In the last years of the fifteenth century, great geographical discoveries had been happened made by adventurous sailors and explorers who undertook long sea voyage with the help of navigational instruments, astronomical tables and maps. The principal aim of European explorers was to find out direct sea routes to fabled Indies. To them, India was a land of fables, Africa, a Dark Continent and America an unheard land. When in 1498, Vasco da Gama, a Portuguese sailor, disembarked at the port of Calicut, a new era began in the relations between Asia and Europe. The immediate effect of the discovery was the elimination of the Turkish power from the seas, washing the shores of East Africa and the Asian lands – Arabia, Persia and India. The Portuguese sailors then established a number of trading settlements in India that included Goa, Daman and Diu.

However, for over two hundred years after the discovery of Indian land, the maritime activities of the Western people remained only in coastal commerce obtaining control over the seas. During these two centuries, viz. the sixteenth and seventeenth, Asia rose to the zenith of its glory. But its very success was confined within its narrow boundaries. On the other hand, in Europe, the fresh air
of freedom began to blow from the fifteenth century onwards. The renaissance and reformation in Europe had released the people’s mind and dynamism had entered in life and people felt uplifted.

In political field, the advancement of the Muslim Turks into Christian Europe from the East and the Christian pursuit of the Muslims around Africa were two parallel movements of the fifteenth century. Vasco da Gama was a portent of this movement. But the country which he represented, namely Portugal, was incapable of sustaining the movement for long and declined from the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Thus, two other maritime countries of Europe, Holland and England, had entered the scene. The East India Company of England and the United East India Company of Holland was formed in 1600 and 1602 respectively. From the very beginning, the European trading companies had started the fortification of their settlements in India and the building of their armed strength to defend themselves from one another, and also to strengthen themselves against the Indian rulers with whom they often got involved in conflicts. They also vied with one another to get favourable terms and rights to establish trading posts from the Mughal emperors. The English founded one of the earliest factories for trading posts in India at Mussolipatnam on the Coromandal coast in 1611. In 1612, they obtained the trade right from the Mughal Subadar of Gujarat, at Surat and Cambay, and the Malabar Coast. In 1615, Sir Thomas Row reached India as England’s first Ambassador and succeeded in securing from Emperor Jahangir some privileges for the English merchants. Then had started a fierce rivalry between European trading companies. In 1622, the English defeated the Portuguese at sea and captured armours/or muz on the Persian Gulf. Their first fortification in India is at Armagaon in 1625. In 1674, Sir Josiah Child became a Director of the Company and under his guidance the Company began for the first time to rush for political importance and power. For the reason, preparations were made on a vast scale. Armed vessels mounted with guns were obtained, several companies of infantry were raised and an entire company of regular infantry with their officers was sent for from England. In the year 1683, the company had became — "A body standing
apart from the nation, yet yielding in India the national powers of coining money, levying taxes, building ports, maintaining troops, and making war or peace."  

W.W. Hunter, the historian informed that its business had made rapid progress and the profits had increased enormously. In one word, in India, its trade was half the trade of the Britain.

From the mid 1680s, Bombay became the English Headquarters in Western India. By the end of the seventeenth century, the Portuguese and the Dutch had been effectively ousted from India and the main conflict now was between the English (with their main bases at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay) and the French (with their main bases at Pondicherry and Chandernagore). Thus, beginning as a conflict for monopoly over trade in India, it soon turned into a struggle for the political domination of India. The manner in which the English people ventured to India’s shores, waited patiently for hundred and fifty years, acting as humble merchants, till its political fortunes began to start and finally captured the whole of India and then at last subjugated the country is an amazing phenomenon of the Indian history. In order to understand it, it is necessary to review the backdrop of the Indian political and social scenario.

As is said earlier that by the end of the seventeenth century, the English East India Company had turned its attention towards the unexplored area around the river Hooghly (Ganges) and gradually Calcutta became one of its main bases. But how did it happen? On 24 August 1690, had happened the historic landing of Job Charnock at Sutanuti. Quoting from his log book,

“August 24, 1690 – This day at Sankraul ordered Captain Broke to come up with his vessel to Chutanutte, where we arrived about noon, but found ye place in deplorable condition, nothing left for our present accommodation and ye rains falling day and night.” 2
Regarding this, the first volume of the Fort William Factory records describes that Job Charnock had chose it for strategic reasons and then his successors transformed it into the first city of the East, the imperial till 1911.

Before Job Charnock arrived, about 1550, two Bengali Merchant families—the Basaks and the Seths had settled at Gobindapur Village on the east bank of the river Ganges, where they set up a weekly cotton and yarn market. Between these two, there was the Dihi Kalikata, where the Nawab’s rent holders the Savarna Chowdhury family stayed. A few miles to the South, there was the famous Kali Temple connected to the big village Chitpur, near Sutanuti. This group of villages had already established market and trade centres before the British arrived.

On the other hand, in the late seventeenth century, the Mughal Emperors could not hold their vast empire together. The Marathas invaded the Deccan. In the East, local Zamindars were making bid for power. The ill-powered Nawab of Bengal received no clear directive from the Emperor. There prevailed lawlessness at various parts of the country resulting in loot and arson.

This disintegration of the Mughal Empire and the failure of any other Indian State to emerge as an all-India power in its place made it possible for the English and French Companies to interfere in the political affairs of India. The Indian Princes did not hesitate to seek the help of the foreigners in the pursuit of their ambitions against their rivals in the country. Foreign traders with their military strength raised hands to protect them. In reply, they sought permission to fortify their settlements at different parts of India. In 1698, Charles Eyre, Job Charnock’s son-in-law, acquired the right to rent the villages of Sutanuti, Kalikata and Gobindapur. In 1700, there was the beginning of the old Fort William in 1700, after the name of King William III for the protection of their trade. In this political situation had started conflict between English and French to establish political domination over Indian States. The conflict began in South
India and within a few years ended in the defeat of the French and the foundation of British power in India has thus been established.

Aurangzeb's demise in 1707 gave rise to great uncertainty with three emperors ruling within a short span of six years. In 1713, the British sent Farruksheir an embassy by John Surman, who visited him with gifts worth $30,000 and they received a Firman in 1717 confirming all their old rights and granting new ones.

When the next round of hostilities began with the French, the English East India Company had already gained control over Bengal. After the war with the French army in Carnatic, the English people were confident that through political intrigues and with the help of a small trained army, they could not only destroy the French, but could also establish their supremacy over the Indian rulers. Siraj-ud-Daulah, the Nawab of Bengal of the time, was annoyed with the English for their misuse of Forman which they had secured from the Mughal Emperor in 1717 and their refusal to demolish their fortifications in Calcutta. He attacked and occupied Calcutta in 1756. The English soon recovered Calcutta and entered into a conspiracy with the help of Omichand. Mir Jafar (Commander-in-chief of the Siraj’s army), Jagat Seth, Rai Durlabh and many other leading officials and business luminaries of the Bengal. On 23 June 1757, took place the battle of Plassey. The English troops under Clive and Watson were victorious in this battle. Mir Jafar was sworn-in as Nawab of Bengal. Siraj-ud-Daulah was killed. Thus, the battle of Plassey marks the beginning of the British conquest of India. In 1760, Mir Jafar was replaced by Mir Qasim as the Nawab, who, though installed on the throne by the English, tried to assert his independence. The decisive battle which finally established the English as the masters of Bengal took place at Buxar on 22 October 1764. At this battle, Mir Qasim and his allies, Shuja-ud-Daulah, the Nawab of Awadh, and Shah Alam II, the Mughal Emperor, were completely routed. On 12 August 1765, Shah Alam II signed a treaty granting the English Company the Dhwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Meanwhile, the English had also succeeded in destroying the French power in
India after a battle in 1760, establishing their influence over Hyderabad and acquiring Northern Parts of India. Thus, in this way the possession of the resource of the rich provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa enabled the English to proceed with the further conquest of India.

Within a decade, after the English East India Company had laid the foundations of British Empire in India, a new development of world-wide significance began. This was the Industrial Revolution which took place first in Britain and later appeared to some other countries of Europe and North America creating a new world economic system. This was the culmination of a long process of mercantile enterprise. In the sixteenth century, Europe had left its medieval agrarian system and entered in the 'burgher plutocracy of the merchant-capitalist or bourgeois middle class'. Thus, a fragmented world had largely been explored and a global linkage setup. This global network was largely colonized and commercially exploited by the big powers. The stage was nearly set for the operation of imperialism and colonialism. The industrialized countries required markets for their manufacturers, secures for the supply of raw materials to feed their industries. These they found in the countries of Asia, Africa and South America where industrial revolution had not occurred. Imperialism arose in the industrialized countries to the needs of the imperialist countries. By the early years of the twentieth century, the imperialist countries had succeeded through war, manipulation and the deception in establishing their direct or indirect domination over almost all the countries of Asia, Africa and South America. Gradually there was a change in the shape and nature of exploitation of countries which had already fallen under colonial rule. British rule over India, for example, was no longer used to serve the interests of a trading company but acting as solid hands of the world wide British imperialism. At the time of historic trial of Warren Hastings, Edmund Burk said, “The East India Company did not seem to be merely a company formed for the extension of the British Commerce but in reality a delegation of the whole power and sovereignty of the Kingdom sent into the East.” Again, the then Director of the Company declared: “To acquire
political privilege was their first ambition, their second that as few as possible should enjoy it."  

Within a hundred years after the battle of Plassey, the British succeeded in subjugating all the Indian States. During the period from 1772 to 1805, the first three Governors-General, Warren Hastings, Cornwallis and Wellesley, added vast territories to the British possessions in India and established their control over many Indian States. The Indian powers who gave a tough fight to the British were the rulers of Mysore, Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan and the Marathas. The British conflict with them lasted many decades and a number of wars were fought. Tipu Sultan, the noted enemy of the British, tried to secure assistance from France and other countries. At last, he was killed in a battle in 1799 and a part of his kingdom was annexed and a descendant of the original ruler installed as the Raja of truncated Mysore. Besides this, the British had also adopted a new strategy of subsidiary alliance. By the rule, an Indian ruler entering the subsidiary alliance had to maintain British troops in his state and could not have independent relations with any other state. The Nizam of Hyderabad signed this treaty in 1798 and the Nawab of Awadh in 1801. After the death of leaders like Mahajaji Sindhia and Nana Pandnis, the British took full advantage of the in-fighting among the Marathas whose power was shattered. Peshwa Baji Rao II has entered into a subsidiary treaty in 1802 and Sindhia and Bhonsle in 1803. By 1805, the British had become the paramount power in India.

It took the British another fifty years to establish their domination over the entire country. It is said earlier that Industrial Revolution provided a new impetus to the policy of British expansion in India. The Marathas, whose power had been broken earlier, were finally subjugated in 1818 when an attempt by Peshwa Baji Rao II and some other Maratha Chiefs to regain their power but was finally defeated. The British also succeeded in managing plunderers called the ‘Pindaris’, mostly former soldiers of Indian States, who had become a menace to the British territories. The Rajput States, which had been dominated by the Marathas earlier also surrendered to the British. Amirs of Sind were defeated and
Sind was annexed by Charles Napier in 1843. Simultaneously, the British had maintained friendly relations with Ranjit Singh, the ruler of Punjab. But after Ranjit Singh, the Punjab had become rebel and engaged in war with British and finally was annexed with British Empire in 1849. The British gave away Jammu and Kashmir which has been a part of Punjab to Golab Singh for Rs. 50 Lakhs. Lord Dalhousie, the Governor-General from 1848 to 1856, annexed many Indian States which has been under indirect British control. Awadh was annexed in 1856. Many other small states were annexed by applying ‘Doctrine of Lapse’. By 1856, almost two-third of India has passed under the direct rule of Britain. The rest of the country was under British control though Indian Princes.

Now, British rulers, in the name of administrative measures designed a new policy to expand and consolidated their hold over the country and economically exploited her. In the beginning, the administration of British territories in India, divided into the Presidencies of Bengal, Madras and Bombay, was entirely in the hands of the East India Company. This was a period of naked plunder, physical torture and rampant corruption by the Company and its officials. Gradually, through various acts of the British Parliament, particularly the Regulating Act of 1773 and the Pitt’s India Act of 1784, the British Governor acquired control over the Company’s administration and policies in India. In this way systematic exploitation of Indian resources had started. Now, the Governor-General, the Chief British authority in India, ruled the country with the help of arm, the Civil Servant and the police. Indians were excluded from all higher posts in three administrative sections. Thus, the British rule resulted in the drain of Indian wealth to Britain, the destruction of old agrarian system and the impoverishment of the peasantry, the ruination of Indian craftsmen and the transformation of India into a market for British manufacturers and a supplier of raw materials.

In this way, a new phase of Indian history began with the establishment of British rule. For the first time, India was subjugated by a foreign power and was ruled in the interest of another country. Previously, there had been foreign
invasions and they had become the rulers. But they did not rule in the interest of their original homeland. But, under British rule, India became a subject country serving the interests of a far-away foreign land. And truly speaking, it was not just a political subjugation, but one that shattered the existing political, economic and social structure of the country, but also disrupted its natural historical development.

Though the British domination over India was over, but the rulers met with stiff resistance from the Indian people right from the beginning. Hardly one year after the battle of Plassey, some localized armed revolt started. The loss of power by the Indian Princes, nobles, zamindars, jobless officials, soldiers and craftsmen of the Indian states; landless farmers and deprived tribal rose up in revolt in every part of the country at different times. They were often joined by the disbanded soldiers of former Indian rulers. There were also mutinies by the sepoys. In some places, the people resorted to hartals to resist new taxes. Though some of them persisted over long time to suppress, but they did not pose a serious challenge.

Following resistances took part in various parts of India between 1763 and 1856:

1. **Sanjyasi Bidroho** (1763-1860) in Dhaka (1763), Rajshahi (1763-64), Cooch Bihar (1766), Patna (1767), Jalpaiguri and Rangpur (1766-1776), Furnea (1770-71), Mymensingh (1773).
2. **Chakma Revolt** in Chittagong (1776-89).
3. **Chuar Peasant Revolt** in Midnapore (1799).
4. **Khasi Bidroho** (1788).
5. **Poligras Bidroho** in South India 1795-1805.
6. **Naik Bidroho** in Midnapore (1810-16).
7. **Rohilla Bidroho** in Bareilly (1816).
8. **Paik Revolt** in Cuttack (1817-18).
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10. Mer Bidroho in Merwara (1891-21).
13. Ramosis Bidroho in Mymensingh (1825-34).
15. Garo Bidroho in Mymensingh (1825-34).
17. Wahabi Bidroho in Bengal, Bihar and Punjab (1830-61).
18. Bhumji Bidroho in Manbhum (1832).
23. Bundela Bidroho in Sagar (1842).
25. Khonda Bidroho in Orissa (1842).
27. Abor Bidroho in North Eastern India (1848).
30. Umarzai Bidroho in Bhagalpur (1855).

The First War of Independence, 1857

The most widespread armed uprising which shook the foundations of the British rule in India took place in 1857. The accumulating hatred against British rule which had resulted in numerous, though localized, outbreaks burst forth in a mighty rebellion in 1857. The dispossessed rulers of Indian States, the nobles and the zamindars who had been deprived of their lands, the Indian soldiers of British Army in India and the vast masses of peasants, artisans and others who had been
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exploited and ruined by British economic policies and had been rising in revolt in their isolated pockets, were now united by the common aim of overthrowing the British rule. The Imperialists called it just a Sepoy Mutiny which occurred at Barrackpore, near Calcutta, where some Indian sepoys revolted in 1857 against the superior British soldiers for various atrocities. But it soon spread far and wide like wild fire, involving all sorts of people, making it the War of Independence. Naturally, the Indian historians hailed it as the first War of Independence. The major centres of the revolt, besides Delhi, where some of the fiercest battles were fought were Kanpur, Lucknow, Bareilly, Bundelkhand and Arrah. Among the prominent leaders of the uprising were Nana Sahib, Tantia Tope, Bakht Khan, Azimullah Khan, Rani Lakshmi Bai, Begum Hazrat Mahal, Kunwar Singh, Maulavi Ahmadullah, Behadur Khan and Rao Tula Rao.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engel followed the uprising of 1857 with great interest. They wrote a series of articles for the New York Daily Tribune on the major events of the uprising - its causes, suppression and its effects, which were published in Moscow in 1959 under the title The First Indian War of Independence, 1857-1859. The one, amongst the articles published on 31 July, 1857, Marx wrote, “By and by, there ooze out other facts able to convince even John Bull himself that what he considers a military mutiny is in truth a national revolt.”

The Beginning of the War

By 1856, the British became the masters of the whole of India. Not only did they deprive Indians politically and economically but also had hurt the religious feelings of the people. It happened on 23 January, 1857 when the sepoys of Dum Dum in Calcutta were ordered to use Enfield rifles, the cartridges of which were greased with the fat of cows and pigs. The sepoys had to remove the greased covers of the cartridges with their teeth before loading them into the rifles. Both the Hindus and the Muslims resented using these cartridges because they felt that the English were defiling their religions. As a result an Indian sepoy
at Barrackpore killed two British officers in anger. That sepoy was hanged to death on April 8, 1857. This news reached other places such as Meerut, Delhi, Kanpur, Jhansi, Lucknow, Faizabad and Arrah in Bihar. Everywhere common men protested and finally revolt started.

**Causes of the outbreak**

A number of political, socio-religious, economic and military causes were responsible for creating discontent which led to the struggle.

**Military Causes**

In 1856, the ‘General Service Enlistment Act’ was passed by the British Parliament which disregarded the feelings of the Indian troops. By this act Indian soldiers were unhappy with their employers as they were looked down upon as inferiors. There was great inequality of treatment with regard to salary, designation and promotion between Indian and British soldiers. With regard to regional provinces, the Bengal Army is consisted mainly of Oudh. The annexation of Oudh and the unfair treatment to Bahadur Shan Zafar, the emperor, by the British had hurt the sentiments of soldiers of Oudh and many other Indian sepoys.

Primarily Indians were of the belief that the British were invincible. But the defeat of British in the First Afghan War removed that illusion. Also, in 1857, there were 40,000 British soldiers and two lakhs Indian soldiers. This numerical strength of the Indian soldiers also strengthened their spirit of revolt obliterating their sense of inferiority complex.

**Socio-Religious Causes**

The British brought about several social changes like the prohibition of the practice of *Sati*, and infanticide and allowing marriage of widows. Side by side, in the nineteenth century, the British introduced Western education and
established schools and other academic institutions. Though these changes were strongly advocated by Indian reformers, the common people looked upon these changes as a comprehensive British strategy to destabilize the Indian religious customs and to replace them with Christian beliefs and practices. The implementation of western education reduced the importance of the Pandits and Maulavis who had been running traditional educational institutions. On the other hand, the British failed to understand that the customs and practices were ingrained into the social fabric and these could not be changed overnight by a legal ordinance. The orthodox people also viewed with suspicion and distrust the rapid expansion of railways and telegraphs. Furthermore, Government imposed taxes on property belonging to temples and mosques for which Indians began to feel that the British were favouring conversion to Christianity.

**Economic Causes**

The East India Company made huge profits at the expense of the people of India. They purchased textiles, indigo, spices and food grains from India at a low cost and sold them abroad at exorbitant prices. By the pressure of the British Government to forbid the sale of Indian textiles in England, the East India Company put restrictions on the import of Indian textiles besides imposing heavy import duties on such goods. All these were necessary for England as a consequence of Industrial Revolution, which developed numerous British textile industries in England. Thus, gradually, India became an economic colony of industrial England and Indian handicrafts and cottage industries had nearly collapsed. Regarding this exploitation and draining of wealth, John Sullivan, the then President of the Board of Revenue, Madras, aptly remarked,

"Our system acts very much like a sponge, drawing up all good things from the banks of the Ganges, and squeezing them down on the banks of the Thames."  

Along with these, the Government decision for resumption of tax-free lands, and the occurrence of severe famines, crippled the life and economy of
Indian aristocracy and the people in general. With Dalhousie's policy of indiscriminate annexation of the native states, many Indians lost their jobs. They became bitter enemies of the foreign rule in India and waited for a chance to join hands with the rebels when the war of independence broke out.

**Political Causes**

The political dishonesty and greed of the British for territorial expansion generated deep hatred among Indians. Lord Dalhousie deceitfully annexed the States of Satara, Jhansi and Nagpur by using the Doctrine of Lapse. By the act, the legitimate Indian practice of adopting an heir was totally abolished. The British also had hurt the feelings of the Muslims by annexing Oudh under the pretext that the State of Oudh was not governed properly. Not only that, they also disbanded the army of the annexed states. This policy of annexation made many nobles, officers and soldiers unemployed. The British did not take into consideration the feeling of the commoners and as well as the higher strata of Indian society. They vowed to avenge themselves on the British by spreading hatred among the people at large. In this incorrigible condition Indians had somehow came to believe that the rulers in India would change after every hundred years. So, the British which had been ruling India since AD 1757 would come to an end in 1857. This belief made the people wait for the end of British rule.

**Main Events and Occurring Places of the War**

The trouble first began at Barrackpore when many Indian soldiers refused to use the greased cartridges. In March 1857, a Brahmin sepoy, named Mangal Pande refused to use the cartridges and killed two British officers and then was hanged for this act. This event caused uprisings in Meerut, Delhi, Kanpur, Lucknow, Jhansi and at other places.

In Meerut, on 8 May 1857, the Indian sepoys who refused to use those cartridges were dismissed, disgraced, stripped of their uniforms and sentenced to
ten years of imprisonment. In reaction, the Indian sepoys at Meerut openly revolted by killing the officers and releasing the imprisoned rebellions and soldiers from the jail. Thereafter, the revolting sepoys along with thousands of civilians marched to Delhi.

The British did not resist and the city of Delhi was captured by the rebels. They proclaimed the Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah Jafar as the ruler of India. The loss of Delhi lowered the prestige of the British. Sir John Nicholson, after a four month attack with the help of the loyal Sikh soldiers from Punjab succeeded in capturing Delhi. The old emperor Bahadur Shah was found guilty and was sentenced to life imprisonment and deported to Rangoon where he died in 1862.

G. S. Griffiths, who saw the emperor on the day after he had been taken prisoner, writes,

“Sitting cross-legged on a cushion placed on a common native charpoy, or bed, in the verandah of a courtyard, was the last representative of the Great Mughal dynasty. There was nothing imposing in his appearance, save a long white beard which reached to his girdle. About middle height, and upwards of seventy years old, he was dressed in white, with a conical shaped turban of the same colour and material, while at his back, two attendants stood, waving over his head large fans of peacocks’ feathers, the emblem of sovereignty – a pitiable farce in the case of one, who was already shorn of his regal attributes, a prisoner in the hands of his enemies. Not a word came from his lips, in silence he sat day and night with his eyes cast on the ground, and as though utterly oblivious of the condition in which he was placed.”

The war of independence at Kanpur was led by Nana Sahib, the adopted son of Peshwa Baji Rao II. He captured the Kanpur fort and imprisoned a large number of British men, women and children. On 17 June 1857, General Havelock recaptured Kanpur after defeating Nana Sahib. Then again Tantia Tope, a
commander of Nana Sahib's force took control of the city of Kanpur. But finally the British defeated Tantia Tope and captured the city.

Lucknow was the capital of Oudh where the revolt of the common men was led by the Begum of Oudh. In the fight, Sir Henry Lawrence and many other British soldiers died. At last, Sir Colin Campbell defeated the Indian soldiers and recaptured Lucknow in 1858.

In Central India, Rani Laxmibai of Jhansi, the great leader of Indian sepoys, occupied Gwalior. Scindias of Gwalior, Loyal to the British, fled and took refuge with the British at Agra. Sir Hugh Rose advanced towards Gwalior and in twin battle Rani of Jhansi (dressed like a man) died like a brave soldier.

In Faizabad, the revolt was led by Moulvi Ahmadullah. He aroused the Muslim community against the British and finally was killed by the British.

The war had also spread to other parts. In Bihar, it was led by Kunwar Singh, a Zamindar of Jagdishpur.

Results of the War

The War of Independence of 1857 did not succeed in achieving its aim. But it had far-reaching consequences.

In 1858, the British Parliament passed an Act for the better governance of India, by which the Government of India was transferred to the British Queen and her Parliament. Thus, the rule of the Company came to an end. This Act was made public in India by Queen Victoria's Proclamation on 1 November 1858. By the Act, Governor-General in India was also made Viceroy, and in England instead of Board of directors, one Secretary of State for India was appointed. Lord Canning became the first Viceroy.
There was a change in the policy of the new Government. In order to make Indian Princes loyal to the British, the Government assured them all treaties with the Company would be honoured, their territories would not be annexed and they were given the right to adopt sons and successors. The proclamation declared that the people of India would be eligible for all public offices irrespective of their caste, creed or colour. It also guaranteed the Indian people freedom to practice their own religious beliefs and customs. The British Government, as per this act, raised the proportion of the British army in relation to the Indian army. To curb nationalism, Indian soldiers of different communities, castes and religions were all mixed up and they were kept away in secluded places.

After the war, the economic exploitation of India by the British became paramount. In the words of R.C. Majumder, "the extinction of East India Company's rule brought in grave economic perils to India. India now became a dumping ground of British manufacturers and an almost inexhaustible field of investment of capital, for it offered unlimited scope for commercial and industrial enterprises like railways, streamers tea and coffee plantation, etc." 8

Causes of the Failure of the War

The War of 1857 became a symbol of challenge to the mighty British which could not subdue Indian's inborn desire for freedom. However, the War failed to achieve its immediate objective of ousting alien rule. For its failure historians say, the most important cause was the lack of efficient planning and central organization guiding the whole movement. A number of isolated outbreaks without any link or common plan among them could hardly succeed against the well organized British forces, directed by a strong will and determination by a central organization which could command the resources of India and later of Britain. The fighters fought in various places like an unruly mob. As decided by the Nana Sahib, the War was supposed to have started on
May 31, 1857, but it started much before the fixed date. Though Rani Laxmibai, Nana Sahib and Tantia Tope were good patriots, they were not the leaders who could lead a War on an all India basis. Also, the War lacked commitment on the part of all segments of the Indian society. It had no single aim for achieving success in the war. In fact, certain people wanted to set up Maratha Empire, while others wanted to revive the Mughal Empire. The rulers of the Nabha, Patiala, Nizam, Scindia and other ruling chiefs did not join it. Even the soldiers from Sikh, Rajput and Gorkha battalions helped the British to suppress the War.

The British, on the other hand, had far better resources in men, money and materials than the Indian soldiers. They had control over the seas, better communication system, better arms and ammunition. The revolutionaries lacked those facilities. Apparently, the War was a failure. But in its apparent failure, it contained the seed of ultimate success. Historian R.C. Majumdar aptly said, "It has been said that Julius Caesar, when dead, was more powerful than when he was alive. The same thing may be said about the War of 1857. Whatever might have been its original character, it soon became a symbol of challenges to the mighty British power in India. It remained a shining example before the nascent nationalism in India in its struggle for freedom from the British yoke." 9

**The Rise of Nationalism: First Phase**

The revolt of 1857 was ruthlessly suppressed by the British, but the spirit of freedom, which had animated the Revolt, could not be suppressed. The memory of this uprising further inspired some localized armed struggle like Indigo disturbances in Bengal (1859-61), the *Santhal* outbreak in Bihar (1871-72) and Kuka non-cooperation movement in Punjab.

All these movements were confined to small areas and involved only some sections of Indian society. But towards the end of the nineteenth century
and in the beginning of the twentieth century, fresh hope and faith had dawned in India. Western contact had acquainted Indians with democratic ideas of the West, and popular methods for their realization. The example of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour had inspired the younger generation. The rise of Japan in the East and China's successful boycott of American goods had electrified them and taught them a method by which they could resist the mighty British imperialism. The practical application of these methods came a few years later.

The following factors were responsible for promoting the growth and development of national awakening. The role of British as ruler as well as exploiter had remained the foremost factor. Another factor was the re-discovery of India's glorious past, rise of politically conscious middle class and various reform movements. In this favourable anti-British climate, suppressive Anti-Indian Acts created a gulf between the British and the Indians.

As rulers, the British imparted Western education in India through the medium of English to serve their own administrative and political ends. But it produced results quite contrary to their expectations. Indian intelligentsia was also concerned for western education and appealed British for doing so. The Western education had widened the horizon of Indians and gave the educated Indians a rational, secular, democratic and national outlook. It was through this English language that Indians from different parts of the country could meet and exchange their ideas. English language gave them linguistic unity and it became the *lingua franca* and the vehicle of national awakening. Because of their contact with the Western world, Indians came to know about the national movements of the Europeans. The slogan, 'Liberty Equality, and Fraternity' impressed them. Revolutionary ideas of liberal thinkers like Rousseau, Mazzini and Thomas Paine brought about social awareness and national consciousness among Indians.

As exploiter, the British followed the policy of economic exploitation in India neglecting nation-building. Being proud of their race and culture they looked down upon Indians and did not like to mix with them. Their rule in India
neither allowed the Indian capital to grow, nor did they permit Indian agriculture or industry to flourish. In agricultural field, they collected land revenues without looking after the welfare of the peasants. The British exploited Indian agricultural production by shipping raw materials to England at a cheap rate, and in return, machine-made goods made in England, were supplied to India. In this way they created a class of Zamindars who merely collected rent and paid it to the Government, after keeping their own share – thus made cultivation uneconomical. The British also changed the land laws. Under these laws a moneylender could charge a high rate of interest and even transferred the land in his own name in case of non-payment of loan, which was not the usual procedure before. Thus, in this way India became the poorest country in this part of globe and village economy, which was largely self-sufficient, broke down completely.

The British economic policy not only adversely affected the peasants but it also brought about industrial stagnation. Instead of encouraging native capitalists to set up industries, the Government assisted the British industrialist to do so. They monopolized Jute, tea and coffee industries and made use of cheap Indian labour without giving them rights. Lord Lytton abolished the import duties that virtually ruined the Indian small-scale industries, specially the cottage industries – hence it increased unemployment. Also, the second Afghan War had cost the Indian treasury a lot. As a result, there were frequent famines in Orissa, Mysore, Bombay and Punjab in the year 1866 and in 1877. These man-made famines gave big gains to the Government and the greedy business community. Lord Lytton held his famous Delhi Durbar in 1877 at a time when the people of South India were suffering from severe famine.

Similarly, in order to facilitate shipment of raw materials at a low cost, the British constructed roads, railways and introduced regular postal system. Lord Dalhousie first promoted railway construction between Bombay and Thane. Though these introductions were mainly for the British commercial interest with a discriminating manner to the Indians in all respects, yet it proved a blessing for the Indians as its various parts, separated by rivers, hills, deserts and mountains,
were connected with one another. In this way, regional feelings began to
disappear and people felt, for the first time, that they belonged to one country and
had one destiny — hence mobilize public opinion on a national scale.

In the political field, the British created a hatred amongst Indians
following an ugly policy of 'Divide and Rule' for de-stabilizing the integrity
between the Hindus and Muslims after the Sepoy War. In the process, the British
first victimized the Muslims and favoured the Hindus and then reversed the
policy.

