CHAPTER-V

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT AND POLICE
The 1857 mutiny taught a lesson to the rulers that the idea of knowing Indians' opinion only through their rebellion is wrong. Therefore, the British administrators became aware that the Indians must be associated with the law-making of the land. Accordingly, the Council Act of 1861 immediately made provision for the non-official members in the Legislative Council. Right from 1853 the experiments were being made in the local self-government to give the local bodies more power in financial as well as in other matters. Lord Ripon in 1877 by his Reforms in Local Self-Government stood as a landmark in the ideal of People's representation in the governance. He established local Boards by making them autonomous and their members elected. This was the beginning of the system of elected representatives deciding the functioning of the Government.

The Indians also in the latter half of the nineteenth century became more awake and politically more conscious. The upper middle class and commercial class in India were making the demands that Indians must have a right to participate in the legislative body and also the other positions in the Civil Services. The political organizations in three Presidency towns, Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, had come into existence and they were demanding for the Indians' rightful claim of associating them with law-making and with administration. It is
in this background that the Indian National Congress of 1885 was formed by middle class intellectuals and the commercial elite of India. The Indian National Congress forcefully demanded on behalf of the whole nation the Indians' right to voice their opinion in law making and participation in the civil services to administer India. The Indian National Congress which was a concession seeking body in the beginning became more militant at the close of the nineteenth century. When twentieth century dawned, the Indian National Congress began speaking not only for the whole of the country but it took an extreme view for demanding Home Rule for India. For securing constitutional rights for Indians, it launched anti-imperialistic economic programmes as well as non-cooperation in the form of Civil Disobedience. The third section which worked parallel to Indian National Congress was of revolutionaries, killing English officers and introducing terror, to paralise the British administration as it was a foreign rule. This is how the first decade of the twentieth century went ahead in national ferment.

The Indian National Congress founded in December 1885 in Bombay held annual sessions regularly and its leaders made demands like Indians' association with administration and law-making. The Muslims, however, right from the beginning viewed Congress organization with suspicion. Not only this, in course of time the tension between the Hindus and Muhammadans went on growing everywhere. In Poona, the Tilakites became quite active in their anti-British activities. Tilak, a moving force in pre-Gandhian era, inaugurated the Sarvajanik Gana...
in 1894, with a view to inculcating the necessity of a National spirit in Poona and elsewhere in the Bombay Presidency.

When the Ganapati festival came around, Ganapatis were publicly exposed in Pandals in the way Tabuts were usually installed. Muslims used to organise processions during the Muharrum. Similarly Hindus also did it on the day of Ganapati immersion. This, in fact, widened the gulf between the two communities. The music rules which had been framed, did not meet with the approval of Tilak and his party, who determined to ignore them and play music while passing mosques. The result was the fatal riot on the morning of the 13th September 1894. After peace had been restored, Tilak's party thought that the Muhammadans might lay violent hands on him and for sometimes he always accompanied by a band of Hindu youths who acted as a sort of bodyguards.¹

Tilak also started celebration of Shivaji's birth anniversary as a public function to highlight Shivaji's career as a patriot and a religious leader.²

The news of the murders of two European Officers - Mr Rand, the Special Plague Officer in Poona, and Lieut. Ayerst, had given shock to the official world in India. The news of executions of four young patriots - (1) Damodar Hari Chaphekar (executed on 18th April 1899), (2) Balkrishna Hari Chaphekar (executed on 12th May 1899), (3) Vasudeo Hari Chaphekar (executed on 8th May 1899), and (4) Mahadeo Vinayak Ranade (executed on 10th May 1899)
must have spread horror and discontent in the country. According to the Sedition Committee Report, "indications of the revolutionary movement were first observed in western India" (Sedition Committee report, p. 1). After 1857 rebellion, Vasudeo Balwant Phadke made an attempt to organize an armed resistance (1877-1878). Within another twenty years, Chaphekar brothers came forward with their terrorist activities. They did it 'for the sake of their people' (D.H. Chaphekar's statement). Atrocities like the pollution of sacred places and the breaking up of idols were committed by European soldiers at the time of house searches in Poona. Chaphekar tells that they wanted to "take revenge" of this. His statement (8th October 1897) amounts to a confession and he was charged under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

Balkrishna, who had remained in hiding, was trapped in the Hyderabad State (January 1899). It is noteworthy that when he was ill during the period of his wanderings, Lokmanya Tilak had made arrangements for giving him medical help at Hyderabad through Shri Keshavrao Koratkar, who later on became a judge of the Hyderabad High Court. It appears that Balkrishna was betrayed by his friend for the consideration of the reward and was arrested.

Vasudeo Chaphekar, Mahadeo Vinayak Ranade and Sathe were arrested in their attempt to shoot the Chief Police Constable Rama Pandu (9th February 1899). Earlier the same night they had shot dead Ganesh Shankar Dravid and Ramchandra Shankar Dravid, who
had supplied information to Mr Brewin (Superintendent of Police, Poona) about the Chaphekar-brothers.

The case of these four accused was conducted in the month of February. Balkrishna and Vasudeo Chaphekar and Ranade were sentenced to death. Balkrishna had made petition for clemency. One of the High Court Judges, Justice Parsons, "did not find it proved that Balkrishna actually took part in the murder". He, therefore, had recommended to the Government to exercise their prerogative of mercy. Justice Ranade, it appears, did not agree with Justice Parsons. All the three accused made petitions that they be hanged on the same day. This request it seems was rejected, and they made the same petition to the Government of India. But that was not complied with and they were hanged on separate days in May 1899. Their accomplice Khandu Vishnu Sathe was sentenced to ten years of rigorous imprisonment.3

The autobiography of Damodar Hari Chaphekar gives a vivid picture of his mind, temper, views and his organization with its aims and objects. He had taken the law in his own hands to punish those who, according to him, were irreligious. He had thrashed Prof. Patwardhan, the editor of 'Sudharak' with an iron bar in the street when he was returning home at midnight. He also had thrashed Prof. Welingkar for accepting Christian faith. Tilak who was supposed to be the champion of orthodox sections, was also not a religious man according to Chaphekar. That was the type of his mind. The
name of his youth-organization was "Society for the Removal of to the Hindu Religion". It appears that the pollution of sacred places and breaking up of idols outraged his mind more than any other things.

His petition for mercy made to the Government of Bombay makes certain very revealing statements. He has alleged that his previous statements were taken by 'force, fraud and inducement' and that he was innocent. He also had stated in it that, "had some educated person been in my place, he would have placed before the Government and the public such a graphic description of the treacherous proceedings of the Police as would have amazed the world. Little would I have cared for the sentence of death, if I had possessed sufficient intelligence to unmask the villainy of the wicked, so as on to put my poor countrymen- on their guard". He stoutly refused to submit to such treacherous proposals. The nature of the evidence on which he was tried and convicted deserves attention. Ganesh Shankar Dravid, a convict in jail, twice convicted on counts of forgery for five years, is the chief informant and guide of the investigating officers. Two years before this murder (Rand), Dravid was sent to jail. He was offered liberal promises and it was through this instrument, that they collected or connected the link. The lawyers who defended Chaphekar were of the opinion that there was not enough evidence against him to justify the sentence of death.

The Swadeshi movement launched in 1905 added dimension
to the problem of the Police. On 16.9.1905, the students of Rajaram High School, Kolhapur, assembled for the preliminary examination to qualify for matriculation examination, had issued to them the usual foolscap paper. They refused to use it as it was of British manufacture and tore the paper up, asking for a native made article. Mr Lucy, the Principal, demonstrating with boys and attempting to restore the order, was insulted. Mr Lucy declined, therefore, to allow any of the malcontents to take part in the examination unless they submit to corporal punishment. After a while, persuaded to that end by Mr Vijapurkar, the Professor of Sanskrit, they gave in and accepted their canings. Mr Vijapurkar was a Tilakite and a great supporter of the Swadeshi Movement. It was generally believed that he instigated the insubordinate behaviour of the boys, but when he found the result was serious beyond his expectations, used his influence, which immediately allayed the trouble.

