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began to evolve rival programmes of Indian independence from the standpoint of the new ideology. The first socialist weekly, *The Socialist*, was started in Bombay by S.A. Dange in 1923. The other leading leader was Muzaffar Ahmed. Workers' and Peasants' Parties were formed in Bombay, Bengal and Punjab. The parties popularized the programme of national independence. They supported the economic and political demands of the workers and peasants and organized them on class lines for their class demands. Further they stood for direct action of the workers and the peasants as the method of struggle to secure independence.

The Workers' and Peasants' Parties built up trade unions and organized and led a number of strikes in the country. The Bombay Party built up in 1928 the Girni Kamgar Union with a membership of 65,000. It was during these years that the highly developed trade unions and Socialist and Communist Parties of England sent to India a number of representatives such as Fenner Brockway, Spratt, Ben Brad-.

The Congress at its Madras session held in December 1927 had declared complete independence to be its national goal. The year between 1927 to 1930 was marked by a negotia-

Finally Gandhi-
CHAPTER IV

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

The aim of this study is to examine the nature and causes of divisions within the nationalist movement of Egypt and India. These divisions were due to ideology, political, social, cultural and economic reasons and sometimes self-interested motives of leaders. This study has also dealt with the divisions in terms of sub-nationalism.

IV.1 EGYPT

The division could be seen from the beginning when Muhammad Abduh was working for the modernisation of Islamic teaching all his life. Muhammad Abduh's attitude towards education, opening society was based on western pattern shocked the traditional leadership. The Egyptian traditional society in particular and leadership in general were not ready for any change as a result, caused a division among leadership. They were not ready to try and reconcile the basic principles of the Koran with the modern scientific world.¹

It is true that the constitutionalists did not explicitly and consciously perceive the problem in any broad theo-

the traditional view of power and the new conditions, and of
the implications for the political community of the absence
of a suitable principle of legitimation. The radical leaders such as Muhammad Abduh and Rashid Rida expressed their
desire to see a reformed Islam taking a central place in
Egyptian public and social life. On the other hand liberal
nationalists sought to reduce religion to the role of mentor
of the individual conscience and a medium of personal rela-
tionship with the divinity. They tried to find social and
political life based on the principle of the nation and on
the ideals and values of western liberalism.

Mustafa Kamil's philosophy was based on Pan-Islamism.
He and Ali Yusuf emphasized the role of Egypt in the Muslim
world, and the importance of preserving the authority of the
Ottoman Sultan. Mustafa Kamil described patriotism in terms
of pathos which had hitherto expressed almost exclusively by
religious mystics. He believed that religion and nationalism
are inseparable twins and that he whose heart is possesed by
religion would love his fatherland and sacrifice his goods
and life for it. During the early part of his career Mustafa
Kamil argued for national independence at the same time he
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defended the prerogatives of the Khadive, while Ahmed Lutfi al-Sayyid was entirely different. Lutfi al-Sayyid had given nationalism a more solid ideological foundation on the basis of a comprehensive liberal philosophy, including a doctrine of popular sovereignty, and to rescue it from the Pan-Islamic entanglements on which Mustafa Kamil emphasised on. At the same time Kamil stressed to break the relations with the British. Lutfi al-Sayyid devoted much of his attention to political thought with the purpose of establishing new foundation for a viable political community. He attempted to do so by constructing a nationalist doctrine within the framework of a comprehensive liberal socio-political philosophy inspired by Aristotle, Rousseau, Locke, Bentham and Spencer.

Lutfi rejected all notions of nationalism founded on religion. We are not partisans of Pan-Islamism because it is religious, whereas we believe that nationality and the bonds of utility are the basis of political action. He realized that what Egypt needed the most was a thorough re-education in a new belief system and did not hesitate to break away entirely from traditional Islamic Political concepts.


IV.1.1 DIVISION IN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT BASED ON ETHNICITY

There was no ethnic feeling in the initial stage in Egypt. The Muslims and Christian Copts lived in very friendly terms. Both considered Egypt as their home land. Every citizen irrespective of their religion, worked to free Egypt from the colonial powers. The communal feeling between the muslim and the Copts started in 1910, when the Christian Coptic held its Congress in Assiut in 1910. The Assiut Congress passed a resolution demanding a special Coptic representation in the Provincial Council. It was opposed by Congress of the Muslims in 1911. The Muslim Congress was against special status based on communal lines. Mustafa Kamil said in 1895 speech that Copts and Muslims had co-existed peacefully for thirteen centuries, and that their religious differences had never had any political problems. Some copts, echoing, Maspero, tried to establish a clear seperation from Muslims by arguing that they descent from the pharaonic Egyptians which made them radically


different. Much later, this claim was repeated by Muslims who were prejudiced against the Coptic Community. Although, Shaikh al- Maraghi was a copt he denounced the coptic influence, stated that the Copts were a racial as well as a religious minority.

The 1919 revolution, which deserves most of the credit for persuading Muslims to regard Copts as genuine Egyptians, gave birth to an article of faith which was frequently repeated. Copts and Muslims were regarded as one and have lived in harmony since the Arab conquest of Egypt. Marqus Simaika's belief that the Copts were a race with both Muslim and Christian members, is only one of many attempts to posit such a unity. Misr al-Fatat said that the Coptic experience of Muslim rule had not led the Copts to fear that they would be excluded from the share in government. Some Copts, accepting that the British presence contributed to their security, described the period immediately after the 1882 occupation as a golden age in the Coptic history. Copts and Muslim relations before 1919 were portrayed accurately as black. The Copts loused for the golden days of the revolution and were disappointed with the failure of the polity to

7. Some copts before the war did countenance a common descent, but Muslims were not at that time interested in claiming Pharaonic ancestors; The Speeches of Mikhail Fanus, Akhnus Fanus and Marquas Hanna at Coptic Conference at Assiont, pp. 6-18, 33-39.
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live up to its theoretical understandings.\textsuperscript{9}

The assassination of Botrus Ghali, the Prime Minister by Ibrahim Nassif el-Wardani on 20 February 1910 closed the possibility of getting any relaxation towards national freedom. The murder crystallized the division of the movement into extremist and liberal wings, into rich and poor, into Copts and Muslims; and it encouraged the development of a Pan-Islamic terrorist section. These developments convinced the Britishers, the political immaturity of Egyptians.\textsuperscript{10} Nationalist leaders were divided in two groups, one was represented by Sa'd Zaghlul, with liberal and secular constitutionalism, in opposition to the reformist and nationalist Islam of Abduh. He established the nationalist party (al-Hizb al-watani) which was intellectually committed to westernization and de-Islamization. Another secular nationalist group, the Ummah Party, had been organized by Lutfi al-Sayyid. But while the nationalist and the Ummah parties represented coteries of liberal nationalists, civil servants, intellectuals and Journalist. Mustafa Kamil formed Watan Party which represented the down trodden people of the

\textsuperscript{9} Misr, 11 November, 1921, 1; 25 July 1931, 1; 27 and 28 August 1951, 1.

Egyptian Society.  

