CHAPTER IV
The initial years of the Indian National Congress were years of Liberal programmes built on the beliefs of loyalty on the whole to the British Government and "indissoluble" partnership with the British Empire. Its early activities were characterised by demands based on liberal principles made simultaneously on the congress platforms, in the legislatures and in England resulting in drawing the attention of the administrators towards the Indian problems. None of the demands of the Indian National Congress were new.

APPLICATION OF LIBERAL PRINCIPLES ON THE CONGRESS PLATFORMS

The Congress held its annual meetings in important towns and capital cities during which both central and regional questions were discussed. The interest evinced was initially sporadic because the leaders did not fully concentrate on political questions as they were interested in their own vocations. Further more, there was no central machinery in the Congress that could engage its members in continuous agitations. It relied on regional associations to carry on the work of agitation. These regional associations lacked the funds and therefore the interest that was shown was spasmodic.
In these meetings, the Liberals discussed topics such as reform of the legislative council, abolition of the India Council, simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service, raising the age of the candidates for the Indian Civil Service Examinations and the creation of new legislative councils. The Congress demanded the introduction of elective principle in the legislative councils and pointed out the ineffectiveness of Parliamentary control over Indian affairs. They disallowed mass meeting outside the Congress pandals.

The Early Liberal Moderate leaders did not stop with just appealing from the Congress pandals. They utilised their presence in the legislatures of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in demanding further reforms.

**LIBERALS IN THE LEGISLATURES**

The Legislatures that worked out the Indian Councils Act of 1861 included Indians who were rulers, landholders and aristocrats. They represented vested interests and did not come under the purview of the Liberal group. Moreover, the Liberals in the Congress were active in the Legislature only after the Indian Councils Act of 1892 had been passed.
The early Liberals however felt that the Legislatures created by the Act of 1861 were really committees for making laws. It had failed to satisfy the national aspirations and racial animosity had developed as a result of the Ilbert Bill 1883 and the Vernacular Press Act-1878. Hence, they demanded further reforms such as increased membership of the councils, introduction of the elective principle and an increase in their powers.

Because of these pressures, the government was forced to pass the Indian Councils Act of 1892. The salient feature of this Act was that the Governor General's Council should consist of not less than 10 and not more than 16 additional members at Calcutta. In Bombay and Madras there were to be not less than eight and not more than twenty members. For Bengal the maximum was to be 20 and for the North West Provinces and Oudh-15.

Some of these members could be elected indirectly by Indians, but the official majority remained. The council was given the right to discuss the annual budget but they could not vote on them.

Among the Liberals who sat in the Imperial Legislature were Dr. Rashbehari Ghose, P.S. Charlu, R.M. Sayani, G.K. Gokhale and Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyay, M.B. Dadabhoy.
In the Bombay Legislature sat M.G. Ranade, Pheroze Shah Mehta and Chimanlal Setalwad. In Madras, the notable Liberals were G.Subramania Aiyar, Rangaiah Naidu, C.Sankaran Nair, V.Bashyam Aiyangar. All the above groups belonged to the educated middle classes.

These groups felt that the Indian Councils Act 1892 did not come up to their expectations. The elective principle had not been granted. Further, they felt that the Provincial Councils were too small in size to represent provincial population. They further stated that the restrictions imposed on the right of interpellation should be removed and the practice of the House of Commons should be followed. They urged that the restrictions on discussion of the budget should also be removed. The debates conducted in the Legislatures were just a farce. The Congress demanded the points raised above as well as partial Indianization of the Executive Council.

THE LIBERALS IN THE IMPERIAL LEGISLATURE

Those legislators who were members of the Congress applied the same principles of liberalism in the legislatures. The laws passed during this time were mostly in the nature of amendments. New legislations were less in number. Among
those in the amendments passed were the Indian Penal Code, Indian Criminal Law amendment, Official Secret Act, Seditious Meetings Acts, Newspaper Incitement Act, Cotton Excise Duties Acts, Cooperative Credit Societies Act, Punjab Land Alienation Act, Indian Mines Act, Officialisation of Universities Act, Indian Emigration Act and finally the Ancient Monument Protection Act. All these Acts were repressive in character. During the passage of these Bills, the Liberals tried to aim at removing some of the fetters imposed by them.

In view of the above, Gokhale and Rashbehari Ghosh objected to the passing of Seditious Meetings Bill as it imposed unnecessary restraints on the movements of the Indians. They passed resolutions objecting to it. However, these were vetoed by the Government.

