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Even before the establishment of the Arya Samaj, many British officials and Christian missionaries came into contact with Swami Dayanand and they formed the opinion that there was a tinge of "sedition" in his teachings. The British spies used to attend his lectures and reported to the Director Criminal Intelligence about the nature of the teachings of Swami Dayanand. In fact the British officials regarded the teachings of Swami Dayanand not conducive to the stability and continuity of their regime in India. Christian missionaries considered Swami Dayanand a serious hindrance in the spread of Christianity in India. Even Lord Northbrook, during an interview with the Swami, was convinced that he was a "rebel" and his activities must be "watched." That is why when Swami Dayanand made an attempt to establish Arya Samaj at Bajkot it was foiled by the British agent of that state. Those who had come forward to establish the Arya Samaj at these places were threatened with persecution.

The C.I.I.'s report about this organisation that "there has been from the beginning a political side to the movement which has sometimes surpassed in importance
the purely religious and social side," carried weight with the British Government which did not bother to go deep into the matter. The repeated declarations of the Arya Samaj from various platforms about their "non-political" character were not accepted by the British officers. When, after the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, a deputation of the Aryas waited upon Ibbetson, his reply was that the Deputy Commissioners all over the state felt that "wherever, there was an Arya Samaj, there was sedition." Later even the C.I.R. agreed that, "since 1907 the Arya Samaj has taken up a much less objectionable attitude towards political question," and "The Arya Samaj meetings and organisations are no longer openly used for dissemination of seditious views." In Lahore, at a meeting of the Nashmulii, Arya Samaj, on 6 March, 1909, the Government was rather praised for having established "religious liberty." But despite all this, the C.I.R. took a strange argument that "the society in the most advanced body in the province in matter of social, educational and religious reforms and it is not surprising therefore that its members should take a somewhat advanced position in regard to political matters also."

Thus, Arya Samaj, though not a political body, was always so, in the files of the government. It was so because Vedananda's teachings and preachings breathed
nationalism, Swami and Swadeshi. His teachings exhorted the Samajists to look to their golden past. He wanted to free his people from foreign yoke. "Vedas Religion" was to him infallible and "Vedas" the most sacred scriptures full of all knowledge. The British officials, Christian missionaries, Anglo-Indian Press and the C.I.I. could not relish these teachings; they rather condemned these at all occasions. Though Arya Samaj as a body never took part in any political event of national importance, it was branded as such. This was so because some of the prominent Arya Samajists like Lala Lajpat Rai, Ram Dass Dutt, etc., could not restrain their spirit of nationalism and jumped into the political arena. It was, in fact, for the activities of these few individual Arya Samajists that Arya Samaj as a body was branded as "Political," "Seditious" and "Undesirable." Of course, individuals from other religions and sects too played a prominent role in the national movement but those religions and sects as such were not suspected and branded "Political."

Christian missionaries were responsible, in a great measure, for making the British Government "suspect" the Arya Samaj because they considered it to be an obstacle in their way of proselytism. Secondly, C.I.I. men generally conveyed adverse reports about the Arya Samaj activities to the Government. The Muslims also could not tolerate "Swaminarayan's criticism of their faith, least the wave of
Shuddhi. Their relations became all the more hostile when a Muslim fanatic assassinated Pandit Lekh Ran, and the Government failed to trace out the murderer. So, the Muslims also misrepresented to the British officials about the activities of the Arya Samaj. Strangely enough, the Government accepted the Muslim version of Arya Samaj, its work and activities. In the years of its infancy, Arya Samaj had also to face the criticism of orthodox Hindus because the former condemned caste, untouchability and encouraged conversion and re-conversion through Shuddhi and also questioned the superiority of the Brahmins and laid stress on the infallibility of the Vedas. The orthodox Brahmin, when found his own self also attacked by Dayanand and his Samaj, came out to fight it tooth and nail. The British government was encouraged on this account as well to take measures against Arya Samaj. Moreover, Arya Samaj also tried to remain independent of the government control; it did not accept any grants from the government for its institutions nor had it any Britishers on its management. It did not employ any foreigners in their institutions; they presented a true picture of Shuddhi. The Arya Samajists did not bother to wait upon British officials and high ups seeking their patronage; rather they tried to keep themselves away from them, which the British never liked.

