In the previous chapter the different factors contributing to Indian national consciousness have been discussed. Our work has now become easier and in the present chapter we propose to discuss the wider and more conspicuous features of the problem of Indian nationalism.

For the subject people the concept of nation is also the idea of struggling for independence. For them the concept of nation is the conscious consolidation for securing independence from foreign control with the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the country.

Partition of Bengal, 1905: burning feeling all over Bengal: true national feeling: deeper & wider unity: Swadeshi movement: Birth of Indian Nationalism as a protest against the Partition of Bengal. Although the Indian National Congress was started in 1885, its function did not go beyond prayers and petitions to the ruling authorities. Unless and until a subject people aspires after complete freedom and strives for this, we hesitate to say that nationalism has grown among that people. However, prior to 1905, we come across many fine and fiery speeches; but the burning feeling among the general people, the masses, which goes to constitute nationalism was wanting. Although Indian nationalism had occupied the head for a long time, it took
possession of the heart when Bengal was partitioned. Nationalism is a feeling. The concept of nation is not ripe so long as feeling for the country and urge for freedom does not grow. During the days of Swadeshi movement a cobbler at Barisal refused to mend shoes of a policeman although severely beaten by him. Such a case was not a rare instance in the days of Swadeshi movement. Surendranath writes: "The year 1905 is one of the most memorable in the history of Bengal. It would be no exaggeration to say that it was an epoch-making year, leaving a profound and far-reaching influence on the public life of Bengal and the future of the country. It was the year of the Partition of Bengal." The Partition cut right through the heart of the Bengalees and made them struggle in a body. Nationalism in its true character became visible in 1905. Although the Swadeshi movement was at first a purely local movement directed against a specific administrative measure concerning only the Province of Bengal, within a very short time it led to, and merged itself in, a national struggle of All-India character against the British, which never ceased till India won her independence. The Swadeshi movement started in 1905 was soon inspired by the distinct and conscious object of gaining political freedom in India; it was sustained and well-organized. "Freedom's battle once begun, passes from sire to son." The original object of the movement—to buy Indian and boycott foreign goods—led to a wider conception of upholding everything Indian at the cost of the foreign and a grim determination to achieve the liberty of India from foreign control. In 1905 Gokhale identified Swadeshi with the highest
type of patriotism, and in 1907 he declared that Swadeshism was not merely an industrial movement but affected the whole of life of the nation. Dadabhai Naoroji referred to Swadeshism as the "cradle of New India." In 1908 Gandhi wrote that the real awakening of India took place after the Partition of Bengal which might lead to the partition of the British Empire. He observed that the demand for the abrogation of the Partition was tantamount to a demand for Home Rule. In 1905 Lala Lajpat Rai observed: "I think the people of Bengal ought to be congratulated on being leaders of that march in the van of progress .... And if the people of India will just learn that lesson from the people of Bengal, I think the struggle is not hopeless."

Almost immediately after its birth the Swadeshi movement acquired an All-India and national character. The movement gave rise to the Extremist or Nationalist Party under Tilak, Aurobindo, Lajpat Rai, Khaparde and other leaders, and radically changed the conception of political goal and the method to achieve it, upheld by the Indian National Congress since 1885. It brought about a great upheaval of nationalist sentiment all over India. This newly born nationalism was first expressed in the Home Rule Movement of Tilak and Besant, and then in the Non-cooperation movement of Mahatma Gandhi.

R. C. Majumdar remarks that the Swadeshi movement may be compared to a tiny brook, which gradually widened itself by
receiving affluents and tributaries and became a mighty torrent of nationalism before it merged itself into the broad stream of India's national struggle for freedom. Will Durant observes: "It was in 1905, then, that the Indian Revolution began." Almost all the characteristic features that marked India's struggle for freedom up to 1947 may be traced to the Swadeshi movement. Even Gandhi's Non-co-operation and passive Resistance had their origin in the Swadeshi movement. Non-co-operation and Passive Resistance were preached by Aurobindo during the Swadeshi movement. Aurobindo anticipated Gandhi's enunciation of the high moral and spiritual values of a non-violent struggle. Aurobindo said: "On their fidelity to Swadeshi, to boycott, to passive resistance, rested the hope of a peaceful and spiritual revolution. On that it depended whether India would give the example unprecedented in history of a revolution worked only by moral force and peaceful pressure." Also, the differences between the political ideologies of the Moderates and the Extremists, and of the Hindus and the Muslims, were developed during the Swadeshi movement and this persisted till the very end.