Meetings at Poona:

On 9th October 1905 at Poona at about 6 PM on the first instant a mass meeting of the students was held in Joshi Hall under the presidency of Narsinha Chintaman Kelkar, who addressed the meeting. He said that the action of the students in support of the Swadeshi movement was justifiable and condemned the actions of the Amraoti and Kolhapur school authorities in punishing the students who supported it in these places, and the dismissal of Professor Vishnu Govind Vijapurkar. After this, several students spoke, among whom one Savarkar spoke strongly urging his countrymen to despise
everything that is English and to abstain from purchasing foreign goods. He suggested that all the students should burn their clothes made of English and foreign cloth on Dassera day at Lakdipool. The following resolutions were passed:

(1) that the students of Poona fully sympathize with the students of Amraoti and Kolhapur for the injustice done to them by the Education authorities;

(2) that after the annual examination is over, students should work as volunteers of the movement.

Another Students' Meeting:

At 4 PM on the 7th instant, the students of the New Preparatory School (otherwise called Maharashtra Vidyalaya) held a private meeting in their school to discuss the steps which should be adopted for the burning, etc., of the European-made clothes. After collecting all the clothes and other articles, such as umbrellas, velvet caps, lead pencils, buttons, etc., from those who were willing to destroy them, all the students, headed by Shivram Mahadev Paranjape, marched down to Tilak Wada and hence joined the procession through Lakdipool to Phulachiwadi, in Haveli Taluka, near the Fergusson College.

A meeting of some 3,000 native students convened by printed handbills freely circulated, was held in Poona on the 22nd August 1906 under the presidency of Tilak at which speeches were made advocating the boycott of articles of British manufacture and expressing
sympathy with the Bengalis in partition question. Tilak was the guiding spirit in the Swadeshi movement of the Bombay Presidency.

On 11th September 1906 Tilak presided at a lecture in Poona on Swadeshi, which was anti-British in tone. In September, the District Magistrate, Belgaum, reported that the movement was given circulation by the local papers and it was being engineered entirely from Poona under the direction of Tilak. On 15th October, Tilak presided over a large meeting in Bombay, which purported to propagate Swadeshi.

On 4th November, Tilak spoke at a meeting in Poona justifying the action of students taking an active part in Swadeshi movement and condemning parents and men like Professor Selby for prohibiting boys from attending such meetings. He urged his audience to continue agitating until they obtained Home Rule. 7

During these months, he visited Miraj and Kolhapur, where he preached Swadeshism. It was also reported that he had an extensive organization with him for preaching the movement from village to village and at all fairs. In December 1906 he was at Yeola in the Nasik District on the same mission. His speeches were reported to be temperate.

On 11th August 1906 a gathering of some students numbering about 50 was held in a building known as 'Dolabro Dhola' situated on the Richey Road, Ahmedabad, at which some 15 Bengalis took part. It is said that the meeting was convened at the instance of
the Bengalis to celebrate the birthday of the Swadeshi movement. The National Bengali Anthem Bande Mataram, rendered in Gujarathi verse, was first sung by the Gujarathi students to the accompaniment of harmonium. The Bengalis then sang Bande Mataram in their own language. Mr Jivanlal Varajrai Desai, Bar-at-Law, who attended the gathering, then delivered a short speech praising the spirit and perseverance of the Bengalis in connection with the Swadeshi movement and offering his assistance in this cause whenever-and wherever needed.  

How the movement was spreading even to village level is indicative in the following event.

The Gokak (Belgaum) Sub-Inspector reports that on 6th January 1908, the District Magistrate (Mr Brendon) distributed the prizes to the Marathi schoolboys in the Anglo—Vernacular School, Gokak, Mr Artal, District Deputy Collector being present. Afterwards Mr Brendon gave the boys some sweets and left in the evening for Dhupdal, some eight miles off. Next day, the boys had a procession through the streets and some of the sweets were stuck together to form a garland and stuck a pole and paraded through the town with the cries of 'Bande Mataram', 'Shivaji Maharaj Ki Jai' and 'Burn the Foreign Things'. The rest of the sweets were thrown at the garlands and left on the ground untouched. It is said that the garlands were made at the instigation of one of the teachers by name Venkappa, who belonged to the Kolhapur State.
The Mitra Mela:

Prior to the year 1906, an association of young men, mostly of Brahmin, existed in Nasik under the leadership of Ganesh and Vinayak Savarkar, which was known as the 'Mitra Mela'. Exciting songs were composed for the Ganapati and Shivaji festivals and the members of the Mitra Mela used to join in singing these songs either in procession or in the precincts of some temple or other place of assembly.

Tilak Trial Disturbances:

Meanwhile, Tilak was arrested for offences under Sections 124-A and 153-A of the Indian Penal Code in Bombay on 24th June 1908. On the 29th June, first hearing of his case came on in the Court of the Chief Presidency Magistrate. During the course of the day, large crowds gathered outside the courthouse, becoming disorderly and had to be dispersed. One Kanchan Kumar, a Swadeshi preacher, took up a position on the Maidan and did much to excite the feelings of the crowd by his harrangue, but on their being dispersed, and attempt being made to seize him, he disappeared, and was not arrested till subsequently. While being dispersed, the crowd stoned the Police and such Europeans as were near at the time and eight arrests were made.

No further trouble was experienced till after the case had been adjourned for the day and the Court had been closed, when remnants of unlawful assembly recongregated and commenced to stone isolated Europeans passing along the Cruikshank Road. The venerable
Arch-Deacon of Bombay and a professor at the St. Xavier's College were amongst those who received injuries from stones. The arrival of some European Police Officers and Native Police on the scene soon put a stop to the desultory stone-throwing, and the members of disorder were chased away not to reappear. 10

On 29th June 1908, the first issue of the extremist paper, styled the Rashtra Mata appeared. One of the last acts of Tilak, on the day he was arrested, was the final settlement of the management of this paper. Tilak was reported to have stated that he was aware that a warrant had been issued for his arrest. If so, it is probable that he had a hand in the articles which appeared in the first issue of this paper.

During the trial in the High Court, Tilak's friends and sympathisers came down to Bombay from all parts of the Presidency, and the interval was made use of by them and friends already in Bombay to stir up the feelings of the people against Government. All vernacular papers drove a roaring trade while a great deal of preaching was done in chalis and private places. No stone was left unturned to show the world the sympathy with which Tilak was regarded in India. Amongst other things, it was decided to endeavour to induce all millhands in Bombay to strike, and to proceed to the High Court in large numbers. 11

There were 85 mills in Bombay employing some 100,000 hands, of which at least 50,000 must be able-bodied. Anyone able to enlist the sympathy of so large a number of men must occupy
a powerful position. Tilak had no doubt considered this point and for some time before his arrest, had endeavoured to win them over.

At Chinchpokali he addressed the millhands, who numbered about 2 lakhs - perhaps larger in number than all the British Forces in India - and told them the benefits of Swadeshi. It was for the advantage of all and if all the people embraced Swadeshism, the poverty of the country and people would not be so great. The work in the Mills would increase and the employees would be benefitted. He also spoke strongly against the use of liquors and advised his hearers to give them up and said that though Government were making great efforts to popularize innoculations, they did nothing to minimize the liquor evil.

One thing at a time was pretty clear and that was that either at the trial or after it, large bodies of millhands would attempt to make demonstrations at or near the High Court, and that, if allowed to assemble in any great masses, they might become disorderly and cause a great deal of damage not only to property but also to life. To prevent this it became necessary to consider the question of Military assistance, in the event of the Police proving unable to cope with the situation. 12

General Greenfield came to the conclusion that the Garrison was not sufficiently strong to afford the necessary number of men with relief, and he consequently arranged forthwith that additional troops including some Native cavalry, should be brought to Bombay.
As a Police precaution, a Notification under Section 23(3) prohibiting assemblies throughout the city during certain dates was issued. A jobber named Deoji Gunoo and a Doctor Salunke were said to possess great influence amongst millhands generally and as it was known that they had taken a prominent part in the movement started by Tilak, it was generally believed that they would have a great deal to say with reference to a strike amongst millhands.  

