CONCLUSION
Conclusion

The 200 years rule of British came to an end. The sun ultimately had to set in the British empire as it could not withstand the flow of blood down the Indus and Ganges. History of the world reveals, liberation or freedom of any country-small or big, can be achieved only after great sacrifices. In India, however sufferings and sacrifices were not over. Mrinal Pande wrote about the great migration: “We saw a trainload of Hindus had been killed and in Dera Baba Nanak, a trainload of Musalmans who had come from the direction of Ludhiana had also been killed.....they killed each others’ people. We saw bodies of Musalmans, utensils lying in the mud, clothes.....some people buried under others and disease and illness all around.”

Uprooting millions of people from the land of their birth and causing physical and mental wounds which are permanent, the partition and independence of India in 1947 triggered off one of the biggest and bloodiest human migrations in history. As quoted by Mohan Congressi: "It was because our big leaders were in a hurry to sit on high chairs, that we have had to face the partition. They are comfortable now but we, who have really paid for this freedom with our home and hearth have been turned into unwanted refugees......all politicians failed us.” In British India those who had land and home became landless and homeless refugees in the free country.

The first Prime Minister of free India admitted this serious problem in several of his speeches and categorically stated at a press conference in New Delhi "West Bengal has suffered continuously.”

The Times of India highlighted the situation on 20th August 1947, just five days after the much awaited Independence in the following ways:

"Direct Action Day surpasses in magnitude anything previously experienced in Indian history, including notorious communal butcheries that took place in the past in Cawnpore, Bombay, Ahmedabad and Dacca. The actual number of dead will never be known owing to shambles to which the city had been reduced......The incendiarism and the looting were of unparalled intensity and extent. The immediate problems of Calcutta are food and sanitation......Thousands have not had a square meal since August 16 owing to the closing or looting of the city...... The cessation of train services denied the
citizens the daily supplies of milk, eggs, poultry, fish and vegetables for which they depend on the railways.....The city stinks. Though many have been removed, putrefying corpses lie about in profusion in many areas and are being eaten by vultures and dogs. Stench masks are being widely used. Garbage, not cleared since August 16, adds to the misery.\textsuperscript{4}

The scenario in the refugee camps were horrible. Several families were hurdled together in one single room like cattle due to scarcity of accommodation. All of them had lost their homes and lands and overnight had turned into paupers and beggars. The stay in the refugee camps for many was prolonged. The condition of Calcutta was particularly horrifying. Refugees were overflowing everywhere. Approximately one million people were killed in communal riots in 1947 and not less than 14 million displaced which made it the largest mass migration in history. Conflict over Kashmir followed soon resulting into four Indo-Pakistan wars and permanent Hindu-Muslim enmity.

Prime Minister Clement Attlee has been termed as Partition's unnamed Villain by Patrick French in his article in Tehelka, 15\textsuperscript{th} September 2007 issue. According to a biographer Attlee "achieved what virtually no one else, in any country, has achieved, before or since to withdraw in good order from a vast slice of Empire." Patrick French does not agree to the biographer's opinion. According to him Attlee facilitated mass slaughter, but never took the blame for it. In later life, he said giving India independence was his greatest achievement.

During the Second World War, when Attlee chaired the Indian Committee as deputy to Winston Churchill, he followed the latter's footsteps. He regarded the Indians as racially inferior and a "beastly people with a beastly religion." In one of his rare pronouncements, Attlee said he found India "particularly intractable and nearly insoluble." When violence spread through the subcontinent, despite warnings, Attlee refused military reinforcements in India.\textsuperscript{5} When Radcliffe's boundary was announced India was the last thing on Attlee's mind. He held a meeting on a currency crisis instead.

The two world wars had shattered the financial condition of Britain and left the British economy hollow. They were no more in a position to rule over the colonies. Hence ultimately they had to accept the fact that sun sets in the British empire also like it sets in all other places. But as the poisonous snake gives its
last death-bite pouring venom before leaving the world, the shrewd, diplomatic British played their last tricks of dividing the country to make her weak before leaving the soil of India for good. They could have never been successful in their cunning plot had the selfish attitude of two power hungry Hindu and Muslim leaders been controlled before the greater interest of the country. But the passion and fascination for power outshined all other wiser thoughts, decisions and far-sightedness forever.

Gandhi explained his movement for the benefit of Muslims: “The movement has only one aim – that is of displacing the British power and so all I have done is to make this appeal on the strength of bare inherent justice, so that it might find an echo in the British heart. It is made from a moral plane and even as they do not hesitate to act desperately in the physical field and take grave risks, let them for once act desperately on the moral field and declare that India is independent today, irrespective of India’s demand. I have not asked the British to hand over India to the Congress or to the Hindus. Let them entrust India to God or, in modern parlance to anarchy. Then all the parties will fight one another like dog, or will, when responsibility faces them, come to a reasonable agreement. I shall expect non-violence to arise out of that chaos.”

