Introduction

> All the great civilizations, and probably all human societies, have known that human beings are capable of imagining; India merely cultivated this art, or faculty, more boldly than most.[1]
>
> (David Shulman, *More than Real. A History of the Imagination in South India*)

From November 1947 India embarked on the preparation of the first draft electoral roll on the basis of universal adult franchise. A handful of bureaucrats at the Secretariat of the Constituent Assembly initiated the undertaking. They did so in the midst of the partition of India and Pakistan that was tearing the territory and the people apart, and while 552 sovereign princely states had yet to be integrated into India. Turning all adult Indians into voters over the next two years against many odds, and before they became citizens with the commencement of the constitution, required an immense power of imagination. Doing so was India's stark act of decolonisation. This was no legacy of colonial rule: Indians imagined the universal franchise for themselves, acted on this imaginary, and made it their political reality. By late 1949 India pushed through the frontiers of the world's democratic imagination, and gave birth to its largest democracy. This book explores the greatest experiment in democratic human history.

India's founding leaders were determined to create a democratic state when the country became independent in 1947. But becoming and remaining a democracy was by no means inevitable in the face of the mass killings and the displacement of millions of people unleashed by the subcontinent's partition on 15 August 1947. Partition led to a mass displacement of an estimated 18 million people, and the killing of approximately one million people.[2] Moreover, creation of a democracy had to be achieved in the face of myriad social divisions, widespread poverty,

---

[1] David Shulman, *More than Real. A History of the Imagination in South India*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2012, p. ix.

[2] The exact number of those killed in partition violence is unknown. The figure of one million is adopted in some studies. See, for example, Ian Talbot and Gurharpal Singh, *The Partition of India*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 61–2. For an

1

and low literacy levels, factors that have long been thought by scholars of democracy to be at odds with the supposedly requisite conditions for successful democratic nationhood.

How, against the context of partition, did democracy capture the political imagination of the diverse peoples of India, eliciting from them both a sense of 'Indianness' and a commitment to democratic nationhood? And how, in this process, did Indian democracy come to be entrenched? It was through the implementation of the universal franchise, I suggest, that electoral democracy came to life in India.

The adoption of universal adult suffrage, which was agreed on at the beginning of the constitutional debates in April 1947, was a significant departure from colonial practice.[3] Electoral institutions existed before independence. But these institutions were largely a means of coopting ruling elites and strengthening the colonial state.[4] The legal structures for elections under colonial rule stipulated the right of an individual to be an elector, and the provisions for inclusion on the electoral rolls were made on that basis.[5] But the representation was based on 'weightage' and separate electorates, wherein seats were allotted along religious, community and professional lines, and on a very limited franchise.[6] Rather than defining voters exclusively as individuals, the law defined them as

estimation of the scale of human displacement see, for example, Gyanesh Kudaisya, 'The Demographic Upheaval of Partition: Refugees and Agricultural Resettlement in India, 1947–67', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 18, Special Issue, 1995, p. 73. For the partition violence see, for example, Urvashi Butalia, *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India*, New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998; Gyanendra Pandey, *Remembering Partition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Yasmin Khan, *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan*. New Delhi: Penguin Viking, 2007.

[3] *Interim Report of the Advisory Committee on the Subject of Fundamental Rights* (presented on 29 April 1947 – date of Report, 23 April 1947), Constituent Assembly of India, Reports of Committees (First Series) 1947 (from December 1946 to July 1947), New Delhi: The Manager, Government of India Press, 1947, p. 20. Accordingly, the Principles of the Model Provincial Constitution and the Union Constitution both contained provisions for elections on the basis of adult suffrage.

[4] David Washbrook, 'The Rhetoric of Democracy and Development in Late Colonial India', in Sugata Bose and Ayesha Jalal (eds), *Nationalism, Democracy and Development: State and Politics in India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 36.

[5] Thus, provisions for franchise in the Government of India Act, 1935 repeatedly specified that: 'No *person* shall be included in the electoral roll … unless he …' *Government of India Act, 1935*, Sixth Schedule, pp. 247–98 (emphasis added). Also see Article 291 of the 1935 Act. For a discussion of the designation of voters as individuals in colonial electoral law see David Gilmartin and Robert Moog, 'Introduction to "Election Law in India"', *Election Law Journal*, Vol. 11, no. 2, 2012, p. 137.