In the administrative field, Lord Lytton declared the Arms Act by which
keeping of arms and their trades without license a crime, but the European were
exempted from the law. On this, Surendra Nath Banerjea said, 'The Arms Act
imposed on us a badge of racial inferiority.' Even in the matter of justice,
Europeans were given special treatment. G. O. Trevelyan, A British writer wrote
in 1864, "The testimony of a single one of our countrymen has more weight with
the court than that of any number of Hindoos, a circumstance which puts a
terrible instrument of power into the hands of an unscrupulous and grasping
Englishman." 10

In this way, educated Indians felt disillusioned with the ways of the
British Government run in India. Their frustration became worse with the
recruitment policy of the Government to the Civil Services. Furthermore, the
expulsion of Surendra Nath Banerjea, a brilliant young Indian from the ICS
added discontent. He organized a political body known as the Indian Association
in 1876 and toured extensively in India and roused political awakening among
people.

At the same time, by virtue of some enlightened English and other
Europeans like Sir William Jones, James Princep, Alexander Cunningham, Sir
John Marshall and Maxmuller showed to Indians the greatness of their
predecessors like the Mauryans, Imperial Guptas, Chalukyas and Pallavas. The
discovery of Mohenjodaro, Harappa and brilliant art traditions found at Ajanta, Ellora, Mahabalipuram and Orissa drew attention to the Indians to its rich cultural heritage and roused the feelings of self-confidence, patriotism, and nationalism.

This sense of national feelings was first felt by the Indian middle class who realized that under the British rule they will remain as second class citizen and could not make any progress in life. Regarding this, Indian Press, namely The Amrita Bazar Patrika, the Hindu, the Patriot, the Maratha, the Kesari, The Azad, the Indian Mirror, the Tribune, the Advocate and the Kohinoor were aptly raised their helping hands towards them, expressing their reactions to unjust measures and made possible a dialogue with the rulers. Surely, it played a vital role in fostering political ideas as well as patriotic sentiments amongst the people.

From the second half of the nineteenth century, India witnessed some movements initiated by Indian national leaders that impressed upon the minds of the people about the greatness of India’s ancient philosophy and culture and inspired them to have self-confidence, self-respect and national regeneration.

The aforesaid events and causes made the overall political scenario favourable for the Indians who realized that without the consciousness for a strong national organization, they could not achieve their objective against a superior and trained military power with money and means at its disposal. This resentment was heightened during Lord Lytton’s Viceroyalty (1876-1880). In order to suppress the public opinion, Lytton passed the ‘Vernacular Press Act’ in 1878. The Act placed many restrictions on the publication of newspapers and thereby hurt the self-respect of the Indians.

The ‘Ilbert Bill’ controversy during the regime of moderate and pro-Indian Lord Ripon further embittered relations between the British and the Indians. Sir Percy Ilbert, Law Member of the Viceroy’s Executive Council introduced a Bill for the purpose of removing judicial inequalities in the powers of the Indian and the British Magistrates. But owing to British opposition and
hostile propaganda, the Bill could not be passed and was substantially modified to accommodate British interests. Lord Ripon became very unpopular among the British officials in India and had to be replaced.

In this way, Indians were disgusted at the racial bitterness and injustice of the British. Feeling the necessity of political organizations they started those before Sepoy Mutiny with a minimum objective to unite the people for a common cause and to make them conscious of the ills prevalent in the British rule. Similarly, the second half of the 19th century also witnessed the establishment of some localized political organizations which were the forerunners of the Indian National Congress founded in 1885.

In 1865, Rajnarayan Bose, Jyotirindranath Tagore and Nabagopal Mitra had founded the Patriots' Association in Bengal.

Dadabhai Naoroji, the Grand Old man of India, made England the centre of his political activities. In 1866, he organized the East India Association (in London) to make British conscious about their faulty economic policies in India and for that grievances of the people.

In 1866 also, Rajnarayan Bose founded the Society for the promotion of National Feeling (Jatiya Gaurab Sampadani Sabha). In the subsequent year, a National Paper, a National School, a National Society and a National Gymnasium were started by Nabagopal Mitra. Being inspired by Rajnarayan Bose, Nabagopal Mitra also established in 1867 the Jatiya Mela, later renamed the Hindu Mela. In 1870, the National Society (Jatio Sabha) was founded to spread and popularize the objects of Hindu Mela.

In 1870, the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha was founded by the nationalists of Poona under the leadership of Justice Ranade.
By the active initiation of Sisir Kumar Ghosh and Sambhuchandra Mukherjee, the Indian League was founded in 1875. It merged with the Indian Association in 1870.

The Indian Association was founded in 1876 by Surendranath Banerjea. It was the first organized political body to express Indian disillusionment with British administration and to create public opinion on political matters and to evolve a common political programme. Among other things, its chief demands were reform of the Indian Civil Service Examination, (b) repeal of the Arms Act, (c) repeal of the Vernacular Press Act and (d) protection of the rights of the tenants against landlords and British planters. Encouraged by the response Surendranath had received in different parts of the country, he conceived the idea of an All India National Conference. The Conference met in Calcutta in December 1885. This was the first political organization of an all-India character.

Birth of Indian National Congress

The birth of Indian National Congress towards the end of the year 1885 started a new era in the political scenario of dependent India. Undoubtedly this birth was preceded by a fairly long period of evolution of Indian national consciousness. Politically conscious Indians were then becoming increasingly aware of the necessity for an all-India political organization to ventilate their grievances and voice their demands, and some of their leaders in different parts of the country, particularly in Calcutta, Bombay, Pune and Madras, had almost simultaneously begun to plan for setting up of such an organisation. Added to this were some sporadic rebellions caused by various suppressive acts and economic exploitation by the rulers. Behind the numerous causes of the birth of Congress, there is a general consensus of opinion that the reactionary measures of Lord Litton and the Anglo-Indian agitation over the Ilbert Bill accelerated the process which ultimately led to its foundation. However, it is not an easy task to trace the genesis of the Indian National Congress as a distinct organisation. But whatever
may be the genesis, the credit of organizing the Indian National Congress undoubtedly goes to a large extent to Allan Octavian Hume, a retired member of the Indian Civil Service and son of Joseph Hume, a fearless Scottish patriot and founder of the Radical Party in England.

In the book *History of the Indian National Congress*, Pattabhi Sitaramyya said, “It is a mystery as to who originated this idea of an All India Congress.” According to him incidents and occurrences like Great Durbar of 1877, the International Exhibition in Calcutta, Theosophical Convention at Madras and the formation of the Indian Union started by Mr. Hume supposed to have been instrumental in convening the Congress. Pattabhi Sitaramayya also wrote, “Whatever the origin, and whoever the originator of the idea, we come to this conclusion that the idea was in the air, that the need of such an organization was being felt, that Mr. A. O. Hume took the initiative, that influenced the thought of the thoughtful Indians in the North and the South, the East and the West, assumed a definite shape and became a practical programme of action.”

Regarding the strange circumstances for the birth of Congress, Gopal Krishna Gokhale said, “No Indian could have started The Indian National Congress, because the British officials would not have allowed such a movement to come into existence.” So, it was left to a Briton, and an ICS official to ‘father’ the Congress organization in 1885.

On April 3, 1892, the Amritabazar Patrika wrote, ‘Mr. Home founded the Congress and brought all the diverse peoples of India to unite, to agree and to work for the common good. It was the theosophists who developed Mr. Hume and he has accomplished the task which would have been considered impossibility a few years ago.”

A. O. Hume during his official career in India had formed strong views in favour of an early attainment of the self-government by India and was sympathetic for the aspirations and demands of the Indians. In 1950’s as Deputy
Collector of Etawah (Uttar Pradesh) he introduced Indian education, setting up no fewer than 180 elementary schools. And then also after the event of 1857 when Government disapproved of the efforts to cultivate the 'native mind', Hume launched in 1859 an Indian language journal titled 'The People's Friend.' Hume was deeply inspired by genuine feeling of sympathy for the welfare of India by setting up a political organization like Congress. And it is also true he was certainly not inspired by the same national sentiment and patriotic urge of the political thinkers of Bengal and other parts of India.

As a bureaucrat Hume was utterly overwhelmed by the misery and sufferings of the people when he toured different provinces and was also horrified by a memorandum prepared by 30,000 reporters contained in seven large volumes which shows that about 15 months before the end of Lord Lytton's administration (1876 – 1880), the general discontent of the Indians threatened the fate of the Government. This terrible unrest, he assumed would lead to some violent outbreak and a person like Hume, who had access to the Government files could only do something and thus avoid a catastrophe. So, he met with the next Viceroy Lord Ripon on December 1864 and informed him of his views and opinions.

Here, we may mention that during his service period Hume was marked as an eccentric and a rebel, who superseded his juniors, was threatened by Lord Northbrook, suffered demotion in 1879 and ultimately retired from service in 1882. But instead of returning to England he settled down in Simla and actively took part in Indian politics. Being convinced of the situation Hume urged to take some definite action which is necessary to counter the growing unrest. After his retirement from the Civil Service, he, on 1 March 1883 had addressed an open letter to the graduates of the Calcutta University regarding the formation of an organization that would work for the material, moral and political advancement of the people in India. He wrote, "Whether in the individual or the nation, all vital progress must spring from within, and it is you, her most cultured and enlightened minds, her most favoured sons that your country must look for the
initiative."15 Hume then stressed upon the necessity of an organization. "What is needed is union, organization, and to secure these, an association is required to promote the mental, moral, social and political generation of the people of India. If only fifty men, good and true, can be found to join as founders, the thing can be established and the future development will be comparatively easy."16

As a well-wisher and genuine part of British imperialism Hume wanted for its successful continuation. In the first week of August 1886, Hume met and discussed with next liberal Viceroy Lord Dufferin at Simla. In the thirteenth of the same month he wrote a letter to Lord Dufferin, "I only want you, dear Lord Dufferin, to understand – to think for yourself – you, who have read and realized history – to turn all these mounting discontent."17 Based on these facts, some historians suggested that the idea of Congress was mooted in the course of that last Ripon-Hume interview in Bombay and got shape after the Dufferin-Hume talk in Simla. Another opinion is that by this time Madras Mahajana Sabha and Indian Association of Bengal had been mobilizing Indian public opinion in favour of political and economic reforms. But what Hume aimed at was 'The fusion into one national whole', all the different elements of Indian nationalism.

Between December 1884 and March 1885, Hume had prolonged talks with eminent Indian nationalist leaders in Calcutta, Bombay, Pune and Madras. But to Hume, Bombay leaders like William Wedderburn, Dadabhai Naoroji, M. G. Rande, Pherozeshah Mehta and D.E. Wacha were more faithful and reliable than Calcutta leaders for launching a new political movement in India. He discussed with them his plans for holding an annual conference of representative men from all parts of India, organizing a central national association for directing political activity throughout the country, preparing a charter of demands to be presented to the British Parliament and also forming an Indian Party among the members of that parliament. No doubt, behind this Endeavour Lord Duffrin was a true inspiration.
On March 1885, Hume laid the foundation of the Indian National Union as a central movement in which 72 delegates came forward from all parts of India. In a short period, local committees of the Union sprang up quickly in Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madras, Bengal and Uttar Pradesh. The first meeting of the Indian National Union was arranged to be held at Poona in 25 December 1885. But owing to an epidemic of plague the venue was shifted to Bombay (Gokuldas Tejpal College) and the meeting lasted three days from December 28 to 31, in 1885. In this meeting Hume advocated the setting up of an organization, which among other things, would aim at the ‘political regeneration of the people of India.’ But according to William Wedderburn, his biographer, “Hume was ready to start his reform propaganda on the social side, it was apparently by Lord Dufferin’s advice that he took up the work of a political organization, as the matter first to be dealt with.”

The meeting was presided over by W.C. Bonerjee. In the meeting, at the suggestion made by Dadabhai Naoraj, the name of the Indian National Union was changed to Indian National Congress as it was looking to the importance of the national movements and the wide support it had required in all parts of India. In his opening address W.C. Bonerjee explained the objective of the Congress which were the promotion of personal intimacy and friendship among all the earnest workers in the cause of the country, the eradication by direct, friendly and personal intercourse of all possible race, creed or provincial prejudices, on the one hand, and development and consolidation of national unity on the other. In this session, Hume moved a resolution for the long life of Queen and advised his fellowmen in Congress to look upon Lord Dufferin not as an enemy but as a friend and well-wisher. And Lord Dufferin also maintained an attitude of indifference towards the Indian National Congress, but desisted from maintaining official link as it criticized the Government on certain issues.

It may be mentioned here that Mr. Hume did not join the Indian National Conference organized by Surendranath Banerjea, as this had very advanced political views. On the contrary, his organization consisted of moderate Indians who were loyal to the British crown. But as All India National Conference more
or less possessed the same objective with Indian National Congress, thereby it merged in Congress in 1886. In this way, Indian National Congress became a national organization representing the interests of the Indians, irrespective of their caste, creed and communities, gave self-confidence and leadership to the people to fulfil their aspirations to shun the yoke of foreign rule. It soon attracted wide membership and held its sessions annually in different cities to rouse public opinion in favour of its aim.

The main aims and objectives of the Congress, as enumerated by its President W.C. Bonerjee were:
1. Promotion of close relations between nationalistic workers from different parts of the country.
2. Development and consolidation of the feeling of national unity, irrespective of caste, religion or province.
3. Formulation of popular demands and their presentation before the Government.
4. Training and organization of public opinion in the country.

The second session of the Congress was held in Calcutta under the presidency of Dadabhai Naoroji. Badruddin Tayabji was the President during its third session in Madras. The number of delegates in the fourth session of the Congress held in Ahmedabad rose to 1248.

In the beginning, the programme of the Congress was rather modest and confined to the demands of administrative reforms, which in the form of resolutions, was submitted to the Government for consideration. Such demands were in respect of the following:
1. Simultaneous examination in India and England for the Indian Civil Service.
2. Provision of more facilities for education.
3. Employment of more Indians to higher posts.
4. Appointment of Indians to the Executive Council.
5. Reduction of military expenditure.
6. Expansion of the Provincial and Central Legislative Assemblies.

At the initial stages, the British Government was friendly with the Congress as it would act as a safety valve for popular discontent. But gradually, the British began to distrust the Congress as its hold on the masses increased year by year. Even they wanted to suppress the Congress and threatened Hume to deport from India. To counter this hostility, Hume initiated effective publicity about the Congress in England. He was supported by Dadabhai Naoroji, then living in England, who designated to set up a branch of Congress office in London in 1887. In 1894, Hume himself left for England to strengthen this activity further.

**Moderate Congress**

Moderate Congress leaders believed in loyalty to the British Crown and thought that the British presence was a blessing and *sine qua non* for political progress of India. They thought that, after centuries of political disunity, social stagnation and economic backwardness, they had now an opportunity to collect from the West the spirit of reform and progress like English education and scientific and technological developments, hence winning India her proper place. For this, they looked for guidance from the English nation, a nation not only one of the greatest on earth, but also, they thought, one of the most progressive.

From the very inception the Moderates of the Indian National Congress, under some political compulsions had maintained friendly relations with the British and relied on the pledges made by them. Their language of demand was extremely cautious. They believed that in the interest of good administration, some means should be provided, not for transferring to Indian hands the right of making decisions, but to secure some representations of Indian opinion in the Executive Councils in England and in India. They thought that once the British...
would understand the mind and heart of an Indian, they would do what was right in India. In this way, they believed in the sense of justice, honesty and integrity of the British. The philosophy of the Moderates can be summarized in the words of Badruddin Tayabji, who said in 1887, "Be moderate in your demands, just in your criticism, correct in your facts and logical in your conclusion." Believing in patience and reconciliation rather than in violence, Moderates had faith only in constitutional agitation, their chief demand being self-government within the British regime. Regarding this, K.T. Telang, a noted moderate leader clarified, "We have not asked for parliamentary institutions which England has got after many centuries of discipline, we have not asked for the power of the purse, and we have not asked that the British Executive should be brought under subjection to us." Surendra Nath Banerjea was more emphatic in saying, "We do not think India is ripe for it, yet nor do we want Home Rule (by Indians), we only press the reform of the legislative Councils which impose taxes and make the laws." Dadabhai Naoroji observed in 1886, "If we honestly expect the English nation will do its duty towards us, we must prove ourselves worthy by showing that we are never unreasonable, never violent, and never uncharitable. We must show that we are earnest, but temperate, cognizant of our rights, but respectful of those of others......"

The programmes of Moderates from 1885 to 1905 were mainly confined to the following demands:

**Economic Reforms** – The early Congress leaders especially Dadabhai Naoroji blamed the imperial Government for all the economic ills of India. The main points for reformation of the economic backwardness and stagnation of agriculture and industry were –

- Eradication of poverty by increasing industrial production, and by giving protection and encouragement to Indian industries. The Indian leaders protested against the exemption of duty for British goods.
- A reduction in land revenue and protection of the rights of the peasants against the high-handedness of the landlords.
Abolition of salt tax because it hit the poor and the lower middle classes hard.

A reduction in expenditure on the army and on the British civil servants.

Utilization of the money thus saved for the welfare projects in India.

Protecting exploitation of Indian labour in British colonies abroad.

Some radical and extremist members even advocated the boycott of foreign cloth and made a bonfire of it in Pune in 1896 to express their disillusionment over the inadequacy of the Indian Council Act of 1892.

**Civil Rights** – The Moderates opposed the curbs imposed on freedom of speech, press and association. Obtaining these rights had been one of the main tenets of the Indian national Congress right from the beginning. When in 1897, Bal Gangadhar Tilak as well as other leaders were arrested for making offensive speeches, the whole Congress stood by them.

**Constitutional Reforms** – Rather than asking for self-government the Moderates sought that the administration of the country should have more representation and co-operation of the people.

- They demanded the expansion and reform of the Legislative Council. There should be an increase in membership and powers of these Councils.
- Members of the Legislative Councils should be directly elected by the people. The Indian Council Act, passed in 1892, failed to satisfy the Indians, as the majority of the members of these Councils were the official members and the real power was not given to the Indians.
- There should be complete separation between the executive and judicial branches of administration.

**Administrative Reforms** – According to the Congress leaders the administrative system was oppressive, inefficient and corrupt.
They favoured Indianization of civil services. They recommended that educated Indians should be appointed to higher posts, which was then occupied mostly by the British.

- They demanded that there should be simultaneous examination in England and in India for recruitment to the Indian Civil Service.
- They demanded the replacement of the Arms Act.
- They urged the development of banking, medical and health facilities as well as educational facilities for people.

As time passed, the Moderates demand became comprehensive and definite. By 1905, Gopal Krishna Gokhle was ascertaining that the evils of a bureaucratic government could no longer be tolerated and goal of the Congress was that India should be governed in the interests of the Indian themselves by that type of government which existed in the self-governing colonies of the British empire. Gokhle explained the policy and programme of the moderates at a meeting in Allahabad and said, "The Indian middle class, at one time so well disposed to British rule, was daily growing more sullen and disgruntled, resenting the non-fulfillment of solemn promises, feeling keenly the humiliation of its subject-position and determined to attain for itself a political status worthy of the self-respect of civilized people." Gokhle wanted his country to take its proper place among the great nations of the world in every walk of life, which was possible, he believed, within the British Empire, as the French in Canada and the Boers in South Africa had done.

The achievement of the Moderates is disputed. Some opine that they failed to achieve their objectives specially of acquiring roots among the Indian masses and to mobilize them. Historian V.D. Mahajan criticized them as being the leaders of the intellectuals and said, "The basic weakness of the Moderates lay in their narrow social base. Their movement did not have wide appeal. The area of their influence was limited to urban community. As they did not have the support of the masses, they declared that the time was not ripe for throwing a challenge to the foreign rulers. This was likely to invite premature repression."
The critics of the Moderates accused them of using half-hearted measures and were treated with contempt by the British. Their methods have been criticized as those of beggary and speech-making without the support of firm determination and follow-up actions. Regarding this, Lala Lajpat Rai had said, "After more than 20 years of more or less futile agitation for concessions and redress of grievances, they had received stones in place of bread."\(^{25}\)

But in a balanced historical perspective, the achievements of the Moderates were significant. According to some scholars they were not blind supporters of the British, and their gentle exercising of patience was not necessarily a sign of weakness. They were the early nationalists who sowed the seed of nationalism. Credit goes to them for educating Indians for a common national struggle and for arousing in them some sort of political consciousness. In short, they popularized the ideals of democracy and civil liberties among the people.

From a critical appreciation, success and failure of the Moderates are to be determined by ways they followed and by the activities they performed. In addition to that, their relation with the Extremists is also a countable factor.

After explaining the Moderate creed and strategy in Allahabad Session, Gopal Krishna Gokhle exposed the weakness of the Extremist doctrine. He added that the implications of an industrial boycott advocated by the Extremists were grave enough as the people would have to buy indigenous articles of poor quality, though costlier than imported goods. He furthermore added that it was impossible within a short time to set up National Schools and Colleges on a scale sufficient to replace institutions aided or run by the Government. The boycott of local bodies, legislative councils and government, was likewise, in his opinion, simply suicidal. The object of the Indian people should be, Gokhle said, "to seek steadily to increase what little power of administration and control they possessed, rather than risk loosing what they had secured after years of agitation and struggle."\(^{26}\)
But the difficulty with the Moderates was that they were victims of inner contradictions. While on one hand their criticism of British administration was very civil, on the other hand, their economic analysis of the Raj was severe. And physically, by 1907 Moderate party was almost exhausted. The veteran leaders were getting old and inactive. So, the Government was not ready to respond to their demands. After Dababhai Naoroji and Pherozeshah Mehta, Gokhle became the only hope of the Moderates, but he was intensely distrusted and disliked by the British authorities for his active part in freeing Lajpat Rai from deportation.

In this way the Moderates found themselves in a tight corner as the political temperature had risen up with the emergence of Extremists and as well as British authorities doubting their bona fide. Thus, there was created a wide gulf between the aspirations of the Moderate leadership in India and the objectives of the liberal statesman in Britain which could not be bridged.

As against the lofty idealism of the Moderate leaders in India, the British were practising Machiavellianism to obstruct the dream of a united and prosperous India. Lord Minto, for example saw the safety of the Raj in the “allegiance of conservative forces... the Indian princes, the Commercial Community, the Mohammedans, and the Indian stuff of public services.” So, Indian Moderates could not stand before this divide and rule policy as Harcourt Butler, a true soldier of British imperialism, rightly said, “We require all our strength and prudence. We must make new friends. We must reward loyalty and make it pay.”

‘Extremist Challenge’

Extremism is a relative term. So in order to understand the rise of extremism in India we must follow the political activities of the early Congress which represented a new trend of thought and action of the extremists simultaneously with the Moderates in between 1905 and 1914. The Moderates influenced by the Pan-Indian nationalism and western ideas had been only
pleading with the Government for reforms and naturally there arose a number of
new leaders who were more radical in their demands and believed in a more
organized form of protests. This radical attitude of the Extremists did not of
course spring up all of a sudden; it had its incubation at least since the revolt of
1857. Some historians opine that from that time feeling of *Swadharma* and
*Swaraj* aroused in Indian mind. The Extremists called the policy of Moderates as
‘Mendicant Policy.’ Rabindranath Tagore made a concrete analysis of the
deteriorating relations between the rulers and the ruled in the article of
*Sadhana* (1893-94) which heightened the protest of the young extremists against the
mendicancy of the old. The intensity and the mode of the Moderates and
Extremists were entirely different. The main support for the Moderates had come
from the intelligentsia and the urban middle class and the Extremists had a
following of the lower middle classes, the students, workers and farmers.

Thus, many reasons were there for the rise of the Extremism in Indian
freedom struggle. It is already said that from the beginning of the twentieth
century, Moderate policy of reconciliation and co-operation was day by day
proved futile. They met three days a year, took a number of resolutions, and then
enjoyed a long spell of rest. So, politics of the Anglicized Moderates remained
silent, neutral and as part-time affair. This attitude of the Congress alienated the
common people from it. Concerning with the situation the second generation of
Congressmen questioned its moral rights to lead the liberation movement. Some
say, it was like the sons challenging the old and their outmoded philosophy of
life. The increase in military expenditure, the Tariffs cotton Duty Act of 1894 and
'96 proved the futility of the passive resistance of the Moderates. Re-acting, the
newspapers like *Bangabashi* went on to call Moderates ‘a Congress of de-
nationalized men’.29 Bal Gangadhar Tilak said, ‘political rights will have to be
fought for’.30 Following the then scenario, he would well understand that India
was being treated like pasture solely for the Europeans to feed upon. In this way,
general dissatisfaction of the common Indians towards the Moderate Congress
helped in the growth of Extremism.
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So, mind set was there in the subconscious which calling people back to their self-identification. Founded on the bedrock of Indian cultural heritage and religion, the concept of Neo-Hinduism had sought to inspire people to take pride in their past, myths and legends. But the English-educated few and the common were accomplished by Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay, Ramakrishna Paramahansa, Swami Vivekananda and Swami Dayananda. They visualized the motherland as the living embodiment of motherhood. The cult of Shakti, a new element also became very prominent. In their view, nationalism is the gospel of every nation. Believing in self-assertion and self-respect they infused Indian mind to self-sacrifice for the achievement of national salvation. Aurobindo wrote Bhavani Mandir, the high priests of which were Ramakrishna and Vivekananda. He highlighted Ananda Math of Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay. Vivekananda’s Chicago Address, Karmayoga and lectures from Colombo to Almorah were reading matter of the youth. All these pushed them to volcanic inspiration. Mentally they became antipathetic to the Moderates.

In between 1886 and 1900, there were severe famines in India. The British rulers were not moved by those natural calamities and instead of organizing relief work; they spent money to celebrate the Silver Jubilee of Queen Victoria’s Coronation. Tilak repeatedly protested against the Government’s apathy to tackling the situation. For that reason, he was sentenced to Vigorous imprisonment by the British.

This discontentment was further aggravated with the repressive policies of Lord Curzon who was of the conviction that, ‘It were only the Englishmen, who by their birth and training are fit to rule India’. After the enactment of the anti-Indian act of 1898, Curzon passed the Calcutta Corporation Act of 1899 and the Indian University Act of 1904. The hatred of Curzon towards Bengali nationalists comes to force when he announced the Partition of Bengal. It was declared that the aim of the Partition was to introduce efficiency into the administration of the Bengal province. But the real intention of the British was to lowering down the national feeling amongst the Bengalee as well as to introduce communalism by
using Divide and Rule policy between Hindus and Muslims. Protesting against this, the Moderates only issued an open letter to Lord Curzon, but such mute protests died down quickly. To the Extremists, instead of prayer and petition, self-reliance and constructive work became the slogan. Their resentment appeared with the starting of *Swadeshi* enterprises, national education and constructive work in villages, use of popular customs and vernaculars etc. Added to this, some new techniques for achieving liberation like individual violence and conspiracies were irrupted. In Bengal, Aurobindo Ghose's 'New Lamp for the Old' marked the beginning of it. He tried to organize secret societies and passive resistance. Disillusionment with the Moderates was also voiced by Ashwini Kumar Dutta who described the Amraoti Session as a 'three-day tamasha.' Similarly in Punjab, people like Har Kishan Lal became active in *Swadeshi* enterprise. In an article in *Kayastha Samachar*, lala Lajpat Rai advocated for technical education. And in Maharashtra, boycott movement took shape of a storm under the leadership of Bal Gangadhar Tilak. He declared that we would not achieve any success if we crook once a year like a frog. Bubonic Plague ravaged Maharashtra at the end of 19th century and took away lives of lakhs of people. In this natural calamity the governmental measures were inadequate, at times brutal and tyrannical. Plague officers dis-honoured the women and away sacred idols from house-chapels in view of cleansing. Tilak sternly exposed the misleading of the government officers. Chaphekar Brothers murdered two robe plague officers, Rand and Ayerst. Eventually, they were hanged and Tilak was imprisoned as an instigator.

In this turmoil, some international events enable Indians to think that British supremacy was no longer unchangeable. They thought if a small nation like Japan and Ethiopia could defeat the huge powers like Russia and Italy, Indians could definitely expel a few Englishman from India. On this, Karachi Chronicle wrote, "What one Asiatic country has done, others can do. If Japan can drub Russia, India can drub England with equal ease." This was heightened by some other revolutions which had taken place in China, Turkey and Iran and inspired the Indians to put up a brave fight in order to liberate their motherland.
In this way, anti-imperialist attitude of the people throughout the world threatened the British for restoring their supremacy in different colonies. In Africa, the Indians, who once helped British to develop colonies there, got ill-treatment and humiliation. This unjust manner fanned the fire of extreme form of nationalism in India.

There were three Schools of Extremists—the Maharashtra School headed by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the Bengal School represented by Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghosh and also the Punjab School led by Lala Lajpat Rai.

Following are the political programmes of the Extremists. In the early phase of 1890s, Tilak resented no more interference by an alien government in the domestic and private life of the people. He criticized government over the age of Consent Bill in 1891 and started Ganapati Festival in 1893. Aurobindo published *New Lamps for Old* in the *Indu Prakash* between 1893 and 1894. Tilak threw a challenge to the Moderates sponsored National School Conference in 1895 by not allowing it to hold its session in Congress Pavilion in Pune. In the same year, the Poona Sarayjanik Sabha was captured by the Extremists from the Moderates. The Shivaji Festival was first celebrated by 1896. Lajpat Rai, between 1893 and 1900 did not attend a single Congress meeting. Extremists launched a countrywide protest against the Tariff and Cotton Duties of 1894 and 1896. Victories of Japan and Ethiopia over Russia and Italy in 1904-05 helped and encouraged Extremists to protest against British in a much more radical way. In 1905 also, Curzon’s plan for the partition of Bengal ensured the emergence of Extremists as a national party and from then *Swaraj* became the main goal. Regarding this, on 26 April 1907, Aurobindo wrote in *Bande Mataram.* ‘It is not a cry of revolt of despair, but a gospel of national faith and hope.’

In consequence of these political tendencies, the next few years of Congress politics was full of conflicts and quarrels between the Moderates and the Extremists. Banaras Congress of 1905 more or less maintained the peaceful coordination amongst them. But in Calcutta Congress (1906) quarrel started over
Presidential post as Bepin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo wanted Tilak to be the President, but the Moderates were in no mood to accept him. They without consulting the Reception Committee chaired Dadabhai Naoroji as President in Calcutta Congress. The Extremists like Tilak, Sri Aurobindo, Bipin Pal, Aswini Dutt, and Kharapade formed themselves into a pressure group to press their points. Also, in regard to achieving Swaraj, there was a difference of opinion for its nature. Moderate Gopal Krishna Gokhle wanted Dominion Status, i.e. self-government under the Crown. However, Extremist sections wanted to achieve complete independence and were in favour of using even force to turn the British out of India. Though Extremists had failed to get Tilak as President in Calcutta Congress yet they were satisfied with what they achieved there. On this, Motilal Nehru wrote to Jawaharlal, 'The Extremists are in the ascendant and they outnumber the Moderates.' Undoubtedly, from Calcutta Congress the ground was being prepared for a head-on clash.

History shows that in Swadeshi Movement, two rival forces had participated, but there was a good deal of difference of temperament and ideology and the clash of personalities on Swadeshism. People in general criticized Moderates who were afraid that the Extremists had already captured Bengal, Maharashtra, and the Punjab, and there was a danger of the rest of the country also being lost to them. Again controversy started for the election of the Presidential Post in the next Congress at Nagpur, where Extremists wanted to elect Tilak as President but Moderates denied. Pandemonium occurred during the meeting of the Reception Committee at Nagpur. To avoid catastrophe, the venue of the Session was shifted to Surat but cease-fire did not happen.

