1. **EMERGENCE OF INDIAN ASPIRATIONS FOR NATION, NATIONALITY AND NATIONAL UNITY**

It is true that in the period before the British rule, a nationalist consciousness was not evolved in India, according to the western notions. India was economically, socially and politically a backward nation. Different cast, creed, races, and religions were the obstacles in the path of National Unity of India.

However, a distinguished Western authority on nationalism, Hans Kohn, has maintained that "a truer basis of unity than modern national sentiment was to be found in a common intellectual heritage, persisting through an unbroken tradition and moulding and permeating India's whole social life to the minutest detail, and in the peculiar contemplative piety which lies at the root of all the various forms of Hinduism".¹

Growth of the middle class in India awakened political consciousness. Few Indians, who were fortunate to receive

western education, had begun taking interest in public affairs. They realised the earnest need for national unity and comradarie amongst various communities living in India, to remove the taunt that India is not a nation.

The Indian Press, both English and Vernacular, had given a strong impetus to this process of political awareness. The increasing number of newspapers and their readers, attested to the growing interest of the people in politics. The position of the Indian Press during this phase of development, to quote William Digby, was as follows: In 1875, there were 374 Vernacular and Anglo-Vernacular newspapers in circulation, as against 147 English papers - 102 were published in Bengal, 86 in Bombay, 65 in the North-Western Province (Utter Pradesh), 38 in Madras, and 63 in Punjab, Sind, the Central Provinces (Madhya Pradesh) and Rajasthan combined.¹

The Indian-language newspapers had altogether a much larger circulation, and the number of their readers was increasing. As Roper Lethbridge pointed out; "if a single copy reaches a village or even a large collection of villages, its contents will soon become known to nearly every man residing in the neighbourhood."²

With the advance of education and as means of communication
developed and contacts between the provinces increased,
the political consciousness crossed the provincial
boundaries and assumed a national character. The desire
for Western knowledge on the part of the middle class and
the requirements of the Government for a larger number of
English-knowing Indians, led to a remarkable growth of
secondary and collegiate education during this period. In
1855, there were in the country 169 secondary schools with
18335 pupils; in 1882, the number of Government schools
alone swelled to 1363 with 44605 pupils.

The Indian contribution, too, was not unworthy. In
1854, the number of schools maintained by Indians was small,
but in 1881-82, it had grown to 1341 - that is almost
equal to the number of Government schools, and nearly twice
as large as that of the missionary schools, viz., 757.

Socio-religious movements of the 18th and 19th
centuries had prepared the ground for national unity.
The Brahmo Samaj, the Arya Samaj, the Ramkrishna Mission
and the Theosophical Society may be prominently mentioned.

1. About Western education, Dadabhai Naoroji, the Grand
Old Man of India, wrote: "New light has been poured
on us, teaching us the new lesson that Kings are
made for the people and not the people for king". See Dadabhai Naoroji's speech read on 2 May, 1867
before the East India Association; Parekh Chunilal
Lallubhai; ed; Essays, Speeches, Addresses and
Writings of Dadabhai Naoroji; Bombay, 1887; pp. 26-45.
These socio-religious movements and their leaders breathed new life into the nation. Raja Rammohan Roy, Bankim Chandra Chatterji, Swami Ramkrishna Paramhans and his great disciple Swami Vivekanand, Swami Dayanand contributed much for Indian Nation. Bankim Chandra Chatterji, in his book Krishna Charitra, discussed not only the religious teachings of Krishna but also their relevance for the advancement of Hindu society. He wrote: "He (Krishna) never sought to be a social reformer. His objective was to bring about the moral and political regeneration of the society, spread religion and establish a kingdom based on religion. If this can be achieved, society will be reformed on its own, social reformation is impossible without this... We create trouble by approaching the problems of the society independently. Religious advancement is also the root of political advancement. Then, every one must endeavour for the advancement of religion. If this is done, no independent effort will be required for the reformation of the society".

In his another book, Dharmatattva, Krishna is described in these words: "He who by the strength of his arm subdued the wicked, by the power of his wisdom unified India, by the power of his knowledge proclaimed a unique selfless religion, Him, I salute..."

2. Ibid., pp. 20-21.
These thoughts provided the moral foundations for social and political society and state were to be built.

Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1836-86) was the centre of light and gentle piety to the common people who thronged to the temple of Dakshineshwar where he lived and worshipped, he helped them to bear their sufferings and sorrows with fortitude and to attain inner contentment and happiness. He was, at the same time, a powerful magnet for sophisticated middle class Westernised men, who were attracted by his utter humility, humanity, and spiritual integrity. ¹

The humanism of Ramakrishna found a powerful advocate in his beloved disciple, Vivekanand. Although Vivekanand was not in favour of political agitation, the building up of a strong, brave, dynamic nation was dear to his heart. Religion, he regarded as the Keynote of the music of national life.² He desired in all fields of activity to awaken that austere devotion of the spirit which arouses heroism. He thus combined a burning love of the Absolute and the irresistible appeal of suffering humanity.

1. Rolland, Romin, The Life of Ramkrishna (Translated from the original French by Dr. Malcom Smith, Advaita Ashram, Mayawati, Almora, 1947).

2. Rolland Romain; The Life of Vivekanand and the Universal (Gospel, Translated from the Original French by Dr. Malcom Smith, Mayavati, Almora, Himalayas, 1953, p. 106.)
He challenged the educated in these words: "So long as the millions live in hunger and ignorance, I hold every man a traitor, who having been educated at their expense, pays not the least heed to them". And he wrote, : "The only hope of India is from the masses. The upper classes are physically and morally dead".¹

He believed in "a religion which will give us faith in ourselves, a national self-respect, and the power to feed and educate the poor and relieve the misery around".²

"I will go into a thousand hells cheerfully" said Vivekanand, "if I can rouse my countrymen immersed in Tamas (inertia), to stand on their own feet and be men inspired with, the spirit of Karma Yoga (Worship through Action)". He wished "in all fields of activity to awaken that austere elevation of spirit which arouses heroism".³

Vivekananda's love of liberty shines through his words and deeds. He said: "Liberty in thought and action is the only condition of life, growth and well-being: where it does not exist, the man, the race and the nation must go down".⁴

¹. Ibid., p. 72.
². Ibid., p. 10
³. Ibid., p. 129.
In a passionately patriotic and nobly evocative speech he apostrophised his country thus:

"O Bharat! wilt thou rely upon this institution of the others, this mimicry, this anxiety to win the other's approbation, this imbecile slavishness, this hateful, abominable hard-heartedness, to win high authority? Wilt thou, with the aid of this shameful cowardice, achieve the independence which only the heroes deserve? Do not forget, your society is the variest shadow of the great illusion, do not forget the lowly, the poor, the ignorant, the currier, the sweeper, are your blood, are your brethren. O, ye brave one, take courage, be proud that you are an Indian, and proudly proclaim I am Indian - every Indian is my brother... The soil of India is my highest heaven. India's good is my good."¹

He proclaimed his political faith in these words:

"Believe, believe, the decree has gone, the flat of the Lord has gone - India must rise, the mass, the poor are to be made happy, and rejoice that you are the chosen instruments in his hands."²

The conviction founded upon the frequency of famines, that the country's poverty was increasing, created prejudice

---

1. Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 185.
2. Ibid., p. 55.
and distrust against the foreign government and its culture, and the discovery of India's ancient past strengthened self-esteem and pride in the country's destiny and disparaged the value of Western Culture. Revulsion against foreign rule weakened the urge for religious and social reform, and politics began to assume a dominating influence over minds.

Vishnu Sastri Chiplunkar (died 1882) wrote in an essay in his journal Nibandhamala: "British conquest put an end to our independence. The loss of freedom means the loss of everything that we hold precious. Our old Kingdoms, our wealth, our learning all have now declined." He bemoaned the general backwardness of agriculture, industry, commerce and the arts, and declared: "But the greatest evil of foreign rule is our moral degradation resulting from the loss of freedom. Our countrymen have attained the stage of a slave who accepts his slavery and loses his self-respect and pride ... Our character is completely demonalised".¹

The Arya Samaj movement inaugurated by Dayanand Sarasvati, made an endeavour to awaken the spirit of self-reliance and strengthen the sense of self-respect among

¹ ("State of the Country" essay contributed to the Nibandhamala, pp. 77-83. On account of its strong tone and severe criticism of British rule, the essay was suppressed in 1910. When the Congress came to power in 1937, it was republished, and a students edition was printed in 1945.)
Indians. The tribute which an English missionary paid to Dayanand's ideals is of value as it comes from an unexpected source not too well disposed towards the 'Arya Samaj'. Said Dr. Griswold: "Pandit Dayanand Sarasvati was a man of large views. He was a dreamer of splendid dreams. He had a vision of India purged of her superstitious, filled with the fruits of Science, worshipping one God, fitted for self-rule, having a place in the sisterhood of nations and restored to her ancient glory".  

The Theosophical Society was a powerful factor in the awakening of hopes and aspirations of Indians. As early as 1903, Mrs. Besant avowed her political faith in these words: "India must be governed on the basis of Indian feelings, Indian traditions, Indian thoughts and Indian ideas". Thus Indian leaders attacked social and religious evils and brought about many reforms. They unfolded the pictures of India's glorious past, ancient civilization and hoary culture Indian people began to realize their ancient greatness and became self-conscious. With self-consciousness came the sense of self-respect, which, in its train, brought dissatisfaction against the British rule.

Indians began to realize the evils of their subjection. These movements preached love for India Indians and Indian things.

Raja Rammohan Roy maintained that Hinduism was not inferior to Christianity as the following extract from his letter to the editor of the Bengal Harkarn shows: "...with respect to Science, Literature, or Religion, I do not acknowledge that we are placed under any obligation (of the English). For by a reference to History it may be proved that the World was indebted to our ancestors for the first dawn of knowledge, which sprung up in the East, and thanks to the Goddess of Wisdom, we have still a philosophical and copious language of our own, which distinguishes us from other nations who cannot express scientific or abstract ideas without borrowing the language of foreigners."1

Thus, in a vital sector of thought and culture, he demonstrated the hollowness of Western superiority and restored the self-confidence of the Hindus, who had been badly shaken by the onslaughts of the missionaries and their allies.

However, Indian National Congress was the most organised, effective and formidable expression of the patriotic will of India. It was the first time in the

history of India, such a national gathering took place to speak out the national aspirations of the people of India. In this national gathering almost highly educated Indians were taking active part. Indian masses were ignorant and illiterate. Educated Indians were interpreters and mediators between the Indian masses and the British rulers of India.

Dr. Rajendralal Mitra had said in the welcome address of the Second National Congress (1886); "It has been the dream of my life that the scattered units of my race may some day coalesce and come together; that instead of living merely as individuals, we may some day so combine as to be able to live as a nation. In this meeting, I behold the commencement of such coalescence... Nations are not made of sects but of tribes bound together in one political bond. We are all bound by the same political bond, and therefore we constitute one nation".

For the development of India, it was most necessary to be integrated physically, politically, economically, culturally and socially. Without it proper development and prosperity of a nation was impossible. It was most necessary to integrate, unite, and consolidate the emerging forces in the country. Therefore, the nationalist leaders were aspiring to cultivate a spirit of generous toleration.

---

1. Natesan G.A. (ed.); Madras (1917); The Indian National Congress Presidential addresses; Nateson & Co. P.D.
and of charity between class and class, and creed and creed. Raja Ram Mohan Roy wrote: "The distinction of castes, introducing innumerable divisions and subdivisions among them (Hindus) has entirely deprived them of patriotic feeling". and added; "We have been subjected to such insults for about nine centuries, and the cause of degradation has been .... our division into castes which has been the source of want of unity among us". 1 British policy was 'divide and rule' — setting one class against another in the administration of the country. Therefore, nationalist leaders realized that unless a solid basis for unity and nationality was laid, the ills of India would not disappear. 2

Leaders like Surendranath Benerje began their political career as the champion of Indian unity. They toured all over the country and made speeches to popularize the concept of the Indian nation. Banerje said, even

1. The Father of Modern India, Commemoration Volume, Part II, Calcutta, 1940, p. 75.
2. At first the Nizam of Hyderabad was lined up against Arcot and Arcot against Nizama; then the Marathas were put against Muslims and Afghans against the Hindus. After 1858, when the British had firmly established themselves in the country, they adopted a policy open hostility towards the Muslims, because they had everything to fear from them (the Muslims) as they had usurped the Mughal Empire. Towards the end of the 19th century, the policy of divide and rule was again reversed, and the Muslims were taken the British protecting wings. An Englishman, Howard Malcolm, himself wrote: "Hindustan could have never been subdued but by the help of her own children. "Malcolm Howard"; Travels in South-Eastern Asia; Boston, 1939, p. 26.
before the establishment of the congress: "Is India's greatness possible unless we are thoroughly welded together into a compact mass? ... And when the whole of India comes to be bound in this treble chain of love, sympathy and esteem, the day of India's greatness would not be distant".  

In the early days of national awakening, the indirect political gains of the congress had not been inconsiderable. Sir T.M. Mehta said in Fifth Congress (1889): "It (Congress) has brought vividly into clear and emphatic recognition that most important fact of the growth of the national idea amongst us. Despite social and religious differences, we have all begun earnestly to realize that, we are fairly on the way to a common national existence, united and bound together by the common political ties of an equal impartial and enlightened rule".  

Supporting the idea of national unity, in the third congress Rajah Sir T. Madhava Row had said: "... varied as are the casts and creeds and races of India, there is still a powerful bond of union which makes our hearts vibrate with sympathy and mutual love and a common affection

NATIONALITY:

Nationality is nothing but a national feeling or attachment, the feeling or sense of being one of a people bound together by common customs, language, religion, or the like. The tendency in national development has been to efface the boundaries between nation and state so that at a certain stage in democratic development states automatically become transformed into nations. Nationality thus implies the formal adherence of an individual to the state.

