Nationalism in Goa was a part, though distinct, of the process of Indian nationalism. But the experience of nationalism in Goa differed from the 'Indian' experience of nationalism.¹

To talk of a uniform 'Indian experience' is an over-simplification. But in India, the fact is that anti-British sentiment was widespread and thousands of people participated in the anti-British struggle. The people were bound by a sense of Indian identity.

In spite of nostalgic reconstructions of Goa's freedom struggle which portray the struggle as being a popular one, traces of a mass struggle are elusive.² At a seminar on the freedom struggle, Dionisio Ribeiro highlighted the sense of isolation experienced by freedom fighters, saying:

In India, for every man who went to jail, the empathy of thousands accompanied him. In Goa, not even the empathy of

---

¹Attention was drawn to this fact at a seminar on Nationality Question in India hosted by the Training for Development Scholarship Society (TDSS) in Pune in 1987, at which Prof Harigopal pointed to the 'absence' of Goa's participation in the anti-colonial national movement [TDSS 1987:450-453]

²Barring a brief period of time spanning a few months in 1946 -- when thousands of people openly protested, asserting their right to civil liberties -- there is little evidence to suggest the participation of the broad masses of people in the anti-colonial struggle.
half a person accompanied him.

Although the colonization of Goa was initiated two centuries prior to the British colonization of India, the freedom struggle in Goa began to emerge when the demand for Swaraj had become popular and nationalist consciousness was widespread in British India.

An important reason for this is the success of the Portuguese in creating an elite which identified its interests as being in consonance with the continuance of Portuguese rule. No doubt, the Portuguese had been discriminatory in their distribution of privileges among various groups. However, till 1910 the manifestation of dissent by the discriminated groups was disorganized and spontaneous, and it was the lusitanised elite that dominated the political scenario.

An organized attempt to build an anti-colonial movement in Goa can be traced to the efforts made by Braganza Cunha in the second decade of this century. Prior to this, sporadic uprisings occurred, reflecting the desire of particular groups to protect their interests. This chapter examines the attempt made to establish an enduring anti-Portuguese nationalist movement.

**Early Struggles**

The early struggles against the Portuguese reflect the discontent that arose among the people on account of the varying degrees of discrimination they were subject to by the Portuguese state.

---

1Ribeiro made this statement at a seminar on *Advent of Portuguese in Goa and Goa's Struggle for Freedom* in December 1990 at Cuncolim, Salcete. Those who took part in the struggle were the chief participants in the seminar. While there was heated debate and disagreements on various issues, no one raised any objection to Ribeiro's statement.
In 1543, the villagers of Cuncolim rose against the Portuguese for their sacrilegious acts of killing a temple cow, smearing the temple idols with its blood and polluting the well water with its carcass. They were further enraged by the desecration of several other temples by a group of Jesuits. Five Jesuits and numerous people were killed in the skirmishes that ensued.

In 1652, Fr Mateus de Castro Mahale, Bishop of Chrisopolis, attempted to organise a revolt against the Portuguese. The immediate provocation was the harassment he suffered from the Portuguese officials, having been made a bishop against their wishes by the ecclesiastical authorities. The attempt was aborted by the Portuguese.

An uprising popularly known as The Conspiracy of the Pintos was planned under the leadership of Caeteno Francisco Couto of Panaji and Jose Antonio Gonsalves of Divar, in 1787. In spite of possessing the requisite qualifications, they were not made bishops. This prompted them to go to Portugal to plead their case. Having received no response from the ecclesiastical authorities, they mobilized support from native priests and army officers in Goa and met frequently at the house of one Father Pinto. They drew up a plan to drive the Portuguese out and to establish a republic. But news of the plan leaked out and the rebellion was foiled.

After the aborted Pinto Rebellion, the most significant struggles that took place were by the Ranes of Sattari. These struggles reflected the aspirations of a people to preserve their lifestyle and uphold their dignity. Between 1740 and 1822, the Ranes rebelled against the Portuguese over a dozen times. But the
most significant rebellion was in 1852 [Gune 1979:187].

In 1851, the Governor of Goa clamped taxes on the people and issued decrees interfering with their local dress. Apparently on the pretext of inspections, many women were raped by Portuguese soldiers. These circumstances resulted in a revolt in 1852, led successfully by Dipaji Rane, forcing the withdrawal of the decree. Revolts by the Ranes continued, sporadically, till 1913.

Goan expatriates attempted a revolt in 1833, to reinstate Bernardo Peres da Silva¹ as prefect (equivalent of governor) of Goa. Da Silva, a Goan appointed prefect by the Crown on account of his merits, was overthrown by the local Portuguese elite, through a military uprising. Wealthy Bombay merchant Rogerio da Faria and other Goans from Bombay, Belgaum, Dharwar and Pune, organized an expeditionary force to sail to Goa to reinstate the deposed prefect. But the onset of the monsoon prevented the success of the plan. Da Silva was deported to Lisbon and his followers imprisoned.