At last in Surat Congress (1907), the unfortunate but inevitable incidents happened that split the Congress. The Moderates and Extremists met separately and adopted the Constitution of the Congress and closed the doors of the party to each other. With a close eye on the events between Banaras Congress (1905) and the Surat Congress (1907), one can understand the following factors responsible...
for the spitting: offensive discussion and harsh letters issued by two sides; clash of personalities and conflict of ideologies.

However, the historians of the Cambridge School have been trying to find out the causes behind the emergence of Extremism on the factional quarrels of the ‘ins’ and ‘outs’ for the control of the Congress. In Bengal, Surendra Nath Banerjea had a running quarrel with the Ghose brothers over the leadership of Indian Association that had overshadowed Ghose’s Indian League. Factionalism was even acute in the Punjab with three groups within the Lahore Brahma Samaj. A major split within the Aryas and a conflict between Lala Harkishan Lal and Lala Lajpat Rai had pause problem. Madras politics was analyzed in terms of a triangular conflict among the Mylapore, Egmore and the Mofussils. In Poona, too, Tilak’s quarrel with Agarkar and Gokhle over the control of the Deccan Educational Society and over the political and social reform issues that made serious threat to the Congress. This view of the Cambridge School has been refuted by other scholars saying that it has been overstressed.

So, Congress was split at Surat which was a great national calamity. It is said that Moderates were the brain of the Congress and the Extremists were its heart. The united action of both was absolutely necessary for the dependent India. The British understood only the language of strength. So, Lord Minto told Morley with Joy ‘Congress collapse was a triumph for us’. Ultimately, after a decade, the two rival fractions were again re-united. But that was another story of liberation movement.

The historians judged the achievements of the Extremists in under mentioned ways:

- They made it a mass movement under their leadership which included not only the educated people but also peasants and workers.
• The national movement, because of its wider base, aroused national sentiments and united the Indian people as a whole in the struggle for freedom.

• For achieving total independence they specified a goal. Thus said Tilak, 'Swaraj is my birthright and I will have it.'

• They installed self-confidence and self-reliance among the people.

• They helped to revive cottage industries by propagating the use of Swadeshi and the boycott of imported goods.

• They tried to cripple the administration by using methods of non-co-operation and boycot. 

• They, through their speeches and writings, infused among the people courage to challenge the imperial regime in India.

Young men were fired with zeal to free their country with extreme sacrifice. The Extremists' philosophy produced such revolutionaries like Barindra Kumar Ghosh, Kanailal Dutta, Satyendra Nath Bose, Jyotindranath Mukhopadhyay ((Bagha Jatin), Bhagat Singh, Chandra Sekhar Azad, Ram Prasad Bismil and Vir Savarkar. One can remembr how Bhagat Singh kissed the gallows and Bismil sang while they were hanged:

"Our hearts are filled with desire
To lay down our heads.
We shall keenly watch the force of arm
With which the murderer strikes." 36

The achievements of the Extremists are summarized by Bepin Chandra Pal as follows: "The militant nationalists added a glorious chapter to the history of the National Movement. They had the people's self-confidence and self-reliance. They had prepared the social base of the movement by including the lower middle class, students, youth and women. They had introduced new methods and new modes of waging political struggles." 37
Muslim League and its Background

When the followers of Islam conquered India, the existing Indian tradition was one of religions tolerance and cultural synthesis. In course of time, there was mutual influence on both sides. During the Mughal period, some sort of social co-existence had further unified this tolerance in India. Thus, there existed commonness between Hindu and Muslim community for a long period of time, though there were certain religious trends and cultural differences which were exclusive and antagonistic. Divisions of these two communities were class wise. Amongst them, there were rich and the poor, educated and the uneducated, but the fine arts formed a common ground between the two communities. There were no prejudices regarding participation in their respective fairs and festivals. They spoke the same language, wore similar clothes and furnished their houses in the same style. This situation continued even during the Mutiny of 1857. In the War, there was little trace of communal motives. Its green Mughal flag was seen to be the symbol of India’s political unity under the leadership of Bahadur Shah Jafar.

As an outcome of the Sepoy Mutiny the British established their rule dethroning the Mughal Kings in India. This made the Muslims bitter towards the imperial rule. Initially, the British suspected these two communities to be behind the conspiracy. Then, the British however considered the Muslim Community to be more dangerous since there was a likelihood of their seeking revenge for snatching power from their kings. On the other hand, the British tried to win over the Hindus. Lord Allenborough thus said 'The Muslim race is fundamentally hostile to us and, therefore, our true policy is to conciliate the Hindus.'

W.W. Hunter wrote in 1886:

"After the mutiny, the British turned upon the Musalmans as their real enemies so that failure of the revolt was much more disastrous to them than to the Hindus. They lost altogether their remaining prestige of traditional superiority
over the Hindus. They forfeited for the time being the confidence of their foreign rulers. In every district, the descendant of some line of Muslim prince is sullenly eating his heart out in roofless place and weed-choked tanks. The Musalmans are excluded from the Army and the law. The judiciary was either Anglicized or Hinduised; while Permanent Settlement led to the wholesale eviction of the Moslem land-lords".  

The vindictive nature of various suppressive measures against the Muslims was envisaged by a poem of Bahadur Shah Jafar, the last of the Mughals:

"A dreadful change of atmosphere has over come us,
And I know not one single moment's peace;
How may I tell my misery in words,
My heart is torn in two with agony;
The people of Hind are all doomed,
What depths of sufferings have they not known;
Whomsoever the masters of the day behold,
They say, 'Fit for the gallows is he too';
Had ever such tyranny been borne my men,
That Lakhs are hanged, for no crime at all?
Still their hearts are full with venom and hate,
For those who utter the Kalma in prayer."

After the successful suppression of the Mutiny, the British lost no time in introducing the policy of Divide and Rule in a preliminary way. In May 1858, Lord Elphinstone viewed, 'Divide et impera was the old Roman motto, and it should be ours.' This was furthered by Wood in a letter to Elgin, 'We have maintained our power by playing off one part against the other, and we must continue to do so.'

During the time, starting of the national movement cautioned the British a lot. They felt that the movement might unite the people and cause a problem to
the British Empire and united Indian people could not be subjugated for long. Thus the British tried to do all they could to keep the people disunited, quarrelling and competing among themselves. First of all, they marked Indian History into Hindu and Muslim periods. In Hindu period, they called the Muslims as foreign invaders. In Muslim period, the Muslims were said to be the rulers while Hindus were their subjects.

But the policy of appeasing the Hindus at the cost of the Muslims did not find favour with all the British rulers. Lord Lytton remarked, "There is no getting over the fact that the British empire of India is a Mohammedan power, and that it entirely depends on the policy of Her Majesty’s Government whether the sentiment of our Mohammedan subjects is to be an immense security or as immense danger to us."\(^{40}\)

But launching of political agitation and founding of the Indian Association in 1877-78 by Surendra Nath Banerjea and others and the formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 again created apprehension in the British mind. Re-acting to this, the Government extended their helping hands to the Mohammedans in education and Government services. Sir W.H. Gregory wrote to Dufferin in this regard,

"I am confident that it will bear good fruits; indeed, it seems to have done so already by the complete abstention of the Mohammedans from Brahmin and Baboo agitation. It will be a great matter to sweeten our relations with this portion of the Indian population, the bravest and at one time the most dangerous. But they all with one voice declared that they got their whipping in 1857, and they take it like men. They now look us, and to us alone, not to be subject to Hindu domination."\(^{41}\)

Some time later, in 1892, the question of expanding the Legislative Councils took place. The idea behind this expansion was ‘to obtain for these councils the services of members who will be in the truest sense representatives, but who will represent types and classes rather than areas and numbers’.
Not only religious communalism, the British encouraged provincialism and casteism also. The Indian upper class was composed of men of learning; *pandits, Maulavis*, saints and *sufis*, *zamindars*, men of wealth merchants etc.... The lower class was composed of artists, craftsmen, peasants, workmen etc.... British, for maintaining their festive interest exploited the Indian caste structure by playing them against other.

As a policy of their governance, the British had made India an impoverished nation. Due to drain of wealth and the absence of industrialization, there was acute unemployment problem. This tempted people to ask for reservation in jobs on the basis of caste, creed and religion.

During the time, militant nationalists gave impetus to the national movement. But in their effort to glorify the past, they presented a one-sided picture of India’s composite culture and praised Shivaji and Rana Pratap and remained silent about Akbar and Sher Shah. The British took full advantage of this situation and motivated Muslims against the Hindu. As a result, many Muslims remained aloof and turned hostile to the national movement.

It is interesting to note how Lord Curzon tried to play one community against each other when he divided Bengal. Bengal was partitioned in such a way that one part was dominated by the Hindus and the other by the Muslims, using the communal lines and applying the principle of full-fledged divide and rule. As a result, the Congress did not support the Partition, but many Muslims leaders supported it as Eastern Bengal and Assam, with Dhaka as its Capital, would gave them a majority and a source of strength and centre for their political activity.

In this difficult and hostile situation, Hindi-Urdu controversy worsened the problem. In Uttar Pradesh, Urdu had been the court language. Against this, the Hindu community had demanded the introduction of Hindi in *Devnagari* script, and the court summons and official announcements should be issued in
Hindi and Urdu. This controversy strained the relations further between the two communities.

The British never lost a chance of making use of these for their own purposes. At the time Syed Ahmad Khan appeared on the scene. Sir Syed was a great educational and religious reformer of the Indian Muslim. He initiated the Aligarh Movement in place of old world Islamic education. In his time, the Muslims of India took no interest in modern education and considered it a crime to learn western education. Being a man of great initiative, though having no western education, Syed Ahmad Khan propounded successfully the view that Muslims in India would never be able to rise unless they adopted modern education. He tried to bring the teachings of Quran in line with modern ideas and stressed the value of Governmental services. He wanted to save his community from isolation caused after the Sepoy Mutiny. To make himself trustworthy and supreme leader of the Muslim Community in all respect, Syed Ahmad went to England and studied in Oxford and Cambridge Universities. After his return, he founded the Muslim Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh in 1874. Meanwhile, his efforts became successful as Government changed its attitude towards Muslims and Viceroy himself laid the foundation of the Muslim-Anglo-oriental College.

Syed Ahmad Khan believed that driving out British from India was an impractical idea. To him, betterment of the Muslim community under British rule was the only way of achieving satisfactory benefits for his community. He stressed upon the principles of Quran which were as follows:

1. The teaching of the Quran is divine, eternal and faultless.
2. The Hadith, comprising of the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad reported by narrators were subject to criticism and acceptable only after scrutiny.
3. The will of man is free.

On Hindu-Muslim relation he believed in political co-ordination and co-operation. Before the birth of Indian National Congress, Syed Ahmad advocated
an All-India Association for placing demands to the Government. In his pamphlet, ‘ Causes of the Indian Mutiny (1863) ’ he stated, “The original cause of the outbreak was the non-admission of a native as a member into the Legislative Council. I believe that this rebellion owes its origin to one great cause to which all others are but secondary branches, so to speak, of the present stem.”

On the question of common Indian nationality, he expressed his view on 27 January 1884. “We (Hindus and Muslims) should try to become one heart and soul and act in unison; if united we can support each other. If not, the effect of one against the other would tend to destruction and downfall of both . . . . .”

But Syed Ahmad’s views changed under the influence of Auckland Calvin and Theodore Beck. He became apprehensive with the rise of Indian National Congress. Surely, the British pulled strings behind the scene. Under Calvin and Beck’s inspiration he made a speech in the Viceroy’s Council (1883) condemning representative institutions on the ground that the Muslim would suffer under them. He was afraid that if the British left, the Hindu majority would rule and it would be unfair to the Muslims. In 1893, under the influence of Theodore Beck, the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association was founded in order to counter the growing influence of Congress. And British, through this Association, wanted to dissuade Muslims from joining the Congress.

Nawab Mushtaq Husain, one of the friends of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, described the reasons that influenced Sir Syed to dissuade support to the Congress:

“Syed Ahmad Khan closely watched the movement for three years. But when he found that it was not moderate or reasonable in its aspirations, nor sufficiently careful about interests of the minorities, and very far from respectful or fair in its tone as regards its relations with the Government of the country or the ruling race, he did not hesitate to warn his excitable co-religionists that participated in the agitation such as the
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Congress advocated, by precept and example, was against their best interests.\textsuperscript{44}

After Beck, Mr. Theodore Morrison became the Principal and he successfully kept the Muslim community out of all political agitation. During the time he put efforts to develop Aligarh into a Pan-Islamic Centre.

Mr. Archibold, the next Principal, played an important role in Muslim politics during his period of office from 1905 – 1910. When he arrived in Aligarh, agitation against the Partition of Bengal was going on. In order to meet the situation, the Government was considering measures for rallying the moderate and loyal Muslim elements by expanding the Indian Councils. Mr. Archibald became the medium between the Government of India and the Muslim leaders. He met the private secretary to the Viceroy at Simla and settled with him a date for the Muslim Community to meet with the Viceroy for separate representation for Muslims in the Constitution. The deputation led by Agha Khan and Mabsin-ul-Mulk met with the Viceroy. Archibald writes,

"Our apprehensions should be expressed that the principle of election, if introduced, would prove detrimental to the Muslim minority. It should respectfully be suggested that nomination or representation by religion be introduced to meet Muslim opinion. We would also say that in a country like India, due weight must be given to Zamindars."\textsuperscript{45}

Accordingly, the deputation led by the Agha Khan submitted the following demands to the Viceroy:

1. The Muslim should be granted a representation in the Council.
2. Their representation should be determined not on the basis of their numerical strength, but on the basis of their political importance and the services rendered by them to the British Empire.
3. Some right should be given to the popularly elected representatives.
4. Special favours should be granted to the Muslims in appointment to Government services and to membership of Central and Provincial Councils.

The Viceroy gave favourable reply to the delegation, and thus separate electorates became part of the Indian Council's Act of 1909, popularly known as Minto Morley Reforms. Separate electorates implied that elections were to be held on the basis of communal representation. It means the Muslim could vote for a Muslim candidate and the Hindus for a Hindu candidate.

The success of the Muslim delegation to in with the Viceroy filled them with a new zeal which quickened their political consciousness. They felt the need then to form a permanent political association of the Muslim as a whole. In December 1906, there was a big assembly of eminent Muslim leaders at Dhaka in connection with the Mohammedan Educational Conference. Nawab Salimullah of Dhaka arranged a meeting and mooted the idea of establishing a Central Mohammedan Association to look after the interest of the Muslims. Accordingly, on 30 December 1906, the All India Muslim League was founded which declared its three objects:

1. To promote among Muslim feelings of loyalty towards the British Government and to remove possible misunderstandings against the Government.
2. To watch the political interests and rights of the Musalmans and to bring to the notice of the Government their needs.
3. Without injuring the objects of the League to discourage the growth of ideas hostile to other communities.

In this way, with the foundation of the Muslim League, the birth of separatist tendencies in Indian politics took deep root. Lady Minto in her biography of her husband writes,

"I must send your Excellency a line to say that a very very big thing has happened today. A work of statesmanship that will
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affect India and Indian history for many a long year. It is nothing less than the pulling back of 62 millions of people (Muslims) from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition (Congress)."46

Partition of Bengal

Partition of Bengal, a vindictive attempt of Lord Curzon against the Bengali nationalists, though failed, had swept the whole country from end to end with a new light of freedom. Its seed or gestation had been progressing for some years prior to partition under the warmth of Lord Curzon’s reactionary rule. During his term of office Lord Curzon became unpopular in India because of his policies against the people. Manchester Guardian of 1 November, 1907, pointed out the following reasons for unrest in India due to under mentioned suppressive measures of Curzon:

- Curzon’s insulting behavior towards the Princes during the Delhi Durbar.
- Unmerited abuse of the Indians at the Calcutta University speech.
- Reducing the number of Indian appointments in Calcutta Corporation, Calcutta University and educational institutions for establishing governmental control over them.
- Increasing the fees of other educational institutions and thus tried to close the door for common Indians.
- Appointing young and immature Englishmen as Magistrate.
- In case of judicial judgment marked difference between Indians and Englishmen.
- Disgraceful treatment of the Indians in Natal.47
The Presidency of Bengal had become large and unwieldy. It included Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Chota Nagpur and some other remote areas extending over an area of 489,500 sq. km. It had a huge population of 78 million people. Curzon in 1902, had written disguising his original intention ‘Bengal is ungovernably too large a charge for any single man’. He therefore, wanted to divide it.

But, the idea of partition for solely administrative point of view was first mooted a few years back by Elgin. Ultimately, this proposal had to be given up as a result of a thorough discussion with Sir Henry Cotton and the opinion expressed by the Calcutta High Court that it would be a ‘retrograde and mischievous’ measure.

Curzon’s proposals for the division of Bengal received Royal assent on 1 September, 1905. Accordingly, a new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam was constituted by amalgamating Assam and Chittagong with fifteen districts of former Bengal. The new province was to have an area of about 2,74,540 sq. km. with a population of about 31 million. Admirers of Curzon unanimously voiced its administrative necessity and opined that if it was determinedly held on, would have resulted in vast improvement in administration. Lord George Hamilton in a public speech declared that he “would predict with the utmost confidence that in ten years, so beneficial would be the operation of the change, the only remark then would be made concerning it, even by those who were opposed to it, would be, why was not this done before.”

But the hidden though real intention of Curzon for partitioning Bengal speaks a different story. One of his intentions was to curb and, if possible, crush the Indian National Congress. He wrote, “The Congress is tottering to its fall and one of my ambitions, while in India, is to assist it to a peaceful demise.” And Bengal, Curzon thought, geographically a compact area where the intellectual and emotional vitality was both animated and sustained by a social and literary resurgences from the beginning of the nineteenth century had been citadel of all anti-British conspiracies. So, to give a crushing blow to the nationalist sentiment
of Bengal leaders, Bengal was divided into two parts. One was put together with Bihar and Orissa and the other with Assam. Curzon hoped, this division would set the Hindus and Muslims against each other. Surely, it was a clever move to divide and rule. It was clear from the partition that the new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam was specially set up so that Muslims would be in a majority in that area. In this way Bengal was to be divided with effect from 16 October 1905. The 16th October 1905, the effective day for partition, was then observed by the people of Bengal as a day of mourning. Bengalis from East to West Bengal shared a common language, culture and tradition. Their friends and family members lived scattered in both parts of Bengal. All were separated in a moment. Against this, people fasted, walked barefoot to the Ganges, singing patriotic songs such as the Bande Mataram. Rabindranath Tagore composed a national song and on his suggestion, 16 October was observed as Raksha Bandhan Day, signifying brotherhood between people of East and West Bengal. People felt that meetings, resolutions and demonstrations were insufficient to move the British rulers. So, they embarked on Swadeshi and Boycott Movements.

Below is culled a report on Raksha Bandhan from an Anglo-Indian Journal, The Empress of 1 November 1906:

"...In the celebrations, above referred to, the Rakhi, it will be seen, occupied a very prominent place. Reis and Royyet, an old established Bengali journal that has not allowed it to be terrorized or rushed by young Bengal’s recent Bandarraming, in a late issue gives the following interesting account of the origin of Rakhi –"the origin of Rakhi is to be found in the Puranas. To wrathful Sage Durvasa is attributed the foundation of Rakhi. The Sage ordered the presiding deity of the month of Sravan to put on a Rakhi for dispelling the evil effects of the stars”.

However, it is well known that the Rajputs made use of it. Lieutenant-Colonel James Tod, late Political Agent to the Western Rajput States, speaks of the celebration in Rajputana in the spring. In his ANNALS AND ANTIQUITIES OF RAJASTHAN, he says:
"The festival of the bracelet (Rakhi) is in spring, and whatever its origin, it is one of the few when an intercourse of gallantry of the most delicate nature is established between the fair sex and the cavaliers of Rajasthan. Though the bracelet may be sent by maidens, it is only on occasions of urgent necessity or danger. The Rajput dame bestows with the Rakhi the title adopted brother; and whiles its acceptance secures to her all the protection of a Caraliere Servants, scandal itself never suggests any other tie to his devotion. He may hazard his life in her cause, and yet never receive a smile in reward, for he cannot even see the fair object who, as brother of her adaptation, has constituted himself her defender. But there is a charm in the mystery of such a connection, never endangered by close observation, and the loyal to the fair may well attach a value to the public recognition of being the Rakhi-bandhan, the 'bracelet-bound brother of a princess'." 51

'The Empress' of 1 November 1906 again wrote about the Bengal's Hero of the hour.

"Sprout Surendra Nath Banerjee, the leader of the Bengali leaders in the – Shivaji, Swadeshi and Boycott movements, that have plunged the country into hysterics and made a radical Secretary of State a conservative of conservatives, as far as India is concerned, is a son of Dr. Durga Charan Banerjee, a physician of note in the forties and early fifties of the last century. Srijut Surendra Nath is a "Devoting Boy". He was a distinguished prizeman throughout the whole of his school career but the facts of his early life are too well known to stand in need of recapitulation. It is also well known that he was under a cloud, so far as Government is concerned for many years. But the late Sir Henry Harrison never did a better piece of work – and he did many things worth remembering – than when he bridged the gulf that yawned
between Government and one of Bengal's most distinguished, but unlucky sons. In 1882, Srijut Surendra Nath was appointed an Honorary Presidency Magistrate – to seal the compact, as it were, that had been patched up by Sir Henry Harrison between Government and the Babu, but for which, the other Sir Henry – the 'failed' I.G. (Sir Henry Cotton) got the credit. After this, the Babu's appointment to the Bengal Legislative Council was a foregone conclusion. The Babu excelled himself here, again, and was returned four times in succession as a member of that assembly – thrice by the Local Corporation and once by the Presidency Division – a unique record in the annals of the Council. Banerjea's achievements have been vast and varied, and even those whom he may, in moments of excitement have called his enemies, have sung his praises from time to time, and like the Pioneer, have always given him credit where credit was due. However, in a moment of weakness he resigned his high honorary offices after the Barisal Fiasco, and thus threw away all restraint and the only safeguard that had hitherto kept him out of the ranks of the Extremists and in the path of peace. His destiny however, brings him back once more into the fold of the 'Moderates' and his return to loyalty will be hailed with joy by all his friends. This is a position from which we trust he will never again recede.”

"THE EMPRESS", of 1 November 1906, comments on the celebration of the first anniversary of the Partition –

"This year (1906), a leaflet in Bengali, signed by Baboos Narendra Nath Sen (Ed. I. Mirror), Moti Lal Ghose (Ed. A. B. Patrika) and Surendra Nath Banerjee (Ed. The Bengali) was largely circulated in Calcutta and the suburbs some days previous to the anniversary and ran as follows: "The anniversary of the Partition Day is drawing near. On this day, a new life sprang up in Bengal whose people have found a blessing in the calamity. On
that day, the memorable 30th Aswin, the 16th of October, it is desirable that (1) there should be no cooking in the house of any Bengali, be he a Hindu, a Mahomedan or a Christian; (2) everyone should abstain from food, or only take such light food as milk and fruits, pass the day in prayers, and, for the good of the country, beseech the blessing of the King of all kings, the Redeemer of fallen nations; (3) Bengalis of all sects and creeds should make a vow to eschew foreign goods, to use home-made articles only and to use their purse to promote the indigenous industries by starting mills and introducing the spinning wheel in every household; and (4) after bathing, the people should tie the rakhi round each other's arms, and resolve to help each other in their sorrows and misfortunes for all time to come.\textsuperscript{53}

National Congress reacted sharply and sincerely against the partition plan since its formative stage to the concrete. It met within a little over three weeks since Curzon made his first public announcement on the proposal, and adopted at its Madras Session (1903) the following resolution:

"This Congress views with deep concern the present policy of the Government of India in breaking up territorial division which have been of long standing and are closely united by ethnological, legislative, social and administrative relations, and deprecates the separation from Bengal of Dacca, Mymensingh and Chittagong divisions of and portions of Chhota Nagpur division, and so the separation of the district of Gangam and the agency tracts of the Gangam and Vizapagatnam districts from the Madras Presidency.\textsuperscript{54}

Sir Henry Cotton, the President of the next Congress (1904) observed, before the final decision of the Government was announced:

"To press on proposals such as these which have been put forward for the break-up of Bengal against the lowly expressed
wishes and sentiments of the Bengali people can only be described as a most arbitrary and unsympathetic evidence of irresponsible and autocratic statesmanship." 55

This open Session of the Congress resolved to "record its emphatic protest against the proposals of the Government of India, for the Partition of Bengal in any manner whatsoever. The proposals are viewed with great alarm by the people, as the division of the Bengali nation into separate units will seriously interfere with its social, intellectual and material progress, involving the loss of various constitutional and other rights and privileges which the province has so long enjoyed and will burden the country with heavy expenditure which the Indian tax-payers cannot at all afford."56

In the next Congress Session at Banaras (1905), Gopal Krishna Gokhale, the President, proclaimed that the Bengal Partition was more than a mere provincial matter, that it was 'the uppermost question in the minds of us all at this moment'. He added:

"A cruel wrong has been inflicted on our Bengali brethren and the whole country has been stirred to the deepest depths of sorrow and resentment as has never been the case before. The scheme of Partition, concocted in the dark and carried out in the face of the fiercest opposition that any government measure has encountered during the last half a century, will always stand as a complete illustration of the worst features of the present system of bureaucratic rule – its utter contempt for public opinion, its arrogant pretensions to superior wisdom, its reckless disregard of the most cherished feelings of the people, the mockery of our appeal to its sense of justice, its cool preference of service interest to those of the Government."57
Banaras Congress followed with a resolution, voicing its "earnest and emphatic protest against the repressive measures which have been adopted in Bengal after the people there had been compelled to resort to the Boycott of foreign goods as a last protest, and perhaps the only constitutional and effective means left to them of drawing the attention of the British public to the action of the Government of India in persisting in their determination to partition Bengal in utter disregard of the universal prayers and protests of the people."  

As said earlier, during the time, the idea of Swadeshi and Boycott Movement had come to the minds of the people. No doubt, national leaders, specially the Extremists were the think tank behind this idea. In early days, as a means of agitation Swadeshi and Boycott had used by Americans and Chinese. In India, Bholanath Chandra recommended in 1870 to use boycott to bring economic pressure on the British. In 1896, Tilak led a full-fledged boycott campaign. It was then realized that Swadeshi and Boycott were complementary. The term Swadeshi means, 'of one's own country' and it implies that people should use goods produced within the country. Boycott means not using foreign-made goods.

The old concept received a new force from the Bengal anti-partition movement. Large crowds at meetings took the oath of Swadeshi. Swadeshi brought into politics a new class of people without any distinction of class or creed. It taught the press to be fearless; Hindus and Muslims to co-operate; students to defy unjust authority and to make sacrifices even of their lives for the sake of their country. Under the leadership of Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai the movement gained momentum and spread all over Bengal and in other states and cities. British goods were burnt at public places, confectioners stopped using foreign sugar and washer men stopped washing foreign clothes. Women stopped wearing foreign bangles and gave up the use of glass utensils. Students refused to use foreign paper. Even doctors refused to patronize dealers of British goods. Picketing was combined with social ostracism.
It is noteworthy that the most zealous workers of propagating the Swadeshi movement were students and women who organized voluntary associations to further their cause. Large sums of money were raised from the people to help this movement. The newspapers and magazines carried reports and articles on this topic and thus helped in making the movement successful. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, President of the Banaras Congress (1905), extended his support to the movement and exhorted the nationalist forces to join hands to fight the reactionary British regime.

The Partition Movement had far-reaching consequences on the freedom movement in India. Firstly, it led to an outburst of revolutionary activity in Bengal. The British Government was shaken but it reacted sharply. They tried to suppress the movement with a heavy hand. During 1905 to 1909, the British invoked the Regulation of 1818 and thousands of people were arrested and sent to jails. National leaders like Lajpat Rai and Sardar Ajit Singh were deported. Meetings were banned; political leaders were insulted and threatened; and peaceful and non-violent processionists were subjected to lathi charges. Schools and colleges were warned and grants were suspended to private schools suspected of participating in the movement. Side by side with repression, the British also conceded to some of the Indian demands. In order to win over the Moderate section of the Congress they instituted the Morley-Minto Reforms.

But this Movement affected negatively the unity of the Indian Congress. The disagreement over methods of agitation in Bengal led to a dispute in the Congress which brought about a clash at the Congress session at Surat in December 1907. The Extremists were excluded from the Congress for about a decade.

Lord Curzon intended to weaken the national movement in Bengal by using the policy of Divide and Rule. On the contrary, the partition of Bengal united the people and mobilized them to a wave of nationalistic feeling. It
became a mass movement – even women and students took the leadership in its activities.

The positive side of the movement gave stimulus to cottage industries and even to large scale enterprises of different types. Swadeshi textile mills match and soap factories, tanneries and potteries sprang up everywhere. Many zamindars and merchants joined hands with political leaders to form banks, steamship concerns and insurance companies. Acharya Prafulla Chandra Ray set up Bengal Chemical Factory, which became famous very quickly. Rabindranath Tagore also helped in setting up a Swadeshi store. Tata Iron and Steel Company refused all foreign and Government help.

The Swadeshi Movement also enlightened national education. To educate people on national lines a scheme of national education was formulated by Satish Chandra Mukherjee, the editor of *Dawn* in 1898. In due course, several educational institutions were opened for imparting literary, technical and physical education. In regard to culture, a new type of nationalist poetry, prose and journalism charged with passion and idealism was born. The patriotic songs composed at that time by the poets, such as Rabindranath Tagore, Mukunda Dass and Rajani Kanta Sen, were not only effective but also had a literary quality of permanent value.

**Trend of Indian Politics between 1907-1917**

The Moderate and Extremist split in the Congress at Surat in December 1907 beset the Congress organization. The British imperialists were happy over this break-up. So, the years between 1907 and 1917 were crucial for both the Congress and the national movement.
History shows that the above mentioned split, discontent and revolt within the Congress might have temporarily made the national movement weak, but soon the Congress was to become a powerful force, challenging the imperialist power after taking lessons from the episode. Modern historians remarked that this split had ultimately activated Congressmen to expand the Congress base and marked the beginning of a new phase in the history of the national movement in India.

The year 1908 was to witness great unrest in many parts of the country – North Western Frontier, Bengal, East Bengal, Assam, Deccan, Western India, Madras Presidency and United Provinces. Bengal revolutionaries established secret societies with young recruits in Maharashtra, the Punjab and the Madras Presidency. They adopted took revolutionary programmes recognizing Bengal as their role model. Newspapers like Yugantar, Bande Mataram, Sandhya, Kesari, and New India became powerful instruments of political education.

The Government came down heavily on revolutionaries and Extremists. Even Moderates were not spared. The Government of Lord Minto announced in 1908 a series of steps to suppress the revolutionary activities and seditious writings by the newspapers. The Laws enacted were the Explosive Substance Act, 1908; the Newspaper Incitement Act, 1908, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908. Then in 1910, the Indian Press Act and several ordinances and circulars were enacted for suspending the rights of free speech and free criticism.