A nationality receives its impress, its character, its individuality, not, unless very incidentally, from physical geography or biological race, but rather from cultural and historical forces. As Hayes defines it as "a cultural group of people who speak a common language (or closely related dialects) and who possess a community of historical traditions (religious, territorial, political, military, economic, artistic, and intellectual)."
Under common rule, common political citizenship, common cultural and literary heritage, political awareness was widened. The political horizon of the educated Indian citizen was no longer his village or district, not even the capital city of his province, but it was now the whole Indian continent, a substitution which was so favourable to the growth of enlightened patriotism. English language linked the Indian people in better communication and served as a common language. In short, all the elements which go to make a common united nation were present in India. The watchword of the nationalists was: "Indians first, Hindoos, Mahomedans, Parses, Christians, Punjabs, Maharathas, Bengalees, and Madreasees afterwards".

Nationalities are the products of the living forces of history, and therefore fluctuating and never rigid. They are groups of the utmost complexity and defy exact definition. Most of them possess certain objective factors which distinguish them from other nationalities like common descent, language, territory, political entity, customs and traditions, or religion. But it is clear that none of these factors is essential to the existence or definition of nationality. Although objective factors are of great importance for the formation of nationalities, the most essential element is a living and active corporate will. For this reason, national leaders of India, stressed more

---

1. The British rule gave "Substance to the idea of a national state", and a "conscious process of unification was set afoot". See Panikkkdr K.M.; A Survey of Indian History; p. 209.
on living and active corporate will of the Indian people. Aurobindo Ghose declared: "The different world religious representing different world cultures that have found a habitation in India will remain here always, form elements of the common national life, and contribute to the evolution of the composite culture of modern India".¹

About this national awakening of Indian people, in a Conservative Review - THE NATIONAL - a conservative wrote with the fulness of intimate knowledge. "The members of the congress met together as men, on the common basis of nationality, being citizens of one country, subjects of one power, amenable to one code of laws, taxed by one authority, influenced for weal or woe by one system of administration, urged by like impulses to secure like rights and to be relieved of like burdens. If these are not sufficient causes to wield people together into one common alliance of nationality, it is difficult to conceive what would be sufficient. It (National Congress) deals with rights and interests in which all the inhabitants of the Indian peninsula are equally concerned".²

Nationalist leaders of India tried to unite all reformers and well-wishers of India. They strived to

1. Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma; Bande Mataram and Indian Nationalism; Calcutta, 1950, pp. 93-94.
2. Ibid., p. 72.
mitigate, if not to eradicate, race-prejudices, to disarm creed-antipathies and to remove provincial jealousies. Every year the national gathering of congress was having more considerable numbers of participants, more cordial in feeling. Conception of a nationality was emerging. Educated nationalists were espousing the aspirations of a nation called 'India' their motherland. For national unity, said Aurbindo; "A political show or talk of brotherhood will not serve, for it will ring false to the ear of feeling; and no true unity can be effected by insincere professions... It cannot be done by diplomacy, it cannot be done by logic, it can only be done by the appeal of heart to heart". ¹

Early leaders were aspiring and hard working to promote fellow feeling and common nationality among Indian people. Dadabhai Naoroji had said in 1893: "My main underlying principle and the desire of my heart is to promote, as far as I can, good fellow-feeling among all my countrymen. And I have no doubt that all the educated and thinking men and all true friends of our own country will continue to do all that lies in their power to bring about stronger and stronger friendly ties of common nationality, fellow feeling and due deference to each other's views and feelings amongst the whole people of our country". ²

2. Ibid., p. 171.
For national unity Tagore wrote: "If we could overcome our internal dissensions; we shall be able to laugh at all attempts from outside to set us against one another". He added that: "Hindus and Muslims constitute the two major communities of India. We must be prepared to show the sacrifice, the patience, the care and the self-restraint that are needed to unite them into a common political organization".

Indian leaders preached their fellow countrymen that all the people of India should regard and treat each other as fellow countrymen, with fellow-feeling for the good of all, interests of all Indians were the same, all Indians were in the same boat, they must sink or swim together, and it was unreasonable to expect any undue favour from the government to any particular class or community. Grand old man of India, Dadabhai Naoroji, advised the people of India. "Let us always remember that we are all children of our mother country. Indeed, I have never worked in any other spirit than that I am an Indian, and owe duty to my country and all my countrymen. Whether I am a Hindu, a Muhammadan, a Parsi, A Christian, or of any other creed, I am above all an Indian. Our country is

2. Ibid., p. 106.
India, our nationality is Indian."¹

Now Indian people were taught that no great cause or object can ever be accomplished without great sacrifices - they should prepare themselves for sacrifices, they should develop public spirit and love for their country. Patriotic speeches of early Indian leaders united the people of India. People started to think, act and speak for the great and ancient land of India. India, the dear motherland of Indians.

2. **INDIAN ASPIRATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS**: 1885-1905:

It has been generally observed that the growth of interest in politics, the formation of public opinion and the organisation of the means of its expression, are stimulated by divergence of objectives and clash of opinions. In dependencies where the rulers and subjects belong to different nationalities the growth of political consciousness and political activity lead the subject people to demand the liberalisation of administration and a share in power. Such a demand rouses suspicions in the foreign government and inevitably a conflict ensued, which develops into a struggle for power between the rulers and the ruled. Exactly this happened in India too. The

------------------------
¹ Ibid., p. 175.
administration became suspicious of the congress, even-though congress leaders continued to proclaim their faith in the British rule. Dufferin called demands of the congress as "eminently unconstitutional", unacceptable to the people in England. He described the congress as a "seditious body" representing the "microscopic minority" of educated Indians, and declared that minority would not be allowed to control the administration.  

During the period from 1885 to 1905, the Indian Nationalists requested the Government to introduce reforms in the Indian administrative system. Indians were not happy with the then existing administration of India. They desired that the basis of the government should be widened and that the people should have their proper and legitimate share in it. Political institution should be based on a wider basis. Three main demands of Indian leaders were:

1. Representative government and expansion of the number and functions of the Legislative Councils - Central and Provincial.
2. Indianisation of higher services and
3. Removal of Indian poverty.

In fact Indian leaders linked representative government with poverty, as the resolution recorded in 1886 stated:

"That this Congress regards with the deepest sympathy and views with grave apprehension the increasing poverty of vast numbers of the population of India, and desires to record its firm conviction that the introduction of Representative Institutions will prove one of the most important political steps towards the amelioration of the condition of the people".1

Even before the formation of the National Congress, Dadabhai Naoroji, in a paper read before the East India Association, London, in 1867, on 'England's Duties to India' posed the question: "Is British rule in India a benefit to India and England? and replied: "But now (under the British) as the country is being continually bled, its vitality and vigour must get low, unless permanent improvements already made, or future development of the material resources, shall restore it to its former health".2 In these phrases, he raised the problem of Indian poverty and of the drain and their intimate

------------------------
2. Dadabhai Naoroji; Essays, Speeches etc., Ed. by C.L. Parekh, p. 31.
connection. In 1876, he said: "Owing to this one unnatural, policy of British rule of ignoring India's interests, and making it the drudge for the benefit of England, the whole rule moves in a wrong, unnatural and suicidal groove." \(^1\)

About the economic aspect of British rule in India, his opinion was wholly adverse. He said: "India's property is not secure. What is secure and well secure is, that England is perfectly safe and secure, and does so with perfect security, to carry away from India and to eat up in India her property at the present rate of some £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 a year." \(^2\)

In regard to the employment of Indians in the services the Congress was even more persistent. Not only did it demanded larger numbers in all higher appointments, it also asked for simultaneous examination for the Civil Service in England and India. \(^3\)

In the India Bill No. 1 no provision was made for the representation of the people of the country. Giving the answer to the question that, how the India Bill was

\(^{1}\) Dadabhai Naoroji; Poverty and Un-British Rule in India; (Bombay 1901) p. 125.
working, Mr. George Yule, President of the Fourth Congress said: "There is no check. The Bill under which our affairs are administered appears, like many other Bills, to be open to more than one interpretation".¹

In this connection the power absorbing despatch of the then Secretary of State Duke of Argly dated 24th November, 1870 is important. He maintained:

The Government in India were merely executive officers of the Home Government, who hold the ultimate power of requiring the Governor General to produce a measure and of requiring also all the official members of the council to vote for it".²

So, in early years of National movement Political position of the Government was this: The Government in India had no power, the Council in London had no power, the House of Commons had the power, but it refused or neglected to exercise it.

Shortly after the inception of the National Congress, the British Government in India began to act in opposition to Congress and to create obstacles in its progress. The fourth Congress found it difficult to get grounds in Allahabad wherein to put up the tents. In 1890, the Bengal Government issued to all Secretaries and Heads of

---

2. Ibid., p. 40.
Departments subordinate to it a circular pointing out that "under the orders of the Government of India the presence of Government officials, even as visitors, at such meetings is not advisable, and that their taking part in the proceedings in any such meetings is also prohibited". On 25 June, 1891, the Government of India issued a modification, restricting the rights of free press in native states.  

From the Blue Books published by the Government of India, it was clear that there were large bodies of men in this country fitted in every way for the proper discharge of duties connected with a constitutional form of government. Still there was not a man in the country outside the Supreme Council who had a vote or a voice in the matter of income or expenditure of the Government. When people are given increasing means and growing intelligence, there invariably follows a desire to have a voice in all matters that concern them. So, naturally aspiration of Indian people was to have a voice in all matters that concerned them.

Reviewing the method of Parliamentary Control over Indian affairs President of the Fifth National Congress  

(1889) said: "Such a method of control is a mockery, a snare and a delusion."\(^1\) People of India were asking for English liberty. According to Alfred Webb: "Once imbue nation with aspirations for progress and enlightenment, and they must go forward towards liberty."\(^2\) The criticism of government measures and policies at the Congress Sessions was repeated in hundreds of newspapers and from numerous platforms. The then Indian administration was an acts of injustice. "Saturday Review", a conservative organ and a supporting of the Government wrote in its issue of the 26th February, 1898: "It is a miracle that in the face of such acts of injustice as this we can still maintain our Imperial Rule in India."\(^3\)

Gokhale said before Welby Commission (1897) in England that: "The full height to which our manhood is capable of rising can never be reached by us under the present system. The moral elevation which every self-governing people feel cannot be felt by us. One administrative and military talents must gradually disappear, owing to sheer disuse, till at last our lot, as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country is stereotyped."\(^4\)

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 58
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 188.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 408.
\(^4\) Congress Resolutions; first Congress-1885-Bombay; (The Indian National Congress; G.A. Natesan; Madras; Second Edition).
The Indian Universities Act of 1904 vested the Government with powers of making, modifying and rejecting the Regulations of the University. Gokhale, a very responsible and moderate public man and an outstanding educationist, made it clear that the provisions of the Act for the reconstitution of the governing bodies of the University "will operate to the prejudice of indigenous enterprise in the field of higher education" and added; "while the good they may do is at least problematical, the injury that they will do is both certain and clear." He alluded to the great hopes of solitary reforms in the University which Curzon's speeches had kindled, and complained "it was, however, not long before the new born hope that had thus gladdened our hearts was chilled to death, and we found that, instead of the measure we were looking for, we were to have only a preparation of this narrow, bigoted and expensive rule of experts."  

The clash between Curzon and educated India was the consummation of the process of education, which had begun with the foundation of the Hindu College and continued during the 19th century. 

In early years of National Aspirations, nationalist leaders believed in gradual reforms. They had genuine

admiration for western culture and institutions. There was extreme moderation in their demands. The aspirations of the Congressmen themselves were not much higher. Congress pleaded for concessions and not for any power and did not deviate from its chosen method of prayer and petition for some decades. 1 Also, they had faith in constitutional method and in British sense of justice and fair play. 2 They regarded connection with the British for the good of India. 3 A foreign rule is, usually the

11. Some of them (Moderates) may have cherished, in their heart of hearts, fullfledge parliamentary self government as a far-off ideal; but all of them wanted to work on lines of the least resistance, and therefore framed their proposals of reforms on such moderate and cautious lines as not to arouse any serious opposition. See R.G. Pradhan's "India's Struggle for Swaraj, p. 24. Moderates stood for the best and practical in politics. Gokhale said; "We are not beggars and our policy is not that of mendicancy. We are ambassadors of our country and get as much for her as we can. That is our position". Lajpat Rai; Young India (1917); p. 217.

2. Dr. Pattabhi in his history of the Congress remarks that the burden of the utterances of the leaders was "that the English people are essentially just and fair, and that if properly informed they would never deviate from truth and the right". Vol. I; p. 66.

At the 12th Congress in 1896, Rahimullah Sayani declared that "a more honest or sturdy nation does not exist under the Sun than this English Nation; and there ought to be no doubt whatever as to the ultimate concession of our demands". Annie Besant: How India Wrought for Freedom; p. 232.

3. Pherozeshah Mehta, at the sixth congress of 1890, spoke warmly about his faith in the "living and fertilising principles of English culture and English education". He had no doubt that the connection between the two countries was a blessing to both and to entire world and that it will endure. Annie Besant. How India Wrought for Freedom; pp. 109-110.
biggest hurdle in the way of advancement of a subject country; but the identification of educated Indians was much more with the power and policies of the British Government.

This loyalty and moderation of Indian Nationalists met with apathy of the British Government. The Act of 1892 was regarded by the Congress as inadequate for the purpose of giving Indians an effective voice in the administration of their own country.

The Indian Councils Act of 1892 did not satisfy the aspirations of even the Moderates.

