CHAPTER VIII

END OF THE WAR : AMERICAN-INDIAN CLAMOUR
FOR NEW INITIATIVE

With the end of the Second World War in sight, Indian nationalists as well as their American friends began to build up pressure for the early grant of promised freedom. The Indians tried to clarify their stand in India as well as abroad. In an appeal to the Indian community in Britain, the Secretary of the Committee Amiyanath Bose and the Secretary of the Indian Workers Association, Chowdhury Akbar Khan stated that India's freedom was not being achieved without a struggle and it was the duty of the Indians abroad to explain the meaning and significance of that struggle to the outside world... They hoped, that this would be the first step towards a systematic campaign, to demand, international recognition of Indian independence.¹

Dr. Krishanlal Shridharani addressing a meeting in connection with Mahatma Gandhi's 78th Birthday in New York under the auspices of the India

¹The Times of India, Bombay, October 3, 1944, p.5.
League said that Indian leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mohammed Ali Jinnah should be invited to the peace table. It would be a proof for all times to come, that generations had listened to their spiritual leaders voice of tranquility and love. Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit on her trip to the United States was reported to have remarked, that things were quiet in India but it was a sullen silence. Wavell declared that Congress should withdraw its August 1942 resolution before he would hold a conference with Gandhi. Sir R.K. Shanmukham Chetty after a visit to the United States declared that it is useless to expect any active American help in the settlement of their political problem. Sir Shanmukham remarked, "There was no doubt that there was general sympathy with India's political aspirations. It would be true to say that Americans as a whole would like to see India as an independent country, at as early a date as possible. One found evidence of pricking of conscience, that if the Indian political problem was not solved satisfactorily, America would be accused of having

---

2 The Tribune, October 3, 1944, p.1.
given expression to the meaningless sentiments about a better world, in which the people of different countries would be free to determine their own political destinies. The average American however, was not showing very much practical interest in Indian political development, for example though the last two months in India had been full of political news of first rate importance, there had been only very meagre references to these in the American press.

A section of the United States public voiced their sympathy for Indian demands. Louis Fischer, author of "A Week with Gandhi" in a speech at Gandhi's 78th Birthday explained that "As long as the British refuse to allow the Indians to establish a National Government, it is always possible for the Imperial power, to keep the Hindus and Muslims apart". Pearl Buck accepting her election as honorary President of the India League said, "I have joined the India League of America because I have been brought to the conviction that India has become an immediate test case for world democracy in the eyes of all darker peoples everywhere. At this moment freedom can be declared only in India. Millions in China, in South America,

---

4 The Tribune, August 24, 1944, p.1.
5 The Times of India, Bombay, October 6, 1944, p.7.
to say nothing of 350 million Indians".  

However, a section of the Americans held the communal problem as responsible for the deadlock. A broadcast on India declared, "As long as the Hindu Congress Party shows intolerant antipathy towards the Muslims and the minorities, India was bound to remain divided and subjugated. The British have liquidated most of their financial interest in India and have become a debtor to India during the war and therefore, not going to loose much sleep over the present". In an article in the 'Atlanta Constitution' on British policy Ralph Jones wrote that India was torn by internal political conflict for which Britain was not responsible and these Indian factions had turned loose a flood of propaganda in the United States, which because it was factionally inspired, was contradictory and confusing. The Cripps offer was there for India to accept any time, if the Indians were themselves United in accepting it. They were entirely free to make their own constitution and choose between dominion status and complete independence.  

