Chapter-I

Historical Background

After taking over the political power in 1757, British East India Company started to deal with the economic policies because the capitalist European society was urged by the logic of its nature to seek expansion over the world to gather raw materials for its industry and to find new markets for its manufactured goods. In this search, it reached India. England, the most advanced member of the capitalist Europe, established its sway over India and set in motion the forces which transformed it.\(^1\) Thus impelled India to traverse the path of nationalism. The emergence of consciousness was instrumental in demanding first the representative form of government especially the expansion of the legislative councils\(^2\). Thus the Indian nationalism continued to pass through various phases of development. As it advanced from one phase to another, its social basis broadened its objectives became more clearly defined and bold.

**First Phase:** In the first phase, Indian nationalism had a very narrow social basis. The new intelligentsia was the product of the modern education system imparted in the new educational institutions established by the British in India in the early decades of the 19\(^{th}\) century\(^3\). It had studied western literature and culture and greatly assimilated the nationalist and democratic ideas and
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formed the first stratum of the Indian society to develop the national consciousness and aspirations. Raja Ram Mohan Rai and other Indian leaders became sympathetic for the mass of their countrymen and laboured for the amelioration of their destitute condition. The first phase extended till 1885 and culminated in the rise of the Indian National Congress in that year.

Before the emergence of Indian National Congress in 1885, many political, socio-religious associations came into being which played a remarkable role in rousing the consciousness among the educated middle class. In 1828, Academic Association and in 1838, the Society for the Acquisition of General Knowledge were founded for the promotion of literary activities essential for the cultural renaissance. First time in 1842, Dawarkanath Tagore brought out George Thompson from England to organize the political movement. After coming to Calcutta, he alongwith Indian Intelligentsia established Bengal British India Society in 1843.

In 1851, upper class landholders and middle class radicals started British India Association with Radha Kant Deb as its President. In 1852, Jagannath Shankar Shet, Dadabhai Naoroji etc. founded the Bombay Association. In 1852, Madras Native Association came into existence on the eve of the renewal of the Charter Act in 1853. All these associations petitioned the
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Parliament of England bringing to its notice the grievances and wants of the inhabitants of each Presidency. It would be pertinent to say that these associations were the harbingers of political mobilisation in different parts of India.

In 1876, S.N. Banerjea, Anand Mohan Bose, Sibanath Sastri, Krishan Mohan Banerji etc. founded the Indian Association. They campaigned to denounce the Vernacular Press Act, 1878, the ‘Licence Act’ and the civil service question.  

Surendranath Banerjea and other educated Indians continued to concentrate their attention mainly on the important questions such as holding of civil service examination, expansion of Legislative Councils, reduction of military expenditure, taxation policy etc. The civil service was ‘indeed a national question’ and it called for ‘a national movement’. Banerjea, Anand Mohan Bose, Lal Mohan Ghose started corresponding with leaders of public opinion in other parts of India in order to organise a national protest against the orders of the Secretary of State for India, Lord Salisbury, reducing the higher age-limit for civil service examination from 21 to 19. Banerjea was deputed to travel all over the country to mobilise support in favour of the memorial. He toured the chief towns of northern India- Lahore, Amritsar, Meerut, Delhi, Aligarh, Agra, Lucknow, Kanpur, Allahabad, Banaras, and Patna. Besides, he also visited Bombay, Ahmedabad, Surat, Poona and Madras in the same capacity. The branches of Indian
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Association were established in the important cities of northern India mentioned above.13 Lal Mohan Ghosh was sent to England to acquaint the British electorate with the Indian problems on the eve of the general election of 1880. 'The Bengalee', the organ of the Association, exhorted people, "to cast off its apathy of ages and show something of that earnestness and energy so necessary for building up the nation...... The friends of India in the country and in England showed thus form a united body and the strength of such a united organization, it was felt, would be irresistible."14 The first national conference met in Calcutta from Dec. 28 to 30, 1883. It was, in the words of Blunt, "the first stage towards a national parliament."15 In 1870, under the guidance of Mahadev Govind Ranade, Sarvajanik Sabha was established. In 1885, Pherozesha Mehta, K.T. Telang and Badruddin Tyabji formed the Bombay Presidency Association to inform the government about the popular views of the people. Such provincial political activities had prepared the ground for the creation of a national political organization which would embrace the whole of India and bring together into one body. The several provincial associations and politically conscious individuals scattered over the country came together for 'the cause of national progress'.16 Conditions were ripe for the establishment of a national platform for the genuine demands and requirements of the Indian people.
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Second Phase: This phase of nationalism roughly covered the period from 1885 to 1905. The social basis of the movement was extended during this period to the educated middle class which, by the end of the 19th century, had appreciably grown as a result of the expansion of modern education.

In 1884, Hume, in consultation with the Indian leaders, launched the scheme of the ‘Indian National Union’ with the three objects:

(a) the fusion into one national whole of all the different elements that constitute the population of India;

(b) the gradual regeneration along all lines, spiritual, moral, social and political, of the nation thus evolved; and

(c) the consolidation of the union between England and India, by securing of the modification of such of its conditions as may be unjust or injurious".17

In this way, it is clear from the objective of Hume that India should be given proper place in the English common wealthship as the Cecil Rhodes intended. Besides, the demands of the Congress were couched in the phraseology of importunity and prayer rather than defiance or challenge except to ask for fundamental constitutional changes. By 1888, the attitude of

government had completely changed and did not bother even to
know the genuine and honest feelings of early nationalists.\textsuperscript{18}

The character of the imperialism and attitude of the British government is clear from the lines of Hobson, an uncompromising critic of imperialism: "We have established a wider and more permanent internal peace than India had ever known from the days of Alexander the Great. We have raised the standard of justice by fair and equal administration of laws; we have regulated and probably reduced the burden of taxation, checking of corruption and tyranny of native princes and their publicans. For the instruction of the people we have introduced a public system of schools and colleges, as well as a great quasi-public missionary establishment, teaching not only the Christian religion but many industrial arts. Roads, railways, and a network of canals have facilitated. Communication and transport, and an extensive system of scientific irrigation has improved the productiveness of the soil, the mining of coal, gold and other minerals has been greatly developed, in Bombay and elsewhere cotton mills with modern machinery have been setup and the organization of other machine industries is helping to find employment for the population of large cities. Tea, coffee, indigo, jute, tobacco and other important crops have been introduced into Indian agriculture. We have gradually breaking down many of the religious and social superstitions which sin against humanity and retard progress, and even the deeply rooted caste system is
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modified wherever the British influence is felt19 "Imperialism and popular government have nothing in common: they differ in spirit, in policy, in method."20

