Impact of Islam on Indian Culture: Bhakti and Sufi Movements

Culture is a complex and a very sensitive phenomenon. Each culture claims to be unique and uninfluenced by any other culture. However, such rigid view of culture cannot be truthful and realistic when specified geographical area is shared by people of different cultures and there is more than a likelihood of ideas, beliefs and practices mixing with one another.

Satish Chandra rightly observes that the 13th century with the coming of the Turks into India and the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate was a period of both turmoil and development. The first phase was one of death and destruction on a large scale with many sacred, beautiful symbols of culture – temples being destroyed and palaces and cities being ravaged. This rather was a continuous process throughout the period of expansion and consolidation of the Delhi Sultanate along with the process of development and peaceful co-existence as well. Contact between the two cultures started much earlier to the coming of Islam to India but the interaction quickened after Islam arrived. It is true that some bigoted Ulemas such as Nasiruddin Mubarak Ghaznavi of the regime of Iltutmish advocated a policy of inveterate hostility towards the Brahmins of the Hindu community as some of the very orthodox Hindus resented the Muslim entry into India.

In due course of time, in spite of the seemingly irreconcilable nature of Islam and Hinduism, with Islam advocating strict monotheism, rejecting the image worship and worship of innumerable gods through Bhakti and Karma paths. Yet we notice the development of a gradual process of mutual adjustment and accommodation along with conflict and rapprochement. No doubt, with setbacks under some rulers in some regions and faster development under some other rulers, travelers and saints played a key role as agents of transmission of ideas of one cultural adherent to another group.

By the time Delhi Sultanate was established, it is rightly suggested that the main features of early Islam underwent many changes. It is also said that outwardly the migrants of Islamic religion professed to be fervent followers and showed respect to the Islamic rites and prayers appear to have imbibed many non-Islamic ideas of the upper strata of the Persian society, retaining some elements of its original simplicity, tribal democracy and social justice. Some Hindus who were opposed to the caste oppression and hierarchical ordering
of social structure appear to have preferred conversion to Islam while some were forced into conversion while there were others lured by pecuniary gains. As Tarachand states, it is hardly possible to exaggerate the extent of Muslim influence over Indian life in all departments. But nowhere else is it shown so vividly and as picturesquely as in customs, in intimate details of domestic life, in music, in the fashion of dress, in the ceremonies of marriage, and fairs, and in the courtly institutions and etiquette. It is to be admitted that though these cultures lived for ages side by side, there was no real fusion of cultures but the impact of each on the other cannot be underestimated.

Tarachand further observes the influence exercised by Muslim mystics and their religious thought, which inspired a number of reform movements among Hindus, which spread over the whole of the country and profusely affected the Hindu outlook. S. Abid Husain writes that one of the most powerful factors, which contributed to the reconciliation was the historic mediating role played by the Muslim Sufis and Hindus saints of the later Bhakti school.

The Sufi Movement

Sufism or Tasawwuf the composite name for various mystical tendencies and movements of Islam. Its object was to establish direct communication between God and man through personal experience of inherent mysticism. It is also based on the spirit of Quranic purity. There is an evolution in the growth and development of Sufism up to the 10th century, where we notice a formative stage of growth of organized Sufi movement. This was also the period of emergence of Sufi poetry in Persian. Fariduddin Attar, who died in AD 1220 and Jalaluddin Rumi, who died in AD 1273 were its two great exponents. The early Sufi mystics stressed on the virtues of repentance, abstinence, renunciation, poverty and trust in God. The early Sufis were wanderers but in due course of time the Sufi groups have become orders and while in Arab regions there developed hostels called Ribat and in Iran there developed hospices or Kanquash, where the Sufi mystics stayed in the late 12th and 13th centuries.

We notice the formation of Sufi orders or Salsilas. Al Hujwiri of the late 11th century was the earliest Sufi saint to settle in India. He was the author of Kasf-ul-mahjub, a famous treatise on Sufism in Persian. After the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate, many Sufi orders were established in different parts of India and Sufism became very influential by the 14th century. Some of the most important Salsilas during the period of the Sultanate are as follows:
1. The Suhrawardi Salsila which was founded in India by Shaik Bahauddin Zakaria (AD 1182-1262).
2. The Chisti Salsila introduced in India by Khwaja Moinuddin Chisti, who died in AD 1236.

Even today he is venerated by Muslims and his tomb is located at Ajmer, which became a sacred pilgrimage. Besides the above two orders, there existed the orders of the Firdausi, the Qadiri, the Shatauri, Qalandari, etc. A critical study of the tenets of Sufism indicates that it was acquainted with Hinduism and Hindu thought and had imbibed certain elements of Indian idealism and adopted many Yogic practices and also was influenced by Upanishadic idealism and Vedanta. The early Sufis were not only ascetics but also lived a life of voluntary poverty shunning all types of worldly pleasures. Khwaja Fariduddin, popularly known as
Baba declared, “The main purpose of this path is the concentration of heart which can be achieved only by the abstination from prohibited means of livelihood and association with kings”. Thus, most of the Sufis in India conceived and preached divine unity in terms of idealistic monoism while many Hindus found the Sufi ideas very similar to those of Vedantic philosophy.

The lower strata of Hindu community appear to be greatly attracted by the ideas of social equality and fraternity of Islam. Thus the simplicity, toleration and liberation of the Sufis in India released syncretic forces and led to a sort of cultural synthesis.

The Bhakti Movement:
Abid Hussian is of the view that another great force that created a general atmosphere of religious harmony between the Hindus and the Muslims was the Bhakti movement that swept northern India between the 14th through 17th century. Bhakti as a path of salvation was as old as the Vedas. The Bhakti stresses mystic realization of God within oneself and the ultimate union of the individual with God based on loving devotion on the part of the devotee and gods is a given popular concept in India.

There are two aspects of Bhakti:
(i) The path of devotion based on service to God by the devotee or Bhakta throwing himself completely on the mercy of God or Prapatti.
(ii) The path of bond based on pure love based on equality rather than service and the ideal being participation in the life divine.

We notice the currency of these two aspects of Bhakti in early medieval period in South India and in the later medieval period in northern India. There is a controversy regarding the origin and relationship between the Bhakti movement of the Nayanars and Alvars of South India and the popular Bhakti movement of northern India. One view is that the new situation created by the coming of the Turks, the defeat of Rajput states, the wanton destruction of the temples and trampling of images, lowering of the image of Brahmins and the failure of the Rajput and the Brahman alliance to stem the tide of Turks led to the popular Bhakti movement in many parts of northern India. Max Weber, a well-known sociologist suggested that an apocalyptic movement such as Bhakti was often the ideology of a defeated ruling class with aspects of quietism and suffering being emphasized. Satish Chandra disagrees with the view of Max Weber as the Bhakti movement was a mass-based popular movement but not an ideology of a defeated ruling class with a vested interest. There is also another view that the movement grew in the north as a kind a defence mechanism to safeguard the Hindu social organization from the threat of Turkish onslaughts of and the challenge faced from the Islamic ideology, which was based on ideas of brotherhood and equality.