---

7The Times of India, Bombay, September 9, 1944, p.5.  
8The Times of India, Bombay, November 25, 1944, p.5.  
9Reported in the Times of India, November 20, 1944, p.4.
in North America, in the Isles of the ocean in South Africa and even in Europe are watching to see if democracy means what it says and if the Four Freedoms are true or false. By what we do about India, democracy will stand or fall.\textsuperscript{6}

Representative Calvin D. Johnson republican Senator from Illinois in a statement to the Reuter in answer to R. Purbrick attack on Johnson's statement asking for immediate independence reiterated. "I hope Mr. Purbrick is able to speak for his Government when he states that "India has been promised independence after the war. When it comes to putting the Atlantic Charter into force this would be something the Indian people may want to remind London. Certainly, it will be news for Ambassador Phillips who in his vigorous language urged this promise to India in his historic letter to President Roosevelt. Certainly it will be news for Col. Louis Johnson who preceded Mr. Phillips as the President's Personal Envoy to India and who pleaded with the British authorities to give the promise of independence to the Indian people. Purbrick's statement will be news to 130 million Americans

\textsuperscript{6} The Times of India, Bombay, September 9, 1944, p. 5.
Viceroy Wavell at this time expressed the view that if they wanted to retain India, as a willing member of the British Commonwealth, they must, make some imaginative and constructive move without delay. The urgency, derived from the fact, that His Majesty's Government had no longer the power to take effective action. The British Civil Services on which the good of the country depended, could be described as moribund, the senior members tired and disheartened. Secondly, at the end of the war, political prisoners would have to be released and they would find a fertile field for agitation, in food shortages and unemployment. The Viceroy suggested a transitional government at the centre, representative of the main political parties. This government would work within the present constitution. It's task would be :-

1. To carry on the Government of British India, until the new constitution and treaty came into force.

2. To appoint the British India representatives to the peace conference and other international conferences.

3. To consider the composition of the constituent assembly and to secure the approval of Indian leaders of
Indian opinion to the composition proposals.\(^{10}\)

The Prime Minister's reply was "these very large problems required to be considered at leisure and best of all in victorious peace.\(^{11}\)

At this juncture, Gandhi and Jinnah tried to come to an understanding. They held talks but the difference proved to be too great. Jinnah adhered to the 'Two Nation Theory' according to which Muslims were a separate nation from the Hindus though intermingled with them. He pressed acceptance by Gandhi of Muslim League's Lahore resolution of March 1940. He would admit no Federation for Defence or any other purpose and demanded ingenuous relations between Muslim States and rest of India, by treaty as between equal and independent powers. Gandhi denied the two nation theory and worked for a form of self-determination within India. Jinnah also declined to cooperate to a demand for transfer of power to Provisional Government, responsible to existing Legislature. He denounced the August 1942 resolution, on unity of India, as being inimical to Muslim interest. Muslims were entitled to separation


before Independence came and would not tolerate interim Government predominantly Hindu. Gandhi pressed for independence first.\(^\text{12}\)

The communal question attracted the attention of even the United States. The influential newspaper Washington Post charged Jinnah with seeking to capitalize on Wavell's plan for purely Pakistan advantage. The paper continued "Certainly if Mr. Jinnah persisted in his attitude, the blame for the failure of the plan will rest entirely on his shoulders, under the circumstances it would be difficult to believe that he and the members of the Muslim League would remain intransigence."\(^\text{13}\) The Indians in the United States in their paper "The Voice of India" published by the National Committee for India's freedom writing on the Gandhi-Jinnah meeting, blamed the British for the communal differences in India. It declared that the trouble between Hindus and Muslims in its present phase was largely political and creation of British. Deliberately and against the expressed wishes of a vast majority of people. Britain introduced into India, a


\(^\text{13}\) Reported in The Tribune, July 13, 1945, p.7.
system of voting that split the electorate along religious lines, thus, accentuating their normal differences. Precisely at a time when under the impetus of a new nationalist movement the people were beginning to think along political lines, Britain invited them to think in terms of religious and communal lines.\textsuperscript{14}

Indian people in general denounced the very idea of Pakistan. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee in his presidential address to the Hindu Mahasabha reiterated, "We do not want any foreign domination of any brand whatsoever. Pakistan can never be won by the Muslim League by its own efforts, nor does its leader expect that it will be thus won. He counts on British support to divide India ... If the British sword is to be perpetuated for defending Pakistan, it becomes a colossal hoax and a badge of unbroken slavery."\textsuperscript{15} Desh Pande an Indian nationalist remarked, "We ought not even to talk of vivisecting our motherland. The communal award must go, separate electorates ought to go and provincial autonomy,

\textsuperscript{14} Reported in \textit{The Tribune}, October 30, 1944, p.1.