As these lines show, there was a strong imperialistic feeling even among the liberal circles of England. On the one side, the ideas of democracy and freedom inspired internal, social and political reforms and became embodied in parliamentary reforms, humanization of criminal laws, growth of education etc; and in the field of foreign and imperial politics, liberal sentiments promoted the formation of groups like the 'colonial Reformers', the 'Separatists' and the 'Little Englanders'.21 But on the other side, the nineteenth century was also the period of the greatest expansion of imperial domination. The government of India was thus shorn of all power to take final decisions in legislative, financial and administrative matters by the assertion of supreme authority by an almost irresistible Secretary of State for India who had ordinarily no direct experience of Indian affairs.22

In India, the government was surrounded by such elements which were largely reactionary and restrictive. Under these circumstances, it was almost impossible for the government of India to plan any long-term policy for dealing with the new and undoubtedly complex problems of a changing India. It was clearly expressed in the report of 'Constitutional Reforms (1918)':
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"Parliament's omission to institute regular means of reviewing the Indian administration is as much responsible as many single cause for our failure in the face of growing nationalist feeling in India, to think out and to workout a policy of continuous advance".23

The racial superiority was also one of the reasons to widen the gulf between Indian nationalists and Britishers. As is shown by the letter of Sir Charles Wood to Lord Elgin dated 26 June, 1862, "I hear that our officers are not so hospitable and kind to the natives (as they were before the mutiny)... that we are sinking in the estimation of the natives as superior race, as gentlemen, and with the qualities of English gentlemen."24

The general psychological sentiments created by the behaviour of the members of the British community in India received substance and force from two sets of grievance. One was the economic policy of the government and the other was its refusal to respond to the political aspirations of the people of India. The most important subject of debate between the educated classes of India and the ruling power was the demand for their share in government of their own country and the establishment of representative institutions.25 The impartial observers of the contemporary ruling class expressed doubt about the permanency of British rule in India. Cobden an Irish nationalist explicitly expressed his lack of faith in the power of England to govern India at all permanently. His opinion was that "the attempt to govern the

hundreds of millions of Asiatics by the crown under the control of Parliament was bound to fail……Hindustan must be ruled by those who live on that side of the globe.”

In every session, Congress continued to pass the resolutions demanding the reform and expansion of the supreme and existing provincial legislative councils by the admission of a considerable proportion of elected members as essential which was not acceptable to the British government. Therefore, rulers started misguiding the Muslims by creating confusion about such demand of the Congress like representative institutions.27

Principal Theodore Beck of the M.A.O. College, Aligarh and the political adviser to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, pointed out four reasons which formed insurmountable obstacles to the success of representative institutions. He thought that the demand of the representative government by the Indian National Congress would be pseudo-representative, representing only the English educated class, ‘a species of oligarchy giving complete supremacy to a class forming a minute percentage of the population.’ At the instigation of Beck, a movement was started among the educated Muslims to oppose the demand of representative government.28 The argument was that India was not a nation and that in a representative form of government, the Hindu majority would oppress the Muslim minority and therefore, it was in the Muslims’ interest that
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administrative power should remain in the hands of the Europeans.\textsuperscript{29}

However, nationalist Muslims like Badruddin Tyabji exhorted their fellows to accompany the Hindus on the path of movement. On the eve of the formation of the Bombay Presidency Association on 31 January, 1885, he gave expression to his political opinions in the following words: "It is, I think, with the nations as with individuals that with the growth of political life, new aspirations arise, and those aspirations require an organization to give them due expression and the organization in its turn watches, regulates, develops and directs national aspirations."\textsuperscript{30}
The efforts of British bureaucracy, Syed Ahmed Khan and his associates were instrumental in creating gulf between both the communities in the country. Commenting on such developments, Tyabji exhorted: "we have awakened to a sense of our political rights and the destructions of race, colour and creed, which have so long and unfavourably divided us, have at last disappeared under the softening and enlightening influences of education."\textsuperscript{31}

When the Indian National Congress met at Bombay in December 1885, Tyabji not only supported the Congress but took pain to repudiate the charge of the London Times that the Muslims of Bombay had kept aloof. To see the response of the nationalist Muslims towards the Congress, feelers were thrown out by the
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Historical Background

governor of Bombay, Lord Reay, to dissuade the Muslims from supporting the congress.\footnote{32}{Dr. Tarachand, History of Freedom Movement in India, Vol.II, p.388.} Of course, there were differences in India. It is also a fact that originally there was no bond of patriotic sentiment which held the people in the same territory together and that Indians allowed themselves to be used as tools for their own destruction. At first, the Hindus and Muslims, princes and chiefs, and after their overthrow, the two communities played the game of the imperialist masters. In the period immediately following the revolt of 1857, and even during the Viceroyalty of Lord Mayo, the Hindus remained the favourites of the government. Their share in the revolt was condoned whereas the Muslims were regarded as the chief enemies of the British rule.\footnote{33}{See Hunter, W.W., The Indian Mussalmans (London, 1876).}

Then the pendulum began to swing the other side. The Hindu resurgence, which founded expression in the movements of socio-religious reform, renaissance in the literature, revival of the memories of the glorious past, rising nationalism in the Hindu intelligentsia, which demanded the removal of political grievances through the press as well as organized agitation, puzzled and annoyed the authorities. So the government reverted to its patronage. Muslim leaders like Syed Ahmed Khan, Ameer Ali and Abdul Latif Khan were exerting themselves to remove British suspicions and propagate loyalty among the Muslims. Sir John Strachey confessed that, "the truth plainly is that the existence of
these hostile creeds side by side is one of the strongest points in our political position in India.”