It is the Swadeshi movement that gave rise to militant nationalism, generally referred to as terrorism. The followers of this cult of violence should be more properly called revolutionaries. Even Surendranath Banerjee who opposed terrorism admitted that the revolutionary movement in Bengal was "backed by men whose selfless devotion to the country could not
be called in question." (4:) At a time when political work was looked upon as a pastime of leisure hours, the leaders of the revolutionary movement as well as the rank and file set the example of placing their whole time and life at the service of the motherland in a spirit of devotion. These people had to work secretly and had no hope for praise and reward. Voluntarily they gave up peaceful domestic life for the life of sacrifice and sufferings of all kinds including imprisonment, inhuman torture and death. The idea of overthrowing British rule in India was their sole inspiration. Many of these revolutionaries were sterling examples of courage, heroism, nobility of soul and high idealism to such a degree that any nation in the world would feel proud of claiming them as their own. Further, the large band of revolutionaries who chose a life of exile rendered Yeoman's service to the cause of India's freedom by disclosing the real nature of British rule in India to people hitherto misled by interested propaganda, and in this way evoked sympathy and enlisted their support to India in her struggle for freedom. Besides, there is no doubt that the political concessions made by the British during a long period were due more to the revolutionary movement than to the constitutional agitation for freedom. The revolutionaries galvanized the political consciousness of the country in a way that nothing else could; they left a deep impress upon all the subsequent stages of her political advance. They really commenced the national struggle for freedom as we conceive it today.
Reactionary regime of Lord Curzon is a great landmark. He attempted to establish absolute control over the universities and municipalities and thus provoked keen protest all over India. But the partition of Bengal in the teeth of an angry, unanimous opposition was his worst folly. R.C. Majumdar writes: "This administrative measure which he carried through by riding roughshod over the feelings and sentiments of more than forty millions of people called forth all the latent forces of nationalism which had been gathering strength for years. Ere long, the protest took the form of Swadeshi movement which soon outstripped its original limitations of space and object and merged itself into an all-India national struggle for achieving freedom from the British Yoke. That struggle continued through ups and downs, but without a break, until freedom was won. So, viewed in this perspective, the partition of Bengal set the ball rolling and ultimately smashed the imperial fabric which the British had reared with so much care in India. As Gandhiji truly prophesied, the partition of Bengal led to the partition of the British empire." (i)

Since the constitution of Assam as a separate Province in 1874 with the three Bengali-speaking districts of Sylhet, Cachar and Goalpara attached to it, the Presidency of Bengal comprised Bengal proper, Bihar, Orissa and Chota Nagpur.
The Government regarded the size of the Province to be unwieldy, and the idea of reducing its size was raised from time to time. In 1903 Lord Curzon's Government proposed to incorporate with Assam the whole of Chittagong Division and the Districts of Dacca and Mymensingh. The publication of this scheme was the signal for an outburst of public indignation all over India. Not only the professional politicians but even the big landlords led the protest and they were joined by every class of people, both Hindus & Muslims. Protest meetings were held in towns & villages. Pamphlets and leaflets opposing the scheme were issued in thousands. From December 1903 to October 1905 more than 2000 public meetings attended by both Hindus and Mohammedans were held in Bengal to protest against the partition.

In East Bengal Lord Curzon undertook a tour "ostensibly with the object of ascertaining public opinion, but really to overawe it." Soon he was convinced of the strength and solidarity of public opposition to a scheme for partitioning Bengal. He realized the strength of Bengali nationalism and the danger it could create to British rule in India. Before it was too late, he decided to remove this danger by destroying the solidarity of the Bengalees. He now conceived the much more comprehensive plan of dividing the Bengali-speaking area into two separate provinces; the whole of Northern and Eastern Bengal and Assam, and Western Bengal and Bihar and Orissa would constitute the Province of Bengal. The motive behind the plan was clear. The Muslims in
East Bengal were politically less advanced and were thus more loyal to the British than the Hindus; the Muslims would be in a majority there. In Bengal the Bengalees would form a minority by the inclusion of Bihar and Orissa. The Bengalees would also be divided from their kith and kin. The Bengali Hindus would thus form a minority in both provinces, and also a wedge would be driven between the Hindus and the Muslims of Bengal. Undoubtedly, it was a master-plan to destroy the nascent nationalism in Bengal.