However, even this view does not take into account the totality of the situation as both the Hindus and the Muslims realized the futility of the efforts to forcibly convert Hindus to Islam. Both Sultans and saints such as Nizamuddin Auliya admitted that the Hindu faith was too strong to be affected either by threats of force or the concept of brotherhood and equality held out by Islam. Further, it is to be remembered that the concept of social equality as a bonding factor long disappeared in Indian Islam as the Turkish ruling group
looked down upon Hindu converts from the low strata of society. It is suggested that the Sufi emphasis on monotheism, on the role of the Pir or Guru, on mystical union with the beloved happen to be elements of Hinduism that influenced saints and people to come together.

Satish Chandra says, “Thus the Bhakti movement marks a phase of symbiosis where common elements were emphasized and this aspect is more important than the claim of mutual borrowings which is always a matter dispute”. K. Damodaran writes that the Bhakti movements in India have many points of resemblance to the Reformation movement led by Wycliff and Thomas More — it was not a purely religious movement, it expressed itself in the cultural field as a national renaissance; in its social content, it represented a revolt of great significance against domination and injustices of the caste system.

It gave a new impetus to the growth of diverse nationalities in India, to the development of national languages and their literature. The doctrine that all men high and low were equal before God became the central idea, which pulled wide sections of the masses to fight caste tyranny. Thus, this great movement of the middle ages not only helped the development of a composite Indian culture embracing different linguistic and religious communities, but also paved the way for united struggle, against feudal oppression. J.T.F. Jordans observes: “During medieval times (13th through 17th century) Hinduism underwent a transformation as great as that of Christianity by the Reformation. The focus of religious activities moved from the great gods and the liturgies connected with polytheism to one god, and his avatars, especially Krishna and Rama.

A new attitude to God, emotional, passionate Bhakti replaced the old approaches of sacrificial rites and monoistic meditation, just a new mysticism, practical yet ecstatic, replaced the former philosophical type. Forms of religious expression changed: love songs to the Lord were sung, and group singing created a new popular cultural form, the Kirtan.

Finally, the Bhakti movement without destroying the Hindu social frame work fostered ideas of brotherhood and equality before the loving God and its saints drawn from all levels of society proclaimed that in Bhakti, caste had no meaning”.

In conclusion, we can say that though there was no visible direct evidence of positive impact of Islam on Indian culture, interactions between common Hindus and Muslims, Sufi and Bhakti saints created an environment for the emergence of a Hindustani culture, wherein we can witness the mutual borrowings from both cultures. As cultures are dynamic but not static when two people, two cultures meet, cultural interaction either positive or negative is inevitable and the same happened in India during the rule of Delhi Sultanate. The initial suspicion, dislike, animosity and hatred did not quite disappear but the slow and gradual realization that the Muslims and the Hindus have to live side by side occupying and sharing geographical space made them reconcile, adjust, accommodate and adapt themselves to the changing circumstances with their identities reflected in their cultural practices and symbols.
A Brief History of the Congress of Vienna

The delegates at the Congress of Vienna (1814-1815) were motivated to a surprisingly large degree by the desire to benefit Europe as a whole, and this is reflected in their purpose in calling the Congress together and the settlement they reached. National interest was modified for the sake of the general interest of Europe.

The Congress of Vienna was held in order to draw up a plan to alter Europe politically and territorially so as to prevent the extensive expansion of any one great power, such as that Napoleon had brought about. Creating a balance of power among the powerful nations of Europe, reinstating conservative regimes, containing France, and reaching an agreement to cooperate with each other were the goals of the Congress, which illustrated the altruistic attitude of the national representatives present and supported the overall purpose of preventing future widespread conflict.

Although the separate ambitions of the victors at the Congress to gain territory were mostly fueled by naked self-interest, they were forced to compromise in order to establish a balance of power. Alexander I of Russia felt the nation was owed all of Poland while Prussia had designs on Saxony. In the final settlement, however, Russia had to share claim to Poland with Austria and Prussia, and Prussia received only half of Saxony with additional territories in the Rhineland as compensation. In this way, national interest was modified for the sake of maintaining the balance of power, which was in the general interest of Europe.

Besides the fact that the final settlement at the Congress of Vienna allotted the territory Napoleon had conquered to the victors in such a way as to prevent any one of them from becoming too powerful, the spoils were distributed in order to create a buffer against France. The Kingdom of the Netherlands was formed, Prussia acquired part of the Rhineland, Switzerland regained independence and the right to neutrality, and Austria dominated Northern Italy according to the terms of the settlement, leaving France boxed in and unable to assert itself. Due to the influence of Prince Talleyrand, France received no punishment more severe than containment, and this benefited Europe in that it kept France from becoming too weak and destroying the balance of power.

In addition to creating a balance of power and containing France, the final settlement at Vienna demonstrated altruistic designs for Europe in that the Concert of Europe was organized. This was the first international group to attempt to deal with European affairs, the main purpose of the Concert being to preserve the balance of power and protect conservative governments from being overthrown.

The fact that the Congress of Vienna was conducted with the aim of preventing universal war, which led to proposals of creating a balance of power, establishing "better" conservative governments, containing France and cooperation between the great powers to meet these ends clearly demonstrates that the welfare of all of Europe was a relevant concern. After much deliberation, the delegates succeeded in creating a final settlement which adjusted the selfish goals of the individual nations to acquire large expanses of
territory to support the balance of power. The containment of France and the formation of the Concert of Europe were two other aspects of the settlement which maintained the balance of power, thus promoting the good of Europe.

**VIENNA SETTLEMENT: JUNE 9, 1815**

One month before the defeat of Napoleon in April, 1814, his four major adversaries (Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia) had agreed in the Treaty of Chaumont (March 10, 1814) to remain allied until final victory and then to hold a general European congress to secure the peace. In signing the First Peace of Paris on May 30, 1814, with the restored Bourbon monarchy of France, the four great powers reaffirmed their intention to hold such a congress at Vienna. From beginning to end, the Congress of Vienna remained almost exclusively a congress of the great powers, the smaller states being summoned to participate only in the discussion of minor matters which pertained to them individually. A plenary session of all the powers was never held.

