CHAPTER I

THE COMING OF THE IMPERIAL WAR

The study deals with the Imperial War and its results especially in connection with the Punjab of 1939-1945. War is a complex phenomenon rooted in the precepts and policies of a regime. It requires analysis as it influences all facets of life. The War impacted economy, agriculture, irrigation, trade, commerce, industry, education as well as the political scenario of the Punjab in particular and India in general. It is pertinent to mention that the World War II was a crucial phase in the history of both imperialism and the evolution of science and technology. Its results were manifold and multilayered. As this War signaled the collapse of imperialism and disintegration of the political and socio-economic systems sustaining it, the War inaugurated at the same time a new world order based on new ideas, institutions and modern science and technology. The collapse of imperialism encouraged struggle for freedom in the colonies leading to freedom of several of them. Curiously, however, the War set in motion contradictory trends working in opposite directions: while the people in the colonies initially came in support of their masters to face the global crisis and the latter initiated liberal reforms for socio-economic reconstruction, there the nationalist leadership in the colonies considered it as an opportune time to step up their struggle for independence. Paradoxically, both of them were successful, to an extent, in achieving their ends. However, the process gave birth to complex developments and trends that were often influenced by the factors and forces operating across the globe. The War time policies provided opportunities to the major political and economic powers of the world to adjust their position in the changing world scenario and fashion the tools for their future operations. Hence, new players emerged on the international scene and a new power structure and equation came into being. The emergence of the United State of America as a global power and its rise in the East was perhaps the most conspicuous and represented of the trend. In the process, imperialism appeared in the new garb of neo-colonialism and international diplomacy refined newer tools in the strategic alliances as well as trade agreements that started with the Allied co-operation during the World War II. By the time the World War II came to an end, it demonstrated the most destructive powers of science; but in the course of meeting the
exigencies of the War and alleviating humanity from its sufferings, no one was left in doubt about the great potentials of science as a means of human welfare and development. In most of the countries, it was a period of economic boom and prosperity that fuelled their rise on the international scene after the Imperial War.¹

I

Since India, particularly, the Punjab on the basis of their share in the India Army was part of the British Empire, it got thickly involved in the War. The felt its impact in full measure. However, experiences were quite different from those of the developed countries. Here, the War accelerated the process of erosion of colonial power and her transition from colonialism to democracy. It acted as a catalyst for state initiative for material reconstruction, indicating a basic shift in the colonial policy. However, the process was not as simple at it appeared at the first glance. The fierce conflict the Imperial War ignited between imperialism and nationalism released great forces of change with immense results. Meanwhile, the internal economy passed through a period of upheavals as it was exposed to the Western capitalist market forces; and when the British authorities and business interests started withdrawing from India, new players entered the scene. All this had deep and long-term implications for the development of science and technology as well as the state policy governing them in India, particularly in the Punjab.²

A cursory glance at the developments in India, particularly in the sensitive border province of the Punjab presented a puzzling scenario from the political view point. The popular memory in the Punjab did not conjure a picture of scientific achievement, material rejuvenation and of economic prosperity as in the case of the West. No scientific breakthrough was recorded here; no technical innovation worthy of note took place; and the socio-scientific movement that gathered strength around the time here, had different goals and priorities than those in the West. For India, especially the Punjab, it was really


² For preliminary sources of information on India, See, Johannes H. Voigt, India in the Second World War, Arnold-Heinemann, New Delhi, 1987.
a turbulent time full of political upheavals, communal riots and human miseries perpetrated by a horrific famine and other natural calamities. Yet, it was a period of unprecedented official initiative for organizing science that led to the establishment of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), the first all-India body to manage and promote the various sectors of science. It was also the period of hectic scientific technical exchanges and industrial collaborations with other countries. It is worth mentioning that the World War II or the Imperial War for India was the period when the Indian resources, especially of the Punjab were likely to be most freely used in the interest of the British Empire and its Allies. From this point of view, it is worth while to follow the development and transformation in India, a classic colony, to find out how England exploited Indian economy in her imperial interest in the conditions of War; and no War could illustrate the better than the World War II. Several problems cropping up during the War in India had their roots in the past. The British connection with the Punjab in particular and India in general started through trade much before political control brought her under complete subjugation as the colony. Though the imperial control from London was never to end absolutely, the consolidation of the British authority in India gradually minimized its needs. Nevertheless, extraordinary situations warranted its activation occasionally-conditions of the War being one of them. No wonder, the imperial control over India and also the Punjab from London was the most overbearing in the 1940s as the period presented the greatest crisis for the British Empire. The collaboration model represented by the Unionists began tottering under the contingencies of the War. Any study of the official initiatives and policy measures here during the period has to be looked at not from only the angle of India as a colony alone but also from that of the British Empire, imperialism and capitalism. Thus, imperialism and colonialism on the one and nationalism as well as indigenous response on the other constitute the most dominating backdrop for the present study-a vantage point from which to look at the developments. A glance at history may, therefore, present a vivid opinion of the goings-on. Since the most decisive clash between imperialism and nationalism, culminating in the end of the British rule took place around the World War II. Moreover, examination of the colonial attitude towards Indian economy as well as science and technology through the expansion and consolidation of the British rule in India may explain several issues of
the period and provide them an appropriate prospective.\textsuperscript{3} Under the Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon (1899-1905) efforts were to promote material progress of Punjab as a source of prosperity for the British Empire.\textsuperscript{4} But the aggressive policy of the Arch-Imperialist soon brought the British Raj in the violent conflict with the nationalist forces which burst forth in 1905 into the \textit{Swadeshi} movement calling for promoting everything indigenous. Although the movement failed, it was, nevertheless, the greatest nationalist showdown after the upsurge of 1857. With its focus on industry, trade as well as on science and technology the \textit{Swadeshi} was significant as much in its success as in its failure. It saw the ungracious exit of Lord Curzon, the Viceroy, but the happening of the period set imperialism and nationalism in motion as rival forces to clash for the half-a-century.\textsuperscript{5} Thus, with the onset of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, scientific elements and new economic policy entered the imperial perception.\textsuperscript{6} Administrative measures undertaken by Lord Curzon largely shaped the future course of development of agriculture, trade, commerce and industry as well as science in the context of further consolidation and progress of the British possessions in India. Whereas these administrative measures and organizational setup provided the \textit{Raj} an effective tool of control, the \textit{Swadeshi} gave Indians a vision for self help, certain goals to achieve and imparted them training to fight against the foreign rule. An intriguing aspect of these parallel developments was the presence of strong scientific elements in both of them.\textsuperscript{7}


\textsuperscript{4} For the developments in India, see Deepak Kumar, \textit{Science and the Raj}, OUP, New Delhi, 1997; Daniel Headrick, \textit{The Tentacles of Progress: Technology Transfer in the Age of Imperialism, 1850-1940}, New York, 1988; See also, David Arnold, \textit{Science, Technology and Medicine in Colonial India}, Cambridge, 2000.