The earlier struggles, including the revolts of the Rancs -- which ended only in 1917 -- are quite distinct from the struggle that developed later on. They were motivated by certain immediate aspirations; for example, the participants of the

¹Da Silva was elected a deputy to the Cortes in the first elections held on 14 January 1822. By the time he reached Portugal, however, he found that the constitutional monarchy had been replaced by an absolute monarchy. This situation persisted till 1827, when a liberal government came to power, and Da Silva was once again elected a deputy. Once more, upon reaching Lisbon, he found the Cortes dissolved! He then aligned with the Liberals in Portugal, as a result of which he was exiled; first to Plymouth and then to Rio de Janeiro. Returning to Portugal on establishment of the constitutional regime in 1834, Da Silva addressed a memorandum to King Dom Pedro IV demanding liberties for the people of Portuguese India. He was appointed Prefeito do Estado on 7 May 1834, and returned to Goa. Immediately, he dismissed employees appointed during previous regimes, reorganized the judicial service, dissolved the religious orders and exempted village communidades from tax, which comprised one-sixth of state revenue. The local Portuguese elite instigated a military coup which deposed him on 1 February 1835.
Conspiracy of the Pintos wanted to establish their right to top ranking positions. Or the struggles were against specific provocative measures of the Portuguese government. No attempt was made to challenge the political domination of the Portuguese, by launching a movement and building an enduring organization.5

In British India, the Indian National Congress (INC) was formed in 1885. The INC grew into the political organization that gave leadership to the independence movement and continued to play a role in the political mainstream after independence.

Attempts to build a similar organization in Goa are discernible only from the second decade of the twentieth century. Concerted efforts were made to give an organizational form to the anti-Portuguese sentiment that existed, and the organizations that emerged were articulate about the need for Goa to be freed from the Portuguese, and integrated with India. For this reason, in referring to the struggle that developed in the twentieth century, the terms freedom struggle or nationalist movement have been used.

The Genesis of the Nationalist Idea

The origin of the nationalist movement is generally traced to the origin of the

5 Antonio Menezes, formerly editor of a local Portuguese journal, Diario da Noite, recalled accompanying Governor General Mendonza Dias to visit Zatideva Zatiba Rane, at the historic house of the Ranes at Sanquelim. Rane talked of the 'friendly and ancient family ties with the Portuguese'. Almost as if presenting proof of this, he showed them the sword received as a present from the last Viceroy, Dom Afonso Henriques. Menezes observed that the sword was maintained 'as if some ancient relic'. As further illustration of the fact that the Ranes were not thoroughly anti-Portuguese as is often made out to be, he stated that when an expedition from Portugal, led by Prince Dom Afonso Henriques, came to suppress the revolt of the Ranes (1895), on reaching Sattari they found a written message affixed to the fort saying: 'The rebels did not wish to open fire against the King of Portugal, represented here by His Highness, and therefore they dispersed' [Menezes:1994].
Goa Congress Committee in 1928. However, prior to this the concept of freedom
began to emerge, and was articulated by individuals who played a role in paving
the way for nationalism in Goa.

A unique privilege enjoyed by Goa was the election of representatives to the
Cortes -- the parliament of Portugal from 1822 onwards. Although the right to
vote was severely restricted -- literacy in Portuguese being one of the requisite
qualifications -- on a few occasions the elected representatives did not remain
mere puppets of the Portuguese but articulated protests against the colonial
regime.

As noted before, Bernardo Peres de Silva, a member of the Liberal Party and
a representative of Goa in the Portuguese parliament between 1822 and 1844,
attempted to assert his right, following his ouster by the military, to continue in
the post of prefect of Goa with the help of the Goan diaspora. Although
unsuccessful, this episode was an indication of the growing self confidence of
Goans.

In 1860, another articulate Goan, Francisco Luis Gomes (1829-1869), was
elected to the Cortes. Gomes' views represent an acceptance of the superiority
of Portuguese culture, while bemoaning the loss of the great Indian cultural
heritage. An oft-quoted letter to French poet, Lamartine, is illustrative of his
manner of thinking:

I was born in the East Indies, once the cradle of poetry,
philosophy and history and now their tomb. I belong to that race
which composed the Mahabharata and invented chess... But this
nation which made codes of its poems and formulated politics in a game, is no longer alive! It survives imprisoned in its own country ... I ask for India liberty and light; as for myself, more happy than my countrymen, I am free-civis sum \(^6\) [Gomes 1931:368 emphasis added].

Gomes advised the Portuguese government to look after the health services, judiciary etc, so as to ensure that the overseas provinces would not become extinct! For him, the Christian religion and primary education did not signify instruments of colonization, but were 'the most powerful instruments of civilization' \(^7\) [1931:148,356].