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{The Tribune}, December 25, 1944, p.8.
with its infinite capacity to do harm to the Hindus must go. The Government of India Act must be revised. Thus, can the communal problem be solved. A resolution reaffirming unshakable faith in unity and integrity of one indivisible India was passed by the Working Committee of the All India Conference of Indian Christians. The resolution however, maintained that no progress was possible, until an agreement was reached between the major parties in India. Even a section of the Muslims were against vivisection of India. The Chairman of the Indian National Muslim Committee, Amim Shah, commenting on the failure of Gandhi-Jinnah talks had remarked, "It must not however, be forgotten that the Muslims and I venture to speak for ninety five per cent of Muslims are unalterably opposed to Pakistan, for we want a United India and not a divided one."

When Gandhi-Jinnah talks failed and there seemed to be no hope of a settlement, some Americans felt that release of all Congress leaders could lead to a settlement.

16 The Tribune, November 12, 1944, p.4.
17 The Tribune, January 3, 1945, p.5.
18 The Tribune, September 21, 1944, p.1.
A demand for their release was made by hundred and twenty-seven prominent Americans in the course of a letter to Lord Halifax, British Ambassador in Washington. They stated it was 2 years since the leaders and thousands of members of Indian National Congress were imprisoned, without trial by the British Government. Many of the men and women imprisoned had long been known for their devotion to the ideals of freedom, democracy and for opposition to fascism, such as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Maulana Azad. These mass imprisonments solved no problems. They served to intensify the bitter cleavage between the British and Indians. And they had made it difficult for Indians to join whole heartedly in the war for world freedom... Every member of United Nations must face the fact that the continued imprisonment of India's democratic leaders was an ever present challenge, to the professed war aims, and denial of those war principles of human rights upon which true civilization anywhere would be found. India's freedom was not India's question alone. It was a question of human liberty, so long as suppression and injustice were allowed to continue in India they were threats everywhere in the world.\footnote{The Tribune, December 13, 1944, p.1.}
press conference, Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew said, "The American Government has continued to follow with sympathetic interest development of the Indian question. It is naturally hopeful, that progress will be made in this difficult matter and United States would be happy to contribute in any appropriate manner, to the achievement of its satisfactory settlement."

Even in London there was a demand by the Labour Party for the release of Congress leaders, to facilitate negotiations to end the deadlock. A prospective candidate for the Sutton Division of Plymouth Mrs. Luch Middleton said that "the key to the Indian problem was 10 Downing Street and it lay in the hands of one man alone. Mr. Churchill could go to Quebec, Washington, Casabalanca, Teheran, Moscow. If the Government was really in earnest with regard to India why could not Mr. Winston Churchill go to Delhi as well and meet the Indian leaders." The Cambridge University Majlis organised a meeting at St. John's College, Cambridge which was attended by over 200 British and Indian students. The resolution adopted was "We who are outside the prison bars but yet in chains, spiritually join our hands with those Congress leaders."

who are behind bars, and take the pledge to do every-
thing in our power, to mobilise public opinion in this 
country, for their immediate release." Mrs. Vijayala-
khsmi Pandi in a Press Conference in the United States 
asserted that if the British set a date for India's 
freedom as Americans had done in the case of Phillipines, 
Indian unrest could be eliminated quickly. She pointed 
out that there could never be unity so long as the British 
remained and stirred up Hindu Muslim difficulties. She 
claimed that the British efforts to block Gandhi-Jinnah 
conversation afforded an example of such a policy.