From 13.7.1908 to 17.7.1908, Tilak was in a temporary lock-up; hence, 12 European officers, 24 unarmed Native Officers and men and 10 armed men were requisitioned for duty during the time the Court rose until it re-assembled, i.e., from 5.30 p.m. to 11.30 a.m. During the sitting of the Court 20 European Police Officers, 11 armed, 190 unarmed and 30 mounted Native Officers and men were on duty in and about the Court. In addition to the above, there was a Military detachment of one Commissioned Officer and 50 rank and file posted in the University Hall.

On 13.7.1908, a number of millhands, and otherwise employed natives, made their way into the Fort and attempted to assemble near the High Court. They were kept moving throughout the day by the Police and the Cavalry, and dispersed in the evening. Mr. J.C. Sumption, an Advocate of India, brought the information that some Europeans whilst passing through Currey Road had been mobbed and assaulted, and had taken refuge in a liquor shop in that road. Along nearly the whole length of this road, there are chals on either side,
occupied by millhands. In all, they were nearly 6,000 and they and the hands living on kala Chowki Road were the most violent in Bombay. Europeans employed on the Railways had no alternative but to use this road on their ways to and fro.

On receipt of the information, at once proceeded to the spot with a few European officers and men, the Magistrates and the Cavalry following. The liquor shop had been wrecked, while the three Europeans, Railway employees, were concealed in an inner room by the Parsi liquor seller were taken out and escorted to the station. When police proceeded along the road, stones were thrown at them from inside the courtyard of a chal and some revolver shots were fired. No one was injured.

On 20th July 1908 at about 6 AM whilst the employees of the Morarji Gokuldas Mill were going into their work, their mill was stoned by hands of the Jacob Sassoon Mill, who had decided not to work. Disorder took place and the Police who were on the spot were attacked by stones, a European officer being especially picked out. What happened on the scene while this was going on, is described in a telegram sent to Government:

At 6.20 this morning, information received that Jacob Sassoon Mill hands about four thousand were out and creating disturbance. Superintendent and Inspector wealed up Curry Road driving the mob in front. Mob retreated for some distance and then turned, formed up and stoned heavily. They
were warned to desist and disperse. Stone throwing became more violent, then they were fired upon. Some rioters wounded. Casualties uncertain. Military held detachment on hearing firing doubled up, but crowd had dispersed. A number of coolies working in godowns at the Grain Bazar and a few cart drivers struck work. 16

On 21st July 1908 some coolies employed in godowns at the Grain Bazar prevented carts from carrying goods belonging to Europeans along Frere Road, in some cases overturning the carts and throwing the goods out onto the road. Foot and Mounted Police under the Superintendent of Police, B. Division restored order. At 2 PM, about 200 men and boys rushed round Girgaum, Sonapur, Chandanwadi and Lohar Street and forced shops to be closed. On Police force being sent to intercept them, the crowd dispersed. Two men were arrested and charged before a Magistrate under Section 122 of Act IV of 1902, and on conviction were sentenced to eight days' rigorous imprisonment each. On 24th July 1908 mills stopped work. At an early hour, some millhands belonging to the Western India Mill situated at Kala Chowki Road stoned the Bombay Cotton Mill while had commenced work, with the result that the employees came out and joined them. The crowd then proceeded along Chinchpokali Road, where they stoned the Rachel Sassoon Mill and the R.D. Sassoon Mill, causing the employees to come out. Superintendent Mayers and Sub-Inspector Finan, who bore the brunt of the attack, received several injuries from stones, also Sub-Inspector Home. 17

To meet this situation massive operations were contemplated
by the Government. About 9 A.M. on 24th July 1908 while the Cavalry were proceeding along Ghorupdeo Road dispersing a large crowd from every direction, Lieut. Summers who was in charge accompanied by a European Police Sub-Inspector fired a few rounds as did two Native Officers with him. Lieut. Robertson in charge of a party of the Royal Scots, which had been stationed near Dockyard, with Inspector Murray attached, came on the scene and had to open fire on a crowd of millhands armed with sticks, who were stoning the Police and the Military. One man was picked up dead.

On 25th July 1908 the Textile Mills began to work; the millhands were perfectly orderly but suddenly stoned and attempted to wreck up the mill, and attacked the European employees. Finding themselves hard pressed, the Europeans fired a few shots.

The stone throwing, however, had not abated and at about 5 P.M. Mr Dracup, Third Presidency Magistrate, arrived. He ordered that the Military should fire. Four rounds were fired and four persons were picked up suffering from bullet wounds. Things then quietened down, and the Military withdrew from the spot.

It is important to note that throughout the trouble, at no point did the Mohammedans join in the disorder, and though strenuous attempts were made by the Hindus to induce them to join forces, they resisted all attempt. Not a small number of Mohammedans were employed in the mills, and at one time, a most resentful feeling sprang up amongst them against the Hindu millhands.
In Bombay city, the "Bombay National Union" was sided by the paper called the Hindu Swarajya. This paper was started with the support of Shyamji K. Verma and it was actually run by his nephew Nitesen Dwarkadas. Its tone from the commencement was most hostile to the Government and its non-suppression for long, gave people the impression that Government was afraid to deal with the situation. Eventually, the Editor C.L. Thanawalla was prosecuted, convicted and sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment on 15th May 1907. A new Editor T.P. Mangrolewalla, also did not change the tone of the paper and he too was prosecuted and on 2nd July convicted and sentenced to three years' rigorous imprisonment.

Even after arrest and trial of Tilak, the closing of shops and going on strike continued for many days. Every Mill had its Brahmin clerks who wielded much influence amongst the jobbers, while the jobbers were the men to whom the millhands looked for their future. Clerks became an excellent channel for the dissemination of sedition amongst the millhands.

During this agitation the police did not do well often and it had to take the help of military because of inadequate number of police and police officials. For example, in the trouble, the Superintendent, K. Division, was practically carrying on the duties of an Assistant to the Commissioner, instead of being engaged in his special work of detection. Since he could not be spared for that work, the work suffered. The Deputy Commissioner found it difficult to carry on the usual office routine of the Inspector General of Police. The
Inspector General of Police, Mr. Kennedy, who acted as Commissioner of Police, Bombay, for six months came to a similar conclusion. He says:

I find constantly also that I require an officer above the rank of the Bombay Superintendent whom I can entrust from time to time with urgent and confidential work in and out of office. I cannot go myself, I cannot ask the Deputy to go, and yet it is highly desirable that someone should be immediately interviewed on business of great moment. I have to fall back on the Superintendent, K. Division, not of the requisite status. This often happens.

During the trouble, the Military Mounted Guard was at 14 posts; this was the maximum number, but each guard consisted of 50 men.

The Native Force was composed of three-fourth Hindus and one-fourth Mohamedans. The Hindu Police of Bombay came mostly from Ratnagiri. A great number of Police had relations amongst the millhands, male and female, and though this might have expected to work in favour of the Police for obtaining information regarding their movements, it worked in a contrary direction in the recent troubles, and the opposition, the millhands met with was not so great as might have been the case, had they belonged to different districts.

With large reserves of civil and military power at their command, government succeeded eventually in putting down the disturbances. If it was legitimate for government to prosecute and transport
Mr Tflak, it was equally legitimate for the people to express their sympathy for a citizen and public-spirited scholar and fellow-countryman who, they believed, worked for men and also suffered for his work. Mr. Justice Davar himself remarked in his charge to the jury that Government had no right to expect that the people should entertain affection for them, when they interfere in the liberty of the millhands and the businessmen of Bombay.

