CHAPTER IV
LAJPAT RAI'S ACTIVITIES ABROAD
1914-19

The activities of Lajpat Rai in Britain, United States and Japan form a brilliant chapter in the freedom movement of India during the period of World War I. His views and methods of work were different from those Indian revolutionaries who had migrated to foreign countries in the beginning of twentieth century in search of greater safety and better opportunities to work for India’s freedom. He was not in agreement with those revolutionaries and terrorists who had aligned themselves with Germany against British Indian Government. He wanted to place the Indian case before the people of foreign countries through writings, press and other constitutional means. By his powerful writings and efforts to win the support of the foreign people he gave new dimensions to nationalistic activities outside India. As a result of his new style of work abroad, the British Government was alarmed and they considered him "a very active and harmful publicist". ¹

Lajpat Rai had visited England thrice (1905, 1908-09 and 1910) before 1914 as a delegate of the Indian National Congress. The Indian National Congress held in December 1913 had decided to send a delegation to represent the views of the Congress on the question of the reform of India Council, for which a bill was to be introduced by the Secretary of State for India in the British
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Parliament. The Bill aimed at the reform of the India Office at Whitehall. The delegates were also to project Indian views on the South African question, the Press Act and the separation of Judicial and executive functions. Lajpat Rai joined the delegation as representative of the Punjab and reached London in May, 1914.

In London, during his stay after the rejection of Crewe's Bill, Lajpat Rai engaged himself in pleading India's case before the English people. He occupied himself with the work of writing for the press on Indian matters, interviewing the Under Secretary of State for India, journalists and newsmen about the affairs of India. The Liberal and Labour Press published his articles and letters. Other Indian delegates, Hazhar-ul-Haque, Sarojini Naidu and Mohammed Ali Jinnah too organised meetings and delivered lectures to place the question of Indian self-government before the British people. In a meeting Lajpat Rai and Sarojini Naidu said: "India does not desire to shatter her allegiance to the Crown, but she passionately desires the removal of the laws which cramp and fetter her; she demands self-government within Empire, and she is resolute to win it."  
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In England, Lajpat Rai raised the question of the miserable conditions of Indians living in Canada. The position of Indians in the Dominions in general and in Canada in particular was one of the burning questions of the day in May, June and July 1914. Canada, with a view to prevent the entry of Indians, had greatly tightened immigration laws. It had been brought into prominence by Baba Gurdit Singh's enterprise in taking "a shipload of Hindus" to the shores of Canada in a ship especiallychartered for the purpose, with a view to test the legality of the immigration rules of British Columbia which denied admittance to Indians unless they had travelled to Canada in the same ship directly from India. He had chartered a Japanese ship, Komagata Maru, and took about 500 Indian mostly Sikhs to Canada. They were not allowed to disembark, and a strict guard was posted in the coastal sea and on the shore to prevent the landing of any of the passengers. On reaching England Lajpat Rai raised the question about Komagata Maru episode. He met Charles Roberts, Under Secretary of State, and other persons and sought their intervention. Referring to Komagata Maru Lajpat Rai writes: "I interviewed the important editors and also wrote to the press pointing out the dangers of the policy and the impropriety of the Dominion Government's stand." The writings of Lajpat Rai attracted the attention of Henri Bourassa, a Canadian Parliamentarian and sympathetic to India. On June 25, 1914, he wrote to Lajpat Rai the following lines:

"As you may have been informed by Mr. Charles Roberts, Under Secretary of State for India, I take a deep interest in Indian
matters, even apart from the acute difficulty existing at present between our respective countries (I am from Canada). I have read with much interest and sympathy the two letters of yours which appeared in New Leader (?) of the 11th and 12th instant and I would be delighted to have a conversation with you on the growth of nationalism in India... We would then go and have lunch together at some quiet place and compare facts and sentiments as between nationalism in India and nationalism in Canada."10

Lajpat Rai met Henry Bourassa and they discussed the question of Indian immigration to Canada. The Canadian leader was sympathetic to the problem of the Indians in Canada and he threw the whole responsibility of anti-Asiatic policy of the Dominion on the British.11

In Britain Lajpat Rai made strenuous exertions to persuade the British Government to exercise their legal as well as moral authority on the Canadian government for the purpose of permitting Komagata Maru passengers to land. But "All our efforts in England", writes Lajpat Rai, "failed to bring any relief to the Komagata Maru victims of British Imperialism."12

Thus, Lajpat Rai championed the cause of Indian settlers abroad and fought against racism and discrimination in the Empire.

In August 1914, the Great War broke out when Lajpat Rai was on the point of starting for Switzerland for rest.13 He did not expect to be away from India for more than six months but the War had completely upset his plans. Under the pretext of War, he was forbidden from returning to India. He, therefore, settled down in
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London and engaged himself in writing his book, the *Arya Samaj*. After completing his book, he decided to leave for the United States hoping that it might be possible to go to India via Japan.  

Lajpat Rai sailed from England on November 14, and reached New York City on November 21, 1914. In the introduction to his *Autobiography*, written in 1914 in New York, he praised terrorists in India for their "valour and patriotic sacrifice". In particular, he extolled the murder of Narendra Gossain (the approver in the Alipur conspiracy case who was murdered in jail by two revolutionaries who were later executed) and remarked that "a day will come when people will take wreaths of homage to their statues." Likewise, he wrote: "The bomb thrower on Lord Hardinge did a memorable act unique for its valour." Lajpat Rai, however, regretted that the secret societies lacked the support of wealthy people and that their revolutionary acts were regarded by the masses as sheer madness. While the revolutionaries "spread the gospel of freedom", he deplored the fact that the educated Indians regarded their efforts as futile and detrimental to India, and he charged them with selfishness and cowardice. Lajpat Rai added: "they (educated Indians) desire liberty but they are not prepared to make any sacrifices for it. If the British declared they would quit India in a week's time, 90 per cent of them would send petitions begging of them not to be foresaken....they were brought up in comfort and fear the hardships entailed in political unrest and revolution... they profess desire for 'liberty' but they prefer
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to continue to enjoy their comfort though it means continuance to wear the badge of slavery. They are slaves to lucre, status and comfort.... Those who blame the extremists' party for 'having injured the cause' by prompting Government repression, do not realise that under foreign rule, peace unalloyed by repression would be fatal. The political consciousness created by the extremists in a decade could not have been created by the moderates in half a century. For a subject nation, nothing is more fatal than peace... liberty can not be won without sacrifice."17