The problem of the organizational relationship between the great and the small powers which plagued the diplomats throughout the opening months of the Congress, was soon overshadowed by a serious dispute within the ranks of the Allies concerning Poland. From the beginning of the first informal discussions in Vienna on September 15, 1814, Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia could not agree on the partition of the Polish territory. Tsar Alexander I of Russia had been determined for some time to reconstitute the former Polish state as a Russian dependency. Prince Karl August von Hardenberg, the Chancellor of Prussia, agreed to surrender to Alexander the Polish lands which Prussia had acquired in the eighteenth century if the Tsar would support the Hohenzollern claim to the whole of Saxony. Prince Metternich, Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Viscount Castlereagh, Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, naturally regarded the Russian and Prussian demands as a serious threat to the balance of power. Above all, Russia would move deeper into Europe than ever before.

The dispute within the Allied camp was particularly welcomed by Talleyrand, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, who for some time had been seeking a voice for France at the Congress of Vienna. He now had his opportunity. In December, 1814, he broached a compromise plan to Castlereagh and Metternich under which Russia would be offered a reduced Poland, and Prussia, a reduced Saxony with some territory in the Rhineland. If Russia and Prussia proved to be slow in accepting the compromise, Talleyrand offered a plan whereby Austria and Great Britain would ally and resist, by force if necessary, the Russo-Prussian stand. Such an alliance, in fact, came into existence on January 3, 1815, but it never had to mobilize its forces because Prussia and Russia decided to accept a compromise solution based on Talleyrand’s suggestion.

In an agreement signed on February 11, Poland was repartitioned among Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Prussia received in addition only two-fifths of Saxony, but by way of compensation annexed parts of both the Rhineland and Westphalia. As part of the same agreement, Austria acquired Salzburg, the Tyrol, and territory along the Dalmatian (or Illyrian) coastline. Talleyrand’s solution to the Polish question thus enabled the Allies to heal the breach in their ranks; his diplomacy, moreover, earned for France a greater role at the Congress than it had before, at least until Napoleon’s temporary resumption of power in
March, 1815.

Despite their preoccupation with Napoleon during the Hundred Days in the spring of 1815, the Allies and the lesser powers met on June 9 to sign the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna. This treaty encompassed previously concluded bilateral agreements and other measures, together with new arrangements worked out in the Congress itself. Most of the provisions of the Final Act can be subordinated under the headings of “Legitimacy,” “Security,” and “Compensation,” which were the three major principles that dominated the Congress. “Legitimacy” involved the restoration of dynasties deposed during the Napoleonic period, among which were the restoration of Bourbon lines to the thrones of France, Spain, and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and the House of Orange to the throne of Holland.

Under the principle of “Security,” the states near or adjacent to France were enlarged to forestall any possible future aggression on the part of that country. Thus Holland received the old Austrian Netherlands; Prussia, as mentioned above, obtained Rhenish and Westphalian territories; and Switzerland was perpetually neutralized and assigned three additional cantons on the French frontier.

Finally, the principle of “Compensation,” besides embracing the territorial provisions made under “Security,” included Russia’s acquisition of Finland from Sweden, which received Norway from Napoleon’s staunch ally Denmark. Great Britain was compensated with Malta, Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope colony, and Dutch Guiana, among other territories. Austria obtained Salzburg, the Tyrol, the Italian lands of Lombardy and Venetia and districts along the Dalmatian coast. These lands, together with the accession of lesser Hapsburg princedoms in the smaller northcentral Italian states, compensated Austria for the surrender of the southern Netherlands to Holland. The only major part of the settlement which did not fall within the principles enumerated above was the disposition of the Germanies. In place of the old Holy Roman Empire, which had come to an end in 1806, the Allies established a confederation of some thirty-nine states under the presidency of Austria. The Diet of the German Confederation was composed of diplomats speaking on behalf of their rulers, not of popularly elected representatives. The tradition of disunified German states over which Austria predominated was preserved well into the nineteenth century.

The Vienna settlement brought about the restoration of a conservative order in Europe. To preserve the arrangement, Austria, Great Britain, Russia, and Prussia signed the Quadruple Alliance later in 1815 to establish the Concert of Europe. They were joined by France in 1818. The Concert of Europe sought to preserve the Vienna settlement for at least twenty years through periodic conferences (several of which were held between 1818 and 1822) to deal with liberalist-nationalist challenges to the settlement in Greece, Spain, and the Italies. In the long run these and similar challenges resulted in the dissolution of the Vienna settlement and the end of the Concert of Europe.

SECOND PEACE OF PARIS: JULY-NOVEMBER - 1815

The Second Peace of Paris was the final peace treaty made between France and the victorious Allies after the final defeat of Napoleon. It was part of the general settlement made by the Congress of Vienna and can only be understood in relation to that conference. The participants were the same at both conferences, but the Second Peace of Paris was
made after the settlement at Vienna. The Second Peace of Paris was also linked to negotiations leading to the Quadruple Alliance, and both agreements were signed on the same day.

The First Peace of Paris consisted of a group of seven treaties which had been signed on May 30, 1814, by the restored French government of the restored Bourbon king, Louis XVIII, and each of the seven belligerent powers: Great Britain, Austria, Russia, Prussia, Spain, Sweden, and Portugal. Basically generous in its terms, this treaty had given to France its boundaries as they had been in existence in 1792 together with some frontier districts and enclaves which added some 450,000 people and 150 square miles. France also regained most of its colonies, except Tobago, St. Lucia, and Mauritius, which had been seized by the British. French posts in India were restored, though without sovereign rights, and France promised to abolish the slave trade in French colonies within five years. No indemnity was imposed, and France was even allowed to keep works of art taken by Napoleon from other countries. This treaty also contained articles which united Flanders to Holland and Genoa to Piedmont as buffer states against possible French expansion.

While delegates to the Congress of Vienna were debating the territorial divisions of Europe, however, Napoleon returned to France from Elba on March 1, 1815. The French army and people rallied to his cause, and the restored Bourbon king, Louis XVIII, fled into exile once again. Napoleon was soundly defeated at the Battle of Waterloo on June 18 by an Allied army under the command of the Duke of Wellington, ably assisted by a Prussian army under General Blücher. Napoleon's second period of rule, the Hundred Days, came to an end. He surrendered to the British, who imprisoned him first in England and then on the island of St. Helena in the South Atlantic.

Napoleon's return necessitated a new and harsher peace treaty, since the French nation had broken the First Peace of Paris and again waged war. The fact that only the British and Prussian armies had been responsible for defeating Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo and that they were the first to occupy France gave these two nations added bargaining power. Louis XVIII was restored once again to the French throne, and Talleyrand was made prime minister of France, but the French were to a large extent excluded from the negotiations taking place at Vienna. The smaller powers played no significant role.