Picking of liquor shops was also resorted to in Belgaum in 1908 as a part of the Swadeshi Movement. Hundreds participated, and fines imposed on arrested volunteers, totalling Rs. 500 on the very first day. Later, volunteers refused to pay fine even by raising contributions and 15 people including Govindrao Yalgi courted imprisonment. 22

There was excitement in Belgaum over the news of Tilak's arrest (1908) and his deportation to Burma. Seventeen persons were arrested in Belgaum for holding a procession on the later occasion. When Tilak was imprisoned he requested Gangadhar Rao Deshpande to manage the newly started Marathi daily Rashtramata in Bombay, and it continued as the mouthpiece of the nationalists under the editorship of Gangadhar Rao for some years. 23

During these years terrorists were also quite active though their number was small. Vinayak Savarkar was in close touch with a small though well-known group of violent Indian anarchists living in Paris. One of the documents found in the possession of Chanjerirao
at the time of his arrest was 'Bande Mataram'. It is a pamphlet in praise of Dingra, a resident of the India House, who assassinated Sir Curzon Wyllie with a Browning Pistol in London in June 1909. The pamphlet strongly advocates political assassination in India and whether or not it is from the pen of Vinayak Savarkar; it, at all events, represents doctrines which he was anxious to disseminate in India. A passage in the pamphlet says:

Terrorise the officials, English and Indians, and the collapse of the whole machinery of oppression is not very far. The persistent execution of the policy that has been so gloriously inaugurated by Khoodiram Bose, Kanailal Dutt and other martyrs will soon cripple the British Government in India. This campaign of separate assassinations is the best conceivable method of paralysing the bureaucracy and of arousing the people. The initial stage of the revolution is marked by the policy of separate assassinations.

These extracts show clearly the objects which Vinajayk had in view in sending Browning Pistols and instructions for the preparation of bombs in India.24

Savarkar sent a parcel of pistols through Chaturbhuj who brought pistols to Bombay and handed them over to Patankar, although the accompanying letter was addressed to the accused persons Bhat and Thatte, for Patankar was in Bhat's room at the time when Chaturbhuj went there to make final arrangement for the delivery of the parcel.
and, at the request of Bhat, Patankar went and took delivery of 19 pistols and the cartridges for his own use. According to the confession of Patankar, he had been informed early in February by Ganesh Savarkar, that in a few days some pistols would arrive with Chaturbhuj and that Patankar should prevent them from being taken to Nasik. He said that it was too late to prevent the arrival of the pistols in Bombay and that Chaturbhuj would come and see Bhat.25

Patankar's first action was to remove the pistols to a convenient place near Bombay and he selected Vithoba Marathe of Pen for depositing the Pistols.

The Terrorist Action in Bombay Presidency:

Some of the important terrorist actions of this period are briefly enumerated below:

On 15.1.1909 in Poona a coconut bomb was found in Cannaught Road by a Muhammadan. It exploded blowing off one of his hands. On 13.11.1909, at Ahmedabad two bombs which did not explode were thrown at the Viceroy's carriage. Again on 21.12.1909, at Nasik Mr. Jackson, the District Magistrate, was shot dead by Anant Lakshman Kanhere. On 18.5.1919, at Satara two coconut bombs, 37 revolvers, cartridges and six Manlicher cartridges were found in the verandah of the house of Gangadhar Kulkarni of village Kanheri in the search by the Police.

The condition of the Police during this period was far from
satisfactory. The Bombay District Police (Amendment) Act (IV of 1912) amended the 1890 Act in several details, e.g., control of traffic, cinemas and public amusements, appointment of sub-inspectors and sergeants and enquiries into the conduct of Police Officers. There was an increase in crime under all heads, including murders, robbery and theft. Recruiting continued to be difficult, there was a slight increase in resignations.26

The Bombay District Police Act, 1890, and the Bombay City Police Act, 1902 (Amendment) Act (V of 1913) contained provisions for strengthening the powers of the Police to prevent disorder and to maintain public safety at places of public amusement, etc. Because of good agricultural condition and vigorous action under the C.T. Act, there was a marked decrease in crime in 1913, but recruiting continued to be difficult due to the inadequacy of the pay offered and resignations increased.27

Proposals for the further reorganization of police in the Bombay Presidency, including the Sindh Police and the Bombay City Police, were submitted by the Local Government in 1912. They envisaged an increase in the Presidency Police of 12 inspectors, 172 sub-inspectors, 9 sergeants, 1,332 unarmed and 1,062 armed constables, in Sindh of 1 inspector, 9 sub-inspectors, 109 armed and 91 unarmed head-constables, and 287 unarmed and 264 armed constables and in the City Police of 14 deputy inspectors, 39 sergeants, 90 unarmed and 15 armed head-constables and 143 unarmed and 66 armed constables, reducing simultaneously, 1 SP, 4 inspectors, 10 sub-inspectors,
9 unarmed Jamadars and 2 armed Jamadars. Minor increases of pay were also proposed mainly for sub-inspectors, sergeants and head-constables. After a good deal of correspondence, the proposal was sanctioned by the Secretary of State in October 1913 to be implemented in 5 years.\textsuperscript{28}

Crime decreased further in 1914 and there was a slight increase in the strength of the force but the total force provided for in the reorganization scheme was still to be reached. Crime increased in 1915. The City Police faced heavy additional duties due to the war. The state of Police buildings was reported to be poor. Recruiting continued to be difficult and the Police were short-handed throughout the year, particularly in Sind.\textsuperscript{29} Thus ended the civil disobedience movement which helped in reforming the police administration quite negligibly.

**Muslim League Meeting at Bombay, 1915:**

The year 1915 was the year of Home Rule propaganda by leading nationalists of Bombay. Mrs. Beasent had requested the executive of the Indian National Congress and of the Muslim League to draw up a joint scheme for the demand of Home Rule for India. Mr. Jinnah was then a staunch nationalist. He was with the younger Congress Leadership in the demand for self-Rule for India. With a view to trying for a rapprochement between the Muslim League and the Congress, he insisted that the 1915 session of the Muslim League should be held in Bombay where also the Session of the Indian National Congress
was being held that year. The Government, it seems, was against unity amongst the Hindus and Muslims for a joint campaign for Self-Rule in India. The Sunni Muslims led by Sardar Suleman Kasam Mitha were opposed to Jinnah and his Shia followers. The Police Commissioner Mr Edwards had strongly expressed his view that the Muslim League should not meet in Bombay. The League Session, however, was held in Bombay in spite of opposition from a section of Muslims and the Bombay Government. But on the second day, there was an uproar caused by supporters of the opposition, and the President of the Session, Mazhar-ul-Haq, had to declare the meeting adjourned sine die. This incident caused a stir amongst nationalists. The Bombay Presidency Association and the Sarvajanik Sabha of Poona sent letters of protest to the Governor, charging the Police Commissioner, Mr Edwards, with having helped the opponents of the League Session by his refusal to co-operate with the organizers of the Session in keeping the rowdy elements away from the pandal. The nationalist press led by the 'Bombay Chronicle' charged Government of coming in the way of Hindu-Muslim unity.  

In the Congress Session of 1916 the Home Rule agitation led by Tilak and Mrs Besant gathered momentum. All prominent leaders of the Central Province joined the movement. Mr Montague took office in July 1917, he made a conciliatory statement in the House of Commons laying down the fundamental objectives of the British Policy as the increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration and the development of self-governing institutions. He expressed his
desire to personally visit India and consult the Indian leaders on the scheme of reforms. However, the British Parliament was in no mood to respond to these sentiments, due to its pre-occupation with the problem of war. The bureaucracy in India was far too unimaginative and was unable to understand the significance of the popular agitation. The situation would not have worsened if the government had not appointed a Committee under the chairmanship of Justice Rowlatt to enquire into the criminal conspiracies and the spread of revolutionary association in India and to advise what legislation should be undertaken to deal with them. This provoked and exasperated the people. It was also a warning that more weapons were being acquired for the chastisement of the so-called sedition-mongers.

