CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1. THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

The great mass of the individual members of a nation identify themselves with the power and the policies of their nation. They experience this power and these policies as their own, and do so with an emotional intensity often surpassing the emotional attachment to their individual aspirations for power. People find vicarious satisfaction in identification with the power drives of the nation. When we speak in empirical terms of the power of a certain nation, we can only mean the power of certain individuals who belong to the same nation and act as the spokesmen of the nation. They speak for the nation, negotiate treaties in its name, define its objectives, choose the means for achieving them, and try to maintain, increase, and demonstrate its power. As a national representatives they wield the power and pursue the policies of their nation. When people are conscious of being members of a very powerful nation, they flatter themselves and feel a great pride. Society encourages and glorifies the tendencies of the great mass of the population, to identify itself with the nation's struggle for power. The national symbols are instruments of that identification of the individual with the power of the nation. The ethics and mores of society tend to make that identification attractive by holding out rewards and threatening punishments. It is a psychological fact that
frustration of individual power drives give rise to an increased desire for compensatory identification with the collective national aspirations for power. The growing insecurity of the individual in society magnifies enormously the frustration of individual power drives. This, in turn, gives rise to an increased desire for compensatory identification with the collective national aspirations for power. As Prof. Morgenthaler says: "The lower middle classes especially, such as the white-collar workers, but also the main bulk of the laboring masses, identify themselves completely with the national aspirations for power."

With this background we can say that the national aspirations are nothing but the sum of people's will and identification of the people of that particular nation with the power and policy of the nation. The projection of nationalism and patriotism is there in the national aspirations of the people. Apart from nationalism as an ideology, it has a concrete meaning. It may be taken to mean some particular way or ways of manifesting national spirit, and may be defined as the sum of social, economical and political national aspirations of the people.

---

Aspirations are nothing but goal statements concerning future level of achievement. National aspirations contain ambitions, expectations, demands, or hopes of the people of the nation. Indian people's aspirations for power or their aspirations for social, economical and political development of India, are India's national aspirations. Rising aspirations of the Indian people and resistance of it by colonial power, discloses many fundamental demands, expectations, and perceptions of identity.

2. NATIONALIST CONSCIOUSNESS AND INDIA:

India has been the home of rich civilization throughout her long history. Foreign critics have usually over-emphasised the diversities of her national life and considered her people as the inmates of some botanical garden. Most of them go to the extent of suggesting that there is nothing like an India, nothing like an Indian people, or an Indian Nation. But in fact, beneath the apparent diversity


2. Sir John Strachey does not hesitate in asserting that "there is not and never was an India, or even any country of India, possessing, according to European idea, any sort of unity, physical, political, social, or religious; no Indian nation, no "people of India", of which we hear so much". India: Its Administration and Progress, Macmillan; 1911, p. 5.

Seeley wrote, "The fundamental fact there is that India had no jealousy of the foreigner because India had no sense whatever of national unity, because there was no India and therefore, properly speaking, no foreigner". (As quoted by Francis G. Hutchins, in "The illusion of Permanence, British Imperialism in India, New Jersey, 1967, p. 141.)
in social, religious and linguistic constitution of Indian society, there runs through a strain of fundamental unity, which gives it a peculiar individuality, of which it has ever been conscious.¹

According to French scholar and critic Ernest Renan, it is not race, religion, language, state, civilization, or economic interests that make the nation. Common experiences, especially a heroic past, great leaders, and true glory, lead to the formation of a community of will. Common grief, even more than triumphs, binds a people together. A nation, in Renan's view, is a great solidarity based on the consciousness of sacrifices made in the past and willingness to make further ones in the future.²

'nation' calls attention to those persons who compose a political community. The word is used to denote an aggregation of individuals united by others, as well as

1. Abbe Dubois, the French missionary, who stayed in South India for considerable period at the beginning of the 19th century, wrote in this connection. "Moreover there is a certain general uniformity of rule and practice in every day social matters, which compels one to look upon the different masses of the population belonging to one big family." Hindu Manners and Customs, Oxford; London; pp. 12-13.

political, ties - ties commonly of race, religion, language, or tradition. The individuals are possessed of common institutions and a common culture which give unity to the group and foster a spirit of sympathy between the members.\(^1\)