Repeated rebuffs and increasing tension in India led Dadabhai to this conclusion in 1898: "The authorities are openly throwing aside their mask and hypocrisy of benevolence, and the people, on the other hand, are beginning to feel that something is wrong, and a fierce struggle is in prospect".

The Government became increasingly reactionary with the passage of time. In this, it was actively assisted by

1. They were proud to be "British subjects, the citizens of a great and free Empire", living "under the protecting shadows of one of the noblest constitutions the world has ever seen". Annie Besant; Op. cit., p. 145.

2. Quoted by Masani R.P. in Dadabhai Naoroji, the Grand Old Man of India, Bombay 1945, p. 404.

3. At the Congress Session of 1898 at Madras; R.C. Dutt said that he could hardly remember any time "when the confidence of the people of India in the justice and far play of English rulers was so shaken, as it has been within the last two years". Annie Besant; Op. cit., p. 27.
the Anglo-Indian press and the European Community in the Country. No concession to Indian Aspirations, however modest, was considered possible or desirable. In order to arm the Government with sufficient powers to deal with "Seditious speeches and activities" Sections 124 (A) and (153 A) were added, in 1897, to the Indian Penal Code. Next year, a kind of thinly-veiled censorship was put on the press through the Secret Press Committees.

On 30 December 1898, Lord Curzon came to India to assume the post of the Viceroy. He was inordinately ambitious, overweeningly vain, obstinate, heedless of advice, contemptuous of opposition, self-righteous, unscrupulous, excitable and moody. He lacked imagination and sympathy, showed little understanding of men and rode roughshod over the feelings of even his own subordinates.

Lord Curzon was a bureaucrat per excellence... He had no sympathy with the aspirations of the people of India. At the Kashi Congress of 1905, Gokhale pronounced a scathing verdict on Lord Curzon's administration: "For a parallel to such an administration we must, I think go back to the times of Aurangzeb in the history of our own country. I think even the most devoted admirers of Lord Curzon cannot claim that he has strengthened the foundations of British rule in India".¹

The announcement of the partition of Bengal, wrote Sir Surendranath Banerja:

"Fell like a bombshell upon an astonished public ... We felt that we had been insulted, humiliated and tricked".¹ This measure agonised the whole of Bengal and deeply stirred national feelings. It was manifestly a Machiavellian measure. It was intended to break the solidarity of the Bengalee race and encourage rift between the two communities.²

The news of the partition produced a terrible shock and gave powerful impetus to agitation. A memorandum signed by thousands of people was sent to the Secretary of State on 6 July 1905³, it was followed by other memorials. Public meetings were convened immediately in Calcutta and the towns in the province to remonstrate against the decision.

From December 1903 to October 1905 over 2000 public meetings attended by 500 to 50,000 people were held in the two parts of Bengal at which Hindus and Mohmedans with

2. It was "part and parcel of Lord Curzon's policy to enfeeble the growing power and destroy the political tendencies of a patriotic spirit". Moreover, it was enforced with a degree of harshness and want of sympathy which are fortunately rare in the annals of Indian administration". Cotton, Sir Henry: New India; 1909; pp. 11-12.
3. Roy P.C.; The Case against the Breakup of Bengal (1905), Calcutta; Appendix.
with equal zeal and earnestness joined in the protest*.1

A new chapter had opened in the history of India, as Ambika Charan Mazumdar declared: "With the partition of Bengal political agitation in this country enters upon a new phase. It has unmistakably demonstrated two things: first, the resolute despotism of the Government, and secondly, the utter futility of the kind of agitation to which we have grown accustomed". He added, "We must now transfer our ideas from the sphere of thought to the sphere of action. We must practise self-respect in order to command respect from those who have learnt to treat us with contempt".2

Main leaders of the anti-partition agitation were Gurudas Banerji, Surendranath Banerjea, Rabindranath Tagore, Satish Chandra Mukherji, Motilal Ghose, Anand Mohan Bose, Romesh Chandra Dutt, Bipin Chandra Pal, Aswinkumar Dutt, Ambika Charan Mazumdar and K.K. Mitra.

Various associations also supported the agitation

British India Associations and the Landholders' association submitted memorials arguing the undesirability of the

2. Mukherjea P.; All about Partition; Calcutta 1906; p. 43.
New associations sprang up which zealously took up the constructive programme, organized volunteers to advance the cause of Swadeshi and boycott and to devise ways and means of establishing educational institutions. Among such associations were the Dawn Society, Bande Mataram Sampradaya, the anti-circular society, the Swadeshi Samaj etc.

Besides what the individuals and organisations achieved, the contribution of the press was outstanding. The Bengalee of Surendranath Banjerjea wrote: "But let not the Government lay the flattering function to its soul that the country will acquiesce in these monstrous proceedings without a strenuous and persistent struggle in which no expense or sacrifice will be grudged". It arraigned the Government for "the crowning movement of the most reactionary epoch in British rule" and announced "We are resolved to wage a ceaseless war with the constitutional means at our disposal".

The Amrita Bazar Patrika wrote: "Never were the sentiments of a nation, consisting of not of thousands or tens of thousands, or hundreds of thousands but tens of millions were outraged so wantonly as in the case of the

1. Bengalee, 7th July, 1905.
2. Ibid.
Numerous pamphlets denouncing the Government made their appearance and were widely distributed through the Bar associations of the districts. Two of them "Who is our King" (Amader Raja Ke) and "Golden Bengal" (Soura Bengla) were very effective. The first questioned the right of the British to rule India, "It is our blood they (the British) are sucking; it is our money on which they are fattening. Why should we submit to these unjust rulers?" The second exhorted the people of Bengal: "To stand united and tear into pieces the nest of the feringhee bulbuls and throw it into the Ganges".

Tilak wrote in his Kesari: "The time has come to demand Swaraj or self-government. No piecemeal reform will do. The system of present administration is recinous to the country. It must mend or end."

Moderate Indian opinion was expressed by Pherozeshah Mehta and Gokhale. According to the first: "Rightly or wrongly, we believe that these measures are calculated to upset and revolutionize or to use a more classic phrase, ...

1. Amrita Bazar Patrika; 7 July, 1905.
to break the continuity of that policy of righteousness which was never so openly denied to be the declared and unalterable policy of the Crown for the good Government of this country as during Lord Curzon's administration.¹

Gokhale opined: "He (Curzon) has no sympathy with popular aspirations and when he finds them among a subject people he thinks he is rendering their country a service by trying to put them down".²

In the opinion of Sir Henry Cotton, President of Twentieth Indian National Congress (1904), the proposal to "break up Bengal against the loudly expressed wishes and sentiments of the Bengali people can only be described as the most arbitrary and unsympathetic evidence of irresponsibility and autocratic statesmanship".³ He defined the goal of India in these words: "The ideal of an Indian patriot is the establishment of a federation of free and separate states, the United States of India, placed on a fraternal footing with the self-governing colonies, each with its own autonomy, cemented together under the aegis of Great Britain".⁴

². Gokhale G.K., Presidential Address, See the Indian National Congress; (Madras, Natesan G.A., 1917) p. 792.
⁴. Ibid., p. 773.
Rabindranath Tagore, expounded the idea of Swadeshi on 22 July, 1904 in an essay on Swadeshi Samaj read at a meeting presided over by R.C. Dutt. The pledge given in the essay explains the objects of the Samaj:

1. to undertake the fulfilment of the country's needs by the effort of the people themselves,

2. to take over the responsibility of the people on their own shoulders,

3. to execute all national activities with the agency of Indians alone and to refuse the help of aliens in these matters,

4. to refrain from writing letters to relations and friends in the English language, using English goods, English furniture, English music, English drinks, and having social intercourse with the English people,

5. to abstain from the use of foreign cloth and other goods,

6. to establish Indian schools,

7. to decide disputes without resort to the courts established by the British Government.

After the partition of Bengal industrialists like Tata associated themselves with the cause of Swadeshi, and the professional classes invested their capital in Swadeshi
enterprises. Anti-partition agitation had developed into a political weapon. It soon became the expression of India's yearning for political independence and the manifestation of India's determination to realize its national identity, its selfhood. It sought to discover the spirit which constituted the invisible connecting link between the varied cultural formulations of the past and the unifying thread in the plurality of the communities of the people in the present.

Gandhiji remarked in 1908: "after the Partition, people saw that petitions must be backed up by force and that they must be capable of suffering ... The Boycott and Swadeshi movements were inaugurated".\(^1\) In Bengal, during anti-partition agitation the sale of English cloth in the eight districts of Jessore, Bogra, Dacca, Nadia, Burdwan, Malda, Arrah and Hazaribagh fell from Rs. 77,000 in September 1904 to Rs. 10,000 in September 1905.\(^2\)

The effect on the mill industry was wholesome. In Eastern Bengal in 1905-6 eleven factories were added to the seventy-one already existing, and the imports from foreign countries showed a decrease of 16 per cent and Liverpool


\(^2\) The Statesman, September, 1905.
salt, a decline of 6000 tons. It was the same with foreign liquors.\(^1\) The Times (London) reviewing the English exports in cotton piecegoods for May 1907 remarked "India took less by \(44,492,500\) yds".\(^2\)

So far as the country made cloth was concerned, the demand had pushed up the earnings of the weavers working with the fly shuttle to Rs. 20 per month or nearly double the average earnings of the class.\(^3\)

After Swadeshi movement twenty two cotton mills were started in Ahmedabad and Bombay by Indian industrialists and fifteen banks with a capital of nearly four crore rupees and five navigation companies with a capital of a crore and quarter had been established.\(^4\)

The 21st Congress session in December 1905 at Banaras marked the turning point in the politics of India. Gokhale in his address describing the situation in India spoke of "The worst factors of the present system of bureaucratic rule - its utter contempt for public opinion, its arrogant pretensions to superior wisdom, its reckless disregard of

\(^1\) Nevinson H.W.; The New Spirit in India; p. 180.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 181.
\(^4\) Speech of the President of the Industrial Conference 1906; Report of the Third Industrial Conference; pp. 28-29.
the most cherished feelings of the people, the mockery of
an appeal of its sense of justice its cool preference of
service interests to those of the governed. He affirmed;
"never was discontent in India more acute and widespread
than when the late Viceroy (Curzon) had laid down the
reins of office", and exclaimed in anguish: "All I can
say is goodbye to all hopes of co-operating in any way
with the bureaucracy in the interests of the people."

Sir Bampfylde Fuller, who took charge of the East
Bengal as its Governor, adopted very questionable means to
deal with people's aspirations, which added to general
unrest and excitement. Some of his utterances were very
irresponsible. To the surprise and disgust of all decent
men, he declared with tremendous compacency that he had
two wives, Hindu and Muhammedan but the Muhammedan was
the favourite one. He also did much to stir up religious
and communal feelings "in a province where no such feelings

______________

1. Gokhale G.K., Presidential Address; 21st Congress,
1905, The Indian National Congress (Natesan G.A.)
Madras, 1917) p. 796.
2. Ibid., p. 793.
3. Ibid., p. 797.
4. Benarjea Surendranath: A Nation in Making,
p. 218.
In a province where no such feelings had existed within living memory. 1

3. ASPIRATION FOR SELF GOVERNMENT : 1906 :

In 1906 the Congress proclaimed self-government as its goal. Dadabhai Naoroji declared in his presidential address of the National Congress that:

"Self government or Swaraj like that of the United Kingdom or the colonies".2 Was the objective before the Congress. Self-government was claimed only under the aegis of the British Empire. It was also admitted that a considerable training period was necessary for achieving this ideal.

Bishop Whitehead records that:

"Aspirations for self-government were stigmatised as disloyal; even the claim of Indians to take a larger share in the government of their own country was looked upon with

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

1. Cotton Sir Henry: India and Home Memories; 1911; p. 316. "Divide and Rule" was the principle boldly enunciated in official circles and there is no doubt that the molestation of Hindus by the Muslim ruffians in East Bengal during this period was due to official mischief. Lord Minto, the Governor General, did not approve of his methods and he was compelled to resign. In the House of Commons, Lord Morlay explained away the communal riots as arising from the Swadeshi movement of 1905, "the attempts made by the Hindus to compel Muslims to abstain from purchasing foreign goods", Cotton consider it pure misrepresentation. Ibid., p. 316.

2. The Indian National Congress; Congress Presidential Addresses; Ed; Natesan, G.A.: Madras; ; 834.
disfavour, until at last men like Mr. Gokhale came to regard the British bureaucracy as a determined opponent of all the cherished ambitions of educated Indians.¹

Encouraged by the British diplomats in India, All India Muslim League was founded on 30th December, 1906. The aims and objects of the league were:

a. To promote among Indian Muslims feelings of loyalty towards the British Government.

b. To protect the political and other rights of Indian Muslims and to place their needs and aspirations before the government in temperate language.

c. Without prejudice to the objects mentioned above, to promote friendly feelings between Muslims and other communities.

Least response of the Government to National demands, Hindu Revivalism, the discontent created by the Famine of 1897; the outbreak of Plague, the repressive policy of Lord Curzon, ill-treatment of Indians abroad, partition of Bengal and defeats of two European powers (i.e. Italy and Russia) by Asian powers (i.e. Abyssinia and Japan) were the main causes of extremist Indian Aspirations, which had

¹ The Right Reverend Henry Whitehead, The Indian Problems; Constable; 1924; p. 211.
started to replace moderate views. Aurobindo Ghose expressed disappointment with the Congress which had failed to be "a well of living water, a standard in the battle, and a holy temple of concord". According to him, India needed a social revolution which aspired towards perfecting of its potential strength in the free air of political recognition and the full light of political predominance.  