Gandhi had struck a new note by informing the Viceroy not to give his assent to the Rowlatt Bill and had declared that if the Bill became law, he would start 'Satyagraha'. The proposal for Satyagraha found widespread support in the Central Province and was observed with remarkable success as in other parts of the country. There was trouble in many parts of the country. Then came the horror of Jallianwala Bagh on 13th April 1919, where the notorious General Dyer by ordering indiscriminate firing brought about a massacre of a number of innocent men, women and children. The Satyagraha was suspended by Gandhiji.

In view of the large increase in the cost of living owing to war conditions and labour unrest in the city which could affect
the morale of the force, the Bombay Government proposed by telegram in October 1917, the immediate grant of a local allowance of Rs. 2 per month to all head-constables and constables of the City Police with effect from 1st October for the duration of the war and six months thereafter or until the introduction of another re-organization scheme, which was then under preparation. They had increased the house-rent allowances for these ranks on their own in order to keep them contented. The Government of India referred the proposal to the Secretary of State telegraphically and solicited orders.

On the 17th Oct. Bombay Government sent another telegram and asked for immediate sanction as 'most disquieting' reports had been received from the districts. On 19th, a similar proposal was made in respect of the Sind Police. Both these proposals were sanctioned by the Secretary of State, with some minor modifications, in February 1918, effective from 1st January. Some of the proposals were still pending. The total number of vacancies in June 1919 was 1,993 as against 2,077 in January of the same year. The Government of India had decided in June 1918 with the approval of the Secretary of State to raise Police Battalions in the provinces for military duties, at the cost of the British Government and their incorporation in the Indian Army and a detailed scheme had been circulated for their purpose.

In the meantime, Mrs Besant had described the reforms contained in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report as "unworthy of England
to give and India to take", and the Congress had condemned the proposals as 'disappointing' and 'unsatisfactory', re-affirmed the demands made jointly with the Muslim League in 1916 and 1917 and declared that nothing less than self-government within the Empire will satisfy the Indian people in a special session held at Bombay under the Presidentship of Syed Nassan Imam on 29 August 1918. The Moderates had not attended the special session and formed a new party in November, which became the nucleus of the National Liberation Federation of India. The War had ended on 11th November, 1918.

Rowlatt Bills:

In pursuance of the policy of reform-cum-repression or vice versa, followed by Lord Minto and Lord Hardinge, Lord Chelmsford appointed a committee to investigate into the revolutionary movement and recommend legislation that may be deemed necessary to suppress it. The committee was presided over by Mr Justice Rowlatt of the U.K., and consisted of four other members, two of whom were Indians, and two British officials in India. The committee prepared a detailed account of the revolutionary movement in India on the basis of the material supplied by the Government of India, and the legislation recommended by it was based on the draft prepared by it to replace the Defence of India act which would automatically cease to be operative after the end of the World War. Montagu had warned Justice Rowlatt that the plan already hatched by the Government of India was a plan of "Government by means of internment and Police" but in vain. After
making a detailed survey of the revolutionary movement in different parts of India, the committee recommended special legislation which sought to curtail the liberty of the people in a drastic manner.

Two bills were prepared on the basis of these recommendations. One, the Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes act, 1919, provided for speedy trial of offences by a special court, consisting of three High Court Judges. There was no appeal from the decision of this Court, which could meet in camera and take into consideration evidence not admissible under the Indian Evidence Act. The provincial government could order any person, on suspicion, "to furnish security or to notify his residence, or to reside in a particular area or abstain from any specified act, or finally to report himself to the Police. The Provincial Government was also given powers to search a place and arrest a suspected person without warrant and keep him in confinement", in such place and under such conditions and restrictions it may specify". The Bill was strenuously opposed throughout the country by Indians of all shades of political opinion. They argued that apart from serious objections to such legislation in time of peace, when the revolutionary crimes were already on the decline, it was the height of unwisdom to undertake it at a time when the constitutional reforms were in the offing. On the other hand, the Government described the condition in India as of unarmed revolt, and the underground revolutionary movement. The real point of criticism was that they never realized the true import or significance of the situation from the point of view of nationalist India.
Numerous public meetings were held to protest against this lawless law. All the non-official Indian members of the Indian Legislative Council were united in opposing the measure, and four of them resigned in protest. The Bill was passed on 18 March - the officials also voted in its favour - and placed it on the statute Book on March 21, 1919. The most curious part of the whole episode was that while the new Act practically remained a dead letter, it brought into limelight a political leader who was destined to achieve worldwide fame and distinction. This was Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, who led India's struggle for freedom to its end. 34

Labour Movement: Trade Unions:

The demand of some social workers in Bombay for factory legislation in the 'seventies of the last century was the beginning of the trade union movement. The Bombay Millhands' Association formed in 1890, was probably the first working class Union in India. When the factory commission of 1890 was set up, it was officially recognized that the workers' viewpoint should be ascertained before any measure of labour legislation was taken up. In Eastern India, the cause of the tea plantation workers and jute mill workers was taken up by political leaders like Surendra Nath Banerjee and some other prominent social workers. There were several strikes in Bombay and Bengal in the early years of the present century. 35

The first Indian Trade Union of the modern type was the
Madras Labour Union - a textile industry union - formed in 1918. The Ahmedabad Textile Labour Association was founded in 1920. The Trade Unions were also formed in the cotton mills of Bombay. A wave of strikes during the years 1918-20 indicated a new militancy in the working class. The Whitley Commission observed of the year:

The two or three years following the close of the war saw the formation of a large number of organizations, owing their origin mainly to the grave economic difficulties of industrial labour ... The worldwide uprising of labour consciousness extended to India, and for the first time, the mass of industrial workers awoke to their disabilities, specially in regard to wages and working hours, and to the possibility of combination. The effect of the upsurge was enhanced by political turmoil which added to the prevailing feeling of unrest and assisted to provide willing leaders to trade union movement.

Ahmedabad Textile Strike:

The most significant facet of this collaboration was the strike organized by the textile weavers in Ahmedabad in March 1918 against withdrawal of the bonus of twelve annas by the millowners.

For some time, the strikers maintained their tempo. But at last they began to show signs of weakness. The attendance at the daily meetings also began to show signs of dwindling and despondency. Gandhi's fast unto death and the workers' pledge culminated in
persuading the millowners to agree to submit the dispute to arbitration through which it was amicably settled and the strike came to an end.

Rowlatt Satyagraha, 1919:

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report was published (July 1918); Gandhi stated that he had not studied the proposals in detail but in his view, they 'deserved sympathetic handling rather than a summary rejection'. When the 'moderates' seceded from the Congress on the question of acceptance of the Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme, he declined to join either group. It was the repressive policy of the British Government, which dragged him away from the shell of political isolation and led him to make a bid for all India leadership.

The Rowlatt Bills (February-March 1919) provoked Gandhi. It was basically different from the Satyagraha in Champaran, Karia and Ahmedabad which had been launched in selected localities for redress of local grievances. It gave a sharp edge to a countrywide movement launched by the Congress as a protest against a national grievance which focussed public attention on a national issue. After the suspension of the movement, he wrote to the Secretary of State, Montagu that "This retention of Rowlatt legislation in the teeth of universal opposition is an affront to the nation. Its repeal is necessary to appease national honour."

Having co-operated effectively in World War-I, India expected...
at the War's end to receive a generous instalment of self-Government. But, instead, there came the Rowlatt Bill which sought to curtail and crush the civil rights of Indians. Bill No. 1, called the Indian Criminal Law Amendment act, was passed on March 3, 1919. While the bills were pending, Gandhiji toured the country and issued statements. A Satyagraha committee was set up and Gandhiji drew up a pledge on March 18.