Ultimately, it was murderous neighbours, religious gangs and criminal militias who were responsible for the slaughter of partition. Nobody was held to account and it was in the interest of all the politicians concerned to play down the scale of the bloodshed and praise their own role in making India free. The Indian leadership and Nehru in particular did not want British troops to remain in a peacekeeping role after independence. K. Subrahmanyam wrote – According to popular folklore both in India and Pakistan, Mohammad Ali Jinnah created Pakistan after he went back on acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan and when Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel faced with the British threat of conducting a referendum in every province, succumbed to pressure. On June 3, 1947 Viceroy Lord Mountbatten presented the partition plan and got the Congress and the Muslim League to agree to it. This interpretation has been turned on its head by Narendra Singh Sarila, ADC to Mountbatten in 1947, who argue in a forthcoming book that the Partition of India was decided in February 1946 on Cold War strategic considerations.
Sarila quotes the telegram of Viceroy Lord Wavell to the Secretary of State for India on February 6/7, 1946. Excerpts from the telegram read: “If compelled to indicate demarcation of genuine Muslim areas, I recommended that we should include: a) Sind, North-West Frontier Province, British Baluchistan and Rawalpindi, Multan and Lahore divisions of Punjab, less Amritsar and Gurudaspur districts. B) In Bengal, the Chittagong and Dacca Divisions, the Rajsahi Division (less Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling), the Nadia, Murshidabad and Jessore districts of Presidency Division and in Assam, the Sylhet district.

2. In the Punjab the only Moslem majority district that would not go into Pakistan under this demarcation is Gurudaspur (51% of Moslem). Gurudaspur must go with Amritsar for geographical reasons and Amritsar being the sacred city of Sikhs, must stay out of Pakistan. In other words Cyril Radcliffe did not draw the partition lines in 1947. Wavell drew them in February 1946. On March 3, 1946, Wavell wired the Secretary of State, “The first, most important is the Pakistan issue ....” Clearly, Wavell was in favour of partition and he was blackmailing the British Labour Cabinet about the adverse consequence of not partitioning India to British interests in other Muslim areas. According to M.J.Akbar, the noted journalist “the very word ‘partition’ implies the division of a whole. The partition in 1947 was a defeat for Gandhi, Nehru and Maulana Azad.” When Gandhi’s eldest son converted to Muslim he said that if on becoming a Muslim his son had stopped drinking (which Islam forbids) then he welcomed conversion!

Contrast to this was Jinnah’s reaction when his only daughter married a Parsi. Jinnah went to Pakistan but his daughter remained in India. It was all a clash of ego which enabled the British to say – We divide, you rule. Muslim masses had never showed any support for the Muslim League until they became fanatic in 1946 & ’47 being provoked by the selfish leaders.

It has been suggested that the British hurried the transfer of power because they were aware of something which no one else, apart from Jinnah knew that the ‘father’ of Pakistan had terminal tuberculosis and if he died before the plans for Pakistan could be announced the whole campaign for the separate country might collapse.
M.J. Akbar also said that it was not the Muslim masses who had created Pakistan but a handful of leaders who were not content with separate beliefs — they wanted separate electorates, separate languages, separate dress, separate identities and also separate homes, away from India. The country was ripped apart in 1947 – the pain was felt by people of both sides. The text books of History contain the painful facts which children of both the countries are studying even today.

"On 15th August 1947 India became independent. Unfortunately the victory of the glorious struggle of the Indian people for independence was tainted by ugly happenings immediately before and after the achievement of independence. Millions lost their homes, several thousand persons were killed."

The children of India are studying the above mentioned extract which is included in the History text book of class X while the students of Pakistan read the following extract:

"After the establishment of Pakistan, the entire subcontinent was engulfed in the communal riots. The riots were widespread in Punjab, Delhi, Bengal and Bihar in which 15 lacs people were murdered. 50 thousand women were abducted and more than one crore people had to migrate."

M.J. Akbar pointed out that despite all the propaganda and provocation, Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims alike were at a loss to understand why they had to leave the villages of their birth! Such was the scene in August 1947: "Blood colour the fields of Punjab. The refugees, only a trickle before August 1947, now crossed over in waves......those trains and caravans and truck convoys carried so much fresh poison in them that it seeped across the subcontinent and is still powerful enough to destroy life."

Abul Kalam Azad had expressed his views regarding the division of the country on the basis of two Nation theory saying "It is one of the greatest frauds on the people to suggest that religious affinity can unite areas which are geographically, economically, and culturally different. It is true that Islam sought to establish a society which transcends racial, linguistic, economic and political frontiers. History has however proved that after the first few decades or at the most after the first century, Islam was not able to unite all the Muslim Countries on the basis of Islam alone."
It is interesting to know that Jinnah himself had said – "A man is Punjabi or a Bengali before he is Hindu or Muslim. They share a common history, language, culture and economy. You will cause endless bloodshed and trouble." The same Jinnah however had said that the All India Editors' Conference was entirely Hindu. He had said "Although you may not believe it, I have never exercised direct influence over its policy and have always regarded that as the Editor's job and within his competence. "The Editor" he added, without a smile" has always been in agreement with my views." He spoke at length on the completely false reports of the Noakhali Killings of Hindus by Moslems. These were first described as a massacre of many thousands; but he claimed they turned out to be little more than a hundred killed and a hundred wounded." Contradictory opinions and thoughts depict except self interest he had nothing in his mind. He knew that his days were limited. He just wanted immortality after his impending death.