[6] See India Office Records, *Return Showing the Results of Elections in India 1937*, London: HMSO, 1937, pp. 5–13. Also see Reginald Coupland, *The Indian Problem, 1833–1935: Report on the Constitutional Problem in India, Submitted to the Warden and Fellows of Nuffield College, Oxford*. Part 1, London: Oxford University Press (Third Imprint), 1943;

members of communities and groups.[7] Thus, not only did the experience and legacy of elections under colonialism offer restricted representation without democracy, the electoral practices, which informed patterns of political mobilisation, resulted in the deepening of sectarian nationalism and impeded unity.[8] British officials unfailingly argued that universal franchise was a bad fit for the people of India. The small and divided electorate was based mainly on property, as well as education and gender qualifications. Under the last colonial legal framework for India, the 1935 Government of India Act, suffrage was extended to a little more than 30 million people, about one-fifth of the adult population.[9]

The national movement had been committed to universal adult suffrage since the Nehru Report of 1928. Anti-colonial mass nationalism after the First World War further strengthened that vision.[10] But there remained a large gap to bridge in turning this aspiration into a reality,

B. Shiva Rao, *The Framing of India's Constitution: A Study*, Nashik: Government of India Press, 1968, pp. 470–1.

[7] Indeed, as Gilmartin and Moog argue, the colonial legal structure of Indian elections was based on contradictory principles. Gilmartin and Moog, 'Introduction to "Election Law in India"', p. 137. For the structure of representation on the basis of communities also see David Gilmartin, 'Election Law and the "People" in Colonial and Postcolonial India', in Dipesh Chakrabarty, Rochona Majumdar and Andrew Sartori (eds), *From the Colonial to the Postcolonial. India and Pakistan in Transition*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 70–1; David Gilmartin, 'A Magnificent Gift: Muslim Nationalism and the Election Process in Colonial Punjab', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40, no. 3, 1998, pp. 415–17.

[8] See James Chiriyankandath, '"Democracy" Under the Raj: Elections and Separate Representation in British India', in Niraja Gopal Jayal (ed.), *Democracy in India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 53–81. Also see Gilmartin, 'A Magnificent Gift'; Sumit Sarkar, 'Indian Democracy: The Historical Inheritance', in Atul Kohli (ed.), *The Success of India's Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 23–46; Alistair McMillan, *Standing at the Margins: Representation and Electoral Reservation in India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005, 18–73; Uday S. Mehta, 'Indian Constitutionalism: The Articulation of a Political Vision', in Dipesh Chakrabarty, Rochona Majumdar, and Andrew Sartori (eds), *From the Colonial to the Postcolonial. India and Pakistan in Transition*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 22.

[9] See India Office Records, *Return Showing the Results of Elections in India 1937*, p. 5; F. O. Bell, 'Parliamentary Elections in Indian Provinces', *Parliamentary Affairs* 1, no. 2, 1948, p. 21; W. H. Morris Jones, 'The Indian Elections', *The Economic Weekly*, 28 June 1952, p. 654; Chiriyankandath, '"Democracy" Under the Raj', p. 51. The estimates for the proportion of the adult population that could vote under the 1935 Act ranged between 20% and 25% at most. The previous electorate to the Provincial Legislatures under the *1919 Government of India Act* reached 2.8% of the population. See 'Summary of Indian Franchise Report' (presented to Parliament, 2 June 1932), L/I/1/607, India Office Collections, British Library, London (hereafter IOC).