IV.1.2 DIVISIONS IN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT BASED ON CLASS

The Egyptian Society was divided into upper class, middle class and lower class. The "upper class" was taken to include groups in whose hand abundant possessions or great wealth are concentrated, the social power groups in Egyptian villages and towns; these groups also had political sway until the beginning of the twentieth century. The class has undergone changes in keeping with political permutations. Apart from being large landowners and merchants this class includes entreprenuers and industrialists. This strata of the Egyptian society had shaken hand with the British to maintain their hold on Egyptian economy. Apart from this class was the 'middle class' is very heterogeneous and diversified, which includes fellahs of limited means, professionals, and small merchants and army officers. It was clear that because of the existence of large scale landed property, the middle class is relatively limited in the village. The middle class in Egypt have not consolidated like the upper class. The middle class bears the greatest responsibility of the independence of their country. This class has been the main force in active politics because maximum leaders in the nationalist movement were from the middle class and were familiar with the notion of liberty.

from the west.\textsuperscript{12}

As late as the end of the nineteenth century, artisans and tradesmen were organized into corporations, each headed by a Shaikh. The last group to be included in the middle classes, is the group of army officers. Throughout the Egyptian history, the army officers periodically seized power in the country in order to introduce fundamental social reform: Urabi in Egypt in 1881-2. The army officers were the pioneers of westernization, whereas the ruling classes were pioneers of traditional rule. The lower classes form a majority of the population of Egypt. The lower classes consisted of landless fallahs and fallahs whose plots are insufficient for their livelihood therefore the lower class people were dependent on rest of the two groups.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{IV.1.3 \textit{IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCE AND EMERGENCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN EGYPT}}

The nationalist leaders were not ready to give-up their ideological differences which caused set-back to the nationalist movement time to time. The egoism in the leadership caused an internal fight which acted as an hurdle to fight against the common enemy i.e. the British. Due to internal rifts several political parties were formed in Egypt, between 1907-10, five liberal political parties were formed in


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, pp.214-223.
Egypt like the Constitutional Reformers (1907), the National Free Party, the Party of Independent Egyptians, the Young Egyptian Party and the party of the Noldes. The Constitutional Reform Party was formed by Shaykh Ali Yusuf with the help of the Khadive. The prime intention of Khadive behind the formation of the Constitutional Reform Party was to counter the nationalist feeling generated by the nationalist leaders.

The question of successor sometimes became an important cause for the division in the nationalist movement. For instance, Mustafa Kamil's al-Hizb al-Watani Party, was divided in two groups after his death in 1908. A rivalry started over the question of leadership between its successor Muhammad Farid and Mustafa Kamil's own brother Ali Fahmi. Gorst Conciliated the Khadive and his ministers by relaxing British control, but made no substantial concessions to meet the nationalists' demand for Constitutional rule. Sa'd zaghlul resigned from the Cabinet in 1912 because he was not consulted on the question of Muhammad Farid's


The first Sultan Prince Husayn Kamil changed his policy and supported the Egyptian nationalist leaders. At the end of the World War I the leadership of the national movement in Egypt rested on Zaghlul, Abd al-Aziz Fahmi, Lutfi al-Sayyid, Ali Sharawi, Muhammad Mahmud. The first split in this alliance of forces which constituted the Egyptian national movement took place in March 1919. Zaghlul had addressed a memorandum to the representatives of the powers in Egypt and informed them about the formation of the wafd and its aims. Lulf al-Sayyid and his colleagues were allowed to proceed to Paris to present the case of Egyptian independence in Peace Conference. The denial of Sa'ad Zaghlul to attend Paris Conference gave an impression that Zaghlul and others have collaborated with the British authority. This confusion caused another division with the resignation of two Wafd members.

IV.1.4 DIVISIONS DUE TO DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP

The Wafd Party divided again on the question of leadership, on 14 May 1921. Ali Sharawi, Hafiz Afifi, George Khayyat and

16. According to Kitchner, the resignation resulted from Zaghlul's clash with the Khadive -- FO.371/1362, dispatch no.15, April 1912; Ahmed Safiq, Mudhakkarati fi nisf Qarn, vol. II, Part 2, pp.271-3.


Abd al-Khaliq Madkur had resigned from the Wafd Party and announced the formation of Liberal Constitutionalist Party on 30 October 1922. Both believed in negotiation and compromise. But the Wafdists on one hand, insisted on a greater degree of internal independence and did not shrink from violence to achieve it on the other, the Liberals, like the Umma, favoured gradualism and shunned violence.¹⁹

The struggle for power between Zaghlul and the other forces took on life-and-death dimensions. In public Zaghlul said that the Wafd was not a party; it was a delegation empowered by the nation to express the will of the nation. "Anyone who says we are a party demanding independence is a criminal", said Zaghlul, "this implies that there are other parties which do not want independence. The whole nation wants independence, we are the spokesmen of the nation, we are the trustees of the nation".²⁰ Adli Yakan went to London on July 1, 1921 to begin negotiations, probably realizing that his efforts were doomed from the start. Strikes and demonstrations had broken out in Egypt, Zaghlul encouraged them. The British Government was under the impression that only because of Zaghlul, no negotiation was possible. Final-


ly, Allenbey, sent on exile to Zaghlul and his nephews Atif and Fathallah Barakat, Mustafa al-Nabhas. The expulsion gave a message that Adli was involved behind the plot.

Adli Yakan, Tharwat and Sidqi formed the Liberal Constitutional Party in October 1922. The Liberal Constitutionalist believed that a policy of moderation and of compromise with Britain would yield more rapid results than Zaghlul's entrenchment had done. Meanwhile they asserted that a constitution was of more immediate importance as a safeguard for any government against the King, whom they all distrusted and whose autocracy was well known.

A major division in the nationalist movement came in 1927 when Muslim Brotherhood disassociated herself with other leadership. The Brotherhood became a major source of inspiration for the new nationalists. The leadership of Brotherhood realized that all political leaders, parties are fulfilling the interest of the elite section of Egyptian society. Therefore they took up the cause of downtrodden people who had been neglected by political parties. The Brotherhood got massive support by the clerks, low paid professionals, technicians and students at both traditional and modern universities. Its puritanism was attractive to many of the more traditional Egyptians, who strongly supported the Brotherhood's campaign against the corruption of the ruling elite. It helped to transform liberal nationalism into a force which was with its strong anti-western base in
They believed that a state and a society based on Quran and the tradition could cure all the ills of their people, but they had no real knowledge of what should be done to build such a state. The ideology of the Brotherhood was grounded more on faith than systematic thought. Hasan al-Banna the founder of Muslim Brotherhood began to agitate for a Muslim State and a Muslim Social order. The Brotherhood was the major nationalist group of the 1930s and 1940s, untainted by any association with the imperialists and the "corrupt" party regime. The Brotherhood combined the concepts of egalitarianism and reform with the tenets of traditional Islam. The Brotherhood devoutly advocated a traditional Islamic State founded on Shariah and the rule of the Brotherhood as the Islamic order, the "true" representatives of the faith and of the Islamic State.

There were few thinkers who advocated socialist ideas before World War I and called for social reforms on the basis of socialist doctrines. The first politician to introduce socialist ideas into the program of political party after World War I was 'Aziz Mirhum'. Mustafa 'Abd al-Raziq, Husayn Haykal, Aziz Mirhum, Mansur Fahmi formed a political party advocating liberal ideas.

---


The Wafd Party did not take long to agree on the political objectives of the party, such as the achievement of independence and the protection of constitutional liberties, not to call it the Democratic Party. When the leaders began to discuss the social and economic goals, they found themselves divided into two groups. Mirhum later joined the Wafd, hoping that his socialist views might have greater appeal among Zaghlul's followers. Mirhum was very disappointed with Wafdist leadership, mainly the party proved no less opposed to socialist ideas than others.23 The Wafd leadership claimed to be the champion for the cause of the common man, opposed the socialist movement on the ground that national unity was absolutely necessary to oppose foreign domination and that their programme was designed to serve the interests of workers and peasants.24 Socialist leaders who used to confine their activities to the literate began to turn their attention to the masses, and their social philosophy was bound to be affected by proletarian interests. The nationalist leaders opposed socialism because it weakens national unity by a class struggle at a time when the nation was engaged in a struggle against foreign domina-

23. Mirhum served as a senator during the 1930s and 1940s, and often spoke on labour problems in Parliament, but no longer identified himself with left-wing groups.

tion. Furthermore, these leaders could not be sympathetic with a movement directed against the upper classes to which most of them belonged. 25

IV.1.5 COLONIAL ROLE IN THE DIVISION OF NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