Every attempt was taken to make the Muslims happy. The extract from 'Morning News' is a proof: 'Every Attempt' Being Made For Muslim University In Calcutta-Rs.10 lakhs for improvement of Muslim Education – A special fund of Rs.10 lakhs has been created by the Govt. of Bengal for the improvement of Muslim Education in Bengal. Every attempt is being made to establish a Muslim University. These facts were stated by the Education Minister, Saiyed Muazzamuddin Hossain in the Bengal Legislative Council in reply to a question by Mr.Nur Ahmed (League) on Monday when the council met for the Budget session.

Had both the parties taken one step forward a compromising situation could have arrived but the shrewd British didn't allow that. They kept on alluring the leaders of Congress as well as the League by showing them the bait. Morning News reported – Outright Withdrawal of Cabinet Plan Not Unlikely New Delhi, Feb 8 – Britain will once again have to clarify her stand and intervene in the Indian dispute. This is strongly believed in the lobby circles here. The State paper of May 16 has given India nothing but Communal feuds and exasperating and almost interminable spells of political deadlock. What with the intransigence of the major political party and what with the as-you-interpret – it character of the plan itself, the award of the Cabinet Mission has obviously failed.
A frank confession of this will be made by the British Govt. in Parliament next week, probably on Thursday. An outright withdrawal of the Cabinet plan is not considered unlikely.\textsuperscript{21}

The Editorial of 20\textsuperscript{th} May in the Times of India expressed the three most important points:

Statesmanship At Its Best –

A Great Combined Operation

Publication of the key correspondence between the Cabinet Mission and the two parties directly concerned in the momentous Simla Conference reveals three main points of the greatest consequence. Firstly it shows that although the conference failed to achieve any final agreement between the parties, there did gradually emerge by negotiation and by virtue of substantial and most creditable concession on the part of the both the congress and Muslim League spokesmen, a much greater approach to identify of view than most people would have thought possible. Secondly, study of the correspondence and the memoranda attached bear witness, as our New Delhi Representative rightly remarks, to the arduous and tactful diplomacy whereby the Cabinet Ministers and the Viceroy contributed substantially to closer understanding by reducing the gap between the parties, particularly in their careful selection and exploitation of the concessions made by each disputant to the others’ point of view. The third and the most important point to be noted is that what appeared at first sight to be a somewhat complicated plan produced by the Mission for lack of party agreement is now shown to be a natural growth and ingenuous adjustment of the respective points of view, the fullest possible account being taken of the objections raised by each party during negotiation.\textsuperscript{22}

The myth of the inevitability of Pakistan had already grown. The historians have even traced the idea of Pakistan back to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century to Shah Waliullah and Shah Abdul Aziz in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century and even to Muhammad bin Qasim, the first Muslim invader of India early in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. This gradually resulted in the determination of the Muslim leaders in India not to submit to the Hindu majority and instead secure a homeland for themselves. The British took the advantage and adopted the policy of ‘divide and quit.’
Bipin Chandra said: "It was the minority problem round which the politics of the Government, the Congress and the Muslim League revolved. The Congress leaders suffered from a great handicap in dealing with it. Their mental horizon was limited by the political thought of England. Their experience was confined to the example of British political and constitutional activity. British thought and practice were wholly ignorant of the minority problem. Hence the Indian students of British philosophy and politics were lacking in a perception of the communal problem. They had little understanding and less sympathy for the fears and apprehensions of the minority community."\(^{23}\)

Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose's concept of freedom was absolutely different from others. His whole struggle was for freedom and he regarded it as the main ideal of a life, a society and a nation. According to him "If we are to bring about a revolution of ideas we have first to hold up before us an ideal which will galvanize our whole life. That ideal is freedom."\(^{24}\) He was not only for national freedom, but for world freedom. His struggle was against imperialism across the world. He said:"Ours is a struggle not only against British Imperialism but against world imperialism as well........We are, therefore, fighting not for the cause of India alone but of humanity as well. India freed means humanity saved."\(^{25}\)

Although Gandhiji had a lot of respect for Subhas Chandra, his blind love for Nehru compelled him to go against Subhas. In his heart of hearts he believed that Subhas would have never allowed partition. The death of Bose was mysterious and Gandhiji also refused to believe in the news of his death. Neither the Shah Nawaz Committee nor the Khosla Committee could give adequate evidence and prove the mystery of Netaji's alleged death. Habibur Rehman accompanied Netaji on that fateful day and according to A.N.Sahay, former Secretary-General of the Indian Independence League "Habibur Rehman had such a sense of loyalty to Netaji that he would not hesitate to tell lies for his(Netaji's) safety."\(^{26}\) He made calculated effort to mislead the British Intelligence from the very beginning. He gave misleading information about flight from Saigon. He suppressed the fact of Netaji's plan to go to Russia.

The version of the five Japanese witnesses and that of Habibur Rehman are not same. Habibur Rehman said that only the upper part of Netaji's body was burnt and his head suffered deep cut injury but the five Japanese said – his whole
body was burnt to greyish ash colour and Netaji suffered no cut injury at all. Habibur said the plane crashed exactly at 2.35 p.m. but the Japanese witnesses mentioned the time of crash as any time between 11 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. The time of his death also was different according to the doctor and Habibur Rehman who claimed to be by his side. Within one month, after the date of alleged death of Netaji, Habibur Rehman gave out four different dates of cremation to four different agencies.  