Bill No. 11 was passed, in spite of the united opposition of elected Indian members of the Councils and was published as an act on 18th March. It provided the Government with special powers to require security; to restrict residence to a particular place; to direct abstention from specified acts to arrest and confine persons in place and under conditions as prescribed; and enable 'anarchical' offences to be tried expeditiously by a 'strong' court consisting of three High Court Judges, with no right to appeal. The Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act (IX of 1919) passed and came into force from 21st March 1919.

The Rowlatt committee reported in 1920 and recommended an increase of two Police stations and a reduction in the number of outposts from 129 to 95. They suggested certain principles for rationalizing the duties of Sub-inspectors and Head-constables and constables posted to rural and urban police stations. They were not in favour of the total abolition of village Chaukiddars, because that would be a most unpopular step and also because it was "impossible
to carry on an efficient Police administration by means of official Police alone", while it was "absolutely essential to secure the aid of the village community". They had been urged from all sides to recommend a substantial increase in the pay of Chaukidars, but they did not do so on account of financial considerations.

They recommended the establishment of training schools for constables at suitable centres for improving their efficiency, starting with one experimental school at a place where buildings could most easily be acquired and the constitution of a superior grade of constables for performing duties other than purely mechanical ones, amounting to about 21 per cent of the strength.

In view of the impending threat of non-cooperation, the imperial government addressed all the local governments and administrations in April 1920 on the subject of improving the pay and prospects of the subordinate ranks of the Police force.

The government called for report on the existing state of feeling in the Police force (excluding Deputy Superintendents and Officers of higher ranks) from the local governments and on the consideration of the measures to remove any well-founded grievances at a minimum of extra expenditure.

The Pay proposals of the Bombay Government submitted in July 1920 were: Inspectors - from Rs. 150-250 to 180-300; Sub-inspectors from 50-100 to a time scale of 75-10/2-145 and two higher
grades of Rs. 150 and 175; Head-constables from 18-35 to 27-50 and constables an increase of Rs. 7 per month on the existing rates. Proposals were made in respect of allowances also. As sanction was not issued immediately, a reminder was sent on 17th September, in which it was stated that "the Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors and Sergeants have resolved to refuse to accept their pay for September due on 1st October unless paid at revised rates and that the Constabulary while disavowing any intention of strike, had resolved to refuse to do the extra duty imposed on them in connection with certain public festivals and race meetings", and sanction was solicited without any further delay whatsoever, because this and this alone could produce good feeling and restore confidence in Government in the minds of the Officers and men. Necessary sanction was issued on 29th September 1920 with slight modification in the pay proposed for Sub-Inspectors and Head-constables. Some of the allowances proposed were also not sanctioned. The revised scales for the different ranks were made effective from different dates on the understanding that the Local Government meets the cost.42

The Government of India issued detailed directions to the Local Government in October 1920. Those were as follows:

In previous discussions of this question, the principle has always been maintained that the preservation of the public peace is the duty of the Police who should be able to deal promptly and effectively with local disturbances without
involving the aid of the military. The principle was affirmed in 1860, was adhered to in 1879 and again in 1887. It was accepted by the Indian Police Commission, and again in 1907, when it was necessary to point out to one Local Government that an improper demand had been made upon the military authority for assistance in a disturbance which could well have been quelled by the employment of the Police force. The function of the Army, on the other hand, is to suppress rebellion, and to resist invasion or disorders of the nature of a rising against Government, which the civil authorities cannot cope with through the agency of the Police.\(^43\)

They further stated that:

> The Government of India recognizes that it is difficult in every case to lay down categorically the precise point at which the function of the Police ends and that of the military forces begins. They are also strongly of opinion that it is essential to maintain in the hands of the civil authorities any power conferred on them by law to invoke the aid of military force in case of necessity.\(^44\)

Thus, for a long time the use of military in the case of civil riots remained problematic. However, it seems that the military was often called against the serious civil riots. Even in our own time the military is often used to put down the civil riots of serious nature.
Non-Violent Non-Cooperation,
1920-22 (Satyagraha):

The non-cooperation resolution was approved both by a special session of the Congress meeting on September 4, 1920, and by the regular session in December. The movement called for the five-fold boycott of titles and honours, of elections and legislatures of schools and colleges, of courts of tribunals, and the foreign clothes. It also had its constructive side. National schools and institutions were to be started, arbitration courts and Panchayats were to be established; spinning on Charakhas was to begin. In addition, Government levees, durbars, and all semi-official or official functions were to be boycotted, and sale and use of drinks and drugs was to be prevented through peaceful picketing. People were asked not to offer themselves as recruits for civil or military services.

There was some sporadic mob violence, but the whole, the campaign was non-violent, vigorous, and defective National Schools sprang up by hundreds. Hundreds of thousands of Charakhas ('spinning wheels') began to play in India. Congress membership went up to five millions.45

The Congress appealed to all persons in Government service, pending the call of the nation, to resign their service, to help the national cause by imparting greater kindness and stricter honesty to their dealings with the people, and fearlessly and openly to attend all popular gatherings while refraining from taking any active part in them and more especially by openly rendering financial assistance to
the national movement. 46

In the Khilafat Conference in Karachi on 10th July, 1921 Ali brothers got the resolution passed to the effect that it would be unlawful for any Muslim to serve in the Army or to assist in recruiting for the Army; also that, should the British Government fight openly or secretly with the Turkish Government of Angola, the Muslims of India would start civil disobedience and would declare complete Independence at the next session of the Congress at Ahmedabad where an Indian Republic would be declared. Ali brothers and five others were arrested just after the Calcutta Session of the Working Committee and proceedings were instituted against them, under Section 120-B read with Section 131 and under Section 505 read with Section 109 and 117 of the Indian Penal Code, for attempting to seduce Mussalman Officers and soldiers in the army from their duty. The reply of the Working Committee to this prosecution was to congratulate those arrested on their prosecution, to declare that the subject matter of the prosecution virtually re-affirmed the principle. 47

The Non-cooperation Movement got new strength, when the All India College Students' Conference was held on December 29, 1920 at Ahmedabad, under the presidency of Mrs Sarojini Naidu. The delegates came from all over India. The audience numbered about three thousand. Representative-students of all the provinces were present.

However, Jinnah called the Boycott Movement a 'blunder'.
Addressing a students' meeting in Bombay on 1 July 1922, he emphasized that students should go to schools and colleges as these were started with people's money. Referring to the Non-cooperation Movement, he said that it was a revolutionary movement but was not practicable and could not succeed. He strongly disapproved of the boycott of Councils and if they were going to have Swaraj on Parliamentary lines based on democratic principles, they must join the Councils where they could vigorously fight for the country's cause. 48

In a largely attended meeting of students in Bombay, Gandhi remarked:

It would not be wrong to disobey even parents in the matter of boycott of schools and colleges after attaining 'satya' (truth), purifying their innerselves ... As long as they were not able to purify their innerselves and bide by their conscience, they were unfit for non-cooperation. After becoming true Brahmacharis and after attaining to the right path of self-restraint, they could even disobey their parents.

He advised the students to leave schools and colleges without bothering themselves unduly about the future. In his opinion, the idea of passing B.A. and M.A., with the hope of obtaining service was also greatly responsible for their parents' slavery. He also made it clear that the present universities and colleges had produced more slaves than scholars. Now they must destroy these slave-producing institutions and the only measure was non-cooperation with the Government
and the boycott of their institutions. But he again reminded them
that their non-cooperation must be non-violent. 49

In the second half of 1921, some students, who came out
permanently from their educational institutions, joined the National
Volunteers Corps. The Volunteer Movement in the last months of 1921
day by day, was getting strength. The volunteers went from village
to village and propagated the constructive programme of the Congress.
The government officials took the following view of their work:

Our information indicates that in certain provinces,
Volunteer movement has recently grown in strength
but we have no reason to believe that it has yet
attained dangerous dimensions. It must be remembered
that many so-called volunteer corps confine their
activities to social service, propaganda of picketing.