All this seems to be the language of an ardent revolutionary. But it would be wrong to infer from Lajpat Rai's praise of the terrorists that he approved of their aims or methods. In America a number of Indian revolutionaries had sought asylum in the hope that they would be able to work there freely and fearlessly. On his arrival in America, Lajpat Rai got into touch with several Indians. "As soon as I reached the shores of America" writes Lajpat Rai, "I came into contact with all classes of my countrymen who were then in that country. With the exception of men who were directly or indirectly in the pay of the British Government I found all of them inspired by a high standard of patriotism. Most of them were extremists, only a few moderates. Among the former a large number were of the revolutionary type-some frank and open advocates of violence, others rather of a mild kind. The former were in alliance with Germany and were being supplied with money by German Government agents."18 In November 1914, Lajpat

17. Ibid.
In December 1914, Heramba Lal Gupta approached Lajpat Rai in Boston, and informed him that the Germans were eager to have his (Lajpat Rai's) support on any terms, and he asked him if he would co-operate. To this Lajpat Rai answered, "No". At Los Angeles, Heramba Lal Gupta again tried to persuade Lajpat Rai to sign the proclamation of independence which they intended to issue and in which they proposed to incite the Indian soldiers fighting in Flanders to revolt against the British. It was again flatly refused. In this connection Lajpat Rai writes:

"Once more he (H.L. Gupta) offered me the leadership of the whole organisation and told me that the German leaders had issued special instructions to their consulates to try to win me over and that they would do anything I would want them to do. Once more I refused and ended with suggestion I had made before future propaganda and asylum for themselves and others."

It is thus clear that the Indian revolutionaries abroad made repeated overtures to Lajpat Rai in order to obtain his support to their cause. It also appears that the German Government were keen to enlist Lajpat Rai on their side. Some Indian revolutionaries in America acted under the misapprehension that the masses in India were ready to join an armed revolt against the British provided they were supplied arms and ammunition. While others deliberately tended to create such an impression in the minds of foreigners, possibly to secure money or perhaps to maintain their position and following. In a talk with Lajpat in April, Ram Chandra the leader of Ghadr party said: "hundreds and thousands of Indians would be there to receive arms to start a revolution at once."
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But in their hearts they knew that this was not a reality. When Lajpat Rai retorted to Ram Chandra that "he could not be ignorant of the fact that outside the ranks of the army, the whole of the Punjab and Karachi could not produce even 5,000 men, who had ever seen a rifle, much less a machine gun", the Ghadr leader had to admit the fact. Lajpat Rai did not see any chance of success even with the German help. On the contrary he believed that the Germans would grab India, and would suck the life blood out of her even more mercilessly than the English had done.27

The Indian revolutionaries in America made repeated endeavours to win Lajpat Rai's sympathy for the Government of Germany. But they failed to persuade him because his means and methods for the political advancement of India were wholly different from theirs. There were reasons which impelled Lajpat Rai to keep himself aloof from Indian revolutionaries. Firstly, he was pessimistic about the plans and success of the revolutionaries. He did not believe that an alliance with Germany would do India any good. "I, therefore," writes Lajpat Rai, "resisted all attempts to involve me into this alliance and simply refused to be a party to any schemes of bringing about a revolution in India with the help of German money or German arms. I knew that outside the ranks of the army there were few Indians who could even yield an ordinary rifle or use even a revolver. What chance was there for the success of a revolution in India, even if German arms could be smuggled into India in sufficient quantities for the use of the revolutionaries?" Secondly, though Lajpat Rai was an enemy
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Shinbun, The Nichi Nichi Shinbun, The Osaka Mainichi, and Japan Advertiser of Tokyo and Yokoham. Lajpat Rai writes, "Throughout my stay in Japan I was in close touch with the Japanese press." In Japan he published a pamphlet entitled, Reflections on the Political Situation in India in December 1915. Lajpat Rai's Reflections is a warning and assertion that only self-reliance and strong measures would free the helpless millions of Indians from the murderous tentacles of the British octopus. He held the British responsible for "unrest", "sedition" and discontent in India. He wrote, "The last ten years furnished ample evidence of the fact that India is, as compared with the decade preceding it, seething with discontent which, not infrequently, manifests itself in forms of sedition and violence. That there is unrest, even the British admit. That there is sedition also they do not and can not deny. But they explain away the former and ascribe it to causes other than a general widespread dissatisfaction with the British rule. The latter, they maintain, is due to the mischievous propaganda of a few revolutionary malcontents, whose numbers and importance they belittle. But the many repressive and coercive measures, to which they have resorted within the last ten years in order to put down sedition, tell a different tale." Lajpat Rai described the Indian situation as grave and explained, the "mere enacting of a Press Act, almost unsurpassed in its comprehensive rigidity and in the summary powers which it gives to the Executive Government, to supress any newspaper or publication which the Government may dislike, has not proved
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effective. The drastic powers given to government by the legislature have been exercised in hundreds of cases.... The situation in India is however becoming grave and the fate of both England and India is involved." He believed, "Repression only intensifies the discontent." Notwithstanding the unsuccessful attempt to enlist Lajpat Rai's support to the Ghadr party, the Indian Nationalist Committee at Leipzig, published in 1917, his article entitled Reflections on the political situation in India with the following introduction:

"Insulted and disillusioned India will realise frustration after the war and will tread upon the red path of revolution to complete the work begun by the patriots who waged the first war of Independence in 1857".

The British Government took a serious view of Lajpat Rai's activities in foreign lands. They prohibited the entry of this pamphlet, Reflections. On April 1, 1916 the Punjab Chief Court cancelled Lajpat Rai's pleader's certificate for the year 1916 on the ground of his continued absence from India and also for having published the Reflections.