On 11 January, 1905, a Conference of 300 delegates from different districts was held with Sir Henry Cotton, the President of the Congress session of 1904, in the chair. Sir Henry Cotton observed that if Partition was at all necessary on the ground of administrative convenience, a Presidency Governorship might be established in Bengal and if even after that any territorial dismemberment was required, then Bihar and Chota Nagpur might be separated and transformed into a Chief Commissionership to the satisfaction of the Behari population, and Sylhet and Cachar, the two predominantly Bengali-speaking districts, might be added to Bengal from Assam much to the satisfaction of the Bengalis.

In the Bengalee published on 7 July, 1905, Surendranath wrote: "But let not the Government lay the flattering, auction to its soul: that the country will acquiesce in these monstrous proceedings without a strenuous and persistent struggle in which no expense or sacrifice will be grudged and in which the people will not fail to take the utmost advantage of the constitutional resources at their
disposal. We are not guilty of the smallest exaggeration when we say that we are on the threshold of an agitation, which, for its intensity and its universality, will be unrivalled in the annals of this province."(6) On 13 July, 1905, the Sanjivani wrote that Lord Curzon had thrown a shaft at the heart of the Bengalis. So long as the Bengalee race would remain alive, they would suffer from this pang. Lord Curzon was attempting to convert Bengal into a second Ireland. The 'Charu Mihir' wrote on 18 July that by disregarding the unanimous approaches of the entire Bengali-speaking nation, Lord Curzon had in a manner proclaimed that the English had no right to remain in India but by the force of arms. A. J. O'Donnell observed: "The Partition of Bengal was from the outset condemned by all that was best, most noble and most educated amongst the Musalmans of Bengal. Even Musalmans of Bengal. Even Musalman peasantry were hostile to it." The English Press in India condemned this measure as injurious to British Administration and financially wasteful.

At the initial stage, however, the opposition had a universal character and the Hindus were fully supported by the Muslims. Lord Curzon soon won over Salimullah, the Nawab of Dacca. The Nawab gradually became a great supporter of the Partition; he soon gathered a section of Muslims round him. The new administration in its actual operation favoured the Muslims. Fuller, the first Lieutenant Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam, said with reference to the Muslims and Hindus that they were like his two queens, the
At first the English, too, opposed the Partition. But, when the Partition led to the Swadeshi, to the movement for the use of indigenous and boycott of British goods, the Englishmen became hostile to anti-partition movement.

The Partition soon took up the character of a challenge to the British authority and British people and ceased to be a mere protest. For the first time, the English-educated people gave up the policy of mendicancy; they were now determined to stand on their own legs in the true spirit of nationalism.

The Partition of Bengal, known in Bengal early in July, was formally announced by the Government on 20 July, 1905. The announcement caused a unique indignation all over India. Surendranath writes: "In my younger days, I had read Macaulay's graphic account of the condition of English society on the eve of Civil War between Charles I and his Parliament — now the coming struggle overshadowed all other considerations, how it penetrated the homes of England and became the subject of conversation round every fireplace, how it leavened thought and moulded aspirations. Something of the same absorbing interest was roused by Lord Curzon's Partition of Bengal. The whole community felt a concern about a matter affecting their province such as they had never
experienced before. The community was writhing under a sense of surprise and indignation .... " (γ)

Krishna Kumar Mitra in the Senjivani of 13th July suggested that people should boycott all British goods, observe mourning, and shun all contracts with officials and official bodies. In a public meeting held at Bagerhat in Khulna District this suggestion was accepted, and the resolutions that all British and foreign goods should be boycotted until Partition orders were withdrawn and that there should be no participation in any public amusement or rejoicing for six months. In the Amrita Bazar Patrika of 17 July in a letter believed to have been from the pen of Lal Mohan Ghose, a proposal was made to abandon and oppose the use of English goods, specially Manchester cloth. On the 21st of July a meeting was held at Dinajpur. The Maharaja of Dinajpur presided over the meeting and Lal Mohan Ghose addressed the meeting. Lal Mohan suggested withdrawal of support to the Government by resignation in a body of all Honorary Magistrates, of all members of District Boards, Municipal Commissioners and Panchayats. He suggested national mourning for 12 months during which period the people should refuse to participate in any public rejoicing. The examples of Bagerhat and Dinajpur were followed by Pabna; the people of the locality assembled in a meeting presided over by the zamindar of Tantibanda and adopted the resolution of Boycott of foreign goods in the name of Swadeshi. Protest-meetings were also held in Faridpur, Tangail, Magura, Bagura,
Mymensingh, Jessore, Manickgunge, Narayangunge, Dacca, Birbhum, Rampurhat, and even in Nowgong of distant Assam.