[10] See Sarkar, 'Indian Democracy', p. 29. It is noteworthy that besides adult suffrage, the Committee appointed by the All Parties Conference to determine the principles of the Constitution for India, which resulted in the Nehru Report, discussed in detail three main proposals with a more restricted franchise and their possible anomalies and implications for the representation of different communities. Their conclusion was that 'the only solution is adult suffrage'. See Moti Lal Nehru, *Report of the All Parties Conference*

4   Introduction

both institutionally and in terms of the notions of belonging that elec-
toral democracy based on universal franchise would require. Throughout
the first half of the 1930s in the course of making inquiries 'into the
general problem of extending the franchise'[11] in the run-up to the 1935
Act, both colonial administrators and Indian representatives in the pro-
vincial legislatures across the country claimed that 'assuming adult suf-
frage' would be 'impracticable at present',[12] as well as 'administratively
unmanageable'.[13]

The preparation of the electoral roll on the basis of universal franchise
was a bold operation, wherein the newly born state set out to engage
with all its adult citizens, ultimately expanding the electorate more than
five fold to over 173 million people, 49 per cent of the country's popu-
lation. Putting adult suffrage into practice and planning for the enrol-
ment of over 173 million people, about 85 per cent of whom had never
voted for their political representatives in a legislative assembly and a vast
majority of whom were poor and illiterate, was a staggering bureaucratic
undertaking.

The first elections took place between 25 October 1951 and 21
February 1952. But the overwhelming and complex preparatory work
for the elections, in particular the preparation of the first draft electoral
roll on the basis of adult franchise, had begun in September 1947. Before
that 'stupendous'[14] administrative task was handed over in March 1950
to the first Chief Election Commissioner of India, it was designed and
managed by a small, newly formed interim bureaucratic body of the state
in the making: the Constituent Assembly Secretariat (hereafter CAS),
under the close guidance of the Constitutional Adviser, B. N. Rau.[15]

(Together with a Summary of the Proceedings of the Conference Held at Lucknow), General
Secretary, All India Congress Committee: Allahabad, August 1928, p. 93.

[11] Letter from Ramsay Macdonald to C. H. Lothian, 29 December 1931, Mss. Eur. f/138/
15, IOC. Emphasis added.

[12] *Reports of the United Provinces Government and Provincial Committee*, 1932, IOR/Q/IFC/
61, IOC.

[13] Bell, 'Parliamentary Elections in Indian Provinces', p. 21. In 1932 the Lothian
Committee estimated that adult franchise would mean an electorate of 130 millions. See
'Summary of Indian Franchise Report', L/I/1/607, IOC.

[14] Election Commission of India, *Report on the First General Elections in India 1951–52*, New
Delhi: Government of India Press, 1955, p. 10.

[15] The setting of the Constituent Assembly Secretariat to assist with the drafting of the
new Union constitution began in May 1946. The Viceroy requested B. N. Rau to pre-
pare a scheme for the secretariat, as well as with those of the Provinces and Groups. See
Rao, *The Framing*, Vol. 1, pp. 360–71. In a letter to Rajendra Prasad in early December
Rau stressed that: 'The whole organisation is non-political and non-party in character
and its services are equally available to every member, irrespective of party or creed.'
Ibid., p. 371. In a note to Nehru dated 7 September 1946, liaising the preparation for
the inaugural meeting of the Constituent Assembly, Rau mentioned the need to create

This book explores the making of the universal franchise in India between 1947 and 1950. It tells the story of the making of the Indian electorate through the preparation of the first draft electoral roll for the first elections under universal franchise. This work was done in anticipation of the Indian constitution. The book, therefore, focuses on the practical – rather than ideological – steps through which the nation and its democracy were built. In this process, during the extraordinary period of transition from colonial rule to independence, bureaucrats inserted the *people* (*demos*) into the administrative structure that would enable their state rule (*kratia*). This process of democratic state building transformed the meaning of social existence in India and became fundamental to the evolution of Indian democratic politics over the next decades.

In the process of making the universal franchise, people of modest means were a driving force in institutionalising democratic citizenship as they struggled for their voting rights and debated it with bureaucrats at various levels. I argue that in India the institutionalisation of electoral democracy preceded in significant ways the constitutional deliberative process, and that ordinary people had a significant role in establishing democracy in India at its inception. By the time the constitution came into force in January 1950, the abstract notion of the universal franchise and the principles and practices of electoral democracy were already grounded.