The Congress was opposed to the Partition of Bengal. Gokhale, in the Imperial Legislative Council emphasised on the need of the Government to conciliate Bengal. According to him the Partition of Bengal was the cause of the distrust, dissatisfaction and disturbance in the country. He and Rashbehari Ghosh wanted a resolution to be passed against it. It was greeted with 6 ayes 3 were against it". Among those whose who dissented was Gokhale. However, the Bill was passed with official support. The action of the Government
resulted in the rise of militant nationalism under the leadership of Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghose. Rash Behari Ghosh had predicted that if the Government persisted in pursuing such strong policies, it would result in the Indian nationalistic activities taking a stronger stand. The activities of Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal proved his prediction true.

The Indian Government appointed a committee called the Lord Herschell's Committee which recommended a re-imposition of import duties except on cotton goods. When a tariff bill was brought before the council on the lines suggested by the Herschell Committee, it met with strong opposition from the non-official members of the Council on the ground that it exempted a class of goods which should pre-eminently bear an import duty that would yield the best results. The volume of trade in cotton goods and yarns represented half of the total imports from abroad. It was further argued that the exemption of these commodities from an import duty could not be justified on its merits as a sound fiscal measure much less when it was an admitted fact that the Budget showed a deficit. The Government of India refused to accept these views as they had a mandate from the Secretary of State for India which they dared not ignore. The Act was passed in the teeth of a strong and united
opposition from the Indians in March 1894. In December 1894, the Secretary of State for India imposed a counteracting excise duty upon yarns produced in Indian Mills to propitiate the Lanchashire Cotton magnates in England. Two bills were introduced, the first subjected cotton yarn and fabrics to a general import duty of 5% as valorem. The second imposed an excise duty on cotton yarns produced by Indian Mills. This was due to Lancashiye's insistence so that no protection could be given to Indian industries. This law satisfied none. The Indian mill owners were dissatisfied. The educated middle class Liberal minded Indians were supportive of the interest of the mill owners. The greatest expansion of cotton imports and exports occurred before 1885 when the duties were in force. The fall in exchange rates may be the factor that gave some measure of 'protection' to the Indian textile industry.

The matter was reconsidered in 1895 and another Act (II of 1896) was passed by which yarn was exempted from duty and a uniform duty of 3½% was imposed on all woven goods whether imported or manufactures in India.

Pherozeshah Mehta, in the true Liberal tradition, supported a move for an amendment of the above mentioned cotton Duties Bill of 1894. The amendment was introduced by Fazulbhais Vishram. Pherozeshah Mehta did not agree with the rulers that the industries of India should be given a step-motherly treatment in order to encourage English industries and manufacturers. The amendment of the Bill was put into motion. There were 9 ayes and 10 noes. The move failed.
The British believed that the spread of education was the major reason for the growth of nationalism. Plans were afoot to introduce greater Governmental control in order to change its modern liberal character. George Hamilton had outlined a plan which was accepted by Lord Curzon, the Viceroy. This plan was embodied in the Officialization of University Bill 1903-1904.

The Liberal Moderates played an important role during the discussion of the Officialization of University Bill in 1903-1904. They abhorred the tight official control sought to be imposed by this Bill. Gokhale felt that this was a retrograde step as it imposed indignity on men who had contributed a great deal in the past. Further, the quorum fixed for the Senate meetings was small and the number of elective seats were low. The seats reserved for the Government was very large.

Gokhale and Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyay tried to bring in amendments when step by step discussion on the clauses took place. Their efforts failed as the Bill had been passed just as the Government had desired.
Gokhale played a prominent part during the budget sessions too. The revised estimate for the year 1901-02 had shown a surplus greater than what was anticipated in the original estimate by £ 3,982,000, about 6 crores of rupees. The following year's estimate was calculated to yield a surplus of 1½ crores of rupees. The Finance Member said "The realization of so large a surplus cannot but be a matter of congratulation to India and following the relatively large surplus which we were able to announce last year, it confirms the hope I then ventured to express that, if no new ill fortune overtakes us, we might, as regards finance, look forward to a period of prosperity". He pointed to certain considerations, which he mistakenly thought indicated growing prosperity.