4. **RADICAL ASPIRANTS: TERRORISTS, REVOLUTIONARIES AND EXTREMISTS:**

Small group of young men started to believe that the British rule was an unmitigated evil and that it was fraught with the gravest and dangerous consequences for India. Violence was the only method by which the British could be ousted from India. They considered it their duty to kill Europeans and specially the Englishmen. Secret murders, destruction of the Government property and sabotage were advocated for achieving the freedom of India.

The extremist leaders welcomed the policy of coercion and violence, because it disillusioned the people and awakened the spirit of self-respect and resistance. B.C. Pal wrote: "The old faith of the people in the British

1. Mukherjee Haridas and Uma; *Sri Aurobindo's Political thought, New lamps for old;* Calcutta; 1952; pp. 68-69.
2. Ibid., p. 112.
Government as the saviour of this country is almost dead. And in proportion as they have been losing their faith in the foreign agencies at work among them, in that proportion they have been acquiring a new and intrepid faith in themselves.¹ Tagore expressed this feeling in verse: "The more they tighten their fetters, the more will our fetters snap; the more their eyes redden, the more will our eyes open."²

Even such moderate papers as the Hitvadi and the Indian Mirror apprehended "that arms will at last be used against arms and the white man's blood will atone for the blood drawn from the inoffensive boys."³ The Sandhya and Yugantar preached the gospel of blood and fire; "force must be stopped by force."⁴

Radical's organization in Bengal, Anushilan Samiti was the most active. The Society had 116 branches⁵ and over 8400 volunteer members in June 1907. It's members

3. Hitavadi, 21 April 1906 (Haridas Mukherjee & Uma Mukherjee; p. 166)
4. Ibid., p. 166.
took two vows: (a) Unquestioning and absolute obedience to the leader and (2) breaking of all family ties. Its objects ostensibly were physical training and diffusion of Swadeshi principles, but its real aim was to effect a revolution and overthrow the British Government. The means employed were economic boycott, social persecution, voluntary service at festivals etc. and maintaining schools.

Table No. 1, 2 and 3 shows respectively the case record of political dacoities, political assassinations and bomb attempt to sabotage government property or to assassinate government officials or informers during the period from 1907 to 1916.

Table No. 1
Case Record of Political Dacoities 1907 to 1916

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Pol. Dacoities</th>
<th>Approximate amount Rs.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29200</td>
<td>Amount of only 3 dacoities is known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73550</td>
<td>Amount of 9 dacoities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73350</td>
<td>Amount of 7 dacoities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40522</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64500</td>
<td>Amount of 9 dacoities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>287850</td>
<td>Amount of 21 dacoities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Amount is not known.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table No: 2

Case Record of Political assassinations 1907-1916

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Pol. assassinations</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table No: 3

Record of Bomb Attempt 1907-1916

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Bomb Attempt</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>At three places the Govt. captured more than 8 Bombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These tables are prepared with the help of confidential report prepared by James Campbell Ker of the Indian Civil Service (From 1907 to 1913 personal assistant to the Director of Criminal Intelligence). This report was first published by the British Government for the benefit of the topmost British Officers. It was a confidential document and was meant to keep the executive officers and policy-makers well informed about the political activities going on in India. ¹

In October, 1908, it was planned to blow-up the train carrying the Governor of Bengal and on December 6, it was blown up, but the Governor had a narrow escape. On December 23, 1908, shots were fired at the ex-district Magistrate, Mr. Allen, but he too escaped. In April, 1908, a bomb was thrown at a French Major in Chandernagore, because it was rumoured that he had stopped the smuggling of arms into British India through French India. ² Two youths, Khudiram Bose and Prafulla Chaki, "threw a bomb on April 30, 1908, at the carriage, but unfortunately Kingsford was not in it." ³ Mr. Kingsford was notorious as a vindictive, judge during the Swadeshi movement, who had sentenced many political prisoners to heavy terms. On July 1, 1909 Madanlal

¹ Ker James Campbell; Political Trouble in India, 1907-1917; Superintendent Government Printing, India; 1917; Calcutta.
² Gupta Manmathnath; History of the Indian Revolutionary Movement. (1972); p. 21.
³ Ibid., p. 21.
Dhingra, a Punjabi youth, shot dead Sir Curzon Wylie at a meeting of the Imperial School in London. Sir Curzon, an officer under the Secretary of State for India, was spying on Indian students. Murder was committed as a revenge for the hanging and transportation for life of Indian revolutionaries.

Madanlal had the statement which he was not allowed to give in court. He said in it: "... I believe that a nation held in bondage with the help of bayonets is in a state of perpetual war and since guns are denied to me, I drew forth my pistol and attacked by surprise. What could a son poor in wealth and intellect offer to the Mother except his own blood?"

National literature plays most important part in raising nationalistic aspirations. Nationalist leaders gave patriotic speeches and wrote inspiring literature. Bande matram became a dearly slogan for every patriotic man. There were several books like Barataman Ranniti (Modern art of war), Mukti Kon Pathe (Which way lies salvation?) Sikher Balidan (The Sikh's sacrifice), Desher Katha and Shivaji, Life of Mazzini, Manual of Explosives,

1. Ibid., p. 15.
etc, which inspired the young and impressionable minds with love of liberty and patriotism, hatred of foreign domination and showed the way to resist it.¹

Purpose of Tilak's famous paper Kesari was: "The evils of flunkeyism and flattery have been growing since the beginning of the imperial rule and surely every honest man will admit that it is harmful to the true interests of our country".² The other paper the Maharatta was produced in English with the same object.

Many leading Indian revolutionaries lived in London. The most important was Shyamji Krishna Verma who had a remarkable career. He was internally connected with the revolutionary activities in Maharashtra. In an article in the Indian Sociologist he said later:

"When the Natu brothers were arrested and Lokmanya Tilak was prosecuted, I came to the conclusion that individual freedom did not exist in India nor was the press free. The so-called British justice was also a myth. That is why I left my mother land and immigrated to England and now when I realised that it was not possible to live in safety in England, I migrated to Paris and this city became my headquarters".³

3. Ibid; p. 8. At the 13th Congress session, Surendranath spoke on his (Tilak's) arrest that a "Nation is in tears" Annie Besant; op. cit. p. 259.
In 1905, under Shyamji's leadership, 20 Indians formed a society called the Indian Home Rule Society. Shyamji became its president and Rana, J.M. Parikh, Godrej and Abdulla Suhrawardy became its vice-presidents. The object of the society was to establish a government of Indians, by Indians, for Indians.¹

These revolutionaries wrote in the Indian Sociologist of December, 1907:

"It appears that any agitation in India must be carried on secretly and that the only methods that can bring the British government to its senses are the Russian methods vigorously and incessantly applied until the English relax their tyranny and are driven out of the country".²

Regarding the vision of India revealed in the Bande Mataram song Aurobindo Ghose explained: "It is not till she (the Mother) takes shape as a great Divine and material Power in a form of beauty that can dominate the mind and seize the heart that these paltry fears and hopes vanish in the all absorbing passion for the Mother and her service, and the patriotism that works miracles and saves a doomed nation is born".³

1. Ibid., p. 9.
2. Ibid., p. 10.
3. Aurobindo Ghose; Bankim, Tilak, Dayanand; (Calcutta);
Aurobindo stated for the first time in the clearest possible terms the political goal of the Indian struggle. He explained the meaning and implications of foreign rule and their total incompatibility with national self-respect and national material and moral welfare. It was impossible for any nation to rise to the full stature of its inherent capacity while it remained under the domination of an alien power. In his words: "according to Hindu Philosophy self-knowledge and self-realization are the end of all religions. It is difficult to see how that greatest aim of human existence can be fulfilled, if influences from outside disorganise us and stifle our growth." 1

He added that subjection made a people wholly tamasik: "a sort of physical, intellectual, and moral palsy seizes them and keeps them down to a low level of being; they are like insects graveling in the dust." 2

In May 1907 the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai, the recognised leader of the Punjab, and Ajit Singh to Burma intensified the unrest. For some time after the deportation of Lalaji the Punjab was very much disturbed and Lord Minto wrote to his wife uneasy. We are informed that "The Europeans and Eurasians have been buying arms everywhere, and I hear the soldiers on the plains have been sleeping with their rifles in

1. Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma; Sri Aurobindo and the New thought; Calcutta; p. 129.
2. Ibid., p. 219.
their beds, and the gunners with their gun-tracers by their sides". 1

Barindra Kumar Ghosh, brother of Aurobindo Gosh, when arrested said in the statement in court: "... I came to the conclusion that mere political propaganda would not be able to capture the minds of the people in India. I never thought that terrorism alone would bring freedom. We took to terrorism, because we thought that the people needed this to boost up their courage. 2

Upendranath Bannerjee, another revolutionary, also said in court:

"I came to the conclusion that until the people are asked to do something as a part of their religious duty, they don't move... I began to spread moral, religious and political teachings among them. I told them that the only method to attain freedom was to fight. Thus a secret society was established and arms began to be collected. Also we wanted to kill the government officers, such as Kingsford and the Governor, who were a nuisance." 3

1. Lord Minto to his wife dt. May 15, 1907. See Mary Countess of Minto; India, Minto and Morley, 1905-10; 1034) ; 136.

2. Aurobindo Ghosh was arrested in the summer of 1907 on a charge of sedition which could not be establish and B.C. Pal had been imprisoned on a charge of contempt of court.


3. Ibid., p. 20.
Nationalist leaders thought that national ideas should broaden out from its middle class limitations and take within its fold the masses. Aurbindo Ghoshe said: "Faith in the potential strength of our people is the basis of our national movement and to realize the strength and energise it by taking every opportunity for unflinchingly courageous action is the only way in which the national movement can be pushed forward to the rapid and triumphant consummation which Asia needs and India demands".¹

A few passages published in the Juganter,² a revolutionary magazine of Barindra Ghosh and Bhupendra Nath Dutt, can prove that the revolutionaries understood the importance of political work in the Indian army:

"The revolutionaries have additional advantages, where the ruling power is a foreign power, because the latter has to recruit most of its troops from among the subject people. Much work can be done by the revolutionists very cautiously spreading the gospel of independence among these native troops. When the time comes for practical collision

¹ Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma; Sri Aurobindo and New Political thought in Indian Politics; p. 220.
² Juganter was founded in 1906 by Barendra Kumar Ghosh, the younger brother of Aurobindo Ghosh, and Bhupendra-nath Dutt, brother of Swami Vivekanand. Its circulation was to over 50,000, "a figure, never attained before by any Indian newspaper". Chirol, V.: Indian Unrest, 1910; p. 95.
with the ruling power, the revolutionists not only get these troops among their ranks, but also the arms with which the ruling power supplied them.1

Thus, there were persons, who believed in overthrowing the British Government in India by means of a general uprising against the government. They aspired to stage a revolution or a popular uprising in the country in order to bring about the downfall of the government. These persons advocated tampering with loyalty of the army and even guerrilla warfare in the country, which might lead to the overthrowing of Government. They openly confessed that they would depend on the supply of arms in such a warefare on foreign countries, hostile to Britain. Hence they were for an organised rebellion against the government.

Also, Leaders like Aurbindo worked for the passive resistance. The object of passive resistance was to, organize an alternative popular authority which would progressively remove the foreigners from various departments of national life and replace them with Indians. Passive resistance was really self-development by self-help. The policy of self-development includes every department: "not only Swadeshi and National Education, but national defence, national arbitration courts, sanitation, insurance against

famine or relief of famine - whatever our hands find to do or urgently needs doing".1

Ultimately, passive resistance must lead to active resistance or defensive resistance, that is, a no-tax campaign, and the breaking of laws, which would paralyse the Government. "In a subject nationality, to win liberty for one's country is the first duty of all by whatever means, at whatever sacrifice, and this duty must override all other considerations".2

It was the belief of the extremists that Swaraj was the birth-right of India and that it was not a gift which was to come from the British Government. They had no faith in 'political mendicancy i.e. begging for political advancement. They believed in organising an effective agitation against the Government in the masses, so that the Government should be compelled to part with power. They also aspired for constructive work and moral-physical uplift of Indians. They believed in fostering the spirit of Swadeshi and its counterpart, the boycott of foreign goods, among the masses. In the last resort, they advocated passive resistance, i.e. non-violent civil disobedience and non-co-operation with the Government in all fields of

2. Ibid., p. 77.
administration. They had no faith in the British sense of justice or fair play. They believed that the Britishers had conquered India for selfish ends and would continue to govern India for similar ends, unless compelled to quit. It was against the economic interests of England to release India from her bondage.

For British rule Tagore declared: This rule has no touch of humanity. Its agents "aid or hinder our aspirations from a disdainful distance"; their; "bloodless policy may pierce into the very core of our life, may threaten the whole future of our people with a perpetual helplessness of emasculation". He adds: "In this reign of the nation, the governed are pursued by suspicion, and these are the suspicious of a tremendous mind and of organized brain and morale. Punishments are meted out which leave a trial of miseries across large bleeding tracts of the human heart. But these punishments are dealt by a mere abstract force, in which a whole population of a distant country has lost its human personality".

The British rule in India became a soulless machine, scornful of Indian opinion, self-assured and uncreative, colour conscious and prejudicial, exploitative and...

1. Tagore Rabindranath; Nationalism; p. 13.
3. Ibid.
repressive. "it is a steam-roller, formidable in it weight and power having its uses but it does not help the soil to become fertile". ¹

The extremists did not regard Indian connection with England to be for the good of India. Most of them believed that the British people had harmed, were harming and would continue to harm Indians. Some indirect good might have resulted from the British rule. The loss to India was heavy and crushing. They also believed that Indian culture was superior to the Western culture.