In this situation, Indian National Congress held its session in Madras in December 1908, with Sri Rash Behari Ghosh as President. The Session came to be known as the ‘Constitutional Congress’ and ‘Moderate’ in attitude, in which Extremists were absent. Sometime back, during the split of Congress the British promised constitutional reforms to the Moderates. At the same time, Lord Minto organized the two-nation theory by pampering the Muslim community in order to counteract revolutionary Indian nationalism. Minto gave not only a sympathetic reply to the famous memorandum presented by a group of Muslim leaders in...
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1906; he assured them that in any scheme associating the people of India in the running of the Government, Muslim interest would not suffer.

The Morley-Minto reforms did not satisfy the legitimate political aspirations of India. In true sense, the reforms did not transfer even an inch of responsibility to Indian hands in administration, in spite of the enlargement of the councils as well as admission of Indians to the Executive Councils of the Viceroy. Simultaneously, as per reforms, the separate representation for Muslims amounted to a real threat to Indian nationalism. Thus, Minto succeeded in dividing Muslim community from the Congress and weakened the national movement.

The year 1911, after Lord Minto’s retirement, envisaged some great changes in the then Indian political administration. King George V visited India for his Coronation Durbar. From that historic gathering he proclaimed withdrawal of the decision of partitioning Bengal and announced shifting of Capital from Calcutta to Delhi.

As a result of the absence of the Extremists, the six Congress sessions since Surat (Madras, Lahore, Allahabad, Calcutta and Karachi) were marked by a damping of enthusiasm and had become a routine affair. The table given below gives the decreasing number of delegates over the sessions:

- Surat, 1907 — 1663
- Madras, 1908 — 626
- Lahore, 1909 — 243
- Allahabad, 1910 — 636
- Calcutta, 1911 — 446
- Bankipur, 1912 — 207
- Karachi, 1913 — 550
The twenty-ninth Congress session held at Madras in 1914 witnessed many changes as compared to previous sessions in which 866 delegates attended. This was due to the impact of war conditions and more directly to a series of articles on the Congress published in New India edited by Mrs. Annie Besant. So, Madras session was called the ‘prologue of the new and epilogue of the old era’.

The First World War broke out in 1914 between two groups of hostile nations. Amongst them, Britain, France, Italy, Japan and Russia were known as Allies and Germany, Austria, Turkey and Hungary were called the Axis Powers. The main cause of the War was the policy of some powers to expand the empires. India then being a colony of England was led into the War to safeguard the British interests. Moderate and Extremist Congress leaders had their own conceptions over the matter. Extremists were opposed to the British decision of using Indian soldiers in the War. But the Moderates and later on Congress followed a conciliatory attitude hoping that in lieu of the Indian participation, the British Government would grant self-government to India as soon as the War would end. Gandhiji wrote to Lord Hardinge, “I would make India offer her able-bodied sons as a sacrifice to the Empire at this critical moment..... We can but accelerate our journey to the goal of Home Rule by silently and simply devoting ourselves heart and soul to the work of delivering the Empire from the threatening danger.” At the end of the War, Lord Birkenhead remarked, “Without India, the war would have been immensely prolonged, if indeed, without her help, it could have been brought to a victorious conclusion.”

The World War brought about tremendous changes in the country – the Indian nationalists were charged by the Irish rebellion and gathered strength under the leadership of Tilak, the Muslims were concerned about the Caliph and the Turks and the Indian people as a whole conscious of their position and as their responsibility as a distinct national unity. The government on the other was urged to take cognizance of the situation and to honour Indian feelings in a suitable manner.
During the First World War, many international events took place which changed the attitude of the Muslims towards the British. The Caliph was the temporal and spiritual head of all Muslims in Turkey against whom Britain was involved in the War. Besides, even during the War between Turkey and Italy and during the Balkan Wars between 1912 and 1913, Britain was indifferent towards Turkey.

This annoyed the sentiments of the Muslims because they felt that the British were pro-Christian and anti-Muslim. The change of attitude of the Muslims towards the British led the former to support the Congress in their efforts to gain self-government in India. Many nationalist Muslim leaders like Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and the Ali Brothers (Maulana Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali) fostered the idea of having a self government within the empire. In order to mobilize public opinion for self-government, Azad started the Urdu newspaper Al Hilal and the Ali Brothers published Hamdard in Urdu and Comrade in English. At the Muslim League session of 1913, delegates declared for the first time that their aim was self-government which was the same goal as the Congress aimed at for long. In the same year Mohammad Ali Jinnah joined the League. Since the aim of the Congress and that of League was identical, both the parties began to see reason and began to co-operate with each other. Mrs. Annie Besant and Bal Gangadhar Tilak played a major role in fostering unity among the two organizations in the National Movement.

The year 1914 is also significant in the history of Congress, cutting across the period of stress and strain. It may be termed as an end of conflicting era. Vigorous efforts were made towards reunion of the two rival wings of the Congress after Tilak’s release from the Mandalay jail in June 1914. Mrs. Besant had joined the Congress and had begun to activate the Congress Committees that were defunct. Her first and foremost mission was to unify the Moderates and the Extremists. Realizing that a united Congress was the need of the hour, Tilak also involved himself in a series of Parleys in October and November that year. Both Tilak and Mrs. Besant had also realized the impact of the War on Indian political
situation and wished for a unified and strong Congress for utilizing the situation and demanding Home Rule for India.

For maintaining the unification process, Mrs. Besant and the General Secretary of the AICC, N. Subbha Rao of Madras, went to Bombay seeking suggestions Gopal Krishna Gokhale. They met Gokhale and also held discussions with Tilak and Moderate leaders like Pherozeshah Mehta. Tilak expressed his ardent desire for unity in the interest of India's political progress.

It was against this background that the thirtieth Congress session held at Bombay in December 1915, which was attended by 2,259 delegates from all parts of India. The session was important for the unity it marked between Hindus and Muslims and the Moderates and Extremists. Mrs. Besant wrote in New India on 31 December 1915:

"A matter of great rejoicing is the closing of the breach between the two wings of the National Party and the declaration that it is not necessary that a delegate should be a member of a Congress Committee in order that he should be elected – thus forbidding any unfair order such as the one by the Bombay Provincial Congress in order to shut out people they disliked. We shall have a united Congress at Lucknow – the first since the Surat split; the wound has been healed and what Madras began, Bombay has completed. Let us now all work together for the common motherland and be rivals only in devotion to her." 61

At last, the Lucknow session of Congress in 1916 turned out to be an epoch-making one where Indian National Congress recognized itself as a true national and united body. After a decade of disunity, the two wings stood shoulder to shoulder to voice India's determination to be free. Surely, it was the 'Congress for Swaraj'.
The Lucknow Pact, 1916

A prominent feature in political scenario of India in the second decade of the twentieth century was an accord between the Congress and the League, known as the Lucknow Pact, 1916. Undoubtedly this was an outcome of the efforts made by both the organizations to come to an agreement regarding political reforms in India. From December 1915 onwards both the Congress and the League shook hands with each other and forged a common plan of post-war reforms. In December 1916, they held their session at Lucknow and adopted a joint scheme, which came to be known as the Lucknow Pact.

The main features of the Lucknow Pact were as follows:

- India must be treated as a dependency but as a self-governing state, as an equal party with equal rights and responsibilities, as independent unit of the empire.
- The Imperial Legislative Council was to be formed consisting of 150 members. Of these four-fifths were to be elected and one-fifth nominated. One third of the elected members were to be Muslims. The elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council were to be elected by elected members of the Provincial Legislative Council.
- The minorities should be given adequate separate representation in elected bodies.
- The Government of India should not ordinarily interfere in the local affairs of the Province. Defence, foreign and political relations of India, i.e. making of war, peace and treaty were exclusive from the control of the Imperial Legislative.
- No bill would be introduced by a non-official member if it affected the interest of any community and such a bill would not be passed if it was opposed by three-fourths of that community.
- Two permanent Under Secretaries (out of which one should be an Indian) should replace India Council of Secretary of State.
• Half the members of the Viceroy's Executive Council should be Indians, elected by the elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council.
• Each bill passed by the Legislature should be effective unless vetoed by the Governor-General in Council. If the same bill was passed again by the Legislative Council within a year the Government would be obliged to pass it.

The Lucknow Pact was praised and symbolized as Hindu-Muslim unity at some sacrifice from both ends. The Congress compromised its secular character by accepting the scheme of a Muslim electorate and the League accepted the Principles of election and majority rule. The leaders of the Congress and the League did not want to give the Government any excuse for delaying political reforms and demanded self-government. Further, in this Lucknow session Extremists and Moderate Congressmen were reconciled and Home Rule Movement led by Tilak and Mrs. Annie Besant gave a new impetus to the National Movement. Against this background the government could not easily reject the demand for constitutional reforms.

**Home Rule Movement**

In 1915-16, two Home Rule Leagues were founded in India, one led by Lokmanya Tilak and the other by Mrs. Annie Besant and S. Subramanya Iyer. Mrs. Annie Besant was Irish by birth and had adopted India as her home land and worked for its social, educational and religious regeneration. By the turn of the 19th century, she became the President of the Theosophical Society in Madras and set up a Central School at Banaras which later became the Banaras Hindu University. Having been disillusioned with the begging tone of the Moderates and also inspired by the Irish Home Rule Movement, Annie Besant decided to start a similar movement in India. In the Congress Session of 1915, she proposed the starting of this movement which was supported heavily by the Extremist Group. Finally, in September 1916, with the support of Moderate and Extremist groups of the Congress, Mrs. Besant organized the Home Rule League at the
Gokhle Hall in Madras. The Home Rule League promoted principles of Swadeshi, National Education, and Home Rule for India. Then the Movement started and spread all over the Country. The main aim of the movement was to demand self-government at all levels of administration. The success of the movement alarmed the Government and in consequence of that, Annie Besant along with her co-workers, B.P. Wadia and G.S. Arundale were arrested. Students were prohibited from attending Home Rule Meetings. Finally, the Government released Mrs. Besant.

Simultaneously, Bal Gangadhar Tilak after being released from prison (he was deported to Mandalay prison on charges of sedition) supported Mrs. Besant’s Home Rule Movement and set up a separate Home Rule League in Pune in 1914. ‘Swaraj is my birthright and I shall have it’, said Tilak and based on that, the objective of the League was attainment of self-government and to organize public opinion in the country in favour of this goal. Within a short time of its establishment, it had 60,000 members. In spite of the government’s opposition, Tilak continued to work for the movement spearheaded by him. He proved himself to be a sincere, fearless, unbending patriot, who fought for his country with a courageous zeal.

**Impact of the Movement**

The Home Rule Movement was started in 1916, during the First World War. At that time Congress had been weak because of the rivalry between Moderate and Extremist. Tilak and Mrs. Besant infused new life in the national movement and intensified the demand for the grant of self-government. Their clear thinking gave concrete shape and direction to the movement for Home Rule. It also encouraged participation of women in large numbers, the revival of the Swadeshi spirit and the spread of the movement far beyond the frontiers of India. Home Rule League for India was established in London and in New York. The Government, therefore, felt that it was absolutely necessary to pacify the Indians by declaration of a new policy. On August 20, 1917, the Secretary of State, Mr.
Montague, announced in the House of Commons, that the policy of the British Government was to develop gradually self-governing institutions in India.

**The August Declaration, 1917 (Montague-Chelmsford Reforms and Declaration)**

The British Government then made a declaration on 20 August 1917 announcing the British policy towards India. E.S. Montague, the Secretary of State for India, made the following announcement:

"The Policy of His Majesty’s Government was the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the Empire."

This announcement disappointed the Indian leaders as it showed that the British were unwilling to grant self-government to Indians. Lord Montague, the Secretary of State for India, was then sent to India to study the situation in consultation with Lord Chelmsford, the then Viceroy of India. On the basis of his report, the Government of India Act, 1919 was passed, which came into operation in 1921. The reforms embodied in the report are commonly known as the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms. The object of this Act was to give some responsibility to the Indian representatives elected by the people. The Central Government was to be governed by the British, while the Indians would be involved in the administration of the provinces (States). According to this arrangement, the Centre would control such areas as Law and Order, finance, defence, external affairs and communications. The provinces would control irrigation, forests, health, education etc.

According to the Indian leaders, the real control of the administration remained in the hands of the British as per this Act. Similarly, to implement different programmes Provinces had to depend on the centre for finance.
Militant Nationalism

Militant Nationalism was a part of a broader Indian national movement. In a true sense, National Movement clearly means a movement directly or indirectly against the suppressive rulers. Militant Nationalism represents ideals, methods and activities of certain organizations and groups of people inspired by the declaration of creating terror, uncertainty and extreme uneasiness amongst the rulers, so as to make their life insecure and unbearable. Side by side, Militant Nationalism intended to instill courage and hope in the minds of dependent and demoralized people. The cherished objective and ultimate goal of the militant nationalists were the attainment of total independence. R.C. Majumdar observes:

"History of all subject nations struggling for freedom shows that bands of young men, goaded by spirit of frustration at the failure of all legitimate means to achieve their goal, or honestly convinced of their futility in advance, are lured by the prospect of gaining their end by armed resistance, and where it is not practicable to resort to it openly, naturally favour underground movements of secret organizations. The same thing happened in India." 63

Kalicharan Ghosh writes,

"That the movement had arrived in the history of India when peace-loving Indians began to talk freely about self-defence, resistance and reprisal against the agents of the Government for their misdeeds." 64

In his book ‘Militant Nationalism in India’, Bimanbehari Majumdar writes,

"The militant nationalists believed that the foreign domination was the fundamental cause of their misery and the quickest way of extricating them from it, was through revolution." 65
(In dependent India, numerous revolutionary activities took place to overthrow the alien rule. Some had happened on the Indian soil and some had activated from distant lands. In this sub-chapter it is not an easy task to incorporate all these. So, researcher has stressed upon some highlighted and also non-highlighted areas.)

To trace the early revolutionary activities of the nineteenth century India under British rule, we can go back to the Sannyasis’ and Fakirs’ militant activities followed by the Waahabi Movement. Sometime after, Vasudev Balwant Phadke of Maharashtra, along with Rohilla leader Ismail Khan took up the charge of continuing revolutionary activities from the Waahabis and made an unsuccessful attempt against the British Raj. Nationalist Muslims of the time like Jamaluddin Al Afgani, Shibi Nomani, Rashid Ahmad Gangoi, Mahmud Hassain toured extensively throughout India and invoked Indians for armed resistance against the British. In Bengal, Nabagopal Mitra had set up a National Theatre, a National Paper, a National Press and as well as Akhras. Bipin Chandra Pal states that in his college days he was a member of this Akhra. Rabindranath Tagore relates in his autobiography Jibana Smriti, how Rajmarayan Bose enlisted him and several other selected people as members of a secret society. Shibnath Shastri was also infected by revolutionary ideas and he then inspired a batch of young men including Bipin Chandra Pal who took oath of 'dedication to the cult of fire.' In the last part of nineteenth century, Vasudev Phadke prepared a manifesto on the ruthless British policy of exploitation which made a thrilling excitement and armed protest throughout India. Against the British domination Vasudev organized his forces and started warfare. But he was betrayed, sentenced to life-long transportation and ultimately died in jail. V. Joshi remarked,

"The single handed fight of Vasudev against the British Raj was found to be a failure. But it left a legacy and the seeds he sowed, grew into a mighty banyan tree with its roots spread over
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India, in about quarter of a century. His daring spirit was later taken up by the Chaphekar Brothers in Maharashtra and the revolutionaries in Bengal."

The period from 1907 to 1918, following the death of Vasudev Balwant Phadke was the formative years of the Classical Agniyuga (Militant Nationalism).

The militant activities in India formally started with the Anti-Partition Movement which was a turning point in the history of Indian National Congress and also of the country. As an outcome of this movement Extremists grouped in Congress which brought Active Resistance, new weapons to fight the Government. But this Active Resistance, very soon had transformed into 'Aggressive Resistance'. Why? History often offers examples of movements started beyond the limits of ideologies originally conceived and preached by a particular school. In this way Extremists favoured direct action against the government in the form of Active Resistance. But in course of time, they say that the man's innate revolutionary urge had generated unforeseen momentum which got its way through a new channel of 'Aggressive Resistance.'

Interestingly enough, some of the old guards of the Moderate School like Surendranath Banerjea had made contact with the militant nationalists. Bipin Chandra Pal in his Autobiography says that the Surendranath’s lecture on Mazzine led to the formation of many secret societies like the ‘Calcutta Student Community’ on the model of the Carbonari organization in Italy. And it is more interesting to know that Surendranath was himself the President of quite a number of secret societies.

Apart from the vigorous influence of the Swadeshi Upsurge, the practical reasons behind the rise of Militant Nationalism were mainly due to the emergence of educated middle class, terrible effect of famine and government's negligence in handling it properly, unemployment and various suppressive acts of the British. Another important factor which shaped the ideas and fired the
emotions of the revolutionaries was the influence of the Bengal Renaissance initiated by Raja Rammohan Roy in the first half of the nineteenth century and afterwards by the Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay and Swami Vivekananda. Side by side, ideology of the Henry Louis Vivian Dirozio invoked the spirit of rationalism and literature of the British and French enlightenment left a powerful intellectual legacy. These factors led to the rise of a group of fearless journalists and writers like Rajendralal Mitra, Ramgopal Ghosh, Peary Chand Mitra, Harish Mukherjee and Sisir Kumar Ghosh.

Here particular mention should be made of Swami Vivekananda and Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay’s inspiring writings. Also patriotic poems, songs and plays of other known and unknown writers played a pivotal role in shaping militant nationalists. Vivekananda wrote in 1897,

“What our country now wants are muscles of iron and nerves of steel, gigantic will which can penetrate into mysteries and the secrets of the universe and will accomplish their purpose in any fashion even if it meant going down to the bottom of the ocean and meeting death face to face. This is what we want and this can only be created, established and strengthened by understanding and realising the ideas of Advaita that ideal of oneness of all.”

He again said,

“Has it gone into your blood, coursing through your veins, becoming consonant with your heart beats? Has it made you almost mad? Are you seized with the one idea of the misery of ruin and have you forgotten all about your name, fame, your wives, your children, your property, even your own bodies? Have you done that? That is first step to become a patriot, the very first step.”
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Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay was able to foresee the need of creating brave sons of Mother India for achieving the liberation of the country. Sri Aurobindo inspired by Bankim Chandra wrote in Bhavani Mandir, "Worshippers of the Mother are they from their birth in her incarnation of the sword, lovers of death are they - not lovers of life - and of storm and stress." Bankim Chandra's *Dharmatattva* and *Anushilan* exerted great influence in shaping the mental outlook and physical organization of the underground revolutionary parties, like the *Anushilan Samity*.

Along with moral and intellectual stirring, the emotional mind of militant nationalism was prepared by the influence of patriotic songs, poems and plays. Mr. Farquhar said in 1912,

"In this new era we have the assertion of the full independence of the Indian mind. The educated Indians now regards himself as a full grown man, the equal in every respect of the cultural European, not to be set aside as an Asiatic or as a member of a dark race ..."

"The new nationalism is much more serious and open eyed than the thin old politician. It is burdened, tortured, driven forward by the conviction that the whole national life needs to be re-inspired, reborn.

"...Finally, where, the anarchists or in men of peace the new nationalism is willing to serve and suffer."70

The whole scenario is highlighted by Dr. Sumit Sarkar in right manner. He wrote,

"Rigidly excluded from military service, constantly accused of effeminacy by the rulers, it was natural for young Bengalees to seek psychological compensation in a cult of physical strength and somewhat exaggerated faith in the efficacy
of purely military methods and the mounting number of cases of intimidation and assault by Anglo-Indians must have helped to make the 'Akhras' seem even more indispensable. With physical culture came to be combined in the cause of 'Anushilan', the development of all human faculties in the service of the country and of a rejuvenated Hindu faith. Vivekananda’s teachings in the 1890’s gave a tremendous stimulus to national pride, tacitly identified with Hindu resurgence and inculcated a spirit of social service. There was also the impact of events abroad – the Boer War, which set Rajnarayan Basu’s nephew Janendranath thinking in terms of secret societies – and the meteoric rise of Japan, the influence in the early years of the new century of Okakura and Nivedita; as well as of course the reaction of Curzon’s arrogant ways."

The first feature of this militant nationalism was the growth of revolutionary journalism in Maharashtra, Bengal, Punjab and United Provinces. Important newspapers and journals of the time were Kesari, Poona Vaibhav, Madevritta, Kal, Vihari, Bande Mataram, Jugantar, Udbodhana, Sandhya, Navasakti, Karanyogin, Pratoda, Sahayak, Peshwal, Hoonkar, Swaraj, Desha-Sevak, Amrita Bazar Patrika, Karmayogin, Swarajya and the Indian Sociologist (London and Paris). Side by side, inflammatory literatures such as Laghu Abhinay, Bharat Gatha, Swadhinatar Itihas, Lives of Mazzini and Garibaldi, Desher Katha and New Lamp for the old and Kali the Mother were published and deserved special mention.

The second feature of the Militant Nationalism was the growth of Samities, whose primary objective was cultivation of the potential faculties of man and development of the self. In Maharashtra, Chaphekar Brothers had established the Samities like Mitramela and Abhinava Bharati. Naba Abhinava Bharati sprang up in Central India. In Bengal Satish Mukherjee and Nibaran Bhattacharya founded Atmaunnati Samiti in 1900. Bowbazar Byeam Samiti of
Calcutta started with the help of Bipin Behari Ganguly, Provash De and Indra Nath Nundy slowly spread over to rural areas, taking an active part in various militant activities. Anushilan Samiti of 1902 was founded by Pramathanath Mitra with the purpose of developing the physical fitness and courage among the Bengalis. It tried to organize a band of strong, vigorous, and fearless workers, ready to sacrifice their self-interest for promoting the larger interests of the nation. Men like Sir Gurudas Banerjee and Swami Saradananda used to take weekly classes in the Samiti. The Yugantar Group, started by Barindra Kumar Ghosh, Bhupendra Nath Dutta and Abinash Bhattacharya was much more outspoken about the means to be adopted in achieving independence. It openly preached the cult of bomb. They also provoked Indian army men to reduce their loyalty to the British. Citing an example of the Russian and the French army which joined the revolutionaries, it wrote on August 12, 1907—

"The revolutionists have additional advantages where the ruling power is a foreign power, because the latter has to recruit most of its troops from among the subject people. Much work can be done by the revolutionists very cautiously spreading the gospel of independence among the native troops. When the time arrives for a practical collision with the ruling power, the revolutionists not only get these troops among their ranks, but also the arms with which the ruling power supplied them. Besides, all the enthusiasm and courage of the ruling power can be destroyed by exciting a serious alarm in its minds." 72

In later times Anushilan Samiti became as a Federation or Cor-ordinator of its sister Samities. But A.C. Guha points out,

"It would be wrong to say that Anushilan Samiti was just a physical culture society and nothing more. It has also an intellectual side, as regular classes were held. It has even a political purpose through very incipient and undefined as yet." 73
Anushilan Samiti was followed by other Samities like *Suhrid* and *Sadhana* in Mymensingh; *Brati* in Faridpur; *Swadesh Bandhab Samiti* in Bakharganj; *Bhаратमत Samiti* in Punjab; Lotus and Dagger in London. But the Decca *Anushilan*, Yugantar Group of Calcutta and the *Ghadar* and *Islamic* Brotherhood had carried the revolutionary movement in India till 1918.

The third feature was the inspiring guidance of Sri Aurobindo, Rash Behari Bose and Sarala Devi in Bengal; Tilak and Chaphekar Brothers in Maharashtra and other notable figures throughout India. They were like institutions, under which a band of secret societies had formed, developed and worked against British. Barinda Kumar Ghosh writes that he was initiated by Sri Aurobindo with a sword and The *Gita* and had to take the following Vow:

“So long as I live and so long as India does not become free, I will maintain the Vow of revolution. If I let out any information or do any harm to the secret society, death will ensure at the hand of a secret murderer.”

Militant activities against the British were first started in the Poona region of Maharashtra. It was Tilak, whose revolutionary thinking, writing and speeches against the inhuman Epidemic Disease Act of 1897 heightened the moral of the commoners. *Dnyansagar*, a weekly, described in 1897 how ‘men and women and children are marched off to the camps with guards at the back and the front, bareheaded, bare-footed as if they were a pack of lawless banditti. Men prefer death rather than to remove to the plague hospital.’ After a few months, Rand and Ayerst, the men behind the enactment and execution of the Epidemic Disease Act were murdered by Damodar Hari Chaphekar and his brother Balkrishna and were sentenced to death. Kalicharan Ghosh described,

“The spirit of sacrifice for a cause that was displayed by Chaphekar Brothers can be traced back to the great mother who could offer two sons at the altar of the Motherland in the course of few months. Sister Nivedita came to know about the momentous event and thought of paying her respect in person to the mother,
then leading a life of devotion and retirement at Poona. The revered lady was engaged in her daily puja. Nivedita was astounded to find the Mother completely self-composed, no complaints; no regret.... The spirit of self-respect and march towards self-realization of the Indian Nation as well as its and Nivedita came to realize that it has proceeded far ahead of the stage of which she had any idea.”

In 1897 also, Shamji Krishna Varma, a member of Mitramela Abhinava Bharati Revolutionary Group left Bombay for London and started a monthly journal naming The Indian Sociologist. He also established a student hostel in London called India House for picking up his cadre for the revolutionary activities after returning back to India. Under the inspiration of Shamji Krishna Varma, came revolutionary patriots like Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, Madan Dhingra, Madame Cama and Lala Hardayal.

It is already stated that the Militant activities in Bengal was started with the Anti Partition movement which produced a deep and sweeping emotional upheaval. Side by side, the Government imposed various suppressive measures to tackle the situation.

In view of those severe repressions, the Calcutta based Amushilan Samiti and Dacca and Chandernagore Group of revolutionaries started Nihilist methods of militant activities – a tooth for a tooth, an eye for an eye. Following this, students started anti-circular movement against the circular of the Sir Bamphylde Fuller. National Volunteer Movement was started in 1906. Then started the period of Aurobindo, who organized Lotus and Dagger Society in London, returned back to India, came in contact with one Thakur Sahib, a Rajput Chief, who made him a practical revolutionary. Then Aurobindo started writing inflammable articles in Indu Prakash, New Lamp for the Old – thus ushering in a new age in revolutionary movement. For organizing revolutionary activities in Bengal Aurobindo sent his ardent followers like Barin Ghosh and others to
different parts of Bengal. Also, *Jugantar* Group of the Calcutta *Anushilan* had embarked upon a programme of terror, decoity and the publication of inflammable literature. In 1905, *Bhawani Mandir* was published, followed by *Mukti Kon Pathe* and *Bartaman Rananiti* in 1907. All these activities prepared the ground for some revolutionary action on the lines of Chaphekar Brothers.

At the night of December 6, 1907, an attempt was made near Naraingarh, Midnapore, to blow up the train in which Andrew Fraser, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal was traveling. On 23 December, 1907, Allen, formerly district Magistrate of Dacca, was shot dead by Sisir Guha, a Dacca *Anushilan Samiti* activist in Faridpur District. The next incident was an attempt on the life of Leon Tardevel, the Mayor of Chandernagore, on April 11, 1908. This assassination attempt was noticed by Paris Police and accordingly they had informed the British Government in this way,

"That there was in Paris a Russian anarchist named Safranshi, an ex-officer of Engineers, who was in touch with some Hindu (Hindusthani) students in that city supposed to be Bengalis; and that they are supplying arms and ammunition to the anarchists of Calcutta and Chandernagore." 76

The situation became grave by an occurrence, which took place on April 30, 1908 at Mazaffarpore. D.H. Kingsford was the District Judge here. While he was the Chief Presidency Magistrate in Calcutta, he incurred the displeasure of the secret societies by convicting several newspapermen and by ordering the whipping of a 15 year boy named Sushil Sen for a fracas with the police at Lalbazar Police Court Compound during *Bande Mataram* prosecution case. Previously Kingsford was planned to murder by a Book Bomb. In attempting to kill Kingsford again, Mrs. and Miss Kennedy were murdered by a bomb thrown at their carriage at Muzaffarpore by Kshudiram Bose and Prafulla Chaki. Kingsford escaped unheart as he was not in the carriage.
Acting on definite information, the police conducted simultaneous searches on May 2, 1908, at the Garden House at 32 Murari Pukur Road, 48 Grey Street, and 33/4, Raja Navakrissen Street, 15 Gopimohan Dutta Lane and 134 Harrison Road. The searches resulted in arrest of a number of revolutionaries like Aurobindo Ghosh, his brother Barindra Kumar Ghosh, Ullaskar Dutta, Abinash Bhattacharya, Sailendra Nath Bose, Satyendra Nath Bose, Sushil Sen and Kanailal Dutta of the Jugantar Group. L. Birley, District Magistrate, 24 Parganas, who after preliminary enquiry sent accused persons to Session Court for trial. In this way, the historic Alipore Conspiracy Case was commenced before C.P. Beachcraft, Additional Session Judge, Alipore, on 19 October 1908. Narendranath Gosai, turned approver in this historic trial. But on 1 September 1908, Kanailal Dutta and Satyen Bose dramatically put an end to Narendranath’s life inside the trial room. This revenge had earned the applause of the French Socialist newspaper *L’Humanite* and the *Indu Prakash* made the following statement on 5 September 1908.

"The Bengal anarchists may be considered to be the most romantic lot in the whole anarchist world and in point of bravery, rascality and cunning they simply cast into the shade Russian and Spanish desperados – quick in action, quick in revenge, smart in overpowering powerful European Warders, and smart in getting rid of an approver. The anarchist law is terrible indeed and their creed in this respect was better let go half dozen spleen-cracking Europeans than allow a traitor to escape." 77

The judgment of the Alipore Bomb Case was announced on May 1909.

After the Alipore Conspiracy Case, in East Bengal in November 1908, Pramatha Nath Mitra, the founder of *Anushilan Samiti* entrusted its effective leadership to Pullin Behari Das and it soon became the most powerful revolutionary organization in India. Incidentally, it may be mentioned here that the Jugantar and Anushilan, though they formally both went under the name of *Anushilan*, maintained separate identities for all practical purposes.
Following revolutionary activities organized by the Militant Nationalists of Bengal in succeeding months.

Conspiracy Cases were held at Midnapore (1908), Nangla (1910), Khulana Jessore Gang Case (1910), Munshiganj (1910), and Howrah (1910).

Bomb attacks in Kankinara, Shyamnagar, Belghoria, Agarpara, Sodepur and Kharda.

Decoity Cases were held at Naria (1908), Barrah (1908), Bajitpur (1908), Bighati (1908), Haludbari (1909), Mahilsa (1909), Nangla (1909), Rajendrapur (1909), Coomilla (1912), Chandra Kona (1915), Gopinath Roy Lane (1916), Ariadaha (1916), Shibpur (1916) and Agarpara (1916). Murder of Monomohan Dey (1911), Rotilal Roy (1911), Rasul Dewani and Kalibinod Chakraborty (1911), Debendra Ghosh (1913), Nipendra Nath Ghosh (1914), Umesh Chandra Dey, alias Ramdas (1914), S.P. Basanta Chatterjee (1916), Inspector Suresh Chandra Mukherjee (1916), Murari Mohan Mitra (1916), Amritlal Roy, Post Master, Sankharitola (1923).