Gokhale's maiden speech in the Viceroy's Council on the Financial Statement for 1902 was an unpleasant surprise for the British administrators. He opened his Budget speech as follows. "Your Excellency, I fear I cannot conscientiously join in the congratulations which have been offered to the Hon'ble Finance Member on the huge surpluses which the revised estimates show for last year. A surplus of seven crores of rupees is perfectly unprecedented in the history of Indian Finance, and, coming as it does, on the top of a series of similar surpluses realised when the country has been admittedly
passing through very trying lines, it illustrates to my mind, in a painfully clear manner, the utter absence of due correspondence between the condition of the people and the condition of the finances of the country. These surpluses constitute a double wrong to the community. They are wrong in the first instance in that they exist at all - that Government should take so much more from the people than is needed in times of depression and suffering; and they are also wrong because they lend themselves, to every misinterpretation and among other things, render possible the phenomenal optimism of the Secretary of State for India, who seems to imagine that all is for the best in this best of lands."

Gokhale saw the true character of the surpluses. He exposed the fallacy which attributed them to the growing prosperity of the people. The surpluses meant something else. It meant that Government took more from the people than it was justified and that more money was available to it than could be spent usefully on measures calculated to provide for the welfare of the people. It was mainly, almost entirely currency surpluses, resulting from the fact that Government still maintained the same high level of taxation which they considered to be necessary to secure financial equilibrium when the rupee stood at it's lowest".
Gokhale pointed out that in 1894-95 the rupee touched the lowest exchange value, the average rate of exchange realised during that year being 13.1d to the rupee. The Government however, maintained an equilibrium between their revenue and expenditure by continuous additions to the taxation. In the year 1894-95 the national account showed a surplus of 70 lakhs of rupees. Due to the operation of currency measures taken by Government in 1893, the exchange value of the rupee rose. With the exception of the famine years of 1896-97 and 1897-98, which showed deficits of 1.7 crores and 5.38 crores, there accrued in the national accounts, surpluses. This movement corresponded to the upward movement of exchange which established itself in the neighbourhood of 16 d per rupee in 1898-99. A rise in exchange meant a saving to the Government of India in the form of Home charges. A difference of one penny per rupee meant a difference of one crore of rupees. The fact that the exchange value of the rupee had risen from 13 d to 16 d was enough by itself to explain the large surpluses of the five years that succeeded 1897-98.

Gokhale further pointed out that had the expenditure in 1906-07 been left at the level of the preceding year, the Finance member would have had a large surplus. He commended the fact that the Finance Member had devoted the surplus to the carrying out of certain administrative reform to the
reduction of local taxation on the land. This provided a relief on certain local authorities at the expense of Imperial revenues. He hoped that the salt tax would be still further reduced and brought down to Rs.1 per maund and pointed out that there were many people who felt that the burden imposed on the masses by a high salt duty was only slight and that the reduction of the rate would affect consumption. But from the figures quoted by Baker, the Finance Member, it was clear that the reductions of the tax on salt, had increased the consumption of that article.

Gokhale laid down the proposition that in dealing with a prime necessity of life such as salt, the only right policy was to raise an expanding revenue on an expanding consumption under a diminishing scale of taxation. Twenty-five lakhs per annum were given away out of the surplus for the reform of the Police, four lakhs per annum for agricultural development, 20 lakhs made the previous year, a small sum of five lakhs for education. Half of it was applied to technical education and the remainder to the education of Europeans and Eurasians.

Hence, from the above arguments, it would be noticed that it was through a spirit of moderation that the Liberals tried to play their role in the legislature. The questions asked by them were more frequent. Some of these questions
managed to irk the British officials. Sometimes when a question would not be answered, the Government would relay it's reasons. The attendance were far more frequent. They asked for a lessening of control of British.