Tagore drawing inspiration from India's past never faltered in his faith that India would rise one day, recover its spiritual strength and contribute its might to the establishment of world unity. He said: "I live today in the hope that the Saviour is coming, that he will be born in our midst in the poverty-shamed Lovel which is India. I shall wait to hear the message he brings with him, the supreme word of promise he speaks unto man from this eastern horizon to give faith and strength to all who hear". ²

---------------------
¹ Sen Sachin; Political Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore, Calcutta, 1968, p. 72.
² Tagore Rabindranath; Towards Universal Man, Calcutta, 1902, p. 359.
He believed: "the turning of the wheel of fortune will compel the British one day to give up their Indian empire." ¹

Indian leaders hated Anglicised Indians, who were aping European customs, manners, and culture. They loved everything Swadeshi. Their identification was much more with the motherland and national interest. They did not identify themselves with the power and policies of Britishers. On the contrary they were bitter and active critics of those policies. The British government dealt with all these radical aspirants for national freedom in a stern and ruthless manner. The bar barons legislation of the government to control sedition, brutal repression of even legitimate expressions of patriotism, converted "prison-houses into martyrdoms". ²

When they began to make their weight felt, the government was exasperated still more and they adopted the Machiavellian game, even more bluntly. Old policy of the divide and rule was intensified soon after the entry of radical elements in Indian politics. Muslims of India were encouraged to think fanatically from communal point of view.

-------------
1. Ibid., p. 358.
5. INDIAN ASPIRATIONS : 1909-13 :

The Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 were accelerated by the Radical Movement, which became sufficiently vocal after the partition of Bengal in 1905. Reforms were announced to prevent the national movement from falling into the hand of the Extremists.¹

The reforms, in 1908 were hailed by congress as fairly liberal, it had however, soon to revise its opinion and pronounce them as a dismal failure. British Government by the reforms of 1909, tried to consolidate the liberal politicians of India, at the same time extremists were isolated and dealt with by an iron rod. In 1909, Mr. Gokhale described the Reforms as, "modifying the bureaucratic character of the Government". In 1910, he was bitter over the Reforms and thought that the Rules and Regulations made to implement the Reforms were so framed that they destroyed whatever good the Reforms contained.²

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

1. The Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Montagu confessed in 1910 that: "The policy of persecution under the penal code has been given a thorough trial during the last three years: its result has been to make martyrs sedition; and to enhance the circulation of offending newspapers". Montagu, E.S.: On Indian Affair, p. 276.

The Reforms also entrenched Muslim communalism in the field against Indian nationalism, which was identified with Hindu extremism. They introduced antidemocratic communal representation and separate electorate. Madan Mohan Malaviya presiding over the Congress at Lahore in December 1909 exclaimed: "This (Reforms) is protecting the interests of a minority with vengeance. It looks more like a case of allowing the majority to be driven to a corner by a minority... The Hindu minorities in the two provinces (Panjab and Eastern Bengal and Assam) have been left out severely in the cold." He cautioned: "The Regulations for the first time in the history of British rule have recognised religion as a basis of representation, and have thus raised a wall of separation between the Mahomedan and non-Mahomedan subjects of His Majesty."  

There were many Government leaders in India and England who declared in the most emphatic terms that by aspiring for national freedom Indians might as well ask for the moon. Writing on May 13, 1909 to Morley, Secretary of State for India, Minto, the Viceroy, declared with absolute finality: "Of course, Swaraj is an impossibility in our time and for generations." On another occasion, 

2. Ibid., p. 955.
he told Morley: "The Raj will not disappear in India as long as the British race remains what it is, because we shall fight for the Raj as hard as we have ever fought if it comes to fighting, and we shall win as we have always won".¹

The success of the Liberal Party of England at the elections of 1905 had raised high aspirations among Indians, but they were disappointed and began to lose faith in English integrity and sense of justice. Now people of India had national slogans like 'Bande Matram'; Iqbal's song 'sare jahan se acha', Hindustan hamara, Tagore's thoughts on liberty and emancipation, Tilak's speeches cutting the net of the imperialist illusion, and national leaders like Aurobindo Ghose, Bipinchandra Pal, Lajpat Rai and Gokhale. Every year nationalist literature was increasing in form of books, magazines, pamphlets, posters, and cyclostyled papers. This literature was spreading national thoughts in minds of people. National schools and colleges were preaching national culture and preparing martyrs for the culture and preparing martyrs for motherland.

Following list records the names of some of the nationalist books, magazines, cyclostyled circulars, pamphlets etc., which played most important part in forming

¹. Ibid., pp. 277-78 also see Mary: India, Minto and Morley, p. 236.
national aspirations of India. This literature has remained and will remain the source of inspirations for Indian people for the generations.

(A) BOOKS, PAMPHLETS ETC.

2. Bhawani Mandir Pamphlet by Aurbindo Ghose.
3. Saktipuja or the Worship of Power by B.C. Pal.
5. Bartman Ranniti (The modern art of war) by Abinash Chandra Bhattacharji.
6. Mukti Kon Pathe? (Which way lies salvation?) (Book is in four parts and it contains reprint of articles from the Yuganter magazine).
10. Battalian drill made easy.
11. Field Exercises.
   I Preparation of explosive substances
   II Fabrication of shells
   III Use of explosives
13. Yuganter circulars

14. The "Shabash" pamphlet

(B) MAGAZINES PUBLISHED IN INDIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of starting</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place of Publication</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Member*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>The Kesari (Marathi Weekly)</td>
<td>Poona</td>
<td>B.G. Tilak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>The Mahratta (English Weekly)</td>
<td>Poona</td>
<td>B.G. Tilak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>The Kal (Marathi Weekly)</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>S.M. Paranjpe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>The Bhala (Three times a month in Marathi)</td>
<td>Poona</td>
<td>Bhaskar B. Jos, Bhopatkar Utt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>The Yuganter (in Bengali)</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Barindra Ghos, Bhupendra Dutt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>The Sandhya (Bengali)</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Saroda Charan Sen, Hari Sharandas, B.B. Upadhyaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Bande Mataram (Daily paper in English)</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>/Aurbindo Ghose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>The Vihari (Weekly in Marathi)</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>Balkrishna Narayan Phatak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>The Suprabbhat (Monthly)</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Miss Kumudini Mittar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>The Karim Yogi (Weekly)</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Aurbindo Ghose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) MAGAZINE PUBLISHED ABROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of starting</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place of publication</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1905</td>
<td>Indian Sociologist (Monthly)</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Shyamaji Krishnaji Varma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1908</td>
<td>The Free Hindustan</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>Tarakuath Das contd..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Starting</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place of Publication</td>
<td>Founder member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1909</td>
<td>The Bandemataram</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Madame Cama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1909</td>
<td>The Talvar</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>V. Chattopadhyaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1913</td>
<td>The Ghad</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>Har Dayal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Weekly in Urdu and Gurumukhi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yugantar, a revolutionary organ had written for Indian people in 1906: “If you cannot prove yourself a man in life play the man in death. Foreigners have come and decided how you are to live. But how you are to die depends entirely upon yourself. Others have meddled in your mode of living, but no one can meddle in your mode of dying.”¹ Again in March 1907 it had written advocating the use of physical force and justifying bloodshed as a religious duty: “The laws of the English are based on their brute force. If we want to liberate ourselves from those laws, it is brute force that it is necessary for us to accumulate. It is there, then, that the right course of action now lies for us... Dedicate your life as an offering at the temple of liberty. Without bloodshed the worship of the goddess will not be accomplished.”²

1. Yugantar, 17th June, 1906 as quoted in P.T. in India, p. 73.
2. Yugantar, 3rd March, 1907 as quoted in P.T. in India, p. 73.
In November, 1907 Yuganter wrote: "... Westerners are a set of fierce and blood-thirsty beasts of prey. They are a nation completely devoid of mercy, righteousness, conscience and manly virtues. They do not want the world to be made happy. They do not want righteousness in the world. They want to live for themselves only. They want everything for themselves to eat. They want to fill their coffers with all the treasures of all the nations of the world. They want all the inhabitants of the world to lay everything that they possess at their feet and become their slaves."\(^1\)

Giving inspiration for making bomb Yuganter wrote: "... in some solitary room in the kitchen, brothers, sisters, mothers and daughters together are making and can make bombs... Let us unostentatious preparations for this great revolution be silently made and collected in every house. A handful of policemen and English soldiers will not be able to find them out ... The inclination to make this preparation is due to the spirit of the age; it is a law of nature; it is the unobstructed awakening of the instinct of self-preservation of a sleeping race, persecuted, despised, and trampled under foot for a long time."\(^2\)

\(^{1}\) Yuganter 30th November, 1907 as quoted in P.F. in India, p. 76.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 77.
Attacking upon detectives and spies, Yuganter wrote: "The enemy is trying to increase the number of traitors by bribes. They have made detectives even of high Government servants by holding out to them the temptation of money. We know all this. They are trying to gather information by sending about low class men as spies .... Such are the spies that are engaged, and they are trying to have all the young men who seek independence arrested. The country has become eager for their expiation. The public is showing great eagerness to know how these traitors will be detected and punished. This general eagerness will, we believe, soon take the form of action. And the indomitable spirit of revenge will continue to be terribly gratified by the traitor's blood. Once the national ire is roused it will be impossible for the antagonist to stand against it".¹

Another radical paper was "Sandhya". The title of the paper means "Twilight". It gave a warning to the English that after the passing of the Sandhya comes nightfall when the squaring of accounts with the Feringhi will begin. In 1907, the paper began to advise the preparation of bombs.

"Let us all come forward now and unite to establish posts in every town and village. It will not do to stock

¹ Ibid., p. 78.
these posts with lathis only. Fireworks will have to be laid in. If the Feringhis do not grant passes for guns, small bombs will have to be kept. Knowledge of the method of preparing bombs is necessary.¹

The following is an extract from the article in the Bande Mataram, which gave radical answer to Morley for his argument that the machinery of the Government cannot work for a week if England generously walks out of India. The Bande Mataram wrote: "While this supposition is not conceivable in the nature of man, did it not strike Mr. Morley that if, instead of walking out the English were by force driven out of India, the Government will go on perhaps better than before, for the simple reason that the exercise of power and organisation necessary to drive out so organised an enemy will in the struggle that would ensue teach us to arrange our own affairs sufficiently well."²

Bengali monthly magazine Suprabhat was also a revolutionary one, which was edited by Miss Kumudini Mitter. The title Suprabhat means "The Auspicious Morning" and the motto printed under the title was:

¹. Ibid., p. 81. (29th April, 1907).
². Ibid., (article 'Politics for Indians') pp. 85-86.
"March on! March on! Oh brother!

It is useless to lag behind; it is useless
to be like the dead. What good is there,
Oh Brother, in living a life in death?
Brother, March on! March on!"

The place of honour in the first number was given
to a poem entitled Suprabhat by the celebrated poet
Rabindranath Tagore, the leading idea of which is contained
in the following stanza:

Whose voice do we hear coming from the Sunrise,
Saying to us, 'Fear not! Fear not!'.

There is no death for him who will lay down his life"
In the editorial it was written that: "The whole nation
is gradually coming to realise what a glory and privilege
it is to be allowed to die in the service of one's own
country. This keen desire to lay down one's life in such
a cause always manifests itself before the rise of any new
nation into power and influence".¹

The Kesari, the title of which means "The Lion", was
a weekly extremist organ in Marathi. Another extremist
weekly the Mahratta was also coming out in English. Place
of publication was Poona. These paper became very popular,
because they voiced Indian aspirations fearlessly. By

¹. Ibid., p. 88.
1907 circulation of Kesari had risen to 20,000 copies, and its tone reflected and concentrated the general feeling of unrest which was at that time spreading over the whole country. Again and again it dilated on "the selfish aims" of the British rulers, the impossibility of Indians acquiring any substantial rights from them, the 'huge and constant drain' of the country's wealth of Great Britain, the unsympathetic attitude of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy towards the political aspirations of the people, the slow and steady 'Russianisation' of the administration, etc. In the course of a series of articles on Russian methods of agitation, it tried to trace the history of the revolutionary movement in Russia and drew from it the moral that popular agitation for increased political rights, when once seriously set on foot, can never be repressed by autocratic measures, and that it is bound to end in victory to the people's cause. While commenting on the repressive policy of the Government, it frequently warned the authorities that persistence in such a policy on their part would inevitably drive the people 'to adopt Russian methods of agitation'. 'Once a people make up their minds to obtain self-government', it remarked, 'nothing in the world will make them turn aside from their purpose'. In another article it twitted the English for 'having developed Russian instincts of autocracy in India' and exhorted the people 'to adopt Russian methods of agitation in fighting with their rulers'. It also asked them to
remember that 'the torch of liberty when once lighted is never extinguished'. It referred to 'the Russian political exiles in other lands, who managed to flood the country with inflammable literature' and alluded to 'the class of insidious writers in Russia, who successfully evaded the censors', and fearlessly preached their revolutionary propaganda to an extensive circle of readers. It welcomed the 'oppression' of the people by their rulers, as calculated to produce a bond of union and the feeling of a common nationality among them. It felt confident that there was a limit to such oppression, and that in the fulness of time the 'Almighty would endow even the timid with strength and make justice and liberty triumph in the end'. Seizing the occasion of the celebration of Garibaldi's centenary it went into raptures over his memorable services to his motherland and drew a dark picture of Italy's degraded condition under the Austrian Yoke. Garibaldi's career, it remarked, had many lessons to convey to Indians. The paper specially applauded 'his spirit of adventure and self-sacrifice' as worthy of emulation by Indians if they aspired to bring about the regeneration of their motherland.

The Mahratta echoed faithfully the sentiments of the Kesari, though in a somewhat guarded and moderate tone. It denounced British rule as essentially selfish. It pinned its faith on the Sinn Fein movement in Ireland and wished Indians to adopt it for the regeneration of India.