Gomes worked to bring about changes in various spheres. He succeeded in getting public servants in the colonies to be placed on par with public servants in Portugal, aside from working for the reduction of court fees, the abolition of certain taxes and other such reforms.

His life was marked by the paradoxical praxis of acceptance of Portuguese colonial rule, and an attempt to strengthen it by taking measures favorable to the inhabitants of the colonies on the one hand, while on the other hand bemoaning the 'death' of the great nation, India, and its cultural heritage.

Gomes expresses his love for the glorious India of the past, but in the present day, asserts that Christianity and education are necessary for progress to be made.

---

\(^6\)The last line of this letter is significant, though many writers, probably in trying to depict Gomes as a nationalist, have chosen to omit this line while quoting him [see Priolkar 1967:4 or Da Cruz 1974:1-2]. This line clearly reveals Gomes' perception of himself as 'free', on account of his being able to live in Portugal as a Portuguese citizen.

\(^7\)It is significant to note that this necessarily meant Portuguese education, conducted in the Portuguese language.
in the colonies. In practice, he expresses his commitment to the people and to the land of Goa, by opting to be part of the Portuguese government, and working for reforms which can ensure that inhabitants of the colonies secure all the rights due to them as citizens of Portugal.

This acceptance of Portuguese colonial rule is by no means simplistic. In his novel *Os Brahmanes*, Gomes is caustic in his portrayal of the new caste system introduced by the European colonizers. However, the hero of *Os Brahmanes* is a priest: a true man of God who cures the European protagonist of his arrogance and lays the foundation for relationships based on equality between all.

While Gomes certainly believed that a struggle to effect changes was necessary, what appears to be important to him is not the overthrow of Portuguese rule but the spread of Christianity and education to facilitate the creation of a more humane and non-hierarchical society.

His affirmative acceptance of Portuguese rule is somewhat similar to Maharashtrian social reformer, Jyotiba Phule’s (1827-1890) response to British colonial rule. However, while Phule attempted to bring about changes by utilizing the relative freedom offered by the British rule (as compared to the cruel, traditionalist rule of the Peshwas) to organize and work among the people; Gomes saw the Portuguese political institutions as vehicles of social change, which could be relied upon.

The emergence of Luis de Menezes Braganza (1878-1938) on the political scenario marked a different trend. First of all, Menezes Brazanana was an agnostic; vocal in his criticism of the Church. However, like Gomes, in the initial
stages of his political life he too believed Goa could benefit from the Portuguese colonial regime. He opposed the monarchy and supported the republican democracy which ruled from 1910 onwards.

The period of the Republic played a vital role in developing aspirations for liberty among Goans. When the Absolutists came to power in 1917 and denied the people their civil liberties, Menezes Braganza put forward the demand for autonomy. In his famous article *Solemnia Verba* [Solemn Issue] he stated:

>(T)he hour is sounded so that we may demonstrate that we have every right to autonomy . . . that we are neither automatons . . . nor beggars, accepting the disillusioning minority in the Government Councils, which is but a mockery of our rights [Shirodkar 1988:26].

When the Portuguese failed to give autonomy after agreeing to do so, Menezes Braganza called for a boycott of the polls to be held, to elect representatives to the Government Council. The result of the polls is indicative of the process of politicization that had been started with the advent of the republic. Of a total of 11,134 electors registered, only 885 voted, mainly comprising government servants afraid of losing their jobs [Esteves 1896:16].

Portuguese failure to concede autonomy and the advent of the dictatorial Salazar regime, caused Menezes Braganza to advocate freedom from Portugal as a necessary condition for the well being of Goa. Thus, Menezes Braganza was the pre-cursor of the freedom movement which began to take shape before his death on 10 July 1938.
Stirrings of nationalist consciousness

During the period of the Republic, journals were started which were important in shaping the ideas of the intellectuals of Goa and in sowing the seeds of patriotism. A number of bi-lingual journals were published and several organizations emerged.

*O Debate* was started by Menezes Braganza in 1921. Later, *Procasha* and *Bharat*, both bi-lingual Portuguese-Marathi journals (mentioned earlier) appeared. The latter was clearly anti-Portuguese in its outlook and was brought out for 30 years. Braganza Cunha regularly contributed to this journal. *Hindu*, a Marathi weekly edited by Dattatreya Venkatesh Pai, was brought out between 1924 to 1931. These were amongst the most influential journals in generating nationalist consciousness.

Around 1911, a political organization called the *Pragatiya Sangh*, comprising Hindus, was set up [Esteves 1986:38]. Its formation marked a change in the political climate brought about by the new republican regime, and the awareness amongst Hindus of their political rights.

In 1937, the *Gomantakiya Tarun Sangh* was started in Margao by Shamrao Madkaikar. The Sangh organized discussions on topical issues which were not overtly political. It also founded the *Swayam Sevak Dal*, which ran a library and published a handwritten Marathi monthly named *Uttejan*. Though it operated under the guise of a social organization, the latent function of the Sangh was to
generate political consciousness in youth that were drawn to it."