What was the need for telling lies and suppressing facts if Netaji was really dead? In Samar Guha’s book ‘Netaji Dead or Alive?’ there are detailed description of contradictory statements of Habibur Rehman and of the missing or destroyed files regarding Netaji which gives hints that Netaji might have escaped at that time when he was declared dead. Later on he was killed by the British and the involvement of his rivals in India in his death can not be ignored. The analysis of the metereological report of the Taihoku Airport for the month of August and an inspection of the hilly features around it showed that the story of August 18 air crash could not be anything but wholly fictitious. It is strange that no photograph of the complete dead body of Netaji was taken! His personal belonging which he was carrying were also not found.

In the sixth volume of the British documents published after 30 years (Transfer of Power – 1942 – 47) it has been categorically disclosed that the British authorities in Delhi and London knew quite definitely that “Bose had again escaped” and they knew further where he had gone. This is perhaps the most startling disclosure of a guardedly kept secret for so many years in the recent history of mankind.  

Sarat Chandra Bose said repeatedly that the story of Netaji’s death was nothing but a myth. He also publicly stated that the Government of India knew where Netaji was? Nehru came to know and according to the secret report sent to Govt. under Wavell by the British Intelligence Department, Nehru received a communication from ‘Bose’ requesting him for making necessary arrangement for his return to India. But Nehru remained quiet.

The Indian independence owes its debt as much to Netaji as to the Mahatma. Mahatma Gandhi prepared the background for the emergence of Indian freedom, but it was Netaji who finally compelled the British power to withdraw from India.
When Lord Attlee visited India as a private citizen after transfer of power, he was asked by the Governor of West Bengal in Calcutta – "Why the British left India after their victory in the war?" The former Prime Minister of U.K. who piloted the Indian Independence Bill in the House of Commons straightway replied, "It was because of Subhas Bose." But our leaders who relished the fruit of Independence, not only remained inactive in bringing him back to India but also did their best to ruin him in the country where he was kept confined during the critical years. Why did they try to get rid of Netaji? Because he was a threat to their absolute power which they enjoyed after cutting their motherland into two halves.

Nehru tried to give many explanations for acceptance of partition one of which was – "We were tired men, we were getting on in years too. Few of us could stand the prospect of going to prison again – and if we had stood out for a united India as we wished it, prison obviously awaited us. We saw the fires burning in the Punjab and heard of the killings. The plan of partition offered a way out and we took it.....We expected that partition would be temporary, that Pakistan was bound to come back to us." Rajinder Sachar, jurist and human rights activist, who has spent a lifetime struggling with the memories of Lahore recalled: “One day I ran into a Muslim villager who had come to Lahore all the way from Sargodha looking for my grandfather, a wellknown criminal lawyer. Poor chap he didn't realise that partition had taken place and that the Hindus had left. It just shows how long it took for the implications of Partition to sink in."32

The freedom changed the society, geographical roots and life of people at one blow. There started hatred, suspicion, loot, abduction of women, rape, panic, hysteria, homelessness and insecurity everywhere. Prohibition was imposed on the newspapers but they refused to heed.

The newspapers refused to obey. It is impossible to suppress news. Blood drips forth from every letter. Riots in Barisal. What a hair-raising story. Hundreds of Hindu women remain missing. It hurts to look into the abnormal faces of half-crazed relatives who have returned, faces blackened with shame. Someone's sister, another's wife, somebody's sister-in-law, snatched away by Muslim
hooligans. These are the pangs of partition described by writers from their experiences.

According to Philip Barkar, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, Radcliffe had indeed altered his award at the last minute but it was done on the advice of Mountbatten. The Radcliffe Award was condemned by Jinnah as "unjust, incomprehensible and even perverse." But however wrong and unjust it was a political award which was binding to them and according to him "An honourable people, we must abide by it." Radcliffe completed his work in India within 36 days. He finalised the Bengal Award on 9th August and the Punjab Award on 12th August which reached the Viceroy on 13th August when he was to leave for Karachi to participate in the Independence Day Celebrations. The Award was released by Mountbatten to Nehru, Liaquat Ali Khan, Vallabhbhai Patel, Baldev Singh and their colleagues on 16 August and made it public on 17 August. By then Radcliffe had left India after destroying his notes and drafts on the Boundary Commission. When asked whether he would return to India he said - "God forbid, not even if they asked me. I suspect they'd shoot me out of hand - both sides."

By the end of March 1947, Gandhiji had been a helpless spectator, watching the course of events, isolated and even betrayed by Nehru and Patel who had become desperate and blind for power. Gandhi tried for the last time on 1st April 1947 to save the country from partition when he met Mountbatten and proposed that Jinnah should be invited to form a government of his own choice to which the Congress would extend its support. The proposal was rejected by Nehru and Patel.

Gandhi's proposition that the British had no right to partition India but should leave India to her fate was neither accepted by the Muslim League nor the British. To Jinnah it was "Partition first and independence afterwards."