**Third Phase:** This phase of freedom movement started from 1905 and continued till 1918. In this period, the liberals were supplanted by the extremists as the leaders of the nationalist movement. In spite of the strong repression by the government, the nationalist movement registered an all-round advancement. The new-found pride in the past of India had given the class self-assurance and a sense of dignity and it discovered in India’s traditions some of great values of life which provided it with an anchor which held the past.

In 1905, the partition of Bengal opened a new phase in the relations between the Hindu and Muslim communities. Till 1905, there was no Muslim political but later on, schools emerged. One school was headed by the upper class Muslims of northern India largely tended to gravitate towards the Aligarh movement and the views of Syed Ahmed Khan. The second was represented by the Deoband School and Ulema who were not trained in the institutions of western education.

The most remarkable characteristic of this phase is the emergence of extremism which instilled a feeling of national self-respect and self-confidence among the people. They did not look to the British for political freedom as counselled by the liberals but relied on their own strength for achieving it. Undeterred by official
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antagonism, the political movement continued together in strength and grew in volume. Congress was stick to her old system of functioning.\(^{37}\) Such were the disturbed conditions when disappointed at the hands of the government, Hume decided to appeal to the nation, “so that every Indian that breathes upon the sacred soil of this our motherland may become our comrade and coadjutor, our supporter, and if needs be our soldier, in the great war that we, like Cobden and his noble band, will wage for justice, for our liberties and rights.”\(^{38}\)

This was a resolve to step out of the limitations of the Congress methods and carry the political agitation throughout the length and breadth of the country. The need for propaganda outside India and especially in England had already been recognized in 1889 when the British Committee of the Congress in England was set-up with William Wedderburn as Chairman, William Digby as secretary, and Dadabhai Naoroji and a number of Englishmen its members.\(^{39}\)

The initiative taken by these leaders alongwith Hume was exploited by nationalist leaders like Tilak and Aurobindo Ghose. Aurobindo exposed the inadequacies of the methods pursued so far by the Congress in a series of articles which he wrote for the 'Indu Prakash' in 1893 under the title ‘New Lamps for old’. The incarceration of Tilak sent a wave of resentment and condemnation against the government throughout India. As indicated by the
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Bengalee: “He loses nothing in the estimation of his countrymen. In their eyes, he will come out of his prison without a stain. His sufferings will only have enhanced his popularity and added to his powers for serving his countrymen…. In the attempt to put down disaffection, they have produced the widest disaffection throughout the country.”

Besides this, Curzon’s officialisation of the Calcutta Corporation and the Universities, his charge of untruthfulness against the Indian educated classes, his declaration that Indians were unequal to the responsibilities of high offices, his contemptuous references to the Indian National Congress and above all, his highhanded action in forcing the Partition of Bengal against the will of the people, were measures which not only earned unpopularity for him personally but irrevocably alienated a great section of the educated classes from the British rule. But the Partition of Bengal increased the intensity of extremism and dissatisfaction. It also affected the proceedings of Banares Congress held in 1905. Even the resolution for extending welcome to the Prince of Wales was opposed. Besides, Congress passed two resolutions: one, to record its emphatic protest against the Partition of Bengal and the other was, to protest against the repressive measures.
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In order to rouse the Muslims against the anti-partition movement, Bamfylde Fuller, Lt. Governor of newly created province – East Bengal and Assam undertook a tour of the Province in November 1905. Morley’s formula for governing India was – unflattering repression on the one hand; and vigour and good faith in reform on the other. He recognized that Partition had gone wholly and decisively against the wishes of most of the people concerned. He also differed from the theory that the agitation was the work of a handful of wire-pullers and agitators. As far as Minto was concerned, he eagerly established contacts with the Moderate Congress leaders. He brought into operation the policy of ‘repression-cum-concession’. He was convinced that the educated class which was represented by the Congress was unfit for self-government but it was useful as an advisory body. Their speeches and writings clearly expressed the mentality of contemporary ruling class for the partition at that time.

The Swadeshi and boycott movements were treated as seditious, anti-British and anti-Muslim. The meetings of protest and propaganda were disallowed; orders were put in force to stop shouting of the Bande Matram and to prohibit students from attending meetings or joining processions. Anti-British feelings of the people and confronting the attitude of the rulers created the ground to be shot into prominence for the more advanced leaders like Ashwani Kumar Dutt, Bipin Chandra Pal, Brahma Bandhab
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Upadhyaya and Aurobindo Ghose who replaced the moderates in the peoples’ favour.46

The 1905 session of the Congress was held when the new dispensation – Minto-Morley combine- had just commenced. The older leaders became apprehensive of this tendency (boycott and swadeshi) of extremism. In their opinion, British guidance was still necessary till the country was fully capable of self-government while the extremist had already decided their final goal as Swaraj.47

The struggle against the foreign rule became visible when the Indian youth resorted to violence. This group of Indian youth is known as revolutionaries who founded the secret organizations in order to carry out their plans. Individuals and small groups had resorted to such methods even before. The Sandhya and Yugantar, Bande Mataram and other prominent papers of Calcutta, preached the gospel of ‘blood and fire’, and ‘force must be stopped by force.’48

While propagandist activities through public meetings and press were proceeding with accelerated pace and massive demonstrations solely based on the patriotic sentiments. The liberals became apprehensive lest boycott stiffen the attitude of government and strengthen the hands of the opponents of reform. Therefore, they disapproved of the passing of the boycott
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resolution at the Calcutta session of Congress in 1906. In order to avert the possibility of the extremists swaying the Congress and obtaining control over the organization and to checkmate the endeavour of the extremists to commit the Congress to their programmes, they (liberals) invited Dadabhai Naoroji. But they (liberals) could not resist the flow and blow of extremists who had to declare, "the boycott movement inaugurated in Bengal by way of protest against the partition was and is legitimate."

This movement created a new and embracing situation not only for the liberals but also for the government. It gave a blow to the prestige of the rulers. A government note complained, "the general attitude of the Bengal became insolent and aggressive." In the tug of war which continued throughout the year, the moderate leaders like Gokhale, Pherozeshah Mehta, S.N. Banerjea, Madan Mohan Malviya and others were pitted against Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh, B.C. Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai and their associates. The two sides exerted themselves to the utmost for obtaining control over the most important political organization of India which commanded not only the homage of nationalist India but also recognized by the government as an important factor in Indian politics. It could not be disregarded at any cost. As in the word of Aurobindo Ghosh, "he wanted to capture the Congress and to make it an instrument for revolutionary action."