At the international conference on Pacific 
Relations, India was discussed. Both British and Indian 
view points were put forward. Representing India, Dr. 
H.N.Kunzru demanded certain concessions from the British 
such as complete Indianization of Viceroy's Council, and 
complete Indianization of the Indian army and all Congress 
leaders to be released immediately. Mrs. Vijayalakshmi 
Pandit at the conference claimed that the British on two 

---

22 The Tribune, January 11, 1945 , p.8.
23 The Tribune, January 14, 1945 , p.1
occasions could have proved their bonafide intentions. Firstly, when Mahatma Gandhi after his release demanded an interview with the Viceroy, Lord Wavell refused to accede to the Mahatma's request. Second, was during Gandhi-Jinnah talks. When the agreement was nearly reached between the two leaders, the British refused to liberate the Working Committee Members of the All India Congress. The British delegate remarked that they could not appreciate criticism from across the Atlantic which assumed that they wanted to perpetuate the colonial system. While an American delegate speaking at the Pacific Relations Conference said, "The Indian problem is of such paramount importance that if it can be solved, the remaining colonial problems will only be of subsidiary importance." 

Again there seemed to be an opinion in United States building in favour of India. Congressman John Coffee advocated freedom for Indians, because as an American he believed it was the birth right of all peoples.

---

25 Ibid.
to be free, to enjoy the fruits of their labour. As long as India's 400 millions were in bondage, there could not be any peace in Asia or for that matter, in the world. Roger Baldwin, Chairman of Civil Liberties Union said, "Let not India be deceived by the silence of our Government. The vast majority of thinking Americans have sympathies with India." Philadelphia Committee for Freedom for India passed a resolution demanding the release from jail of Gandhiji and Nehru. They declared, to continue to hold the Indian people in bondage, is a negation of the Atlantic Charter; a negation of the spirit and practice of democracy. It is to India's struggle against this operation that we pledge our support. Summer Wells in his "Intelligent Americans" said "Despite the resistance of the die hards in Great Britain and vested interests in India, especially some native princes, India could not fail to advance to ever greater autonomy.

Indians were however, disappointed with United States Government's reaction. Mrs. Vijaylakshmi Pandit criticizing United States pointed out "India has been

27 All India Congress Committee Papers,FileNo. G.27,1945, p.17.
28 The Tribune, February 18, 1945, p.12.
greatly disappointed in America. We certainly looked to the United States to come out with some sort of a statement regarding India's position. President Roosevelt's silence is incredible. For one thing America should definitely say, that the Congress Party Executive should be released from prison immediately."29 In another statement at Boston (Massachusetts) she declared, there is talk of the affairs of the world being settled by the Big Five. Who the dickens are the Big Five to determine what is to be done for the world.30 G.L.Mehta, Deputy Leader of the Indian Delegation to the International Business Conference in the United States in an interview referred to the tendentious propaganda that was being carried on in America, against the Indian National Movement, particularly against the Congress. He said American public opinion was sympathetic to Indian aspiration but was ill informed about the Indian situation. The mass of people in America although interested about India, were unfortunately very badly informed. Information about India was really lacking.31

---

29 The Tribune, January 13, 1945, p.8.


31 The Times of India, January 5, 1945, p.7.
collaboration with several Americans was carrying on the India League of America. Dr. Anup Singh and his colleague had organised a National Committee, for the freedom of India in Washington having a monthly paper called the *Voice of India*. Mehta added that until their delegation went practically all the delegations that had gone from India had been either official or nominated by the Government, so they were not in a position even if they wanted to do, to place India's viewpoint frankly and fearlessly even on economic matters.  

The Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry at their Annual Session at New Delhi passed a resolution, protesting against the systematic propaganda carried on in the United States against Indians and the Indian National cause by His Majesty's Government and the Government of India, under the camouflage of imparting information, regarding India to the citizens of America. "The Federation urged that early steps should be taken to make India's Agent General in the United States independent of the British Embassy, to counteract

---

\[^{32}\text{Ibid.}\]

\[^{33}\text{Ibid.}\]
such mischievous propaganda, by giving the Americans a true picture of the country and its people."34