On 1st June 1947, a day before Mountbatten formally presented his partition plan to the Indian leaders, Gandhi's Secretary Pyarelal heard him murmuring to himself: "I find myself all alone. Even the Sardar and Jawaharlal think my reading of the situation is wrong and peace is sure to return if partition is agreed upon.....They wonder if I have not deteriorated with age. I can see clearly that
the future of independence gained at this price is going to be dark. Everybody is
today impatient for independence. Therefore there is no alternative."36
Gandhi had even suggested Jinnah's name as the Prime Minister for undivided
India. That would have been the best suggestion to follow because within six
months he would have died leaving the post to Nehru. But Nehru had lost all
patience. When independence came, Gandhiji was in Calcutta and is recorded
to have said, "It is not for me to rejoice. Leave me alone to shed my tears."37
Nehru had become poetic in his justification of accepting the Partition proposal:
"Of one thing I am convinced that ultimately there will be a strong and united
India. We have often to go through the valley of the shadow before we reach
the sunlit mountain tops."38
A close associate of Gandhiji S.N.Aggarwal said "If we could compel the
Britishers to quit India, we can also tell them plainly but firmly –No India shall not
be divided.39
Kamaladevi Chattopadhyay also said that the only alternative to the partition
was a mass movement because the British were willing to quit only on the basis
of partition.
It is shocking to note that some businessmen also were in favour of separating
the Hindus and Muslims. One of them was G.D.Birla, who wrote a letter to
Gandhiji's Secretary: "The chief difficulty (impending a settlement with the British
Government) still seems to be the Hindu Muslim question.....I wonder why it
should not be possible to have two federations, one of the Muslims and another
of Hindus. The Muslim Federation may be composed of all the provinces or the
portions of the provinces which contain two-thirds of Muslim population and the
Indian States like Kashmir which is composed of Muslims. Another Federation
may be of Hindus and such States as are composed of Hindus. I fear if anything
is going to check our progress, it is the Hindu – Muslim question – not the
Englishmen, but our own internal problems."40
No one in this vast country had the courage like Subhas Chanda Bose who
dared to tell his Muslim countrymen "Will you be a party to the vivisection of your
motherland? What will your status be in divided India? Therefore my friends if
you want freedom; you must fight for it and kick the British out."41
Maulana Azad who was so against partition said – "There is need for immediate settlement.....The division is only of the map of the country and not in the hearts of the people and I am sure it is going to be shortlived partition."^42

The question why independence was preponed troubles the mind of many Indians. In the words of Mountbatten himself "The idea that my “reckless speed” caused all the bloodshed is absolute nonsense. I haven’t the slightest doubt that any other course would have been a disaster. Read Lord Ismay. Ask any person who was out there with me. I just managed to hold out. That’s one of things that’s still not believed or understood.....The reason for speed was not to go and muck up Pakistan. It was because the thing was breaking up under my hands. The reason was that neither side would cooperate with each other. I could feel the damn thing simmering. It’s like standing on the edge of a volcano and feeling the moment of explosion."^43

In July 1947, when the Transfer of Power had been arranged The Times of London carried this article: "Mr.Attlee rose to make a statement in the House of Commons and the overheated atmosphere was charged with a sense of sharp expectancy. Mr.Attlee quickly drew an approving cheer for his opening announcement that the offer of Dominion Status has been favourably received by all three parties represented by the Conference and by the Viceroy. He continued to praise Lord Mountbatten for the great service he had performed. The spontaneous cheers were led by Mr.Churchill who said that if the hopes that are enshrined in this declaration should be borne out, great recognition should be given, not only to the Viceroy but to the Prime Minister who had the wisdom to make the appointment."^44

George VI had said on the context of transfer of power to India- "I’ve been crowned Emperor of India without ever going to India. And now I am going to lose this title right here."^45

How hollow the words of Nehru seemed when he said "Can the Indians get together? Yes, certainly, if impediments in their way created by foreign authority are removed, if they can face their problems without external interference. Every problem finally will be solved either by peaceful means or by conflict, though this may give rise to new problems. Independent India will solve her problems or cease to be. The past history of India shows us she has successfully tackled her
problems and out of every conflict of opposing forces had produced a new synthesis. Synthesis is a dominant trait of India's civilization and history."

But in fact when the country finally slit up into bits, national unity seemed impossible. Till the partition of the country there were only two colours in the political map of India — pink & yellow. The areas coloured pink represented British India and those coloured yellow indicated Princely States. These Princely States were under the paramountcy of the British Crown. With the transfer of power, this paramountcy lapsed and the states were left free to decide their future relationship with India. These Princely States ranged in area from States as big as Britain to various small estates of a few hectares with less than a thousand people. If all the Princely States decided to pull in different directions there was a possibility of numerous islands of independent and semi-independent states within India leading to utter chaos in the country.  

The effort and political acumen of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel persuaded the Princely States to come under Indian Union. The division of the provinces provoked the dangerous and reckless feeling that they belonged exclusively to the majority communities, the others being interlopers, with no right to remain in their homes, no matter for how many centuries their families had lived in them. In the Punjab serious riots took place resulting into massacre and death. The movement of the refugees between the two countries often assumed the terrifying proportion of a river in spate, the number of the unfortunate men, women and children involved on each side being some 5½ millions by the middle of 1948.  

Regarding Hyderabad, Junnagadh and Kashmir Jinnah's view was that the ruler of these States were at liberty to decide the fortune of the States to either dominion. India on the contrary, held that in all cases of disputed accession, the verdict of the people concerned should be decisive.