In 1945, Purshottam Kakodkar founded the *Goa Seva Sangh*, a social-cum-political organization in Margao. It held spinning classes, instructing people how to spin *Khadi* cloth, and introduced *charkhas* in many homes. It organized prayers and *pravachanas* and later on became part of the National Congress (Goa), or the NCG.

Juliao Menezes formed a group in Assolna known as the *Juvenile Club* in 1938. The club was short-lived. When the Piazza Cross at Assolna was found to be demolished the action was attributed to the club, on account of which its office was sealed. Menezes, a doctor by profession, then shifted to Bombay and started an organization called the *Gomantak Praja Mandal* in 1939, and in 1942 launched a weekly called *Gomantak* in Konkani and English.

**The Role of Braganza Cunha in the Nationalist Movement**

Braganza Cunha can be said to be a child of the republic. Born in 1891, he was nineteen years old when the republic was established, and was very aware of the optimism it had generated in Goa. He left for France in 1912 and returned to Goa the year that the Portuguese Army seized power through a coup and disbanded the republic, in 1926.

Braganza Cunha's activism can be classified into two distinct periods. The first period; prior to his imprisonment and transportation to Portugal in 1946, begins after his return to Goa in 1926. This was also the period prior to India's

---

*Personal communication made at an interview with Shamrao Madkaikar on 20 May 1992, at Navelim.*
independence, when there was much nationalist activity being conducted throughout the country.

It marked the initiation of political activity by Braganza Cunha at a time when the military dictatorship had just seized power in Portugal. This meant a reversal of policies in Goa; notably the revival of racial discrimination, which had been considerably relaxed under republican rule. Civil liberties, too, were completely withdrawn from the colonized people.

During this period Braganza Cunha was concerned with arousing nationalist consciousness amongst the intelligentsia in Goa. It was a formidable task, considering the apparent apathy prevalent amongst the people, particularly the largely Portuguese-educated intelligentsia.

Significantly, during this period, his writings appeared mainly in the form of Portuguese pamphlets, some of which were subsequently translated into Marathi by fellow nationalists to reach a wider audience.

Unfortunately, immediately after the struggle for civil liberties in Goa was brought into the open after Lohia's intervention in June 1946, Braganza Cunha was arrested, sentenced, deported and deprived of the opportunity to participate in the liberation struggle from within Goa.

The second period is the post-Indian independence period, beginning with his return to India in 1953, till his death in 1958. Braganza Cunha was compelled to participate in the liberation struggle from Bombay. His activism consisted in appealing to the Indian government to take steps to bring about a solution to the Goa problem, and in appealing to different nationalist groups to unitedly work
for Goa’s freedom.

Braganza Cunha’s writings during this period were mainly in the form of articles, editorial notes and reports. These were in English and occasionally in Portuguese, and appeared in the fortnightly journal Free Goa, which he edited from 1955 to 1958 and, for a brief period of time, in Roman Konkani in Azad Goem. Both of these were published from outside Goa and so had a limited circulation in Goa.

**A Free Goa in a Free India**

In 1928, he established the Goa Congress Committee [GCC]. Its significance in the history of Goa was that it was the first attempt made to forge an organizational link between the interests of the people of Goa and the Indian independence movement. That same year, the GCC was affiliated to the INC at its Calcutta session.

The GCC was greatly inspired by the Indian nationalist movement. This was reflected in its activities. The late Berta Menezes Braganza, the only surviving member of this organisation, recalled distributing copies of the Quit India resolution and propagating the need for Goans to support the Indian nationalist struggle, which was intrinsically linked with Goa’s liberation struggle. It also published pamphlets and booklets, many of which were authored by Braganza Cunha.

Unfortunately, the INC derecognised the GCC in 1934, as part of its decision to derecognise the branch committees of the INC functioning in foreign
territories like London and New York. As it was functioning in a territory under Portuguese rule, the GCC was treated in the same category [Shirodkar 1988:29].

In spite of the existence of repressive legislation, the GCC was able to distribute literature openly. Its influence was limited to a small intellectual section and it comprised dedicated patriots. After its establishment, other groups were formed, but the significance of the GCC was that it represented the first attempt to build an enduring organisation which would link the anti-Portuguese struggles in Goa with the nationalist movement that was rapidly gaining ground all over India.

While this effort suffered setbacks on account of the derecognition of the GCC by the INC, the foundation for Goa’s freedom was laid.

In spite of the INC decision to derecognise it, the GCC continued to function and, in 1936, a branch of this committee was started in Bombay and its main office was based there [Rao 1963:29].