II

After Lord Curzon, as the imperial authority abed with the rise and growth of nationalism and struggle for liberation, colonial emphasis shifted to articulation of administrative control over technical services and scientific organizations which were to, in the future, leave some deep impact on the industry and agriculture. With the prospects of the permanence of British rule in India and its provinces dwindling, the British Raj began to lose interest in long term scientific projects of the magnitude of the service, and adhocism dictated most of the government measures. The period before 1905 had seen the expansion and consolidation of the British power and impact in every walk of life including agriculture, industry, trade, commerce, science and technology. The period between 1905 and 1939, particularly after the World War I, was one of intense administrative maneuvering compromises with short-term goal and frequent changes in the government policy to counter the political changes. All along, Lord Curzon’s tools and techniques were variously used by the successive regimes through legislative measure as 1919-1935, and organizational reforms. However, the nationalist leadership held to heart their own talisman-Swadeshi (indigenous) and Swaraj (self-rule)-that continued to inspire and guide them until they won freedom. It was the continuous dialogue between these two parallel trends that determined the nature and fate of several issues concerning the development of science on which the evolution of agriculture, industry, trade and commerce, elite, middle class and over and above education in the province of Punjab and also in other parts of country. This dialogue obviously came to an end during the World War II when the colonial authorities succumbed to the local needs, demands and also international pressure. Finally, the British agreed to accommodate the indigenous interests on the official agenda in a big way. Another very significant issue worth-mentioning is the rise of socialism and decolonization. These two

are the other angles of inquiry, as socialism gave a great momentum against colonialism setting of the process of decolonization that was boldly catalyzed by the World War II in the Punjab in particular. Impact of the Russian Revolution was felt soon after 1917 as revolutionary factions sprang in the various parts of the country. In 1925, the Communist Party of India was formed. By 1930, the indigenous view started visualizing the country reconstruction using some of the socialist tools like planning and industrialization. Soon, the national leadership advocated socialism as a panacea of country’s problems and pleaded for all-round national reconstruction. Interestingly, several noted and prominent scientists, such as M.N. Saha and industrialists thought on the same lines. This resulted in a mutual collaboration among the scientists, the nationalist leadership and the industrialist at the National Planning Committee. It had been constituted in 1938, by the Indian National Congress. It was to plan for country’s reconstruction under a national government. Some of the results of socialism and the socialist experiments in the USSR ought to be at once taken note of. First, opposition of socialism to all forms of inequality and exploitation and, thus, to capitalism and imperialism; second, the encouragement and inspiration it provided to the freedom movements all over the world; and, third, its world view of progress based on modern science and technology as well as modern industries. Since a perceptible understanding of these realities was a pervasive truth in India even before the World War II began.

Thus, by the time the Imperial War broke out, the British Empire and imperialism were on the defensive. The process of decolonization had started. Canada and Australia had already achieved dominion status. On the Indian sub-continent, in 1937, Burma ceded from India where the struggle from freedom had entered its last phase. The constant growing pressure from the Axis Powers in both the East and West; further territorial losses during the War were shown to compel the governments in London and New Delhi to consider rethinking India’s problems, especially keeping in mind the

---


geography of the border policy.\textsuperscript{14} All this has to be seen and viewed in the background of development the world over, especially in the former colonies. The War was not only the greatest War of the human civilization but also a major turning point in its evolution as it brought into being a new world order that increasingly sustained itself by relying on collective wisdom, democracy and modern science. It has no longer the brute might and violence but the mutual understandings and cooperation of nations that appeared to hold out the better prospects for human existence and evolution.\textsuperscript{15}

During the World War II, reconstruction was another significant cause that influenced the development of science. With Britain’s declaration of the War against Germany, India became a party to it; she was thus subjected to its requirements, demands and strains. In the process, she was exposed to the happenings beyond her borders and to the myriad of global forces that accelerated the pace of her freedom struggle. The early exigencies of the War led to a number of War supply and preparatory measures, stimulating industrial activities and the training of technical personnel in India. But as the War expanded and prolonged, the situation became worse. It demanded long term measures. Responding to the situation, the colonial government launched a massive program of all-round reconstruction based on modern lines.\textsuperscript{16}

Finally, the process of transition and globalization, set in motion in the 1940s in India and all over the world, requires to be addressed to follow why the happenings in India took place the way they did. For India, it was not merely a period of transition from colonialism to democracy but also one of an unprecedented exposure to the global forces of change. This offered the Punjab happy and rich prospects for interaction with the world beyond the colonial and imperial confines. Yet for a country still under subjugation and tied to the Allied cooperation, the situation was really puzzling and not certain. Whilst Germany and Japan were highly admired in India for their development and

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
ingenuity, they were officially kept at bay as the enemies of the Empire. In reality, the study of developments in various walks of the life of the province of Punjab in relation to the World War II has been a relatively slow affair even in the developed countries closely involved in the War, like Britain and the United States of America. The Cold War has been one of the main reasons behind it. The rivalry between the superpowers contributing to the power bloc politics and armament in the post-War year has generally held back nations from revealing their War time activities, particularly in the fields of armament, technology and science. The recent revelations about War crimes had stirred strong nationalist sentiments several countries embittering their international relations. Information regarding secret scientific plans and missions, experiments in chemical warfare and field trials of military medicines were pregnant with disturbing implications arising out of racial, religious and nationalistic discriminations. These were likely to cause problems and embarrassment. It was bound to deter authorities from declassifying records in the near future, and in several cases oblige them not to ever do so at all. As such, the Imperial War was destined to remain a most secret War of history. All these issues have obstructed research here also, where, like many other regions of the developing world, the subject is yet to open up sufficiently for historical investigation. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the World War II, nearly one and half decade ago, a spate of literature on it was produced. However, India’s share and contribution were negligible. India, especially the undivided Punjab had had additional problem despite the fact that the Western science had eclipsed the indigenous knowledge and skill. Here, it could not draw the attention of historians at provincial as well as national level at once because it was yet to address the local problems meaningfully. As a consequence, political and economic problems stole the limelight for decades after liberation. Thanks to the freedom struggle and the World War II, serious paucity of sources has also come in the way of much focused research on the subject. Many of the records that could possibly have added to our information in vital regions are not opened till day. There are others which are not easily accessible; and fate of several is unknown. Scattering of papers here and there has also added to the problem. Not all the important papers are located at the

---

Indian archives, libraries and some other government records offices several of them are retained by the imperial establishments in England and may be some of its Allies. Happily, the publication of the Nicholas Mansergh’s multi-volume *Constitutional Relation between Britain and India: the Transfer of Power* has, meanwhile, brought to light a range of official documents of immense value for our purpose, yet it is not all-embracing and exhaustive.\(^{18}\) Despite this difficulty, the sheer dynamism of the World War II and its impact on the post-War developments in the area for study, however, obliged scholars from various disciplines to take note of the War-time occurrences. Since, besides polity, trade, industry, transport, and communications were the first to experience the impact of the global crisis, economists, economic historians and political scientists were among the earliest to take up its study in their respective fields. While addressing the problems and issues arising out of the disruption and dislocation during the War period, concern for security and Post-War reconstruction had actively engaged the official attention. Their value for post-War development could not be over-looked. So, as soon as the national government initiated developments plans through the Five Year Plans after freedom, planners and policy makers looked back to learn from the wartime administrative experiences.\(^{19}\)

However, a deeper perception of the social results of the War appears to have downed later; and it is intriguing to notice that it were the sociologist and anthropologist, and not the historians who first came up with studies focused on the subject under review. But they had to work within the parameters of their own disciplines confined to individuals, groups and organizations.\(^{20}\) To the history students, their attention to bigger issues and problems, though historical forces at work are overview or seen inadequate. In that the chief components of contemporary backdrop-imperialism, nationalism and the

---


\(^{19}\) A. Rahman (1973); A. Rahman and K.D. Sharma (1994); and Sukhmay Chakrbarty (1987) listed in the Bibliography.