Since 1905, if not earlier, many revolutionary organisations like Annusilan samiti, Yugantar Group, Abhinav Bharat society, Bharatmata Society etc. were established in several parts of India. In the early stages, their main function was physical, moral training and national service. Englishmen in the past used to taunt the Bengalis that they were the race of weaklings, cowardly, garrulous and lacking in manly virtues and without a sense of responsibility. These societies were brought into existence to refute the charges of the detractors. Among the acts and ordinances passed by the colonial masters were noteworthy for rousing and strengthening the extremist and revolutionary activities in India.53

The Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act, 1907; The Explosive Substance Act, 1908; the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908; The Newspapers (Incitement and Offences) Act, 1908; and the Press Act, 1910 were meant to suppress the rising tide of the nationalist movement.54

This phase of freedom is also known for widening the gulf between two main communities of India e.g. Hindu and Muslim. At the turn of the 19th Century both the middle class Hindus and Muslims had become conscious of their in-group integrity and their out-group diversity.

Having reached the stage of community, political forces pushed them into the next stage in social evolution, namely nationality. This transformation was accelerated in the early years
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of the twentieth century. The factors which brought it about were both negative and positive. The communal consequences of the partition were that the Muslim community realized that it was a majority in a defined region, which provided a territorial base for an incipient nationalism. This helped in the evolution of the sense of Muslim nationality. The Hindu and Muslim separation was accentuated. The Muslim population was thoroughly aroused and a new factor had been introduced into history which was bound to affect the future not only of the province but of the whole of India.

It is interesting to note that the Muslim leaders referred only to services, memberships of councils and university education, and the main interests of the upper class only. They made no mention of the vicious land revenue policies, the discrimination against Indian industries, the neglect of the education of masses. They seemed to be fully unaware of the miserable plight of the large number of the Muslim peasants, workers and artisans. Minto succeeded in the policy of detaching an important section of the Muslim community from the danger of joining the Congress and strengthening the cause of national unity.

But the annulment of the Partition of Bengal changed the attitude of Muslim leadership toward British government. Lucknow Pact was the result of this changed attitude and was an
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emphatic refutation of the theories that agreement between Hindus and Muslims was not possible under any circumstance because of their habitual, cultural, religious differences. Another reason for agreement was that the nationalist leaders like Jinnah, Ansari, Muhammad Ali, Mazumdar, S.N. Banerjea, Motilal Nehru, Gandhi and Tilak had the same terms of likeness e.g. home rule, responsible government, and constitutional amendment on their tongue.\textsuperscript{58} But this agreement could not serve the national movement for a long time because the Muslim opinion became divided on the issue of Turkey to take part in First World War in the support of Britain or remain neutral.

Some considered it their duty to remain loyal to the government and help it in the war. Others were concerned with the future of the Ottoman Caliph. They had rushed to this aid during the Balkan wars. Now, they began to devise plans in support of Turkey. Muslim leaders of various streams like Mahmud Al Hasan (Deoband), Abdul Bari (Lucknow) and Ali brothers sent agents to the Frontier Province, Afghanistan and Arabia a view to inducing the Turks to advance, with the assistance of Germany towards India. This would rise in their favour and help to overthrow the British yoke. The triumph of the German arms on the western expedition to Gallipoli and the campaign in Mesopotamia raised their hopes high.\textsuperscript{59}
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In India, they exerted their influence to bring about changes in the objects of the Muslim League. Their success was noteworthy, as the League was to embrace the Congress offer of mutual cooperation in fighting the common enemy. Lucknow Pact signed by both the organizations was the result of their concerted efforts.

Besides Liberals and extremists, there were revolutionaries who came into existence during this period with approximately common objective i.e. to overthrow British rule but with different methods of fighting. Draconian laws passed against the press and public meetings changed the character of movement and it went underground. The revolutionaries took to the pursuit of violent activities like bomb-throwing and dacoity. Outside the country, revolutionary activities were organized in England, France, Germany and the United State of America etc. during the First World War. They also moved into Switzerland, Germany, Turkey and other countries of Middle East in order to create anti-British feelings there.

The first phase of the terrorist movement in Bengal had come to an end with the close of the Maniktola Garden Case which was tried in Alipore Jail. During the trial, two young accused killed the approver in the jail compound and were hanged. The leader of the group, Barinder Kumar Ghosh, with others, was sentenced to transportation for life, and several others received various terms of imprisonment by the judgment of the court on 6 May, 1909. The
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prosecution and punishment of these young men, however, had little effect on the secret revolutionary activities. There were 110 cases of dacoity and robbery between 1906 and 1917.\textsuperscript{62}

Besides Bengal, Punjab and Maharashtra also figured prominently in revolutionary activities. Sikhs from the U.S.A. and Europe had returned to India to propagate these activities especially through rebellion in Army. The revolutionaries also targeted those Indians who served the cause of British imperialism. They were regarded as treacherous enemies of India. They were of the opinion that by the assassination of individuals, they would be able to demoralize government servants and paralyse the administration in the country.\textsuperscript{63}

The terrorist movement in India concerned itself with secret conspiracy and individual action. But the Indian revolutionaries abroad, though not averse to such methods, came to realize that the liberation of India was not attainable that way and therefore they began to plan an armed rising in which soldiers and fire-arms would be employed. In order to obtain the armed-rising, the Indian troops had to be approached their loyalty transferred from their British masters to the cause of their country’s freedom.\textsuperscript{64}

So far as the second was concerned, arms had to be procured by purchase from arm dealers from countries hostile to Britain and possibly by raiding armouries in the country or sending the
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advocates of armed revolution to pursue their plans in countries outside India.\textsuperscript{65}

Indian revolutionaries knew the history of the European revolutionaries which inspired their activities and successes. They regarded England as the refuge of all those at war with foreign or native oppressors. The Indian students or businessmen who resided in Europe came into contact with each other and with the revolutionaries of various countries. The Indians of an earlier generation like Dadabhai Naoroji, Surender Nath Banerjea, Aurobindo Ghosh and other owed much of their élan for India’s emancipation through the world public opinion.\textsuperscript{66}