A nation is not an empirical thing. It cannot be seen. We can empirically observe the individuals who belong to a nation. As Morgenthan says: "A nation is an abstraction from a number of individuals who have certain characteristics in common, and it is these characteristics that make them members of the same nation."\(^2\)

Most nations are formed of agglomerations of tribes or peoples either of a common ethnic stock or of different stocks fused by long intercourse. A single language or closely related dialects, a common religion, a common tradition and history, and a common sense of right and wrong, and a more or less compact territory, are typically characteristic; but one or more of these elements may be lacking and yet leave a group that from its community of interest and desire to lead a common life is called nation.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Nationalism: A report by A Study Group of Members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (London, 1939), pp. xvi-xx.
\(^3\) Webster's New International Dictionary; 2nd ed.; Unabridged; London, G. Bell & Sons Ltd.; 1949.
India had possession in common of a rich legacy of remembrances and Indians had desire to live together, and the will to continue to value the heritage which all hold in common.

So, it was not true to say for India that 'it is not a nation'. Nation was there. Inherent unity was hidden in it. The only thing was that with the march of time the nation was lost in darkness. In the span of time it was scattered in pieces, caught by ignorance, jealousy, and many other evils. In the long period of history it was exploited, divided and mistreated by its conquerers.

It is, nevertheless, true that India could not evolve a nationalist consciousness, according to the Western notions, in the period before the British rule. Tagore was so impressed by the racial diversities of India and the communal and caste repulsions that he concluded: "India has never had a real sense of nationalism". In India, National Consciousness was hardly possible in the self-sufficient feudal, medieval environment. In the word of Tagore, during British rule: "every single individual in the country of No-nation (India) is completely in the grip of a whole nation (Britain) - whose tireless vigilance being the vigilance of a machine has not the human power

to overlook or to overlook or to discriminate. He held "the desolating despair of the haunted world of suffering man possessed by the ghastly abstraction of the organising man" was the State of India.

The national idea is essentially a concept of modern times, the concept of a free political community exercising sovereign rights within a territorial unit which it claims as its homeland. Nationalism implies a common political consciousness or patriotism which the people of a country must share among themselves. It represents the consciousness of society at an advanced stage of material development. It also implies an integrated political system, economy and exchange on a country-wide basis.

In Western countries national sentiment was very highly developed long before. Norman Angell, British journalist and economist, therefore once made this statement. "Political nationalism has become, for the European of our age, the most important thing in the world, more important than civilization, humanity, decency, kindness, pity; more important than life itself." 3

1. Ibid., p. 25.
2. Ibid., p. 28.
But in fact Indians had not developed this national sentiment — most powerful of historical forces — for some period before the British rule over India.

A deep attachment to one's native soil, to local traditions and to established territorial authority has existed in varying strength throughout history.

India, too, acquired national consciousness with the growth of her society on modern lines and gave birth to nationalist agitation. For nationalist leaders like Aurbindo Ghose nationalism was veritably a religion, the phrase motherland was not a figure of speech but literal truth. In his own words: "Nationalism is a divinely appointed shakti of the Eternal and must do its God-given work before it returns to the bosom of the Universal Emergy from which it came".¹ He further advocates: "Nationalism is simply the passionate aspiration for the realization of the Divine Unity in the nation, a unity in which all the component individuals, however, various and apparently unequal their functions, as political, social or economic factors, are yet, really and fundamentally one and equal".²

Everywhere men seek realization of their dearest dreams, whatever they may be, within their nations,

¹ Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma, Sri Aurbindo and the New thought in Indian politics; Calcutta; 1952, p. 226.
² Ibid., p. 127.
everywhere they erect their nations into bulwarks, no matter how weak, against adversity. Accordingly with the march of the time, Indians remembered their past glory, their old rich civilization and came into close-contact with Western concept of nationalism which imbubed in them love for their mother land and thus they regained their national consciousness.

3. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDIAN ASPIRATIONS:

The insurrection against British authority in India in 1857 lacked the sustaining inspiration of nationalism. The leaders of the revolt were hardly conscious of national unity and had divergent political aims. The revolt was also in a large measure a reaction of Hindu-Muslim orthodoxy to the modern spirit of progress and innovations.¹

It is usually said that the history of the Indian National Congress is the history of Indian Nationalism. It is not exactly so. The nationalist movement had begun to take shape earlier than the foundation of the congress in 1885. Moreover, the nationalist movement was more comprehensive than the congress movement. The congress movement has, more or less throughout, acted as a safety-valve and, strictly

¹ "It was", writes Dr. Topa, "much a revolt against the new order of things without having any consolidated ideas about the general national unity". Dr. Topa: The Growth of Nationalist Thought, New Delhi, 1950. p. 75.
speaking, it never allowed agitation to grow beyond safety-limits. It did not patronise the revolutionary technique and even sympathise with the aspirations of the fiery exponents of nationalism. The nationalist record, on the other hand, cannot afford to ignore them. Their activity forms a striking current of the national struggle, a current not completely submerged with the non-violent agitations of the later period. These were the outbursts of revolutionary activity in India that made the statement in London aware of the psychological moment to offer political concessions. It is, however, true that the congress movement was the most organised and formidable expression of nationalist opinion and sentiment. Its history naturally forms a very substantial part of the history of Indian aspirations.

Indian aspirations were inspired by the idealism of the French Revolution and the example of national agitations for democratic government in Europe in the 19th Century. The Irish Home Rule Movement which began to develop towards the seventies of the last century and which aimed at the unity of all classes and creeds was a tremendous stimulus to the Indian movement. The leaders of the politically-conscious class in India, owing to their regular visits to England were intimately familiar with most of the Irish leaders and developments in their country. The world-wide
agitations against colonial domination and for responsible government towards the close of the century and onwards also intensified the Indian aspirations. Nation's watchwords were national unity and national progress. People started to aspire for the political interests of the Indian people as a whole. They did not identify themselves with any class or creed but represented the aspirations of the Indian nation. They worked on the assumption that the people of India, in spite of their marked local and linguistic differences, constitute a family and have identical national interests. They aimed at the establishment of democratic government, the heritage of the modern civilized world.

Pricked by imperialist repression, India's national self-consciousness began to seek inspiration from the past. The religious movement of the 19th century also aroused the nation to a realization of its greatness in the past and the possibilities of progress in future. Its revivalist doctrines exercised a strong spell on the political imagination of the country and worked up a tremendous sentiment of patriotism. The revivalist outlook of Indian nationalism proved an effective antidote to the slavish mentality bred by foreign rule. It deprecated the craze for the superficial glamour of the West. It strengthened
the moral fibre of the nation to resist the onflood of European manners and morality.

Indian aspirations, naturally, were much more than an agitation for political reforms. It was something of "the revival of an historical tradition, the liberation of the soul of a people" and acquired the force of a national renaissance.\(^1\) India now had visions of a great destiny for her people and aspired to be in the van of civilization in the hope of effecting "true reconciliation between the East and the West".\(^2\) The awakening of India, truly, observes Pandit Nehru, was two-fold. "She looked to the West and at the same time, she looked at herself and her own past".\(^3\)

The interaction of modernist and revivalist influences made Indian aspirations a complex phenomenon. At a later stage it became a curious blending of religion and politics, materialism and spiritualism.

Indian nationalistic aspirations began as a movement for political concessions and reforms from the British

\begin{enumerate}
  \item MacDonald, J.R., \textit{The Govt. of India}, Oxford 1930, p.27
  \item Nehru Jawaharlal; \textit{The Discovery of India}, The Signet Press; 1946, p. 392.
\end{enumerate}
Government, and it retained a compromising attitude towards the government throughout its history. Even in the Gandhian period of mass upheavals, it never aimed at snapping the British connection altogether.

4. PHASES OF THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN ASPIRATIONS:

We can see, three well marked phases of political development of the Indian aspirations. The first is the period of the ascendancy of liberalism lasting till the stormy regime of Lord Curzon. Political agitation in the first phase lacked vigour and effectiveness and was exclusively an upper middle-class agitation. But it was an intellectual feat par-excellence, and supplied intellectual foundations to Indian nationalism. The evolution of nationalism in this phase was accompanied by the assimilation of Western thought and even mode of life by the upper educated strata of society. The spirit of nationalism was especially marked in the old provinces of Bengal, Madras and Bombay where this process had started earlier and struck deeper root.

In the second phase, (1900-1919) - Indian nationalism acquired a more dynamic and threatening character. It evolved the school of self-reliance of passive resistance and vigorous agitation, and that of violent retaliation also. The British government, however, succeeded in weakening...
the nationalist aspiration for radical political reforms.