\(^{20}\) Shiv Visvanathan, *Organizing for Science: The Making of an Industrial Research Laboratory*, Delhi, 1985, is probably the most important of them. Others are V.V. Krishna (1987), Zaheer Baber (1998); for an anthropologist, see Robert S. Anderson (1975), all listed in the Bibliography.
War are rather diffused. The paucity of sources, especially archival, has often held historians back from producing broader and in-depth studies. Doubtlessly, sharing the joys of victory of the British Empire in the War, the Indian Government commissioned a massive project of the official history of the Indian Armed Forced in the World War II soon after the end of the hostilities.\textsuperscript{21} Unlike its British counterpart-\textit{History of the World War II},\textsuperscript{22} the volumes produced under the Indian Project confined themselves mostly to the different aspect of the armed operations. A wider view of the War with its socio-cultural results was yet to be taken up. The research on the War time developments in various walks of life has an intriguing feature: while the most interesting book on the evolution of science and other discipline in the countries,\textsuperscript{23} the accounts of the War by the historians in Germany are sparse, strikingly, the performance of the Indian historians in this respect is today better than the Germans. The Indian scholars, scientists, politicians and even the historians, too, have written little on the technical advances in various fields, especially in technology and science in the area of our study and on the whole within the country. Of course, a few works in the two decades or so have made admirable attempts in so far as the socio-economic results of the War are concerned. However, in them too, science and technology are addressed indirectly and from the angles that generally fail to appreciate its worth and value fully as a means of development.\textsuperscript{24} As a consequence the relation between science and progress in different fields is virtually untouched, ironically in a period that marked the pinnacle of science in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. It is only recently that the developmental aspects have started engaging attention of some historians and other

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
The official archival records are opening up slowly; meanwhile, the non-
onofficial sources assume sufficient importance, as the period abounds in them. There are books and tracts which provide valuable information on contemporary happenings. Indian view on the colonial policy, and a few journals with social concern for science, technology, industry, trade and commerce, education and rise and growth of various classes that braved through the War, like *Science and Culture*, are there to assist. Likewise, proceedings of the Indian National Congress and professional organization like the Science Congress Association offer us rich information. The private papers of scientists, of military men, political leaders, statesmen, diplomats etc. take us beyond the dark tunnels of history and shed light on the crucial goings on behind the scene.\(^{26}\) A.V. Hill, S.S. Bhatnagar, and M.N. Saha, are the scientist and industrialists like the Tatas, Birlas and Walchand Hirachand are worth-mentioning. Going through these papers along with the official records, one is confronted with a fierce battle going on between imperialism and nationalism and bizarre things happening. A War of wits is going on between the authorities on the one hand and the Indian scientists, technocrats, industrialists and the likes on the other. This sometimes leads to intrigues, ganging up and official surveillance. Throughout the Imperial War the British employed some of their oldest tools- ‘divide and rule’ and racial discrimination even in scientific, industrial and other development matters. The inter-War period proved golden one as science, industry and technology in India developed. Her scientists, technocrats and industrialists earned international laurels for basic research.\(^{27}\)

III

It is pertinent to point out that an attempt will remain to trace out only the impact of the World War II on the province of Punjab here. However, whatever has been discussed

---


above was greatly needed to understand in the larger perspective the subject under review. We are fully aware that the World War II was one of the most significant happenings of the first half of the 20th Century. Because, it was much more truly a World War with large scale campaigns fought not only in Europe but also in Africa and Asia. India being under the British contributed heavily with men, material and money. The Punjab’s share and contribution in the Indian Army was not less than 50 per cent. A large number of Punjabi’s were recruited in different branches of the Indian Army. Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy of India, wrote to Lord Amery, the Secretary of State for India in March, 1942, that the Punjab supplied nearly 50 per cent of the soldiers to the Indian Army. Moreover, the War had a devastating impact on India’s economic life. It

---

28 Germany invaded Poland on 1st September 1939. Britain and France declared War on Germany on 3rd September. The Germans occupied Norway and Denmark in April 1940 and invaded Belgium and Holland on 10th May 1940. Other nations joined the War with the passage of time. The Germans surrendered unconditionally at Reims on 7th May 1945. However, the War continued in the Far East. Japan controlled South East Asia and Burma. With a view to terminate the War surgically, the USA dropped two atom bombs on Nagasaki and Hiroshima on 6 and 9 August 1945 respectively. Finally, Japan surrendered on 14th August 1945. The World War II was over after colossal human and material loss.

29 Marquess of Linlithgow (1887-1952): Viceroy of India from 1936 to 1943. Victor Alexander John Hope, Second Marquess of Linlithgow was the scion of an old Scottish family. He was Chairman of the Royal Commission on Indian Agriculture (1926-28). He had a stiff demeanor. Indian politicians called him “Great Moghul”. He was firm, resolute and hardworking man. He found resonance with the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. He was succeeded by Sir A.C. Wavell (1883-1950) as the Viceroy from October 1943 to March 1947. He was a modest, dogged, courageous, and serious minded man of integrity, fond of history and poetry. Lord Wavell had served India as C-in-C during 1941-43. He was promoted to the rank of Field Marshal since 1943. He did not enjoy confidence of Winston Churchill who sent him to secure India from Japan: Surjit Mansingh, *Historical Dictionary of India*, Vision Books, Delhi, 1999, pp. 231-32; 439-40.

30 Lord L.C.M.S. Amery (1873-1955), Secretary of State for India and Burma, (1940-1945); He was born in Gorakhpur, (U.P. India). He held ministerial posts such as First Lord of the Admiralty (192-1924); Secretary of State for the Colonies (1924-29); Secretary of the State of the Dominions (1925-1929).

31 The *Transfer of Power*, Vol. I, Document No. 1 1942, p. 328. However, for P.S. Lokanathan, the Punjab’s share was just 30 per cent of the total recruitment: *Transition to Peace Economy*, Delhi, 1945, 44-45.

also exhausted the economic resources of the colonial state in India, particularly of Punjab which had been annexed by the British in 1849. As a result, England ended its rule and supremacy over India which was at that time heavily in debt. The purposed present attempt is to examine the results of the World War II on the economic, socio-cultural and political life of the Punjab province. Let it be noticed that during the course of War nearly twenty lakhs Indian joined the armed forces. It was, in fact, ten-fold increase. Large scale recruitment had a great impact on the various aspects of people life in the Punjab. Especially, the Punjabi soldiers shed their blood for the British imperialist in Europe, Africa, Middle East, South East Asia and Far East. They traveled throughout the world during various campaigns. They came in contact with the subjects of various countries. This contact changed their outlook and thus broadened their vision. Above all, these recruits sent huge amounts out of their salaries to their families (parents and other relatives). This economic help to them raised their standard of living. Pucca houses were built even in the rural areas; some families bought agriculture land in their villages if they did not have it before the War. To some extent ‘leveling of class’ did take place in the province.

Here, it will not be out of place if we take note of the fact that there are some very good studies pertaining to the World War II. Thus, the rationale to explore, probe and examine, critically the consequences of the Imperial War, particularly in the Punjab are justified. At the same time, historiography of the World War II is comprehensive and exhaustive at the documentation level. Winston S. Churchill’s *The World War II* in six volumes remains a courageous attempt to historicize the War, though in an autobiographical mode, yet an authentic statement of intent. War is multi-layered

---


34 A local saying put in this way: *Naukran de Chitte Kapre* (Servants have put on clean clothes): R.S. Nakra, *Punjab Villages During the War: An Enquiry into Twenty Villages in the Ludhiana District*, BEIP, No. 91, Lahore, 1946, p. 16.