Naturally, to curb the revolutionary activities in Bengal, the Government by virtue of a special power vested in it by the 14th Amendment Act of 1908 declared the following organizations unlawful:

1. Dacca Anushilan Samiti
2. Swadesh Bandhab Samiti of Bakharganj
3. Brati Samiti of Faridpur
4. Suhrid Samiti of Mymensingh
5. Sadhana Samiti of Mymensingh

In the Punjab, revolutionary nationalism was sparked off by Lala Lajpat Rai in 1906, when he went with Bal Gangadhar Tilak to Bengal to attend the Shivaji Utsav organized by Bepin Chandra Pal in collaboration with the Calcutta
Anushilan Samiti. The State of Punjab had the background of the Kuka uprising of 1868 which continued till 1871. Thus, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was a great stir in Punjab against the British over the land Alienation Act and the Colonization Bill. Lajpat Rai took up the case along with Sardar Ajit Singh, Kishan Singh, Aga Hyder, Sufi Amba Prasad and Syed Hyder Reza.

This revolutionary nationalism of Punjab had transformed to revolutionary secret societies with a different aspect. In 1907 were organized Indian Patriots’ Association and Bharat Mata Samiti for the betterment of the condition of the peasants. But very soon it had infiltrated the armed forces. Ajit Singh openly preached the removal of British rule and exhorted the people not to be afraid of the armed superiority of the Government. He even told them that it would be better and nobler to die for freedom of the country than to die of hunger and plague. Lala Lajpat Rai could not be indifferent to these developments and when he joined in, he became the natural leader. In May 1907, the Civil and Military Gazette of Lahore described him as ‘a rebel busily involved in the affairs of his insurrectionary enterprise with a hundred thousand desperados at his command.’ The Englishman openly charged him with having tampered with the loyalty of the Indian Army. The reason behind this allegation of the British was genuine as the whole of Punjab was erupting like a volcano. Even discontentment was spreading fast in the army. Lord Kitchener, Commander-in-chief of the British Army was perturbed and sent an urgent message to London suggesting the modification of the Agrarian system and the immediate arrest of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh. Accordingly, they were arrested and sent to Mandalay Jail in Burma. Regarding this arrest, the Lieutenant Governor of Punjab, Sir Denzil Ibbetson remarked, “Everywhere they could sense a new wind blowing through men’s mind.”

This burning anti-British flame swept the entire Punjab including Rawalpindi, Sialkot, Lyallpur, Amritsar, Ferozpur and Lahore. Sarala Devi became an organizer of revolutionary secret society there. After 1908, Niralamba
Swami (Jatin Bandopadhyay) made an extensive tour in Punjab to pick up revolutionaries in order to form a society on the model of Bhavani Mandir. Sufi Amba Prasad had started to maintain contact with the Calcutta Anushilan Samiti. Jugantar, Mukti Kon Pathe, Bartaman Rananiti and other proscribed literatures were available to them. Lal Chand Falak was arrested with bombs and seditious literature. Bhai Paramanand was also prosecuted on the charge of carrying a copy of bomb manual used by the Alipore conspirators.

The next attempt to strengthen the militant nationalism in Punjab was made by Lala Hardayal, a distinguished revolutionary of international fame. When in England on a state scholarship, Lala Hardayal first came in contact with Shamji Krishnavarma and got initiated into the revolutionary party. As a protest against the tyranny of British rule, he left England for Lahore. There, he started teaching students and under the name Dinanath, he initiated two students, J.M. Chatterjee and Abodh Behari, into revolutionary activities. He then introduced these two young revolutionaries to Rash Behari Bose and very soon under the leadership of Rash Behari, the Bengal and Punjab Group worked jointly against the British.

In this regard, mention should be made of Sundarlal of Punjab, who played a pivotal role in spreading disaffection through the paper Karmayogi of Allahabad from 1919 onwards. Along with Karmayogi, Swarajya and Hindi Pratap with which Sundarlal was deeply involved, defying all threats became instruments of revolutionary activities in Northern India. When Sundarlal was on a tour with Lajpat Rai and Bal Gangadhar Tilak in 1909, he organized different revolutionary cells in Kanpur, Lucknow and Allahabad. His speeches, according to Punjab Police record, showed him to be 'a reckless youth of considerable ability.' A. C. Guha rightly comments on Sundarlal,

"Besides spreading sedition by means of his papers, Sundarlal was evidently, therefore, closely connected for the time being with this very dangerous gang of active revolutionaries. He spent most of his time in Allahabad, and so was not in the centre
of the movement of Banaras, but his influence in preparing the
ground in that part of India was very great."

From the early years of the twentieth century, groups of Indians
established centres for revolutionary activities in Europe, America and Asia.
They carried on propaganda for India's independence among Indians living
abroad and mobilized them for revolutionary operations. They maintained
contacts with revolutionary groups in India and supplied them with concerned
literature and even arms. One of the earliest Indian revolutionaries outside India
was as said before, Shamji Krishnavarma in London. He published a nationalist
journal, 'The Indian Sociologist', and established the India House, a hostel for
Indian students. Soon, the hostel became the centre for a Revolutionary Group
which included V.D. Savarkar, a founder of the Abhinava Bharati Society
in Maharashtra. Savarkar established contacts with the Irish revolutionary
organization Sinn Fein. In 1911, he was sentenced to transportation for life.

Madan Lal Dhingra, a member of this Group, assassinated Curzon-Wyllie, an
official of the India Office in 1909 and was executed. During 1910-1914, Paris
became the most important centre of Indian revolutionaries in Europe. Madame
Cama, who brought out the journal Bande Mataram, S.R. Rana and many others,
had already been active there. They established contacts with Socialists in France
and elsewhere. Madame Cama also participated in the Congress of the Second
International at Stuttgart in 1907. When the First World War broke out, Cama
and Rana were interned in France, and Krishnavarma moved to Geneva. Indian
revolutionaries tried to secure the help of Turkey and Germany, Britain's enemies
in the War for overthrowing the British rule. Berlin became their most important
centre in Europe. Virendranath Chattopadhyaya, who published the Talvar, was
joined by Bhupendra Nath Dutta, Barkatulla, Champak Raman Pillai and others,
and the Berlin Committee was formed. In the meantime, a powerful organization
of Indian revolutionaries had been formed in North America. This, and the Berlin
Committee taking advantage of the War, tried to organize anti-British uprisings
in India during the War.
In Madras, early in December 1910, some hardcore revolutionaries, viz, V.V.S. Aiyar, Shyamji Krishnavarma, Madame Cama and others joined in a secret meeting and choose Vanchi Aiyar, trained him as a professional revolutionary and deputed him to assassinate to Ashe, District Magistrate of Tinnevelly. On 17 June, 1911, the action was performed with rare perfection. Vanchi committed suicide as directed. Upon the body of the Vanchi was found a letter in Tamil language which asked every Indians to drive out the English ad restore Swarajya and Sanatan Dharma. His model was Shivaji, Krishna, Guru Govind and Arjun. Three thousand Madrasis had taken a vow to kill George V, as soon as he landed in the country.

The British Government of India, in honour of the visit of the King George V, had arranged a grand Imperial Durbar at Delhi on 12 December 1912. On the occasion, when Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy of India made a state entry into the imperial city (transfer of Capital from Calcutta to Delhi was one of the agenda for the occasion), a powerful bomb exploded, but the Viceroy narrowly escaped death, although one of his A.D.C.s was killed. The revolutionaries considered this attack on Lord Hardinge as their greatest triumph.

After some time, the police ultimately suspected that Rash Behari Bose was the brain behind the Delhi bomb case. Police there circulated his photograph and offered a reward of Rs. 7,500/- to any one giving information leading to his arrest. But Rash Behari was highly skilled in threat of befooling the authorities. He was then employed as a C.I.C. informer. When he came to know that the police had come to suspect him, he went underground.

Another incident happened in Lahore to kill Lawrence Gordon. Gordon had already earned hatred of revolutionaries while posted at Maulvi Bazar, Sylhet by indiscriminate firing on followers of Swami Dayananda. The job of boarding Cordon had been assigned to Basanta Biswas. The attempt, on 17 December 1913...
was however, miscarried. The police arrested Diananath, Bal Mukund, Abodh Behari, and Amirchand as instigator and operator.

At the approach of the First World War, leaders of all the revolutionary parties Anushilan Samiti and Jugantar Group joined hands for an armed revolution. Thus organized a plan for achieving German arms, money and technical assistance. A Committee, named the Indian Independence Committee was formed for the purpose. Its first plan was to collect all the Indian revolutionaries working outside India. The second plan was to organize an attack on the Andaman Cellular Jail to liberate the deported revolutionary prisoners. The third and most important plan, the Committee decided to undertake was to send arms to India through the Pacific Ocean. A plan of the Committee a ship with arms left from San Francisco and halted Yokohama and Manila. But ultimately the plan could not achieve the estimated result.

Then came the famous Komagata Maro incident of 29 September 1914. More than 350 discontented Sikhs having the intention of freeing India started from Vancouver on 23 July 1914, on the S.S. Komagata Maru, a Japanese ship. After two months, the ship was enter in the Hooghly River and stopped near Budge-Budge of Calcutta. Having suspected the intention of the ship, the British police came on ship-board and ordered the passengers to leave from the ship. Then was happened a massacre of un-armed Sikhs by the firing of British police, in which, according to official report, 20 died while 211 were arrested out of 350 passengers.

The history of the revolutionary movement during the War years, from July 1914 to November 1918, may be divided into four sections:

1. The attempt to raise an army revolt which ended in failure in February 1915.
2. The unsuccessful implementation of the German scheme in the Far East which ended by the middle of 1915.
3. The unsuccessful implementation of the Turco-German Scheme in the Middle East which ended by the middle of 1916.

4. The desperate revolutionary forces of the major parties like Anushilan, Jugantar and Ghadar between 1916 and 1917.

Here, mention should be made of Ghadar Party and Pan-Islamic Brotherhood, who constituted an uprising in three sectors – Far East, Middle East and Northern India, in collaboration with the Islamic Brotherhood of Deoband.

As early as 26 August 1914, the Atmaunnati Group, led by Bipin Behari Ganguly and Anukul Mukherjee and also leaders of Jugantar Group managed to remove 50 Mauser pistols and a huge quantity of ammunition ready to delivery to Messrs Rodda & Co. premier Gun Merchants of Calcutta. Surely, this theft of 50 Mauser pistols and 46,000 rounds of ammunition was an event of major importance in the development of revolutionary crime in Bengal. These arms had been distributed amongst nine different groups including Anushilan Samiti members and official record shows that in later time these Mauser pistols were freely used in revolutionary action.

In early 1915, Jatindra Nath Mukherjee (Bagha Jatin), along with Narendra Nath Bhattacharya, Atul Ghosh, Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyay and Naren Ghosh Chaudhury made elaborate plans to collect German arms, as per the information received from the Barlin Committee. For purchasing these arms they performed a series of robberies in Calcutta. These robberies provoked Charles Tegart a lot. Nearly all the Yugantar leaders had to go underground to avoid arrest.

In March 1915, Jatin Lahiri, an activists of Jugantar Group returned from Germany with the information that the S.S. Maverick and few others ships would start for India with a huge load of arms in April. Accordingly, Jatin Mukherjee and his colleagues such as Bhupati Majumder, Phani Chakrabarti, and Bholanath
Chatterjee made organizational arrangements to receive the arms and money expected to be landed at Raimangal in the Sundarban, at Orissa coast and at Goa. Unfortunately, the plan was leaked by one Czech revolutionary refugee. Naturally, the British Government took every precaution to prevent S.S. Maverick and other ships on high areas. The ships were prevented by the Dutch authorities in Batavia and the British authorities in Shanghai. It was further arranged by the revolutionaries that one shipload of arms would be unloaded at a place called Gokarn on the Konkan coast near Goa. But before that could happen, concerned activities were arrested. Bholanat Chatterjee, the key planner, was betrayed in Goa. On 27 January 1916, Bholanath committed suicide in prison. He was considered to be one of the most reliable and brilliant members of Jugantar and hope of getting arms through west coast thus disappeared with Bholanath’s arrest.

Regarding the aforesaid attempt, British police searched heavily for Jatin Mukherjee and his allies. But Jatin was no where to be found. As organization in concerned, the extensive areas of the Chhota Nagpur Hills from Chakradharpur to Mayurvanj and Balasore on the South, the revolutionary activities were needed to be properly organized. The police however got a clue of those activities. Jatin Mukherjee went there after a few days along with Monoranjan Sengupta, Chittapriya Roy Chowdhury, Niren Das Gupta and Jyotish Pal. They lived in a village called Kaptipada, 30 miles away from the Balasore Town. Having heard the news from a definite source, the police immediately rushed there. In the meantime, Jatin and his allies left the village and decided to start the last battle inside the dense forest nearby. Jatin was repeatedly requested by Chittapriya and Monoranjan to escape alone, but that was not to be. The battle with British Police had continued for long hours. Chittapriya became the first martyr while Jatin Mukherjee expired his brave life in the next day in hospital. Monoranjan, Niren and Jyotish were tried. Thus ended a glorious but tragic episode in the history of the freedom struggle in India.
Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, better known as Mahatma Gandhi (Father of Indian Nation), was the greatest national leader, whose emergence on the Indian political scene was spectacular. Born on 2 October 1869, at Porbandar (Kathiawad) in Gujarat, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi first studied in Law in England and then worked as pleader in South Africa. There he earned political fame as a leader of the Asiatics against the white rule. He returned India, 'the land of deliverance' in 1915, and set up an Ashrama at Sabarmati near Ahmedabad, where he planned to train his followers in his own methods and ideas to which he had given shape in South Africa. The inmates of the Ashrama were supposed to observe truth, non-violence (Ahimsa), control of food, non-stealing, non-possession, fearlessness and use of Swadeshi goods.

Mahatma Gandhi’s political career was neither sudden nor accidental. Only sharp political eyes on the objective conditions of the then India had contributed towards his success. Scholar like Judith Brown views his rise primarily in the context of Indian power politics. Some consider him basically to be a humanist and place him to the level of a saint. He was quite intelligent to guess the pulse and nerve of the people, and at the right time he projected himself with some basic principles which were too different from the prevalent Indian political trend followed by a new technique of un-armed non-violent struggle, he had developed in South Africa. So, political Gandhi cannot be separated from the saint-like other Gandhi and unification of the two gave Gandhi a unique strength and enabled him to gain a grip over the masses. Judith Brown says,

"Here was a man who announced that he wished to live the life of a Hindu ascetic, yet plunged into politics and parleyed with Viceroy. Here was an Indian who castigated his compatriots as unfit for Home Rule because of their moral and social failing, yet presented them with a novel technique of revolution with which to undermine the might of the British Raj. Here was a nationalist
who preached love of the imperial opponent. In the face of this phenomenon both rulers and ruled were at a loss. They had only a dim idea of Gandhi’s ultimate goal, and consequently were often unable to understand or anticipate the steps he took towards that goal.\textsuperscript{82}

When he came back to his motherland, Gandhiji was little known to the public. But his political career as well as his potentiality in politics was, by then, an established fact in South Africa. The fact was that the Secretary of State for the colonies in South Africa felt relief and wrote in March 1914 that “The best possible outcome will be if Gandhi will return to his native land”.\textsuperscript{83} The British authorities in India also became alert of his homecoming. According to Government report, the British identified him as a leader so different from other Indian leaders of the time. The Governor of Bombay, Lord Willington had expressed his keen desire to meet Gandhiji for knowing his viewpoint on the Government. Responding to the call, Gandhiji answered," I can very easily give the promise, in so much as it may my rule, as a Satyagrahi, to understand the viewpoint of the party I propose to deal with, and try to agree with him as far may be possible."\textsuperscript{84}

Gandhiji’s political philosophy was first reflected in Hind Swaraj, the true testament of Gandhian ideology in 1908, where influence of Tolstoy is quite evident. This was divided into twenty chapters and also in perfect Gandhian style – terse, simple and logical. He himself said,

“I have but endeavoured humbly to follow Tolstoy, Ruskin, Thoreau, Emerson and other writers, besides the masters of Indian philosophy. Tolstoy has been one of my teachers for a number of years.”\textsuperscript{85}

In Indian politics, Gopal Krishna Gokhle was considered by Gandhiji himself as his political Guru. In early 1912, Gokhle commented,
“Gandhi is without doubt made of the stuff of which heroes and martyrs are made. Nay, more. He has in his men around him into heroes and martyrs.”

In the initial stage, Gandhi as advised by Gopal Krishna Gokhale acquainted himself with the politics through a dialogue with the educated classes already active in the Congress and also by undertaking an extensive tour of the country. But Gokhale’s pre-mature death at the age of 49 was a great loss to the nation and as well as Gandhiji. It was in accordance with Gokhale’s advice that Gandhiji took one year time to study minutely the trends of Indian politics before participating in any direct political action. Then within the space of few years, he led movements of the peasantry at Champaran and Kheda; and a strike of the textile workers of Ahmedabad. Gandhiji’s association with this agitation provided him with an insight into the political attitude of the popular classes.

By the time, when the aforesaid limited Satyagraha experiments of Gandhi came to a successful conclusion, he then appeared on the border national scene. Jawaharlal Nehru wrote,

“And then Gandhi came. He was like a power current of fresh air that made us stretch ourselves and take deep breaths; like a beam of light that pierced that darkness and removed the scales from our eyes; like a whirlwind that upset many things, but most of all the working of people’s minds. He did not descend from the top; he seemed to emerge from the millions of India, speaking their language and incessantly drawing attention to them and their appalling condition. Get off the backs of these peasants and workers, he told us, all you who live by their exploitation; get rid of the system that produces this poverty and misery. Political freedom took new shape then and acquired a new content ... The essence of his teaching was fearlessness and truth, and action allied to these always keeping the welfare of the masses in view. The greatest gift for an individual or a nation, so we had been told
in our ancient books, was abhaya (fearlessness), not merely bodily courage but the absence of fear from the mind.... But the dominant impulse in India under British rule was that of the widespread secret service; fear of the official class; fear of laws meant to suppress and of prison; fear of the landlord's agent; fear of the money-lender; fear of unemployment and starvation, which were always on the threshold. It was against this all-pervading fear that Gandhi's quiet and determined voice was raised. Be not afraid.87

Gandhiji's political methods and directions are as follows:

**Satyagraha and Value-Based Politics:**

Gandhiji developed his philosophy of action - *Satyagraha* during the course of his struggle against Racialism in South Africa. *Satyagraha* means the force born of truth, self-suffering and non-violence. Some scholars have noticed strains of the Vaishnava tradition of *ahimsa* in the ideology of *Satyagraha*. *Satyagraha* represented a much higher level of thought which is a curious blend of philosophical, ethical and mystic elements. Thus, a *Satyagrahi* would refuse to submit to whatever he considered to be wrong and remain peaceful under provocation. According to Gandhiji, *Satyagraha* depends upon moral values and value-based politics depends upon the human courage, patience and sufferings which are considered as vehicles to achieve higher goals. Pattavi Sitaramayya says,

"It involves self-chosen suffering and humiliation for the resisters. If it is effective, it is so by working on the conscience of those, against whom it is being used, sapping their confidence in the exclusive rightness of their cause, making their physical strength impotent, and weakening their resolution by insinuating a sense of guilt for the sufferings they have part in causing." 88
Satyagraha, according to Gandhiji—

1. A Satyagrahi, i.e. a civil resister, will harbour no anger.

2. He will suffer the anger of an opponent.

3. In doing so, he will put up with assaults from the opponent, never retaliate but he will not submit, out of fear of punishment or the like, to any order given in anger.

4. A civil resister will not salute the Union Jack, nor will he insult it or officials, English or Indian.

5. As a prisoner, civil resister will behave courteously towards prison officials and will observe all such discipline of the prison as is not contrary to self-respect; as for instance, whilst he will salaam the officials in the usual manner, he will not permit any humiliating gyrations and will refuse to shout ‘Victory to Sarker’ or the like.

6. A civil resister will make no distinction between an ordinary prisoner and himself, will in no way regard himself as superior to the rest; not will he ask for any conveniences that may not be necessary for keeping his body in good health and condition. He is entitled to ask for such conveniences as may be required for his physical and spiritual well being.

7. A civil resister will joyfully obey all the orders issued by the leader of the corps, whether they please him or not.

8. He will carry out orders in the first instance even though they appear to him to be insulting inimical or foolish, and then appeal to high authorities .... If the sum total of the energy for the corps appears to a member to be improper or immoral, he has a right to sever his connection; but being within, he has no right to commit a breach of its discipline.

9. No civil resister is to expect maintenance for his dependents. It would be an accident if any such provision is made. A civil register entrusts his dependents to the care of God. Even in ordinary warfare wherein hundreds of thousands give themselves up to it, they are able to make no previous provisions. How much more, then should such be the case in Satyagraha? It is the universal experience that in such times hardly anybody is left to starve.
In its practical application Satyagraha has several hands:
1. Non-cooperation – Hartal, Fast, Picketing, Non-violent March;
2. Civil disobedience.

**Swadeshi and Swaraj:**

Swadeshi was Gandhiji's watchword. It is that spirit in man which restricts him to the use and service of his immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the more remote. Gandhiji's Swadeshi programme was directed towards the social and economic uplift of society, especially of the villages. In this connection Gandhiji denounced western civilization in its entirety. He said,

"We consider our civilization to be far superior to yours; we consider your schools and law courts to be useless. We want our own ancient schools and courts to be restored. The common language of India is not English, but Hindi. We can hold communication with you only in our national language". So he raised the slogan, 'Drive out Western civilization. All else will follow.'

Regarding Swaraj, he wrote in 1921,

"I am individually working for the self-rule pictured therein. But today, my corporate activity is undoubtedly devoted to the attainment of parliamentary Swaraj in accordance with the wishes of the people of India".

After coming to India in 1915, Gandhiji offered all support with money and men to Britain during the First World War. So, he was awarded the Kaiser-Hind Medal for his service to the British Empire. But, in Indian politics he preferred to remain in the background and refused to participate in any particular political network, though he attended the Congress session in 1915 and was nominated as a member of the Subjects Committee. In 1916, he attended the Belgaum Conference and supported the reunification of the two wings of the
Congress; but he declared that he was an outsider, who did not belong to any party, and was merely present because he thought it was his duty as a servant of his country. He attended the reunited Congress of Lahore in 1916, but kept himself aloof. Thus, like an ideal diplomat cum politician he restored his energy and devoted all his attention to a slow as well as steady preparation for launching his own weapon – Satyagraha – when there was no other alternative but to look to him for a new leadership.

The situation came alive for Gandhiji after the World War when prevalent brand of politics reached a dead-end under the imperialist repression. This ultimately paved the way for the emergence of Gandhian era in Indian National Congress in the succeeding years. Regarding Gandhiji’s entry into the Congress, Jawaharlal Nehru wrote,

“Gandhi for the first time entered the Congress organization and immediately brought about a complete change in its organization. He made it a democratic and mass organization. Democratic it had been previously also, but it had so far been limited in franchise and restricted to the upper classes. Now the peasants followed in and, in its new garb, it began to assume the look of a vast agrarian organization with a strong sprinkling of the middle classes. This agrarian character was to grow. Industrial workers also came in, but as individuals and not in their separate organized capacity”.

So, in 1919, Gandhiji plunged into India’s struggle for freedom and considered it as a ‘spiritual crusade.’ He then projected his method of Satyagraha which was an attempt to spiritualize politics. Soon, the common men of India accepted this creed and gradually leaned towards the Gandhian path which ultimately manifested itself in the Non Co-operation Movement.

Following circumstances led to the Non Co-operation Movement:
The Rowlatt act, 1919

Indians were not satisfied with the Reform of 1919. The Government granted them concessions which were much below their expectations. Disheartened Gandhiji organized in 1917, the Champaran Satyagraha in Bihar to fight for the right of the farmers against Indigo planters and he forced the Government to make investigations into farmers' grievances, and find a solution for their problems. The Ahmedabad Mill employees' strikes in 1918-19 against exploitation by the employers also received Gandhiji's support. He persuaded the capitalists to increase the wages of the workers. Gandhiji and Sardar Patel also led a successful Kisan campaign in Khaira in Gujarat. Meanwhile Indian soldiers, who returned after their victory in the World War, were also disillusioned with the political conditions in India. The countries in which they had fought, enjoyed civil liberties while in their own country, these were denied.

In this volcanic situation, British Government passed an Act known as the Rowlatt act 1919 (so named after the President of the Committee). The Act passed a set of new repressive measures to counter all political unrest, which manifested itself in many situations. By this Act, the Government could arrest any person without assigning any reason for the arrest, search any place without a warrant and imprison anyone without trial.

Opposition to this ‘Black Act’, as it came to be known, spread like wildfire. An all-India hartal was observed on 8 April 1919. Meetings were held all over the country to show people's resentment to the inhuman repressive measures. The Indian Press, too, gave full support to the mass agitation. It is at this juncture that Mahatma Gandhi came to the forefront and took the lead of the freedom movement in his hands.

The Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy

After the First World War, the hopes and aspirations of the Indians met with not a reward but with repression. There was a wave of anger and frustration
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at the promulgation of the Rowlatt Act. Gandhiji requested the Viceroy to repeal the Act, but he refused. Then he decided to launch his Satyagraha campaign and called for an all-India hartal on a certain day and asked people to suspend business, as well as to pray and fast. The strike was peaceful, but in some areas, it took serious turn.

On 30 March and 6 April 1919, peaceful strikes were organized at Amritsar to protest against the Rowlatt Act in which Congress leaders like Dr. Satyapal and Dr. Kitchlu were arrested. This sparked off a strike in the city and people marched to the Deputy Commissioner to request him to release the leaders. When police opened fire, the mob turned violent and killed a few officers, injured two British women, set fire to Government buildings, as well as looted property.

On 13 April 1919, people organized a peaceful general meeting in a small garden in Amritsar, against the proclamation issued by General Dyer on 12 April which forbade public meetings and processions. The meeting place was an enclosed plot of ground known as Jallianwala Bagh. General Dyer came with troops, blocked the only exit of the compound and ordered his troops to open fire on the crowd without warning. A large number of people were killed and wounded.

The whole of India was stunned by this inhuman massacre and widespread resentment started. To prevent this, Government proclaimed Martial Law all over Punjab and university students in Lahore were subjected to untold indignities. Citizens of Lahore were ordered to crawl across a street which was nicknamed the 'Crawling Street.'

This notorious act of the British Government shattered the faith of Mahatma Gandhi. He vowed not to co-operate with the British and declared, 'Co-operation in any shape or form with this satanic Government is sinful.'
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The Khilafat Movement

In the First World War, Turkey had fought against the British and was defeated. The British and their allies divided the territories of Turkish Empire among themselves and abolished the office of the Khalifa who was regarded as a spiritual head of the Muslims all over the World. This harsh treatment had generated anti-British feelings among the Muslims of India and under the leadership of the Ali brothers, Mohammed Ali and Shaukat Ali, a powerful agitation was launched. This was known as Khilafat Movement.

The Khilafat Movement adopted the non-co-operation programmes like boycott of Legislative Councils, foreign goods, Government Schools and Colleges, Government functions and surrendering of titles and distinctions. In 1921, the Khilafat Committee appealed to all the Muslims not to join the police or armed forces, and not to pay taxes.

Gandhiji found in this movement, vast possibilities of achieving Hindu-Muslim unity and of putting up a joint front against British imperialism. So, he extended the full support of the Congress to the Khilafat Movement. Hartals and protests meetings were jointly organized. Then, the Ali Brothers were arrested and jailed in September 1921.

The Non-Co-operation Movement

Under the leadership of Gandhiji, the Indian National Congress at the regular session held at Nagpur in 1920, passed the Non-Co-operation programme with a large majority. Mahatma Gandhi announced that the goal of this movement was the attainment of Swaraj or self-government by peaceful and legitimate means.

The Non-Co-operation Movement involved the following:
1. Surrendering of titles and offices and resignation from nominated posts in the local bodies.
2. Boycott of Government schools, colleges and law courts.

In order to give an example of this movement from his own life, Gandhiji returned the medals he had been awarded for his work in South Africa. Inspired by this many educated Indians returned their degrees, titles and honours. People boycotted Government functions and thousands of people left the Government jobs. The lawyers gave up their legal practice. Students left their schools and colleges. Teachers submitted their resignation and worked for the movement.

The Congress boycotted the elections and put up no candidates for the first elections to the Councils. The boycott even extended to the visit of the Prince of Wales to Bombay on 17 November 1921. To prevent the royal visit, there were violent demonstrations which the police countered with severe methods of repression in Bombay.

People made contributions to finance the Movement. Women offered their jewellery to augment the national fund. Shops selling foreign goods and liquor were picketed. Bonfires were made of foreign cloths in busy streets and market-places all over the country. Because of the positive principles of this movement, indigenous educational institutions were established, such as the Jamia Milia Islamia in Delhi, Kashi Vidyapeeth in Varanasi and Gujarat Vidyapith in Gujarat. They inculcated feelings of patriotism and nationalism in students along national lines. Khadi became the symbol of freedom. The Charkha appeared in every house by July 1921. In short, the Movement had thoroughly roused the country.

Reacting on this, the Government declared the Congress an unlawful organization and arrested many of its members and volunteers. People defied Government orders and were, therefore, jailed. Almost 30,000 people were put behind the bars.
In December 1921, the session of the Congress was held at Ahmedabad which decided to continue with greater vigour the Non Co-operation Movement. Gandhiji was authorized to intensify the movement by breaking the British laws such as non-payment of taxes. He decided to try civil disobedience in Bardoli, a small tehsil in Gujarat. But a serious incident at Chauri Chaura in Uttar Pradesh made Gandhiji change his plan.

**Chauri Chaura Incident**

At this juncture, violence broke out at Chauri Chaura - a village near Gorakhpur, where a violent mob stormed and burnt a police station and killed twenty-two policemen. Gandhiji, the apostle of non-violence, was, therefore, visibly moved and disappointed. He realized that the country was not yet ripe for a non-violent struggle and suddenly announced the suspension of the movement. Gandhiji remarked, "As a congressman wishing to keep the Congress intact, I, advice suspension of Non-co-operation, for I see that the nation is not ready for it. But as an individual, I cannot and will not do so, as long as the Government remains what it is. It is not merely policy with me, it is article of faith. Non Co-operation and Civil Disobedience are but different branches of the same tree called Satyagraha. It is my Kalpadrum, lam-i-jam, the universal provider. Satyagraha is search for truth, and God is truth. Ahimsa Or non-violence is the light that reveals that truth to me. Swaraj for me is part of the truth.

Congress leaders like Chittaranjan Das, Subhas Chandra Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru were shocked at this decision. Subhas Chandra said, 'To sound the order of retreat, just when public enthusiasm was reaching the boiling point, was nothing short of a calamity'.

On 10 March 1922, Gandhiji was arrested and sentenced to six years imprisonment on the charge of sedition. He not only pleaded guilty but also asked the judge to give the most severe punishment.
Outcome of the Movement

The Movement brought Gandhiji into close touch with the masses, both the peasants in the rural areas and the workers in the urban areas. Earlier, the national movement had remained the concern of the middle class and intelligentsia. Now, Gandhiji was the only leader whose personal identification with rural masses was total and complete. Therefore, he became the symbol of the poor and the down-trodden.