1. Ibid., pp. 91-94.
It also exhorted them to show 'more spirit and nerve' in their struggle with the Government, and assured them that if it was carried on with full determination on their side, it was sure to end in the defeat of Government.¹

The Kal was published weekly in Poona in Marathi. Its tone was also very radical. In 1908, it wrote: "People desire to get their rights. If these cannot be had by straightforward means, they are prepared to secure them, by crooked devices. If the English do not conciliate the people by granting them Swarajya, there will soon be a trial of strength. People are prepared to do anything for the sake of Swarajya and they no longer sing the glories of British rule. They have no dread of British power. It is simply a question of sheer brute force. It is quite unjustifiable to call the bomb-throwers in India anarchists. They do not desire that India should have no Government whatsoever. They do not advocate misrule. They merely want Swarajya."²

The Vihari was published weekly in Bombay in the Marathi language. The title Vihari means "The Rambler". It was also the revolutionary organ. In 1906, it wrote: "Let us contemplate the Goddess of Independence, and go to

¹ Ibid.
² The Kal, 15th May 1908; Ibid., p. 101.
the battlefield to propitiate the Goddess of War. Let us delight her with the auspicious bath of the blood of enemies and lovingly offer her a garland of their skulls. Let us kindle the light produced by the clash of weapons, and make the world resound with the heroism of Indians of the present day and make her an offering of our souls". 1

In 1907, the Vihari published a review of the 'Autobiography of Joseph Mazzini' the book, which was translated into Marathi by V.D. Swarkar, contains: ".... Mazzini was the Shivaji while Garibaldi was the Ramdas of Italy. If an oppressed and downtrodden nation earnestly implores Providence for deliverance, He is sure to send saviours to rescue it from tyranny. The study of Mazzini's autobiography is useful to those who are anxious to regain their independence and to be rid of foreign rule. The Austrian rule in Italy in Mazzini's time closely resembled British rule in India to-day. The same repressive measures which we find the British Government adopting at the present day to nip the spirit of independence in the bud were adopted by the Austrians in Italy in the time of Mazzini... We recommend our readers to read and digest the contents of Mr. Savarkar's book as it discusses the same problems and difficulties with which Indians are now confronted, and which happen seriously to exercise their

1. The Vihari, 16th July 1906; Purport of Verses headed "Goddess of Independence"; Ibid., p. 103.
minds... The perusal of the book will also reveal to its readers the great potentiality of secret societies when freedom of speech and writing are seriously restricted by the Penal Code of Governments. History shows that secret societies have done a world of good to people struggling towards their independence. We recommend parents and guardians to place Mr. Savarkar's book in the hands of their wards as it is likely to make them spiritual and patriotic.¹

The Bhala, which means "The Spear" was a Marathi paper, edited by a Maratha Brahmin named Bhaskar Balwant Bhopatkar, B.A.L.L.B., and published in Poona three times a month. The Bhala published many radical articles, as a result of Bhopatkar was convicted and sentenced to six months¹ imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 1000.

The Indian Sociologist was started in London by Shyamji Krishnavarma in January, 1905, and appeared regularly every month till July, 1914. Its importation into India was prohibited by a Notification under the Sea Customs Act, but copies continued to be sent to India in covers which were changed from time to time so as to escape detection in the Post Office. In one of the issue Indian Sociologist wrote: "At the risk of alienating the sympathies and good opinion of almost all our old friends

¹. The Vihari, 17th June, 1907; Ibid., p. 104.
and acquaintances in England and some of our past
helpmates in India, we repeat that political assassina-
tion is not murder." 1

'The Bande Mataram of Geneva' described itself as
'a monthly organ of Indian Independence'. When Bande
Mataram of India became impossible in India due to the
Government's restrictions, Indian patriot started this
paper from Geneva. Madame Cama was the main brain behind
it. In a signed article she said: "I also appeal to
your patriotism to make the best of your stay in the West,
by taking all kind of physical training (which is not
allowed in our country). Above all learn how to shoot
straight because the day is not far when for coming into
the inheritance of Swaraj and Swadesh you will be called
upon to shoot the English out of the land which we all
love so passionately". 2 The importance of learning
to shoot was also emphasised in another article.

The Talvar, the title of which means "The Sword"
was also a radical paper, started by V. Chattopadhyaya.
Other radical paper like The Free Hindusthan and the
Ghadr were also coming out from foreign land. Thus,
when the Government tried to prevent radical Indians
from spreading their views in India, they went in foreign

1. The Indian Sociologist; July, 1909; Ibid., p. 108.
2. The Bande Mataram of Geneva; September 1911,
Ibid., pp. 116-17.
countries and there also inspite of many troubles, they published patriotic literature. In this work they took every risk including the risk of their own lives.

Inspite of many revolutionary papers and magazines, some circulars and pamphlets were also prepared and distributed among large number of people. Notable circular is Yuganter circular. This circular was sent to India in large numbers in February, 1913. It was prepared in Paris. The theme of the circular was on the significance of the bomb. It was prepared by one of the revolutionary Har Dayal. The 'Shabash' pamphlet, the title of which means 'Bravo!'. It contained a picture of the tree of Liberty and below was written: "Price per copy the head of an Englishmen'. In June 1913 copies were received in India from the Far East of a pamphlet in Urdu entitled: "The Sword is the last resort". It was mentioned in the pamphlet that the English have spread the organisation of the Criminal Investigation Department far and wide. The mullahs in mosques, pujaris in temples, prostitutes, street hawkers, shop-keepers, teachers are now connected with the Criminal Investigation Department. Indians should, therefore, make the work of the Criminal Investigation Department as dangerous as possible. In view of the European situation, and especially of the possibility of a war between England and Germany, Indians should make preparations now far an armed rising.1

1. Ibid., pp. 117-35.
Thus, several publications, carrying radical thoughts provided enough courage and spread burning patriotic feeling among a lot of Indian people. Outside the country, revolutionary movements were organised by Indians in England, France, the United States of America, and when the first world war started in 1914 they moved into Switzerland, Germany, Turkey and countries of the Middle East.¹

The revolutionaries, projecting radical aspirations of nation, were inspired with a lofty idealism, and in the pursuit of the independence of their country, they were prepared to make the supreme sacrifice of their life and all. They were men and women of extraordinary daring. Some of them possessed amazing capacity for organisation and wonderful combination of skill and resource. Even their bitterest enemies recognised that they were moved by the spirit of patriotism and selfless sacrifice.

Psychological effects of the radicals' high adventure and bold defiance cannot be ignored. Each act of political assassination, dacoity or train derailment sent a thrill of excitement through the hearts of the people. People supported, sympathised and helped these revolutionaries. Secret distribution of radical national

---

literature created hate for the foreign rule, as well as love for motherland and desire for freedom.

The Extremists had lost their faith in the good intentions of the rulers. The leaders were suspected and repressive laws were applied to them in full force. But the Extremists refused to be frightened or subdued. Lala Lajpat Rai, the extremist leader, explained India's demand in these words:

"We want political power in order to raise the intellectual and political status of our masses... Our goal is real liberty, equality and opportunity for all. We want freedom to legislate and freedom to determine our fiscal arrangements. That is our main purpose in our demand for Home Rule."

Lord Hardinge, who succeeded Minto as the Governor-General of India followed a sympathetic policy towards the Congress:

He expressed his feelings of sympathy for the national aspirations of the people of India. He wept with them in

1. The statistic about the deeds of violence committed in Bengal (East and West) from January 1906 to December 1917 yielded a figure of 311 outrages; 1038 persons were accused but only 84 were convicted. See India in 1917-18, p. 158.

the matter of the treatment of Indians in South Africa. It was during his regime that the partition of Bengal was cancelled, a thing demanded by the Indian Patriots. The result was that the Congress adopted a policy of conciliation.

The period of Lord Hardinge prepared the ground for Indo-British collaboration during the war.

In the despatch of Lord Hardinge of 1911 to the Home Government there was a suggestion that the policy of the Government of India was:

"Gradually to give the Provinces a larger measure of self-government, until at last India would consist of a number of administrative units, autonomous in Provincial affairs, with the Government of India ordinarily restricting their functions to matters of Imperial Concern."

This was an obvious hint to Provincial Autonomy.

Lord Grew, then Secretary of State for India, wanted to remove this impression. While speaking to the House of Lords in June, 1912, he said:

1. For the first time he (Lord Hardinge) received the Congress deputation, in the words of Sir William Wedderburn, "in friendly personal recognition". Annie Besant; Op. cit., p. 512.

"There is a certain section in India, which looks forward to a measure of self-government approaching that which had been granted to Dominions. I see no future for India on these lines. The experiment of extending a measure of self-government, practically free from parliamentary control to a race which is not our own, even though that race enjoys the services of the best men belonging to our race, is one which cannot be tried. It is my duty as Secretary of State to repudiate the idea that the despatch implies anything of the kind as the hope or goal of the policy of Government." 1

Lord Crewe's outburst was in line with the policy of Lord Morley, who also believed that the goal before India was anything but responsible government.

In 1910, at Allahabad the Congress President Wedderburn had advocated Hindu-Muslim unity and attempted to bring congress and Muslim League close to each other. In 1911 the Congress met at Calcutta with Bishan Narayan Dhar in the chair. The announcement of the modification of the Bengal Partition, evoked the gratitude of the Congress. But the resolution about separate representation was repeated. In the following year (1912) it demanded a revision of the Government of India Act of 1909, and deplored the extension of the principle of separate communal electorates to the local bodies. A welcome feature of the Congress session of 1912 at Bankipare (Patna) was the large attendance of Muslims. At this 1913 session, Congress welcomed the adoption of the ideal

1. Ibid., p. 70.
of self-government for India by the Muslim League. It hoped that in future the two organisations could have harmonious co-operation and joint concerted action for concern political ends.

Next year the Congress met after the outbreak of the first World War on August 4, 1914. It expressed its profound devotion to the throne, its unswerving allegiance to the British connection, and its resolve to the Government that in view of the manifestation of loyalty by the people of India, the British Government should take such measures as may be necessary for the recognition of India as a component part of a federal Empire, in the full and free enjoyment of the rights belonging to that state. Said Bhupendranath Basu, the President of the Congress session for the year: "The world is swinging onward on the uplifting ropes of time... The war of nations will knock off the vestiges of medieaval domination of one man over many, of one race over another, it is not possible to roll back the tide of wider life which is flowing... into the still waters of the East... India wants that her government should be consistent with her growing self-respect and intellectuality... India wants that her government should be an autonomous Government under the British Empire."

Mr. Bhupendranath Basu emphasised the importance of a united ideal, for India was not the India of the Hindu or the Muslim but the India in which all had a share. "If there have been misunderstandings in the past, let us forget them," said he, and that if they could unite, "The India of the future will be a stronger, nobler, greater, higher, aye, and a brighter India than was realized by Ashoka in the plenitude of his power, a better India than was revealed to Akbar in the wildest of his vision."

Bombay session of the Congress in 1915, marked a notable advance in bringing the Muslim League and the Congress to an agreement on the political goal of India. Satyendra Prasanna Sinha, the President of the year, told the audience: "the only satisfactory form of self-government to which India aspires cannot be anything short of what President Lincoln so pittily described as government of the people, for the people and by the people. He exhorted the British rulers in the following words: "Let it be realized, that great as has been England's mission in the past, she has a far more glorious task to fulfil in the future in encouraging and guiding the political self-government of the people. The goal to which India may attain is still distant, but .. India may be regarded

as a true friend of the Empire and not merely as a trusty dependant... I appeal to the British nation to declare their ungrudging approval of the goal 'autonomy within the Empire' to which we aspire; such a declaration will be the most distinguished way of marking their appreciation of India's services and sacrifices. Thus in his Presidential address at the Bombay Congress in 1915, Lord Sinha earnestly requested the British Government for a declaration that self-government was the goal of the British Policy in India.

Meanwhile Muslim League also accepted the goal of self-government for India suited to its conditions. The League decided to enter into negotiations with the Congress to formulate a scheme of the future Government of India.

6. **INDIAN ASPIRATIONS : 1914-1919 :**

The British Government received remarkable co-operation from Indian leaders in the prosecution of the war. When the war broke out, Britain cried for India's help. As with the British Prime Minister, made a pronouncement that in future Indian questions were to be viewed from a 'different angle of vision'. He held out the promise of self-government as a reward of India's loyalty. Soon after, Lloyd George declared that the principle of self-determination was to be applied "in tropical countries also".
Then America joined the Allies in June 1917 and President Wilson proclaimed that the war was to make "the world fit for free men to live in". The success of Germany was painted as the success of brute force over democracy and Indian politicians were swayed by the promises of the Allies. They appealed to the people for co-operation, with British authorities.

"The keynote of my address was that self-government, which was the goal of our political aspirations, connoted self-defence, and that, if we sought the privileges of Imperial citizenship, we must bear its burdens and responsibilities, and the foremost among them was to fight for the defence of the Empire. The appeal went home, and in not one of the numerous meetings that were held was there a single dissentient voice heard."

Gandhiji was in London at the time of the outbreak of the war, and after reaching India, he actively pleaded for India's support to the Allies. He writes: "Was it not the duty of the slave, seeking to be free, to make the master's need his opportunity? This argument failed to appeal to me. If we would improve our status through the help and co-operation of the British it was our duty to win their help by standing by them in their hour of need".

Tilak the pre-eminent leader of the Extremists, and regarded by the Government as the inveterate enemy of British rule, declared "at such a crisis it is the duty of every Indian, be he great or small, rich or poor, to support and assist His Majesty's Government to the best of his ability".¹

In 1917 India supplied about 285,000 soldiers for the Allied campaigns and in 1918 about half a million men. India's contribution to the war effort in money was equally substantial.² Thus India came to the rescue of the Allies at a critical moment of the war. The war raised India's expectations and quickened her political consciousness. There was a new sense of pride in the realization on her part that her influence counted in deciding the fate of European powers. It gave impetus to the movement for constitutional reforms and India framed her demand for freedom in definite terms. The war bridged the gulf between the moderates and the extremists, the Hindus and the Muslims and brightened up political life.