35 Winston S. Churchill, *The Second World War*, Vols. 6, London, 1948-54. Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill (1874-1965) was a son of Lord Randolph Churchill who acted as the Secretary of State for India in mid 1880s. Winston Churchill visited India in 1896. He held prominent positions in his public life: President of the Board of Trade (1908-10);
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phenomena, a chance and even a rapture that a society passes through. At the conceptual and historiography planes, Arthur Marwick has done a comparative study to delineate the processes of social change in the context of War.\(^{36}\) In India, the World War II got an official historian in Dr. Bisheshwar Prasad, who edited 25 volumes.\(^{37}\) These volumes documentation needs further probing to note subterranean changes taking place at the regional level, for us the Punjab. P.S. Lokanathan\(^{38}\) and Nandan Prasad\(^{39}\) have enriched our understanding about the changes that took place during the World War II in India and its provinces/states. However, Johannes Voigt’s *India in the World War II* is an important historical work.\(^{40}\) Britain had to compensate India’s role and contribution to the War with concessions that cut at the root of the *Raj*.\(^{41}\)

The history of Punjab yet requires a young researcher to explore and examine the World War II such as Dr. Raja Ram of Panjab University, Chandigarh, who studied the World War I. In the late 1930s and 1940s, the history of Punjab past through to overlapping processes: changing political fortunes and impending collapse of the imperial

---


38 P.S. Lokanathan, *Transition to Peace Economy*, Delhi, 1945.


apparatus. The former process occupies the majority of the historical writings. Indeed, Sardar Khushwant Singh has devoted one complete chapter the World War II and political fortunes of the Sikhs.\textsuperscript{42} David Gilmartin, Ayesha Jalal, Anita Inder Singh, Ian Talbot and Amarjeet Singh\textsuperscript{43} have mainly concentrated on the changing political fortunes of different parties in the Punjab and India with a trajectory to explain ‘the politics of the partition’ of the Punjab and also India. The World War II remains at the backdrop unfocused and unexplored so far. However, Ian Talbot,\textsuperscript{44} Raghuveendra Tanwar\textsuperscript{45} explain the collapse of collaboration of the Punjab Unionist Party making way for the rise of the Muslim League. The British effort to make best use of research collaboration during the War has been amply documented leaving much more to dwell at such as how the World War II unleashed economic forces and pressures which made certain slogans and political preferences more amendable and appealing?

IV

The concept of War covers various definitions: the functional or the socio-political definition of War; the operational and the quantity criteria adopted in the definition of War; the judicial conception or the legal and general definitions of War; and then the analysis of War and violence. Before undertaking a deep and broad analysis of the causes of War, it is essential to know what a War is. A Canadian scholar Gernot Kohler highlighted the need and importance of the definition and typology of War: “The definition and typology of armed conflict and War is important in Causes-of-War Research, because causes differ between various types of conflict. The causation of a


large international War tends to be different from the causation of a border incident, from
the causation of a Civil War, etc., although some causes may be common to all of
them”.\textsuperscript{46} R.M. Williams (1972) had suggested a very broader view over the
multifactoriality of War causation as War itself was a very complex event: “War as a
complex multi-dimensional social phenomenon has so many sources and causes that no
theory of a single cause can explain its nature. One cannot find a single necessary
condition and a single sufficient condition; one can only try to find sources, factors,
conditions important for the occurrence of War”.\textsuperscript{47} War occurs among the different
human groups belonging to the international society to achieve certain socio-political
ends. War is a means to achieve political ends. Therefore, it cannot be separated from
politics. As human society and politics is a continuous changing phenomenon, therefore,
definition of War may vary from time to time. Attempts have been made to reach towards
nearly a perfect and balanced definition of War. The study of its definition has been
attempted into four major dimensions mentioned as such: (i) The functional or the socio-
political definition of War; (ii) The operational and the quantitative criteria adopted in the
definition of War; (iii) The judicial conception or the legal definition of War considered
within the framework of international law; and (iv) The general definition of War.

\textbf{The Functional or the Socio-political definition of War:}

(a) Carl Von Clausewitz had suggested one of the most commonly accepted
definitions of War through explaining the functional value of War. He thought
violence as an integral part of War. War is merely a means to achieve the political
ends. Hence, War cannot be separated from the national politics. Considering the
motives and objectives of War, he defined War as, “An act of violence intended to
compel our opponents to fulfill our will.” He further emphasized the continuity of
violence with other political methods. “War”, he wrote, “is nothing but a
continuation of political intercourse, with a mixture of other means”\textsuperscript{48};

(b) In the broadest sense, Quincy Wright defined War as “A violent contact of
distinct but similar entities. In this sense a collision of stars, a fight between a lion
and a tiger, a battle between two primitive tribes, and hostilities between two

\textsuperscript{46} Unesco Yearbook on Peace and Conflict Studies 1980, Greenwood Press Westport,

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 139.

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 131.
modern nations would all be War”.\(^{49}\) He (Quincy Wright 1968: 483) suggested a simple and a balanced definition of War: “A conflict among political groups, especially sovereign states, carried on by armed forces of considerable magnitude and for a considerable period of time”\(^ {50}\);

(c) Prof. L. Oppenheim has defined the War as "a contention between two or more states through their armed forces, for the purpose of over-powering each other and imposing such conditions of the purpose as the victor pleases”\(^ {51}\);

(d) Hoffman Nickerson proposed a definition of War explaining War as an instrument of national policy: “War is the use of organized force between two human groups, pursuing contradictory policies, each group seeking to impose its policy upon the other” (cited in Palmer and Perkins, ‘International Relations’, p. 213). An anthropologist Bronislow Malinowski (1941) suggested a definition of War almost similar to that of Hoffman: “War is an armed contest between two independent political units, by means of organized military force, in the pursuit of a tribal or national policy”\(^ {52}\)

Both definitions say nothing about the amount or magnitude of violence and use of force as a prerequisite for War and hence fails to differentiate between Wars and smaller incidents among organized forces, such as coups d’etat, riots, ambush, revolt, smaller uprising and other low-intensity-conflicts etc. “In fact, War is ‘a political act, usually undertaken only when it appears that all other alternatives have failed”.\(^ {53}\)

**The operational and the quantitative criteria adopted in the definition of War:** Singer and Small (1972) and Deutsch and Songhua (1973) call “War” any series of events that meets the following three criteria: (a) **Size:** it results in at least 1000 battle deaths (not counting, therefore, the indirect victims through famine, lack of shelter, and disease); (b) **Preparation:** it has been prepared in advance, and/or is being maintained, by large-scale social organizations through such means as the recruitment, training and


\(^{53}\) *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica* (in 30 Volumes) MACROPAEDIA Volume 19 Knowledge in Depth (1978), William Benton Publisher and the University of Chicago, p. 540.
deployment of troops, the acquisition, storage and distribution of arms and ammunition, the making of specific War plans and the like; and (c) **Legitimating**: it is being legitimized by an established government or quasi-governmental organization, so that large-scale killing is viewed not as a crime but as a duty”. ⁵⁴

**The Judicial Conception or the legal definition of War**

The judicial concept of War is not only closely related with the political definition of War but the legal aspect of War is also taken into account in the Quantitative criteria mentioned in its third part titled as ‘legitimating’ in order to justify the large-scale killing during War not as a crime but as a duty. In a narrower sense, Quincy Wright defined War as “the legal condition which equally permits two or more hostile groups to carry on a conflict by armed force”. ⁵⁵ The Marquess de Olivert declares: “War is a litigation or suit (Litigious) between nations that depends their rights, in which force is the judge and victory is the judicial award”. ⁵⁶ The legal aspects of War stress that at least one of the Warring Party must be a sovereign nation-state. ‘A struggle can be considered a War only if the contenders or belligerents are sovereign political units (tribes, fiefs, empires, nation-states, etc.). According to *New English Dictionary* “War is a hostile contention by means of armed forces, carried on between nations, states, or rulers or between parties in the same nation or state; the employment of armed forces against a foreign power, or against and opposing party in the state”.