The adverse reports and criticism of Anglo-Indian press about the activities of the Arya Samaj and its members
added fuel to the fire. The Anglo-Indian papers branded Arya Samaj as a "seditious," "dangerous," and "political" body. This agency always advised the government to take stern measures against Arya Samaj and its members. When Lala Lajpat Rai was deported, the Civil and Military Gazette, the Pioneer and other Anglo-Indian papers were all "jubilant." The Pioneer went to the extent of telling the government not to release the deportees early. But, to their dismay, when two leaders were released by the government, the Anglo-Indian Press was "furious" on the "unwise" decision of the government. They expressed this feeling in their respective issues without any reservation. Similarly, when Martial Law punishments were inflicted on many Aryas, it was happy; but when the punishments were reduced, it expressed its "disapproval." It was the Anglo-Indian Press again which was instrumental in getting the F.A.V. College students maximum punishments during Martial Law. When the Civil and Military Gazette wrote an editorial on Satyarth Prakash on 21 August, 1919, through which it tried to excite class hatred among different communities, and held Arya Samaj responsible for that, the Arya Samaj members became furious and expressed their resentment against the paper to the government. Since the rigours of the Press Act were not applicable to it, it continued to indulge in presenting many false and fabricated accounts about Arya Samaj. When non-cooperation was launched, the Anglo-Indian
Press accused the students of R.A.V. College alone for going on strike, when the students of other colleges did not lag behind.

There was a time when Weston, the Lt. Governor of U.P., Hardinge and Chalmers, the Viceroy's, were convinced about the non-political character of Arya Samaj by their personal visits to Curukula and other Samajic institutions and through the efforts of Arya Samaj friends like C.P. Andrews. But the C.I.E. and subordinate staff continued to hold the earlier view about Arya Samaj. Some of them were even offended with Weston for giving a clean shot to Arya Samaj that it was "non-political."

On the eve of First World War, Arya Samaj had helped the British Government with men and money. They passed resolutions of sympathy and prayed for the victory of the British in the war. But to their dismay they found that the Aryas themselves were not recruited in the Army. They were not to be awarded any titles in recognition of their services. The government inflicted severe punishments on the Aryas; their entry into the government service was restricted; those already there were dismissed or harassed through transfers etc. Many of them were compelled either to leave the Arya Samaj or their service in the government departments.
Then the Chief Commissioner of the Punjab asked his commissioners and Deputy Commissioners to report on the causes of the disturbances of 1919, most of the Deputy Commissioners held Arya Samaj responsible for the disturbances and they accused that the Aryas were the "king-leaders" behind the troubles. Of course, the Hunter Committee and the Congress Enquiry Committee, established to go into the causes and nature of the disturbances found the Arya Samaj least guilty.

Thus the British attitude and policy towards Arya Samaj can be termed as a monumental piece of egregious folly not of transcendental wisdom or solid statesmanship.

Nor wonder, when non-cooperation movement was launched by Mahatma Gandhi, most of the Arya Samaj leaders jumped to join it without any reservation. Swami Shraddhanand, Lala Lajpat Rai were of course the leading spirits to short then. "The Arya Samajists appeared thunderstruck when they saw the Swami suddenly take a leading political role," but Swami Shraddhanand was later on satisfied to see "that practically all of them came over to my (Shraddhanand's) views and gradually even those who were in the front rank in religious discussion were attracted towards the movement." Lectures were delivered at Arya Samaj platforms and people encouraged to join the movement. Here too, though persons like Hans Raj were not convinced about the viability of "Boycott of Schools and Colleges" as a part of the non-
cooperation programmes, and many others also were of the similar views, but they were clear about the national cause. "The R.A.V. College authorities did not discourage those students who wanted to give up their studies for national service or for joining non-university institutions." The students of the R.A.V. College did not lag behind. They stopped attending the classes and asked the management to disaffiliate their institution from the Government University.

Thus, the Arya Samaj having experienced suspicion, suffering in the past at the hands of governmental officials decided to join the mainstream of national movement. In the post-war era, on account of a variety of reasons, the nationalist struggle assumed new heights secured overwhelming popular support. Obviously, the Arya Samaj with its background of Swaraj, and Swadeshi, independent outlook and pride in India and its past could not remain silent, passive and unconcerned.