The first draft electoral roll on the basis of universal franchise was ready just before the enactment of the constitution. Indians became voters before they were citizens. This process produced engagement with shared democratic experiences that Indians became attached to and started to own. The institutionalisation of procedural equality for the purpose of authorising a government in as deeply a hierarchical and unequal society as India, ahead of the enactment of the constitution turned the idea of India's democracy into a meaningful and credible story for its people.

There is an ambiguity about the use and meaning of the term democracy. It both designates and describes empirical institutional structures, as well as a set of ideals about the power of the people by the people, and

forthwith a Reference and Research Section in the Constituent Assembly. H. V. Iengar, the Secretary of the CAS, recalled: 'it had been decided by the Viceroy that I would be the secretary of a new department, the object of which was to prepare the way, for all the administrative arrangements for the Constituent Assembly which was to meet in the month of December … Now, there were two people appointed. One was Sir B. N. Rau, a very fine man, he was made the Constitutional adviser; he was to prepare the ground for the constitution and the other was myself.' H. V. Iengar, *Oral History Transcript*, No. 303, p. 129, Nehru Memorial and Museum Library, New Delhi (hereafter NMML).

the will of the people. While analytically distinct, in practice the insti-
tutional and normative components always coexist.[16] The thrust of this
book lies in the structural makeup of democratic rule. It explores how
Indian bureaucrats departed from colonial administrative habits and
procedures of voter registration to make the universal franchise a reality.
In some ways, they were taking their cue from pre-independence local
Indian constitutional convictions about franchise such as the position of
the Nehru Report, which stated that '[a]ny artificial restriction on the
right to vote in a democratic constitution is an unwarranted restriction
on democracy itself' and that the colonial notion of 'keeping the num-
ber of votes within reasonable bound' for practical difficulty 'howsoever
great has to be faced'.[17] To do so, in the circumstances of independence,
Indian bureaucrats used imaginative power with which they ultimately
shaped their own democracy.

This book explains the relations between two key democratic state-
building processes – constitutional and institutional – that took place
against the backdrop of partition over the two and a half seam line years
of India's transition from dominionhood to becoming a republic. The
first was the process of constitution making, during which the ideals of
electoral democracy and the conceptions of the relations between the
state and its would-be citizens evolved. 'Who is an Indian?' was a con-
tested issue and a constitutional challenge at independence.

The second process, which took place on the ground, was the prepara-
tion from November 1947 of the preliminary electoral roll. The prepara-
tion of the roll dealt in the most concrete way with the question of 'Who
is an Indian?', since a prospective voter had to be a citizen. The prepara-
tion of the preliminary roll for the first elections was principally based
on the anticipatory citizenship provisions in the draft constitution. The
enrolment throughout the country, in anticipation of the constitution
engendered, in turn, struggles over citizenship. This process provided the
opportunity for people and mid to lower level public officials to engage
with democratic institution building and to contest the various exclusivist
trends to be found at the margins of the Constituent Assembly debates.
The quality of the engagement and the responses to these contestations,
the suggestions and questions that arose in the process of making the
roll, and the language that these interactions produced, democratised
the political imagination. It was these contestations over membership

[16] There is a vast literature on that subject. For a brief analytical discussion see, for exam-
ple, Raymond Geuss, *History and Illusion in Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press, 2001, pp. 1–5.

[17] See Nehru, *Report of the All Parties Conference*, 93.

in the nation through the pursuit of a 'place on the roll', I argue, that grounded the conceptions and principles of democratic citizenship that were produced in the process of constitution making from above. For some key articles these contestations and the experience of roll making even shaped the constitution from below. Moreover, as a consequence of the process of implementing a universal franchise and the consequent citizenship making, the government at the centre was able to assert legitimate authority relatively smoothly over the changing political and territorial landscape of the subcontinent, giving meaning to the new federal structure.

The preparation of a joint electoral roll on the basis of universal franchise in anticipation of the constitution played a key role in making the Indian union. It contributed to forging a sense of national unity and national feeling, turned the notion of people's belonging to something tangible. They became the focus of the new state's leap of faith, in which they now had a stake.