Its policy of conciliation, the Minto-Morley Reforms, (1909-13) created a breach in the solidarity of Indian nationalism and also won over the Muslim intelligentsia. The storm of the extremist agitation subsided to a great extent in the time of Lord Hardinge and there was reconciliation in all directions.

In the final phase, the Gandhian epoch, (1920-1947) Indian nationalism acquired greater vitality and adaptability.

Throughout these phases, the national movement made steady progress. It ultimately came to cover every sphere of national activity and touch every spring of national life. The scope of the movement widened as it grew in strength and organization. In the later period the congress became the pivot of all public movements of industrial and social progress. It engaged itself in constructive work to improve the social and economic condition of the masses. Under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi, the national movement received new light and inspiration and became a comprehensive movement of national renaissance and reconstruction.

5. THE PROBLEM:

It was during this period, during this last phase of the Gandhian epoch, - that World War II broke out in Europe on September 3, 1939. India was involved in it by force.
The British Government made India their partner in the war without consulting the Indian political leaders. This action of the British Government ran counter to the spirit of democracy. Since the popular and responsible ministries were in charge of the Provincial Administration the British Government was expected to consult them on such a vital issue. But the British Government did not consult them. Moreover it was not ready to state even war aims and how they were applicable to India. As a result of the political differences between the Government and the Indian nationalist leaders a political deadlock arose. Out of 11 provincial ministers, 8 provincial ministries resigned one by one, between 27th October and 15th November, 1939. Even in March 1942 this political deadlock remained unsolved. On 10th March, 1942 Prime Minister Churchill made a statement in the House of Commons for sending Sir Stafford Cripps to India to solve the Indian political deadlock. From March 22, 1942, to April 11, 1942, Sir Stafford was in India, to solve the Indian political deadlock.

The purpose of this study is, in general, to examine Indian aspirations during the British rule and British diplomacy toward Indian aspirations. In particular effort is made to examine India's national aspirations during the Cripps Mission and how the Mission met with the aspirations of India. In other words, the specific aim of this study is to examine the diplomacy of the British Government in
response to the national will of India, during the Cripps Mission.

5. SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY:

Immediately after the failure of Cripps Mission in solving Indian political deadlock to this day various eminent national and international authors, reporters, political leaders, critics and researchers, in the light of their personal knowledge and available source material published their views about Cripps Mission. Some of them were even participant, directly or indirectly, in the Mission.

Sir Winston Churchill has written a chapter on the Cripps Mission in the Volume IV of his war memoirs.

---------------------

1. From U.S.A. "Amerasia" magazine published whole issue on "The Cripps Mission to India" (See 'Amerasia' May 1942). In "Amerasia", 6 (July, 1942) Kinzer, Benjamin H. wrote the article "Another view of the Cripps Mission" in which he criticised the attitude of the Indian National Congress. The Hindustan Times Press (New Delhi) published Documented account from the Nationalist point of view of the Cripps negotiations under the title "Why Cripps Failed".

Fischer Louis wrote two articles:


During the Cripps Mission he was Prime Minister and the Head of the War Cabinet of Britain.

Maulana Abulkalam Azad has also given account of Cripps Mission in his Auto-biographical narrative. During the period of Cripps Mission he was the president of the Indian National Congress.

Other eminent Indian political leaders Gandhi, Sardar Patel, Nehru, Rajaji etc. have also given their views on Cripps Mission. Cordell Hall, then U.S. Secretary of State, had published his memories in 2 volumes. Earl of Halifax has given his memories in the form of a book. He was viceroy of India during the years 1926-31 as Lord Irwin; also he was His Majesty's Ambassador in Washington since 1941.

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, eminent Indian scholar and a political leader also described Cripps Mission in detail in his book.

---

Bose has been published, in which he included his memories and political views covering the period 1939-42.¹

Mr. Amery, then Secretary of State for India and member of war cabinet during the period under review also wrote on India and its freedom.² Mr. Attlee who was Lord Privy seal from 1940 to 19 February, 1942 and Deputy P.M. and Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs from 19 February 1942 has written his memories.³

Reporters, political critics, and political scientists like Louis Fischer, Durgadas, B. Shiva Rao, Kanji Dwarkadas, Sir Regenold Coupland, Herold Laski etc., has given their views on Cripps Mission.⁴

With its abrupt termination after only seventeen days, the Cripps Mission was widely discussed in Britain, India and the United States.