The Hyderabad Government refused to enter into cordial or lasting accord with India since it sympathised with Pakistan. They forgot the sense of obligation and loyalty towards their own country as the bond of religion seemed stronger. On June 1, 1948 the Governor General of Pakistan declared that the Nizam's dominion was an independent sovereign State and that not only the Muslims of Pakistan but Muslims all the world over fully sympathise with Hyderabad in its
struggle. The Indian troops marched into Hyderabad on 13th September under the command of Major General J.N. Chaudhuri having accepted the surrender of the opposing army on the previous day. Within 108 hours the whole operation was over proving the power of the protectors of Hyderabad. Following a referendum held in February 1948, Junagadh and the adjoining minor principalities acceded to the Indian Union. The Kashmir issue was more serious one and it has not even ended in the 21st century. The ruler of the State had invited both India and Pakistan to sign an agreement with him, with the object of legalising the status quo under the new dispensation for a specific period so that he could have time to reflect on what would be the best permanent arrangement for his state. Pakistan signed the agreement but India did not. Mountbatten assured the Maharaja that no difficulties would be created by this country if he chose to accede to the neighbouring Dominion. Pakistan was over ambitious about Kashmir and with the anticipation that Kashmir would fall into their side the Govt. of Pakistan brushed aside the agreement and enforced a rigorous economic blockade against the state. The frontier tribesmen were incited and they started invasion exhibiting their inhuman brutalities to the possible extent. Their cruelty was defended by Pakistan. The Maharaja of Kashmir then pleaded with the Indian Government and frantically asked for help. He signed an Instrument of Accession on October 26th. The accession was endorsed by Sheikh Abdullah, leader of the State's largest popular party – the National Conference. From October 27, the Indian troops were airlifted from India to Srinagar. Within a month the raiders were pushed back beyond Uri, sixty-five miles from Srinagar. Pakistan condemned the State's accession to India. Jinnah was deeply mortified by his failure to annex Kashmir. In December 1947, India took her case to the United Nations at the insistence of Mountbatten who suggested this course of action to prevent a full-scale Indo-Pakistani war on the Kashmir issue.

Pakistan's main claim to Kashmir rests on the fact that it is a Muslim-majority state. The Pakistanis are not able to forget their claim and the relationship between India and Pakistan remained strained forever.

The President of the Council for Protection of Right of Minorities, J.P. Mitter, sent a telegram on 2nd February 1950 to President Truman on the reported atrocities
committed by armed police forces on the defenceless villagers of Khulna and neighbouring places. The telegram was published in Amrita Bazar Patrika which is as follows:

"East Pakistan government enraged at complaint against them to UN for aggression on Hindus have now inaugurated unparalleled reign of terror and ruthless persecution of minorities. Pakistan armed and police forces recently burnt, destroyed and looted several Hindu villages in Khulna, Barisal and Rajshahi rendering 50,000 unarmed men, women and children destitute and homeless. Many were killed and enceinte women raped in the presence of husbands. Young girls ravished in presence of parents. There has been large scale abduction of women and forcible conversion. Month-old babies snatched away from panic-stricken feeding mothers and thrown in the rivers. Army and civil officials openly threatening complete annihilation of Hindus. Immediate intervention of civilized governments imperative or else peace in this region will be jeopardized."

Kushwant Singh's The Train to Pakistan vividly portrays the trauma of a nation and the dilemma faced by its people, individually and collectively. Invariably the destiny of individuals, everywhere is shaped by political decisions, taken at the higher levels.

Many Hindu refugees from Punjab, Sind and Hyderabad moved about the Nagpur city narrating tales of Muslim atrocities on them. Some Muslims who returned to their homes in the CP and Berar from Hyderabad were strongly disliked by the enraged Hindus. All this needed the imposition of curfew and promulgation of Section 144 in Nagpur and the latter's extension for about two years after August 1947. The influx of refugees, the assassination of Gandhi in January 1948, the strong anti Brahmin and anti RSS feelings sweeping the country following the assassination of Gandhi, prolonged labour troubles and communist agitations – all this created grave problems for local authorities in Nagpur justifying the imposition of Curfew and Section 144. Communal tension was acute in August 1947 following reports of Muslim atrocities on Hindus in Bihar, Bengal and the Punjab, although no riots worsened the situation.

What Nehru and other leaders who had accepted the proposal of partition predicted proved to be absolutely wrong. Hindu Muslim Unity which was
expected as an outcome of partition remained a myth or a fairytale and the relationship rather strained further. As a result of the partition millions of Muslims and Hindus were forced to leave their homes. They attacked each others' refugee columns and trains, massacring their former fellow citizens by lakhs. "The massacres were at their worst in the Punjab where trains were sent across the borders into India filled with dead bodies. The carriages were marked "A present from Pakistan" and a train carrying dead Muslims in the other direction to Pakistan was marked "Presents to Pakistan." While this was going on, the British Army, with no role left to play and forbidden to interfere, stood by and watched the bitter fruits of independence."\(^{51}\)

The Press was not a silent observer of the blood bath which drenched the dawn of freedom and vitiated the air. It played its role which was eloquent enough and which captured the facts in print. In British India Gandhiji had made a remark: "The Government would kill us if they could by a flank attack. To accept defeat in the matter of free speech and free association is to court disaster....We must speak the truth under shower of bullets. We must band together in the face of bayonets. No cost is too great for purchasing these fundamental rights. And on this there can be no compromise, no parling, no conference."\(^{52}\)

The newspapers have never made any compromise, neither with the British nor with the Indian or Muslim leaders and did full justice to their power of pen. A number of papers and journals started after the 1st World War which were edited by journalists who were committed towards the Nation. Their aim was to move people to decision and action through the papers. Public opinion made the editor of such a newspaper a hero who took courage to defy the foreign rule. The Young India, under the control of Mahatma Gandhi was the chief exponent of people's sentiment. Gandhiji had adopted journalism as an instrument of fighting against British imperialism.