World War of 1914-18 intensified Indian Nationalism.

Mrs. Annie Besant who had till now devoted her energies

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


2. The official figures of recruitment during the war are 800,000 combatants and more than 400,000 non-combatants. See, India in 1917-18, p. 5. and the Presidential Speech of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, 1918, Natesan G.A.; (Ed); Congress Presidential Addresses; 1933; Second Series, pp. 380-1
to religion entered the field of politics. She started the weekly "Commonweal" in January 1914 and a few months later the daily "New India". In 1915 she published her plea for India's autonomy in her book entitled "India a nation", which was followed by a series of articles on the history of the freedom movement under the caption "How India Wrought for Freedom". She laid the foundations of the Home Rule League. About the same time, Tilak who had been released in 1914 from the prison in Mandalay started the Home Rule League in Poona.

In 1916, at Lucknow the Moderates and the Extremists as also the Home Rulers and the Muslim Leaguers came together, and unanimously adopted the agreement known as the Lucknow Pact. In December 1915 the Congress had lifted the ban on the entry of the Extremists. Tilak took the fullest advantage of this change at the 1916 session. He took with him 300 delegates by a special train from Bombay to Lucknow to attend the congress. All along the journey the party received the most rousing welcome at every station. At Lucknow thousands crowded the station demonstrating their admiration and reverence for the great leader. The Congress accorded him an unprecedented ovation.

The Lucknow Pact was the basis of the resolution on self-government. With one voice the united congress told the Government that "It is of opinion that the time
has come when His Majesty the King Emperor should be pleased to issue a proclamation announcing that it is the aim and intention of British policy to confer self-government on India at an early date".  

The famous Montagu Declaration of 1917 and the act of 1919 were the inevitable result of rising aspirations of Indian Nationalists during the war. There was nothing new in the promise of the Declaration that the future policy of the British Government would be to provide for the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the Indian administration. The Government had said so, as far back as 1833, repeated it in 1858 and had been saying so again and again, since 1861. Further it was stated that the future policy was:

"The gradual development of self-government institution with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire".  

It was for the first time declared from the government side that the goal was the introduction of the

---

responsible form of government, which meant a government that is responsible, to or removable by, the elected representatives of the people. The goal of the Dominion Status, it was later said by the British Government, has the goal for India. Government still thought that the responsibilities for the welfare and advancement of the Indian people lay on them. It was disappointing to note that the British Government would continue to be the sole judge of the nature and time of each advance. Key to every step towards responsible government was to be held by the Parliament. In the Declaration inherent threat was there that Indians must gratefully accept the various instalments of responsibility as ordered by the British Parliament, in the absence of which further progress may be stopped. The Declaration was made in August 1917. About three months after the Declaration, Montagu arrived in India along with many advisers. In his diary, he angrily recorded:

"I wish I could get the damned Bureaucracy to realise that we are sitting on an earthquake."

Following were the national demands which remained unsatisfied till the year 1918. The figure shown into bracket with each demand indicates the year in which for the first time that particular demand was made through the

---

1. Edwin Montagu; An Indian Diary; Heinemann, 1930, p. 288.
national congress by passing a resolution: The Congress repeated several times these demands only to hear 'no' from the British Government.

1. Abolition of the India Council (1885).
2. Simultaneous examinations (1885).
3. Equitable apportionment of military expenditure between India and England (1885.)
4. Extension of trial by Jury (1886).
5. Finality to be given to the verdicts of juries (1886)
6. Enabling accused persons in warrant cases, to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate, they be committed to the Court of Sessions (1886).
7. Separation of judicial from Executive functions. (1886).
8. Volunteering among Indians (1887).
9. Establishment of Military Colleges in India for the training of Indians as officers (1887).
10. Amendment of the Arms Act and Rules (1887)
11. An Active policy of technical education and industrial development (1888).
12. Reform of the Land Revenue Policy of Government (1889)
17. Reduction of 'Home Charges'.
19. Recruitment of the higher judiciary from the Bar (1894).
20. Condition of Indians in the Colonies (1894).
23. Improvement in the conditions of third class railway travelling (1895).
25. Reorganisation of the Educational Services so as to do justice to Indians (1896).
26. Repeal of the Bengal, Madras and Bombay Regulations of 1818, 1819 and 1827, respectively (1897).
27. Re. the Sedition Act of 1898 (1897).
28. Re. the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Act of 1898 (1897).
29. Re. the Calcutta Municipal Act of 1899 (1898).
30. Re. the Punjab Land Alienation Act of 1900 (1898).
31. Inquiry into the economic condition of the people of India (1900).
32. Larger employment of Indians in the minor Civil Services (1900).
33. Protest of the Restriction of the employment of Indians in the superior offices of the Public Works Department (1900).

34. Admission of Indians to the Police competitive examination in England and their larger employment in the higher ranks of the Police (1901).

35. Re. the increase of 786000 per annum in capitation charges borne by India on account of the British forces in this country (1902).

36. Re. the recommendations of the Indian Universities Commission (1902).

37. Re. the Indian Universities Act of 1904 (1903).

38. Re. the Official Secrets Act of 1904 (1903).

39. Cost of the India Office and the salary of the Secretary of State (1904)

40. Revival of periodical Parliamentary inquires into Indian Affairs (1905)

41. Advance in Local Self-Government (1905)

42. Re. the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908 (1908).

43. Re. the Newspapers (Incitement to offences) Act of 1908 (1908).

44. Free and compulsory primary education (1908)

45. Reform of Legislative Councils Regulations (1909)

46. Inquiry into the system of administration of the North-west Frontier Province (1909).

47. To throw open the office of Law Member to advocates vakils and attorneys (1910).
48. Re. the Selections Meetings Act (1910).
49. Re. the Indian Press Act (1910)
50. Inquiry into the growth of Public expenditure (1910)
51. Amnesty to political prisoners (1910).
52. Mr. Gohale's Elementary Education Bill (1910).
53. Governor-in-Council for the United Provinces (1911)
55. Reform of the India Council (1913).

Therefore, the Indian National Congress, in its annual session held at Amritsar in December, 1919, declared the reforms as:

"Inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing", but at the same time, decided to, "Work the Reforms, so as to secure the earliest establishment of responsible government".¹

Mrs. Besant had pronounced the Reforms as being "unworthy of England to offer and India to accept".² Tilak had characterised the Reforms as "unsatisfactory and disappointing a sunless dawn".³

¹ Natesan G.A.; Congress Presidential address; Second Series, 1911-1914; p. 403.
² Annie Besant; Builders of India, p. 130.
³ Tahmanker, D.V., Lokamanya Tilak; p. 265.
When India was in this mood, the Government of India had passed the infamous Rowlatt Act in 1918 in spite of opposition from quarters.

On December 10, 1917, the Government appointed a committee to investigate and report on the nature and extent of criminal conspiracies connected with the revolutionary movement in India and to advise as to the legislation necessary to deal effectively with them. Rowlatt, a judge of the High Court of Justice in England, was appointed the President. The Act passed on the basis of this Committee's report is known as Rowlatt Act. The Act was a very drastic one. It gave the Government powers to crush popular liberties, to arrest and detain suspected persons without warrant and to imprison them without regular trial. Extraordinary powers of search, arrest, demand of security, etc. were conferred on the provincial governments. A wave of anger spread all over India, and even the Moderates joined hands with other Indians.

The act evoked opposition and condemnation from Indian people. Even Sankaran Nair, a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, did not agree with certain parts of the law. In his dissenting minute he wrote:

"It means, in effect, that a person may be deprived of his liberty and his freedom of speech; and that the freedom of press is dependent upon the will of the executive government. Briefly the discretion of the
bureaucraft is substituted for the ordinary laws of the country".¹

During the debate in the Assembly the elected Indian members belonging to different parties and interests condemned the bill. Srinivasa Sastri, the liberal leader observed: "the possession in the hands of the executive of power of this drastic nature will not hurt only the wicked. It will hurt the good as well as the bad, and there will be such a lowering of public spirit, there will be such a lowering of the political tone in the country; that all your talk of responsible government will be mere mockery". He ended his speech with these words: "If our appeal falls flat, if the Bill goes through, I do not believe there is any one here who would be doing his duty if he did not join the agitation".²

Jinnah, the Chairman of the Muslim League warned the Government in his speech in the Assembly: "I do not wish to state it by way of threat or intimidation to Government, but I wish to state it because it is my duty to tell you that, if these measures are passed, you will

¹ Home Department, 1919, Political A. Proceedings, January 1919, Nos. 45-72 & Appx & K.W., Minute of C. Sankaran Nair, 11 November, 1918.
² Srinivas Sastri-Legislative Assembly debate on the Rowlatt Bill, February 1919.
create in the country from one end to the other a dis­
content and agitation, the like of which you have not
witnessed, and it will have, believe me, a most disastrous
effect on the good relations that have existed between the
Government and people". ¹

When the Bill was put to vote, 22 Indian members voted
for its rejection. After the passage, Jinnah, Malaviya and
Mazhar ul Haq tendered their resignations from the Assembly.
In his letter of resignation to the Viceroy, Jinnah stated :
"...by passing this Bill, your Excellency's government have
actively negatived every argument they advanced but a year
ago, when they appealed to India for help at the War
Conference and ruthlessly trampled upon the principles for
which Great Britain avowedly fought the war. The funda­
mental principles of justice have been uprooted and the
constitutional rights of the people have been violated at
a time when here is no real danger to the state... In my
opinion a Government that passes or sanctions such a laws
in times of peace forfeits its claim to be called a
civilized Government". ²

-----------

1. M.A. Jinnah, Legislative Assembly debate on "The
Rowlatt Bill, February, 1919.

2. Montagu Papers; M.A. Jinnah to Chelmsford, dated
28 March, 1919.
Outside the Assembly the Indian Press was unanimous in expressing its strongest disapproval. The Amrita Bazar Patrika (Calcutta) called it a "Gigantic blunder which would arouse the worst passions of a peaceful law-abiding people." The New India (Madras) described it as "monstrous". The Panjabee (Lahore) regarded it "a bare-faced attempt on the part of a bureaucracy which has been demoralised by the exercise of unrestrained power to interfere with liberty". The Hindu (Madras) wrote: "the Indian public would read the proposed provisions with shame, indignation and disgust". The Bombay Chronicle (Bombay) treated it as "repression in excessis".

Gandhiji's immediate reaction to the Rowlet Bill was to draft a pledge which committed the signatories who followed him and were convinced that the bills were unjust, subversive of all principles of liberty and justice and destructive of the elementary rights of an individual, "to refuse civilly to obey those laws in the event of those bills

2. New India, Madras, 18 January 1919.
4. The Hindu, Madras, 22 January 1919.
becoming law and until they were withdrawn.\textsuperscript{1}

Meanwhile the Bill had become an Act. The pledge was followed by a call for hartal (a suspension of economic activity) on an all-India scale. The date was first fixed as the 30th March, 1919, but subsequently changed to April 6. It was to be a day of fasting and prayer, the day on which India opened non-violent war against British imperialism.

The response to the call was amazing. Towns and villages in every part of the country vied with one another to make the hartal a success, to demonstrate that a common feeling stirred the hearts of all Indians. A new confidence was born, and it was the beginning of a new era. Gandhiji noted: "The whole of India from one end to the other, towns as well as villages, observed a complete hartal on this day. It was a most wonderful spectacle.\textsuperscript{2}

One of the outcome of this black Act was the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy. A meeting of the people was summoned at the Jallianwala Bagh in the afternoon of 13th April. Fifteen to twenty five thousand people had gathered. They were peacefully listening to the speeches of the leaders when imilitary men with their leader Brigadier Dyer, appeared

\textsuperscript{1} Bombay Chronicle, 2 March, 1919.

at the main gate. Dyer immediately deployed his troops and without any warning, opened fire. Men died in hundreds, many were crushed in the blined stampede that ensued. The dead piled up, the wounded lay in agony groaning and crying for water, but the fire continued till the ammunition was exhausted. Dyer then moved away from the slaughter house proudly surveying his handiwork, unconcerned about the dead and the wounded. The exact figures of the killed and the injured was much more than the official version 379.¹

"The Punjab was isolated, cut off from the outside eyes." exclaimed Jawaharlal Nehru.² But gradually the news percolated and India was convulsed. "Jallianwala Bagh kindled a conflagration throughout India". There was an outburst of condemnation from every side. Rabindranath Tagore's renunciation of the knighthood conferred upon him by the British Government was a grand gesture repudiating the ruler's title to be the dispensers of recognition and honour.

¹. See (1) Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-Committee of the Indian National Congress (2) Disorders Inquiry Committee. Report (Hunter) in Six Volumes; and Dutt V.N.; Jallianwala Bagh.
In a special session of the Congress at Calcutta in September, 1920, the Congress for the first time decided to adopt the policy of direct action, i.e. non-co-operation and civil disobedience against the government. Upto the regular session of the Congress, held at Nagpur in December, 1920, the goal of Congress was the attainment of self-government within the British Empire. The goal was now declared to be the attainment of Swaraj which according to Mahatma Gandhi meant, Swaraj within the British Empire, if possible, and outside, if necessary. Till then, according to the constitution the Congress could employ only constitutional means to attain its objectives. Now it was laid down that the congress could adopt all peaceful and legitimate means to achieve its end.