The bargaining extended over a period of four months because Prussia desired a harsh treaty. The misconduct of Prussian soldiers toward the French people also led to friction and objections from Wellington and the British. Some of the smaller German states and the Netherlands supported the Prussian demands. Although Prince Karl August von Hardenberg, Chancellor of Prussia, favored moderation, the Prussian generals largely overrode his influence. The Prussian military sought a large indemnity and the acquisition of Alsace, Lorraine, French Flanders, and Savoy, as well as the return of works of art stolen by Napoleon.

Metternich, Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs, followed a somewhat hesitant course. He had to tread carefully because of hostile popular opinion in Austria. He may also have been not unwilling to shift his position in order to gain territorial advantages for Austria. His secretary, Friedrich von Gentz, was basically sympathetic to the policies of Viscount
Castlereagh, Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, and a moderate peace. Tsar Alexander I of Russia remained firmly opposed to any changes except for his endorsement of a moderate indemnity. Castlereagh and Wellington agreed essentially with Alexander, but they were subjected to counterpressures from British influences at home, where the press, public opinion, the Prince Regent, the Prime Minister (Lord Liverpool), and the Cabinet all sought more punishment for France. There was considerable agitation for the punishment of French military leaders such as Marshal Ney and political leaders such as Fouché who had joined Napoleon after his return from Elba. The arrest and subsequent execution of Marshal Ney tended to quiet the public outcry in Great Britain for punishment.

Castlereagh succeeded in convincing Lord Liverpool and his Cabinet that his policy of “security, not revenge,” was the correct one to follow. He pointed out that a vengeful peace would lead to further French attempts to regain lost territory, and that France should be kept strong and friendly as a possible future ally. As security against possible French expansion he proposed the temporary occupation of France, some minor frontier adjustments, and the dismantling of certain French forts. He also proposed a moderate indemnity and the return of works of art. Metternich agreed basically with Castlereagh, and Alexander was persuaded without undue difficulty to accept this compromise. The Prussians found themselves alone and gave way. Talleyrand, however, would not accept this arrangement, and he resigned. Louis XVIII replaced him with Armand Emmanuel du Plessis, Duc de Richelieu, who signed the treaty after obtaining a few minor concessions.

The territorial provisions of the Second Peace of Paris were based on the boundaries of France as they had existed in 1790. Compared to the earlier treaty, this second one took away a small area on the Netherlands frontier, part of the Saar in Germany (including the forts of Saarlouis and Landau which went to Prussia), and part of Savoy (which went to Piedmont). The fortress of Huningen near Basel was demolished. The colonial provisions remained the same as in the first treaty. An indemnity of seven hundred million francs (about 125 million dollars) was awarded to the Allies and 240 million francs were awarded to private creditors. France also had to pay for the upkeep of the Allied Army of Occupation in northern France under Wellington. Some of the art treasures taken by Napoleon were returned to their original owners. The signing of the treaty took place on November 20, 1815.

Although the Second Peace of Paris was harsher than the first treaty, it was still a comparatively generous peace. The indemnity and occupation payments were not as heavy as they probably should have been, for France itself had suffered little devastation from the Napoleonic Wars. Since French boundaries were restored as they had existed in 1790, France lost little land and even retained a few minor acquisitions. Few defeated nations had ever received such easy terms. Perhaps such leniency may be ascribed to its being the final product of eighteenth century balance-of-power diplomacy rather than the approaching emotional and vengeful nationalistic diplomacy. The decisions made were probably wise, in view of the fact that France did not attempt to expand or regain territory, and soon became part of the European system again.
Causes of the French Revolution

The French revolution of 1789 is great changeable event in the history of world. The unlimited monarchy in France, despotic rule of Burbo dynasty, anarchy in administration, inefficiency of Louis 16th, arrogant queen Marie Antainet such bad political condition and in addition to it climax of inequality was in Frane. The French Philosophers like Rousseau Montesque, Voltaire awakened people against this injustice and inspired them for revolution. So the revolution took place in France on 1789. Many events happened in the course of revolution. It began with very important role of National Assembly from 1789 to 1791. Fall of fort of Bastille, declaration of human rights including liberty, equality and fraternity, the great principles. Imprisonment of king and queen then their assasination, end of Reign of Terror with Robesper etc. were main events in course of revolution. Revolution overthrew despotic and corrupt rule in France, Moderate thoughts took place of orthodox. Unlimited monarchy and feudalism was rejected. Revolution had effects on world also. It gave advise to world that king cannot be a representative of God but of people. People being supreme, can over throw despotic ruler. Because by such type of contract is done between king and people. Man is free in born, sovereignty rests with people not with king was new message was given by revolution to world.

1.2 Subject interpretation 1.2.1 Causes of French revolution of 1789 -
Political, Social religious, intellectual, economic.

A) Political causes - The political condition in France was grave due to following political aspects –

1) Despotic rule of Burbo dynasty - From 1553 there was depotic rule of Burbo dynasty in France. All rulers followed devine right theory. Every king ruled unlimitedly. Total power was centralised. From 1614 the session of parliament (Estate General) was not called. In the reign of Henry 4th, Louis 13th and 14th industrial, educational, cultural development was done. Some colonies were acquired. But rules of 15th and 16th Louis were despotic only.

2) Law and Judiciary - All power was centralised with king. So his word was law and justice. Every province had different law system, feudals and clergies had their own laws. So there were hundreds of law systems in nation. Laws were 3 unwritten, not clear, unequal, unjust. Voltaire says while travelling in France found many law systems than number of horses changed in travell. Judiciary was defective. Many courts were on various levels. Military, political, religious courts were there. Judges were from upper class and royal family only. Uniformity was not in judiciary. Judges were getting salaries without working. Corruption was in judiciary punishments were inhuman. Judgements were partial. There was not system of appeal.

3) Divine right theory - There was unlimited monarchy in France. King is the part and representative of God. In that capacity only, he was ruling on earth. So nobody can challenge him. So disloyalty to king was to God. It created unrest.

4) Aggrasive policy - Burbo rulers accepted imperial policy. Established colonies in Africa, Asia. French East India company also helped to this policy. On this issue France had to fight with many European countries. It caused to much economic loss. During 1748-60 France had to fight against England over influence in India, in which France was defeated. At the same period, 1756 to 1763 for seven years France fought and defeated against England. Due to economic loss injustice taxes imposed upon people. So agressive policy was not at all beneficial to nation.