**General Definition of War**

In his classic *A Study of War* Quincy Wright, tries to combine the legal, sociological, military, and psychological views of War and offer a synthesis: War may be regarded as: “an extreme intensification of military activity, psychological tension, legal power, and social integration….” ⁵⁷ Evan Luard (1986) has concluded a general and brief definition of War: “all encounters which have involved substantial, organized fighting

---


over a significant period may be classified as War”.58 Synthetically, approach of functional and operational definitions of War further provides a general definition of War: “War is the art of organizing and employing armed force to accomplish the purpose of a group”.59 Hence, War is an act of a quantum of violence used by the legalized and well-organized armed forces of two or more sovereign nation-states or of rival parties/groups within a nation-state in order to achieve a definite political goal.

**Quincy Wright (1942, 1965)**

“Since the publication of Quincy Wright’s pioneering ‘A Study of War’ in 1942, many attempts have been made to devise a taxonomy of armed conflict….Classification of Wars by basic causes is more difficult since it is rare for a War to have a single cause”.60 Quincy Wright has developed a typology of War in which the *boundary conditions of both opposite combatants* have been considered as the primary criteria of classification. On the basis of boundary conditions he distinguishes Wars among four categories: (a) **Civil War**, which takes place within the boundaries of a sovereign nation; (b) **The Balance of Power War**, in which members of a state system are at War among themselves; (c) **The Defensive War**, which acts to guard a civilization against the intrusions of an alien culture; and (d) **The Imperial War**, in which one civilization attempts to expand at the expense of another”.61

**Evan Luard (1968, 1970)**

Evan Luard’s classification of Wars is not comprehensive and general. He places greater emphasis on the typology of external Wars (1865-1968) on the basis of the motivations of nation-states in their initiation of War. He made separate study for colonial and civil Wars. He regards the external War as “Wars of Aggression” because some dominant motive stimulates nation-states for aggression. He develops a classification of “external Wars” based on the main motivation of the initiating power

---


into four categories: (i) “Expansive Wars, whose main aim was the conquest of foreign territories not previously controlled, in the inter-War period (i.e. 1919-1939) were still common. For instance, the Japanese invasions of Manchuria (1931) and China (1933, 1935 and 1937-1945 during Chinese Civil War); the Italian invasions of Ethiopia and Albania; the German invasion of non-German Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, the Low Countries, the Balkans, and the Soviet Union; the Soviet absorption of the Baltic States are some examples of this kind. (ii) Irredentist Wars, directed against territories inhabited mainly by people of the same race as the conquerors, to bring about the reunification of a nation, whether conceived in ethnic, linguistic, or historical terms, declined. Between the Wars (i.e. 1919-39) there were the German occupation of Austria and German-speaking Czechoslovakia, Hungarian and Polish participation in the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet occupation of Poland east of the Curzon line, and the Italian occupation of part of Savoy. After 1945, the North Korean attack of South Korea (1950) and the Indian attack on Goa (December 17, 1961) might be placed in this category”. Irredentism may be defined as: “The long standing and frustrated desire of the people of one state to annex some area of an adjoining state that contain peoples of the same culture or ethnic group. Examples of irredentism include France’s attitude towards Alsace and Lorraine after 1870 and Germany’s attitude toward the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia after World War I”.

“Strategic Wars, May be motivated by a desire on the part of a nation to enhance its logistic and military position vis-à-vis some real or imagined threat”. In the Inter-War period i.e.1919-1939, the Soviet invasions of Finland (1939) and Baltic States (1940) were partly of this type. In the postwar period, the Israeli participation in the Suez campaign with Egypt (1956) might have been similarly motivated. In Coercive Wars, a sovereign government exerted force, threat or pressure on other states to compel to fulfill

---

one’s will. Examples of this type are the Anglo-French attack on Egypt (1956); Arab invasion of Israel in 1948 and the Soviet repression of the Hungarian Uprising in 1956.

**Interstate War or International War**

All Wars with system members on both sides are classified as interstate or international.

**Extra-Systemic War**

It involves a system member against a non member. These Wars are subdivided into imperial, colonial, and civil: (a) it includes Imperial Wars which involve a system member on one side and an independent entity which does not satisfy the Singer-Small inclusion criteria on the other side (b) Colonial Wars are also included into this category. These Wars involve a system member fighting against a colony, dependency or protectorate which is peripheral to the center of government of the system member. (c) Civil Wars involve political factions fighting against each other in a given state. However, these Wars may become internationalized through the military intervention of one or more outside state(s) on the side of the opposing parties.  

**Etiology of War**

“The dictionary meanings of the word ‘etiology’ (US)/also ‘etiology’ (Br) are (i) the study of causes and reasons (ii) the word ‘etiology is often used in medical terminology in which it represents ‘study of the causes of disease’.

The causes of World War II have also been summarized by the *The World Book Encyclopedia* – W.X.Y.Z. Volume 19- Field Enterprises Educational Corporation, Merchandise Mart Plaze, Chicago, 54. Illinois at pp. 381-386. “The three main causes of World War II were: (a) the problem left unsolved by World War I; (b) the rise of dictatorships, and (c) the desire of Germany, Italy, and Japan for more territory. Above mentioned three main causes have been further subdivided into Secondary Causes; Cause No. 1 has been elaborated into five Secondary Causes; (i) The Versailles Treaty; (ii) The League of Nations; (iii) attempts of disarmament; (iv) Economic Problems; (v) Nationalism. Cause No. 2 has been elaborated; (i) Communism in Russia; (ii)

---


Fascism in Italy; (iii) Nazism in Germany; (iv) Militarism in Japan. Cause No. 3: Desire for Territory: Aggression on the March; (i) Japanese invasion of Manchuria and China, (ii) Italian invasion of Ethiopia; (iii) Germany’s invasion of the Rhineland, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland (The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis formed)"

Theories of War Causation

A number of interdisciplinary approaches have been made in order to cure our ignorance of the causes of War during recent decades. Varied and numerous theories of War causation can broadly be divided into two main Categories:

1. Mono-causal theories of War; and
2. Theory of multifactoriality of War Causation.

Mono-Causal Theories of War

Various scholars of different disciplines have attempted to postulate a particular theory explaining a cause or correlate of War. Each one has emphasized over a particular determinant in the process of War causation. But all of them are inadequate and unsatisfactory to explain the occurrence of War comprehensively hence they are being rejected. “As P.A. Sorokin observed (1928), most such theories are inherently unsatisfactory as explanations since they fail to explain “When, why, under what conditions, and in what way their factor is an efficient cause of War, and why, under what conditions, and so on, it has no such influence”. This is true even of recent studies which rely on statistical evidence, as Michael Wallace (1971) discussing the relationship between status inconsistency and War in the international system”.