Lloyd Lord's policy in Egypt had done much to keep Anglo-Egyptian relations bubbling on the front burners to the detriment of any sound internal reforms. Lloyd undermined the Wafd Party representing the nation and supported Mahmud's cabinet againstst the will of the masses. He also encouraged Mahmud to run an organization parallel to the Wafd which caused a division among leadership in Egypt. In 1929 general elections held in England, the Labour Party led by Ramsay MacDonald came to power, as a result Lord Lloyd, resigned as a foreign secretary. Arther Henderson, the new foreign secretary showed an inclination to open the subject of Anglo-Egyptian negotiations. Mahmud was reluctant to embark on any negotiations and feared that it might force his cabinet into resigning before it had had time to carry out its projected reforms. Mahmud had no choice but to go for negotiations. In the face of the intransigence Mahmud showed and his unreasonable demands of pushing British interest above the Egyptian ones, 26 Mahmud wanted to extend general elections by changing constitution of Egypt. Mahmud

25. Ibid. p.108.


213
planned to modify the electoral law of 1924 in favour of one that would be of less benefit to the Wafd by disenfranchising many of their supporters, and then submit the terms of the treaty, which were to be kept secret till then. Unfortunately Mahmud's plans, the terms of the treaty were leaked by the foreign office to Makram Ubaid. On 9 August, Hugh Dalton, the parliamentary undersecretary for foreign affairs, who was not in good terms with Mahmud, announced publicly that treaty negotiations were conditioned i.e., in a return for constitutional government in Egypt and no change in the electoral law.²⁷ It was proposed to form a coalition government but the Wafd leadership refused to run government with Mahmud. The Wafd leaders were confident that whenever election will be held, the Wafd would return to the power. Keeping in mind that the Wafd will not work according to wishes of the British, the new British High Commissioner, Sir Percy Loraine, decided to support Mahmud's Cabinet rather than having the Wafd in power.²⁸ Loraine opined, Nahhas and the Wafd were incapable of thinking in nationalist terms. Loraine further wrote that the Wafd leaders merely want to have Mahmud kicked out, to have elections, to get a big majority, form a Wafdist government was the only target. The Labour government headed by Henderson finally

²⁸. F.O. 371/13845
gave an instruction to Loraine to ask Mahmud to step down. Adli Pasha Yakan took the charge of government but he also resigned.

Mustafa al-Nahhas a Wafd Leader was called upon for the second time to become Premier. Nahhas had begun treaty negotiations with Henderson, the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations had failed. The Wafd leadership blamed Nahhas for this failure. Nahhas resigned within six months after coming to power. Ismail Sidqi was asked by King Fuad to lead the new Cabinet. The King planned to use Sidqi to crush the Wafd, and then to crush Sidqi who had no popular backing, Sidqi was used by the King against the nationalist movement in Egypt. Sidqi was a man who announced plan to draw up a new constitution so that Wafd could be stopped to get majority in any forthcoming election. The King believed that Egypt's future depended on its links with Britain and the Wafd would "compromise" Egypt's independence unless they were eliminated from the political scene.29 The Wafd believed that British sympathy for parliamentary institutions would compel cooperation with the majority party, while Sidqi believed that British sympathy for good administration and stability, hatred for demagoguery, and exhaustion with the Wafd would allow him to retain power. The riots and strikes which the Wafd had incited against the government and which were reminiscent of early Wafd fervor were now used as an instru-

ment against all opposition cabinets.

The Wafd faced internal difficulties once again and seemed to be splitting into two different factions. Nahhas and Makram were pitted against Mahir and Nuqrashi. The last two were infavour of exploiting the international situation and using militant methods to force Britain's hand by bringing down the Towfiq Nasim government. Nahhas and Makram this time counseled moderation and support of Nasim.

IV.1.6 FORMATION OF UNITED FRONT AGAINST COLONIAL POWERS

The students who by 1930's had become disillusioned with their leaders started acting on their own, often in opposition to Wafd directives, and they began to pose problem to the Wafd. In an effort to bring them under stricter Wafd discipline, a plan was evolved to create the Rabitat al-Shubban al-Wa-Rabitat al-Shubban al-Wafdiyya, League of Wafdist Youth, Known as the Blue shirts. On December 14, 1935, the United Front requested the high commissioner for the statement from the British government regarding their willingness to conclude a treaty with Egyptian government on the basis of the Nahhas - Henderson 1930 negotiations so that the Egyptian leaders may get specific time when British will vacate Egypt. A rift had appeared in the united front.


Muhammad Mahmud had been receiving student leaders at his house and was offering them large sums of money in return for their support on the side of the Ahrar and against the Wafd. The Wafd was further weakened by serious internal dissension which culminated at the end of the year the expulsion from the party of Ahmad Mahir and Muhand al-Nugrashi. In turn Nugrashi and Mahir founded a new party, the Saadist party, in which they adopted the name Saad as an indication that they were the true followers of Saad Zaghulul, unlike the Wafd which had become decadent in the hands of Nahhas and Makram and had deviated from the true nationalist principles. It is notable that Makram too was soon to be displaced and cast out of the party. In 1942 he found another political party, al-Kutla a-Wafdiyya, the Wafdist Bloc, which also claimed to follow the true Wafdist principles.

IV.2 INDIA

The main division of the society was between rulers and ruled: the former enjoyed the spoils of power while the rest of society operated under its own traditional institutions almost depending on the rulers.

The Paradox of nationalist demands emerging from the minds of people trained by their imperial rulers articulate them in the English language and ideals of westernization proved to be an almost insuperable obstacle. The nationalist movement was divided on liberal and extremist line after 1906. W.C. Bonerji and S.N. Benerjea, M.G. Ranade and G.K.
Gokhale, Dadabhai Naoroji and Pherozshah Mehta were representing liberal camp of leadership. To some extent all of Congress founding fathers were, indeed, prototypes of Macaulay's early nineteenth century dream, hybrids "Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions ... in intellect". The dis-satisfied leaders framed a separate group known as militant extremist wing within the Congress rank. The extremist wing of B.G. Tilak, LL. Rai and B.C. Pal wanted to break the relation with the British. Another reason for the divisions within the nationalist movement was the orthodox and liberal views of leaders. In Tilak's opinion women's role was simply to "look after the house", whereas the liberal leaders as Gokhale and other friends were very much open about women's education and their role in the nationalist movement because the Indian liberal leadership was highly influenced by liberal English people like Hume, Cotton and Hunter. By offering girls and boys equal educational opportunity, Tilak argued in Kesari "Society would merely suffer", for "in this world the spheres of duty of women are different from those of men, and therefore the education of the one must differ from that


of other.\textsuperscript{34} Whereas Gokhale was an ardent advocate of female education in all its branches, as "a factor of the highest value to the true well-being of every nation.\textsuperscript{35} Justice M.G. Ranade, however, championed the girls claim to her freedom. Tilak argued that Ranade should not interfere with the dharma shastra.\textsuperscript{36} The ideological difference among the two groups had several times affected the nationalist movement.