British propaganda against India was manifested by British Daily Mail correspondent to New York, when it described Vijayalakshmi Pandit as a "menace", declaring that "Mrs. Pandit was touring the country inflaming American emotions about India", the correspondent added "she did not hesitate to distort the record and slander Britain... The spectacle of this women going from town to town addressing huge audiences and stirring up anti-British feeling is not calculated to improve Anglo-American team work."35 Amery in a letter to Wavell vehemently criticized Vijayalakshmi Pandit and her influence in the United States. "Mrs. Pandit seems to have talked egregious nonsense in America, but Americans are so naive and she has I believe so attractive a personality that from her they might even swallow the statement that India is one vast concentration camp and that there are no religious differences, but only unanimity of passionate desire to escape from British oppression."36

34 The Statesman, March 4, 1945, p.5.
35 Reported in The Tribune, March 8, 1945, p.5.
Meanwhile Wavell announced a meeting at Simla where he intended to discuss the proposals of His Majesty's Government. Wavell proclaimed that he proposed to invite Indian political leaders to take counsel with him with a view to the formation of a New Executive Council, more representative of organized political opinion and including an equal number of caste Hindus and Muslims. Except for the Viceroy and Commander-in-Chief, it would be an entirely Indian Council and for the first time 'Home, Finance' and 'Foreign Affairs' would be in the Indian hands. The Council would work within the framework of the existing constitution and one of its main task's would be, to prosecute the war against Japan to a successful conclusion, but its members when they thought it feasible would reach an agreement for a permanent constitution. Wavell also announced the release of the members of the Working Committee of the Congress. 37

The Americans watched the Simla conference with keen interest. Taking a broad cross section of the responsible press - The New York Times in the East, the

Kansas City Star in the Mid West, the San Francisco Chronicle on the Pacific Coast all urged the acceptance of the plan on "good deal better then nothing basis". Accompanying the majority held view that Lord Wavell was sincere in his attempt to break the Indian deadlock, was a feeling among many quarters that United States on the eve of joining the New League of Nations, could not herself back from this event as a critical but disinterested observer. This was the reason why the American Press was treating the Simla Conference with perhaps greater sincerity, then any other Indian political event of the last two decades. This consciousness of American interest was summed up in St. Louis Post Despatch "The first move does not solve the problem of India's future status, whether within or without the British Commonwealth. It does not even provide for an interim Home Rule, pending the post war solution of that problem. It is only an invitation to the "Two great rival groups within India", to sit down together on the same Executive Council and try out the experiment of working together." 38

---
38 Reported in The Statesman, June 28, 1945, p.5.
The Baily Telegraph described the 1945 meeting as "The most momentous conference ever held in India". Sincere belief in the success of the Simla Conference was shown in Reuters Survey among the friends of India in political, social and literary spheres in the United States with complete unanimity. They all stressed the crucial importance of the conference which was being described as "India's San Francisco". Pearl Buck expressed herself as being "more optimistic about the Indian situation then I have ever been ... after the Cripps Mission. I feel that both sides are now more sober and less inclined to be willful then they were then." Louis Fischer declared that the present white paper stood a far better chance of being accepted then the Cripps proposals. "The Chief stumbling block in the way of agreement is no doubt that the white paper provides, that the Viceroy's Executive Council should include equal proportions of Muslims and caste Hindus. It is conceivable that the conference will break up in failure, unless this provision is dropped or modified. Clare Booth Luce regretted that Gandhi was not attending the conference. "Without him the conference was deprived of India's most powerful voice."

---


40 Reported in The Statesman, June 29, 1945, p.5.
However, the conference failed. Jinnah's non-cooperative attitude resulted in the ultimate failure of the conference. Wavell had made selections for the Executive Council, including 4 members of the Muslim League and one non-league Muslim. Jinnah flatly refused to co-operate unless he received a categorical assurance that all the Muslim members would be drawn from the League and that once the Council was formed, decision to which the Muslim's objected, would be taken only on a vote of a specified majority say two-thirds. Wavell refused, as the right of communal veto if granted to the Muslim's, would have to be granted to the Hindus, the Sikhs and Scheduled Caste Members would have put forward similar claims. According to Wavell Jinnah had rejected a move within the present constitution, based on parity between the cast Hindus and Muslims so it was not clear what he would be prepared to accept short of Pakistan.  