Konard Z. Lorenz’s Theory of Animal Aggression (1966)

Nobel Prize winner in Physiology/Medicine in 1973 was widely recognized by his famous work ‘On Aggression’ (1966); he defined ‘aggression’ as-“The fighting instinct in beast and man which is directed against members of the same species”. Therefore, aggression is an ineradicably instinctive behavior, it is not a learned reaction to social cues or environmental stimuli but a species-specific instinct man has inherited from his anthropoid ancestors in the service of evolutionary adaptation and survival”.


Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis

This theory of War causation “starts with the assumption that aggression is always a consequence of frustration”. 69 “But in fact, frustration as such does not lead to War; whether or not it leads to War will depend on displacement techniques. War may result from frustration if the pent-up (unexpressed/repressed) aggression is successfully displaced by one state on to a foreign state or group. Displacement is achieved these days by means of mass communication and highly developed methods of political indoctrination”. 70 Dollard and McDougall suggested some modifications in the above hypothesis: “I should like to propose that every frustration increases the instigation to aggression, but this instigation is here termed anger” 71 and sometimes termed as fear. The frustration-aggression hypothesis does not wholly explain the phenomenon of War; there is incomplete chain of War causation e.g. if aggression is one of the prime ingredients of War, and aggression is originated through frustration, ultimately the problem remains still unresolved that-what causes a frustration?

Marxist-Leninist Theory of War Causation

In the midst of the First World War (January-June, 1916), V.I. Lenin (1870-1924); founder of the first Socialist State, wrote the book Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism. Lenin did an extensive research on the problem of capitalism and War and arrived at the inference that the two are inseparable. 72 “Since War is a troubled human relationship and belongs in the superstructure, it derives its root from the economic base. All human relations mirror the process of turning out concrete articles necessary for daily life. When the latter change, the former will also change. He considered capitalism the breeding ground of War. Lenin declared that War is a form of ‘class conflict’; and in the age of imperialism the whole world is the battlefield, the enslaving of men by men being the motivation. Thus understood, War begins with the advent of class community and


70 Ibid., p. 6.


ends with its disappearance”.\textsuperscript{73} V.I. Levin further elaborates: “Our aim is to achieve a socialist system of society, which, by eliminating the division of mankind into classes, by eliminating all exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, will inevitably eliminate the very possibility of War”.\textsuperscript{74} So, V.I. Lenin propounded the theory of ‘inevitability of War’ and said, “Capitalism, has concentrated the earth’s wealth in the hands of a few states and divided the world up to the last bit. Any further enrichment could take place only at the expense of others, as the enrichment of one state at the expense of another. The issue could only be settled by force-and, accordingly, War between the world marauders became inevitable”.\textsuperscript{75} The article “Long Live Leninism” reads like a running comment on the book ‘Imperialism’ “we believe in the absolute correctness of Lenin’s thinking: War is an inevitable outcome of the system of exploitation, and the source of modern Wars is the imperialist system”. It is argued that Wars are waged by the imperialists due to “their insatiable appetite for more wealth”. The article ends by saying that “so long as capitalist imperialism exists…the sources and possibility of War will remain”.\textsuperscript{76}

Karl Marx (1818-1883) with his friend Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) wrote \textit{Manifesto of the Communist Party} and \textit{Das Capital} (1867). “According to Marxists the exploitation of labour leads to shrinkage of the domestic market with the result that the capitalists press for ever new markets and sources of raw materials abroad. This, in turn, leads to a policy of annexation, Colonization and War”.\textsuperscript{77} “On the other hand, some thinkers did not agree with the Marxist-Leninist theory of War Causation. Writers of the classical tradition like Norman Angell and Lionel Robbins have insisted that the cost of modern Wars always exceeds possible economic gains so that there cannot be an economic motive for War. Hence, they trace the cause of War either to the fears of the uneconomically minded patriots or to the propaganda of special economic interests”.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., pp. 11-12.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., p. 7.
Economic Base of War Causation

It is the widespread belief that economic is the root of all evil. “Most men devote the major portion of their time and energy to tasks related, directly or indirectly, to the production of goods and services. From that fact it is tempting to conclude, as many do, that economics is primarily or even exclusively, at the root of all human behavior”. 79

(a) The Economic “Devil” Theory of War

Means that in a satanic thirst for economic gain, ammunitions makers (“merchants of death”), international bankers, and “Wall Street” capitalists, provoke Wars in order to profit by the blood of men’s sons, including their own. This view gained considerable headway in the U.S. in the inter War years (i.e. 1919-1939). There is no real-evidence to support this view, but even if it did contain a modicum of truth it is absurd (unreasonable) to think that it was of any great importance.

(b) Capitalism and War

There are controversial and even contradictory views about the relationship between capitalism and War. The orthodox Marxist view is that imperialism and War are inevitable results of capitalism. Contrary to this view: “E.M. Winslow (1948) states that the pursuit of power by states can arise from a number of factors in which economic has no part. Fear, Love of adventure, prestige, strategy, civilizing missions, political and ideological clashes has certainly been important causes of imperialism and War”. 80

Catalytic approach in the War Causation

There are such conditions or factors whose presence/or absence insufficiency or excess influence the occurrence of Wars. In other words, we should identify that whether a particular cause of War is leading toward or away from War. Just to explain this idea, an example of a research work Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate Wars, 1816-1965 by Stuart A. Beamer (1992) is being cited: “Perhaps the most important contribution of this study is that it provides, for the first time, a direct assessment of the relative importance of more than a few factors that are alleged to promote or inhibit the outbreak of War. In order of declining importance, the conditions

---

80 Charles P. Schleicher, International Relations: Cooperation and Conflict; p. 287.
that characterize a dangerous, War-prone dyad are; presence of continuity; absence of alliance; absence of more-advanced economy; absence of democratic polity; absence of overwhelming preponderance; presence of major power; nothing in these findings suggests that high levels of military preparedness reduce the likelihood of War. 

Considering the factors influence War Causation in terms of their presence and absence; an example can be cited from the causes of the First World War: Absence of international organizations (such as League of Nations; UNO, OAU, etc.) for amicable and negotiated settlement of disputes among nations.

**Classification of the Causes of War**

The genesis of War is a multidimensional phenomenon therefore the theory of multi-factoriality of War causation has been universally recognized and accepted with consensus. The causes of War are not only numerous but sometimes they are very complex too. Therefore, it seems necessary to employ the analytical method for their classification to make the study of ‘causes of War’ easier and simpler.

Traditionally causes of War may be classified into different categories as: Psychological, economic, cultural and Ideological, Political, religious, ethnic or racial etc. R.J. Rommel has attempted to classify the causes of War as under: (a) Necessary Causes, (b) Necessary and sufficient causes. (c) Aggravating conditions, (d) Inhibiting conditions and (e) Trigger causes (it is a special type of sufficient cause). Direct and Indirect causes of War: Broadly thinking, the causes of War can be divided into two main types: Direct and Indirect. The causes or conditions which are directly correlated with the outbreak of War may be regarded as its direct causes while the causes or factors indirectly interlinked with the occurrence of War may be categorized as the indirect causes. For example, illegal or legalized control over the territory of any sovereign nation-state is the direct cause of War. Trigger causes or immediate causes of War are included in the category of direct causes of War. Sometimes ‘real cause’ of War is hidden deeply and aggressive party makes invasion under false pretences to justify his aggression. Therefore, War analysts must be careful enough to distinguish between Ostensible versus real; Apparent

---

versus actual; Immediate or trigger or proximate versus Remote; and finally the root cause of War. Assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife Sophia was the immediate cause of World War I - some writer called it trigger cause of proximate cause. Hence, overpopulation, Social injustice; poverty; awareness about one’s political, economic or cultural exploitation; political instability in autocratic or non-democratic system of government, etc. have been considered as some indirect causes of War.