5) Anarchy in administration - There was very much anarchy in administration. It was corrupt. No responsibility among officials. Influence of upper class was on administration. Officials were busy to
find sympathy of king and royal family only. There was no room to common people in administration. France was divided among 40 provinces and 36 generalities, again those were divided among Districts and communs. Higher posts were reserved for members of royal family and upper class. Like this the inefficient, corrupt and oppressive administration was responsible for unrest.

6) Marrie Antainet - 1755-1793 - She was daughter of Austrian empress Meria Theresa. To create friendship between Austria and France, she was married to Louis 16th, the king of France. She became an empress of France. But she always remained Austrian and not French. Being so smart Louis always remained under her influence. She was luxurious, egoism and having interest in politics. Making very much expenditure for pleasureful living. It affected national treasury. So she was called 'Madam deficit.'

7) Louis 16th - He was ruling France at the time of revolution. But the background was already prepared for revolution. He was not interested in politics, though he was king of nation. His hobbies were strange like repairing locks, hunting etc. He was not strong enough to administrate nation. He said to his ex-minister, 'how 4 fortunate you are, I wish I could resign too.' But such king adopted policy of his predecessors. Did not care for people. But by advise of upper class introduced oppressive policy and opposed revolution. So revolution became inevitable.

B) Social Causes - It was important cause of all to revolution. There was inequality. French Society was divided among classes like –

1) Feudals - It was called nobles also. They were rich, landlords, exempted from tax. They have their own tax, 'Tally', on common people. Higher posts in civil and military were reserved for them. They were living luxuriously. They were doing injustice and exploitation of common people for many years. Their population was less than 1% but were holding 60% land, poor, common people were working on land as bonded labours. Taking prizes and presents from people. Montesque defined this feudal like - "who can talk to king, communicate to minister, has pension, loan and hereditary rights is feudal."

2) Clergies - Roman catholic was national religion of France. Religion had great influence on King and people. Clergies were owners of 1/5 land of nation, and all religious centres. They were rich and tax free. Even they collect their own tax, 'tiths' from people. They were away from religious duties, busy in getting sympathy of king and royal family. They had much respect and rights. Living luxuriously like feudals. Exploiting common people.

3) Common people, third Estate - This class was in majority but living in very grave situation. They had to pay 4/5 taxes of all types. Working like bonded labours on land of upper class. Trying to be alive on 1/5 remain portion of production or income. So the situation in France was 90% people were facing starvation while 10% indigesation. It is sufficient to clear the inequality. This third estate included doctors, advocates, professors, teachers, journalists, farmers, workers etc. the important people of middle class were exploited by upper class. They had not any chance in administration. This middle class led the people during revolution. So this class was waiting for opportunity to raise voice against this inequality. They got it on 1789.

C) Religious causes –

1) Luxurious clergies - The clergies of France were included in upper class. Nearly there were one and half lac clergies. Number of religious centres was five thousand. There were 25 thousand men and women each in all centres. Immorality was among them. Religious institution was strong. There was strong chain from Priest of village to Pope of Rome. Their officials were Pope, Cardin, Archbishops,
Archdikan, Bishop, Bikan, Abat etc. 5 Roman Catholic had their monopoly in France. Reformist Protestants were minor in value in France. The massacre of Protestants was done at night at the day of the memory of saint Saint Bartholo in Paris. Clergies were rich, selfish and luxurious. All worst things were going on in the name of God and religion. There were two groups, upper and lower clergies among them. Lower were totally neglected by uppers. So there was unrest. 2) Injustice with people by Religious institutions - To do religious activities, to maintain and increase social morality was duty of clergies. But actually they had influence over government also. So they got rights, concessions, ownership of land, money and the religious centres were very rich like of feudals. Even concept of religious authority was necessary to king at the time of coronation. Then what the condition of common people might have been before such clergies. There were evil traditions by which people were exploited. So unrest was among people against religious centres, and clergies. D)

**Intellectual Causes**

1) Montesque - 1689 to 1755 - He was born in noble family. Advocate Montesque was judge also. He studied history, political science and law. He wrote a book, 'Spirit of Laws' on 1748. It was so popular that within one and half year 18 editions were published. He criticised monarchy, accepted democracy. In his opinion parliamentary democracy was ideal. He said, three types of government 1) Monarchy, 2) Dictatorship, 3) Republic, are there.

1) In ideal monarchy, though power gets centralised, nobles and council of experienced people should be there to help and discuss with king. It should be bold and independent in thinking. It can prevent king to be a dictator.

2) In dictatorship all power gets centralised with king; lack of any factor to control his power. Dictator creates his terror and make people slaves. Terror is the base of his existence.

3) In democracy government takes care of people. Ordinary man also gets chance to be a leader. For success of republic people must be aware of it, economic equality is important. For the well fare of people power should be separate. Montesque gave his famous theory of separation of power, in his book, 'Spirit of laws.' He said there are three factors of government-Legislative, Executive and judiciary. These factors should be separate from each other. Otherwise there will be injustice with people. He strongly demanded it and parliamentry democracy. He awakened people to overthrow rule in France.

2) Frene - 1694-1774 - He was medical practitioner. He studied economic condition of nation indetail. To develop nation economically, it is necessary to concentrate and reform in agriculture, trade and business. These sectors should free. During course of revolution his thoughts were accepted and implemented.

3) Voltaire - 1694-1778 - He was poet, journalist, author, historian and scholar of law. He was famous by his writings. Ridicule was the feature of his writing. Though he was theist, he criticised church. He criticised luxurious living of clergies. Due to his ridicule writing he was jailed in Bastil. He wrote famous book 'Candid'. Monarchy and religious corruption were main subjects. He did not like mobrule in democracy. He accepted limited monarchy. He said, 'I would prefer, to be ruled by one lion than by hundred rats.' He said Louis rulers are responsible for exploitation by upper classes. So he suggested to overthrow reign of Burbo and establish limited monarchy.

4) Rousseau - 1712 - 1778 : Jazak Rousseau is great political philosopher of the modern period. He born at Jinevha in middle class, poor family. Further he settled in France. He wrote autobiography, named 'My confession.' 'Amil' and 'Social Contract' are his famous books. 'Man' was his main subject of Writing. He wrote, 'man is born free, no need to give it. Man is bound in political, social and religious institutions. In ancient period state came into existance by a contract. For the welfare of people socio, economic, religious condition should be improved. He was theist but criticised on clergies for their corruption and hypocrisy. He is world known philosopher by his principles like Welfare and limited monarchy, sovereignty of people, liberty, crative change, right of people of passing law, social contract etc. His work was responsible for revolution. Napoleon Bonaparte says, "If there had been no Rousseau, the French revolution would have been not occured."
contribution in creating modern Europe is very important. 5) Didro - 1713 to 1784: He was editor of encyclopedia’s art and science sections. Through writings he brought real condition of nation before society. Criticised on inequality, economic exploitation, anarchy in religion. Reforms are necessary for the development of nation. Injustice with people will be certainly problematic to government. By his thoughts middle class people were very much influenced. French government imposed restrictions on encyclopedia.