Wavell in his final address to the conference conceded that the root cause of the failure had been Jinnah's intransigence and obstinacy, but Wavell also

---

felt that this intransigence represented real fear on
the part of the Muslims, including those who did not
support Jinnah, of Congress domination which they
regarded as equivalent to Hindu Raj. 42

Gandhiji had not even attended the conference.
The Congress party laid emphasis that it was a National
and not a communal party. Maulana Azad laid the blame for
the failure on the Muslim League and suggested that the
only possible solution was a firm decision by His Majesty's
Government, who could not divest themselves of the respon-
sibility. Rajgopalachari followed suit and said that he
thought a further attempt to form an interim Executive
Council on a territorial or administrative, rather than
on a communal basis might succeed. Jinnah made a long
statement bringing out the Muslim fear of Congress intrigue
and Congress propaganda. He pitched the League claims
higher than ever, demanding the acceptance of Pakistan and
a right of communal veto within the Executive Council, as
the price of league's cooperation in any provisional
arrangement. Tara Singh pointed out that the Sikhs would

42 Wavell, F. M. V., The Viceroy's Journal, ed. by Penderal
Moon, p. 156.
not agree to Pakistan, unless they were given a separate Sikh State of their own.\textsuperscript{43}

British Government was satisfied with the efforts made by Wavell. L.S. Amery in a letter to Wavell expressed his approval when he wrote "Our plans have far the moment broken down in face of Jinnah's intransigence. That does not in the least alter my conviction that we are right in putting them forward and I am convinced that not only here and in the United States, but in India itself, our action will be regarded as justified. It is at any rate something to have further confirmation of the fact, that the difficulty does not lie as between India and His Majesty's Government but within India itself."\textsuperscript{44}

United States Press disappointed with the Indian situation, continued its attack on the new Labour Government which had come into existence. The leftist press attacked British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's speech in the House of Commons, outlining the foreign policy of the Labour Government. A British Newspaper


\textsuperscript{44} Mansergh, N. and Moon, Penderel, The Transfer of Power, Vol.V, July 12, 1945, pp.1236-1237.
commented "It is impossible to over estimate the gravity of Bevin's speech and warned its readers, that seventy million white men cannot continue to rule over and exploit 400 million coloured people much longer." The *Daily Worker Organ* of the Communist Party of United States said that Britain should join the Soviet Union, in demanding an effective system of supervision of colonies.\(^45\)

The Indians also tried to focus the attention of United States on India. Gandhiji in a message to the American people conveyed through Emanuel Cellar, Member of the House of Representative, "The best way for America to assist India's struggle for independence, is to study the question, so as not to be misled by the untruth that was being spread by the British agency about India."\(^46\)

Vijayalakshmi Pandit in her tour of United States in an address to the University of Wisconsin declared, "America has a challenge unique in history and if you miss your chance for world leadership, you can plunge the world into chaos ... India seeks freedom, we have the same ideals and the same aspirations as when you fought for your

\(^{45}\)Reported in *The Hindustan Times*, August 27, 1945, p.3.

\(^{46}\)Reported in *The Statesman*, August 30, 1945, p.5.
freedom. British India today is occupied in the same sense as Poland and Czechoslovakia were occupied by Germany." Nehru while welcoming President Truman's declaration on United States foreign policy, in an exclusive interview to the Associated Press of India said, that unless some effective solution to the Indian problem was found within the next few months, a new crisis would develop in India, which would not be solved by parleys at the top and that crisis would effect the world situation. Nehru declared that President Truman's announcement would help to some extent in lessening doubts, but obviously mere announcement could not go far at a time, when active interpretations of policy was the need of the hour. Nehru reiterated, that there was no doubt that during the past few years, there had been some disillusionment in India, in regard to American championship of freedom. At San Francisco, the Soviet Union took the lead in championing independence for subject peoples. Dr. Anup Singh, President of the National Committee for India's Freedom told the United Press of America that