The Goa Congress Committee, Bombay, issued the pamphlets titled *The Attack on the Indian Rupee* and *The Denationalisation of Goans*, authored by Braganza Cunha, in June 1944. In January 1945, at the request of the Portuguese consul in Bombay, both booklets were banned in British India. The ban order was revoked in September 1945 following a historic ruling by Justice Chagla of 9

9Ilerta Meenezes Braganza (interviewed on 14 June 1990 at Margao) stated that they openly sold or distributed nationalist literature prior to 1946. Repressive legislation was enforced only after the launch of the Civil Disobedience Movement on 18 June 1946.

10*The Denationalization of Goans* is Braganza Cunha’s indictment of the Goan intelligentsia, which he believed could not attain freedom unless it regained its pride of race and its identification with the Indian nation. This formulation of his has been discussed in greater depth in Chapter 5.
the Bombay High Court.

Braganza Cunha had believed the affiliation of the Goa Congress Committee to the Indian National Congress to be a significant step, which would facilitate the identification of the people of Goa with the nationalist struggle being waged in India. He was also optimistic that the Goa Congress Committee would be greatly strengthened with its affiliation to the Congress. The high opinion he had of the Congress is reflected in the following words:

The evolution of Indian nationalism has today reached a stage which does not permit the Congress to limit its field of activities to British India alone, but compels it to accept within it all Indians without any regard for distinctions made by the foreigners in their own interest. This is the reason why we, like the subjects of the Indian states, cannot but welcome with enthusiasm the ideal of independence [Cunha 1961:145].

Braganza Cunha had obviously seen the affiliation of the Goa Congress Committee to the Indian National Congress as a necessary step. However, there is no evidence to indicate what he felt after the GCC was disaffiliated by the Congress in 1934. In contrast to his conception of Indian nationalism evolving to a certain stage, had Indian nationalism taken a step backwards?

Braganza Cunha's approach towards the Congress was marked by a certain ambivalence, in that he regarded its leaders and the cadres differently. After attending the Indian National Congress at Calcutta in 1928, where the GCC had secured affiliation, he remarked:
The old leaders . . . seem to have lost contact with the new mentality which rules India today . . . they (the leaders) are no longer able to keep up with the rapid evolution in the country [Cunha 1961:159].

Braganza Cunha possibly viewed the disaffiliation as a technical matter, or perhaps thought that to comment adversely on the disaffiliation would have a negative effect on the GCC cadre. This could explain the statements made by him in the 'Concluding Remarks' of Portuguese India, an essay written in 1939:

The Indian National Congress has long proclaimed India to be one and indivisible... It is on the combined efforts of all Congress organisations functioning throughout India, that depends the success of this struggle for freedom [Cunha 1961:54].

Braganza Cunha constantly emphasised that the liberation of Goa was linked with the independence of the Indian nation and would come about with its re-integration into India, as articulated in the slogan: 'A Free Goa in a Free India'.

Prior to 1946, propaganda had been carried out and the seeds of nationalist consciousness had been sown. However, the use of repressive legislation by the Portuguese authorities was not in evidence till the launch of the Civil
Disobedience Movement on 18 June 1946.¹¹

Perhaps the comparatively mild attitude of the Portuguese authority in dealing with political activity prior to 1946 indicates that it did not view this activity as a threat to its rule.

This complacency was rudely shaken when the Portuguese witnessed the mass support received by the Civil Disobedience Movement. On 18 June 1946, the Civil Disobedience Movement was launched in Goa by Dr Rammanohar Lohia, a socialist and a respected nationalist leader in India.¹² Thousands of people participated in this movement, and the Portuguese authorities were obviously caught off guard.¹³

Following the meeting of 18 June 1946, a series of public meetings was held. Braganza Cunha, who had not been contacted when the movement was initiated, was apparently requested to act as a guide to the struggle after it had

---

¹¹Prior to the civil disobedience movement, incidents of harassment and the arrest of activists did take place, but the penalties were mild compared to the penal action taken after June 1946. The editor of Bharat, Govind Pandurang Hegde Desai, was arrested a few times but the longest period of detention he underwent was eight months. Shamrao Madkikar was arrested after the Gomantakya Tarun Sangh had invited a Royist from Belgaum to give a lecture in Margao in November 1938, without taking the permission of the Portuguese authorities. He was sentenced to five days imprisonment or a fine Rs 15 (Shamrao Madkikar was interviewed on 20 May 1992, at Navelim).

¹²According to popular accounts, Lohia came to Goa at the invitation of Juliao Menezes, for a holiday. Seeing the state of repression that the Goans lived in, he decided it was time to come out in open defiance of the Portuguese regime and to wage a struggle for civil liberties. However, Urselino Almeida -- a relative of Menezes -- insists that the Civil Disobedience Movement was launched in a planned manner, and that Lohia had come to Goa with the express intent of launching this movement (interviewed on 6 March 1992, at Margao, Salcete).