6) Cane: He was French economist. He said the economic progress depends upon freedom of agriculture, business and trade, emancipation of farmers from government and upper class is important. His theory was, total freedom in economic field is the real progress of nation.

Economic causes:

1) Feudal economy: France was agriculturist. Out of total land 60% to feudals, 20% to clergies and 20% to common people who were 80 lacs in number. 10 lac serfs were labours on land of feudals. Farmers had to pay tax to government, feudals and clergies. Government did nothing to improve farming, feudals also neglected it. Exploited farmers and serfs were waiting for change.
2) Unsatisfied merchants: There was ample mineral wealth in France. Many rivers like Sen, Rhoan, Luar and Atlantic, Mediterranean sea shore was useful for development of trade. Many ports and cities were there. Trade of silk and cotton, wooden furniture, liquor, steel was developed. French East India company was existed for foreign trade. But by the negligence of government and exploitation by upper class downfall of traders was began.
3) Injustice in tax system: There was very much injustice in tax system in France before revolution. Burdon of taxes was imposed on common people. Relatives of royal family, ministers, feudals, clergies had concession in taxes. Common man had to pay 80% income as tax. There were not rules for taxation. Tax collection was inhuman.
4) Bankruptcy of France: Due to oppressive government people were in the calamity like poverty, starvation, hard work. Economic condition of people was worst. Government did not took care of it. In addition to it offensive policy of rulers, expenditure of royal family; loan on nation etc. made nation bankrupt. Expenditure to build palace was 30 crore franks, annual expenditure of royal family was 20 lac pounds. 1800 labours were working in Varsailles palace. It affected treasury so king decided to collect new tax. It increased unrest.

F) Effect of American war of independence: Thirteen American colonies fought against British empire during 1776 to 1783 and got independence. In 1776 England declared war against America. Under the leadership of Lafayat French troops were sent to help America. England was defeated. French army got valuable experience and inspiration there. They thought that we can also overthrow unwanted own government. It is notable that this Lafayat played very important role in the French revolution. In this way, by the above causes favourable condition to French revolution was created. In this situation new tax was imposed by king, which was opposed and Louis 16th was compailed to call session of Estate General in the beginning of 1789. From there the course of revolution began.
Rise of Napoleon

Napoleon was born on 15th August 1769 at Ajasio of Corsika island. Short ago it was conquered by France from Italy. So his family became French. His father Charles Bonaparte was advocate. Mother Romalina was smart, ambitious and active. His father died, after a few years. So he had to suffer economically in his childhood. Had to take help of others for education. He took his education in the military schools of Brian and Paris. History, Maths, Geography were his favourite subjects. He was influenced by the philosophy of Voltaire, Rousseau, Plato and Aristotal. Due to bad experiences in childhood he was looking maliciously towards upper classes. After completion of education, he joined in Artillery section of French army. But he left it, went to Corsika. Then in 1792 he again came to Paris. He experienced 22 many things of revolution of 1789; like September massacre, assassination of Louis 16th and Marrie Antainet, reign of Terror etc. He was jailed also but survived. Meanwhile he had joined French army. He suppressed rise of Tulon against republic in 1794, bravely. Next year he managed one more revolt. In 1796 he became General. At this time he married to Josephine. Causes of rise of Napoleon

1) Weakness of Directory : From 27th Oct. 1995 Directory was ruling France. But it was not effective in working, but depended upon help of army. Napoleon was chief of army. It means Directory was depended upon Napoleon. He got importance. On 21st January 1793 Louis XVIth was hanged. So many countries in Europe became enemies of France. Napoleon played important role to manage those enemies. He completed successfully all responsibilities given to him by Directory. He became much popular in France. On the other hand, at the same time Directory was unpleasant. This contradiction led Napoleon towards the throne.

2) Campaign on Italy 1796-1797 : Napoleon’s this campaign and his victory in it was vital cause of his political rise. Austria was prominent enemy of France. Her army was in Italy, near the border of France. Which was dangerous. So Directory had to pay attention towards Austria. Napoleon was appointed as a General against Austria in 1796. It was his campaign of Italy. He had many problems initially. The army and weapons were not of that standard and small in number. The senior officers and soldiers, in age, did not like his leadership. With only 30 thousand army he had to face enemy of 70 thousand. By his nature, discipline, daring he solved many problems. Before coming together Austria and Sardenia, Napoleon very speedily first attacked Sardenia and defeated. Imposed treaty on her. It increased enthusiasm and inspiration of French army. Then he turned towards Austria. By his machine daring, strategy he defeated powerful Austria. It was his great victory. He crossed bridge on Lodi river. It was an unique example of bravery. He captured Milan city the Mantua centre. Austria surrendered him and signed treaty on 1797. Treaty of Campoformio-April 1797 - 1) Lombardi, Belgium were given to France 2) France accepted supremacy of Austria on Venetia, Dalmetia and Iritia. 3) Territory and west side of Rhine river should be given to France 4) Problems of Germany should be solved by Roman Empire and France

By this treaty influence of Austria in Italy ended. French influence in eastern territory of Rhine established. Many changes in Europe took place. By this victory Napoleon became more popular in France. He behaved like a dictator, took decisions independently. Destroyed some states and created some new also. He done it without consent of Directory. He got huge amount, things like statues, books, articles brought to France. He was warmly wel-comed by French people. It was helpful to his rise. Campaign of Egypt - 1798 This campaign was planned top secretaly. On 17th May 1798 he left for Egypt. Reached to Kairo on 21st July. Conquered it. But then in the battles of Nail and Suria he suffered much loss. Then he defeated Turkey. Meanwhile Russia, Austri, England came together against France. So Napoleon handed over responsibility of the campaign to next General
and on 21st August 1799, came back to France. He could not achieve much success in this campaign. 3) Coup d’etat of 9th Nov. 1799 : French people were totally unhappy over administration of Directory. There was unrest and disorder in nation. In this situation Napoleon had come back from Egypt campaign. He decided to take benefit of the situation. The meeting of Legislative council was going on in the palace of Sent Cloud, near Paris. He went there with army and captured palace the members were driven out. Directory was dissolved by Napoleon. This military revolution took place on 9, 10 Nov. 1799. He formed consulate of three members to run administration of France on 10th 1799. Among three members Napoleon himself was first consul (member), second Abasis and third was Ducas. All members took oath to be loyal with principles of revolution. In this way in the form of 1st consul Napoleon came in power of France in 1799. Napoleon was warrior as well as diplomat also. There were differences between Napoleon and Abasis over power. But Napoleon was successful in it. Then he prepared constitution as he wanted. He managed that the power should be with him only. The period of first consul was for ten years. But in 1802 with amendment in constitution, managed that he should be 1st consul for life long. He was not even satisfied. In 1804 he was coroneted and became Emperor of France. Like this Napoleon became ruler of France specially the background of French revolution of 1789 proved useful to his rise. At the same time he had ability to take benefit of favourable situation. He ruled France from 1799 to 1804 as First consul and from 1804 to 1815 as Emperor of France.