THE LIBERALS IN THE BOMBAY LEGISLATURE

Liberals like C.H. Setalvad took up the question of primary education. The primary school teachers were paid law salaries. Chimanlal Setalwad succeeded in getting their pay scales increased. In 1901 the Land Revenue Bill was introduced to amend the Bombay Land Revenue Code of 1879. Under that Act, land was given conditionally only on the payment of amount due as of land revenue, and the right of occupancy, was declared to be inheritable and transferable. Under the pretension of protecting the ryots from the money lenders, government tried to do away with the right of alienation with powers to grant lands forfeited to the Government on such terms and for a certain period as the Collectors may prescribe. This inroad on the proprietary right of the landholder produced a hue and cry from the Congress. It was feared that the measure was
designed to establish state landlordism. Pherozeshah Mehta moved the following amendment. "That the Bill to amend the Bombay Land Revenue Code 1879, be referred for opinion to all District Judges, Collectors and Commissioners of the Presidencies, the Chief Justice and other Judges of the High Court of Bombay, to the Advocate General and the Legal Remembrances and to such native gentlemen and public bodies and associations as government may select and that the Bill be recommitted to the Select Committee for further report after consideration of such opinion and representation as may be received in respect thereof within six months from this date, with instructions to submit their report within two months thereafter". He stated that his amendment was only an appeal to the Governor-in-Council for caution and patience. It was an appeal for justice and sympathy. He pointed out that "agitation against the measure is owing only to the money lending classes, that it is not bonafide, that the agricultural classes have little or nothing to do with it, and that what little alarm and consternation does prevail, has been fanned into a flame by sedulous and interested mis-representation". According to Pherozeshah Mehta, the Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill was a formidable measure, "far more formidable than the Punjab Alienation of Land Act of 1900". "The latter Act prohibited permanent
alienation of land except to defined agriculturists without
the sanction of a Deputy Commissioner, permits temporary
alienations only within certain defined limits and forbids
execution of sale of land. "It did not affect land tenure
in any other way". Pherozeshah Mehta pointed out that the
Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill dealt with the question of
transfer, and provided powers by which the tenure of land
in the Bombay Presidency would be in time completely altered
by executive action. According to him the Bill culminated
in the full assertion of State ownership of land. He described
the bill as a flank movement to introduce state ownership of
land. He said "frontal attacks are superseded in favour of
flank movement by which the declaration of sole ownership
may be quietly and effectively established and declared".

The amendment introduced by Pherozeshah Mehta was
however defeated by 14 votes to 9. Pherozeshah Mehta walked
out. Among others who walked out were Balchandra Krushna,
Gokhaldas, Daji Abaji Khare, and Gokhale. This was the first
instance when early liberal congressmen took this step of
slaging a walk out. The people who sat in the Bombay Legis­
lative Council were from the moderate middle class group
and Pherozeshah Mehta was more advanced of the early
Moderate Liberals. This showed that Indians were becoming
more conscious of their rights by now.
As already mentioned, G.Subramania Aiyar, Bashyam Aiyangar, C.Sankaran Nair, Vijayaraghavachariar, Rungiah Nayudu sat in the Madras Legislature during this period.

At its first session, Subramania Aiyar, who had been a nominated member of the Madras Legislative Council, took a leading part. He complained that the non-official members had nothing more to do than to register the decrees of the Executive Government. Nothing was done in the matter.

During the meeting of the Legislative Council on 28th February 1893, Mr.Sankaran Nayar asked questions regarding the scheme of reorganisation of the Madras Educational Service. He wanted to know if an officer of distinguished merit and ability in the Provincial service was eligible for promotion into the Imperial Service. To this question, he was given a reply by Sir Henry Stokes who was in charge of the Education Department. Henry Stokes informed that the Imperial Educational Service was to be recruited entirely in England. Provincial Officers could be appointed to act in Imperial Service posts on increased allowances. However, no mention was made whether the Provincial Officers would be of Indian origin.
Other Liberal minded educated Indians who spoke in the council proceedings of Madras Legislature included P. Rangayya Naidu, C. Sankaran Nayar, N. Subba Rao Pantulu, C. Jambulingam Mudaliar, K. Kalyan Sundaran Aiyar, C. Vijayaraghavachariar, S. Srinivasa Raghaviengar and Vellore Muhammad Sheriff Khan Bahadur. During the time allotted for question hour, K. Kalyanasundara Aiyar plied questions. He wanted to know whether a special tax on trees was collected in some cases even when such trees stood on assessed lands. He further wanted information on the extent of lands in the districts which was subjected to this dual system of taxation. He wanted the Government to order the remission of one of the two taxes in Tanjore and other districts.

However, he was given a tactful reply that the Government was not in the position to answer the questions fully until further inquiries were made.