**Overpopulation and War**

Overpopulation and War are indirectly correlated: “There is no definite evidence that overpopulation directly leads to war. Overpopulation by itself does not emerge as an important determinant of conflict and violence nevertheless it is indirectly interlinked with the outbreak of War. Choucri and Bennett (1972) and Choucri and North (1972) argued: “An increase in population must bring about increased demands for resources and a greater level of technological development before “lateral pressure”, competition and crisis are likely to lead to violent conflict. In her monograph “Population Dynamics and International Violence”, the most extensive quantitative analysis available to date, Chourci (1974) presents the following conclusion…population factors indeed have a pronounced effect upon the development of conflict situations, and can often be critical determinants of violence and Warfare. But the linkages between population and violence are rarely direct: complex intervening networks are at work. Major Wars, as well as local conflicts, often emerge by way of a two-step process: first, in terms of internally generated pressures and demands occasioned by growing needs associated with added population; and then in terms of reciprocal comparisons, rivalries and conflict for control over resources, territory, valued goods or spheres of influence. Each step is closely related to the other, and each can be traced to the interaction among the population, resource and technological attributes of a society. In those terms, population factors amount to critical determinants of violent conflict.”

The location and distribution of population in relation to resources is not uniform throughout the world at all. It creates economic disparities due to unequal distribution of human population and natural resources on the earth further resulting conflict-generating

---

conditions within the developing and underdeveloped countries. H.R. Khanna has pointed out the present economic disparities very aptly: “Today the developing world has 75 per cent of the world population and 14 per cent of the world income, a situation attributable not only to resource capitalism but also knowledge capitalism. This would become a source of constant irritation and create a fertile soil wherein sprout seeds of conflict”.  

Unequal distribution of population and natural resources all over the world has created the economic disparities among nation-states and divided the human population into two distinct categories so called ‘the Haves’ and ‘the Have-nots’. “Dr. Hiroshi Nakajima, Director-General of the WHO proceeded to argue that so long as the world is divided into ‘Haves’ and ‘have-nots’ a state of tension and work against peace will continue”.  

“The ghastly imbalance between the Haves and the Have-Nots, between the affluent North and the deprived South, militates against the very law of nature apart from the sheer immorality of it”.  

And overpopulation is directly linked with Poverty which is determined, by the factors such as ‘per capita income’, ‘level of standards of living’, etc. “And poverty does not mean only the question of hunger: with it is linked illiteracy, malnutrition and social inequity in the wider sense, all these contribute to environmental degradation”.  

### Rise of Nationalism as an indirect cause of War

“Nationalism has two faces: one is good while other is bad. Nationalism is the binding factor: It has led to the development of the well-known “my country, right or wrong” concept. More even concept of live and die for ones of belonging and pride, and a willingness to make sacrifices for their country. They also take a greater interest in their nation’s achievements in such fields as literature, music, and games & sports, etc. But the other side of the coin is more horrible as nationalism also produces rivalry and tension between nations. Desires for national glory and military conquest may lead to war.

---


Extreme nationalism may result in racial hatred and in persecution of minority groups. Nationalism is a people’s sense of belonging together as a nation. It also includes such feelings as loyalty to the nation, pride in its culture and history, and—in many cases—a desire for national independence. Since the mid-1700’s nationalism has become an important force in international relations. Nationalistic feelings, particularly the desire of each country to govern itself, have helped change the map of Europe several times since the 1800’s. Since the late 1940’s, nationalism has also transformed Africa and Asia. Nationalism is widespread today, but it once did not even exist. People have not always had a sense of nationhood. Early people felt they belonged to cities or tribes. During the middle Ages, people were loyal to a number of groups and rulers. The rise of nationalism occurred along with the development of a political unit called the “nation-state”. A ‘nation’ is a group of people who share a common culture, history, or an area of land whose people have an independent government. A ‘nation-state’ exists if a nation and a state have the same boundaries. Nation-states began to develop during the late middle Ages. Travel and Communication improved at that time. As a result, people became increasingly aware of the part of their country that lay outside their own community. Loyalty to local and religious leaders began to weaken, and allegiance to kings grew stronger. By the 1700’s, England, France, Spain and several other countries had become nation-states. Other people developed a sense of nationhood by the early 1800’s. But most of them had not become nation-states. Many persons trusted that a national group had the right to form its own state. This belief, known as the ‘doctrine of national self-determination’, caused many nationalistic revolutions in Europe. For example, Greece won independence from Turkey in 1829, and Belgium became independent of the Netherlands in 1830”. 87 “Like many “isms”, over the years nationalism has changed its meaning. Nineteenth-century nationalism gave rise to the modern nation state, to the concept of self-determination, and to Separatism”. 88

---


The World War II broke out on September 1, 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland. In the morning, the mobilisation of all British forces was ordered. An intense debate in the British Parliament began on the issues of the War and the National Government in England. An Ultimatum to Germany was served at 9.30 PM and second and final on September 3rd at 9 A.M. The British Prime Minister, Nivelle Chamberlain spoke on the Radio at 11.15 A.M. On September 3rd, both Britain and France declared war on Germany. On the same day (Sunday) at 8.30 PM IST, Lord Linlithgow from the Viceregal Summer residence in Simla announced the War against Germany. The Government of India immediately declared India to be at war with Germany without consulting the Congress or the elected members of the Central Legislative Assembly. Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy, was industrious, clear-headed, patient and capable. He had rock-like firmness. He was immediately immersed in war problems. He was characterised as ‘a great War Viceroy’. His principal claim ‘to fame was his organisation of the Indian War effort. He successfully handled both the question of supply and military expansion’. A Defence of India Ordinance restricting civil liberties came into force the day War was declared. It established the power of the Central Government ‘to rule by decree to promulgate such rules as appear necessary for securing for defence of British India or the efficient prosecution of the War or for maintaining
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supplies and services essential to the life of the community. On the eve of the War, India was even more unprepared in a material sense than Britain and with a much more divided mind. Within the Indian National Congress, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, were sympathetic towards France and Britain. In spite of their sympathy for Britain, the Congress leaders felt outraged as the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow ‘dragged India into the War without consulting the representatives of Indian people’. The Congress Working Committee met at Wardha from 10 to 14 September. Subhas Bose, Achrya Narendra Dev and Jayaprakash Narayan were also invited. Sharp differences cropped up. Mahatma Gandhi favoured the Allies against the Nazi State. However, the socialists and Subhas Chandra Bose argued that the war was an imperialist one since both sides were fighting for gaining or defending colonial territories. Therefore, the question of supporting either of the two sides did not arise. In between, Jawaharlal Nehru made ‘a sharp distinction between democracy and Fascism. He had a soft corner for Britain, France and Poland. He was equally convinced that Britain and France were imperialist countries and the war was the result of the inner contradictions at capitalism maturing since the end of the World War I. He, therefore, argued that India should neither join the War nor take advantage of Britain’s difficulties. The CWC again met at Wardha on 22 October 1939 and condemned the Viceroy’s Statement of 17 October as ‘unequivocal reiteration of old imperialist policy’. It was resolved that any support to Great Britain would amount to an endorsement of Imperialist policy. From the Indian nationalist point of view, the World War was ‘a conflict between old and new imperialist powers’. The left-wing groups : Forward Bloc, the Congress Socialist party, the
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Communists and the Royists characterized the war as an imperialist war. They asserted that the war-crisis provided an opportunity to achieve freedom through an all-out struggle against British Imperialism.\textsuperscript{101} India entered into the War not on its own will, but committed to it by its rulers. Imperialism is the same everywhere and in every age. Ethically, the war was not India’s seeking. It was entirely due to European rivalries and imperialist competition. The British Government had made its subservient Government of India join in their extra-frontier Imperialist Operations.\textsuperscript{102} Lord Zetland, the Secretary of State for India, informed Lord Linlithgow that the whole strength of the Empire might have to be developed. First step was ‘to increase the output of India’s mutinous factories to the maximum in order to meet their own needs as also all outside demands’.\textsuperscript{103} The Congress asked the British government its ‘War aims’ regarding India.\textsuperscript{104} Jawaharlal Nehru argued that the Congress leadership wanted to give chance to the Viceroy and the British Government.\textsuperscript{105} The Muslim League had also some reservations, yet tacitly supported the War efforts.\textsuperscript{106} The Unionist Party passed a resolution on the War offering unconditional support to Britain.\textsuperscript{107}