The results of Lajpat Rai's visit to Japan were very significant. Among the high officials whom he met were the Premier (Count Okuma), several members of the Cabinet and other politicians.
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Professor Iso Abe and Professor Whelnack were his close friends. He delivered lectures at the Waseda and Keio Universities and also Higher Commercial School at the invitation of the authorities. In November 1915 he had presided over a banquet in honour of the coronation of the new Emperor of Japan which was attended by about 100 people, half of which were leading professors of the Universities while the other consisted of people holding high status in business, politics and society. Lajpat Rai also became popular among the Japanese students. They addressed letters to him in which sympathy was expressed for Indians. In a letter to Lajpat Rai, one Japanese student wrote:

"I have seen Europe. It has, I think, no great future for itself. But Asia, especially India, is of a great promise. Here it is needless to say what India feels, thinks, wants and does or must do, because you will know about all these. From my humble study on your country, I wish heartily that I may in the heart of the great land with my background and foreground of the Himalayas, the Ganga, the Indus and historical monuments before all which I shall bow in silence. My silence however some day will break into voice to declare to my countrymen for Pan Asia. Take me to your country if you have business for me. Call me to Lahore if you want me for India."  

But the British Government censored these letters, and they never reached the hands of Lajpat Rai.

Thus Lajpat Rai was able to enlist the sympathy of many Japanese leaders and students to the cause of India. Lajpat Rai studied at first hand the Japanese institutions and wrote about that marvellous country and its phenomenal success. By his writings in the Japanese papers and by lectures and discussions he explained
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India's case to the people of Japan. He exposed the various evils resulting from British imperialism in the country.

While in Japan, he received information of how Indians of independent political views, especially those returning from America and Japan, were being maltreated by the British Government of India. He made up his mind not to return to India. He left Yokohama for America on 12 December and landed at San Francisco on December 27, 1915.\textsuperscript{52} It was possible for him to do so because the United States had not yet entered the War and the Espionage Act and other laws restricting the right to travel had not been enacted.

In the United States, Lajpat Rai found partisan jealousies and mutual bickerings among the Indian revolutionaries. Bhagwan Singh on his return from Japan to the United States assumed the leadership of the dissatisfied elements of the Ghadr party. He along with Santokh Singh and Ram Singh accused Ram Chandra of graft. They also attributed the failure of their plans to Ram Chandra. Besides these wranglings there were the provincial differences. Lajpat Rai was of opinion that the Bengali revolutionaries in the United States brought nothing but "discredit to their cause in this country (U.S.A.) as well as in German circles.\textsuperscript{53} His experience about the Indian revolutionaries was very sad and disappointing. He analysed the situation thus: "I think the temptation to which youngmen, undisciplined in public
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life, struggling for a mere living in a foreign country against
great odds where moral moorings had been unloosened by free
thought and the teachings of Nietzsche, were subjected by a
sudden accession of pecuniary strength, proved too much for them.
It is no wonder they succumbed to it."  

In October 1917, Lajpat Rai started the Indian Home Rule
League in America with himself as President and Treasurer.
Besides the Ghadr party many other associations of Indian
patriots were already working in the United States for the cause
of Indian independence. One such association was the Hindustan
Association of the United States of America founded in 1913 at
Chicago. During the War the association was rather obscured
by the activities of the Ghadr party. Dr. Narayan Subrav Hardikar
and Keshav Deo Shastri were its prominent members. On December 11,
1914, in a letter to Lajpat Rai, Dr. Hardikar suggested that he
should carry on his nationalistic advities and propaganda work
through the Hindustan Association of America. But Lajpat Rai
did not feel enthusiastic to join this Association largely on
account of the fact that he was not satisfied with the attitude of
the Bengali members of the party whom he accused of provincialism.
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Lajpat Rai refused Hardikar's invitation thus: "I have not yet made my programme and when I make it I shall try to meet your wishes." He was also of the view that it was impossible to achieve independence for India with foreign help. "No outside help can matter if there is nothing inside." Lajpat Rai, therefore, organised the Indian Home Rule League in October 1917. The objects of the League were:

"To support the Home Rule movement in India and co-operate with the Home Rule League, the All India Moslem League and the Indian National Congress and organisation of India and America. Secondly, to further all kinds of friendly intercourse, social, educational, cultural and commercial between India and America."  

Lajpat Rai's Home Rule League ardently supported the allied war aims, more particularly the principle of self-determination in the hope that after the conclusion of hostilities this principle would be applied to India also. India, it argued, was rendering great help to England in terms of men, money and material. During this period great care was taken not to voice strong anti-British sentiments that could be distasteful to the people working for the successful prosecution of the war. At this stage all the hopes of the Indian Nationalists of Lajpat Rai's school in the United States were fastened on the Allied Victory and on the coming events at the Peace Conference. American entry into the War had roused considerable hope and it was widely believed that President Wilson would use his influence in favour of the principle of self-determination for all oppressed nations. During the War
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it also worked in harmony with the Home Rule Movement in India and England.

Lajpat Rai's League's progress was rapid. Several workers of the Hindustan Association and Ghadr Party became the members of his Indian Home Rule League. J.T. Sunderland became its General Secretary and N.S. Hardikar the Executive Secretary. From January 1918, Lajpat Rai also began publishing a monthly journal, Young India, with N.S. Hardikar as its editor and D.S.V. Rao as general manager. The League also established an Indian Information Bureau to furnish facts and reliable information about Indian affairs to editors of periodicals, writers, students and others, and to serve as medium through which books on India might be ordered. The office of the both Indian Home Rule League and the Young India was at 1400 Broadway, New York. It was decided that Shastri should do most of the outside lecturing work while Hardikar should work at the headquarters of the association in New York. Under the presidency of Lajpat Rai, Indian Home Rule of America made considerable progress. In June it had over 300 members, of whom about half were Americans. Other members of the League consisted largely of Indian students (more especially Maratha students), some members of the Ghadr party had some enthusiastic theosophists. On November 29, 1918, the membership of the League rose to 600 and the financial account showed a
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balance of $5,900. By May 1919, branches of the League were organised in Ann Arbor (Michigan), Berkeley (California), Chicago (Illinois), Cleveleveland (Ohio), Columbus (Ohio), Indianapolis, (Indiana), Kansas City (Missouri), Louisville (Kentucky), Milwaukee (Wisconsin), Minneapolis (Minnesota) and Philadelphia (Pennsylvania).

Lajpat Rai received financial assistance from various sources to carry on the work of the Indian Home Rule League. In the beginning he had to depend exclusively on whatever help he could get from his countrymen in the United States and from his American sympathisers. Another important source was his sale of literature and lectures in different parts of America particularly in California, Boston and Philadelphia. He also wrote on behalf of Hardikar and K.D. Shastri to collect money for league.