The first organized attempt to establish a centre for training, propaganda and political action was made by Shyamji Krishan Varma at London. After gaining bad experience of British residents in the Darbar of Indian States through the tour of various native states, he turned his mind and began to have dream of India’s independence. Therefore, he went to England in 1897 where he found to some extent congenial atmosphere. He established the ‘Home Rule Society’ in 1905.\textsuperscript{67} He then opened a centre for study and propaganda in London, called the ‘India House’. A monthly journal ‘The Indian Sociologist’ was also started. Lal Hardayal, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, Madame
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Bhikaji Cama, S.R. Rana and Madan Lal Dhingra were the main personalities active in London.\(^\text{68}\)

The teachings of Shyamji Krishan Varma laid emphasis on peaceful civil resistance which anticipated some of the programmes of Gandhiji who did not approve of violence. V.D. Savarkar, under the guidance of Bal Ganga Dhar Tilak and his elder brother Ganesh Savarkar, organised a society which was later transformed into the Abhinava Bharat Society on the model of the Anusilan Samiti of Bengal.\(^\text{69}\) In the meanwhile, British Government after receiving informations regarding the activities of the India House began to take steps to suppress them. Shyamji alongwith Madam Cama and S.R. Rana shifted their headquarters to Paris. They sent their members to learn the manufacturing of bombs and smuggle them into India. Besides, Hardayal also left India and went to France, U.S.A. and then to the Western-Cost of America. There he found the Indian emigrants, mostly Sikhs, very much agitated and converted Hindu (Indian) Association into Gadar Party to give secular colour to the movement.\(^\text{70}\)

When the I World War brokeout, some of them including Hardayal transferred their base of activities to Germany and sought the aid of the German Government in the liberation of India. The German foreign office in its keenness to threaten the British Empire in East encouraged them with money and other facilities including arms. The Indian revolutionaries organised the Indian

---
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Independence Committee in Berlin. The Committee planned schemes to initiate propaganda work in U.S.A., India, the near East and other countries to recruit troops and ambulance units of Indians in Europe.\textsuperscript{71} It rendered help to Germans in disseminating anti-British propaganda, to incite rebellion among the troops in India, to train experts in explosives, to induce the Indian prisoners of war to renounce British allegiance. They wanted to send arms to India and to do all that was necessary to bring about the downfall of the British Empire.\textsuperscript{72}

In 1915, Hardayal went to Constantinople where he met A. Enver Pasha. About this time Deoband school leaders sent a number of Punjabi Muslim youths to the North-Western Frontier to work among the tribals. Obaidullah Sindhi was sent to Kabul where he tried to win over the Amir of Afghanistan. Mahmud Al Hasan and Husain Ahmad Madni went to Arabia and met the Turkish officers (Ghalib and Enver Pasha) there. From Berlin Mahendra Pratap and Barakatullah arrived in Kabul with some German officers.\textsuperscript{73} They founded a Provisional Government of India with Mahendra Pratap as the President of the republic, Barakatullah as Prime Minister. However, they failed in their mission out of them Mahmud Al Hasan and his companions were handed over to the British rulers who kept them as prisoners in Malta. The disasters which befell the German arms scattered the
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Indian revolutionaries. Hardayal left Germany and took shelter in Sweden.\textsuperscript{74}

Germans made great efforts to export large quantities of weapons to Indian from the U.S.A., by way of Honolulu, Shanghai, Batavia, Singapore, the Andaman Islands to ports in Orissa but none of them succeeded due to alertness of the British navy and the ineptitude of the Germans. An offshoot of the revolutionary activities abroad was the Kamagata Maru case. Around 1914, however, the national movement was at a low ebb because the moderate politicians had lost their appeal to the public; the extremist leaders were scattered to the four winds; some ones like Tilak were withering in jails; others like Bipin Chandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai had gone into self-imposed exile and were keeping up the fight from their distant bases in England and U.S.A.\textsuperscript{75}

Revolutionary activities from the anti-partition agitation to the First World War had changed the outlook of younger generation from mendicancy to militancy and spread from Bengal, Punjab and Maharashtra to new regions like U.P., Bihar, Orissa, Madras, and Gujrat. Annie Besant who entered politics in 1914 and Tilak, who was released from jail in the middle of the year, formed their Home Rule Leagues in order to use the energy of their emerging strength for the noble Indian cause. With the adoption of the Home Rule League objective of self-government on the model of the government of Dominions, a great stimulus was given to the movement. Almost all the emerging provincial leaders of various

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ibid.}
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thoughts joined Besant's Home Rule League. She brought "new ideas, new resources and altogether a new method of organization".76

Immediately after the return from Mandalay, Tilak tried his best to organize all the emerging youths in his Home Rule League. But Tilak very soon realized that for the success of the struggle, it was necessary to cooperate not only with the Congress but with Muslim League also. And he succeeded in convincing the other extremist leaders about the benefit of cooperation of both the communities to fight against the foreign rule.77 In this way, the United Congress and the Muslim League came together and passed resolutions to the effect that the time had come when the King-Emperor should be pleased to issue a proclamation announcing that it was the aim and intention of British policy to confer self-government on India at an early date.78

The I World War was the result of economic rivalries and competition for colonial expression among the European powers. Tilak and Gandhiji supported the Government by declaring that, "at such a crisis it is the duty of every Indian, be he great or small, rich or poor, to support and assist His Majesty's government to the best of this ability." Gandhiji became a self-appointed recruiting sergeant for the Army. But Muslims were unhappy at the attitude of the Western powers, especially Britain, towards Turkey. The other sections of society – the princes, landlords, merchants and
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non-political classes, vied with each other in joining the chorus of loyalty.79

The loyalty and cooperation of Indians in war effort surprised the British people and the British statesman. Prime Minister, Asquith, acknowledged that “in all the moving exhibitions of national and imperial patriotism which the war had evoked, there was none which had more touched the feelings of the British people than the magnificent response which the princes and the people of India had made to their need.”80 But after the war, rulers completely ignored the expectations of those who sacrificed everything for the cause of Britain and her Empire. Therefore, reaction of political parties naturally was one of disappointment and dissatisfaction. However, they were not yet prepared to break with the rulers.81

There were two factors which were agitating the Indian mindset. One was the effect of external events – the aggression of European powers against Muslim countries, and the treatment of Indians by the whites in the Dominions. The other was the hostile attitude of the government of India towards the Indian demands for self-government. On 10 December, 1917, the government appointed a committee, “to investigate and report on the nature and extent of criminal conspiracy connected with the revolutionary
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movement in India and to advise as to the legislation necessary to deal effectively with them."  