Great Revolt of 1857
The Great Revolt of 1857 (also Indian rebellion of 1857, the Great uprising of 1857, the Great rebellion, Indian Sepoy mutiny) is regarded as India’s First war of Independence against the British rule. It was the most remarkable single event in the history of India after the establishment of British rule. It was the result of the century-old British rule in India. In comparison to the previous uprisings of the Indians, the Great Revolt of 1857 was of a greater dimension and it assumed almost an all-India character with participation of people from different sections of the society. This Revolt was initiated by the sepoys of the company. So it has been commonly termed as ‘Sepoy Mutiny’. But it was not simply a revolt of the sepoys. Historians have realized that it was a great revolt and it would be unfair to call it just a Sepoy Mutiny. Our historians now call it by various names – ‘Great Rebellion’, ‘First War of Indian Independence’, etc.

The Revolt
On 29 March 1857, the Indian sepoys of Barrackpore revolted under Habildar Mangal Pande’s leadership. On 10 May, the Meerut sepoys of the East India Company revolted. The revolt quickly spread to Delhi, Kanpur, Aligar, Lucknow, Jhansi, Allahabad, Oudh and other places of north India. The revolt that was started by the dissatisfied sepoys soon became a general rising against the British government. It soon became a great challenge to the mighty British power in India. Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi, Tantia Tope, Kunwar Singh of Bihar, Nana Sahib, the Begum of Oudh and Ahmadulla of Faizabad were some of the important leaders of this revolt. Entire north India from Bihar to the Punjab was in arms against the British. The city of Delhi was captured by the rebels after terrible fighting. Gwalior also was snatched from British hands. The rebels had declared Bahadur shah the emperor of Hindustan.

Causes
The causes of the Great Revolt of 1857 and Sepoy Mutiny may be studied in the following heads:

**Political cause:** Major political cause for the outbreak of the Revolt was the policy of annexation followed by Dalhousie. On application of the ‘Doctrine of Lapse’ or on the ground of mis-governance he annexed states after states deplored their rulers. Satara, Jhansi, Sambalpur, Nagpur, etc. fill victim in his aggressive policy. All these states came under British rule. In 1856, he captured Oudh on the plea of misrule. He looked the palaces of Nagpur and Oudh. Not only the ruling house, but also the employees and other dependent families were deprived of their livings for the policy of Dalhousie. His maltreatment towards the Mughal emperor Bahadur Shah-II hurt the sentiment of the Muslim community. Discontinuation of the pension of the Peshwa Nana Sahib shocked the Marathas. This discontent of royal families, army men and common people jointly exposed in the Great Revolt of 1857.

**Economic cause:** The Great Revolt of 1857 was also an outburst of grievances due to the economic exploitation of the company. India’s traditional economy collapsed as a result of the British ‘investment’ policies and revenue administration. The company’s trade policy destroyed Indian handicrafts. Huge numbers of Indians were thrown out of employment. The British, opened a new avenue of exploitation on the peasants by introducing permanent settlement. Exploitation of the Zamindars gave rise 10 landless laborers who became restless by and by. Thus out of discontent the artisans and peasantry joined hands with the sepoys in the mutiny.

**Military cause:** The sepoys of the company regiment had been feeling dissatisfied with the English for various reasons. Thus was a great disparity in salaries between the Indian and European soldiers. The Indian sepoys were treated with contempt by their European officers. The sepoys were sent to distant parts of the empire, but were not paid any extra allowance. Indian sepoys were refused promotion in service as like their European counterparts. Out of such discontent the Indian sepoys led to a mutiny.

**Social cause:** The English could not establish any social relationship with the Indians. The racial arrogance of the British created a difference between the rulers and the ruled. Enactment of some Acts greatly offended the sentiment of the people. Some of these acts were taken as deliberate blow at the Hindu religion, custom and right of inheritance. Direct cause: At that time, Enfield rifles were introduced in the army. The bullets of these rifles were covered by paper with grease like thing. The Sepoys were to cut the cover by teeth before using it. The Hindu and Muslim soldiers refused to cut the covers. They protested against this and were arrested. That ignited the fire.

Under the leadership of Mangal Pandey the agony of the Sepoys exposed at Barrackpore in Calcutta (March, 1857 A.D.). But the planned revolt started at Meerut (May, 1857 A.D.). Gradually it spread from Punjab in the north to Narmada in south, from Rajputana in the west to Bihar in the east. As the revolt was started by the Indian sepoys in the British army, the revolt became known as Sepoy mutiny. When the sepoys of Meerut reached Delhi there was huge upsurge. They declared old Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah as the Badshah of India. He was accepted as the symbol of Hindu-Muslim unity. With the outbreak of mutiny
among Sepoys common men joined the revolt. Farmers and artisans put further force behind the mutiny. The second reason for this mass revolt was the unity among the Hindus and Muslims. On observing this historians thought that, up to this period there was no communal feelings among the masses.

End of the Revolt
The British government came out with all the powers to suppress the revolt. The sepoys fought the battle with their limited strength for four months. Then, the sepoys had to retreat. On 25th September British troops regained Delhi. Bahadur Shah was arrested. Nana Saheb lost the battle of Kanpur. His commander Tantia Topi continued the fight up to April, 1859 A.D. and surrendered to the British force. Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi lost her life in the battleground. Kunwar Singh, Bakht Khan of Bihar, Bahadur Khan, Moulavi Ahmed of Faizabad lost their lives one after the other. By the end of 1859 A.D. the British power was reestablished in troubled areas.