Tilak and his many 'disciple's major thrust of their message to British was "Get out of my house, and give me the key before you go!" They put freedom before reform, whereas Ranade and Gokahle argued that before India could be ready to bear the responsibilities connected with self-rule. It was essential for all Indians to treat one another more humanely, with equality for all religions, sexes, castes, and outcastes. Equally outspoken British liberals, like Sir Henry Cotton and Sir William Wedderburn, early president of the Indian National Congress, dedicated their energies and fortunes to helping young India assert her claims to enjoy all the rights, privileges, and freedoms of British subjects the world over.\textsuperscript{37} Gokhale was an admirer of the west,

\begin{itemize}
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persuasive, conciliatory, and constructive; Tilak was an admirer of the Indian Past, rugged in personality, sardonic and provocative in expression, a sickler for rights, a relentless and bonnie fighter. Gokhale's attitude appealed to the judgement of the cautious bourgeois, while Tilak's made of blood tingle with proptings to direct action.38

IV.2.1 PARTITION OF BENGAL AND SWADESHI MOVEMENT

The partition of Bengal in 1905, designed solely with regard for administrative efficiency which was partially true, but it was more correct that the Bengal was the place of learning. The people were conscious in regards to their rights. The British divided the nationalist spirit emerging from Bengal.39 A storm of protest, under the leadership of Surendranath Banerjea and Rabindranath Tagore, was lodged against the British raj. The middle class and the common people as well had been deeply stirred in Bengal. Broadly the result was the capture of this class by a revivified Congress. The Congress had begun to possess political power as well power of persuasion. The feeling that the British government had set its face against the Indian renascence had not only inspired a splinter terrorist group in Bengal


but it had greatly increased anti-government feeling and correspondingly increased the following of Tilak.40

The government had changed in England in 1906 elections. The new government were friendly to Indian aspirations and were expected to reverse Curzon's most controversial measures. The new government attempted to win back the goodwill of the political class. Two years later the partition of Bengal itself was revoked.41

Holly dip in Ganga, Kali Puja and Ganesh puja was performed by the Hindus to mark their protest against the partition of Bengal and the orthodox attitude of Tilak's group which hurt the sentiment of the Muslim leadership. In reaction to the Hindu glory, the Muslims of East Bengal supported the partition and in retaliation they formed Muslim League.42

To see all possibilities close to keep Hindu-Muslims together, a special political representation by the Indian Council Act 1909 was given to the Muslims which shown small success tending to the direction of Hindu-Muslim unity. The plea being that with a property franchise, poverty would prevent Muslims from having an influence in general constituencies in proportion to the numbers. An effort had been

41. Spear. n.38, p. 178.
made to reach an agreement between the Muslim League and the Congress Party in 1916 in Lucknow. Under its terms both Congress and the League agreed to work together and campaign for self-government. In return Congress accepted the idea that there should be separate electorate for Muslims. The British and Gandhiji also recognized the separate electorate formula for the Muslims.\(^43\)

IV.2.2 DIVISION IN CONGRESS AND THE EMERGENCE OF INDIAN LIBERAL FEDERATION

The Chelmsford Reforms were partially successful as with the Morley-Minto scheme a decade earlier, in creating a division in the upper class national camp, but the support of the liberal leaders thus seemed was of far less weight in the political situation at this more advanced stage of development. Mrs. Annie Besant was elected President of the Indian National Congress in 1917. But when the report on reforms came out in the summer of 1918 a special session of the Congress at Bombay condemned the proposals as "disappointing and unsatisfactory". It was after this special Congress that the principal liberal leaders left the Congress and formed the Indian Liberal Federation, representing those bourgeoisie

elements which wished to cooperate with imperialism.\textsuperscript{44}

Gandhiji found a sensitive gap between the predominantly urban middle class congress and the Indian masses. He shifted his attentions to the villages and the peasants. He began his experiments with Satyagraha or non-violent resistance, which he translated as "Soul force".\textsuperscript{45} The Satyagraha revolutionized Indian politics and galvanized millions into action against the British rule.\textsuperscript{46} Despite the still-continuing co-operation of the Congress, the whole situation in India had changed in 1919 and the basis for cooperation was disappearing from under the feet of the Congress. The Congress cooperation was disappearance of Indian nationalist identity. On the contrary Gandhiji deployed different methods of cooperation but in a different manner so that the Congress as well as leadership could not lose their identity. Gandhiji declared that he would not purchase independence at the price of bloodshed. Being in Congress he marginalize the revolutionary leadership. Gandhi's way of

\begin{itemize}


\end{itemize}
struggle was mass resistance with peaceful manner. 47

Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali popularly known as Ali brothers formed a central Khilafat organization in northern India to arouse Muslim opinion on Turkey. Ali brothers inform the protest against the injustices of the Treaty of Sevres to Turkey, the leading Muslim power. In 1919 Gandhiji capitalized on Muslim consciousness by articulating the community's dissatisfaction with the treaty between the Allied powers and the Turkey at the end of the war. 48 The early promise of a unified nationalist movement was not fulfilled because the British fastered and encouraged the Muslim League and Congress failed to contain Muslim separatism. The Congress and Gandhiji committed a mistake for agreeing to the Lucknow Pact of 1916 and to the principle of separate electorates for Muslims, and for associating the non-cooperation campaign of 1920-21 with the Khilafat movement, with the result that Islamic consciousness, as distinct from national consciousness and the exclusiveness and fanaticism that go with it were revived in the Muslim masses. 49


IV.2.3 DIVISION DUE TO THE EMERGENCE OF COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Indian nationalist movement was divided on communal basis, with the emergence of Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League on the scene. The Mahasabha dealt with religious, communal, and social questions, and was largely attended, protested strongly against any Hindu weakening on this subject whereas Muslim League emerged to cater for Muslim interests. The Muslims feared that the large community would override the interest of the smaller one and that Muslims would be left behind as a minority without any proper representation. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan (1817-98) never accepted the Congress as a truely national organization, insisting that "India is inhabited by different nationalities" and considering "the experiment which the Indian National Congress wants to make fraught with dangers and sufferings for all the nationalities of India, especially for the Muslims". Though Mohammad Ali Jinnah said that the Muhammadan gaze was, like the Hindu gaze, fixed upon the future. He said Indians were determined to prove their fitness for

50. Lovett, n.40, p. 120.

Another division in Indian nationalist movement occurred when the leaders such as Shaukat Usmani, Sripad Amrit Dange, Muzaffar Ahmed and M.N. Roy denounced the ideology of Congress and formed Communist Party. Communist Party characterized Congress as a bourgeoisie reactionary body trying to prevent mass urges from following their natural course. The Communist characterised the World War II as an imperialist war, bitterly attacked on Congress and Gandhi for not launching a mass struggle, immediately after the war began for the emancipation of India.

IV.2.4 DIVISION IN CONGRESS ON THE QUESTION OF COUNCIL ENTRY

The nationalist movement divided again on the issue of council entry. The Congress leadership was not in favour to contest council elections. The legislative councils boycotted the Congress. C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru left the Congress in protest and formed Swaraj Party to contest the next council elections with the purpose of destroying the reforms from within by 'uniform, consistent and continuous

---


Many swarajists were led increasingly to favor a position of "responsive cooperation" with the government for the achievement of Swaraj. The group led by Gandhiji opposed the swarajist strategy. Gandhiji sought to achieve a peasant society, self-governig and self-sufficient. Purity of the soul and requisite to the attainment of swaraj; only through self-discipline could India prepare herself and make herself worthy of freedom.

IV.2.5 DIVISION IN THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT ON DALIT QUESTIONS

Gandhiji wanted to improve Dalit's social and economic condition within the Hindu social structure whereas Dr. Ambedkar wanted a change in social structure. The first meeting between Gandhiji and Ambedkar took place on 14 August 1931. Gandhiji clarified his stand by saying that I understand that you have got some grievances against me and the Congress. I may tell you that I have been thinking over the problem of untouchables ever since my school days - when you were not even born. You may perhaps be knowing what enormous amount of efforts I had put into incorporate this


problem in the programme of the Congress and make it a plank of the Congress platform. The Congress leaders opposed it on the plea that it was a religious and social question and as such it should not be mixed with political ones. Dr. Ambedkar responded that it is true, Mahatmaji, that you started to think about the problem of untouchables before I was born. All old and elderly persons always like to emphasize the point of age. It is also true that because of you the Congress party gave recognition to this problem. But let me tell you frankly that Congress did nothing beyond giving formal recognition to this problem. Dr. Ambedkar again said that the Congress is not sincere about its profession. Had it been sincere, it would have surely made the removal of untouchability a condition, like the wearing of Khaddar, for becoming a member of the Congress. This is my charge against you and the Congress. You say the British Government does not show a change of heart. I also say that the Hindus have not shown a change of heart in regard to our problem, and so long as they remain adamant we would believe neither the Congress nor the Hindus. We believe in self-help and self-respect. Dr. Ambedkar founded the Social Conference, an All India organization which ran an adjunct to the Indian National Congress. Year after year the Conference met to discuss the social ills and to find the ways of remedying