The Prince of Wales arrived in India on 17th November
1921. The arrival of Prince caused the volunteers movement all over
India to consolidate itself. The Government of India declared the National
Volunteer Corps illegal under the Criminal Law Amendment Act and
a large number of volunteer students and other leaders were arrested. 50

In the thirty-sixth session of the Indian National Congress
held at Ahmedabad under the presidentship of Hakim Ajmal Khan in
December 1921, the following sentiments were expressed by him concerning
the national institutions:
In regard to the boycott of educational institutions all the work that ought to have been done has been done. Some of the best schools and high-schools have cut off their relations with the Government and of these not one is in a bad condition. In most of the national institutions, the number of pupils has increased. Here there is one National College and a National University. Many of the national schools have been affiliated to it. The number of boys and girls is 31,000 in the national schools that are affiliated to the Gujarat University.

A heap of foreign clothes was burnt by Gandhi in Bombay on 10th October 1921. The contribution in terms of foreign cloth to be burnt was made by the people living in the mill area. Gandhi emphasized the significance of carding and weaving. Thus, he thought it was the duty of the liquor vendors to bow to the wishes of crores of their countrymen. By closing their shops, they would benefit their country, and what was good for their country was also good for them.

The Satyagrahis adopted various devices while picketing the liquor shops in a non-violent way. Whereas they tried to persuade the shopkeepers to surrender their wine licences and the customers to give up the habit of purchasing and using intoxicants of any kind, they also adopted a novel method of snatching bottles from customers without any inquiry to the latter. This device proved successful in certain areas and also reduced the number of customers for intoxicants.
In Bombay, Swaraj Sena volunteers were posted on all liquor shops. The Government also posted its Police force and mounted Sowars on each shop with orders to arrest the pickets. As soon as one batch was arrested, the reserve volunteers took their place and performed their duty in a non-violent way. 52

Bombay Riots: 17th to 21st November, 1920:

The precise value of the All India Congress Committee's injunctions regarding the observance of the principle of non-violence, was almost immediately apparent in the serious rioting which occurred at Bombay from 17th to 21st November. In accordance with the Working Committee's directions regarding the visit of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee, in common with other provincial committees, had arranged for a 'General Voluntary Hartal'. As a counter-attraction to the ceremonies attending the landing at Bombay of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, a public meeting was arranged which was addressed by Gandhi himself. The crowd, on dispersing after the meeting, went into the city and commenced violent interference with persons who were not observing the hartal in accordance with its desires, burnt tram cars and motor cars, assaulted Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Parsees of whom 2 were murdered and one severely wounded with a bayonet. The trouble developed due to assault and the action of the military and the Police in suppressing the disturbances. 53

Lawlessness Outside the Courts (1921):

Situation of lawlessness prevailed outside the Courts. It
may be broadly stated that causing injury to the person, property or reputation of a non-cooperator not only ceased to be an offence, but came to be regarded as an act of loyalty to the Government of a specially meritorious character. Specific references may be made to a few typical varieties of oppression.

The Gandhi caps and Khaddar dress were anathema to the officials generally throughout India, and marked out the weaver for all kinds of insults and humiliations, as also for false prosecution. Assaults on volunteers, stripping them of their clothing, and ducking them in village tanks in winter months were some of the practical jokes designed by the Police for their own amusement. Confiscation of licenses for arms, forfeiture of jagirs, Watans and Inams, withholding of water supply for irrigation, and refusing Taccavi advances were some of the punishments for those who were not charged with specific offences. Destruction of Congress and Khilafat offices and records and of national education institutions, burning of houses and crops and looting property were resorted to in more obstinate cases. The estate of an extra-loyal Zamindar in Utkal (Orissa) had gained a wide notoriety in that province for cases of shooting assault on women and a novel method of humiliating and insulting high caste people by sprinkling liquor on them and compelling them to carry night soil on their shoulders.

In spite of all round suppression a large number of the co-operators had responded in all parts of India; while on the other
wing, tendency to discard the principle of 'non-violence' was apparent.  

Boycott of Law Courts:

To effect the boycott of Government Courts, litigants were urged to refuse to use them and members of the legal profession were appealed to give up their practices. In place of Government Courts, the non-cooperation programme provided arbitration courts and these were set up in a few places. They had, however, generally a very short life for the justice they administered was indifferent and often tainted, while they had not sufficient authority to enforce their orders without recourse to violence. Some Barristers, vakils and Mukhtars resigned their practices. Perhaps the most striking result of this boycott was the refusal of non-cooperators to defend themselves when prosecuted.

In view of these developments, government appointed a Royal Commission on 15th June 1923 with Viscount Leet of Fareham as the Chairman to enquire into the organization and general conditions of service, financial and otherwise and of the Superior Civil Services in India. The Commission met in India on 4th November 1923 and submitted their report on 27th March 1924.

The Commission recommended for increased quota for selected Provincial Service Officers for the higher posts in the Police Department. They further recommended that in any year in which the full quota of 30 per cent of direct recruits was obtained by open competition,
the balance should be filled in by the promotion of the requisite number of young officers of not more than five years' service, who had been directly recruited as Deputy Superintendents, and who had given proof of fitness. In spite of the recommendation it must be noted that the Indianization of the Indian Police proceeded at a very slow pace.

In considering the question of pay, they recognized that the case of the Police Service was 'popular', the conditions had changed and, while more specialized training was necessary to equip the Police Officer for the efficient discharge of his duties, his responsibilities had become 'more onerous and irksome' and required 'greater intelligence and resource'. They recommended, therefore, that as the initial basic pay may be raised from 325 p.m. to 350, without altering the maximum and the senior scale of pay starting from Rs. 650.00, the selection grade was fixed at Rs. 1,450 and the pay of D.I.G. at Rs. 2,150 p.m.\textsuperscript{56}

These recommendations did not become effective on the plea that government had no money and therefore, the progress in effecting the recommended changes was slow.

When the nationalist movement was gaining more ground the appointment of Simon Commission added fuel to fire and created more unrest.

Lord Birkenhead, Secretary of State for India in Baldwin's
Conservative Government, was a leading lawyer and a political die-hard. He had disapproved of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. He wrote to Lord Reading, "It was frankly inconceivable that India will ever be fit for Dominion Self-Government". He expressed his contempt for Indian nationalists by describing them as "failed B.As." and noisy malcontents.

Yet the political situation in England practically compelled him to appoint in 1927 the Royal Commission for enquiry into the working of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, which was scheduled to be appointed 'at the expiration of ten years after the passing of the Act' of 1919. A general election was due in 1929, which was expected to return the labour party to power in England. The conservative Government did not wish to give the labour government a chance to appoint the statutory commission, lest it should be composed of members with liberal and pro-Indian view.

Congress Reaction:

The commission was composed of seven British members of Parliament. These were Sir John Simon (Chairman) Viscount Burnham, Baron Strathcona, E.C.G. Godogan, Stephen Walsh, G.R. Lane Fox and C.R. Attlee. It was obvious that there was no Indian member on the commission.

At the 1927 Madras Session, the Congress decided to 'boycott' the Commission on the ground that it had been appointed in 'utter
disregard of India's right of self-determination'. Resentment and suspicion were not confined to Congress circles alone. The Viceroy (Irwin) found that 'moderate men and proved friends of Great Britain like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, M.R. Jaykar and Shrimiwas Sastri felt as bitterly as did Motilal Nehru'. As leader of the Muslim League, Jinnah said, 'Jallianwalla Baug' was a physical butchery. The Simon Commission is a butchery of our soul'.

The Commission paid two visits to India (1928-29). It made extensive tours, facing hostile demonstrations, and took evidence at many places. The central legislative assembly rejected the scheme of the Commission and declined to co-operate with it. But a Commission elected by the Council of State and some members of the Legislative Assembly nominated by the Viceroy, and all provincial Legislative Councils, except the legislative council of the Central Province, appointed committees to collaborate with the Commission.  