The movement also surpassed all caste and creed distinctions in the society. The Khilafat Movement and Gandhiji himself played a great role in bringing about long-awaited Hindu-Muslim unity for a time.

The Congress became a revolutionary organization because it adopted a new and changed programme. It followed the aims and objective of the militant nationalism, but tempered them with its creed of non-violence, hence received the support of the common masses.

The Non Co-operation Movement instilled confidence among the Indians and made them bold. They came to understand that if they work united, the road to freedom was not far away. It exploded the notion, 'It was only the Englishmen who by their birth and training are fit to rule India.'

Political atmosphere was so tensed when Government arrested Mahatma Gandhi and did not mitigate their repression. The thirty-seventh Annual Session of the Indian National Congress was held at Gaya in December 1922, where some frustrated and disappointed Congress leaders like Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das (President of the Session), and Pandit Motilal Nehru advocated ‘Council Entry’ to follow a plan of ‘uniform, consistent and continuous obstruction for mending or ending’ the new Constitution by entering the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Councils. But the majority Congress leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel and Dr. Rajendra Prasad opposed to this policy. The pro-council group formed the Swarajya Party early in 1923 with Deshbandhu
Chittaranjan Das as its President and Pandit Motilal Nehru as its Secretary. The other leaders of the Party were Hakim Ajmal Khan, Vitalbhai Patel and N. C. Kelkar.

The Swarajya Party functioned with a new zeal as a political organization in the legislatures and carried out its programme. The Party then contested elections to the Imperial and Provincial Legislatures in November 1923, and won maximum number of seats. The Party leaders bitterly attacked the working of the Government of India Act, 1919, and disproved of the British claim that the reforms were acceptable to a large section of the people. In 1924, the Swarajya Party succeeded in getting Vithal Bhai Patel elected as President (Speaker) of the Central Legislative Assembly and Chittaranjan Das as Mayor of Calcutta.

But the main objective of the Swarajya Party was not fulfilled because of the premature death of Chittaranjan Das on 16 June 1925, which was a severe blow. Then on the 22 and 23 September 1925, at Patna, the All India Congress Committee invested the Swarajya Party with authority of the Congress to deal with the political affairs of the Country. The Swarajya Party maintained its influence on Indian Politics till 1928.

Mahatma Gandhi was released from jail on 5 February 1924. Due to the appearance of some unwanted factors he decided to retire from active politics. The year 1923-24 marked the beginning of a critical phase in the history of Indian nationalism. Solidarity of the Congress movement was affected by the widening of the dividing lines among the different parties and groups. After the Kanpur session of the Congress in December 1925, some prominent leaders like Jayakar, Kelkar and Moonjee left the Swarajya Party and formed the Responsivist Party in 1926 with Jayakar as its President. In April 1926, the responsivists joined hands with the Independents at Bombay, and formed the National Party with the object of preparing the country for the establishment of Swaraj of the Dominion type. Even Lajpat Rai resigned from the Swarajya Party.
in August 1926, and helped Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in the formation of a new Party called the Independent Congress Party.

As mentioned earlier, during this time, Mahatma Gandhi had remained silent and with a devoted mind carried constructive work for eradication of the acute internal problems of the country and to eliminate the alien rule, he undertook tours in different parts of the country. He remarked, “I travel...... because I fancy that the masses want to meet me. I certainly want to meet them. I deliver my simple message to them in a few words and they and I are satisfied. It penetrates the mass mind slowly but surely.” 91

By 1927, there was a turn in the tide. “There seemed to be a new impulse moving the people forward, a new stir that was equally present in the most varied groups.” 92 The Conservative Government of Stanley Baldwin of England announced in 1927 that a Commission would be set up to assess the merits of the Government of India Act of 1919, at the end of ten years, in order to advice the Government about the next step to be taken. Therefore, before the expiry of the period, it appointed a Commission consisting of seven Englishmen as members, known as the Simon Commission after its Chairman, Sir John Simon.

The Commission was to tour the country and meet various political leaders and tell the Government about the next constitutional reforms. It was an all-white commission and no Indian was associated with it. Indians thought that its composition was a deliberate attempt to insult the Indians. So, all the political parties including the Congress and the Muslim League, decided to boycott it. Sri Tej Bahadur Sapru at Allahabad, on 11 December 1927 considered, “The exclusion of Indians is a deliberate insult to the people of India, as not only does it definitely assign to them a position of inferiority, but what is worse, it denies them the right to participate in the determination of the constitution of their country.” 93 The Legislative Assembly passed a resolution on the 18 February 1928, “that the present Constitution and scheme of the Statutory Commission are wholly unacceptable to this House and that this House will therefore have
nothing to do with the Commission at any State or in any form." 94 The Commission was received with black flags, mass demonstrations, hartals and slogans of ‘Simon, go back,’ when it reached Bombay on 3 February 1928 and visited other parts of India. The Government used repressive measures and lathi-charged the people. Some eminent leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru and Gobind Ballabh Pant were beaten and Lala Lajpat Rai succumbed to his injuries.

Some Important recommendations of the Commission:-

1. There should be complete autonomy in the provinces including the department of Law and Order, but the Government should be given overriding powers in certain matters like internal security.
2. There should be a Federal Government at the Centre, consisting of British India and the Princely States.
3. British troops and British officers should stay on in Indian regiments for many years.
4. Provincial Legislative Councils should be enlarged.
5. The Governor-General should be free to select and appoint members of his Cabinet.
6. High Courts should be under the administrative control of the Government of India.

The Committee submitted its report on 27 May 1930. The Indians did not merely boycott the Simon Commission, but they also proceeded to take steps for formulating an Indian scheme of Constitution as Simon Commission proposed a limited transfer of power with many restrictions.

In view of that, an all-party conference was held at Bombay on 19 May 1928, under the Presidentship of Dr. Ansari and Chairmanship of Pandit Motilal Nehru was deputed to draft a Constitution for British India.
The Committee submitted its report in August 1928, which is known as the Nehru Report containing the following recommendations:

1. Attainment of Dominion Status to India at an early date.
2. Safeguarding the interest of the religious minorities and also giving them full protection.
3. Executive to be made responsible to the Legislature.
4. India to be a Federation, built on the basis of linguistic provinces and the provisions of provincial autonomy.

Again in August 1928, the All-Party Convention held at Calcutta which accepted the recommendation of Nehru Report with certain amendments. But Jinnah opposed some of its provisions on behalf of the Muslim League. However, the League provisionally approved the Nehru Report, after certain safeguards for minorities, as proposed by Jinnah, were incorporated. But in January 1929, a Muslim All-Party Conference was held at Delhi, where the League totally rejected the Report and then in March 1929, Jinnah put forward his famous Fourteen Points as the minimum condition acceptable to the League for any political settlement.

In the Indian National Congress, a section represented by S. Srinivas Iyenger, Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose stood for 'Complete Independence' as against the 'Dominion Status' of the Nehru Report and formed the Independence of India League in November 1928, to further its cause. In spite of these differences, the Calcutta Congress of December 1928, passed a compromise resolution which, while 'adhering to the resolution relating to complete independence passed at the Madras Congress (1927)' approved of acceptance of the constitution recommended in the Nehru Report, if it was accepted in its entirety by the British Parliament before 31 December 1929. In the case of its non-acceptance by that date or its earlier rejection, the Congress was to 'organize a campaign of non-violent non-co-operation by advising the country to refuse taxation and in such other manner as may be decided upon.'
There was tremendous excitement through the country. Considering the situation, the Viceroy, Lord Irwin went to England in 1929 and after consultation with the Labour Cabinet, of which Ramsay Macdonald was the Prime Minister and Wedgewod Benn, Secretary of State for India, the Viceroy made an announcement on 31 October 1929, to the effect that 'the natural issue of India’s constitutional progress’, implicit in the declaration of 1917, was the attainment of Dominion Status. But this announcement was opposed by many statesmen in England. The situation suddenly changed after an interview of Mahatma Gandhi and Motilal Nehru with the Viceroy at Delhi on 23 December which became clear that the Dominion Status was still far off.

At this uncertain situation, the Congress was compelled to take a strong and bold step. Therefore, at the annual session of the Congress held at Lahore in December 1929, under the Chairmanship of Jawaharlal Nehru, a resolution for complete independence (Poorna Swaraj) was passed. It advocated a complete boycott of the Central and Provincial Legislatures and authorized the All-India Congress Committee to launch a programme of Civil Disobedience, including non-payment of taxes, whether in selected areas or otherwise, a under such safeguards as it may consider necessary. At the midnight of 31 December 1929, Jawaharlal Nehru unfurled the Tri-colour, the flag of Indian Independence, with slogans of 'Inqulab Zindabad' and 'Long Live Revolution.' The 26 January 1930 was celebrated as the Independence Day.

After the declaration of the complete independence at the Lahore Session in 1929, the All India Congress Committee passed a resolution on the 15 February 1930, to start Civil Disobedience for attaining the goal of independence and authorized Mahatma Gandhi and others to commence with it as and when they decided to do so. Mahatma Gandhi thought of launching Satyagraha by violating the monopoly of salt, a commodity of prime necessity for all. Simultaneously, all Congressmen were asked not to take part in future elections, and the sitting members were asked to resign their seats. The Movement included non-violent Satyagraha, boycott of schools, colleges, courts and foreign goods,
picketing of shops, burning of foreign cloths, spinning, large-scale fighting against untouchability, breaking the Salt Laws and no-tax campaign.

Mahatma Gandhi started the movement on 6 April 1930, at Dandi, a seaside village in Surat district, about two hundred miles from the Sabarmati Ashram. Before doing so, he sent a letter to the Viceroy, incorporating in it the evils of British imperialism for India, and expounding the true meaning of independence for the millions of Indians and the details of the plan of the movement. On the appointed day, after walking 200 miles, Mahatma Gandhi reached the beach of Dandi with a band of 78 followers and commenced the violation of salt laws. He made salt from sea water and thus began the Satyagraha through the violation of the Salt Law. On 9 April, Mahatma gave the following message – ‘Swaraj won without sacrifice cannot last long.’ Immediately there was an outburst of a mass movement on large scale in all parts of the country in which women participated in large numbers. The movement spread rapidly. Strikes, hartals, boycott of British goods and liquor shops were resorted to and even violent actions like the Chittagong armoury raid took place.

As a result of this movement, the British administration was put out of gear in many places like Midnapore in Bengal and United Provinces. In the North-West Frontier Province, the Pathans adopted the policy of non-co-operation under the leadership of Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan.

The British Government came down heavily to suppress the movement. It promulgated a series of Ordinance by which the normal laws were suspended and stringent restrictions were imposed on the Press. Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, other leaders and thousands of people were arrested on 5 May 1930, and were imprisoned. The Congress was declared illegal. Firing took place at 29 places, for which many people lost their lives. Sholapur in Maharashtra became almost independent. Referring to Government’s policy of ruthless repression, Mahatma Gandhi observed, ‘Even Dyerism pales into insignificance.’
The British tried to suppress the Movement, but did not succeed. The more the repression, the greater was the determination of the Congress volunteers to carry on the struggle. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and M.R. Jayakar made some efforts for compromise, but did not succeed. The report of the Delegation sent to India by the India League, London, in 1932, to study the Indian situation for the acts of repression on the part of the Government. 'The sufferings of the common people,' the Report states, 'have been great, but they have borne them with a courage and endurance which has stood the test of savage repression.' 95

At the same time, there was a change of Government in England, and the Labour Party led by Ramsay Macdonald came to power. Lord Irwin, the Viceroy, flew to England and held consultations with the new Government. On his return to India, he announced that a Round Table Conference of British statesmen and representatives of British India and Indian States would be held in London on 12 November 1930, to find an acceptable solution to the Indian leaders for a political settlement. The Congress reacted unfavorably to the announcement, as it was convinced that the Indian princes and representatives of the communal parties would not support the Congress demand for complete independence as well as for a joint electorate. Rather, the Congress wanted the summoning of a Constituent Assembly to draft a Constitution for India. The British Government refused to accept the Congress stand and went ahead with its plan of summoning a Round Table Conference. The Congress decided to boycott the Conference and it was adjourned sine die.

After this unsuccessful venture, the British Government in England announced,

"His Majesty’s Government will consider a plan by which our co-operation may be continued, so that the results of our contemplated work may be seen in a new Indian constitution. If, in the meantime there is a response to the Viceroy’s appeal to those engaged at present in Civil Disobedience, and other wish to cooperate on the general lines of this declaration, steps will be taken to enlist there services". 96
Re-acting on this, the Working Committee of the Congress meeting at Allahabad on 21 January 1931, with Dr. Rajendra Prasad in the Chair, expressed the view that this declaration of the British Government was too vague and general to justify any change in the policy of the Congress. The Independence Day was celebrated with much enthusiasm on the 26th January.

Soon there was a change of Government policy in India. The British realized that repression could not suppress the spirit of a nation. On the 26th January 1931, the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, released Mahatma Gandhi unconditionally and also other members of the Congress Working Committee to give an opportunity for them to consider the Premier's statement at the Round Table Conference. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Dr. Jayakar became the mediators between the Congress and the British. This was followed by the signing of an agreement between Mahatma Gandhi and Lord Irwin at Delhi on 5 March 1931, known as the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. Though the atmosphere in the country was tense due to the hanging of Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Sukdev, the Congress endorsed this settlement at its next annual session, held at Karachi on the 29, 30 and 31 March 1931, but it was made clear that the Congress goal of Swaraj will remain intact. The Congress appointed Mahatma Gandhi as its sole representative at the Second Round Table Conference which was held from the 7th September to 1st December 1931. The representatives of other groups like Muslims, Sikhs, and Christians were more concerned with safeguarding their narrow objects than fighting for country’s independence. After discussions on various problems, the Round Table Conference formulated a draft constitution for India. But it did not consider the fundamental questions and its work was far from satisfactory from the point of view of Indian national demand. Gandhiji became disgusted and left England in December 1931.

Mahatma Gandhi landed in Bombay on 28 December 1931 and observed that the country was under severe repressive measures like arrests, ordinances and proscriptions for smashing the Civil Disobedience Movement. Meanwhile, Lord
Willingdon had succeeded Lord Irwin as the Viceroy in April 1931, and thus the Gandhi-Irwin Pact had become extinct. Mahatma Gandhi sought an interview with Lord Willingdon, but it was rejected. So, on 1 January 1932, the Congress Working Committee passed a resolution for resuming the Civil Disobedience Movement, including non-payment of taxes, in the case of a satisfactory response not coming from the Government. Government remained adamant and the country was again become restless after the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi on 4 January, 1932. The Congress and other bodies like the Kishan Sabhas, Peasant Unions, Youth Leagues, Students’ Associations, Seva Dals, and National Educational Institutions were declared unlawful by the Government.

Unfortunately, the question of the position of the so-called Depressed Classes had produced some complication in the situation. The British, in order to perpetuate their policy of Divide and Rule, declared the official Communal Award early in 1932. The Award provided for separate Hindu, Harijan and Muslim electorate with reservation of seats for Harijans. Lord Willingdon insisted that the Communal Award must be accepted. Gadhiji was jailed in Yervada jail, near Poona for his uncompromising protest, where he as a mark of his disapproval of this Award, began ‘fast unto death’ from 20 September. Then there was a compromise on the part of Dr. Ambedkar, the leader of the depressed classes regarding the Communal Award. The outcome was the Poona Pact by which the system of separate electorates was replaced by reservation of seats for Harijans. On acceptance of this Pact by the British Prime Minister, Mahatma Gandhi broke fast and released from jail in May 1933.

Meanwhile, the Third Round Table Conference was held in London from 17 November to December 1932. The Congress boycotted it. Thus, the Conference became a Conference of loyalists only. The Government went ahead with its plan and on the basis of the recommendation of the Round Table Conference; it enacted the Government of India Act of 1935.
In the meantime, for certain reasons, the Civil Disobedience Movement was gradually loosing its strength from the middle of 1933. Under Mahatma Gandhi's advice, the Congress decided in July 1933 to suspend mass Civil Disobedience, but permitted individual Civil Disobedience. Before Mahatma could give the lead to individual Civil Disobedience he was arrested on 1 August 1933. But due to growing seriousness in his condition he was released unconditionally on 23 August 1933.

The All India Congress Committee then thinks for reorientation of Congress policy and decided further line of action. The Committee met at Patna from the 18 to 20 May 1934 and suspended the Civil Disobedience Movement. Gandhiji remarked,

"The introspection prompted by the conversation with the Ashram inmates had led me to the conclusion that I must advise all Congressmen to suspend civil resistance for Swaraj, as distinguished from specific grievances. They should leave it to me alone. It should be resumed by others in my life time only under my direction, unless one arises claiming to know the science better than I do and inspires confidence. I give this opinion as the author and the initiator of Satyagraha. Henceforth, therefore, all who have been impelled to civil resistance for Swaraj under my advice, directly given or indirectly inferred will please desist from civil resistance." 97

\textit{Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose} \textit{126}

Subhas Chandra Bose is a luminous name in the great saga of India's freedom struggle. Firstly, a rebel child under Gandhiji's leadership, then independently the indubitable revolutionary Netaji Bose, he has rightly been called the awe inspiring flaming sword by the poet-statesman Mrs. Sorojini Naidu. Born on January 23, 1897, in Cuttack (Orissa), Subhas Chandra Bose
gave early evidence of an undaunted spirit. At the age of 17, he left home secretly
on a trek of the Himalayas in quest of the spiritual guru, but returned home
without finding one. Then and afterwards, the teachings of Swami Vivekananda
and Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa gave him the inspiration he needed.

Academically he was brilliant. After graduation from the Scottish Church
College at Calcutta he was sailed for England for appearing at the ICS
Examination and in a very short time of eight months he ranked fourth among
successful candidates in 1919. But without joining the ‘Heaven born service’, he
decided to plunge himself in the Indian liberation movement. ‘National and
spiritual aspirations are not compatible with obedience to Civil Service
Conditions’—he said. 98

Subhas Chandra had studied the European History and international
affairs and was deeply influenced by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 in Russia
and the ideal of Socialism. The other three events which stirred his admiration
were the Resurrection Movements of Italy, the liberation activity of Ireland under
the Irish leader De Valera and the Insurrection of modern Turkey led by Kemal
Pasha.

On reaching the shores of India on 16 July 1921, he immediately went for
interviewing Gandhiji who was then leading the Non-Co-operation movement but
was disappointed regarding the plans and programmes of the Mahatma. He then
returned to Calcutta, met Chittaranjan Das and in him found his ‘political guru.’

In 1922, at the fourth Congress of the Communist International, Subhas
Chandra was one among the five Indians who had been invited there.

In 1923, he became the chief organizer of Youth League. In 1924, he
became a Trade Union leader. In this year, he also became Secretary to the
Bengal Provincial Congress.
After his difference of opinion with Gandhiji at the Gaya Congress, Chittaranjan Das had formed the *Swarajya Party* within the Congress and subsequently captured the controlling power of Calcutta Corporation through election and made Subhas Chandra its Chief Executive Officer.

In October 1924, Subhas Chandra was arrested, sent to Mandalay. In late 1926, having in prison, he was elected a member of the Bengal Legislative Council. In May 1927, he was released. In December of that year he was chosen one of the General Secretaries of the Congress at its Madras Session.

Undaunted Subhas and other left minded leaders formed Congress Democratic Party within the Congress in 1929. From 1932 to 1933 he was mostly in jail. He fell ill and was allowed to move to Germany for treatment. There he wrote his famous book 'The Indian Struggle'. Defying Government order he returned to India and was again arrested. Finally he was released in 1937.

With the consent of Gandhiji, Subhas Chandra was elected President at the Haripura Congress in 1938. But the future plans and programmes he placed at the Presidential Address was not to the liking of Gandhiji. Subhas wanted re-election as he felt that the World War was imminent and if India could strike back, she would win her freedom. But the right wing opposed his candidature, whereas he was supported by the entire left wing. Subhas had won with a comfortable margin defeating Gandhiji’s nominee Pattabhi Sittaramaiya at Tripuri. In his Presidential Address at Tripuri Congress on 10 March 1939, Subhas again proposed that the Congress should give an ultimatum to the British Government demanding independence within six months and should simultaneously prepare for the final battle for freedom. But his proposal was bitterly opposed by the rightist Gandhi wing, which were rather inclined to take path of collaboration and conciliation with the ruling power. They made concerted efforts to curb Subhas’s power and foil all his action programmes.
Before the Tripuri Congress, Subhas seriously fell ill and his life was in danger. Paying no heed to that, the Right Wing passed a resolution (Pant Proposal), which specified that the Congress President could only nominate the Working Committee with the consent of the Mahatma Gandhi which was before the prerogative of the President. The Mahatma did not put his approval to the Committee, the President had presented an un-soluble stalemate. Having no other way Subhas resigned at the AICC meeting held at Wellington Square, Calcutta and then formed the Forward Bloc, a left consolidation Party within the Congress.

Then a major incident in the history of anti-imperialist left movement was the holding of No-Compromise Conference at Ramgarh under the Presidentship of Subhas Chandra Bose on 19 March 1940. The pioneer of the Peasants’ Movement of India – Swami Sahajanada Saraswati actively participated in this conference as the Chairman of the Reception Committee. This conference was held parallel to the Congress Session held in an adjoining site, but it succeeded in drawing a much bigger crowd than that of Congress Session. Subhas Chandra in his Presidential address, while defining the characteristics of left movement in India, said: “The immediate future will prove to be the acid test of Leftist will be those who will wage an uncompromising fight with imperialism. In the next phase of our movement Leftist will be synonymous with socialism.” He further declared: “In India we are now ringing down the curtain on an age that is passing away .... The age of imperialism is drawing to a close and the era of freedom, democracy and socialism looms ahead of us. India stands today at one of the crossroads of history.”

After formation of Forward Bloc he declared its three-fold objectives – consolidation of left forces winning over the majority section of the Congress and launching the national struggle for freedom. On 12 August 1939 Subhas Chandra wrote in his editorial article in Forward Bloc: “The Forward Bloc will rally all progressive, radical and anti-imperialist elements. Through this consolidation, the people will equip themselves for the anti-imperialist struggle that will bring India
her birth right of liberty. But the attainment of political independence will not mean the dissolution of the Block. It will mean a new phase in its life and activity, and the phase will undoubtedly be a Socialist one.\textsuperscript{101}

For further strengthening the left consolidation within the Congress Socialists, Radical Democrats (led by M.N. Roy) and the National Frontiers, the first All India Conference of the Forward Bloc was held at Bombay on 22 June 1939, where the Constitution and programme of the Block was adopted. Subhas was then at the forefront of left consolidation.

On 3 September 1939, the Second World War broke out and British became involved. Bose felt that the much awaited international crisis had arrived and from the platform of Forward Bloc he called upon the people to utilize this golden opportunity emanating from the international situation for launching the final assault on British imperialism. Unfortunately neither the Gandhi Congress nor the other left parties responded to his call. So Subhas went ahead alone under the banner of Forward Bloc with tremendous public support behind him. He addressed hundreds of meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country and created a strong public opinion in support of his call for uncompromising anti-imperialist struggle.

Following the spirit of Anti-Compromise Conference, Subhas Chandra gave a call for observing a National Week from 6 to 12 April 1940, throughout the country. In response to the call thousands of Forward Bloc leaders and workers took part in Civil Disobedience Movement and were arrested.

Subhas Chandra continued his anti-imperialist movements with untiring zeal. On behalf of the suspended Bengal Provincial Congress Committee and on the initiative of Forward Bloc, a political conference was held at Dacca on 25-26 May 1940, which was presided over by Prof. Jyotish Ch. Ghosh and inaugurated by Subhas Chandra Bose. The well attended conference adopted quite a few far
reaching action oriented programmes, including demands for removal of Holwell Monument and release of political prisoners.

To consolidate the countrywide movement, the first Plenary Session of the All India Forward Bloc was held at Nagpur from June 18-22, 1940, under the Presidentship of Subhas Chandra Bose. In his Presidential address, Subhas Chandra gave a concrete plan of action for winning Purna Swaraj in the immediate future.

Being inspired by the Party’s Nagpur Session, Forward Bloc started direct movement, firstly on demand to remove the Holwell Monument which was erected by the Britishers representing the so called ‘Black Hole tragedy’ to malign the good name of Sirazdulla. Subhas picked up the issue to develop among the people a spirit of communal harmony, nationalism and hatred towards British imperialism. The Government came down heavily upon the party workers and arrested Subhas on the eve of the movement on 2 July 1940.

Being imprisoned for the eleventh time, Subhas now realized that the British Government would not allow him to go outside the bars till the end of the War. He became impatient with the idea of wasting his days in the prison and thus frustrating the revolutionary possibilities of freeing India through his planned anti-imperialist struggle. So, in November 1940, Bose gave an ultimatum to the Government demanding immediate release, otherwise he would fast unto death. After his fast for a week, the British Government became perturbed apprehending country-wide reactions and put him to the house arrest and kept a strict vigilance on his movements. But Subhas himself didn’t move out of his residence and made himself solitary confinement in his bedroom for about forty days. There he secretly planned for great escape outside India to organize fight for his country’s freedom from outside in a war situation utilizing enemy’s power abroad. On the dead of night of 17 January 1941, he left home secretly. After a thrilling fearful journey across the country, in disguise of a Pathan, he reached Kabul. From Kabul Subhas tried to contact the Soviet Union, but failed.
Afterwards, with the help of Italian Embassy there, having a passport of Orlando Mazzota, he arrived at Berlin on 28 March 1941 through Moscow. Subhas formed the Free India Army, Indian Legion, Free India Centre and Azad Hind Radio on German soil in 1941.

In Germany, Bose was well received by Ribbentrop, the right hand man of Hitler to whom he proposed that— he would broadcast anti-British propaganda from Berlin; raise Free Indian units from Indian prisoners of war in Germany and in return the three Axis Powers would jointly make a declaration of Indian Independence.

But, neither Germany, nor Italy agreed to the third proposal, but the other two were accepted. Bose now worked hard for the recruitment of an Indian legion, and its training. He raised the legion to its full strength of 3000, when the phenomenal success of Japan against the British and her allies in Burma and South-East Asia culminating in the fall of Singapore on 15 February 1942, opened the prospect of a more ambitious enterprise with greater chance of success.

The Indians living in territories of this region, which were freed from British domination by the Japanese had organized themselves into associations with the object of helping the liberation of India from the British yoke. A definite shape was given to this idea by the great revolutionary leader Rash Behari Bose, who after 1920 escaped to Japan and settled there as a Japanese citizen.

On 15 February 1942, Singapore fell to Japan. The abandoned 20,000 British Indian soldiers were taken over by the Japanese who in turn handed them over to Captain Mohan Singh of the 14th Punjab Regiment in British army.

Rash Behari Bose now summoned a conference in Tokyo, the Capital of Japan, on 28 March 1942, for setting a programme of activities for the liberation of India. The Tokyo conference passed a resolution to form an Indian National
Army under the direct command of Indian Offices who would conduct the campaign for the liberation of India. An Indian Independence League of overseas Indians was provisionally established throughout Japanese Asia, and it was decided to hold a fully representative Conference of Indians at Bangkok in June.

Captain Mohan Singh attended the Tokyo Conference and on his return called a conference of Indian military officers in April 1942. It was at this conference that he first proposed the formation of the Indian National Army as a part and parcel of the Indian independence movement.

The conference at Bangkok, decided upon at Tokyo, was held from 15 to 23 June 1942. Rash Behari Bose was elected Chairman. The conference was also attended by Captain Mohan Singh and some representative of the Indian prisoners of war who had renounced their allegiance to the British and were eager to fight for the liberation of their motherland.

The conference at Bangkok, which met under the Tricolour Flag of India, formally inaugurated the Indian Independence League and passed a resolution inviting Subhas Bose to East Asia. It also resolved that an Indian National Army be formed comprising the Indian troops and civilians of East Asia, under the command of Mohan Singh. A council of Action was also established with Rash Behari Bose as President and four other members, including Mohan Singh. Responding the call, Subhas Chandra left Germany on 8 February 1943, and then through a perilous 90-day submarine voyage to Sumatra and Penang reached Tokyo by air on 13 June 1943, where he succeeded in obtaining Japan’s assurance of full cooperation on the basis of mutual respect. From there he reached Singapore on 2 July 1943 and on 4 July took over the charge of the Indian Independence League being handed over by Rash Behari Bose. In Singapore, Subhas Chandra was welcomed with tremendous enthusiasm by crowd and hailed as Netaji, the supreme leader. On 5 July 1943, he publicly announced the formation of the Azad Hind Fauz and gave the slogan ‘Delhi Cholo’ (on to Delhi). He then organized the recruitment and training departments.
In the Fauz, women volunteered in large numbers and formed the Rani of Jhansi Regiment.

Netaji had already announced his decision to form a Provisional Government of Free India. He re-organized the civil departments that were already functioning at the headquarters, viz, General, Finance, Publicity and Propaganda, Intelligence, Recruitment and Training. He not only strengthened these departments, but also added the following ones: Health and Social welfare, Women’s Affairs, National Education and Culture, Reconstruction, Supply, Overseas, Housing and Transport.

The Provisional Government was formally inaugurated in the Cathay Hall at Singapore on 21 October 1943, in the presence of delegates from all over East Asia. In the said meeting, Netaji read his famous Proclamation setting up the Provisional Government of Free India which is as follows:

"Having been constituted as the Provisional Government of Azad Hind by Indian Independence League in East Asia, we entered upon our duties with a full sense of the responsibility that has developed on us. We pray that providence may bless our work and our struggle for the emancipation of our Motherland. And we hereby pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades in arms to the cause of her freedom, of her welfare, and her exaltation among the nations of the world.

"It will be the task of the Provisional Government to launch and to conduct the struggle that will bring about the expulsion of the British and their allies from the soil of India. It will then be the task of the Provisional Government to bring about the establishment of a permanent National Government of Azad Hind constituted in accordance with the will of the Indian people and enjoying their confidence. After the British and their allies are overthrown and until a permanent National Government of Azad
Hind is set up on Indian soil, the Provisional Government will administer the affairs of the country in trust for the Indian People.

"The Provisional Government is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Indian. It guarantees religious, as well as equal opportunities to all its citizens. It declares its firm resolves to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all its part, cherishing all the children of the nation equally and transcending all the differences cunningly fostered by an alien government in the past.

"In the name of God, in the name of bygone generations who have welded the Indian people into one nation, and in the name of the dead heroes who have bequeathed to us a tradition of heroism and self sacrifice – we call upon the Indian people to rally round our banner and strike for India's freedom. We call upon them to launch the final struggle against the British and all their allies in India and to prosecute that struggle with velour and perseverance and full faith in final victory -- until the enemy is expelled from Indian soil and the Indian people are once again a Free Nation."

In a few days, nine world powers –Japan, Germany, Italy, Croatia, Burma, Thailand, Nationalist China, the Philippines and Manchuria accorded their recognition to the Provisional Government of Azad Hind.