¹³George Vaz recounts that the Portuguese authorities, after arresting Lohia, were unable to control the mass of humanity that gathered to listen to him. Consequently, they appealed to the arrested Lohia to address the crowd and order their dispersal: 'Rammanohar Lohia took advantage of this to address the people in Hindi from a balcony of the police station and to assert the fundamental right of the people to assemble and discuss. The police did not understand what he was saying as he talked in Hindi but they soon realised that he was talking something else and took him back. They ordered a lathi charge. But the fear complex was broken. This was his (Lohia's) most important contribution' (interviewed on 18 December 1990 at Assonora, Bardez).
been launched, on account of his seniority and experience.\textsuperscript{14}

The Portuguese officialdom, accustomed to viewing Goa as 'an island of imperialist safety', now felt the need to utilise its repressive laws. Braganza Cunha, who actually had little role in initiating the movement, was identified as a leader and 'a subversive element' [Shirodkar 1991:16].

On 30 June, when Braganza Cunha was accompanying his niece, Berta Menezes Braganza, who was to offer satyagraha at Margao on that day, Portuguese soldiers beat him with rifle butts till he fell to the ground.\textsuperscript{15} This was the first recorded incident of police brutality on a political activist in Goa's freedom struggle.

This was followed by another unprecedented step -- the arrest of Braganza Cunha on 12 July, his trial before a military court on 24 July and the sentence of eight years imprisonment, deportation to Portugal and the suspension of political rights for 15 years, awarded to him. He was the first freedom fighter to be tried by a military court and exiled (for a detailed account, see the biographical essay in Appendix II).

The fact that the rest of India was on the verge of attaining independence appears to have had a dual impact. On the one hand, it gave an impetus to the people of Goa to develop the struggle -- many who otherwise may not have

\textsuperscript{14}A document of 1946 describes the atmosphere that prevailed subsequent to Lohia's arrest:

'Meanwhile, the Civil Disobedience Movement to safeguard the rights of freedom of expression and of press under the leadership of Tristao Braganza e Cunha [sic] who belongs to the Committee of Goa Congress is making rapid strides. Huge crowds of four to five thousand persons (an [sic] unique event in the political history of Goa) attend daily, the meetings held at Madgaon, where there are persons who in spite of prohibitory orders desire to speak' [Shirodkar 1991:48 emphasis added].

\textsuperscript{15}Narrated by Berta Menezes Braganza on 14 June 1990, at Margao.
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participated, chose to take part. On the other hand, one cannot rule out the possibility of some opportunistic elements entering the struggle at this juncture, believing that this was their chance to carve out a niche for themselves in the political mainstream.

Meanwhile, the Portuguese authority stepped up the use of terror tactics as it began to view the freedom struggle as a threat to its rule over Goa. Long sentences of imprisonment and deportation to Portugal or, worse still, to the colonies in Africa, was common fare that awaited almost anyone whom the Portuguese identified as a 'trouble maker'. Since many of the leading freedom fighters were arrested and the use of terror tactics mounted, the civil disobedience movement petered out by the end of 1946.

The offering of satyagraha on certain symbolic occasions continued for some time -- such as every 18 June, 15 August or on Gandhi Jayanti (after 1948) -- but the fear of arrests effectively hampered its growth within Goa.\(^\text{16}\)

Nationalists of Goa worked under the banner of the National Congress (Goa). Regular meetings of the NCG took place outside the territory. But in Goa, the activities of the NCG consisted mainly of distributing literature secretly and the hoisting of the national flag of independent India.

Terrorist groups emerged, but had limited impact as they functioned in isolation and could not join forces because of personal and ideological

\(^{16}\text{The Portuguese exhibited a certain paranoia in dealing with dissent. A case in point was the deportation of a well known surgeon, Dr Pandalik Gaitonde, for his act of having said 'Eu protesto' (I protest), to the assertion of a Portuguese officer at a party, that Goa was a part and parcel of Portugal, and that Goa was in fact Portugal.} \)
India’s Independence Incomplete without Goa’s Freedom

After Braganza Cunha’s return to India in 1953, he continued to emphasise the concept of 'A Free Goa in a Free India'. However, he focused his efforts in a different direction. While earlier he was concerned with convincing the Goan intelligentsia that they were Indians, in his later activism, Braganza Cunha’s efforts were directed towards impressing upon the government of independent India that it could not be considered truly independent while pockets of its territory remained under foreign colonial domination.

Braganza Cunha was hopeful that Goa and the other foreign pockets would soon be free as India had become independent. He immediately initiated efforts to bring various groups committed to Goa’s freedom under one umbrella organisation, the Goa Action Committee.18

While he believed that it was important for groups with divergent ideologies to unitedly resist Portuguese colonial rule, he no longer seemed to view the apathy of the Goan intelligentsia, or the ‘denationalisation’ of Goans as a matter of major concern. On 25 June 1954, writing about the Civil Disobedience movement in Free Goa, Braganza Cunha asserted:

(T)he savage sentences of long years of imprisonment and

17 The Azad Gomantak Dal (AGD), formed in April 1947, was the first terrorist group, comprising persons who broke away from the NCG.