IV.2.6 DIVISION DUE TO PERSONALITY CLASH IN LEADERSHIP

There had been no strong control over the party after the death of C.R. Das, President of Swaraj Party on 16 June, 1925. Everybody became decision maker in absence of responsible leadership. Motilal Nehru issued an explanation notice to Tambe, (a prominent leader of the Swarajists in central province) in what circumstances he had accepted membership of executive council of the province which was against the party decision. An uproaring scene was created inside the Swaraj Party on the issue of explanation notice. Before any reply coming from Tambe, P. Jaikar issued an statement asserting that Tambe's action was analogous to the acceptance of the salaried post of the president of the Legislative Assembly by V.J. Patel. Jayakar and Kelkar resigned from Swaraj Party executive committee on the ground of humiliation. A senior party colleague and formed a new party of responsive cooperationists, with the intention of giving a fillip to the Council entry programme "by occupying every place of power, initiative and responsibility and giving no


quarter to the bureaucracy". 60

The Viceroy, Lord Reading took full advantage of the situation and in his opening address to the Assembly on January 20, 1926, made conciliatory gestures to attract those who were chafing under the hard discipline of the Swaraj Party. The Viceroy made every possible efforts to create a division among the Swarajist by supporting the dissatisfied group. On the other hand he refused everything concerning the all-important question of political reform he regretted the refusal of the Indian leaders to utilize the opportunities offered by the Act of 1919 and observed:

"A more generous response would, I feel sure, have evoked generous action. The heart of Britain would have been won by immediate and sympathetic acceptance of the advance she had made and a new situation would have been created based upon mutual trust and goodwill". 61

New elections were now approaching and the unity process initiated by Gandhij i, Mrs. Naidu, and the Congress president in 1926 had failed. Messers Jayakar, Kelkar, Moonje and others formed the Responsive Cooperation Party. Malviya's effort ultimately failed to bring Responsivists

60. The Indian National Congress 1925, Discussion on Motilal Nehru's resolution regarding the political programme, Jayakar's speech. The Indian Annual Register, 1925, vol. II. p. 336.

The Indian nationalist movement was divided on the question of Dominion status or the complete independence to India. The Nehru Report on Dominion Status was adopted in 1928 at the Congress session, and the British were given precisely one year to accept their demand; otherwise, Congress promised to launch a new nationwide satyagraha campaign under the leadership of Gandhiji. On the contrary, Subhas Chandra Bose said that nothing less than "Complete Independence" was the Congress immediate goal. Motilal and his liberal allies did not care about opposition. On the contrary, they convinced the British friends in parliament to grant dominion status. Maulana Mohomed Ali from Assam opposed the demand of dominion status to India in his words: "It is better to die than to be a coward for one minute". He supported the demand of attainment of independence of India, but he was ignored. Dominion status in the words of Maulana

---


Mahomed Ali, is certainly not a thing to be "attained". India had yet to attain independence.64

IV.2.8 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOCIALIST AND THE CONGRESS LEADERSHIP

The Congress had been declared illegal by the British Government. Gandhi and the British reached an understanding. As a result he withdrew Civil Disobedience on 6 June 1934. The government issued the notification declaring the constituent part of the Congress organization illegal was being withdrawn. The inevitable return to parliamentary methods of political struggle deeply perturbed Jawaharlal Nehru. He expressed his feelings and the toning down of the Congress ideal of Purna Swaraj.65

The socialists rejected Gandhism on two counts: the axiom of change of heart and the constructive programme. They formed the Congress Socialist Party in India in May 1934. It held its first All India Conference under the Presidentship of Acharya Narendra Dev at Patna on 17 May 1934. Gandhiji announced his withdrawal from the Congress. Tej Bahadur Sapru maintained that even after the co-called retirement, Gandhiji would still continue to dominate the
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The socialists embraced socialism on account of the economic situation in the country. The Congress leaders, however, looked upon poverty in India "as a political grievance" Narendra Dev visualised a link up of the economic struggle with "the national struggle"; for it would give "social content to the national struggle".

The socialist leaders were bound to reject the new constitution provided under the Government of India Act, 1935. They would not fall for the idea of accepting office within the framework of the new constitution. Their insistence on an economic programme and their policy of struggle stemmed from their commitment to socialism. They were not prepared to negotiate or compromise with the British for India's independence. The lure of power and prestige, however, proved too great for the Congress leaders.

In the Lucknow session, Nehru sponsored many radical measures, but the All India Congress Committee ultimately either "rejected or drastically modified" those measures. It turned down even his proposal for collective affiliation of

---


peasants' and workers' organizations. Nehru did not choose to fight it out. He said "I have no desire to force the issue in the Congress and thereby create difficulties in the way of our struggle for independence". Expediency determined his flexibility.

IV.2.9 DIVISION IN THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT ON THE QUESTION OF LEADERSHIP

There had been sharp division between Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru on the question of acceptance of office. One group supported by Gandhiji favoured acceptance and other group led by Jawaharlal opposed. Jawaharlal Nehru was in search of a leader who could challenge the domination of Gandhi and his group. Subhas Chandra Bose emerged as a leader. He entered into politics in 1921. He had disagreed when Gandhiji had staged the non-cooperation movement in 1922. Vathalbhai Patel and Bose expressed their opinion that Gandhiji had failed as a political leader and advocated for a radical change in the Congress on a new principle, with a new method, and under a new leadership. Bose became the leader of the younger Congressmen, who believed in socialism. On the question of election of Bose as a President of the Congress


for Second term, Congress divided in two segments. One group comprising B. Sardar Ballabh bhai Patil, Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Bhulabhai Desai, J.B. Kripalani, Shankarrao Dev, Jamnalal Bajaj. Jairamdas Daulatram wanted to put up presidential candidate, Maulana Abul Kamal Azad but he denied on health ground. This group again decided to P. Sitaramayya for presidential candidate. Other group comprising Sawami Sahajanand Saraswati, Jaiprakash Narayan, the Congress socialist leader and Acharya Narendra Dev were supporting Bose's candidature for Congress president. The election for fifty first session of the Congress took place on 29 January 1939. Bose defeated Pattabhisitaramayya by 1,580 votes against 1,375. The defeat of Sitaramayya was a prestige issue for Gandhiji and issued a statement saying that the defeat of Sitaramayya was 'more mine than his', and also that the victory of Subhas Chandra Bose meant, 'that the delegates do not approve of the principles and policies for which I stand.70

The right-wing Congressmen led by Gandhiji was not prepared to accept the leadership and policy of President Bose. Having failed to constitute the working committee by

---

Bose, he resigned from Presidentship on 2 April 1939, the day the All India Congress Committee meeting began at Calcutta. Upon his resignation, Mrs. Sarojani Naidu presided over the Congress Committee meeting. After resigning, Bose formed Forward Block on 3 May 1939.

Soon after the German invasion of Russia the Government finally made up its mind to give its effect to the offer of August 8, 1940. In July, the Executive Council was enlarged to 12 members of whom 4 were British and 8 Indians. At the Working Committee of Muslim League held out on December 28, 1941, at Nagpur, the threat of direct action in case any attempt was made towards constitutional advance without the consent of the League. Fazlul Haq joined the Defence Council at the bidding of the Viceroy, then retreated at the threat of Jinnah, then resigned from the League. But soon after he broke up his alliance with the League Party in the Bengal ministry and founded the progressive party.

On March 24, 1940, the Muslim League at its annual session in Lahore formally adopted the resolution which demanded the division of India on communal lines and the establishment of independent, sovereign Muslim states. Jinnah's two nation theory was rejected and Allah Bakhsh
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Chief Minister of Sind declared, "No segregated or isolated region but the whole of India was the homeland of all the Indian Muslims and no Hindu or Muslim or any other had the right to deprive them of their homeland". He considered the idea of Pakistan fantastic, and advocated complete independence for India, because Pakistan was impractical and harmful. He desired the constitution to be settled by a Constituent Assembly in which safeguard would be provided for the minorities.