1. Bose S.C. Indian Struggles 1920-1942; Published by Chackravarty, Chatterjee & Co. Ltd., 15, College Square, Calcutta-12.
4. Louis Fischer has discussed Cripps Mission in his book The Life of Mahatma Gandhi; Harper & Brothers, New York; 1950. Durgadas wrote a book of his memories, From Curzon to Nehru and other ; Collins S.T. James' palace, London; 1969; B. Shiva Rao has given his memories and views in his book India's Freedom Movement Some Notable Figures; Orient Longmans, 1972; and Kanji Dwarkadas has also published his political memories; Ten years to freedom; in which he has discussed Cripps Mission, Popular Prakashan, Bombay; 1968.
Some commentators voiced suspicions that the whole affair was a propaganda gesture, a cruel hoax to Nationalist hopes, while others concentrated on describing the complex nature of negotiations and the variance in the positions of the parties. Blame for the breakdown was widely distributed, depending on the observer's viewpoint.

The explanation of Azad for failure of the Mission is recorded in his book. He writes: "There has been a great deal of speculation in India and some outside as to why Sir Stafford Cripps changed the position between the first and second interviews. One possible explanation is that Sir Stafford Cripps had hoped to persuade the Congress to accept the proposals, even though there was no change in the basic situation, by his persuasive powers and pleasant manners. When, however, the proposals were examined in detail and he was subjected to cross examination, he felt that he must be cautious and refrain from raising hopes which he was not in a position to satisfy. An alternative explanation is that during this interval the inner circle of the Government of India had started to influence him. A third alternative

---------------------


explanation is that during the interval, messages had passed between Delhi and London, and the British War Cabinet had sent him fresh instruction which made him feel that if he went too far he might be reprimanded. Cripps was essentially an advocate and as such he was inclined to paint things in a rosier colour than was warranted by the facts.¹

The British official view was that it was the pacifism of Gandhi that brought about the failure of Cripps Mission. Sir G.S. Bajpai, then Indian agent general in U.S.A. laid the entire responsibility for the failure of the negotiations at the door of Congress Working Committee. The Indian intelligensia at least an important section of it - doubted the sincerity of the British Cabinet and held that the Cripps Mission was designed merely to placate American opinion.²

Hodson who had first-hand information about the Mission and its working, reveals the cause of failure thus: "The fault clearly lay with Sir Stafford in negotiating on such an issue to a point of vital commitment without the clearest understanding with the Viceroy. (The busy body Col. Johnson obviously made matters worse). But the blame did not rest with him alone; for the War Cabinet, especially the India committee, made a fundamental mistake, strange in a body so

experienced, when they sent an emissary to promote a policy in India which had not been fully agreed with the Viceroy, thought he would have to carry it out!\(^1\)

Cripps himself took the line that the Congress was wholly to blame for its suicidal rejection of an offer which met all its demands. He attributed the decision of the Working Committee to the influence of Gandhiji. His biographer writes: "There had been along, long telephonic conversation between congress leaders and Mr. Gandhi. The import of that long conversation with Mr. Gandhi had now become clearer; the congress committee had swung back towards the view of the Mahatma - a practical constitutional independence of government was the only road to agreement with the British Cabinet".\(^2\) Gandhiji primarily and the Congress Working Committee as his blind followers were, in Cripps' opinion, answerable for the failure.

This fanciful explanation of Colin Cooke's is-based probably upon all kinds of wild rumours then circulating in Delhi was entirely baseless. Gandhiji himself denied it

------------
2. Cooke Colin; *The Life of Richard Stafford Cripps*; Hodder and Stoughton; 1957; p. 292.
American journalist Louis Fischer gave his independent opinion which is very interesting. He concluded:

"Cripps maintained, however, that he had full authority to set up a real Cabinet Government in India. On April 9 this authority was specifically withdrawn in new instructions to Cripps cabled from London. Cripps was told therein that he could not go beyond the Text of the British Government draft declaration unless he obtained the consent of the Viceroy and Wavell. That explains the collapse of the Cripps Mission."