At the Greater East Asia Conference, Premier Tojo announced on the 6 November 1943, that Japan had decided to hand over the Andaman and Nicobar Islands to the Provisional Government of Azad Hind. Thus the Provisional Government acquired its first stretch of territory in Free India. Netaji visited these two islands which were renamed respectively 'Shahid' and 'Swaraj' Islands.
In March 1944, INA proceeded towards Indo-Burma Border and then entered into Indian Territory through Manipur. The emotion of the INA men, when they first set foot on Indian soil, was thus described by Thivy, a member of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind in October 1945:

"The uncontrollable urge to press forward and plant the Tricolour Flag of Free India on the soil of India was so great, that by the early hours of the morning of the 19th March, our valiant troops were rushing down the hillside, racing with one another to be first to cross the border and fall prostrate to kiss Mother India. Who can describe the ecstatic joy with which the band of India’s Freedom Fighters hoisted the National Flag to the strains of the National Anthem." 103

Two days later, Tojo, the Prime Minister of Japan stated that the Provisional Government would administer the occupied territory. In May 1944, the INA troops captured Mowdok, the British post of Indian side about 50 miles to the east of Cox Bazar. The scene is described by Shah Nawaz, the Commanding Officer of the Subhas Brigade:

"The entry of the INA on Indian Territory was a most touching scene. Soldiers laid themselves flat on the ground and passionately kissed the sacred soil of their motherland which they had set out to liberate. A regular flag-hoisting ceremony was held amidst great rejoicing and singing of the Azad Hind Fauz National Anthem." 104

INA was defeated in distant lands and its Netaji disappeared under mysterious condition, but its story reached India and created unprecedented enthusiasm resulting movement in British Royal Navy and Royal Air force. Having seen the disturbances in the Army, the British Prime Minister Atlee commented that it was not possible to keep India any more.

At last came the day, when on 15 August 1947, the long awaited freedom of India is achieved, but Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose was not there, having left
behind him a story of mystery, but remained at the hearts of millions' love and admiration.

**Quit India Movement**

The Quit India Movement is regarded as India's most broad based anti-imperialistic struggle. It marked a new light in terms of popular participation in the national movement.

As a consequence of Civil Disobedience Movement the British government was compelled to arrange Round Table Conference with Indian National Congress which ultimately led to the formation of the Government of India Act, 1935. This Act provided for the creation of an All-India Federation comprising the eleven British provinces and those Princely states that acceded to the Federation. Provincial autonomy was given to the provinces, while other provisions of the Act were never put into operation.

As a result of the elections held in 1937, the Congress Ministries were formed in seven provinces out of the total number of eleven provinces in India. But they were not destined to work there for long. On 3rd September, 1939, the Second World War broke out and England declared War on Germany. In this war, the Congress leaders were in favour of Britain as they looked upon the Nazis and the Fascists as enemies of freedom and progress. They opposed imperialist designs of Italy, Germany and Japan and were in favour of such a move against imperialistic tendencies. But at the same time Congress was unhappy because declaration of war was made without informing the Indian leaders and Indian troops were sent to Singapore and the Middle East to fight on the British side. Furthermore, at home, the Indian Legislative Assembly passed emergency laws to correspond to the state of war which not only limited the autonomy of the provinces but also restricted the civil liberties of people. Against this background, the Congress Working Committee met on 8 September 1939 and asked the
Government to declare what their war aims were in regard to democracy as well as the British Imperialism and how their aims were going to benefit Indians. Finally, Congress demanded independence for India.

Re-acting on this, Lord Linlithgow, the then Viceroy of India issued a statement on 17 October 1939, in which it was stated that Dominion Status was the goal of the British policy in India and to that end, the Act of 1935 would be reconsidered after the war in the light of the Indian views, and with due regard to the opinions of the minorities. Furthermore, the Viceroy proposed to establish an Advisory council, representing all Indians in order to associate them in the war efforts of the British.

This attitude of the British showed that they were not ready to part with power and grant complete freedom to India. The Indian leaders felt that the British preached about freedom and democracy in the world, but in India, they imposed severe restrictions on freedom by suspending civil liberties and imprisoning people without trial. The Viceroy also began to order the Provincial Governments to carry out the war policy thus making them powerless.

The Congress Ministries in the provinces resigned in protest and accused Britain of imperialistic designs similar to those she was fighting against. The resignation had several implications. The Viceroy was relieved as Congress Ministries had controlled several provinces. The Congress, on the other hand, justified its stand by reiterating its demand for independence and its opposition to imperialism. Simultaneously, this course of events gave the Muslim League a new lease of life. The League, which had been lying low for the previous two years, suddenly burst into activity and offered its friendship to the Government. It also celebrated 22 December 1939, as a day of deliverance and launched a new offensive against the Congress. The League Ministries in Punjab, Bengal and Sind did not resign and as a result, the Muslim won the goodwill of the British.
But political scenario somewhat changed with the progress of the World War II. The Germans launched a fierce offensive in 1940, and conquered Norway, Denmark, Belgium and Holland. Naturally, England was the next target of Germany. At this juncture, the Working Committee of the Congress offered help to Britain in its war effort, provided that India’s demand for independence was conceded and a Provisional National Government was formed at the Centre. The Muslim League opposed the move and British too refused to grant this. The reason for the Government’s refusal was that power could not be given to a Body whose authority is denied by another large and powerful element in India’s national life. This was a clear reference to the Muslim League and other minorities.

On 8 August 1940, Lord Linlithgow made a new offer known as the August Offer which is as follows:

- After the war, the Government would set up a Constitution-making body to frame a Constitution for India.
- The present Executive Council of the Viceroy would be expanded to include Indian leaders.
- The Viceroy’s War Council, consisting of representatives of British India and the Indian States, would be set up.
- The Government would give due weightage to the minority demand in the new scheme of reforms.

The August Offer did not satisfy the demands of the Congress. There was no time limit within which the Constitution-making body was to be set up and no agreement could be reached on the expansion of the Executive Council. The Congress had demanded a provisional National Government but the offer of Dominion Status did not touch this point. Jawaharlal Nehru said that the offer was ‘as dead as a doornail.’ Though Muslim League welcomed that part of the Offer which contained an assurance to the minorities, yet it did not accept the Offer as it did not give any assurance for establishment of an independent...
homeland for the Muslim community. Thus The August Offer failed to produce any result.

At this juncture, the Congress did not want to embarrass the British which were involved in a bitter struggle against Hitler and Mussolini by a mass movement against it. Also, at the same time, the Congress wished to register its protest against the British policy in India. Therefore, under the guidance of Gandhiji, individual Congressmen were selected and asked to offer Satyagraha. Acharya Vinoba Bhave inaugurated the campaign on 17 October 1940, followed by prominent Congressmen like Sardar Ballavbhai Patel, C. Rajagopalachari and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

In December 1941, Japan entered the World War against England and started advancing towards India. Earlier in June 1941, Germany had invaded Russia. By March 1942, the Japanese were at the eastern frontiers of India. Gandhiji observed, ‘The presence of British in India is an invitation to Japan to invade. Their withdrawal removes the bait’. In that situation, the possibility of Indian soldiers supporting the Japanese invaders posed a threat to the British. To control the situation in India, Prime Minister Churchill sent Sir Stafford Cripps, a seasoned diplomat, with fresh proposals of constitutional reforms. Cripps made the following offer:

- A Constitution-making body (consisting of members elected by the Lower House of the Indian Legislature and the representatives of the Indian States nominated by their rulers) would be set up to draft a new Constitution.
- India would be given the Dominion Status immediately after the termination of the War.
- It envisaged a Federation of British India and the Indian Status as a dominion (like that of Canada, Australia and New Zealand) within the British Commonwealth.
- Britain would accept the Constitution framed by Constitution-making body, subject to the following conditions:
If any Province did not wish to join the federation, it could retain its present position and the British Government would give it the same status as the rest of the Indian Union.

A treaty would be signed between the Constitution-making body and the British Government covering all subjects regarding transfer of power, including the rights of the minorities.

- Indian leaders were invited to participate in the Council of their country and the Commonwealth.
- The power of Viceroy would remain as hitherto and he would be responsible for the defence of the country.

Both the Congress and the Muslim League rejected the Offer. The objections made by the Congress were:

- It offered Dominion Status and the same time, granted provinces the right to secede from the Union. This provision was made as a concession to the League's demand for partition and against the unity of the nation.
- The powers of the Viceroy remained undiminished during the war and he was still responsible for the defence of the country. The Congress thought, how it could ask their countrymen to fight against the Japanese, if the responsibility of defending the country was not handed over to the national leaders.
- Since the very foundation of the British Empire seemed to be uncertain at the moment, the long-term offer of Dominion Status was, as Gadhiji remarked, a 'post-dated cheque on a failing bank.'
- The people from the Princely States had no right to send their representatives to the proposed Constitution-making body. Their representatives were to be selected by the rulers.
- The Congress leaders could have joined Viceroy's Executive Council, if an assurance was given to them to indicate that the Viceroy would act as a Constitutional Head. But, there was no assurance. Hence the Congress was totally disappointed.
The Muslim League also rejected the Offer because it feared that once the Constitution for a single Union was formed, the creation of another Dominion could become impossible. The League demanded a definite pronouncement in favour of partition.

So, August Offer of 1940 and Cripps’ Mission of 1942 had failed to dissolve the demands of the Indians. Moreover, Second World War and estimated threat of Japan’s attack on India created a black shadow in its future. The situation became worse with the activities of the Muslim League. On March 24, 1940, at its annual session in Lahore, the League resolved to work for an independent country of its own. The resolution affirmed, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India, should be grouped to constitute Independent State, in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign. In his presidential speech, Jinnah proclaimed that the division of India into two autonomous states was the only solution to have peace in the region. His arguments for a separate nation are given in his famous ‘Two Nation Theory’ which is as follows:

“The problem in India is not of an inter-communal character, but manifestly of an international one and it must be treated as such .... They (Hinduism and Islam) are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders .... To Yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as numerical minority and the other a majority, must lead to growing discontent.”

Furthermore, the attitude of the British, pampering the Muslim League made the communal problem more acute. The Congress felt that the British should quit India immediately to enable the people to settle their disputes amicably. Gandhiji said, ‘India’s safety, and Britain’s too, lies in orderly and timely British withdrawal from India.’
In that terrible situation, the Congress Working Committee met at Wardha in July, 1942 and demanded the immediate withdrawal of the British from India (Quit India Resolution). The All India Congress Committee ratified the Resolution at its meeting in Bombay in August 1942, and said that the continuance of the British rule in India was not good for India or for the success of the allied nations. It insisted that a provisional government should be formed in India. If this demand was not granted, the Congress would start a non-violent mass struggle under the leadership of Gandhiji who said, 'We shall do or die. We shall either free India or die in the attempt.'

So, the movement started with the declaration of Mahatma Gandhi that it would be his final struggle for the freedom of the country. On 9 August, Gandhiji was arrested and the Congress was declared an illegal body. Other Congress leaders too were put behind bars. But, news of the Quit India Resolution and the arrest of the leaders angered the people of India, who responded immediately by organizing protests and demonstrations throughout the country. Official sources showed that the movement was spearheaded by women, students, workers and peasants. In some places, the movement assumed a violent turn. People observed hartals, took out processions, and organized demonstrations. Public life came to a standstill and all business was suspended. The people became violent and burnt Government offices, police stations, buses and other buildings. They cut off telegraph and electric lines. The bridges were blown up and roads were dug up. In short, everything was paralyzed and all life came to a standstill.

The main storm-centers of the movement were Bihar, East Uttar Pradesh, Midnapore (Bengal) Orissa and Maharashtra which present a picture of formidable mass rebellion. In Bihar, both intensity and extent of the movement were greatest. Patna for several months was cut off from all districts and nearly 80% of police stations were captured or had to be temporarily evacuated in the ten districts of North and Central Bihar. Slogans of 'Thana Jala, Station Phook do' were raised. There was considerable tribal participation in the area. The number of Europeans killed was highest in Hazaribag. In Eastern Uttar Pradesh,
sporadic guerilla activities went on till 1944. Along with this, parallel Governments were formed in Ballia, East Uttar Pradesh, under the leadership of Chittu Pande. Government sources stressed on the duality of the revolt in this region. In Bihar and Eastern Uttar Pradesh, had erupted not only one but two interacting insurgencies – an elite nationalist uprising which began with the circulation of the news of the arrest of the Congress leaders and the initiation of heavy repression of the Congress Party. They were also supported by high-caste peasants, small landlords and a section of subalterns. Thus, in this way different strata of the society got engulfed in the movement.

In Balasore district of Orissa, the Congress organized plunder of salt depots, disruption of communication and village Swaraj Panchayets to hold on to food stocks. Cuttack was another strong centre though here terrorist activities organized by a local Rakta Vahini soon became more important than mass action. Koraput with its large tribal population witnessed a massive upsurge including a no-rent movement.

In Bengal, the best available account of a rebel national government (Jatiya Sarkar) came into existence in Tamluk, Midnapore in December 1942 and lasted for two years. It was headed by local Congress leaders like Satta Samanta. As compared to Bihar and Eastern Uttar Pradesh, the movement of Bengal was less elemental and violent but perhaps better organized and sustained.

In Maharashtra, the historic August meeting at Gowalia Tank, Bombay was unprecedented in the popular enthusiasm it generated. Afterwards, the movement in Bombay Presidency took two distinct forms –

- Peasant guerilla war in few pockets and
- More widespread terrorist activities and sabotage carried on mainly by educated cadres. The main centers of peasant rebellion were East Khandesh and Satara.
Satara in Maharashtra proved to be one of the cyclonic centers of 1942. It emerged as the base of the long and most effective parallel government. *Nyayadan Mandals* were set up there. A recent study showed that the Satara movement was closely related to the peasant-based non-Brahmin *bahujan samaj*.

The Government reacted sharply, Lathi charges, mass arrests and firing transformed the country into a police state. Punitive fines and summary sentences became the order of the day. The oppressive measures used by the Government killed more than ten thousand people and injured many more. In Delhi, the police opened fire on unarmed crowds in which a large number of people were killed in a short span of time, besides wounding and crippling a large number of innocent victims. The Congress leaders who were present at the meeting in Bombay were arrested and hustled away from Bombay in a special train. Gandhiji was detained at the Aga Khan Palace in Pune and other leaders were sent to jail in Ahmednagar Fort.

The Government’s suppression of the Movement was cruel and it was crushed within two months. So, the Movement of 1942 was therefore, short-lived, but it had a lasting impact on the freedom struggle. According to historians, the Quit India Movement was the last mass uprising against the British rule in India in which people from all walks of life – the Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians and Parsis took part. Revolt itself was not confined to one region – it was universal which marked people’s depth of national feeling, collective heroism and enthusiastic response for the freedom of the mother land. The show of such extreme courage and sacrifice of the Indians made the foreign imperialists conclude that they must be prepared to quit India in the near future. The Viceroy confided to the British Prime Minister that it was “The most serious rebellion since that of 1857, the gravity and extent of which we have so far concealed from the world for reasons of military security”.

145
Workers' and Peasants' Movement between 1885 and 1947

"The world is in the third epoch under the domination of the Vaishya Community. The fourth epoch will be under that of the Sudras." — said Swami Vivekananda. He was foreseeing that future India will be governed by the Sudras or Working Class.

The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed an important development in Indian economy when Working Class had emerged as a group that started becoming conscious of their rights. History shows that organized labour is a special feature of industrial societies. Such societies by generating a working class and then for their own interest by placing that class in a situation of exploitation, create conditions for organized movement. The timing of the growth of industrial workers, their number, origin and their attitude to industries are important factors that determine the nature of the working class in any society at any particular time. Apart from depending on the nature of the working class itself, the working class movement also depends on broader structural, cultural, institutional and leadership conditions of the society. In India, the social unevenness created by the British rule led to the emergence of western educated, economically more or less middle class elite who were united by common aspirations and resentments against the Raj. During this time, growing foundation of Industries in India created also a corresponding growth in the number of industrial workers. In fact, the industrial worker, once they develop a sense of community among themselves and become organized could be a great asset. In India, with the help of western educated elite, industrial workers become united and labour movement came into forth. It may be mentioned here that during the British reign in India, the newly emerged workforce was deeply tradition bound, overwhelmingly agriculturists and characterized by the presence of archaic social structures and beliefs.
Traditionally, the industrial workforce was under a common platform called Trade Union. ‘A Trade Union’, as we understand the term, ‘is a continuous association of wage earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their employment.’\textsuperscript{109} It is also define in Chambers’ Encyclopedia as “An association of wage earners or salary men formed primarily for the purpose of collective action for the forwarding or defence of its professional interests”.\textsuperscript{110} Again Trade Union can be defined as machinery for social change and the movement needs solidarity and cohesion and broad based ideas with social responsibility to bring a structural change of society. Considering this phenomenon the old craft guilds and other organizations of the labour in ancient times are also to be taken into consideration before anyone proceeds to a chronological record of the Indian working class movement under organized trade unions.

The trade union movement is a by-product of the industrial revolution. But the working class in India emerged at the initial stage through agrarian movement in various forms of struggle, starting from \textit{Sanyasi Bidroha} (1763-1800), \textit{Santhal Bidroha} (1855-1857), \textit{Nil Bidroha} (1859-61), \textit{Mopla Bidroha} and some such against oppression, deprivation and denial of human right by the feudal landlords and alien rulers of the time.

The British rulers who actually destroyed the cottage and village industries started the establishment of factories and mills along with the transport and communication systems. Foremost among these are the jute mills around Calcutta and the cotton mills of Bombay. The other industries that they developed were Coal and tea. This actually helped the creation of new work force which by 1890 was about 3,00,000. Then these work forces started to highlight their genuine grievances to the respective employers. A few remarkable incidents of this period related to workers may be mentioned below.
Between 1850 and 1900, there were a number of industrial strikes and movement in the Presidencies of Bengal, Bombay and Madras and adjoining areas. Notable among these were the Nagpur Express Mill Workers' Strike, the Surat Spinning Mill and Weaving Mill Workers' Strike, the Ghusuri Cotton Mill Workers' Strike, the Wardah Cotton Mill Workers' strike, the Madras Textile Workers' Strike, the Coachmen and bullock carts' Strike in Bengal, the Cease Work of Palanquin Bearers' in Calcutta, Ahmedabad Weavers' Strike. The most remarkable strike was held on 1862 at Howrah Station where 2000 labourers struck work demanding eight hours works a day. The aims of these strikes were for fewer working hours, humane working atmosphere, increased wages and cessation of exploitation among others.

Incidentally it may be mentioned here that the initial steps reported on the direction of a labour movement in India was the report of Major Moore, the Chief Inspector of Bombay Cotton Department, in which he pointed out the bad condition of the labourers in the industrial areas specially in the cotton mills. Major Moore's report was followed by Mr. Alexander Redgrave, H.M.'s Inspector of Factories, who, in one of his reports on Indian Labour situation, writes:

"We see a cotton industry springing up in India extending with rapid strides and it behoves us to enquire whether that industry is carried on upon the old lines of cotton manufacturers here, and if it is so carried on, as is the common report, by factories working 14 hours a day, it is well that legislation should step in while the industry is so to speak, in its infancy and, by wise and moderate regulations, stop the growth of habits of long hours and of the employment of child labour."

The discussion of factory legislation in India was first taken up by the House of Commons in February 1875. In July that year, the Earl of Shaftsbury took up the matter in the House of Lords, London. In the subsequent years, Mr. Redgrave, Major Moore, Mr. Ballard, Miss Carpenter, Mr. S. S. Bengali, Mr. W.
B. Mulock and others took important parts in forming of the Indian Factory Act. Ultimately, in 1891 Indian Factories Act was formed based largely on the recommendations of the Indian Factory Commission of 1890.

But, modern historians have criticized this Act as its real intention was to safeguard the larger interests of the British Empire. Because through this Act the efforts of the labourers were almost entirely confined to making prayers and petitions to the British government, sometimes over the head of the British Indian government, for protective legislation. The result of this was a considerable increase in the number, intensity and duration of strikes in the following years.

Here mention should be made of Sasipada Bondyopadhyay, a leader of the Brahmo Samaj, who published ‘Bharate Shramajibi’ in 1874 and founded the working men’s club at Baranagore for the betterment of the lots of the working people can be called a pioneer of the Indian Trade Union Movement. In the said paper, Shibnath Shastri, another great leader of the Brahmo Samaj, published a poem which he wrote to underline the solidarity of the workers of the world behind the international working class movement. Its English version is like this: “Look at the tailors, hundreds of them, on the other shore of the ocean, fighting for their cause, their resolves not to remain in the dark any longer, come let us look at them all.”

Surendra Nath Banerjea once had to write to the Secretary to the Government of India for his personal interference to stop the inhuman treatment of the tea plantation workers by the British owners of tea gardens in Assam.

According to Times of India Report notable workers’ strikes were Textile Workers’ Strike in Bombay (1901), Press and Machine Workers’ Strike in Madras Government Press (1903).

From 1905 onwards, the Swadeshi Movement also created a favourable climate for the working people to start their movements against the foreign industrial entrepreneurs. It was also part of the struggle for freedom. The strikes
in the Government of India Press, East Indian Railway, Burn and Standard, Calcutta Tramways, Calcutta Corporation and in the jute industry were events of this period.

Under mentioned leaders who helped the working class to built up their organization which ultimately helped the freedom movement were Dadabhai Naoroji, Surendra Nath Banerjea, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das, Bipin Chandra Pal, N. M. Lokhunday, Sorebjee Shapurji Bengalee, C.F. Andrews, Josef Batista, J. M. Sengupta, Subhas Chandra Bose, Prof. Abdul Bari, Mrinal Kanti Bose, V. V. Giri, N. M. Joshi, Jawaharlal Nehru and others.

The most remarkable event of the Indian working class movement during the early period was the first political strike of workers against the arrest of Bal Gangadhar Tilak in 1908. This Strike, according to Lenin is the revolt of Indian proletariat and it had lasting influence on many other liberation movement of India.

In between 1910 and the World War I, there was a few strikes in industrial arenas, but more of them created a deep-rooted significance.

The World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution had brought a dramatic change in industrial workers' attitude to social and political issues. The birth of the Communist Party of India and the role of the Communist International inducted a new philosophy in the Working class movement derives from Marxian ideology. Bolshevik Revolution performed a catalytic function in raising the tempo of the Indian Nationalist Movement. These changes demanded that the boundary between the two movements - political mass movement and the working class movement, not necessarily to separate but to recognize their identity. On 27 April 1918, one of the first Trade Unions in India – the Madras Labour Union – was formed in Madras at a meeting of textile workers. Following this, the long cherished desire of the Indian working class and the national leaders
were fulfilled with the creation of the AITUC in 1920, with Lajpat Rai as its President. During the time, under its able leadership there was a wave of strikes in most industrial centres in India. The Congress Session at Amritsar (1919), Calcutta (1920), Ahmedabad (1921), Gaya (1922), Karachi (1931), Lucknow (1936), Hajipur (1937), Haripura (1938) and Tripuri (1939) provided scopes to the working class people in contact with the Congress creating awareness that political freedom and economic freedom are interrelated.

Between 1921 and 1924, a debate centering on the proper relation between the labour movement and the Congress-led political movement took place on the national scene. The two main contenders were Chittaranjan Das and Mahatma Gandhi. A large section of the Indian National Congress under the leadership of C.R. Das believed that the labourers had an important political role to play. They believed that labour should be organized on all-India basis and brought in close connection with the Congress. Gandhi and his followers, on the other hand, believed that labour had no political role, at least for that moment.

In this regard C.R. Das's ideas and relationship with the labour movement is necessary to discuss. It is true that Das was not a labour leader in the sense of organizing individual trade unions, or leading particular strikes. He was predominantly a political leader of the national struggle for freedom. But as a political leader he understood the importance and the necessity of organizing the working class and is also at the same time observed how the incipient labour movement should relate itself to the far stronger political organization like Indian National Congress. As a practical politician, he tried to put those ideas into practice. On the other hand, Mahatma Gandhi has a labour ideology of his own and also stood for a distinct model of labour movement at this time. From the year 1920 Mahatma Gandhi spoke before many workers' meetings in different places throughout India. These speeches as well as his articles on the problems of workers and strikes in Young India, Harijan, Gujarati and other papers represent his ideology about labour movement in India.
In the Post-War period, especially between 1921 and 1924, major strikes took place in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Ahmedabad. In these labour strikes Congress should be more positive and should do something to bring the working class into the liberation movement led by it. The Champaran Satyagraha and Barduali Satyagraha launched by Gandhiji and Sardar Patel; Assam Tea Plantation strike headed by C. R. Das; The Buckingham and Carnatic Mill Strike under the leadership of B. P. Wadia paved the way to introduction of the Indian Trade Union Act in 1926.

The Post-War industrial unrest along with general political agitation, made the British Government anxious and apprehensive. In 1920, questions were frequently raised in the House of Commons regarding the number of Indians imprisoned as a consequence of the strikes. There was also the question whether the British Indian Government would remain a mere spectator to this great working class upsurge which frequently showed a racial bias and whose particular target was mainly the European investors. Though official records show that the Government did not want to remain a passive observer, yet, it was conscious of the risks involved in frequent interventions in employer–employee conflicts. Thus, the Government enacted some welfare-oriented acts, viz., Factories Act of 1922, Mines Act of 1923, Workmen’s’ Compensation Act of 1923 in between 1920 and 1925.

The major incident, as said before, in the history of Indian Trade Union Movement was the foundation of the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) in 1920. As its foundation coincided with the Non-co-operation Movement and AITUC contained almost all the top leaders of the Congress, some think that it was an organ of the Indian National Congress. But that is not true. From the very beginning, AITUC has existed as a separate body and it did not have any formal organizational connection with the Congress. The AITUC after its origin, immediately send representatives to the International Labour Conference in Geneva. However, the first elected President of the AITUC was Lala Lajpat Rai.
The first session of the All India Trade Union Congress began on 31 October 1902. The following excerpts are from the reports published in the Bombay Chronicle of 2 November 1920 —

"The first Trade Union Congress of India opened its session at the empire theatre, Bombay on Sunday ........... The theatre was crowded to its utmost capacity by delegates and visitors. The delegates, who came from different parts of the country, were present in large numbers representing practically all branches of labour in India ........ Lala Lajpat Rai, President of the Congress, received tremendous ovation on arrival." 113

Dewan Chaman Lal, General Secretary of the AITUC wrote in the 'Manifesto to the Workers of the India' on 1921 —

"Workers of India: The time has come for you to assert your right as arbiters of your country’s destiny. You cannot stand aloof from the stream of national movement. You cannot refuse to face the events that are making history today for India. You are the mass of the population. Every movement of the political chessboard, every step in the financial or economical arrangements of your country, affects you more than it affects any other class. You must become conscious of your responsibilities. You must understand your rights. You must prepare yourself to realize your destiny." (Excerpts of the Manifesto). 114

The Indian National Congress from 1919 to 1930 did almost nothing to associate the working class with the independence movement except passing some resolutions regarding labour. In this very field, the Congress expresses its fullest sympathy with the workers of India in their struggle for securing their legitimate rights through the organization of Trade Unions. On the contrary, as is said earlier that Congress did not want to mobilize the working force as a component part of freedom struggle. As evidence, when some workmen in Bombay struck work to protest against the arrest of the Ali Brothers, the
Congress issued a rather stern statement urging them to stop the strike. The relation between Indian National Congress and labour movement are aptly stated by Amrita Bazar Patrika in its Editorial column on March 13, 1923,

"Call it national if you will, but if the truth must be told, the masses of the Indian people have not yet been completely brought within the fold of the Indian National Congress ... The question which the Indian National Congress will soon be called upon to solve is whether it will allow this newly evoked mass energy to struggle blindly to through sporadic outbursts and to organize itself outside the Congress movement or whether, under proper direction it should be harnessed to the cause of the Swaraj in India and made to strike at the very root of economic and political subjection. The problems have not been faced in the right spirit up to now." 115

This has been the story down to 1934. Meanwhile, Congress had constituted a strong move in forming of a Labour Committee. This Committee was to act in co-operation with other labour organization including AITUC. This, however, was done with a view to the elections of 1937. In the elections of all the provinces, Congress contested in twenty labour seats and own 90% of the seats contested. After 1937 till independence, the history of labour movement in India had undeniably proved that labour organization and political parties are indispensable. In 1947, the desperate attempt of Congress to bring the AITUC under its control had failed and thus was organized INTUC under its fold. This is because of the increasing communist influence on AITUC from 1925, and from 1929 had started open conflicts between nationalists Trade Unions and Communist Trade Unions.

Traditionally India is an agricultural country where factories and industries are like islands in a vast agricultural sea. Here, agriculture continues to employ the largest number of total population. In all its regions the landlords and rural middle class dominate the agrarian social structure.
The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed the long series of peasants' movement (mostly organized by tribal people) which was related to the introduction of the Tenancy Legislation Act employed by the British Government and also by the environmental degradation caused by the massive deforestation. Behind these movements, the nationalists writers like Ramesh Dutta searched for high increase of land tax, neglect of irrigation, famines, and showed a tendency to exaggerate the benefits of a permanent settlement of land revenue. On the other hand, Marxist historians viewed some crucial social changes evident at that time. To them, transfer of land from peasants to non-agriculturists was the foremost cause. By the mid-nineteenth century onwards due to the effects of industrial revolution land had become a favourite form of investment for traders and urban middle class. In this way had emerged a non productive rent receiver class who stated an ugly 'de-peasantizing process.' The Strachey Commission headed by Richard Strachey, the Chairman of the Committee, 1880, referred to the erosion of cultivator's rights and cultivators were 'rack-rented tenants-at-will who, owing no permanent connection with the land, have no incentive to thrift or improvement ....' 116

The effect caused havoc for the peasants throughout the country. In Bengal, the peasants were reduced to share croppers known as adhiars, bargadars and bhagchasis. In Uttar Pradesh, zamindars employed peasants as tenants on their own land who had no occupancy right and had to pay produce-rent to the zamindars. Same thing happened in Bihar also. In the Punjab, land transfer had continued and the peasant had not received any sort of benefit. In ryotwari areas in Madras after cultivating the large promotion of lands, the peasant-tenants paid almost 80 percent rent to the zamindars and remained in poverty.

So, it is clear that Tenancy Legislation had resulted only in safeguarding the interests of the rural elite represented by the landlords. The Bengal Tenancy Act, 1985 allowed the zamindars to increase the rent if they think so. In Uttar
Pradesh, Rent Act of 1886 hardly checked the eviction of tenants. In 1888, the Indian Association, of which Dwarkanath Ganguly was a prominent leader, submitted a memorandum to Lord Ripon on the worse condition of the Assam Tea Garden Coolies. Some time after, Bipin Pal, a prominent Extremist leader of the later times moved a resolution in the Bengal Political Conference, demanding the appointment of an independent commission to enquire into the condition of the coolies.

The same thing also happened in the tribal areas of different states and provinces. On the one hand, tribal lands were handed over to the non-tribal landlords and on the other, their traditional rights on forests for using it were encroached by the Government. It is true that for the development activities enormous demand for timber was raised. In all the tribal regions cleaning of jungles and making of railway building and urbanization made the situation worse for the inhabitants. Also, to prevent the occupancy right of Santals on lands, the Rent Act was introduced in Santal Pargana, Palamau and Chhota Nagpur.