Tilak also came to Lajpat Rai's assistance. Towards the end of 1918 he received a fairly large remittance from Tilak which helped him to carry forward his work. Tilak's death in 1920 was a great set-back to the financial resources of the League. "Now Tilak gone it will not be very easy to finance you", lamented Lajpat Rai to Hardikar. On his return to India in 1920, Lajpat Rai continued to give financial help to the League. On August 13, 1920, in a letter to Hardikar, Lajpat Rai wrote in this
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connection thus: "In consultation with friends at Poona we have resolved to supply you with at least 8250 (Rupees) a month. The balance you must find from the U.S.A. Cut down your expenses. The office must be maintained."  

The work of the League was vigorously carried on by lectures, writings, and dissemination of news and information about India. The League's main publicity organ was Young India. From time to time it published facts and figures, geographical data, economic, educational and linguistic statistics relating to India. Lajpat Rai wrote mostly on various aspects of India's political developments. Another typical method of the League's work was organizing dinners and talks. The first came off at the Civic Club on October 15, 1918, which was addressed by Reverend Dr. J.T. Sunderland, the New York publisher, B.W. Huebsch, H.R. Mussey of the Nation, and Lajpat Rai. The most successful of such dinners was the League's first anniversary dinner at the Grand Hotel on Broadway, New York City, on November 20, 1918. Three hundred guests heard speeches by Oswald Garrison Villard of The Nation, J.T. Sunderland and Lajpat Rai.  

During his stay in America Lajpat Rai actively propagated Home Rule for India. He argued that the splitting up of an independent India into a number of political units was still preferable to its remaining under emasculating British rule. He said that while English political ideas negated the totalitarian
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philosophy of Heinrich Non-Treitschke, British rule in India acted upon the doctrines of the Prussian Professor. He pointed out that under Muslim rule, the Muslims had no Lancashire-like industries to protect, nor had there been an Indian Officer in Arabia or Persia, while under British rule, India, for the first time in her history, was ruled from the outside by an alien race, with the result that "for the first time in the political history of India it has become a political disqualification to be an Indian." After the War, on August 29, 1919, Lajpat Rai and N.S. Hardikar were allowed to address the Foreign-Relation Committee of the Senate on behalf of the Indian Home Rule League.

Besides pleading for national self-determination for India, it was pointed out in the brief that although the Covenant of the League of Nations had been signed on behalf of India by Secretary of State for India and the Maharaja of Bikaner, neither of them derived any authority from the people of India. It refused to attach any significance to a League of Nations which did not provide for the application of the principle of self-determination to the Nations that were held in subjection by the signatories of the Covenant. Thus the inclusion of India in the League of Nations without the application of the principle of self-determination was a mere sham. The brief referred to the resolutions of the Indian National Congress, passed in December 1918.
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relating to the subject and also to the representation made by B.G. Tilak to the Peace Conference in his capacity of a delegate, chosen by the Congress, to represent India at the Conference. After Lajpat Rai's departure J.T. Sunderland was elected President of the Indian Home Rule League. It continued to work in a peaceful way for many years in the United States for India's independence.

In the United States Lajpat Rai employed his time in study, writing and propaganda on behalf of India. In September 1916, while in Berkeley, he wrote a book entitled Young India with the object of drawing the attention of the civilized world to what was happening in India. Lajpat Rai's name slowly captured the minds of the Americans through this book and reviews published in the American press. The British Government passed an order under the Sea Customs Act prohibiting the entry of this book and subsequent issues into India. Inspite of prohibition the Indian Home Rule League of England had published its own edition of the Young India. Colonel Wedgewood wrote the foreword to the book and spent his own money to present a copy of the book to each member of the British Parliament. This ban on the book was not removed until 1924. The Government's view was that Lajpat Rai was a professed ardent noncooperator against the British Government. Hence these restrictions.
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In 1917, Lajpat Rai published two letters entitled An open Letter to the Right Hon'ble David Lloyd George, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and An open Letter to the Right Hon'ble Edwin Samuel Montague, the Secretary of State for India. In his first letter, addressing to the Prime Minister of Britain on June 13, 1917, Lajpat Rai wrote: "the only justification for my exile is that (in exile) I continue to speak about conditions in India and draw the attentions of the world to them." "But when the War broke out", he added in the same letter, "I thought that the best thing under the circumstances for us was to stand by you and establish our claim to better treatment." He again declared: "At no time before or during the War did I place my faith in the likelihood of India getting any help from Germany." Lajpat Rai stoutly refuted the allegation that he tried to secure German help or that he had pro-German leanings:

"You know as well as any one else does, how the German Government has been trying to win the goodwill of the Indians. It cannot be denied that the temptation was alluring. If, then, we have withstood it, it was not because we were in love with your Government in India, but on different grounds. Personally, I donot believe that any liberty is worth having which we cannot win ourselves, because liberty won by the aid of another, places us at the mercy of that other. European diplomacy is so crooked that it is futile to place faith in the promises of any of them. I would esteem German friendship as much as British or American or that of the Japanese or the Chinese; I would gratefully accept any help anybody would render in educating and fitting our youngmen for the coming task, but I would not do anything that would cause useless bloodshed in India... The World is not in love with you, Sir. There are a dozen peoples in the world who will be glad to see your downfall and help in bringing it about." 
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Lajpat Rai was confident that the leading countries of the world would help India:

"They (other countries) will encourage him in every way they can, without bringing about diplomatic complications. So India will not be altogether friendless when the next opportunity to strike comes. By that time the country also will be better prepared to do some thing definite and more spectacular."84

Lajpat Rai also endeavoured to answer the oft-repeated charge levelled by many British statesmen and bureaucrats that India was not a nation. He believed that a common nationhood transcended the differences of religion, language, and culture as modern history and conditions prevailing in a large number of countries had clearly and effectively demonstrated. He did not accept that "sameness of language, religion and race is necessary for a political national existence. Switzerland, Canada, the United States, South Africa, Russia, Austria and Hungary have demolished that theory."85 Lajpat Rai even went to the extent of suggesting that splitting up of an independent India into a number of smaller political units was still preferable to its remaining under emasculating British rule. He elaborated:

"Very well, Sir, divide India into small nations and give them self-government separately. You will admit that there are parts of India which are homogenous, entitled to be called small nations in the sense in which Belgium, Switzerland, Denmark and Holland are. The bulk of the population follow the same religion, speak the same language and belong to the same race."86
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Lajpat Rai further argued that the sentiment of unity was steadily growing in India over the past few years and the attempts on the part of certain British officials would not succeed. In a letter to the Secretary of State he said:

".....India of 1917 is also quite different from India of 1907. Hindus and Muhammedans have sunk their differences and are making a united stand in their demand for political liberties. The Anglo-Indian plans of creating an Indian Ulster have miscarried and never before during the British domination was India so united in its political and economic ideals as today. In 1907, we were yet babies "crying for the moon". We had not yet grasped the fundamentals of the situation. Our horizon was clouded by sectarian boundaries and we were fighting for crumbs. In 1917 we are a united people no longer praying for concessions, but demanding rights....."87

Lajpat Rai made untiring and relentless efforts to espouse India's cause before the high officials and the British people. He warned the British that the policy of neglecting the rights of a nation might be a dangerous game. To counteract the threat to India on account of German plots and propaganda, he urged the British Government to concede self-government to the people of this country. He also saw the Indian problem in the context of world developments and situation. In his article, "The International Importance of India" in the Nation of New York, Lajpat Rai wrote:

"Now that Germany is knocking at the doors of Asia, it is well to consider the international importance of India, not only for maintaining the balance of power in the great Eastern continent, but also for establishing the basis of a durable peace.... The vast bulk of her population come of Arya stock, being this racially related to the Europeans. There is, however, enough mixture of the Semitic and the Mongolian stock to make her people cosmopolitan; of the
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former race there are many among India's seventy million of Mohammedans, and of the latter there are large numbers in the populations of Bengal, Burmah, Nepal, and the Himalayas. There is also some negroid blood in the South. Thus Indian racial composition is a guarantee against the exclusive predominance of one race over others. The fear of German plots in Afganistan and India, through Persia and Turkestan, has begun to disturb the peace calculation of the belligerents. Let Great Britain take a bold step and cut the Gordian knot by granting self-government to India......"38

The publication of Lajpat Rai's book, Young India, was followed, a year later, by England's Debt to India, which depicted a sordid picture of economic exploitation of the country under British rule. In 1919, was published the Political Future of India which contains Lajpat Rai's views on the Montford reform scheme and related problems. In a different class stands his Problem of National Education for India (London, 1920), also written during his stay in America. This work, the product of serious study and observation for many years, offers a clean analysis of his philosophy of education. A monthly organ, named Young India, was started in January 1918 with Lajpat Rai as Editor. A year later he set up the Indian Information Bureau in New York to serve as a publicity organisation on behalf of India. As a result of Lajpat Rai's writings considerable interest in India and Indian problems was aroused in the press of America. "In the United States today", Lajpat Rai wrote, "the daily, the weekly and the monthly press of the country is constantly full of reference of India."39
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During the period Lajpat Rai was away, India passed through many turmoils. He was aware of the changing situation in the country. He kept himself in close touch with the political developments in India. The World War broke out in 1914 when he was in England. India being a mere dependency was also dragged into the war. Although Lajpat Rai had signed the pledge of loyalty to the Emperor along with other members of the Congress delegation, Bhupendra Nath Basu, M.A. Jinnah, M.A. Samrath and Sarojini Naidu, he did not believe in unconditional support to the British in the War. He belonged to the school of such Indian politicians who wanted to extend help to the British on a clear understanding that after the cessation of hostilities India would be granted self-rule. He issued an article in which he held the British Government responsible for discontent and sedition in India. He warned that the situation might easily and rapidly grow very grave unless the British handled it in a spirit of liberal statesmanship.  

"India", he wrote, "the land of romance and chivalry, should help England with men and money, in her splendid mission to restore liberty in Europe and erect high again the temples of gods sacrilegious by the German Barbarians... believing English might have seen her own mistakes and changed her policy and would willingly give to India her rightful dignified place in the Councils of Nations."  

Expressing his views on War on behalf of India he wrote: "What the present attitude of the Indians establishes is that they will stand by the Empire in any quarrel that England may have with other European powers."  

---
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he added, "this does not justify our concluding that India forgets her grievances against the English Government." He further wrote: "What the Indians aspire to is political independence - not an exchange of masters. They would rather keep their connexion with the British Empire, and would prefer to remain in it, if only they would be allowed to share in the privileges of its membership, instead of continuing in their present dependent position." He assured the British Government and the British people about Indian loyalty to the Empire. But he hoped that British statesmen and the British people would not construe them as representing an absolute condition of the Indian mind. "Expressions of loyalty from India", Lajpat Rai wrote, "must therefore be taken with a pinch of salt - not that one underrates their importance, or doubts their sincerity as against the other European powers with whom we are engaged in War, but just to remain the British public that there is an Indian problem which must imperatively be considered when, after the war is over, we sit down to recast the political map of the world, and to readjust the political relations of the different races and the nationalities of the world. Nay, I go a step further, and say that it would be fine stroke of policy if the authorities were at this moment to do something to strike the imagination of the people of India, and to convince them beyond a shadow of doubt that the British do value their loyalty and really respect their desire to be citizens of the Empire."  
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In contrast to the Congress declaration, Lajpat Rai maintained that India should not support England in the War as mercenaries. But he did not want to take advantage of England's difficulty during the War. He believed that the struggle after the War might, however, be even more bitter and sustained. Even when preparations for what proved to be a hopeless 'rising' in India at the instigation of Germany were being made in the U.S.A., Lajpat Rai had the courage to declare that no thoughtful Indian at present was anxious to or even willing to seek the aid of a foreign government. He criticised the revolutionaries as they were angling for German help against the British in India.