With the beginning of the Non-cooperation movement the congress felt the necessity of a daily of its own in the South the outcome of which was Hindu which was followed by Swarajya in 1922 which became very popular. But this paper could not last long. In the coverage of the political developments during the national struggle, the Hindu published patriotic writings like:
"In misery and want and oppression and pain one cry has always been able to raise the Indian heart, "It is for India" and the strong man hesitates not; the wife bids her husband go; the mother. kisses and blesses her son as he stands upon the threshold and the maiden waves a farewell to her lover as he tops the distant hill. Children in arms throughout the land have learned love of country. Tell me, does not this race deserve to be free?" Kesav Menon had written the above mentioned article in Hindu. The Amrita Bazar Patrika took a leading role in Bengal to voice its protest against the British rule. Another leading paper was the Leader of Allahabad. One of the consequences of the Akali movement was the starting of the Hindustan Times in Delhi. M.N.Roy's fortnightly journal 'Vanguard of Indian Independence' was described as a 'journal of revolutionary politics.' At the top of the paper appeared the motto "Not the Masses for Revolution – But Revolution for the Masses!":

The Advance Guard was the changed name for the Vanguard of Indian Independence. In a letter written from Berlin M.N.Roy stated: "The circulation of the paper has become a difficult task.... At least a thousand copies are sent out in all.... The title of the paper has been changed in this issue but I do not think it will have any effect. They will again issue orders of prohibition and confiscation. It is necessary that secret circulation of the paper should be arranged.

The Nationalist press was an eye sore for the 'Raj.' It was brought under strict Government regulations. The prominent newspaper which stopped publications as a result of Government's restrictions on them were the Amrita Bazar Patrika, Hindustan Standard, Hindustan Times, Basumati, Jugantar, Matrubhoomi, Telegraph, Lokmanya, Jagriti, Daily Krishik, Bharat, Andhra Times, Dinamani, Hindustan and others. Devdas Gandhi, editor of the Hindustan Times was arrested for breach of the order of the Government that not more than three columns be devoted to news about the national movement.

The following letter shows the impact of the news published in the English newspapers on the leaders.
Top Secret

The Hon. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,
Prime Minister of India,
17, York Road,
New Delhi.

When I said good-bye to Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan at 10.30 this morning, he was extremely upset because the Hindustan Times and the Indian News Chronicle had published the following statement.

"The implementation of the recent agreement arrived at between the two Dominions on the division of assets and liabilities, and the Rs.55 crores which Pakistan expects as immediate payment may also hang on a satisfactory solution of the Kashmir affair, it is suggested in political circles here. It is stated that the Indian Dominion could not imperil its very existence by providing the sinews to wage what is an undeclared war against itself."

Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan pointed out that, at the meeting between the Prime Ministers last night, you had agreed that there should be no publicity regarding the question of the date of implementing the financial agreements, and the "linking-up" of this implementation with an initial settlement in Kashmir.

He himself had not signified full agreement on this point at the meeting; subsequent to it, however, he gave a verbal assurance that he would not allow any such publicity in Pakistan.

The reason, of course, for the decision to avoid publicity was primarily that it, and the resulting press comment, could but embitter relations; and, secondly, that the Government of Pakistan would subsequently, when the payment is made, be put in a very difficult position, as they would be accused of having called off the invaders for the sake of the remaining Rs.55 crores.

Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan therefore regarded this statement, within a few hours of both Prime Ministers having agreed that there should be no publicity, as a breach of faith. He had intended to send you a written protest on his return to Karachi, but I urged that he should not enter into further correspondence which would only exacerbate the situation. He finally said that it would satisfy him if I were to transmit his protest to you.
I think I should inform you of the fact that, although I understand he was extremely angry when he first saw the press statement, by the time I saw him he was sad and depressed since he felt that it was an indication that even a verbal agreement between the Prime Ministers was not going to be implemented. I made it clear to him that there could of course have been no question whatever of your having given this information to the Press after the meeting. This he was quite willing to accept: but he gave his view that the organisation in India was such that a decision reached with the Prime Minister was “apparently incapable of being implemented.”

I am well aware that it is extremely doubtful if Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan could, in similar circumstances, have “controlled” the Pakistan Press in the way in which he apparently expected you to have “controlled” the Indian Press.

I am also well aware that the comment of which Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan complains has been common currency in the Indian Press for some days and is probably no more than a mere repetition, in the absence of any further guidance, of informed comment made before the meeting took place.

However, in view of the desirability of avoiding a further incident such as this; in view of the great delicacy of the present negotiations; and in view of the impossibility of preventing further speculation by any other means, I am sure that you will not mind my suggesting that steps should now be taken to give high-level off-the-record guidance to the leading Indian and foreign correspondents, which will help to keep them on the right lines.