C. Vijayaraghavachariar played an important role during the discussion on a Bill to Repeal Madras Act 111 of 1882 and the Act of 1859 which gave the Madras Governments Legislature limited power to repeal or amend any Bill passed by the Supreme legislature which adversely affected Madras Presidency.
The Bill was opposed by C. Vijayaraghavachariar. He said that the Bill was called erroneously the Madras Act. In actuality it was an ‘All India Act’. The Madras Legislature had no power to repeal it as it was passed by the Supreme Legislature. However whilst he agreed that the Act XXIV of 1859 had been amended and portions of it repealed by three Madras Acts, he pointed out that this was done under section 42 of the India Council Act of 1861. Under that Act the Madras Legislature had the limited power of amending and repealing laws and regulations made by the supreme legislature in so far as it affected the Madras Presidency, provided, they were passed prior to the coming into operation of the Indian councils Act of 1861. But now they could not repeal or amend any portion of an Act of the Supreme Legislature except with the previous sanction of the Governor General.

Further, during the course of the debate, he stated that the Bill should not be repealed but left alone and that, if necessary, a new bill be introduced in accordance with the views of the Government of India. It was unnecessary and undesirable to get rid of the old law. He also submitted that, instead of repealing the present law, it is better to have a law more suitable to circumstances of this Presidency in the place of the Act admittedly barbarous in its principles and pernicious in its effects but justified
on the ground of special necessity in the north of India. He was supported by Subba Rao Pantulu.

Subba Rao Pantulu expressed the disappointment at the way in which legislation was proposed to be undertaken. Though it appeared on the face of it to be simple and non-contentious measure, it raised important questions as to the rights and privileges of the council and the people. He and Jambulingam Mudaliar felt that no reference, was made to the Madras Presidency or the Bombay Presidency. These two Presidencies had not been given an opportunity of representing their views of Act VIII of 1895 when it was under discussion in the Viceregal Council. However the Bill was passed into law.

C.Vijayaraghavachariar also took part in a discussion on a Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act 1884 introduced by Mr.A.T.Arundel.

The two amendments proposed by Arundel were as follows. The first was with regards to a suggestion originally brought forward by the Jagirdar of Arni that provision be made in the Bill to enable landholders to recover land cess from inamadars. Provisions had been made in the Bill to bring this into action. It was found that/slight verbal alteration should be made so that it would apply to minor inams and inamdars too.
The other important change was to enable District Boards under certain restrictions to raise the land cess with the object of obtaining funds for light railways.

This motion was seconded by Nawab Saiyid Muhammad Sahib Bahadur. The motion was put to the Council and accepted. Vijayaraghavachariar pointed out to the changes that should be inserted in terms of specific words like insertion of the words 'Taluk Board' instead of vague terms like 'subordinate positions'. He was supported by the Raja of Bobbili. Mr. A. T. Arundel was prepared to accept this amendment. The amendment was put to the Council and agreed upon.

Bashyam Aiyangar introduced the Bill to further amend Madras Rent Recovery Act VIII of 1865. He was seconded by Mr. J. Grose as it was considered very desirable that an improvement in the law between the landlord and tenant be effected before any Tenancy Act was passed. During the interim period glaring defects of the Bill must be remedied.

Bashyam Aiyangar stated that Madras Rent Recovery Act did not work well. Cautious Zamindars had their pattahs settled in consultation with competent lawyers. "I may say I have found it almost impossible in two or three cases when I was consulted, to settle exactly such a pattah as the tenant was bound to accept". He pointed out saying that it is not true to say that the mistakes in pattahs are due
to the inferior agency that was employed by the Zamindars. He said that such mistakes were due to the defects in the Act and changes in the judicial decisions and the obscurity that attended several customs. However the motion was put to in the council and agreed upon.

At a meeting of the 19th December 1899 debate in the council, Vijayaraghavachariar asked the Government to move the Government of India to make a provision in the Bill to amend the Religious Endowment Act to the effect that the income derived from inams if not appropriated for the purpose for which they were originally intended be devoted to educational purposes. Mr. Stokes pointed out that the Government was not prepared to comply with the member's suggestion.

In a discussion on the financial statement for the year 1900, C. Vijayaraghavachariar urged the Government to take the public into its confidence. He hoped that the public would include the Chamber of Commerce and Public press. He wanted the educational policy to be revamped. He wanted private independent educational institutions to be developed.
Thus, in Madras too, the Indian Liberal minded Congress Members played an important role in highlighting need for reforms in political, educational and economic spheres of life. Sometimes they were able to generate public opinion but most times they were not able to do so. They experienced the same sense of frustration. Although the Liberals failed to gain much in the exercise of their limited rights in the Legislature, the points they raised had an impact on the minds of the British bureaucrats. The nonfulfillment of the demands even within the rules prescribed by the British and their repressive measures brought disillusionment among the various section of the Congress.