The Archive

The archival materials that form the bedrock of this study are from the record room of the Election Commission of India. In addition, the book draws on a host of primary materials I researched at the National Archives of India, and the manuscript room of the Nehru Memorial and Museum Library, both in New Delhi, and briefly at the Maharashtra State Archives in Mumbai. Moreover, I was also able to gain copies of reports, parts of reports and documents prepared, in the main, in the context of the work of committees of the Constituent Assembly that are not available in the Constituent Assembly Debates, or in the collection of Select Documents in the *Framing of India's Constitution*.[18] In the UK I obtained supplementary materials from the India Office Collections (IOC) at the British Library, London, and from archival materials at the Centre of South Asian Studies, Cambridge.

The Election Commission of India Record Room was a true treasure trove. The materials on the preparation of the first electoral rolls on the basis of universal franchise that lay at the bottom of long shelves at the back of the cool basement of the building, held the tale of a staggering bureaucratic endeavour. The materials include 70 folders, containing more than 1,600 documents, among them correspondences between and among the Secretariat of the Constituent Assembly of

---

[18] Rao, *The Framing of India's Constitution: A Study*, Vols I–IV.

India in Delhi, high-, mid-, and low-level public officials and with a wide range of civic organisations and people from across the country. Between September 2010, when I sought permission to inspect the files dealing with the planning and preparation of the electoral roll for the first elections, and September 2012, I consulted all these records at the Election Commission record room. Thereafter, the files were transferred to the National Archives of India, where archivists catalogued them for the first time. The files became available for review there from December 2012.

What impelled me to search the early records of the Election Commission was a question I had been asking of senior election management officials for some time, and for which I could not get a satisfactory answer. I asked repeatedly how the first list of voters on the basis of universal franchise was prepared. How, under the conditions prevailing in the country at the time, did they actually enrol millions of men and women? The official *Report on the First General Elections in India* includes just over two pages on the 'preliminary steps taken by the Constituent Assembly' for the preparation of the electoral rolls.[19] It states, with reference to the Constituent Assembly, that it was 'decided that the work should be taken in hand immediately', and that in November 1947, the Secretariat of the Constituent Assembly addressed the state governments on the matter, and notes some steps that were taken thereafter.[20] I could not find a record of such a decision by the Assembly in 1947, nor of the work of the Secretariat. It was clear to me that behind these two pages there lay a much bigger story.

Once I began reading the records, I found myself drawn into an overwhelming story. I read the records in daily instalments; my schedule set by the opening hours of the record room, or by the working hours of its keeper, Mr Mahto. He suggested that I read the files upstairs in the air-conditioned library of the Commission. But I insisted on immersing myself in the files' home, quarrying through the solid dust that covered the files. Excavating my way through to the 'bottom of India's electoral democracy', I could gradually piece together the core plot. But there were manifold stories within the main story. On each issue or question raised there were a series of opinion notes prepared by members of the CAS, who each, in their turn, wrote a note on the previous note. The string of notes started from the junior staff, who usually presented the subject matter, and ended with comments and revisions made by the Joint Secretary of the CAS, and sometimes the Constitutional Adviser. These notes unravelled the thinking process

[19] Election Commission of India, *Report on the First General Elections in India 1951–52*, p. 20.
[20] Ibid., pp. 20–1.

that underlay the steps the CAS took for the preparation of rolls. From time to time, a member of the CAS prepared a note that recapped the 'story' of the preparation of rolls as it developed until that point. At the end of the working day I was left in great anticipation for the next, eager to find out how the CAS had replied to this person or that official. What were their decisions on the matters they were grappling with? I was like Padma, from Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, keen to know 'what happened next'.[21]

I began, I realised, to read the archive as a 'serialised epic': the epic of India's democracy. In particular, as I encountered letters from ordinary people and read the notes of members of the Secretariat on these letters, I grew eager to know what ultimately happened. I also grew in my admiration and appreciation of the real heroes of the making of the universal franchise in India: the staff of the Secretariat, under the leadership of B. N. Rau.[22]

There has been much theoretical discussion over the last few decades about politics and statecraft in the fashioning of archival knowledge, its structure, and control of what materials are preserved or 'lost', and the limits these impose on the discursive possibilities that the archive allows.[23] These, of course, caution against the excitement in the face of new archival discoveries. The story of the preparation of the rolls in this book also draws on a variety of other sources. Nonetheless, it has been truly impossible, as a reader of these records, not to be profoundly inspired by them. One striking omission in the archive of the preparation of the electoral rolls for the first elections, however, is that there was not a single letter from or to a woman.[24] It is also clear that some of the material is missing. I hope the following chapters will take the reader, as authentically as possible, with me along the archival trail.