Fourth Phase: This phase is marked by the participation of every section of society up to the grass-root level and is known as 'Gandhian Era'. As a result of the great upheaval which began in 1918, all parties in India came to realize that the main issue before them was the attainment of Swaraj. They were no more interested in the idea of progress by stages towards self-government separated by intervals of unknown between nationalist and communalist parties in this matter.  

One striking development during this phase was that the nationalist movement gained a broad mass basis and added to its arsenal the weapon of direct mass action. Wrong doings through Rowlatt Act and Jalianwala Bagh massacre furiated the every Indian mind in 1919. Besides, the revolutionary terrorists were severely suppressed during World War I, with most of their leaders either in jail or absconding. Consequently, in order to create a more harmonious atmosphere for the Montague-Chelmsford reforms, the government released most of them under a general amnesty in early 1920. But all these measures could not deterred Congress and League from starting Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movement in which most of the revolutionary terrorists took part and gave up their own activities on the urging of Gandhiji and C.R. Das.

83. *Ibid*.
The sudden suspension of the Non-Cooperation Movement shattered the high hopes raised earlier. Many young people began to question the very basic strategy of the national leadership and its emphasis on non-violence and began to look for alternatives. They were not attracted by the parliamentary politics of the Swarajists or the patient and undramatic constructive work of the no-changers. Many were drawn to the idea that violent methods alone would free India. It is not accidental that nearly all the major new leaders of the revolutionary-terrorist politics, for example, Jogesh Chandra Chaterjee, Surya Sen, Jatin Das, Chandrashekhar Azad, Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev, Shiv Varma, Bhagwati Charan Vohra, and Jaidev Kapoor etc. had been enthusiastic participants in the non-violent Non-Cooperation Movement.  

Gradually two separate strands of revolutionary terrorism developed – one in Punjab, U.P., and Bihar and the other was in Bengal. Both the strands came under the influence of several new social forces. One was the upsurge of working class trade unionism after the war. The second major influence was that of the Russian revolution. The politics of the revolutionary terrorists had severe limitations – above all theirs was not the politics of a mass movement; they failed to politically activate the masses or move them into political actions. They could not even establish contact with the masses. All the same, they made an abiding contribution to the freedom movement. Their deep patriotism, courage, determination and sense of sacrifice stirred the Indian people. They
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helped in spreading the nationalist consciousness in India. In northern India, the spread of socialist consciousness owed a lot to them.86

There was a mixed response of Muslims towards non-cooperation movement. According to the biographer of Jinnah: "The Muslims were mainly concerned about the Khilafat question to settle for which they were inclined to be even militant. To them the questions of Swaraj (etc.) were of secondary nature."87 But Jinnah speaking at the Muslim League meeting at Lahore in 1924, said, "we must not forget that one essential requisite condition to achieve Swaraj is the political unity between the Hindus and the Mohammadans. I am almost inclined to say that India will get Dominion responsible government, the day the Hindus and Muslims are united."88

After the withdrawal of Non-Cooperation and arrest of Mahatma Gandhi, alongwith the regeneration of revolutionary and terrorist tendencies, fissiparous tendencies also surfaced due to two factors: the endeavour of the Government to repair the damage done to British-Muslim friendship by advertising its support to the claim of Turkey, and the measures of the Turkish leaders in regard to the caliphate. Some Muslims began to think that more could be achieved through the goodwill of the government than through suffering and sacrifice at the call of the Congress and the Khilafat Conference. The dismal tale of savagery which disgraced the

history of the years between 1921 to 1929 baffles all description. To overcome the doubts and apprehensions both the Hindu and Muslim leaders made earnest efforts. Unfortunately they failed. As Gandhiji later realized, “the presence of their party made the task almost impossible.”\(^89\)

These fissiparous tendencies of both the communities and failure of their leaders to overcome these tendencies augmented the morale of rulers and therefore government formed a purely white body commission amidst the protests by Indians. The Indian reactions to the statutory commission report had three aspects:\(^90\)

(i) of resentment and negation which inspired the boycott of the commission, the demonstration of protest, and the Styagraha movement;

(ii) of positive endeavour to remove communal differences; and

(iii) of constructive response to the challenge of producing an Indian constitution.

But these aspects were not fruitful to the cause of nation and society. Society witnessed very dangerous riots in various parts of the country. These riots were an indication of the distrust which inevitably followed the failure of the joint endeavour to achieve their common aims.

---

This phase also witnessed the bifurcation of Congress party between no-changers and pro-changers or Swarajists. It lost the will to pursue direct action, and withdraw from the political arena to carry on social upliftment work and economic organization. Later on, Swarajist split into two factions – the Swarajists, who were against the acceptance of office and the Responsivists who were in favour of cooperation with the government and holding ministerial and other appointments.\footnote{Gupta, D.C., \textit{Indian National Movement} (Delhi, 1970), pp.113-114.}

Muslim leadership also suffered from the ideological differences e.g. traditionalists and modernists. During the Khilafat movement, the first groups throw itself into the agitation in full strength. The Ulema were the life and soul of the Khilafat agitation and were dead supporters of the Non-Cooperation Movement. Modern educated men had also accepted the lead of the Ulema. Muslim League which was the organ of the English-educated middle class Muslims and the propertied upper classes was left out in the cold during the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movement.\footnote{Home (Deptt.) Poll. B, July 1924, pp.6-9.}

In 1924, the Khilafat leaders lost the leadership of the community and the Muslim League sprang into life again under the fostering care of Jinnah. At the same time, other groups were formed, e.g., the All-India Muslim Conference, the Ahrars, the Khaksars, the Khudai Khidmatgars. In this way, Muslim leadership again detached from the mainstream of freedom movement. According to the biographer of Jinnah, “The Muslims were mainly
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concerned about the Khilafat question to settle which they were inclined to be even militant. To them the questions of Swaraj were of secondary nature.”