IV.2.10 DIVISION IN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT BASED ON REGIONALISM

The Indian nationalist movement had failed to satisfy every region of India. The movement did not recognize many regions as a part of India. As a result several movements had been fought by regional leaders without recognizing Indian National Congress.

TAMIL NADU

D.V. Ramaswami Periyar joined the Indian National Congress in 1920. Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu and C.R. these three men had extended all possible help to Gandhiji who was providing leadership to the Congress. As soon as he joined the Congress he began to adopt Gandhiji's principles punctiliously. He staged a satyagraha in front of the
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Mahadevar temple in Vaikkom for seeking rights for the lower castes to enter the temple streets, opposed bitterly the practice of having separate dining arrangements for Brahmins and non-Brahmin students in Shermadevi Gurukulam. After a series of experiments within the Congress, which may be termed as experiments on question of citizenship in the nation, he finally broke ranks with the organization in November 1925, when two of his resolutions favouring 'communal representation' were disallowed in Kanchipuram Conference of the Tamil Nadu Congress. Thereafter he declared his political agenda to be: "no god; no religion; no Gandhi; no Congress; no brahmens."

E.V. Ramasamy's doubts about the place of the subordinate classes in the Congressite nation and his resolve to fight the Congress, Gandhi, and brahmanical Hinduism were strengthened by Gandhi's utterances in Tamil Nadu during 1927. In the highly charged Tamil Political environment, Gandhi not only said, "Varnasharma Dharma is not an unmitigated evil but it is one of the foundations on which Hinduism is built and defines man's mission on earth" [Irschick 1969:337-38], but also described the brahmans as the "finest flower of Hinduism and humanity". He added: "I will do
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nothing to wither it. I know that it is well able to take care of itself. It has weathered many a storm before now. Only let it not be said of non-brahmans that they attempted to rob the flower of its fragrance and luster...."

Importantly, the identity that E.V. Ramasamy established between God, religion, Gandhi, the Congress and the brahmans were based on his understanding that all of them stood in the way of different subordinate social groups such as the sudras, the dalits and women, attaining free and equal citizenship in the nation-in-the-making. His political career then onwards was more or less an unwavering journey through the Self-Respect Movement (founded in 1926) and the Dravidar Kazhagam (founded in 1944) in search of substantive, as opposed to formal, citizenship for the subordinate groups.

At one level, he viewed the nationalist demand for Swaraj or self rule as a conspiracy by the local elite (who, for him, were as varied as the brahminse who opposed to the sudras, the marwaris as opposed to the Tamils, men as opposed to women...depending differing relational context) to hegemonise the subordinate classes, and as a process which would eventually affirm rather than erase their unequal status. At another level, he viewed it as an impossible project given the innumerable criss-crossing of hierarchies and relations of authority and subordination. Writing in 1928 also the condition of untouchables and women, he noted, we have been telling that unless the above two oppression
[i.e. of untouchables and women] are destroyed, asking for freedom in India or claiming that Indians will take care of India's administration and security or telling that India does not need even a little association with outsiders ... is utterly foolish or dishonesty involving selfish conspiracy.

He as a Congressman 'fanatically' committed to Gandhi, condemned the Raj unequivocally. Periyar realized the way the Congress is fighting for the liberation of the country. After detachment from the Congress he re-evaluated his stance on the raj and founded several things of the raj worthy of support. According to him "though we have lost so much from being the slaves of the British, we have profited atleast a little and understood ourselves as human being. Had we remained the slaves of north Indian, we would have remained 'sudra', 'rakshashan', 'Chandalan', 'asuran' 'Kundalan', 'Kolakan', 'Pratilokan', 'narakan'... He, time and again, claimed that substituting the British rule with Swaraj would be equivalent to the "suicide of the common people" unless one could be confident of a new rule based not on Manu Dharma, varnashrama Dharma and brahmin hegemony. He was disappointed that the British, unlike in their own nation, did not attempt sufficiently to establish a full-fledged rule of Manitha (Human) Dharma in India, but also followed Manu Dharma in large measure.

During the course of the anti-Hindi agitation which contested the compulsory introduction of Hindi in schools by
the Congress government in 1937, E.V. Ramasamy began airing his demand for separate Tamil Nadu, which evolved into a demand for a separate Dravida Nadu. Till the end of his life, he more or less steadfastly denied legitimacy to India as one nation and kept his demand alive. He used this difference primarily as a heuristic device to deny legitimacy to the Hindus of north India to exercise hegemony over other regions and people who had a better record on matters relating to equality.

He could thus, while talking about Dravida Nadu, accommodate the whole of the sudras of the north India in his nation: "...[People] who suffered from this [Aryan] degradation are not only those who speak Tamil ...[They are] also there in other states, i.e. states like Bengal, Bihar, Bombay, Maharashtra where they speak different language. And similarly, he could denounce Tamil, while opposing the imposition of Hindi in schools: in 1939, when Hindi was a burning issue in Tamil Nadu. Periyar criticised even Tamil language in these terms "I don't praise some thing because it is my language, my nation, my religion... If I think my nation is unhelpful for my ideas and cannot (also) be made helpful, I will abandon it immediately. Likewise, if I think my language will not benefit my ideals or will not help my people to progress and live in honour. I will abandon
NORTHEAST

The various tribes inhabiting in Northeeastern region had lived for long in isolation from rest of India. Even among the different tribes within the region, hardly any communications was possible because of difficult terrain in which they lived. During the British rule, not much of a contact was established because the Britishers were mainly interested in their trade and commerce. They did not want to invite trouble by interfering with the normal life of the tribes. It was Christian missionaries which connected these tribal people with the rest of India.

In Assam Civil Disobedience failed becuase the growing conflict between Assamese and Bengalis, Hindus and Muslims, and the tensions developing from densely-populated East Bengal. The Congress leader Tarunam Phookan was hostile to Civil Disobedience, and N.C. Bardolai unenthusiastic Sylhet became the principal base of the movement, and no less than 892 out of the 2373 arrests during 1930-31. There was a certain amount of poaching in reserved forests necessitating a route march of the Assam Rifles through north Kamrup in January 1931 and in December, Mrs Chandraprabha Saikia was reported to be inciting the aboriginal Karachi villages in that region to break forest laws. But the Assam Congress
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leadership refused to take up forest satyagraha officially. 79

TRIBAL MOVEMENTS IN CHHOTA NAGPUR, BASTAR, ORISSA AND MANIPUR

A tribal leader Jatra Bhagat started tribal movement in Chhota Nagpur region in Bihar in 1914 calling for monotheism, abstention from meat, liquor and tribal dances, and a return to shifting cultivation briefly took on a more radical millenarian colour in the following year as a rumour spread of imminent coming of a saviour variously identified with Birsas or a 'German' or 'Kaiser Baba'. Quick repressive action stamped out this militant stand, but a more specific 'Tana Bhagat' movement survived among the Oraons and developed important links with Gandhian nationalism from 1920's. The British troops suppressed a rising in the Jagolalpur region against the Raja of Bastar in 1910; though partly provoked by a succession dispute, the main cause was again the recent imposition of forest regulations banning shifting cultivation and free use of forest produce. The rebels disrupted communications, attacked police stations and forest outposts, burnt schools (which were being built by forced labour and compulsory levies on tribals), and even tried to besieze Jagolalpur town. In Orissa feudatory state of Daspalla in October 1914, a Khond rebellion began over a

disputed succession, quickly took on a different colour, as rumours spread that a war had started and soon there would be no sahebs left in the country' and the Khonds would 'live under their own rule'. The British feared a general Khond rising which could 'set ablaze the whole of the vast inaccessible mountain tracts stretching along the Eastern Ghats so far as Kalahandi and Baster', and so went about burning Khond villages.  