Besides, Curzon’s Partition of Bengal brought about a great deal of furore. The Indians were hurt. Gokhale considered it a British/to dismember Bengal in order to promote the interest of Assam. The British partitioned Bengal to suit their interest and convenience. It was a period of unrest, of conflict between the Government and the educated classes.

Gradually over the years, militant nationalism had been growing. The failure of the British Government to fulfill important demands produced disillusionment among the
politically conscious liberal moderate group. A strong demand for a more vigorous political action was considered the need of the hour.

The Liberals believed that the British rule could be reformed from within the framework provided by them. The spread of knowledge with regard to political and economic questions undermined this belief slowly. The pattern of agitation of the Liberals was responsible for this situation. The politically conscious within the Congress now wanted a vigorous stand. The clash between the Moderates and the Extremist started. The Liberals within the Congress wanted to adhere to the moderate patterns set by the founding fathers of the Congress in 1885. The Extremists set for their goal, self government.

The Extremists believed that Indians must be self reliant. They felt that India could develop without British support and declared that Swaraj was their goal. The Partition of Bengal gave them another reason to enter upon a more vigorous programme. In the wake of the Partition, new movements like boycott, Swadeshi and National Education began. These were not new ideas, but they received a new impetus in 1905. Of the three movements, boycott proved to be more controversial between the Extremists and the Moderates. The boycott was a demonstration of the people's
deep resentment at the treatment received from the British administration. It was also a ploy which the Extremist used to attract the attention of the people in England to the Indian grievances. It was a political weapon used for a definite purpose. To Gokhale and other Moderate Liberals, boycott was justifiable but he cautioned that a weapon like this should be utilised only as a last resort. Boycott for boycott sake was unsavoury. If boycott was confined only to the British goods, it would leave the Indians free to purchase goods of other foreign countries. This Gokhale said, would not help Swadeshi Movement in India. The Extremist wanted the British to lessen their grip over the economic activities. Hence they adopted the boycott plan, Gokhale, however went against the tide as can be clearly discerned from his views.

At the same time Gokhale considered the Swadeshi Movement as bringing immense possibilities of good to the country, if it was carried on in the right spirit. He said "the question of production is a question of capital, enterprise and skill and in all these factors our deficiency at present is very great. Whoever can help in any one of these fields is, therefore a worker in the Swadeshi Movement and should be welcomed as such not by methods of exclusion but by those of comprehension, not by insisting on every one working in
the same part of the field but by having each one free to select his own corner by attracting to the cause all who are likely to help and not alienating any one who are already with us, are the difficulties of the problems likely to be overcome. Above all let us see to it that there are no fresh divisions in the country in the name of Swadeshism. No greater perversion of its true spirit could be imagined than that". Gokhale wanted to work within the frame work provided by the Government and cautioned the people to go very slow especially in the wake of stiff competition between the British and Indian goods. The above opinion of Gokhale was a typical liberal moderate attitude. It mistakenly ignored the historical fact that Bengalis purposely adopted boycott and Swadeshi to injure British interests. It was not at all vindictive/sinister like Gokhale had described, it was because it/a weapon used to achieve definite results. The American had employed this method to achieve independence.

This resistance brought to the limelight the value of passive resistance which could be more effective. Further, Swadeshi activities became a concrete symbol of nationalism. Gokhale said "my personal conviction is that in this movement we shall ultimately find the true salvation of India. So, Gokhale had ultimately accepted the need for stressing Swadeshi.
Curzon's policies and repressive measures made the students of the Calcutta University boycott their classes. Some eminent men of Bengal held a meeting on 10th November 1905 and decided to establish a National Council of education in order to organise a system of education - literary, scientific and technical - on national lines and under national control. The number of National Schools grew. In 1908 there were 25 secondary about 300 primary national schools. The Bengal Provincial Conference endorsed the idea in its annual session of 1908 and resolved to establish and maintain National Schools throughout India.