Reason of failure of the revolt
There were several reasons behind the failure of this revolt. There was no central organization of the sepoys. There was no unified action also. Bahadur Shah, Nana Saheb, Lakshmi Bai, no one had acceptance as a real leader. They had different goals and times again they had contradictions. The British had a huge number of forces. New groups of soldiers were sent to India after the end of Crimean war. Fresh army men came from Singapore. As a result of these, in the middle of the revolt the strength of the British force was doubled. The chance of a win became remote.

The sepoys had no improved arms with them. On the other hand, the British force had huge and improved armory. They could not match improved guns and rifles with their old model musket, spears and sword. So the defeat was almost certain. Further the leaders of this revolt could not get the support of several native states like Holker, Scindia and Rajput sardars and kings. They supported the British. Educated middle-class people also were behind the British power.

Nature of the Great Revolt of 1857
There are differences of opinions amongst historians about the character of this great revolt. Some historians are of opinion that the revolt in the North-Western province was a lawless revolt by a group of sepoys. On the other hand, some historians believe that it was more than just a sepoy mutiny as it had a large mass base. Though in the beginning it was like sepoy mutiny, but later on it turned out to be a real mass upsurge. Karl Marx in his several essays described this revolt as nationalist fight for independence. Marxist writers looked at this event as uprising of peasants against feudal system of exploitation. V.D. Savarkar, the great revolutionary, described this revolt as the first struggle for independence. M.N. Roy said that it was the reaction of the feudal against capitalism.

On the centenary of the great revolt Dr. Ramesh Chandra Majumder wrote and published a book entitled 'Sepoy Mutiny' and 'Revolt of Eighteen Fifty Seven'. Dr. Majumder thought that this was nothing but a revolt of the sepoys. He also said that in some places few non-military persons came out in support of the sepoys but they were local landlords, talukdars
and feudal leaders. In his opinion it was nothing better than feudalistic reaction of the revolt.

But many historians are of opinion that the Great movement of 1857 A.D. cannot be termed as narrow, isolated and reactionary. The sepoys established a symbol of Hindu-Muslim unity by electing Bahadur Shah as the Emperor of India. In the Ajamgarh declaration a call was given to people of all classes of mass to unite against the British rule. It may be rightly that they had no idea about national government, but nationalism was there. So it can be called a national movement.

**Importance and Outcome of the Great Revolt of 1857**

It can be said that the great revolt of 1857 A.D. was a failure, but was not fruitless.

1. **United Effort:** From this revolt, we can have a picture of India’s struggle for keeping the rights. There were several revolts before this, but there was no feeling of Indian-ness in those revolts. The revolt of 1857 A.D. was a collected effort of different sections of people.

2. **Awakening of Peasants class:** The peasants joined this revolt which was out and out against the British. This was unique.

3. **Development of National Feeling:** Dr. K. M Panikkar wrote that though the sepoys had limitations and weaknesses, but their efforts to make India free from British rule was patriotic work and a progressive step. If we do not consider any historical event on the basis of its success then the revolt of 1857 A.D. was never a tragedy. Even inspite of failure that served a great purpose, it was a source of inspiration in India’s freedom struggle.

4. **End of Company Rule:** The political result of this great revolt was the end of company’s rule in India. By a new act introduced in the British Parliament British government took the charge to rule India. From then onward a Viceroy as a representative of British King ruled India.

5. **Queen’s proclamation:** The Queen’s Proclamation showered many promises in 1858 A.D. Government service was promised irrespective of cast, religion and on the basis of merit only. Ill framed “doctrine of lapse” of Lord Dalhousie was cancelled. New recruitment policy of the army men was announced to see that they could not organize any revolt. In the important positions of the government no native people (Indian) was given any chance.
Causes and Effect of Kalinga War on Ashoka

Ashoka Priyadarsi ascended the Magadhan throne as the new Maurya ruler in 273 B.C. Ashoka was anxious to distinguish himself as a conqueror. Ashoka was ascended to the throne in 273 B.C. But he was coronated four years later and in the 9th year of his reign after coronation, he invaded Kalinga and conquered it.

Causes of Kalinga War
The Modern day Orissa and Ganjam was the Ancient Kalinga. The exact reason of invading Kalinga is not known. It is known that Kalinga was a part of Magadhan Empire during the time of the Nandas. Then what led Ashoka to re-conquer it. Historians have divergent views while answering this question 'What prompted Ashoka to invade Kalinga'. According to Dr. H. C. Raychowdhury, Asoka attacked Kalinga because Kalinga had asserted its independence taking the opportunity of general revolt during the time of Bindusara’s rule. According to some historians, Kalinga had increased its military power from the time of Chandragupta to that of Asoka and Asoka could not ignore the complexity of the situation. Kalinga had a vast army and could be detrimental for the security of the Maurya Empire. It was also true that due to her commercial relation with Malay, Java and Ceylon Kalinga had enormous material prosperity. Possibly this had also provoked Asoka to invade Kalinga.

According to Dr. R.S.Tripathy during that period of confusion that followed the overthrow of the Nandas, Kalinga declared independence. Chandragupta had no time to reconquer it and Bindusara had no intension for this. Moreover since its independence Kalinga became an arch enemy of Magadha and allied itself with Chola and Pandya countries of South against Magadha. Thus, Ashoka invaded Kalinga.

Losses during Kalinga War
Ashoka invaded Kalinga and after a fierce battle Kalinga was conquered. Kalinga suffered with horrifying loss. Asoka himself had described the horrifying story of killing, death and deportation of the Kalingan people. Thousands had died, about 100,000 men were slain and 1, 50,000 people deported. Countless people suffered as a result of the brutality, severance and other eventualities of war. There were Blood and tears everywhere and the magnificence of the world turned into the flaming pits of hell. Asoka himself witnessed the brutality of Kalinga war.

Effect of Kalinga War on Ashoka
The invasion of Kalinga was a big milestone in the history of Magadha, and of India. It had influential consequences. It had incredible influence on the personal life and policy of Asoka. The despair and casualty which he had inflicted upon the people of Kalinga filled his heart with deep sorrow and regret. The cry of the wives and women of the deads, the tears of the children, the terrifying sufferings of the dying men, all had changed his heart and mind. He found his consolation in Buddhism. He was repenting for his deeds. He embraced Buddhism and took the vow of inculcating 'Dhamma' to all men throughout his life. The King Asoka left behind the policy of Digevijaya and adopted the policy of Dhamma-vijaya.
There were significant changes in state policy. It ended the policy of Magadhan imperialism. Asoka ended the age old policy of aggression and conquest of the Magadhan Kings. A new policy of Peace and non-violence began to be adopted in the realm of inter-state relation. The call of Dharma – where all are equal and where all feels for all began to flourish. The blood-thirsty tyrant became a lover of mankind who preached non-violence.