18 Many freedom fighters chose to go to Bombay, where they could carry on their political activity openly, rather than remain in Goa under fear of being arrested. Consequently, in Bombay, representatives of all the organizations concerned with Goa’s freedom could be found.
deportation, with bestial treatment, are on their part the best recognition of the magnitude of the movement that they tried to defeat using such bestial repression [Cunha 1954:1].

The reason for this was possibly the overwhelming response that Lohia's call to start a movement demanding Civil Liberties received, and his experience of participation in this movement, in addition to the fact that his base of operations was outside Goa. Thus, there is a clear shift in his thinking. The onus of freeing Goa was no longer on the Goans, but on the Indian government. Contrary to his own earlier position about the denationalisation of Goans, he now disputed claims that only a handful of discontents had declared themselves against foreign rule and for independence. In the wake of the popular upsurge for civil liberties during the civil disobedience movement of 1946, he now held that overwhelming popular sentiment within Goa was for its re-integration into India.

**Attitude of the Indian Government**

Besides attempting to forge unity between the various groups, Braganza Cunha urged the Indian government to take strong economic action against Goa, so that the Portuguese government in Goa would find it difficult to survive. He believed that such action would pave the way for Goa's liberation. However, he was critical of the manner in which the Indian government imposed the economic blockade which, according to him, 'served to harass innocent Goans without in the least affecting the Portuguese and their supporters, for whom they (the
sanctions) were meant' [Cunha 1961:389].

The further course of events increased his disillusionment with the Indian government. In 1954, at the initiative of the *Goa Vimochan Sahayak Samiti* formed by Peter Alvares, a member of the Congress Praja Samajwadi Paksha (a Socialist Party faction), the *satyagraha* movement was relaunched. In August 1954, nationalists crossed the India-Goa border in a symbolic act to show the 'artificiality' of the boundaries. Significantly, the Indian government banned Indians from taking part in this protest.

Probably on account of the awareness created of the Goa problem by the *Goa Vimochan Sahayak Samiti*, the Indian government did not ban the participation of Indians in the *satyagraha* of 1955. It attracted the participation of thousands of nationalists from India, and was described by a nationalist of Goa as being representative of 'true national integration'. The Goa problem invited international attention as the Portuguese troops opened fire on the unarmed *satyagrahis*.

Braganza Cunha's disillusionment with the Indian government was enhanced; firstly, on account of the attempt of the Indian government to prevent the participation of Indian nationalists in the movement; and secondly because of the response of the Indian government to the brutality shown by the Portuguese troops in dealing with the *satyagrahis*, which consisted in merely making 'platonic

---

19 In fact, two Goan nationalists -- Pandurang Mulgaonkar and Purshottam Kakodkar -- visited Nehru in 1960, asking for the relaxation of curbs that were causing hardships to the Goans.

20 On 15 August 1954, three batches of Goans marched into Goa from Banda, Karwar and Tiracol. The batch entering Goa through Tiracol captured and held the Tiracol Fort for one night. All the *satyagrahis* were arrested.
protests'.

The Portuguese tried to project the movement as the creation of non-Goans, but in spite of the fear of arrest, Goans participated in significant numbers. Further, of 49 martyrs listed in a journal published soon after the movement, 28 were Goans [United Asia 1957:342].

On 10 July 1957, Braganza Cunha wrote in Free Goa:

By stressing the distinction between Indians and Goans, the Indian bureaucracy not only fully recognised the Portuguese sovereignty on Goa, as it was never recognised by the Britishers, but treated Goans in India as foreigners and thus rendered more difficult their integration into India.

The question of Goa had not been considered in a 'broad national aspect' by the Indian leaders but through a 'narrow-minded, bureaucratic angle' [Cunha:1958]. The role played by the Indian government in the liberation of Nagar Haveli in 1954 was another case in point.

Members of the Goan People's Party [GPP], a leftist organisation, entered Nagar Haveli with the intention of liberating it but were arrested by the Indian police on the instructions they received from the then Bombay Presidency Chief Minister Morarji Desai. The reason for this was that he did not want a leftist organisation to take the credit for liberating Nagar Haveli.

Meanwhile, the Azad Gomantak Dal was permitted to enter Nagar Haveli. By 11 August, the liberation of Nagar Haveli was complete. On 15 August 1954, Braganza Cunha was called to Silvassa, the capital of Nagar Haveli, to hoist the
national flag. At first he refused on the grounds that the GPP members had been arrested by the Indian police. Ultimately, however, he went ahead with the flag hoisting ceremony as he did want to create ill feeling and highlight the differences that existed in the movement.

Shortly before his death, Braganza Cunha authored an editorial in Free Goa on 25 July 1958, titled *Portuguese Occupation of Goa Supported by Indian Merchants*, in which he stated his views about the Indian government in no uncertain terms.