In India the enthusiastic expression of Congress support to England in the War was dimmed by the end of 1916. The War and its many-sided effects completely transformed the attitude of Indians towards British rule and towards the hitherto acknowledged superiority of the West. In 1914 Tilak after the end of his period of internment at Mandalay had come back to the country on the crest of popular enthusiasm. The change also coincided with the death in 1915-16 of the three most prominent moderate leaders, Pherozeshah Mehta, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and G. Subramania Iyer. The Congress was robbed of the Moderate's influence. During the War the Muslim League had also come near the Congress. Turkey's
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war against England was considered in the orthodox circles as a Jihad (holy war) and some Muslims drifted towards nationalism. The authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform, 1918 truly observed that the "Muslims suspected a concerted plot of the Christian Powers to make an end of Islam as a temporal power." 100

On November 17, 1916 the All India Congress Committee and the representatives of the Muslim League met at Calcutta, and resolved to make a joint demand for responsible government in India. The result was the Congress-League scheme or the Lucknow Pact of December 1916. Until 1915 the Congress voiced national aspirations but it was a body whose watchword was caution. Though still largely composed of lawyers, journalists, teachers and merchants, but under the control of the extremists it was becoming a powerful vehicle of militant nationalism. The change was expressed by Lajpat Rai thus: "India of 1917 is different from India of 1907. In 1907 we were fighting for crumbs. In 1917 we no longer pray for concessions but are demanding rights." 101

At the 1916 Lucknow Congress, the Extremists headed by Tilak, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. 102 Annie Besant 103 and Bipan Chandra Pal, wrested the control of the Congress from the Moderates. "The Congress", Tilak declared, "had done its work as a deliberative body." 104 He called for action and voiced the demand of the
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Congress for Home Rule, that is, India to be a self-governing Dominion. He explained Home Rule as a form of Government within the British Empire in which the rule of the bureaucracy would be replaced by an administration responsible to the people.

The Home Rule League movement launched by Tilak and Mrs. Annie Besant soon created a new political consciousness in the country. The Indian political temperature began to rise. The two leaders visited various parts of India, and addressed largely attended public meetings. A large number of branches of the Home Rule League were established all over India. Lajpat Rai fully subscribed to the views of Annie Besant and Tilak. He described Home Rule in India as "inevitable and also imminent." 105

In view of the countrywide agitation for Home Rule and the change brought by the War and in order to satisfy Indian nationalists the Secretary of State for India, Edwin Montagu observed on August 20, 1917 in the House of Commons:

"The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire." 106

This was an attempt to stem the rising tide of nationalism. The August 1917 declaration caused disappointment among those Indian nationalists who were demanding immediate self-government. They felt that it fell short of the legitimate expectations and hopes of the Indians. The Moderates, on the contrary, greatly welcomed
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the historic announcement and characterised it as "Magna Carta" of India. Soon after Montagu's declaration of the reform proposals (Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms) popularly called as Dyarchy were announced in 1918. These reform proposals were whole-heartedly and enthusiastically accepted by the Moderates as progressive and substantial while the Extremists rejected them as disappointing, unsatisfactory and meagre. Mrs. Besant considered the reform scheme as "unworthy to be offered by England or to be accepted by India."

Lajpat Rai criticised the Moderates on their having accepted the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. He countered their argument that excessive criticism of the proposed reforms might result in their complete retraction by emphasising that the reforms were given not as a matter of favour, but because the pressure of circumstances in India made it no longer possible to postpone them. Moreover, he explained that even if the proposed reforms were to collapse the outcome would be preferable since they would either be replaced by a more democratic scheme or by a policy of repression that would serve to invigorate the Indian movement for liberty.¹⁰⁷

The Rowlatt Report and the circumstances connected with it proved more effective in the spread of political stir in India. The drastic powers which the Government had taken during war period were to expire after six months of the armistice. The Indian Government knew that the atmosphere in the country was surcharged with excitement and discontent, and the post war reforms were still not in sight. The Government, therefore, appointed a

committee (popularly known as the Rowlatt Committee after the name of its President Mr. Justice S.A.T. Rowlatt) in December 1917 to ascertain the situation in the country and to advise the Government whether any fresh legislation was necessary to enable them to deal more effectively with the revolutionary movement. On the report of the Committee the Government of India passed two repressive Acts in March 1919 to substitute the war regulations.

This heavy dose of repressive legislation created strong anti-British sentiment and indignation in India. It greatly nullified the effect of the proposed reforms. The Indian Muslims were also greatly distressed at the dismemberment of Turkey and the future of the 'Khilafat'. A sense of common danger brought Hindus and Muslims together. They started Satyagraha movement under the leadership of Gandhi. As soon as Gandhi launched his Satyagraha movement, Lajpat Rai expressed his full sympathy with the general spirit of the movement. On August 13, 1919, in a letter to Gandhi from New York, Lajpat Rai wrote: "I may be unable to sign the full pledge of a Satyagrahi; but if and when I return to India I shall sign the 'pure Swadeshi vow'."108 He sincerely wished to be in India to share in full the misfortune and tribulations of his countrymen. He wrote, "My heart bleeds for them, but more for myself in having been deprived of the opportunity to serve and suffer."109 He was whole-heartedly in favour of Gandhi's policy of passive resistance. Gandhi wrote to Lajpat Rai that to him it was intolerable that a man like
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Lajpat Rai should have to remain outside India at that critical moment. He felt that "the place of every true Indian was in India." He regarded the doctrine of Satyagraha as the most effective remedy, not only for India's problems but also for the world. The political temperature having risen Lajpat Rai was keen to come to India. He, therefore, immediately decided to apply again for passport.

Instead of meeting the situation sympathetically the Government decided to crush the Indian movement and brush aside whatever the Indians might say in the press or on platform. Along with the policy of concessions and reforms announced earlier the British Government continued to rely upon a policy of repression in order to meet the changed situation in the country. Chelmsford allowed various Local Governments to deal with the situation as they thought best. He gave wide and extensive powers to them. "Our policy then has been not to impose uniform methods on Local Governments, but to support each Local Government as far as possible in the measures which it considered suitable," the Viceroy informed the King-Emperor.

No provincial head made such extensive use of this policy and authority as Sir Michiel O'Dyer, the Lieutenant-Governor of Punjab. He issued orders under the Defence of India Rule to
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deport two popular leaders, Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal to Dharamshala. It created great discontent and anger among the Hindus and Muslims. On April 13, 1919, General Dyer enacted with unprecedented cruelty the ghastly massacre of Jallianwala in Amritsar. This act of unrestrained brutality and the horrors of the martial law regime in Punjab roused the country to a bitter determination to fight against the alien rule.