Hindu communalism received impetus from these developments. The Hindu Mahasabha which gathered strength, began to attract a number of Congress leaders and started the movement of reclamation – reconversion (Sudhi) and solidarity (Sangathan). The Hindu and the Muslim communalisms competed with each others and succeeded in spreading the poison of hatred and fear through the length and breadth of the country. They found vent in frequent bloody clashes, arson, loot and violence.

While the rulers in denying self-government to India took their stand on the inner conflicts and diversities of the Indian people, the Indian nationalists justified their demand for independence on the obvious failure of the rulers, to provide remedies, for their removal. In these circumstances, the unavoidable tug of war between the two was bound to ensue. The Government of India Act, 1935, was but an incident in this continuing struggle. Rulers felt that the flood of demands could not be kept behind the wall of the denial perpetually.

The economic and political interests of imperialism counseled otherwise. To serve their interests, rulers started to befriend the minorities, accentuate their differences with the majority, incite their distrust and fear of the majority, and thus
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attracting them to the coat-tails of the rulers. But just when the constitution came into existence, England was confronted with an even more devastating crisis, namely, the internal threat created by the ambitions of Hitler. While in England anti-war feeling was growing. India which in recent times had occupied a great deal of the attention of British Parliament fell into the background as the European scene assumed rapidly increasing somberness.

In the field of politics, the position was deplorable. The British rulers had prepared a constitution for India which the political parties had either totally rejected or reluctantly acquiesced in. Yet the Viceroy was coaxing the party leaders to accept it by assurances of cooperation. He told the Legislative Assembly on 21 September, 1936: “My heartfelt plea to every men and women of goodwill and public spirit is that they may give these reforms a fair and reasonable trial, and that they will join with me and with the Governors of Provinces in an earnest endeavour to work the new constitution, for the honour and good of their motherhood.”

Congress accepted to take part in elections but kept away from expressing any type of opinion on accepting or not accepting office after elections. The elections were over and Congressmen were legitimately jubilant over their success. The claim of the party which stood for complete independence from foreign rule and immediate termination of the benevolent government of the self-appointed trustees of India was fully vindicated by the people. But the immediate problem before Congress was whether to accept

office or not because party leaders were not unanimous on this issue. Jawahar Lal Nehru in his presidential address at Lucknow urged with great vehemence the outright rejection of office. He urged that under the Act, Indians would have responsibilities without power, and even the responsibilities, which were transferred, were hedged with undemocratic safeguards and reserved powers and mortgaged funds. He expressed his words: “I am convinced that for the Congress to favour the acceptance of office, or even to hesitate and waver about it, would be a vital error. It will be a pit from which it would be difficult for us to come out.”96

The All-India Congress Committee which met at Delhi on 17 and 18 March, 1937 resolved: “The All-India Congress Committee authorizes and permits the acceptance of office in provinces where the Congress commands a majority in the Legislature.”97 Congress and League differences accentuated over the formation and sharing of ministry in U.P. One among the many reasons which had been advanced to explain why the Congress League negotiations failed in U.P. was that Jawaharlal, who was directing the election campaign in U.P., revoked his agreement with Khaliquzzaman that two Leaguers would be included in the ministry, and offered only one post. The League could not accept the change, and the offer of cooperation broke down.98

The Muslim League, which till 1937 adhered to the idea of one country, one nation and one state insisted that the Muslim community should be recognized as a sub-nationality possessing its own culture, language, religion, traditions and personal laws which involved separate political interests and hence constitutional safeguards. Amidst these fissiparous circumstances Congress again faced the tendencies of ideological differences within its fold. On the question of acceptance of office, Congressmen had been divided at start. One group supported by Gandhiji favoured acceptance, the other group led by Jawaharlal opposed. But when in March 1937, Jawaharlal yielded, the first group searched for a new leader. 99

Suhash Bose though young had already achieved national level reputation. Since his entry into politics in 1921 under the fostering care of C.R. Das, he had suffered many imprisonments and exile. But he possessed a highly resilient nature and was independent of mind, and stubborn of will. It had been never possible for him to swim with the current. He had disagreed with Gandhiji when he suspended the Non-Cooperation Movement in 1922 when it was on its peak. Again in 1928, he differed from the Congress policy and its methods of resisting the government. In 1933, he was in Vienna undergoing treatment when he heard of the withdrawal of mass civil disobedience movement by Gandhiji. He became extremely annoyed and felt very sore. He considered the

decision as an object surrender and in anger exclaimed, “Gandhiji is an old, useless piece of furniture.”100

Bose agreed with Bismark, “No real change in history has ever been achieved by discussion. But the only alternative is war: what of it? India can well afford to bring a blood sacrifice for her liberation; 350 million miserable lives are waiting for deliverance.”101

In 1935, he expressed his political views in his autobiography The Indian Struggle written in exile and published in London, but it was proscribed in India. Next ear in April, he returned to India where he was immediately arrested on landing at Bombay. He was interned in his brother’s house in Calcutta, but was later on released. Bose was a born rebel and emotionally a dissenter. He believed that “the future of India lay with those radical and militant forces that will be able to undergo the sacrifice and suffering necessary for winning freedom.”102

Besides having so much difference with the main principles of Congress, he was the unanimous choice as the President of the Congress in 1938. However, Gandhiji desired to install him in the high office with the belief that the responsibilities of office and organization would moderate his extremist ardour. But Bose had in his mind a plan of struggle in the existed circumstances which was not acceptable to the Gandhian camp.