In reply to the article written by Graham Spry, Cripps' Secretary, denying that such a promise was made, Fischer observed: "Cripps did not withdraw his promise (about national government) because he made it without sincerity, he withdrew it because he was stabbed in the back.

1. "After Gandhiji left Delhi there was no consultation with him of any kind and it is entirely wrong to imagine that the rejection was due to his pressure". Nehru reiterated this view in his book, The Discovery of India, published in 1946, years after the heat of the Cripps controversy had dissipated. In 1946 Gandhiji said to Louis Fischer, "They have asserted that I had influenced the negotiations after I left Delhi. But that is a lie". Fischer Louis; The Life of Mahatma Gandhi; Harper & Brothers; New York; 1950. p. 359.

by Englishmen who differed from him.1

On the contrary Laski put the blame for the collapse of Cripps Mission squarely on his shoulders. In his opinion, "it was psychologically disastrous for Sir Stafford to go to India in a 'take it or leave it' mood, and, on his return, practically announce that he washed his hands the offer. That was bound to make it look as though our real thought was less the achievement of Indian freedom than of a coup de main in the propagandist art among our allies".2

Glendevon, an apologist of his father Linlithgow, goes to the extent of accusing Cripps of "not running straight with them (Indians)" and indicately adds that "the same charge must be levelled at him over his dealings with the Viceroy".3 He further asserts that in his earlier discussions with the Congress leaders on the nature of the new Executive Council, Cripps went "well beyond his brief".4 Apparently agreeing with this, Eric Stokes writes that "Cripps' actions will require a great deal of explaining".5

1. Ibid., p. 329.
2. Ibid., p. 331.
4. Ibid., p. 232.
Whereas D.A. Low describes such views as unwarranted, and remarks that Cripps was not only careful never to travel beyond his brief, "but convinced he should not".¹ R.J. Moore broadly agrees with this view, but remarks that the allegation of volte face levelled by the Congress against Cripps was "substantially warranted".²

Thus, clear or complete picture regarding Cripps Mission remained unknown. Even Louis Fischer wrote in his book: "Some day the official British and American reports on the Cripps Mission (Louis Johnson functioned as intermediary at one stage) will be published".³ Accordingly, American government published some of its secret documents of the foreign office, and some unknown facts came out related with the Cripps Mission.⁴

Still complete facts about Cripps Offer remained unknown due to the lack of secret British documents concerning the Mission.

To understand the salient points emerging from the mass of emotional and legalistic documentation which blocks a clear


view of the Cripps Mission, it is necessary to examine his
mission in some detail. Now, it is for the first time that
Her Majesty's Government, have published the British documents
on the Cripps Mission to India. There are about seven
hundred such documents which the British Government have
published. So, in the light of these documents and the
documents which are made available in India by private persons,
political organisations etc., is valuable study from the
point of view of its political perspectives.

6. LIMITS OF STUDY:

To have a better understanding of India's National
aspirations during Cripps Mission, it is necessary to know
growth and development of Indian aspirations from the very
inception of national consciousness of the Indian people.
Similarly, to understand British diplomacy during the Mission,
it is equally essential to know past dealing of the British
Government with Indian people's aims and aspirations.
Therefore brief background of Indian aspirations from 1885
to 1935 has been given, with the British response to them.
The nationalist aspirations of India are gleaned from the
writings and speeches of Indian leaders, and the proceedings
of the various nationalist organizations. British response
to the Indian aspirations is drawn from official documents,

1. Mansergh and Lumby; The Transfer of Power, 1942-47,
Then political situation of India and people's aspiration during the second world war are discussed in detail. Also, British diplomacy towards Indian aspirations during early years of the war is discussed in detail. After that genesis of the Cripps Mission is presented. Then the period of actual Cripps negotiations is discussed in detail. Reactions to the failure of the Mission is discussed at length. Also, an attempt is made to place responsibility of the break-down of Cripps negotiations. At last I have drawn my conclusions emerging from the study.

In brief, scope of this study is limited to get the answer of the following definite questions, in the light of newly published documents and other relevant source material. These questions are:

1. What were the Indian Aspirations?
2. What was the real intention of the British Government in sending the Cripps Mission to India?
3. Why did the Mission fail in meeting with these aspirations?
4. What were the reactions to the failure of the Mission?