Lajpat Rai was shocked by the account of the naked repressive policy of British Government, the arrest of popular leaders, Jallianwala Bagh episode and above all the vote of approval of repression by the British Parliament. On November 9, 1919, in an article in the New Republic of New York, Lajpat Rai expressed his deep anguish:

"India stands waiting to learn what England is going to do for her. The Government of India has in the meanwhile replied by the enactment of Rowlatt Acts and by the use of bombs, machine guns, and aeroplanes for the preservation of order. Moderate appreciation of Mr. Montagu's reform scheme has been rewarded by wholesale arrests and deportations of political leaders in the Punjab and public flogging and court martialisings of their followers. The Punjab has now been under military law for about three months and during this time the people had a veritable production of a Tsarist regime there. The Government of India's final dispatch of the constitutional reforms is another indication of the same mind. The original scheme as enunciated during the war has been modified in important particulars with a view to maintain the supremacy of the bureaucracy. The need for conciliation is over, and Imperialism is again asserting itself in its shameless nakedness." 114

112. B. 1888; President of the All India Khilafat Committee; General Secretary of the All India Khilafat Committee 1924; Chairman of the Reception Committee of the 44th Congress; d. 1963.

113. B. 1885; published Urdu newspaper Congress (Lahore); co-author of Sixty Years of the Congress; Speaker of the Punjab legislative Assembly; d. 1954.

Lajpat Rai compared the 1919 repressive policy to that of 1902 and 1910. But he did not advise his countrymen either to adopt hatred and revenge or force and violence. He asked his people to fight for their rights. He advised them to "listen, wait, decide and determine."  

Lajpat Rai's exertions for securing the freedom of his country and placing India's case before the peoples of the world elicited praise from Indian leaders. When Tilak came to England in connection with his libel suit against Sir Valentine Chirol, he wrote to Lajpat Rai: "I get your monthly (journal) regularly and am too glad to find therefrom that you, and Dr. Hardikar under you, are doing good work there. The work requires to be continued until we succeed in reaching our goal; at any rate, until the reconstruction of the world is finally settled by the League of Nations after the conclusion of peace."  

The thirty-fourth Congress held at Amritsar in December 1919 praised the nationalistic activities of Lajpat Rai abroad. In a resolution it thankfully recognised the valuable services rendered by Lajpat Rai to the cause of the country by his earnest and self-sacrificing efforts of constitutional agitation in the United States of America by representing the views of the Congress before proper authorities in America in the matter of the demand for self-government and self-determination for India.  

Conference held under the presidency of Motilal Nehru on May 17, 1920 expressed profound appreciation of Lajpat Rai's selfless and invaluable services rendered during his stay in America.\footnote{A.I.C.C. File Ho. 19/1920.}

Meanwhile, Lajpat Rai's activities abroad were closely watched by the India Office in England. The widespread popularity of Lajpat Rai in American press created alarm and fear in India Office and in the British press. The Secretary of State began to think of the possibility of deporting Lajpat Rai from America and he sought the advice of the Viceroy on this delicate question. He asked "It is possible that arrangements for the deportation of Lajpat Rai... from the United States might be made. Do you desire this? If so, whether to India or some other country". "At present", he added, "Lajpat Rai appears to be very active and harmful publicist."\footnote{Telegram, (Secret), February 1918, Secretary of State to Viceroy, Chelmsford Papers.} After consulting the Punjab government and the advocate who was concerned with Lajpat Rai's deportation in 1907, the Viceroy replied that he did not favour the policy of deporting Lajpat Rai or bringing him to trial in India for he knew his popularity in the country and any action of this kind was bound to result in public excitement. He was "opposed strongly to his presence in this country (India), particularly just now."\footnote{Telegram, July 14, 1918, Viceroy to Secretary of State, Chelmsford Papers.} "It is doubtful", the Viceroy wrote, "whether Lajpat Rai could be prosecuted in India and his prosecution and even his presence here would not arouse political excitement..."
which is undesirable and of which he would be focus and be represented as political martyr by Extremists." He further added, "In view of the impression the trials have created it is probable that the Chicago and San Francisco convicts would be harmless in America for a considerable time to come... In these circumstances, it is not advisable to make any (Lajpat Rai's) deportations." 121

Lajpat Rai's activities in America had also caused stir in the British press; the editor of London Daily Express wrote:

"I would like to call Mr. Montagu's attention to the pernicious activities of Lajpat Rai, the Indian agitator, who is doing his best in America to stir up anti-British sentiment. The Indian Home Rule League of America, at No. 1400 Broadway, publishes a paper called Young India, in which Mr. Lajpat Rai indulges in the wildest harangues. Insult to the King, tears for Eugene Debs, who is in the prison for treason, and appeals to the Irish and Germans are a feature of his work. Is it not time that the people of United States were "put wise" regarding the position of this man, Lajpat Rai?" 122

So far as the Daily Express' insinuations of appeals to Germans were concerned there was no truth in them. Lajpat Rai had disclaimed any cooperation with the Germans. He was, however, on friendly terms with Irish liberation organisations. They often invited Lajpat Rai and Hardikar to address their meetings, and passed resolutions favouring self-determination for India.

Lajpat Rai's activities in America also led to an interpellation in the House of Commons. Rt. Hon. Colonel Yale drew the attention of the Secretary of State for India to the activities
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of Lajpat Rai who was said to be doing his best to stir up anti-British sentiment in America, and inquired as to what steps were being taken in the matter. The Secretary of State gave the following reply: "I am aware and regret the efforts to misrepresent to the American public the character of British rule in India to which Hon. and gallant friend refers... Steps have been taken to counteract them." 123

What the British characterised as "efforts to misrepresent... the character of British rule in India" was, in fact, the real education of American public regarding India's claim to self-government. The Secretary of State for India had not only taken steps to counteract Lajpat Rai's propaganda in the U.S. Press, but had also exerted pressure on the United States government to prevent him from carrying on his work there. Because of this pressure Lajpat Rai had received considerable attention from the U.S. police and the Department of Justice. Six times he was examined by them and almost always at length. His telephone was tapped, correspondence opened and for full one year and a half he lived in a house, a part of which was occupied by a detective in the employ of the U.S. Government. But, in spite of all this, Lajpat Rai acknowledged that on every occasion that the Department of Justice sent for him, due courtesy was shown by the officials. 124