47 The Times of India, November 22, 1945, p.3.

48 The Times of India, October 30, 1945, p.7.
United States Congress was no longer indifferent to what happened in India, because the Americans realised that the events in India had a direct bearing on the United States. The National Committee on India's freedom was preparing a note on behalf of all the Indian Nationals residing in United States, protesting against the use of Indian troops in Indo-China. During the war Anup Singh said, "Our organisation was handicapped because criticism against Britain harmed one of America's staunchiest allies, but now we are planning to come out into the open to expose the British policy towards India." The Committee would enlist the cooperation of prominent United States Organisation's such as American Council of Democracy, as well as that of prominent Indian leaders such as Gandhi and Nehru, in their campaign to make known to the people of United States, reasons for India's desire for freedom.

The British Government however, tried to clarify that it wanted to give India full self-government. The Secretary of State for India, Lord Pethick Lawrence in a address to the Indian students declared, "I do not know anything about the end of the India office, but I do know, 

49 The Tribune, October 26, 1945, p.12.

50 Ibid.
that it is my hope and it will be my endeavour, to see that the road along which you are travelling to full self-government shall be as easy as possible. It is not the will of our Government or the people of the country, to put obstacles upon that self-government."\(^{51}\)

To prove this point to the United States, the British Ambassador Halifax informed United States Secretary of State, that His Majesty's Government in United Kingdom desired to obtain the consent of the United States Government, to the raising of the status of the Agent General for India, in Washington, to that of a fully accredited Minister. Halifax also informed that they were making similar approached to the Government of China regarding the status of the representatives of India at Chungking.\(^{52}\) However, the United States Government pointed out that they would wait, till the British Government came to an agreement with the Indians. The Secretary of State in his note to the British Ambassador Halifax pointed out that "During the discussion in 1941 between the British and American Governments which resulted in the

\(^{51}\)The Tribune, October 19, 1945, p.1.

\(^{52}\)Foreign Relation Papers, Vol.VI, October 28,1945,p.262.
exchange of the present type of representation between the Government of United States in India, it was felt that Agent General, Commissioner or Diplomatic Agent were the designations most appropriate to India's Constitutional Status at that time. As it is understood, that steps are now about to be taken in India for the purpose of revising India's constitutional position, this government believes, that it would be preferable to postpone a decision on the question raised in your note, pending the outcome of the development." Meanwhile this Government would be pleased if the Government of India so desires to accord to the representatives of that Government in the United States on a reciprocal basis the status of a Commissioner of Diplomatic Agent with the privilege of maintaining his own separate diplomatic establishment. In such a case he would be given a position in the diplomatic corps immediately above Charge'd'affaires.\(^\text{53}\)

The Labour Government invited the Viceroy to come to London, to discuss the Indian situation afresh. Lord Wavell went to London in August 1945 to review with the British Government, all the problems with which India was confronted. Labour members of Parliament, who had

\(^{53}\textit{Foreign Relation Papers}, \text{ Vol. VI, November 7, 1945, p.263.}\)
always advocated the cause of India's freedom, tried to impress on the British Government the necessity of redeeming the Labour Party's pledges for granting full self Government to India.54 The Labour Government suggested a constitution making body for India. Wavell felt that a mere expression of their intentions however, good did not solve the Indian problem and that there were many awkward questions to be answered and decisions to be made before the Constitutional making body could come into being, much more before a constitution could be agreed. The composition and procedure of a constitution body, the secession issue, the pledges to the princes, the rights of minorities all had to be taken into account.55

The British people voiced the hope that the Government would authorise speedy implementation of policy towards India, for which it had received an overwhelming mandate from the people of Britain. The "Sovereign equality of India", her national independence and her right to self determination, were a part of


their "policies and principles."\(^56\) Wavell assured on his return to India, that the British sincerely wanted to give India her freedom. Addressing the annual meeting of Associated Chambers of Commerce, His Excellency the Viceroy said, "the British Government and the British people honestly and sincerely wished the Indian people, to have their political freedom and a government of their own choice. But there were certain elements of the problem, emphasized the Viceroy which must be recognised. It was not a simple problem. It could and would not be solved by repeating a past word or formula. It would not be solved by violence.\(^57\) The Secretary of State in a broadcast to India in January 1946, reiterated the British stand "1946 will be a crucial year in India's history," said the Secretary of State Lord Pethick Lawrence. "I believe the whole of the British people earnestly desire to see India's rise to full and free status, as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth... we will do our utmost to assist India to attain