Perspectives on Democracy and Modern Indian History

India's democracy and its survival has been a subject of major research interest over the last two decades. Previously, scholars of comparative politics and political theory considered India's democracy to be an

---

[21] 'But here is Padma at my elbow, bullying me back into the world of linear narrative, the universe of what happened next.' Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, London: Vintage Books, 2006, p. 44.

[22] On B. N. Rau and the staff of the Secretariat see Appendix 5. I.

[23] For an interesting discussion see Ian Almond, *The Thought of Nirad C. Chaudhuri. Islam, Empire and Loss*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 65–99. Also see Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.

[24] See a reference to that point in Chapter 3.

anomaly from which there was little to learn.[25] Yet, India's democracy
has proved to be robust. A number of major challenges, which are cur-
rently being faced by other democracies – both old and new – such
as the problem of managing democratic regimes in multicultural and
multireligious societies, have already been debated and experimented
with in India. Thus, comparativists and political theorists are no longer
been able to ignore the contribution of the study of India to general
democratic theory and practice.[26] As Sunil Khilnani pointed out, India
represents 'the largest exercise of democratic election in human history;
an index of what is in fact the largest reservoir of democratic experience
within a single state, a resource for intellectual reflection that remains
still underused'.[27] Indeed, since the 1990s, scholars of South Asia have
'highlighted the political and intellectual limitations of universalizing
Western experiences of democratization by bringing to light the particu-
lar genealogies of postcolonial democracy in South Asia, many of which
lie beyond the colonial state'.[28] This book about the institutionalisation
of democracy in India aims to contribute to the study of democracy in
three main ways.

[25] See, for example, Robert Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*, New Haven: Yale University
Press, 1989; Dahl, *On Democracy*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000; Arend
Lijphart, *Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Governments in Twenty-One
Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984. India is not included in the classic
study of the transition to democracy: Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and
Laurence Whitehead (eds), *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives*,
Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991 (first published in 1986).

[26] See, for example, Sunil Khilnani, *The Idea of India*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1997;
Khilnani, 'Arguing Democracy: Intellectuals and Politics in Modern India', Centre of
the Advanced Study of India (CASI) Working Paper Series, University of Pennsylvania,
2009; John Keane, *The Life and Death of Democracy*, London: Simon & Schuster, 2009;
Alfred C. Stepan, Juan Linz, and Yogendra Yadav, *Crafting State-Nations. India and Other
Multinational Democracies*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

[27] Khilnani, 'Arguing Democracy', 2009, p. 4.

[28] Eleanor Newbigin, Ornit Shani, and Stephen Legg, 'Introduction: Constitutionalism
and the Evolution of Democracy in India', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and
the Middle East* 36, no. 1, 2016, p. 42. For the work of scholars who focus on the emer-
gence of the Indian liberal subject and democratic ideas and politics as they emerged
locally, from within India, in the context of anti-colonial struggle, see, for example,
Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*,
Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993; Chatterjee, *The Politics of the Governed:
Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*, New York: Columbia University Press,
2004; Uday Singh Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British
Liberal Thought*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999; Mrinalini Sinha, *Specters
of Mother India: The Global Restructuring of an Empire*, Durham: Duke University Press,
2006; Sinha, 'Totaram Sanadhya's *Fiji Mein Mere Ekkis Varsh*: A History of Empire and
Nation in a Minor Key', in Antoinette Burton and Isabel Hofmeyr (eds), *Ten Books
that Shaped the British Empire: Creating an Imperial Commons*, Durham: Duke University
Press, 2014, pp. 168–89; Anupama Rao, *The Caste Question: Dalit and Politics in Modern
India*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.