On January 22, 1919, Lajpat Rai made an application for his return to India via England and France. As mentioned earlier, he was very eager to return to his homeland. Though engaged in all
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sorts of valuable work in America, Lajpat Rai's mind, full of patriotic emotions, turned expectantly towards India. How at this stage his heart pined for India is narrated in a paragraph of his *Young India* for August 1919. He wrote: "I am exceedingly sorry that the Secretary of State's order prevents my going to India and England just when I wanted most to be there.... Events are developing rapidly in India and every Indian who feels for his country and is desirous of taking part in its life must feel that his place is there, in the midst of his countrymen and not 12,000 miles away from home in a position of comparative safety, comfort and ease... I am overwhelmed with a sense of guilt at not being in India to play my part in the great struggle which my countrymen are carrying on against such great odds."125 He was hopeful that the British might allow him to return to India. In a letter to Hardikar he expressed his hope thus: "I have received an acknowledgement of my application for passport from the British Military Mission in the U.S. They say it is under consideration. Who knows they may grant it."126 But the India Office in Britain rejected the application without any reason. The fact was that the Government was aware of the political developments in India in 1919, and they did not want Lajpat Rai to be there. This move was bitterly criticised in the Indian press. In August 1919 Lajpat Rai again applied for a passport via England. The Secretary of State asked Chelmsford: "You are

---

aware of his (Lajpat Rai's) lecture and press campaign in the United States. Its repetition is not desirable in the United Kingdom. It would be well to have him out of America. Would you agree to a passport direct to India?'' The Viceroy was not in favour to grant passport for fear of effect Lajpat Rai's presence might have in the Punjab. On September 21, 1919, the Viceroy wrote: "In view of the recent events it is very desirable that for the present he should be kept out of India, where his presence would constitute a danger to the public peace." He rather preferred to keep Lajpat Rai in United Kingdom if the authorities had objection to his remaining in America. He believed that he "would do less harm in the United Kingdom than in India". Since the Secretary of State considered Lajpat Rai's prosecution in England as "impossible" he was impressing upon the Viceroy that prosecution against him could be launched in India. To this Chelmsford was strongly opposed and he characterised the measures as "very undesirable." The India Office was also aware of the fact that persistent refusal to grant permission to Lajpat Rai to come to India was regarded as unjust and undemocratic. Consequently the Secretary of State was thinking of allowing him to return to his native land. He wrote to the Viceroy: "We cannot indefinately refuse to grant a passport. He makes capital out of refusal to the injury of your Government." The Government finally decided to grant him permission and on
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November 13, 1919, the British control officer, New York, informed Lajpat Rai that the British Government had authorised the New York officer to grant him a passport to proceed from United States to India. He was, however, not allowed to return India via England.

According to M.N. Roy, Lala Lajpat Rai was repeatedly refused permission to return to India because the British Government regarded him as a German agent. "It was suspected", writes M.N. Roy, "that while in America, he had established some conspiratorial contact with the Germans. Like all colonial nationalists he was of course pro-German but he was too cautious a man to be actively connected with any clandestine arrangements." But this view is hardly correct. As explained earlier, Lajpat Rai never approved of the methods of Indian revolutionaries in America who were making efforts to liberate India with the help of German money or arms. He had turned down all such overtures made to him. The British Government refused permission to Lajpat Rai to come to India not because they suspected him to be a German agent. The Government records unfold a different tale. The fact was that in view of increased political consciousness and activities in the post-war period in India, the British Government did not deem it desirable that a leader of Lajpat Rai's stature should come to India. They feared that his presence would further fan "public excitement."

During his forced stay in the United States and Japan Lajpat Rai came in contact with many Indian revolutionaries who aimed at bringing about revolution in India with the aid of German arms and funds. The German authorities too wanted to exploit political unrest in India for bolstering their own imperialistic designs. Prompted by them the Indian revolutionaries made repeated overtures to Lajpat Rai to enlist his support to their cause. They fully realised the importance and stature of Lajpat Rai. But he turned down their offers unhesitatingly and refused to associate himself with their plans. He did not have much faith in the bonafides of the British promises but at the same time he did not believe that alliance with Germany would do any good to the Indian cause. He condemned the revolutionaries because he believed that they "have taught us lying and deception, double dealing and duplicity, besides assassination, robbery and dacoity." He was convinced of the futility of attempts to bring about armed revolution in India.

The object of Lajpat Rai's visit to America was "to know more of that fascinating land and to study the social and political conditions that prevailed there, to cultivate acquaintance with a few at least of its intellectual leaders, to get first hand knowledge of its system of education and to find out what opportunities we had of training young men there." With this purpose in view he travelled throughout the length and breadth of the country, visiting New York, Princeton, Boston, Washington, Atlanta, New Orleans, Chicago, Urbanica, Los Angeles and San Francisco.

But his most significant work in the U.S.A. was to educate her people about India's problem. Lajpat Rai also carried on vigorous but enlightened propaganda for Indian independence throughout his stay in the United States, and he met with considerable success particularly among liberal circles. He made full use of the opportunities available to him to address American audiences, to remove their ignorance about his country. His vigorous pen was also called into service in India's cause and during this period Lajpat Rai wrote several books, pamphlets and published innumerable articles about the unjust and despotic character of the Indian bureaucracy. He circulated no less than ten lakhs of booklets in America.¹³³

Lajpat Rai's Indian Home Rule League of America was an effective way of supporting the Home Rule Movement in India. The League provided an institutional form to its propaganda and made it possible for Americans sympathetic to the Indian cause to collaborate with Indian nationalists. He also started other propaganda organisations. All these efforts were directed towards the sole object of creating a favourable and sympathetic opinion about India's aspirations. R.C. Jauhri has rightly assessed that "Lala Lajpat Rai achieved better success in enlightening the American public regarding India's political aspirations."¹³⁴ He was also able to acquire invaluable wealth of information about modern democratic institutions. In spite of the success he achieved in


this direction, Lajpat Rai did not believe that the salvation of his country would come from outside. He was opposed to reliance being placed on foreign assistance, political or military.

Thus, during the entire period of his stay in England, America and Japan, through writings, speeches, organisation and association gave a new dimension to the nationalistic cause of India. His pioneering work in U.S.A. was able to win moral support and sympathy of many citizens of America. One can say that by creating a favourable and sympathetic public opinion he prepared ground for subsequent American help in India's freedom.