From the beginning of the nineteenth century, tribal-peasant movements were started agitating against those Government policies. In 1831-32, the Hos, Oraons, Mundas and Kols in Chhota Nagpur had taken up arms against the non-tribal landlords. In Malabar region, between 1855 and 1896, several Moplah outbreaks were started and Moplahs became increasingly anti-British. Birsa Munda, the master-leader of the Mundas started an agitation against the land-laws of the Government and finally arrested in 1895. Having heard the arresting news of the Birsa Munda, his followers had arranged meetings in villages and started working to form a fighting force. On 1900, about 300 Munda peasants attacked the Khunti (Chhota Nagpur) police station and killed two constables. The movement then spread to Ranchi, Palamau and Hazaribagh. In 1916, the Malabar Tenants' Association was formed. Then, in 1921, there started a popular movement called Tana Bhagat Movement, led by tribal leader Sibu and Maya, refused to pay rent or Chaukidari Tax. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Ranchi wrote, “The Tana Bhagat movement continues to give trouble and there is ample evidence that the efforts of agitators to associate it with non-co-operation has given the movement a new life.” The Tana Bhagats were drawn into the nationalist movement, and some of their leaders attended the Gaya Session of the Congress in 1922.

Based on ethnic solidarity the tribal peasants’ struggle was flared up in other parts of the country. In 1910, there was a rebellion in Baster which was mainly directed against the curtailment of rights enjoyed by the tribal peasants. In Manipur, there was an uprising of the Thadoe Kukis in 1917-19. In the Godavari forest in Madras disturbances broke out which ultimately transformed into a guerrilla war against the British. In 1922, the Koyas organized an uprising in Andhra Pradesh.

The Indian National Congress in its early stage showed little interest for the landless tenants. Only it adopted resolutions in 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1895. The resolution of the 1891 session speaks that fuel, wood, grass, stones, earth, leaves, bark, roots – all had been taken away from them not by God but by men. But after 1895 Congress became involved in forest Satyagraha in different parts of the country. And in this way, tribal-peasants with the active support of the Congress were drawn into the mainstream of the nationalist movement. Bal Gangadhar Tilak was tried to organize a non-revenue movement in the Maharashtra-Deccan in 1896-97. During the time, Poona Sarvajnik Sabha, captured by Tilak, sent members in the villages and asked peasants to withhold payment of revenue due by them. In Punjab, under the leadership of Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh the agrarian movement of the affluent peasants started on 1906-07. During the World War I, owing to the change of production conditions the peasant movement flourished with new zeal and energy. Madan Mohan Malaviya organized Kishan Sabha in Uttar Pradesh in 1918, which generally represented Rajput tenants and small landlords.
Congress, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi took active part in peasant mobilization. In 1917, Gandhiji himself started campaign in every corner of Champaran. The positive effect of this campaign has been noted by Gandhiji, the ryots who had all along remained crushed now somewhat came into their own .... In 1918, Gandhiji launched the *Satyagraha* of Patidar ryots in Kairn (Kheda) in Gujarat. The 1920s marked a distinct turning point when the rural poor were drawn into the nationalist movement. In 1921, the peasant unrest in Rae Bareilly took place. The following excerpts are from the report entitled “The Writing on the Wall – Agrarian Troubles in Oudh” published in the Amrita Bazar Patrika on 5 February 1921:-

“The disturbances in Rae Bareilly in the course of which the police fired upon the peasants and some lives are lost and which has been described ... as a reproduction of the Jallaianwalla Bagh episode, have evidently spread to the neighboring district of Fyzabad.”

In Andhra Pradesh, Alluri Sitaramaraju led an uprising of the tribal people and peasants in 1922. It took the British two years to suppress it. A successful peasant struggle was led by Vallabhbhai Patel in Bardoli in 1928 against increase in revenue.

In Eastern Uttar Pradesh, Jawaharlal Nehru and Babu Ramchandra started a ‘no-revenue’ movement in 1931. An official report shows, “In various parts of India the movement for tenants’ unions or Kisan Sabhas has become increasingly prominent. In many cases these unions have confined themselves to collective bargaining with local landlords and overloads and to secure improved conditions of tenure..... This has been considerably increased by the policy of hostility to the government preached by the Non-Cooperation Party ... there is a considerable increase in the class consciousness of the rustic.” In the following years, the peasantry became the most important mass base of the freedom struggle and peasant leaders like Vijay Singh Pathik, Sahajananda Saraswati and N.G. Ranga played a prominent role in the struggle for independence.
Historical Outline of Freedom Movement in India in General

**Partition of India**

The World War II came to an end in 1945. After the War, the freedom movement of India entered into a new phase. In 1942 and 1943, during the period of Quit India Movement, the Congress was declared illegal and Muhammad Ali Jinnah gained popularity and separatist tendencies gained much ground. In fact, Jinnah adopted a new slogan 'Divide and Quit' in contrast to the Congress slogan of 'Quit India.'

**Lord Wavell’s plan**

Lord Wavell, the then Viceroy of India, convened a conference of different political leaders at Simla with a view to grant more powers to Indians. At the conference, the proposals of the Cripps Offer of 1942 were renewed and Lord Wavell offered to reconstruct the Viceroy’s Executive Council. He made the following proposals:

- The Viceroy’s Executive Council would be reconstructed consisting of Indians excepting for the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief.
- Hindus and Muslims would be represented at par on the Viceroy’s Council.
- India would be given a Dominion Status in the long run.
- The Constitution of India would be drafted by the Indians themselves.
- The Governor-General would retain the veto power which he would use in the interest of the people of India.

Lord Wavell’s Plan was not acceptable to the Muslim League. It insisted that the right to appoint members from the Muslim community should entirely rest with the League. The Congress opposed the proposal of the League on the ground that the former represented both the Hindus and the Muslims. The
Congress had agreed to Lord Wavell's Plan, but the adverse attitude of the League to the plan made it inoperative.

**The Cabinet Mission Plan**

As a consequence of the War, the power and politics throughout the world had changed a lot. The Labour Party, under the Prime Ministership of Clement Attlee, came to power in England which was beneficial to India as the Labour Party had always favoured self-rule for India. Also, the War shattered the British power and simultaneously the USA and Russia had emerged as world powers. Both these nations supported India's demand for self-government.

After the surrender of Japan in August 1945, the Indian National Army soldiers were taken as war prisoners. The Government wanted to try some of the leaders as traitors since they had broken their pledge of loyalty to the British crown. The historic trial of Shah Nawaz Khan, G.S. Dhilon and Prem Sehgal was held in Red Fort in November 1945, which roused tremendous national sentiment. Leading Indian advocates like Bhulabhai Desai, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Jawaharlal Nehru, appeared as defence counsels. The entire country was united on the demand for their acquittal. Furthermore, the Royal Indian Navy revolted in Bombay followed by demonstration and violence which unnerved the Government.

In the winter of 1945-46, there were general elections in the provinces. Congress won a majority of the general seats and the Muslim League captured a majority of seats reserved on the Muslim quota. Consequently, the Congress formed ministries in eight provinces (Assam, Bihar, the United Provinces, North West Frontier, Bombay, Madras, Central Provinces and Orissa). A coalition ministry, headed by Malik Khizar Hayyat Khan, leader of the Unionist Party, formed the Government in Punjab. But the Muslim League could not form the government in any province, in spite of its victories in the elections in respective fields. Thus, communal passions rose high and the entire political atmosphere was charged with suspicion, distrust and violence.
The Cabinet Mission of India

To tackle this turmoil, the Prime Minister Clement Attlee announced in Parliament that the British Government would send a Cabinet Mission to India consisting of Lord Pathick Lawrence, Sir Stafford Cripps and A.V. Alexander. The purpose of this Mission was to hold consultations with the Indian leaders with the object of setting up complete self-government in India. Attlee further announced that his Government was aware of the rights of the minorities, yet he could not allow a minority to place a veto on the rights of the majority. The Cabinet Mission arrived in India on 16 May 1946 and met the leaders of the political parties.

It rejected Jinnah's demand for a separate Pakistan composed of Muslim majority areas in the North-West and North-East on the following grounds:

- The partition of India as claimed by the League would not solve the communal problem, because Hindu minorities would still live in the areas demanded by the League and there was no justification for keeping large Hindu districts in Bengal, Assam and Punjab in Pakistan.
- A small Pakistan would not be viable, particularly when its two parts—one in the East and other in the West—would be separated by hundreds of miles of Indian Territory.
- Partition would involve dislocation of communication network and would involve division of armed forces and services personnel along with communal lines.

The Cabinet Mission, therefore, made the following fresh proposals with the aim of maintaining the unity of India, yet giving reasonable satisfaction to the demand of the League for Pakistan.

Final Proposals

- India would be a federation of British provinces and the Indian States.
The Federal Government would deal with defence, foreign affairs and communication. All other subjects would be under the control of the respective provinces.

British provinces would be divided into three groups.
  Group A – Madras, Bombay, the United Provinces, Bihar, Orissa and Central Provinces.
  Group B – Punjab, North West Frontier Province and Sind.
  Group C – Bengal and Assam.

Each group referred to above would draft a Constitution for a regional union if so desired.

A province could opt out of the group by a majority decision of its legislature.

A Constituent Assembly would be elected to draw up the future Constitution of India. It would consist of 389 members, 292 from the Provinces, four from Chief Commissioner’s Province and 93 from the Indian States.

Therefore, it should be divided into three sections, comprising the three groups of British provinces mentioned above and each section would draft a Constitution for a regional union if so desired, and also for the Constituent provinces. Thus, it envisaged a three-tier system of Government, for the provinces, for the groups and for the union of India.

- The constituent Assembly would sign a treaty with Britain to provide for certain matters arising out of the transfer of power.
- An interim Government at the centre representing all communities would be installed on the basis of parity between the representatives of the Hindu and the Muslims.

**Reaction of the Congress and the League**

The Cabinet Mission Plan and Proposals had mixed reaction in the Congress and the League campus. It preserved the unity of India, but at the same
time, conceded to a large extent, the substance of Pakistan, by providing for the grouping of Muslim-majority provinces. The Congress welcomed the proposals which provided for an Indian Union of Provinces and States as it preserved the unity of India. It was also glad to see the proposals rejecting the idea of Pakistan.

However, the proposals of the Cabinet Mission with regard to the grouping of the provinces were not clear. The League regarded the Compulsory Grouping of the Provinces as one of the corner-stones of the Plan and was not prepared to compromise on that issue. The Congress stand was that the making of groups was optional for the provinces, which should be free to join any group. As a matter of fact, Gandhiji asked the people of Assam not to join the groups if they did not approve of it. Against this, it was suggested that the provinces might join the proposed groups provisionally, but later on, freedom might be given to them to leave it, if they so desired. Finally, the British Government gave its verdict in favour of the compulsory grouping of the Provinces. Then, the League won and the Congress lost its battle.

After due deliberation, the Congress accepted the long-term plan, but rejected the proposal for an Interim Government on account of the differences between the Congress and the League over the parity of representation in it. Congress rejected the League's claim of having the exclusive right for nominating members of the Muslim quota in the Interim Government. The Congress held that it too had members from the Muslim community who could represent that community. Besides, the Congress said that it could not give up the national character or accept an artificial parity with the Muslim League in the formation of a National Government.

At the end, the League accepted the Plan and Proposal in its entirety and asked Wavell, the Viceroy, to constitute an Interim Government. The Congress accepted only that part of the scheme which dealt with the Constitution-making. And Congress would join the Constituent Assembly with a view to framing the Constitution of a free, united and democratic India.
The Viceroy refused to implement the Interim Government Plan as it had been rejected by Congress, the largest political Party in India. The Sikhs too found this proposal unacceptable because they (Sikhs) were included in the North-Western Muslim Block, i.e. in Group B. The Schedule Castes were of the opinion that these proposals were illusory because no seats were reserved for Schedule Caste and also because only one seat was offered to them in the Interim Government.

**Observance of Direct Action by the League**

In July 1946, elections were held to the Constituent Assembly and Congress won 212 out of 298 seats, while the League won 73 seats. The League feared that it would be outvoted in the Assembly and for the reason they withdrew its acceptance of the entire Cabinet Plan and also demanded appointment of two different Constituent Assemblies. On 27 July 1946, Jinnah addressed the All India Muslim League Council, where he charged Lord Wavell with playing into the hands of the Indian National Congress by treating the latter's conditional acceptance of the Plan as genuine and postponing the formation of the Interim Government. Thus, the League withdrew its earlier acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan.

Jinnah was no more content with negative action. The League under Jinnah’s leadership passed a Direct Action Resolution on 30 July 1946, considering the British Government and the Congress for their breach of faith in the Muslim community and set 16 August, 1946 as ‘a day of protest.’ The League declared that the time had come for it to resort to direct action to achieve Pakistan.

Dr. Tarachand explains the basis for this ‘Direct Action’ in the way,

"Jinnah justified it by stating that the British had machine guns to enforce their will, the Congress had the weapon of civil resistance, therefore, the Muslims could not sit with hands and feet
tied and must bid good-bye to constitutional methods and prepare for self-defence and self-preservation by Direct Action.\textsuperscript{120}

On 14 August 1946, the Viceroy invited the Congress to form the Interim Government at the centre. Jawaharlal Nehru, on behalf of the Congress accepted the offer and invited Jinnah to join it. But Jinnah refused.

On the Direct Action Day of 16 August 1946, no programme of action was chalked out. In many places, there were peaceful demonstrations of Muslim solidarity. But Calcutta was an exception. There, a section of people went on a rampage, arson, looting and murder. Nearly 5000 people were killed, 15,000 injured, and about one lakh were rendered homeless. The violence continued for four days. This worst situation was apparently encouraged by the Muslim League Ministry in Bengal and the British administration paralyzed. This episode is known as the Great Calcutta Killing. Like Calcutta, violent agitations were also spread to other places such as Noakhali, East Bengal and in Bihar. In the midst of violence, Gandhiji went around from village to village in Bengal and Bihar and tried his best to bring peace in riot torn area.

\textbf{Clement Attlee's Announcement of 1947}

Several attempts were made between August 1946 and February 1947, to find an amicable solution to settle differences between the Congress and the League. In August 1946, responding to the invitation of the Lord Wavell to form the Viceroy's Executive Council, the Congress submitted names of 12 members to the Council. But Jinnah refused to accept the offer.

On 2 September 1946, the Congress formed the Council and Jawaharlal Nehru became its Vice-President. The League soon realized that the Congress had grasped power at the Centre and wanted to join the Interim Government. Jinnah gave a tacit understanding to the Viceroy and the Congress that the League would give a fair trial to the Cabinet Mission Plan as well as would join the constituent Assembly. On 26 October 1946, representatives of the League
were inducted into the Interim Government. So far the Interim Government had been working like a team. But the induction of the Muslim League led to bickering regarding the interpretations of the Cabinet Mission Plan. The Government seemed to be paralyzed.

Elections to the Constituent Assembly, which was to draft the new Constitution for India, were held between July and December 1946. Its first meeting was held on 9 December 1946. Contrary to the expectations of the Viceroy, the League refused to participate in the Assembly which placed Lord Wavell in an awkward situation. The British Government in England said that if the League were not to join the Constituent Assembly, its decision could not be implemented in so far as they affected Muslim majority areas.

Meanwhile, the Constituent Assembly again met on 9 December 1946 with the presidency of Dr. Rajendra Prasad. Various committees were made to look after the different tasks connected with the drafting of the new constitution for India. However, the League demanded on 31 January 1947 that the Constituent Assembly should be dissolved.

Under these circumstances, the Cabinet Mission Plan failed to achieve its objectives. The Congress and the League drifted apart. In order to end this stage of chaos, Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of England, made an important announcement on 20 February 1947, declaring that the British would leave India by June 1948 and power would be handed over to one or more Central Governments. This announcement referred to the Partition of the country. For the purpose of taking necessary steps for the transfer of power, Lord Wavell was recalled and Lord Louis Mountbatten was appointed the Viceroy of India.

The League welcomed this announcement and further intensified its agitation for the achievement of Pakistan. The League also succeeded in toppling the non-League Government in Punjab. Communal feelings were let loose so much at this time that the unity of India seemed an impossible goal to achieve.
The Mountbatten Plan

Against this horrible situation, Admiral Lord Mountbatten had arrived in India on 22 March 1947, with a definite plan. He was given powers to negotiate and affect transfer of power to Indians. After series of meetings with the different political parties and communities, Mountbatten came to conclusion that he could not unite the two major parties and partition of the country was inevitable.

Congress was against the partition of the country. Gandhiji said, 'Even if the whole of India is in flames, it will not bring Pakistan. Pakistan should be made on my dead body.' On the other, Jinnah was adamant and said that Muslims were a separate nation and must have their own State.

According to Mountbatten Plan, transfer of power could be done on the basis of the partition of the country. For this, a Bill would be introduced in British Parliament in July 1947. The Plan had the following points:

- The date of British withdrawal was advanced from June 1948 to 15 August 1947, when power would be handed over to successor Governments in India.
- The country would be divided into two dominions, i.e. India and Pakistan.
- The princely states would have the option to join either of the two dominions or to remain independent.
- A plebiscite would be held in the province of North Western Frontier Province (NWFP) to ascertain whether the people in the area wanted to join India or Pakistan.
- The provinces of Assam, Bengal and Punjab would be divided. A boundary commission was to be instituted to delimit the boundaries.

Acceptance by the Congress and the League

The Mountbatten Plan had a mixed reaction. Jinnah said that it created a truncated and moth-eaten Pakistan since Punjab and Bengal were divided on the
same principles on which the entire country was partitioned. Congress accepted partition of the country as a necessary evil. Jawaharlal Nehru said, “For generations we have dreamt and struggled for a free, independent and united India. The proposal to allow certain parts to secede is painful for any of us to contemplate. Nevertheless, I am convinced that our present decision is the right one.”

Gandhiji was still against the partition. In a last attempt to keep India united, he suggested offering Jinnah the post of Prime Minister in a free, undivided India. Other Congress leaders like Nehru and Sardar Patel disagreed with this suggestion as they felt that they could not rely on the future policies of Jinnah against their past experience of him. In the end, Gandhiji too accepted the Mountbatten Plan.

The Congress reluctantly accepted the Plan for the following reasons:

- Extension of the British rule was harmful for India. The British instigated the native rulers of Indian States to remain independent. So, the Congress thought that it was better to accept partition of the country than have confusion created by the Divide and Rule Policy of the British.
- A smaller united India was better than a bigger disorganized country.
- The Congress believed that it could not have a joint administration with the League against the bitter experience it had when the latter joined the Interim Government on October, 1946.
- Large scale communal riots that engulfed the whole country proved beyond doubt that it was better to accept the partition of the country than to have bloodshed.

**The Indian Independence Act, 1947**

Lord Mountbatten with the approval of the British Cabinet announced the plan of preparing a draft for the Indian Independence Bill on 3 June 1947. After incorporating the comments of Congress and League, the final draft bill was
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prepared. Prime Minister Attlee introduced the Bill in the House of Commons on 4 July 1947. The Bill was duly passed by the both House of the British Parliament and received Royal Assent on 18 July 1947.

Provisions of the Act

The Indian Independence Act was a short document, consisting of less than 20 sections and 3 schedules. Following were its main provisions:

Creation of Two Dominions: It provided for the creation of two independent Dominions from August 15, 1947 to be known as India and Pakistan. Pakistan was to comprise East Bengal, West Punjab, Sindh, Baluchistan, North-Frontier Province and the district of Sylhet in Assam. India was to comprise all the remaining territories included in British India.

A Governor-General for Each Dominion: The Act provided for the appointment of a Governor-General for each of the Dominions. He was to functions as a Constitutional Head. There was no sphere in which he could act against the wishes of the Ministers. Similarly, the Provincial governors were to act on the advice of their Ministers.

Constituent Assemblies to serve as Central Legislatures: Pakistan would have a separate Constituent Assembly. The Constituent Assemblies of the two dominions were to serve as their respective Central Legislatures. They were sovereign bodies to make the Constitution and to formulate laws. The existing Central Legislative Assembly and the Council of State would automatically stand dissolved.

End of the Jurisdiction of the British Parliament: With effect from 15 August 1947, His Majesty’s Government would cease to have any responsibility for the Government of India and all treaties and agreements between His majesty’s Government and the rulers of Indian States or any authority in tribal
areas would lapse. The words ‘Emperor of India’ would be omitted from the Royal Styles and Titles.

**Princely States would Become Independent:** All powers and authority of the British Empire to the Princely States were terminated. These States thus became independent.

**The Abolition of the Office of the Secretary of State:** The office of the Secretary of State for India was to be abolished.

**Safeguarding the Interests of Existing Officers:** Provision was also made for safeguarding the interests of the existing officers appointed by the Secretary of State, who would not make any such appointments in future.

**Division of the Indian Army and the Sharing of Assets:** Provision was made for the division of Indian Army and the sharing of assets and liabilities between the two Dominions.

**Power for Bringing the Act into Operation:** The Governor-General was vested with all powers and authority necessary for bringing the Indian Independence Act into effective operation.

Thus, the Indian Independence Act created two independent dominions – India and Pakistan. Pakistan came into existence on 14 August and India on 15 August 1947. On 20 June 1948, Chakrabarti Rajagopalachari was shorn in as Governor-General of India. Before that Jawaharlal Nehru continued the same office from 15 August 1947 to 19 June 1948. On 26 January 1950, India became a Republic and Dr. Rajendra Prasad assumed office as President of the Indian Union and the Constituent Assembly became the Parliament of India under the transitional provisions of the new Constitution.
On 15 August 1947, the first Independence Day in India, Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister addressing the nation:

“At the stroke of midnight hour, when the world sleeps India will awake to life and freedom. A moment comes, which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new, when an age ends, and when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance. It is fitting that at this solemn moment, we take the pledge of dedication to the service of India and her people and to the still larger cause of humanity.”

National Anthem

‘JANA-GANA-MANA ADHINAYAKA’

I

Jana-gana-mana-adhinayaka jaya he
Bharata-bharata-bhagya-vidhata
Punjab-Sindhu-Gujarata-Maratha
Dravida-Utkala-Vanga
Vindhya-Himchala-Yamuna-Ganga
Uchhala-Jaladhi-Taranga
Taba subha name jage tava subha asisa mage
Gahe tava jaya-gatha
Jana-gana-mangala-dayaka jaya he
Bharata-bhagya-vidhata
Jaya he, jaya he, jaya he, jaya jaya jaya jaya he.
II

Aharaha tava ahvana pracharita, suni tava udara vani
Hindu-Buddha-Sikha-Jaina
Parasika-Mualmana-Khristani
Purva-paschima asc tava simhasana-pase
Prema-hara haya gantha
Jana-gana-aikya-vidhayaka jaya he
Bharata-bhagya-vidhata
Jaya he, jaya he, jaya he, jaya jaya jaya jaya he.

III

Patana-abhyudaya-bandhura pantha
Yuga Yuga dhavita yatri
Tumi chira-sarathi tava ratha-chakre
Mukharita patha dina-ratri
Daruna-Viplava-majhe tava sankhadhvani baje
Sankata-dukhatrata
Jana-gana-patha-parichayaka jaya he
Bharata-bhagya-vidhata
Jaya he, jaya he, jaya he, jaya jaya jaya jaya he

IV

Ghora-timira-ghana-nivida-nisithe
Pidita-murchhita dese
Jagrata chhila tava avichala mangala
Nata-nayane animese
Duhsvapne atanke raksā karile anke
Snehamayi tumi mata
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Jana-gana-dukhatrayaka jaya he
Bharata-bhagya-vidhata
Jaya he, jaya he, jaya he, jaya jaya jaya he.

Ratri prabhatila udila ravichchhavi
Purva vihangama, punya samirana
Nava-jivana-rasa dhale
Tava karunaruna-rage nidrita Bharara jage
Tava charane nata matha
Jaya jaya jaya he, jaya rajesvara
Bharata-bhagya-vidhata.

English Version of ‘JANA-GANA-MANA ADHENAYAKA’ translated by Rabindranath Tagore.

Thou art the ruler of the minds of all people,
Thou dispenser of India’s destiny,
Thy name rouses the hearts
Of the Punjab, Sind, Gujarat and Mararha,
Of Dravida, Orissa and Bengal.
It echoes in the hills of the Vindhyas and Himalayas,
Mingles in the music of Jumna and Ganges,
And it chanted by the waves of the Indian sea.
They pray for thy blessings and sing thy praise,
Thou dispenser of India’s destiny,
Victory, Victory, Victory to thee.
Day and night, thy voice goes out from land to land,
Calling Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs and Jains round thy throne
And Parsees, Mussalmans and Christians.
Offerings are brought to thy shrine by the East and the West
To be woven in a garland of love.
Thou bringest the hearts of all peoples into the harmony of one life,
Thou dispenser of India’s destiny,
Victory, Victory, Victory to thee.

Eternal charioteer, thou drivest man’s history
Along the road rugged with rises and falls of Nations.
Amidst all tribulations and terror
Thy trumpet sounds to hearten those that despair and droop,
And guide all people in their paths of peril and pilgrimage.
Thou dispenser of India’s destiny,
Victory, Victory, Victory to thee.

When the long dreary night was dense with gloom
And the country lay still in a stupor,
Thy Mother’s arms held her,
Thy wakeful eyes bent upon her face,
Till she was rescued from the dark evil dreams
That oppressed her spirit,
Thou dispenser of India’s destiny,
Victory, Victory, Victory to thee.

The night dawns, the sun rises in the East,
The birds sing, the morning breeze brings a stir of new life.
Thouched by golden rays of thy love
India wakes up and bends her head at thy feet.
Thou King of all Kings,
Thou dispenser of India’s destiny,
Victory, Victory, Victory to thee. 123

National Anthem

After achieving Independence, Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister of India, made a statement in the Constituent Assembly on 25 August 1948, which is as follows, “The National Anthem tune should be that of Jana-gana-mana.”124 He again said in the cause of this statement that “the Jana-gana-mana tune, slightly varied, had been adopted as National Anthem by the Indian National Army in South-East-Asia and had subsequently attained a degree of popularity in India also.”125

The circumstances under which the tune of Jana-gana-mana was adopted as National Anthem are mentioned by J.L. Nehru in the following historic statement. “The matter came to a head on the occasion of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1947 in New York. Our delegation was asked for our National Anthem for the orchestra to play o a particular occasion. The delegation possessed a record of Jana-gana-mana and they gave this to the orchestra who practiced it. When they played it before a large gathering it was very greatly appreciated and representatives of many nations asked for a musical score of this tune which struck them as distinctive and dignified.”126

Then, the Constituent Assembly appointed a Committee to make recommendations about the final selection of the National Anthem. Finally, on 24 January 1950, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the President of the Constituent Assembly declared that the “composition consisting of the words and music known as Jana-gana-mana is the National Anthem of India.”127

Here, it should be mentioned that the song Jana-gana-mana had been gradually emerging as India’s National Anthem since its composition in 1911. The song was first sung at the commencement of the second day’s sitting of the
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twenty-sixth session of the Indian National Congress held at Greer’s Park (now Ladies Park on Acharya Prafulla Chandra Road) on 27 December 1911. Regarding this, the official report of the aforesaid Congress Session (1911) mentions Jana-gana-mana as “a patriotic song composed by Babu Rabindranath Tagore.” In its report of the Congress Session on 1911, the Amrita Bazar Patrika mentioned Jana-gana-mana as a ‘Bengali song of benediction.’ Similarly, the Bengalee reported the proceedings saying that they “commenced with a patriotic song composed by Babu Rabindranath Tagore, the leading poet of Bengal.”

Jana-gana-mana was sung for the second time on 25 January, 1912, (just a month after it was sung at the Congress Session in 1911), at the Maghotsav at Tagore’s residence at Jorasanko with the poet himself leading the choir ...

The song was first published in January 1912 with the title Bharatavidhata in the Tattabodhini Patrika on which Rabindranath was then Editor. And, finally in 1960, Jana-gana-mana was published in Gitavitan as song number 14 in the section of Swadesh.

Then in 1917, Jana-gana-mana was again sung in a chorus in the thirty-second session of the Indian National Congress in Calcutta with Mrs. Annie Besant as President. The official report of this session of the Congress includes Chittaranjan Das’s comments on the song which are as follows – “Brother Delegates, at the very outset I desire to refer to the song which you have just listened. It is a song of the glory and victory of India.”

In 1936, an English translation of the song in the poet’s own hand-writing was printed in the Commemoration Volume of the Theosophical College Magazine.

In 1937, a controversy as to whether Bankimchandra’s Vandemataram or Rabindranath’s Jana-gana-mana should be adopted as the National Anthem of
India. For this, J. H. Cousins issued a statement saying that "Rabindranath’s own intensity patriotic, ideally stimulating, and at the same time world-embracing Morning Song of India. Jana-gana-mana, should be confirmed officially, as what it has for almost twenty years been unofficially, namely, the true National Anthem of India." Then it became imperative that the Congress decide which of the two was to be the National Anthem.

Subhas Chandra Bose adopted Jana-gana-mana as the National Anthem of Azad Hind during World War II. Anand Mohan Sahay, a member of the Azad Hind Cabinet, issued a statement published in the Nation, on 10 March 1949 — 'The original song, Jana-gana-mana, used to be sung as our National Anthem by the Indians in Germany under the leadership of Netaji and Netaji himself directed the Bandmaster of the INA in practising the tune of Jana-gana-mana.' And Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose himself sang Jana-gana-mana with enthusiasm when he used to be alone.

**National Flag**

The Indian National Flag was hoisted on the historic Red Fort and a new chapter in the history of India began — the chapter of Independent Nationhood. The end of foreign rule was marked by rejoicings all over the country, and people in every city and village went wild with joy, hoisting the National Flag, bringing out colourful processions and chanting 'Bande Mataram' and 'Joi Hind'.

Below is the story of the evolution of the Indian National Flag:

1906: Three colours — saffron with eight stars across, white with ‘Bande Mataram’ and green with moon to right and sun to left. Proposed by some Indians in England and France who thought of an ‘Indian National Flag’. But it was not recognized in India.
1916: Two colours – red and green, with five red and four green stripes. Emblem of the great Bear. Union Jack at top left. In vogue during the ‘Home Rule’ days.

1921: Three colours – white, green and red, with ‘chakra’ across all colours. Sponsored by Gandhiji at the time of Bezwada Session of the AICC. Used at Congress sessions till 1931, though not officially accepted by Congress.

1931: One colour – saffron, with ‘charka’ at top left. Proposed by a committee appointed by the Working Committee after the Karachi Congress. But it was not approved by the Working Committee.

1931 (August): Three colours – saffron, white and green, ‘charka’ in blue colour in the middle, across the white strip. Length and breadth in the proportion of 3:2. It was proposed by the Working Committee. Form of flag suggested by Gandhiji retained with slight changes in order of colours and position of ‘charka’. Accepted by the AICC officially in Bombay. Colours not symbols of communities. Saffron represents courage and sacrifice, white truth and peace, green faith and strength. The ‘charka’ stands for the welfare of the masses.

From 1931, April 26 was observed as National Flag Day.

1947 (July 22): New flag with the ‘Ashokan Wheel’ instead of the ‘charka’ in the middle. Proposed by Jawaharlal Nehru and accepted by Constituent Assembly.\textsuperscript{133}
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