that position. There is no longer any need for denun-
ciations or organized pressure to secure this end... To
the attainment of this practical objective, Lord Wavell
and the whole of the British Government will apply them-
selves in the coming year to the best of their ability.
They believed that what was widely desired could be
achieved, but they must have the active help of leading
Indians in every community and of every way of thought.
It is only through moderation and compromise, that great
political problems could be solved."58 "India\[^{\text{a}}\], said
Attlee "must choose as to what will be her position in
the world. Unity may come through the United Nations or
through the Commonwealth, but no great nation can stand
alone by herself, without sharing what is happening in the
world. Attlee expressed the hope that India would elect to
remain within the British Commonwealth.59 While a former
Viceroy Lord Halifax currently Ambassador to United States

58 Mansergh,N. and Moon, Penderel, The Transfer of Power,

59 All India Congress Committee Papers, File No.G.57(1946),
p.57; Mansergh, N. and Moon,Penderel, The Transfer of
Power, Vol. VI, March 15, 1946, pp.1200-1201; The
declared "India's best interests demand, that complete
transfer of responsibility from the British to Indian
hands should be made, in good order if that is humanly
possible."\textsuperscript{60} Professor Harold Laski, Chairman of the
British Labour Party at the Sussex Federation of Labour
Party's meeting said, "Britain must get an agreement
with India, after this summer it might be too late."\textsuperscript{61}

Britain decided that another effort was
necessary to end the deadlock. An All Party Parliamentary
Delegation to India to end the Indian Political deadlock
was announced. It was hoped that the Delegation would help
by its personal contacts to bridge the gap between politi­
cal opinion in India and London, to demonstrate the
sympathy of Parliament with Indian aspirations and to
assure Indian opinion of the sincerity of British inten­tions to help India forward, with the least avoidable
delay on the path of self-government,\textsuperscript{62} His Majesty's
Government arranged for the parliamentary delegation to
go to India, under the auspices of the Empire Parliamentary

\textsuperscript{60}The Tribune, March 4, 1946, p.5.

\textsuperscript{61}The Tribune, January 14, 1946, p.1.

\textsuperscript{62}Mansergh, N. and Moon, Penderel, The Transfer of Power,
Vol.VI, November 21, 1945, p. 516.
Association. It was decided that it would have eight members and would be selected by the Association, in consultation with the political parties in the country.  

United States papers welcomed Britain's offer of Parliamentary Delegation to India. Washington News called Attlee's offer as an act of statesmanship and greatness. St. Louis Post Despatch remarked "Atlast the Labour Government is beginning to function as a Labour Government should function." The Chicago Sun felt that Attlee's statement would go a long way in restoring the faith of the colonial people in the British Labour Government.

The Parliamentary Delegation had arrived in India on 5th January, 1946 and left back for England by the middle of February, 1946. On the eve of their departure Richards, Leader of the British Parliamentary Delegation summarizing the Indian situation remarked, "We are also conscious of the fact that India has atlast attained political manhood, and it will be the privilege of the Government in England, I hope to extend and further that confidence which India has in herself and in her

---

ability to take her place among the free nations of the world". Reginald Sorensen, a member of the Parliamentary Delegation commented, that the observations which he stated held general agreement with the delegation such as, the Indian situation was one of almost explosive urgency. Independence was an almost unanimous demand and must be met in the very near future. He also added, "No one of us, doubt's that Pakistan represents a very powerful, tenacious body of conviction that cannot easily be placated, and that Pakistan does involve many serious economic and political problems."66

The Indian crisis was reaching its climax. The British had no alternative but to move towards giving India her promised independence. Even the communal question was to fail in withholding Indian independence.

---