accelerating the demand for complete independence should also be critically examined.

Common Student Confusion

Difference between Morley-Minto reforms and Montagu-Chelmsford reforms regarding parliamentary system.

A common misunderstanding is to equate the parliamentary system elements in the Morley-Minto Reforms (1909) with those in the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms (1919).

Correction: The Morley-Minto Reforms introduced separate electorates and expanded legislative councils, allowing for more discussion and representation of Indians. However, these councils had no power to control the executive. They were advisory bodies, and the principle of responsible government was explicitly rejected. In contrast, the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, through the introduction of 'diarchy' in the provinces, for the first time introduced the concept of 'responsible government' for 'transferred subjects.' This meant ministers for these subjects were elected members of the legislative council and accountable to it, a direct move towards a parliamentary system, even if limited to specific areas. The 1919 Act thus provided the first, albeit partial, experience of a parliamentary system, unlike the 1909 Act.

Understanding ‘responsible government’ versus full independence.

Students often confuse ‘responsible government’ as promised by the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms with ‘full independence’ or complete self-rule.

Correction: ‘Responsible government’ meant that certain departments of the government would be run by ministers chosen from and accountable to the elected legislative body. It implied a degree of internal autonomy in specific areas, but within the larger framework of the British Empire, with the British Governor and Viceroy retaining significant powers, especially over ‘reserved subjects.’ ‘Full independence,’ on the other hand, implies complete sovereignty, where the nation has absolute control over all its internal and external affairs, free from any external authority. The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms aimed at the former, as a gradual process, not the latter. At this stage, one issue becomes clear: the British envisioned a self-governing India *within* the Empire, a vision that increasingly clashed with Indian nationalist aspirations for complete freedom.

Short Revision Points

- The Government of India Act 1919 originated from the Montagu-Chelmsford Report.
- Morley-Minto Reforms (1909) failed to introduce any form of responsible government or a parliamentary system.
- The Indian National Congress was very active during World War I, advocating for significant political reforms.
- The August 20, 1917 Declaration by Edwin Montagu explicitly promised the ‘progressive realisation of responsible government’ in India.
- The Government of India Act 1919 was a significant, though limited, constitutional step towards India’s eventual independence.

FAQs

1. What was the Montagu-Chelmsford Report?

It was a report published in 1918 by Edwin Montagu (Secretary of State for India) and Lord Chelmsford (Viceroy of India) proposing constitutional reforms for India, which formed the basis for the Government of India Act 1919.

2. What led to the Government of India Act 1919?

The Act was a response to growing Indian nationalist demands, India’s contribution to World War I, and the limitations of previous reforms, directly stemming from the recommendations of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the August 1917 Declaration.

3. What did the August 1917 Declaration promise?

It promised the ‘increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration’ and the ‘gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire.’

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the Government of India Act 1919 thus mark a critical juncture in India’s constitutional journey, introducing foundational concepts of responsible government that would evolve into the fully independent parliamentary democracy seen today. For those aspiring to understand these intricate historical developments for their [civil services examination](#), comprehending

the nuances of such reforms is essential. [SHRI RAM IAS](#) is regarded as the best [IAS coaching in Delhi](#), providing comprehensive guidance to help students master these and other crucial topics for the UPSC examination.

SHRI RAM IAS