The Viceroy repeatedly declared his intention to avoid ‘running after the Congress’. In fact, his attitude was part of general British policy to take advantage of the War to regain for the white-dominated Central Government and bureaucracy the ground lost to the Congress from 1937.\textsuperscript{108} Moreover, his principal claims to fame was his
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organisation of the Indian war effort.\textsuperscript{109} The Viceroy in his statement of 17 October 1939 harped on the differences among Indians. He tried to use the Muslim League and the Princes against the Congress and refused to define Britain’s War aims beyond stating that Britain was resisting aggression. Next day, Lord Zetland, the Secretary of State for India, spoke in the House of Lords and stressed differences among Indians, especially among Hindus and Muslims and branded the Congress as a purely Hindu organization.\textsuperscript{110} Thus, the British Government had no intention of loosening their hold on India during or after the War. It was willing to treat the Congress as ‘an enemy’. The Congress Working Committee on 23 October demanded a national government at the Centre and promise of Independence at the end of the War. However, the Viceroy promised Dominion Status.\textsuperscript{111} The Committee rejected the viceregal statement as a reiteration of the old imperialist policy. It decided not to support the War. The Congress asked its provincial ministries to resign in protest against the British policy of involving India in the War without prior consultations with Indians. The Congress was still reluctant to give a call for a massive anti-imperialist struggle. With no assurances coming from the British, all the Congress Ministries resigned by mid-November 1939.\textsuperscript{112}

Individuals and groups were willing to give help, but India as a whole sat back to watch the mighty drama unfolded in the European arena.\textsuperscript{113} The Congress announced boycott of the War efforts. However, call for individual Satyagraha did not carry much appeal with the people of the Punjab.\textsuperscript{114} The Unionist Party, unlike the Congress and the Muslim League unconditionally supported the British War efforts. At the local level, the
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landowners actively encouraged army recruitment. Initially, there was great enthusiasm for the British cause. ‘The declaration of War by England’ stated the Deputy Commissioner of Sheikhupura, ‘has touched the hearts of the Punjabis and the various communities are vying with each other in offering their services and resources to the Government’. The Punjab Legislative Assembly dominated by the landlords lost no time in passing resolutions in support of the British Empire. In the Punjab, the Unionist leaders had assured the Governor, H.D. Craik that they would join the War efforts. They also advised him to create a fund to bribe the press to the right time. Even the Governor reported to the Viceroy that ‘expenditures on a fairly generous scale be fully justified in War time and would be money well spent.’ In fact, the Punjab Premier Sikandar Hayat Khan urged the Governor to fully exploit the readiness of the Punjab to help in the War and not to miss out the psychological moment when enthusiasm among the local population was high. Economic interest as well as tradition of loyalty to the King Emperor played its part in creating an ‘outburst of popular enthusiasm.’ Infact, the recruiting officers reported no difficulties in acquiring recruits for the army during the early months of 1940.

The Akali leader, Master Tara Singh, declared that the War was a ‘golden chance’ for the Sikhs to regain and consolidate their position. The War created a crisis of conscience for the Sikhs. They wanted to regain coveted position in the Armed forces.

---
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The titled gentry of the Chief Khalsa Diwan promptly declared their support for Britain.\textsuperscript{122} In matters of Sikh participation in the War, the Khalsa National Party, a coalition partner in the Unionist Government, openly supported the War efforts. The Khalsa Defence of India League under the Chairmanship of Maharaja of Patiala was established January 1941 to encourage and coordinate Sikh enlistment into the Indian Army. The ban on the enlistment of Sikhs was lifted.\textsuperscript{123} The Maharaja of Patiala intensified war efforts among the Sikhs especially the work of recruitment.\textsuperscript{124} It was reported in vernacular media in the early phase of the War, that it would be a limited War and end soon.\textsuperscript{125} The ‘phoney’ War ended in Europe with the fall of France. In May 1940, Winston Churchill took over as the Prime Minister with L.S. Amery as his Secretary of State for India.\textsuperscript{126} The formation of the Khalsa Defence of India League was ‘another step in the right direction’. It was argued that the strength in the army would enhance the political position of the Sikhs.\textsuperscript{127} The Sikhs considered ‘the army vital for the preservation of the Sikhs as a separate entity’. The Punjab Governor wrote to the Viceroy in June 1941 that ‘the Akalis have come to realise that a decline in the Sikh military quota must result in a serious setback to the community’.\textsuperscript{128} However, the non-inclusion of Sikh in the Viceroy’s Executive Council was widely grudged about.\textsuperscript{129} The Viceroy nominated two Sikhs to the Defence Council.\textsuperscript{130}

---


\textsuperscript{124} \textit{The Khalsa}, Lahore, 10.8.1941.

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Akali}, Lahore, November 2, 1939.


\textsuperscript{127} \textit{The Khalsa}, Lahore, August 3, 1941.

\textsuperscript{128} Ian Talbot, \textit{Punjab and the Raj (1849-1947)}, pp. 155, 177.

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{The Khalsa} Lahore, August 10, 1941.

\textsuperscript{130} Khushwant Singh, \textit{A History of the Sikhs (1839-1988)}, Vol. II, 244.
M.B.E, Member, Punjab War Publicity Ward, Gujranwala, exhorted the Sikhs to join the army in large numbers. It was argued that the Sikhs are chiefly agriculturists. They supplement their income by joining the army. Sardar Rajwant Singh Kang M.A. brought out a pamphlet “The Sikh and the Present War”. It was widely recommended and considered to be of immense help in the recruitment of the Sikhs. The Khalsa Defence of India League, Lahore, issued pamphlets highlighting the glorious traditions of Sikhism such as selfless sacrifice for the country. The Khalsa Defence of India League, made a very vigorous speech exhorting the people to join the army in large numbers. The Chief Khalsa Diwan supported the British Government. However, the Akali Party could not give unqualified support to the British War effort. Propaganda, publicity, fundraising, recruitment and maintenance of law and order proceeded without difficulty because the structures that enabled recruiting officers, deputy commissioners and local notables to act rapidly and with minimum friction were already in place. Onwards, the colonial state single-mindedly moved towards mobilisation of resources both human and material. Every stone was turned to achieve that goal.
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