So the Swadeshi boycott, National Education Movement spread to Bombay and Madras. Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Lajpat Rai propagated the ideas from 1906-1909. National Education made progress in U.P., Berar. A National College was opened at Masulipatam by the Andhra National Council of Education in 1909. This period also saw the use of traditional festivals as means to reach out to the masses. Tilak organised the Ganpati festivals spreading the Swadeshi message. The Moderates wanted the national struggle to be carried out on secular lines and they disapproved of the masses being included at this stage in the national movement.
The Liberals, whilst believing in self reliance did not want to loose sight of the British connection. It was understood that the boycott and Swadeshi Movement would loom large in the Congress Pandals. The boycott resolution proved to be a bone of contention. In the 1906 Congress session, the Extremists within the Congress forced the Moderates to pass a resolution on Swadeshi and National Education. Ultimately four drafts were agreed upon and passed in the open session. The Congress session of 1906 reiterated its Resolution of its 1904 and 1905 sessions in condemning the partition of Bengal.

A great deal of heated arguments arose over the boycott resolution which reads as follows. "That having regard to the fact that the people of this country have little or no voice in its administration, and that their representations to the Government do not receive due consideration, this Congress is of opinion that the Boycott Movement inaugurated in Bengal by way of protest against the partition of that province, was and is legitimate". This resolution was moved by Ambika Charan Majumdar and was seconded by Pal. Moderates like L.A. Govindaraghav Iyer did not think that boycott could be used ordinarily in other provinces. Madan Mohan Malaviya and Gokhale felt that the
Congress could not be committed to the views of Bipin Chandra Pal. But the resolution was carried.

The resolution on Swadeshi was also passed stating "that this Congress accorded it's most cordial support to the Swadeshi Movement and called upon the people of the country to labour for it's success." Then the resolution on National Education had been passed for boys and girls. The most important resolution was self government. In order to avert a major split, Dadabhai Naoroji decided to attempt a compromise which was in keeping with the liberal tradition. This step was taken in the interest of the Moderates so that they may not lose their grip on the politics of the day.

Discerning from the turn of events, the Liberals were uneasy and alarmed. They felt that their positions were threatened especially in the wake of Pal touring the country to increase the Extremist impact. His lectures were calculated to develop the quality of grimness and strengthen discontent. So Gokhale too toured round the country to canvass support for the Moderate cause. He chose Lucknow and Allahabad and secured the support of Malaviya and Motilal Nehru. He tried to secure the neutrality of Lala Lajpat Rai. It was against this background that the Congress session of 1907 took place. The leading opponents were Gokhale and Tilak.
The legacy left by the 1906 manifested itself in the controversies between the Extremist and Moderate groups in this session. It gave rise to the fear that the Moderates may recover some of the grounds they lost in the Calcutta session. This fear had some element of truth in it as the provincial conference of Surat, April 1907 had excluded Boycott and National Education from it's discussion. This was due to the influence of Pherozeshah Mehta. It was decided by the Calcutta session of 1906 that the following annual session would be held in 1907 at Nagpur. During the discussions on the preliminary arrangements, there were pointed differences between the two groups especially over the question of selection of the President. As a result the meeting broke. The next venue was to be Surat. The Extremist interpreted this move to be incited by the Moderates as Surat was considered to be the bastion of the Moderates who were followers of Pherozeshah Mehta. Further, the differences of opinions over the selection of the next President continued. The Extremists initially chose Aswini Dutt. But since Aswini Dutt was not an All India figure, his name was dropped. The Extremists next suggested Lala Lajpat Rai's name. The Moderates would not accept the suggestion and therefore chose Dr. Rash Behari Ghosh. Lala Lajpat Rai withdrew his name. The Extremists were further irked by the fact that the list of subjects taken up for discussion did not include self government, boycott and National Education.
The Extremists were truculent and the Liberals were adamant. If both sections had given up their stiff posture, perhaps the Congress session would not have ended in a split. Tilak wanted that an assurance be given that boycott, Swaraj, Swadeshi and National Education would be discussed in the sessions. Gokhale's statement that it was difficult to print draft resolutions before the next congress session was baseless. He gave an unconvincing assurance that the Extremist topics of Swaraj, swadeshi, boycott and national education would be discussed. This resulted in a pandemonium. The schism/began in/1890s now became a reality. This ended the first phase in the national organisation. The entire split took place because of fear. The Liberals could have helped to allay the fear by taking the Extremists into confidence regarding the topics they were to discuss, when Tilak promised to withdraw his opposition if the four subjects were discussed. But, the Liberals did not come forward for a compromise. Between 1907-1916 the Congress did not really represent the national views as it did not include the Extremists.
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