(Sd) MOUNTBATTEN OF BURMA

What happened in 1947 was only a semicolon in the evolution of the subcontinent, not a full stop – according to M.J.Akbar. Pakistan was again divided and Bangladesh was born.

In the mid eighties the Sikh Communalists were all set to create Khalistan. On 31st October 1984 two Sikh guards took revenge by gunning down Mrs. Indira Gandhi and the Hindus rose in revolt spreading violence against the Sikhs. One partition paved the way for several other thoughtless and meaningless demands of partition even within the country. Sheikh Abdullah’s ‘mausoleum’ near
Hazratbal in Srinagar, which was supposed to be a place of pilgrimage, is under the constant vigil of Indian Security forces since 1989 because of threats of desecration at the hands of Muslim militants and Kashmiri activists. The Bombay Blast, Godhra incident, Sarojini Market Blast in Delhi, Terrorists menace at Akshardham, Lal Quilla, Golden Temple, Jaipur Cycle Bomb Blast etc. resulting into thousands of untimely death of innocent people are nothing else but the suppressed lava of rage bursting out time to time from the volcanic hatred of communalism for which Pakistan was never a solution.

A frequently asked question is why Great Britain agreed to transfer power? Clement Attlee, when visited India in 1956 is reported to have said at Calcutta that one of the most important reasons was the activities of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose which had weakened the very foundations of the attachment of the Indian land and naval forces to the British Government. After the publication of the Top-Secret documents of the British Government and the revelations made by OSS regarding the World War II period it is confirmed that the formation of the I.N.A. and its subsequent trial contributed to a very great extent towards the decision of the British Government to transfer power to India.

After the two World Wars the financial position of the British had become hollow and there was nothing left for them in India after the drainage of wealth. But one thing they had understood i.e., the manpower of India which was beyond any comparison to that of any other country of the world. The only way to weaken this manpower was partition in the name of communal dispute and religious discrimination.

Independence was preponed because the British had the fear that if Jinnah, who had been suffering from tuberculosis died within six months, as feared by his doctors then their plan of dividing the country might not have been successful. Nehru and some other leaders had also become impatient and wanted immediate transfer of power to fulfil their dream of acquiring power and position in independent India.

Their dreams were fulfilled no doubt, but the division bred suspicion and animosity between the dominions of India and Pakistan, which were reflected in
their disputes concerning Kashmir, the sharing of the river waters, the restoration of evacuee property and of abducted women and children and the final settlement of the boundaries. Today Samjhota Express is running between Delhi and Lahore. Gates of India and Pakistan open everyday at Wagha Border which has become a tourist spot for both the countries where thousands of people watch the ceremonial closing of the gates in the evening but the barbed wires and iron nails have left permanent scars in the minds of people which can never be healed. Any sensible person would feel the pain of watching the piece of land that once was ours from the other side of barbed wire. Is this what we deserved after the sacrifice of lives of millions of people? Harindranath Chattopadhyaya paid his homage to the brave martyrs in his poem:

"We talk of Gandhi and Jawaharlal,
Of Motilal and Tilak and the rest—
But never of these men who bared their breast
To bullets brave, necks to the swinging rope.
They are forgotten; noble horoscope
of India's freedom — each a precious gem
In India's crown, come: let us honour them."

Like the martyrs the Press was also a part of the freedom struggle right from the beginning to the end. Several times Press was gagged but the newspapers continued to be eloquent in motivating people to fight for the country. The editors were so drenched with the downpour of patriotism that the newspapers mostly covered the news on national movement and inspirational articles.

"Our hope is that we shall be able to win over the new generation easily. Even now there are echoes of our principles from many places. Do not be hopeless on any account. Victorious we must be.....Many will be able to create obstacles to our work but none will be able to wreck it."58

This was the reply of Muzaffar Ahmad to M.N.Roy when the latter had written a letter to him regarding safe despatch and distribution of Communist literature and asking him to select young men to be sent to Berlin for training.

One psychological effect of the vivisection of India in order to create an Islamic State was the feeling generated among some Hindus that what remained in India should logically be a Hindu State. Seth Ramakrishna Dalmia was a prominent
exponent of this view who urged that India should be proclaimed a liberal, religious state. His statement was published by Times of India: "The only right course for saving the country from economic collapse, ending refugee distress, establishing cordial relationship with Pakistan and assuring complete protection to the Muslims in India is to declare India a liberal, religious State, which is beyond doubt the wish of an overwhelming majority of India's citizens."

Since 1947 poverty, political corruption and religious discrimination have led more and more groups in both India and Pakistan to insist on their identity as specially underprivileged groups. Militant spokesmen raise separatist demands and when they do so, they often fall back on the legacy of 1947.

The History of Press before and after Independence is full of instances of extraordinary bravery and sacrifice by the nationalists, patriots and the pressmen. They became the beacon light for the enactment of Press Legislation after Independence. Newspapers were used as weapons of Satyagraha which provided an alternative to violence; the methods adopted by the editors of English newspapers, journalists and authors have left a unique legacy of outspokenness and patriotic fervour. The leading articles, the press reports, the inspiring articles etc. published in the newspapers during the national movement and communal disturbances contribute greatly to the history of the country which could make herself free from the foreign rules after paying an invaluable price.

******