101. Ibid., p.37.
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There was a lot of stir and turmoil in the circles of Congress leadership. A variety of ideas had spread among Congressmen. Some professed faith in the Gandhian ideology, in the ancient traditions and ideals of India, some were attracted by the new concepts of the West-Socialism, Communism, Fascism. There were others who wished to combine Eastern and Western social ideals but the conservatives did not favour any radical transformation. After electing to the office of President of the Congress, S.C. Bose declared his policy on the eve of the session in these words: "My term of office as the Congress President will be devoted to resist the unwanted features, with all its undemocratic, anti-national features, with all the peaceful and legitimate powers, including non-violent, non-cooperation, if necessary, and to strengthen the country’s determination to resist this scheme."\textsuperscript{103}

During his year of Presidentship, he organised the National Planning Committee of which Jawaharlal Nehru was made Chairman. His policy of large-scale industrialization and stiffening of opposition against compromise with Britain "caused annoyance in Gandhian circles who were then looking forward to an understanding with the British government."\textsuperscript{104}

It is true that attempts were being made to come to a settlement with the government concerning the early establishment of the federal structure. Gandhiji met Linlithgow on April 6, 1938 and told him that he attached utmost importance to the formula which he had indicated to Lothian. Acceptance of it, he regarded it
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as the real test whether or not were denying India complete sovereignty but Gandjiji got the impression that he would accept federation, if some larger states introduced principle of popular choice.105 After the ‘Munich Pact’ in September 1938, Bose began “an open propaganda throughout India in order to prepare the Indian people for a national struggle which would synchronise with the coming war in Europe.”106

Thus the breach between Bose and Gandhian camp of the Congress continued to grow. The result was that Gandhi opposed the candidature of Bose, while he renominated himself for this post and this time as the spokesperson of militant politics and radical groups. Putting forward his candidature on 21 January, 1939, Bose said that he represented the new ideas, ideology, problems and programmes that had emerged with ‘the progressive sharpening of the anti-imperialistic struggle in India.’ The Presidential elections, he said, should be fought among different candidates ‘on the basis of definite problems and programmes.’107

On 24 January, 1939, Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad, J.B. Kriplani and four other members of the Congress Working Committee issued a counter statement declaring that the talk of ideologies, programmes and policies was irrelevant in the elections of Congress bodies like A.I.C.C. and the Working Committee, and that the position of the Congress President was like that of a
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constitutional head who represented and symbolized the unity and solidarity of the nation\textsuperscript{108}

Bose's re-entry into office resolved nothing except to raise confrontation. There were two major reasons for the crisis. One was the line of propaganda adopted by Bose against Sardar Patel and the majority of the top Congress leadership whom he branded as rightists. He even openly accused them for working for the imperial government on the question of federation and even prepared a list of prospective central ministers. Therefore, they did not want a leftist as the President of the Congress who could be an obstacle for a compromise and also an obstacle for the negotiations.\textsuperscript{109}

The suggestions of Bose in Tripuri session were sidelined by the Congress leadership and instead a following resolution was adopted: “The Congress declares its firm adherence to the fundamental policies of the Congress which have governed its programme in the past twenty years under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi, and is definitely of the opinion that there should be no break in these policies, and that these should continue to govern the Congress programme in the future…. In view of the critical situation that may develop during the coming year and in view of the fact that Mahatma Gandhi alone can lead the Congress and the country to victory during a crisis, the Congress regards it as imperative that the ‘Executive Authority’ of the Congress should command his implicit confidence and requests the President to
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nominate the working committee for the ensuing year in accordance with the wishes of Gandhiji.\footnote{Indian Annual Register 1939, Vol.I, p.332.}

This was a clear notice to the President that it was not possible for him to act independently of Gandhiji and the party. The delegates who had elected him to the office had apparently repented for causing displeasure to Gandhiji and, therefore, by an overwhelming vote reconfirmed their confidence in Gandhiji's leadership. This created a deadlock which could not be resolved by negotiations between S.C. Bose and Gandhiji. Bose commented, "The negotiations between Mahatma Gandhi and the writer revealed that on the one side, the Gandhi wing would not follow the lead of the writer and that, on the other, the writer would not agree to be a puppet President. There was, consequently, no other alternative but to resign the Presidentship."\footnote{Bose, S.C., The Indian Struggle, p.333.}

On 29 April, 1939, Bose resigned from the Presidentship and formed the Forward Bloc in order to give a better fight to the Gandhian wing afterwards and in any major crisis to be able to act on its own. The exit of Bose was unfortunate as a grave crisis soon overtook the world and unity in the Congress rank was necessary.

Therefore, it is clear that though there is a historiographical consensus that India's independence was the end result of Congress led mass movement and Congress was not just a party but a movement.\footnote{Sumit Sarkar, op.cit.; Bipan Chandra, op.cit.} The whole freedom movement was made energized and effective through sacrifices by the revolutionaries.
However, the role of violence in the tortuous process of decolonization is overlooked by not only the imperial historiography but also Indian historiography. But it is perhaps unhistorical to counterpoise Mahatma Gandhi to Subhash Chandra Bose. Both were staunch anti-imperialists devoted to the welfare of the exploited masses without being committed to a distinct social ideology.\textsuperscript{113}

But the historical roles they performed were very different. Gandhiji acquired his place in history above all as the organizer, mobiliser and inspirer of great popular mass movements. He brought the Indian people into political motion. Moreover, unlike Subhas, Gandhiji was also the strategist of the anti-imperialist struggle. Subhas was undoubtedly a militant nationalist, but he was a great general in a war whose strategy Gandhi was formulating.\textsuperscript{114}

The agenda of my work is not to take away from the greatness of the Gandhian methodology or to misguide about the mutual regard and appreciation between both the great leaders. Thus this work is an attempt to assess and evaluate the role of numerous forces working abroad as well as in India against British imperialism. But recent researches have shown that in the interwar period, the Raj was more concerned with revolutionary terrorism rather than with the Gandhian Congress.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{113} Bipin Chandra, \textit{Essays On Indian Nationalism}, (New Delhi), 1993, p.113. \textsuperscript{114} Ibid., p.113. \textsuperscript{115} Richard J.Popplewell, \textit{Intelligence and Imperial Defence: British Intelligence and the Defence of the Indian Empire} (London, 1945).
Thus, it is clear that the efforts of Forward Block and S.C. Bose were neither against the Congress nor any other organization to denigrate any personality but to make the freedom movement all-round powerful and bold so that nation could be made free from British dominance. There was no other option before him except the armed struggle which could alone be started outside the country with the help of anti-British forces during the II World War. Hence, he left India for giving concrete shape to his planning and programme as far as the question of India's freedom struggle was concerned.