British efforts to recruit tribal labour for manual work on the Western Front led to a Santal rising in Mayurbhanj and a rebellion in Manipur among the Thadoc Kukis in 1917. Guerrilla war went on here for two years, fuelled also by other grievances like Pothang (tribals being made to carry the baggage of officials without payment), and government efforts to stop Jhum (shifting cultivation). Meanwhile in southern Rajasthan, the Bhils of Banswara, Sunth and Dungarpur states (adjoining Mewar) had stirred to action by a reform movement under Govind Guru. This began as a temperance and purification movement, but in late 1913 developed into a bid to set up a Bhil raj, 4000 Bhils assembled on Mangad hill, and the British were able to disperse them only after considerable resistance in which 12 tribals were killed and 900 taken prisoner.

MAHAR MOVEMENT IN MAHARASTRA

The new emphasis on north Indian 'martial races' in army recruitment provided the immediate provocation for the beginning of Mahar organization. The Mahars of Maharastra, later the backbone of Ambedkar's movement, were beginning to organize themselves under an ex-serviceman, Gopal Baba Walangkar by the end of nineteenth century. An 1894 petition drafted by Walangkar claimed Kshastria origins and more jobs in the army and services for this untouchable caste of inferior village servants (watchmen, local arbitrators, messengers, sweepers etc). Some of whose traditional occupations had been threatened under British rule but which had also for a time obtained new opportunities through military service. The anti-Brahmin tocinc was first sounded in Maharastra in 1870s by Jgotiba Phule with his book, Ghulam Giri (1872) and his organization, the Satyasodhak Samaj (1873), which claimed the need to save the 'lower castes from the hypocritical Brahmans and their opportunistic scriptures'.

IV.3 COMPARISON OF DIVISIONS WITHIN THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

The division in the nationalist movement of Egypt and India could be seen from the beginning where the leadership was not ready to denounce their old customs and traditional view of power in changing atmosphere. On contrary to that India's peculiar social, economic and political structure and relig-

---
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ious history paved the way for the division in nationalist movement in India.

The nationalist movement had been divided on the practice of Islam in Egypt. The traditional leaders favoured Pan-Islam. On the other hand liberal leadership wanted to reduce religious interference in every walk of life. On the contrary, the discrimination on women had reflected in the nationalist movement of India. The Indian leadership was divided on the issue of female education. The orthodox nationalist view represented by Tilak and his group who opposed female education whereas the liberal group led by Gokhale and others favoured western education to women so that they could lead the nationalist movement along with their male colleagues.

The Egyptian nationalist movement was ideologically divided in two groups. One group was represented by Mustafa Kamil and other leaders who believed that religion and nationalism are inseparable twins. He could not lead nationalist movement by denouncing religion and he was deeply stirred by the Pan-Islamic ideology, Egypt could achieve independence by preserving the authority of Ottoman Sultan. On the other hand, Ahmed Lutfi al-Sayyid talked for popular sovereignty and to rescue it from the Pan-Islamic entanglements. Mustafa Kamil's view was to disassociate with British for ever whereas Lutfi and his Umma (nation) Party had always been in good terms with them. Lutfi rejected all notions of nationalism founded on religion.
The Indian nationalist movement was divided from the beginning on communal lines. The Muslim leadership made all possible effort to avoid confrontation with their Hindu brothers. But the constant humiliations by the Hindus could not stop Muslim reactions. The emergence of the Muslim League was the outcome of reaction. The dissatisfied Muslim leaders were not ready to come along with the Hindus on national questions. The British also expressed the sympathy with the Muslims. Realizing the grave situation the Hindu leaders including Gandhiji accepted the demand of separate electorate to the Muslims. But it also failed to satisfy the Muslim leadership. The Hindu-Muslim communal feeling ended with the partition of India in 1947. Whereas Egyptian society was a composition of the Muslims and Christian Copts. Muslims and Copts lived in harmony. But the situation gradually changed in 1910 when the British recognized Christian Copts as a minority community. The feeling of minority-majority once created had never been brought to previous position. Copts and Muslim feeling gone to such an extent when Shaikh al-Maraghi a Muslim leader stated that the Copts were racial as well as a religious minority. The nationalist movement of Egypt and India was divided between the western and traditional leaders. The western educated leadership struggled for independence in western accepted parameters whereas traditional leadership used indigenous means to achieve independence. The western educated leadership was easily acceptable to the colonial powers whereas the tradi-
tional leaders always preferred to go to extreme to sort out any problems. The division based on western and traditionkal prevailed every time till the independence of Egypt and India.

The Egyptian and Indian nationalist movement was again divided due to ideological differences and personality clash of leadership. Several political parties in Egypt and India had been formed to counter others. Abduh was not satisfied with Zaghlul's idea of liberal and constitutionalist thought who launched nationalist Party (al-Hizb al-Watani). It was committed to westernization and de-Islamization and adopted a secular and nationalist ideology. This policy was later adopted by Ummah Party formed by Lutfi al-Syyid. On the other hand the Indian National Congress was formed in India. But secular and reformist parties of Egypt and India had represented a coteries of civil servants, intellectuals, journalist who never visited in rural areas. As a major chunk of population left to participate in the nationalist movement of Egypt and India. As a result a gap widened between the rural and urban people. In 1920's Gandhiji himself regretted that Congress Party has been deviated from her right path and he took up the cause of rural people. Whereas none of the political parties or leaders identified themselves with the rural masses in Egypt. As a result the nationalist movement was between the urban elite and the colonial powers.

The Indian nationalist movement had been divided on the
dalit questions. Gandhian era started after 1920's in Indian nationalist movement. Gandhiji started his politics with new experiments. The problems of untouchables had been marginalized by the upper castes leadership of the Congress. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar challenged Congress leadership and particularly Gandhiji against his wrong policies for the upliftment of Dalits. According to Ambedkar, Muslims and Christians were given political recognition because they formed in fact separate elements from Hindus. Dr. Ambedkar recognized untouchable distinct and separate from the Hindus. He opposed Gandhian Satyagraha because he thought that Gandhiji never used the weapon of Satyagraha against the Hindus to get them to throw open wells and temples to the untouchables. He said that there was not a single fast undertaken by Gandhiji for the removal of untouchability.

The situation in Egypt was changed after 1920's. The division in the nationalist movement was created by the colonial powers. The British proved weak to continue direct control over Egypt. As a result the British agent extended help to Sultan to run parallel political organization to counter the Wafd Party so that a division within the nationalist leaders could be created. Sultan Mahmud prepared the ground to keep the Wafd Party out of power by changing existing constitution.

British High Commissioner Sir Percy Loraine joined hand with Sultan Mahmud in extending general election so that the nationalist party such as Wafd could be kept out of power.
This was a time when Indian nationalist movement again divided on communal line. The communal organization such as the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League emerged in strong manner in regards to their communal demands. On the other hand Egyptian nationalist movement was divided because the Pan-Islamic leaders were not ready to accept liberals view. The Salafiyya movement which prepared the ground for Muslim Brotherhood. Both rejected the Wafd demands.

Previous leadership in Brotherhood's opinion was serving the interest of the elite of Egyptian society and under the clutches of the British so they are not fighting for independence in real sense. They have surrendered the cultural identity of the nation before the British and deviated from the principle mentioned Islam. Hasan al-Banna the leader of Brotherhood propounded a different philosophy to liberate Egypt. Brotherhood transformed liberal nationalism into a force with its strong anti-Western based in Egyptian society. They believed that a state and a society must be based on Quran Brotherhood took up the cause of the neglected people of Egyptian society. This is the reason why brotherhood challenged rest of the leadership. Brotherhood stood for egalitarianism and reform with the tenets of traditional Islam. Brotherhood criticised the dependency of previous leadership on west and advocated for a traditional Islamic state based on sariah. The rest of the leadership was highly western influenced. Their ideology was to minimise religious interference as much as possible while Hindu-Muslim castes
blaming each other for not getting share in administration in proportion to their population. This caste-conflict gone to such an extent that minority groups were given proportionate representation. The gap once created could not fulfil even upto the independence of Egypt and India.