In the non-cooperation movement, as Jawaharlal pointed out: "a demoralized, backward, and broken up people suddenly straightened their backs and lifted their heads and took part in disciplined, joint action on a countrywide scale".1

The non-cooperation campaign had two kinds of objects: constructive and destructive. It was decided to raise a fund of one crore of rupees in the name of Tilak to finance.

the non-cooperation activities, to enrol a volunteer corps of one crore members to help in the promotion of the various boycotts—social, educational, legal and economic, and to distribute twenty lakh spinning wheels to provide work for the unemployed or underemployed and to replace foreign cloth by hand-made Indian cloth.

The ratios fixed by the Congress for each province during the non-cooperation movement for men, money and charkhas were as under. The distribution was fixed mainly on a linguistic basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Charkhs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>650000</td>
<td>650000</td>
<td>130000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra</td>
<td>682000</td>
<td>682000</td>
<td>136000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnatak</td>
<td>390000</td>
<td>390000</td>
<td>78000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>227000</td>
<td>227000</td>
<td>45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>390000</td>
<td>390000</td>
<td>78000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>357000</td>
<td>357000</td>
<td>71000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>130000</td>
<td>130000</td>
<td>26000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Provinces</td>
<td>1592000</td>
<td>1592000</td>
<td>318000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>877000</td>
<td>877000</td>
<td>176000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Frontier Province</td>
<td>97500</td>
<td>97500</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajmer-Merwara</td>
<td>617000</td>
<td>617000</td>
<td>123000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P. (Hindi)</td>
<td>292000</td>
<td>292000</td>
<td>58000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P. (Marathi)</td>
<td>97500</td>
<td>97500</td>
<td>19400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berar</td>
<td>97500</td>
<td>97500</td>
<td>19400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contd..
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Charkhas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behar</td>
<td>942000</td>
<td>942000</td>
<td>188000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utkal</td>
<td>487000</td>
<td>487000</td>
<td>97000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>1527000</td>
<td>1527000</td>
<td>305000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>130000</td>
<td>130000</td>
<td>26000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>390000</td>
<td>390000</td>
<td>78000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surma Valley</td>
<td>97000</td>
<td>97000</td>
<td>19200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Provincial contribution announced by Gandhiji on the 30th June 1921 were as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Rupees in lakhs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bombay city</td>
<td>37½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujerat and Kathiawar</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Provinces and Berar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra (including Bombay suburbs)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sind</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Provinces</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajmer and Merwara</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orissa, Assam, etc.</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See Bamford P.C., (Deputy Director; Intelligence Bureau, Home Dept, Govt. of India); Histories of the non-co-operation and Khilafat movements; Govt. of India Press, Delhi, 1925, pp. 27-31.
To achieve destructive objects, important items were:

(a) the boycott of the law courts by the lawyers who would set up popular tribunals for administering justice,

(b) the boycott of schools and colleges owned or aided or recognised by Government and the establishment of national educational institutions,

(c) the boycott of elections to the assembly and the provincial councils,

(d) the surrender of honours, titles, etc., and the boycott of official functions,

(e) the boycott of British goods and the encouragement of Swadeshi, especially khaddar or home-spun, home-woven cloth; and

(f) the prohibition of drinking liquor.

Lawyers of the distinction of Motilal Nehru, C.R. Das, Rajendra Prasad, Rajagopalachari, surrendered their highly profitable profession; thousands of students came out of colleges and schools and many national institutions were founded. Subhas Chandra Bose resigned his post in the Indian Civil Service and worked as Principal of the National College at Calcutta. Jawaharlal Nehru gave up the Allahabad High Court and worked for the campaign. He gave
expression to the feelings which moved the non-co-operators in these words:

Many of us who worked for the Congress programme lived in a kind of intoxication during the year 1921. We were full of excitement and optimism and a buoyant enthusiasm. We sensed the happiness of a person crusading for a cause. Above all we had a sense of freedom and a pride in that freedom. The old feeling of oppression and frustration was completely gone. 1

From the first of August 1920 when it started to 6th February, 1922 when it was suspended, the non-co-operation campaign moved in crescendo. The Tilak Fund was over-subscribed. Lakhs of spinning wheels were distributed. The recruitment of volunteers reached half the target. Of the triple boycott, the response in regard to honours was meagre which was not surprising; the educational boycott was quite effective in the beginning. The number of students in colleges was reduced from 52,482 in 1919-20 to 45,933 in 1921-22, and in secondary schools from 128,1810 in 1919-20 to 123,9525 in 1921-22. 2

The effect of the boycott of foreign cloth was felt throughout India. It attained considerable success in

1. Ibid., p. 69.
Bengal, Bombay, Madras and the United Provinces. The review of the Trade of India in 1921-22 published by the Commercial Intelligence Department stated:

Another factor which seriously affected piece-goods importations during the year under review was the vigorous revival of the campaign in favour of Indian made piece-goods, reinforced by a further development in favour of the wearing of home-woven goods made from Indian hand-spun yaro.¹

Regarding the boycott of liquor during the year 1921-22 the excise reports of most provinces show that it had considerable effect in reducing excise revenue. In the Punjab, Bihar and Orissa and Bombay the reduction was respectively 33, 10 and 6 lakhs of rupees.²

A Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee was set up by the Congress to take stock of the situation and assess the attitude of the people. The Committee presented its report in August 1922. It came to the conclusion that the country was not prepared to continue the movement, and recommended the entry of Congressmen into the legislative councils. On January 1, 1923 Deshbandhu Das and Motilal Nehru formed the Swaraj Party within the Congress. The elections for legislative councils took place in November, 1923 and the Swaraj Party contested them with great success.

² Ibid., p. 109.
On March 8, 1926, Motilal Nehru told the Assembly that he had twice before informed the Government that the Swaraj Party refused to participate in an administration forced upon the country against their will. The Government had paid no attention. On the contrary the utterances of the authorities had shown that any further action in the legislature was futile. He then declared: "We feel that we have no further use for these sham institutions, and the least we can do to vindicate the honour and self-respect of the nation is to get out of them."¹

The National Aspirations during 1920-22 and the activities of the Swarajist Party in the Legislative Assembly of India during 1924-27, led to the appointment of the Simon Commission two years earlier i.e. in 1927 instead of 1929, as laid down in the act of 1919.

8. INDIAN ASPIRATIONS 1927-28 : NEHRU REPORT : 1927-28

We can see Nation's clearly changed aspiration from self-Government at the distant goal to complete independence at immediate effect, in the Congress resolution of December, 1927, Congress at Madras. The injured feelings of the country during 1927, due to the composition of Simon Commission were expressed by the Congress in it:

"This Congress declares the goal of the Indian people to be complete National Independence."¹ In the words of Mrs. Besant:

"It was a dignified and clear statement of India's goal."²

Making remarks on this Independence Resolution Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"It means what it says. It means complete independence. It means control over the financial and economic policy of the country. It means control over our relations with foreign countries. Without these things independence would be a travesty and camouflage."³

He added that this goal was the immediate goal and not a goal of the far distant future.

In September, 1928, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru resigned his secretaryship of the Congress, because in Nehru Report, the goal had been diluted to Dominion Status. There was a difference of opinion in the Congress over this issue of Dominion Status vs. Independence. Mr. Subhas Bose and

2. Ibid., p. 319.
3. Before and after Independence; Ed : Bright J.S. Vol. I & II Pub. The Indian Printing Works; N.M. Road, New Delhi; p. 150.
Jawaharlal Nehru were the leaders of the young element, which stood for the independence. There was no material difference between Dominion Status and Independence. The controversy was rather sentimental. Mr. Churchill who had always been an arch enemy of India's freedom, described Dominion Status for India as a crime. The Liberals were also not sympathetic towards the Nehru Report, because it meant the shelving of the Simon Commission Report with which their leader Sir Simon was vitally associated. If the British Government had been sincere in supporting the growth of responsible government in India, it should have readily endorsed the Lucknow scheme of 1916, for which the country's two foremost political parties were agreed to co-operate in securing its acceptance. The Nehru Report shared a similar fate since Whitehall regarded it as its exclusive right to give India a constitution that would never be acceptable to her.

1. On November 8, 1927, the Secretary of State in England and the Viceroy in India announced the appointment of the Statutory Commission on reforms for India. Sir John Simon was appointed Chairman of the Commission. Report of this Commission is known as Simon Commission Report.

2. In 1916 both the associations (i.e., Congress and the League) held their sessions at Lucknow and almost at the same time Mr. Jinnah, the President of the League session at Lucknow, passionately spoke of "a new India under the influence of Western education, fast growing to identity of thought, purpose and outlook". They adopted the joint scheme of reforms, known as the Congress League Pact and pressed it on the Government as a united national demand. Lovett: A History of Indian National Movement; (1921) p. 121. Sarojini Naidu hailed Mr. Jinnah as an "ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity". Nehru J.: Autobiography, (1938), p. 67.
Actual intentions of the British Government regarding the immediate grant of Dominion Status to India were not clear. The Viceroy was not in a position to give any definite assurance that a constitution conferring full Dominion Status would be framed at the Round Table Conference. Thus, the Government was not willing to concede even Dominion Status as asked for in the Nehru Report. It was clear in the minds of National leaders that unless they were prepared to make further sacrifices for the cause of Independence and to fight for it, there was no chance of getting justice at the hands of British Government.

Simon Commission was greeted with hartals (closing of shops), demonstration of black flags, meetings and processions of protests all over India. Lala Lajpat Rai of the Nationalist Party in the Assembly on February 16, 1928, moved in the legislature the following resolution:

"The Assembly recommends to the Governor-General in Council that he be pleased to convey to His Majesty's Government the Assembly's entire lack of confidence in the Parliamentary Commission which has been appointed to recast the constitution of India." 1

There is no doubt that the overwhelming weight of political opinion in India was against any dealings with

---

the Commission. The Rionees wrote: "Despite the optimistic generalizations of Sir John Simon the Pioneer does not believe the parliamentary visit of the Commission to India has been a success. The support is sectional and spasmodic and by no means representative of political India".\footnote{The Pioneer, March 29, 1928}

Processions flying black flags and shouting slogans like 'Simon go back' massive meetings demanding recall of the Commission, stoppage of business and complete social boycott greeted the Commission wherever it went, and in most Indian towns. The boycott was so effective that the Commission had to be sneaked from the railway station to their place of residence. The police had to protect them from being mobbed and to cordon off the demonstrators on the routes.

9. **FINAL GOAL: COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE: LAHORE CONGRESS:**

1929:

Final goal of the Congress was declared under the Presidentship of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru at midnight on December 31, 1929, at Lahore Congress in a tense atmosphere:

"This Congress declares that the word "Swaraj" in article of the Congress Constitution shall mean complete..."
Independence, and further declares the entire scheme of the Nehru Committee's Report to have lapsed".  

One can very well realize that when in October of 1949, China became independent under Mao's communist rule in China, yet it was known to Mao that he was under the control of Moscow. In other words Moscow was controlling the destinies of communist China, because, both China and Russia were following communism. Mao knowingly permitted the exploitation of Community China's natural resources for the betterment of Russia until a point when Mao was confident that he would protect national interest of Communist China in the International World, and than he broke away with Russia and told Russian Government that thus far and no further.

The parallel here is as long as the Indian political leaders were uncertain of the political consciousness of Indian masses of the national aspiration of India, till then they did not and could not openly put up a political fight against the imperialist British rule in India. But at the Lahore congress President Jawaharlal Nehru could realise the awakening of Indians masses and therefore he had in very clear cut terms passed the resolution of complete independence for India, because he knew very well

---

that the British was following the age old colonial policy of exploitation of the natural resources of India for the betterment of Great Britain.

Hence complete independence was the goal of India. It was also decided to observe January 26, as the Day of Independence, every year. A pledge was drawn up, which was to be read and taken, while celebrating the day. The pledge declared:

"It is the inalienable right of the Indian people to have freedom and to enjoy the fruit of their toil, and have the necessities of life, so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any government deprives the people of their rights and oppresses them, the people have a further right to alter it or to abolish it. The British Government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom, but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally, and spiritually. We hold it to be a crime against man and God to submit any longer to a rule that has caused this fourfold disaster to our country. We will, therefore, prepare ourselves for civil disobedience and solemnly resolve to carry out the Congress instructions issued from time to time for the purpose of establishing Purna Swaraj". 1

The impatience and insistence of the national demand in 1929, exhibited by the Independence Resolution, and the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-31 and 1932-33, led to the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, Round Table Conferences and the Act

1. Ibid., pp. 363-64.
of 1935. It is true that solemn pronouncements were made about the future of the country by the British Government, but they lacked sincerity. The fact is that so-called political advance claimed on behalf of the Morley-Minto Reforms, the Montford Reforms, and the Government of India Act of 1935 did not amount any real transfer of power.

It may be mentioned here that Churchill as a Conservative Opposition leader seems to have been mainly responsible for the British Government's refusal to include in the New Act any reference to Dominion status as the ultimate goal for India. In doing so he stuck to the British Conservative policy of granting India self-government by degrees. Dr. Keith remarks that "... the omission of any reference to Dominion Status, following on the complete silence of the joint committee, inevitably aroused a painful feeling in India, and annoyed to those supporters of the ministry who realised that its action was certain to be interpreted in India as in some way seeking to evade frank acceptance of Dominion status as the final goal." ¹

During all these stages, for every constitutional advance, the main cause of advance was the National Aspirations of the Indian people itself. Every constitutional advance fell far short of Indian Aspirations. Identification of Indians with the power and policies of the British Government of India became lesser and lesser. Foreign

rulers never took any sufficient care for Nation's Aspirations, on the contrary they always thought in terms of Imperial interest only. There was no generosity in Britisher's politics, still the tree of freedom, watered cautiously, but constantly and steadily, in the fullness of time was bound to grow. Four years after the Act of 1935, World War Second broke out in Europe.