According to him, Goa’s continued colonial status was owing to the protection given by Indian politicians to Indian businessmen for deriving profits from Goa, with the help of the Portuguese. He referred to the ‘pseudo Gandhians in power in India’ safeguarding the interests of the Indian merchants in Goa, who operated in connivance with Portuguese officialdom.

On 26 September 1958, Braganza Cunha died in Bombay of a heart attack. Ironically, though he has been called the ‘Father of Goan Nationalism’, what he attempted to do during the period of his political activity was to work for Goa’s integration with India.

While he was politically active in Goa, he tried to convince the Goan intelligentsia of the fact that Goa was an integral part of India. When he was forced to carry out his political activities from outside Goa, he attempted to convince nationalists and the officialdom of India that India’s independence

---

21As this was the last polemical piece he ever wrote and it has not been included in the selection of his writings, *Goa’s Freedom Struggle*, published in 1961, this has been appended to the thesis. See Appendix 3.
would be incomplete without the integration of Goa and other foreign-ruled pockets within India. The result of his efforts was that the question of nationalism in Goa was put firmly on the agenda of Indian nationalism.

**Course of Goa’s Freedom Struggle**

The integrationist concept voiced by Menezes Braganza towards the end of his life, was shaped and developed by Braganza Cunha. The dominant trend in the freedom struggle was integrationist, though other trends also existed, as we shall see in the next chapter.

The government of India’s attitude of non-interference and the repressive measures used by the Portuguese government, led to a sharp decline in the tempo of the movement. No open struggle was conducted after 1955, till Goa was liberated by the Indian army in 1961.

The activities of the terrorists groups in Goa continued, but possibly did not have the desired impact on the Portuguese state because they were unable to join forces with each other.22 Undercurrents of tension on grounds of moral issues or personality clashes marred the relationship between the groups.23

---

22Having seen the 'futility' of the satyagraha movement, which only had the effect of further brutalising the Portuguese state, a need was felt for more militant action against the Portuguese, leading to the formation of the Goan Liberation Army. Among the actions they undertook was the sabotage of mines at Bicholim [interview with Urselino Almeida on 6 March 1992, at Margao, Salcete]. In 1957, a breakaway group from the AGD formed the Rancour Patriotica (RP). The RP led a series of formidable attacks on police outposts and launched a major attack on the Mulgao mines. In 1961, prior to liberation, they destroyed a tanker and a military van [Shirodkar 1986:334].

23While none of the members of different groups made any direct accusations at each other, Prabhakar Sinari, leader of the Rancour Patriotica, asserted: ‘We wanted to uphold the principles of integrity and did not want any misuse of power.’ He was implying, perhaps, that this took place in the AGD, from which his group had broken away.
Efforts were also made by various individuals to solve the Goa problem by mounting national and international pressure on the Portuguese government to end its colonial rule, and on the Indian government to re-examine its *panchasheel* philosophy and its policy of 'non-interference' in relation to Goa.

Dr Pundalik Gaitonde was elected as the President of the National Congress (Goa) in 1960 and visited America in 1961 trying to elicit support from leaders like Norman Thomas. Later, he and others worked to hold the Afro-Asian Seminar on Portuguese Colonies in Delhi in October 1961, at which representatives of various African colonies questioned the Indian stand on the Goa problem.

International awareness of the Goa problem had been growing ever since Portugal's inclusion in the UNO on 22 December 1955. On the day of its inclusion, Portugal had filed a case in the International Court at The Hague, demanding the right of passage over Indian territory between Daman, Dadra and Nagar Haveli. The case continued till April 1960 and concluded with the International Court's rejection of the Portuguese claim [Gune 1979:205].

Subsequently, in July 1960, some countries in the UNO demanded that Portugal give information about Goa and its other overseas territories, which Portugal refused to do. This resulted in the UN Trusteeship Committee passing a resolution in November 1961, condemning Portugal's refusal to divulge the information asked for. Further, it asked all members to deny any help to Portugal which could be used by her to subjugate the people of the non-autonomous territories under Portuguese administration [Kher 1947:32].
Within India, propaganda for Goa’s liberation had been undertaken by the National Campaign Committee [NCC] formed by various individuals such as Romesh Chandra, Aruna Asaf Ali and Berta Menezes Braganza. All over India, widespread support was expressed for Goa’s liberation in the meetings held by the NCC.

Meanwhile, all the above developments led to a change in the attitude of the Indian government. In the seminar on Portuguese colonialism (mentioned earlier) held in October 1961, Nehru confessed that India’s policy on dealing with the Goa problem had failed, possibly necessitating the adoption of ‘other methods’ [Thapar 1962:9]. Similarly, in November 1961, when the UN Trusteeship Committee made a statement that Nehru had renounced the use of force, Krishna Menon denied this [Khera 1974:32]. Within a month of this, the Indian government launched Operation Vijay on 18 December 1961. In less than 48 hours, the Indian army succeeded in freeing Goa. On 19 December 1961, Goa was free.