Simon Report 1930:

The Simon Commission Report was published in May 1930. The first Volume contains a valuable survey of the working of the Act of 1919. The second Volume contains the Commission’s recommendations.

In sketching the principles of a new Constitution, the Commission recommended that India would be a constituent State of the Commonwealth of Nations united under the Crown. The ultimate Constitution of India
would be federal, for it is only in a federal constitution that units differing so widely in constitution as the provinces and the (Princely) States could be brought together while retaining internal autonomy. A federal structure should at first be created with the British Indian Provinces only, but provision was to be made for the entry of 'individual states or groups of states' as soon as they wish to join.

The Central Legislature should be reconstituted on a strictly Federal basis. It should consist of two Chambers: a Federal Assembly composed mainly of members chosen by the method of proportional representation and the Council of State (with some changes in its existing composition). No alteration was proposed in the existing legislative powers of the Central Legislature.\(^59\)

The Central Executive should be composed of the Governor-General and his Executive Council (with minor changes in its constitution). It should not be responsible to the Central Legislature in the same sense as the British Cabinet was 'responsible' to the British Parliament.

In the provincial sphere, Dyarchy should be abolished, and all departments should be placed under Ministers who should work jointly and be 'responsible' to the provincial legislature. The Governor should not be strictly constitutional ruler, nor should he have 'absolutely unlimited powers of overriding his Ministry'. The provincial legislative councils should be enlarged in size, and the official blood should be excluded. This would mean that still the governor should remain a sort of autocrat.
As regards the Princely States, the Viceroy and not the Governor-General in Council, should be the 'Agent of the Paramount Power in its relations with the Princes'. Pending the entry of the States in a federal Union of the British Indian provinces, a list of "matters of common concern" should be drawn up, and a new body, called the Council of Greater India, composed of representatives from the provinces and the States, should be set up for reaching conclusions on those matters of common concern. This set a process of integration of the princely states.

By the time the report was published, its recommendations became outdated as a result of political developments in India during the year 1928-29. The Congress committed itself to complete independence in 1929.

When Simon Commission landed at Bombay on 3rd February 1928, it was greeted by an all India hartal and a procession of 50,000 demonstrators. The trouble in the city continued for a fortnight. The Army was called out and the Police and the troops opened fire several times with casualties amounting to 149 killed and 739 injured.

Figures of reported crimes fell in Bombay and Sind, but not to a great extent. There were communal disturbances in Godhra, Surat, Nasik, and in Bombay city, towards the end of the year, 1929 in which troops were called out and Police from other districts
was mobilized. The year was also marked by considerable industrial unrest. The Bombay Government proposed an amendment to Section 73 and Section 74 of the Indian Penal Code to abolish solitary confinement as a judicial punishment. Many opinions were in favour of the proposal, but the Local Government not being unanimous, the proposal was dropped. It was reported that the public were unwilling to report crime in areas remote from a Police station. Recruitment to the unarmed branch was kept suspended in 1927 and 1928, which resulted in the accumulation of a very large number of vacancies.

The progress of the Indianization of the Indian Police Service in India is indicated in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Europeans</th>
<th>Indians</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1925</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1926</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1927</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1928</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1929</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second conference of Inspector-Generals of Police was held from 12th to 19th January, 1929, and was attended by 4 I.G.P.s, 3 Dy. I.G.P.s and 2 S.Ps.. The I.G.P., North-West Frontier Province presided. Among the important points discussed were: principles to be observed in the use of fire arms for the dispersal of mobs including the selection of a target on such occasions; the employment of motorized units of the Police for the suppression of riots and training of Special Reserve Units for this purpose; any other means
that may suggest themselves for the dispersal of dangerous mobs as an alternative to the use of fire-arms; optional investigation of cases reported to the Police; strength, recruitment and training of the prosecution and accounts branches of the Police; motor traffic and the training of the Traffic Police; and special detective staff for the investigation of grave crimes in districts from the C.I.D.

The Conference framed a set of general principles with regard to the first item; recommended the use of motorized Police units in the Presidency towns and certain industrial areas and thought there was no justification for their use elsewhere; but felt that the Police throughout India should be provided with motor lorries for the rapid transport of Police parties; and dealt with the use of tear-gas in a confidential report on the third item. They could not evolve any general principles with regard to the fourth item, recommended improvements in the existing systems in regard to the fifth and sixth and favoured the suggestion made in the last item.63

Crime increased considerably in the Bombay Presidency, the total being the highest in the previous 8 years, except 1927, even though there was a decrease in Sind. In Bombay City, there were grave labour troubles, and communal riots and troops were called out for 23 days in February and 15 days in May. There were 249 riots cases against 32 in the previous year. The modus operandi was introduced in certain districts by removing men from other duties, since financial stringency precluded the employment of a special staff.
The Government of India suggested for the serious consideration of the provinces, the provision of adequate telephone and telegraph communication in districts, typewriters at important Police stations, wider use of the C.T. Act, for setting and reclaiming criminal tribes and facilities to the Police to verify the antecedents of imported labour. In another letter, the provinces were told that conference of the Inspector Generals of Police would be held biennially, that it was desirable to aim at a gradual separation of investigating staff and the uniform Police in all big cities and towns subject to a careful examination at a later date of all experiments made in this regard and that there should be a detective staff of suitable strength at every district headquarters.

In order to augment the manpower, without increasing expenses, a volunteer Police Bill was introduced by the government but due to the opposition by the native councillors it was withdrawn.

The Government of Bombay decided in 1927 to raise the rate of the land tax nominally by 22 per cent, and in some exceptional cases, by over 60 per cent. In Bardoli, a tehsil where Gandhiji wanted to make an experiment of his mass civil disobedience in 1922, the peasants alleged that the increase in the tax rate on the recommendation of the carelessly compiled official report was unwarranted and unjustified. On the failure of all the customary, legal and constitutional methods to get their grievances redressed, the peasantry decided to organize a no-tax campaign. Signatures of the peasants were collected.
and a pledge was taken that taxes would not be paid. In a very largely attended conference of the peasants in Bardoli on 12th February 1927, Sardar Patel exhorted. 65

Seven members of the Bombay Legislative Council, 63 Patels and 11 Talathis tendered their resignations in protest against the bureaucratic oppression. Vithalbhai J. Patel, President of the Legislative Assembly, despatched a letter to the Viceroy, threatening to resign and participate in the movement, actively, if the Government refused to relent. In another letter addressed to Gandhiji, he announced a monthly donation of Rs. 1,000 so long as the campaign lasted. People from Maharashtra, Sind and other provinces sent messages to Gandhiji expressing their desire to participate in the movement.

The Congress organization made the boycott a great success. On February 3, 1928, the day of the arrival of the Commission in Bombay, complete Hartal was observed on all important towns in India, and huge demonstrations marched in processions waving black flags and carrying banners with slogans "Go Back, Simon", inscribed on them. A numerous public meetings of protest were held on that day. The one held at Bombay was the most memorable. Over fifty thousand people were assembled on the Chaupati Beach, and political leaders of different parties strongly condemned in one voice the action of the British Cabinet. 66

In 1928, the Satyagraha at Bardoli (in Gujarat) led by Vallabhbhai Patel, thrust Gandhi into the arena of political struggle. It was
a protest by the peasantry against the Patidars' demand for enhanced rent. It succeeded in securing from the Bombay Government an enquiry into the level of enhancement. Gandhi played only an advisory role, but it publicized him and his methods throughout India.\textsuperscript{67}

In short, the atmosphere was explosive when the Congress declared for a 'Purna Swaraj' (Complete Independence) and authorized the Civil Disobedience. If someone did not rise to channelize the energy into a disciplined non-violent movement, the people were expected to break out everywhere and create chaos. "Here to the People", Mr Gandhi had to declare, "I must follow them, for I am their leader". He put himself at the top of the rising wave and the movement started.\textsuperscript{68}
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