The movement had further divided when Communist Party characterized Congress as a bourgeoisie reactionary body which prevented mass urges. The Communist favoured mass struggle immediately after the war but Congress, the party of elites of India refused Communist demand.

The Congress divided again on the question of Council entry. Congress Party had decided not to participate Council elections but C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru opposed Congress decision and left the Congress. They formed Swaraj Party to fight for national independence. Personality clash also affected the spirit of nationalist movement.

The leaders who had been given responsibility to draft constitution of India for future. They deliberately asked for "Dominion Status" to India so that they could oblige their British friends. The leaders, like, Subhas Chandra Bose and Maulana Mohomed Ali from Assam opposed Dominion Status to India and emphasized that we will not accept any thing less than complete independence. But this demand was rejected by dominant leaders in Congress.

**IDEOLOGICAL MISUNDERSTANDING**

Saad Zaghlul launched Wafd Party presented Egyptian case in Paris Peace Conference so that nationalist demands
could get international support. Wafd demand was not only rejected but protectorate over Egypt was recognized. The rejection of Wafd demand was considered that Zaghlul and others have collaborated with the British authority. Adli and other Wafd Party members as Ali Sharawi, Hafiz Afifi, George Khayyat and Abd al-Khaliq Madkur express their resentment through the formation of Liberal Constitutionalist Party. Both parties believed in negotiation and compromise.

**CLASS CONFLICT**

Egyptian and Indian upper class leadership had collaborated with the British to maintain their hold on economy, besides, the middle class was very heterogeneous and diversified. The middle class in Egypt and India were not consolidated like that of upper class. The lower middle class was fully dependent on both upper middle and middle class. The British could prolong her claim for longer time over Egypt and India due to policy formulated by the upper class which suited their interests. This policy widened the gap between the upper class and middle class.

Egyptian leadership was divided over the question of reserved points. Majority of leadership was in favour to accept four conditions posed by the British in the name of reserved points. Other leader opinion was that it would be suicidal of Egypt if they accept British condition, they would say further that we should go for revolution whereas Indian leadership was divided on the methods which will suit to India. Some of them was in favour of dominion status and
rest for complete independence. Gandhiji was for dominion status whereas Subhas Chandra Bose demanded that nothing less than "complete independence" should be the Congress immediate goal.

**WESTED INTERESTS OF LEADERSHIP**

A section of leadership was not happy with the functioning of the Wafd because it was not taking up social issues. The Wafd leadership given a plea that social issues may cause a division in society and its need of hour to strengthen national unity to oppose foreign domination. National unity was a important for the preservation of upper class interest of Egyptian society. The Wafd leadership was aware that taking a social issue will lead a movement based on the principle of class struggle, it will certainly goes against upper class interest which the Wafd didn't want. Knowing the fact that the Wafd party is a combination of upper class people, dissatisfied leadership comprising Aziz Mirham, Mansur Fahmi, Husayn Haykal and others would prepare the ground for mass upsurge against the Wafd. Due to their vested interest Wafd leadership never came to close to the socialist leadership which directly or indirectly given support to the British. Besides in India, Gandhiji announced withdrawl of Civil Disobedience movement without prior discussion with any leaders. This method of political struggle deeply perturbed Jawaharlal Nehru. Nehru and Minoo Masani supported Congress socialist party of India. The Socialist rejected Gandhism on two grounds: the axion of
change of heart and the constructive programme. They had embraced socialism on account of the economic situation in the country whereas Congress leaders, however, looked upon poverty in India "as a political grievance" Narendra Dev linked up economic struggle with "national struggle" for it would give "social content to national struggle".

Indian nationalist movement was divided on the question of candidature of Subhas Chandra Bose for Congress President. Gandhiji supported the candidature of Pattabhi Sitaramayya, for Congress President, though Sitaramayya was defeated. Gandhiji took it his personal defeat and threatened to resign from the Congress. Gauging the situation Subhas Chandra Bose himself resigned from Presidentship. The final outcome of this resignation was the division within the Congress in two blocks. Congress was led by Sarojani Naidu and the newly formed organization Forward Block was led by Subhas Chandra Bose. Muslim League again emerged powerful and put up a condition that any attempt towards constitutional advancement without League approval would cause direct action. The final and last division came in 1947 when united India partitioned in two groups known as India and Pakistan.

**DIVISION BASED ON REGIONALISM IN INDIA**

The Indian nationalist movement was very much divided on regional lines. The central leadership of Congress which was representing elite society of upper caste never incorporated untouchable and tribal issues in Congress agendas. The re-
gional leaders, like, E.V. Ramasamy Periyar revolted against the caste discrimination in Tamil Nadu. He led an anti Brahmin movement to mark respect to the untouchables. Mahatma Jotirao Phooley sacrificed his life for the upliftment of untouchables in Maharrastra. Jotiba Phooly carried on his movement for social equality. He founded Satyashodhak Samaj (society in search of Truth) in maharastra. Phooly in his evidence before the Hunter Commission in 1884 pleaded for a compulsory free education to the untouchables. Phooley attacked the suprimacy of the upper castes. There had been several tribal movements took place in many parts of India. The tribals of Chhota Nagpur, Baster, Orissa, Manipur fought against the British to preserve their cultural identity.

IV.4 SUMMARY

The Egyptian nationalist movement was primarily divided on the tactics to be adopted against the colonial power. Mustafa Kanaal stressed to adopt Pan-Islamic approach led by Ahmed Lutfial-Sayyid adovcated an approach based on pupular sovereignty. It was also divided between middle class on the one side and upper class and the British on other. The ethnic feeling between the Copts and Muslims was an important reason for this division. Beside Indian nationalist movement had been divided in 1905 when Indian Muslim formed their separate organization, namely, Muslim league in reaction to their Hindu brothers who performed all Hindu rituals at the time of Bengal Partition in 1905. Communal conflict also gave a birth to the division in Indian nationalist
movement. Liberal and secular leadership in Egypt and India was an organization of an elite class. They talked for elite interests only which gave a chance to emerge leadership from middle class communal organization such as Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and Hindu Mahasabha and Muslim League in India used religion to convince their people in respective countries.

The Congress leaders did not discuss religious and social issues because it may lead to awareness among the untouchables. The discussion on social and religious issue might challenge caste hierarchy which Congress leadership wanted to avoid. The Indian leaders who dominated the Congress deliberately asked for Dominion Status so that they could maintain their previous relations with the British. As a result dominant leaders marginalized the emerging leaders.

Gandhi used all sort of tactics to maintain his domination in Congress. As a result faced division after divisions. In some cases when he did not get success to convince other leaders he adopted a different tactics, such as, withdrawal from the nationalist movement to mound pressure on others.

The division in nationalist movement after 1930's was a product of personal egoism. Every leaders were representing the interest of on specific class-caste. That's why each one was not ready to listen others. It was also fact that the awareness among the people and leaders gone high. Nobody could influence others by his own ideology. The division of
united India in two parts India and Pakistan was the outcome of religious based politics in India whereas the British policy of projecting one group against the other was an important cause of division in Egyptian nationalist movement. Simultaneously, Khadije always given first priority to British interest in Egyptian independence which caused delay and further delay to achieve independence.

The Indian National Congress failed to take up issues of untouchability and tribals. As a result a separate movement started in many part of the country. Jotiba Phooly carried on the movement of social equality in Maharastra. He devoted his life to improve social status of untouchables. Similarly, E.V. Ramasami Naiker "Periyar" revolted against the brahmanical domination in Indian society. He led a self-respect movement to improve the conditions of untouchable in Tamil Nadu. Tribal movements in Manipur, Assam, Chhota Nagpur, Baster and Orissa were the product of the Congress negligence toward their recognition.