On July 26, a large meeting was held by the people of Barisal in the compound of the Braja Mohan College. On that occasion Aswini Kumar Datta was the main speaker. "Thus while Calcutta was talking, history was being made in the mofussil. In fact it was the forward march of the mofussil that helped the leaders in the metropolis to determine the future line of action."(3) The awakening of the people of the mofussil is a mark of the growth of the concept of nation. A city is the centre of education and therefore the concept of nation first arises there. The concept of nation spreads from the city to rural areas, from the educated people to the masses. The first important meeting of the students in Calcutta, pledging themselves to the ideology of boycott was held on July 17 in the Ripon College, and the next on July 26 or 29, 1905.

Another meeting held on 30 July, when about two hundred students of the Eden Hindu Hostel adopted the boycott resolution. There was a still bigger meeting on 31 July when the students of all the Calcutta Colleges assembled to protest against Partition. Steps were also taken at this meeting for organizing Students' Committees in the different Colleges, both private and Government, for the purpose in view. The leaders were holding almost daily conferences. A very great public meeting was held on 7 August, 1905, at the Town Hall in Calcutta. A huge procession of students, estimated at not less than 5,000 in number, marched from College Square to the Town Hall. The crowd was so great that it was impossible
to accommodate them all in the Hall. "Rajas and pleaders and Babus jostled each other and the gathering shaded off into the poorest class." (9) So, in addition to the main meeting, two overflow meetings had to be arranged outside.

Meetings and processions took place daily in towns and large villages. In Barisal, at one meeting, an effigy of Lord Curzon was burnt. Shouting of Bande Mataram was adopted as the war cry of the agitation. The general attitude of the Bengalees towards Europeans became insolent and aggressive. Suggestions were made in many papers to boycott the visit of the Prince of Wales.

The Proclamation of Partition was published on September 1, 1905. It was finally stated that the new arrangement would come into force from October 16, 1905.

A section of the English people, and even the Times as well as the Manchester Guardian made adverse comments and expressed sympathy with the feelings of the Bengalees and the anti-partition agitation.

English sympathy oftentimes encouraged our national feelings and widened and deepened our national agitation.

The Proclamation made the popular movement more intensified. All over the country a new spirit was manifested. This new spirit was marked by a high degree of patriotic
fervour; and religious devotion to motherland, symbolized by Bande Mataram. The students all over the country held meetings and organized processions. The Government took strong measures. The Town Hall meeting of August 7 was followed by a number of student meetings. The picketing system was started and students of colleges and schools paraded the markets dissuading customers from purchasing foreign goods. Even the land-holders actively encouraged the boycott through their 'naibs' and peons. The spirit of boycott moved the people, both high and low. In Mymensingh the cobblers refused in a body to mend English shoes. In Farisal the Oriya cooks and servants held a meeting declaring that they would not serve masters using foreign goods. The washermen of Kalighat resolved boycotting the washing of the foreign clothes. The washermen of Faridpur refused to wash European clothes and the cobblers refused to mend European shoes. A young girl of 6, even when she was seriously ill, refused to take foreign medicine. In marriage ceremonies where foreign clothes were used the priests refused to officiate. On the ground that the answer books supplied to them were made of foreign papers the students refused to appear in the examination. Even the orthodox 'pandits' lent their support to the movement by laying down that the use of foreign salt and sugar was not sanctioned by Hindu religion. So strong was the feeling among the Bengalees that the Englishmen called upon the government to strike at the root of the Boycott movement.
Surendranath observes: "It was the fervour of the students that communicated itself to the whole community and inspired it with an impulse, the like of which had never been felt before. It was a strange upheaval of public feeling. The Swadeshi movement invaded our homes and captured the hearts of our women-folk, who were even more enthusiastic than the men. ... The air was surcharged with the Swadeshi spirit, and it is no exaggeration to say that our young men were the creators of this stupendous moral change."(i) All classes of people in Bengal joined hands in the common cause. The Bengalee wrote: "Some of the leading noblemen who had hitherto hesitated to join the movement of protest found that they had no alternative but to swell the chorus." In spite of British machinations, the Muslim community threw out leaders from its bosom, and men like Abdul Rasul, Liakat Hossain, Abdul Halim Ghaznavi, Yusuf Khan Bahadur, Mohammad Ismail Chowdhuri became trusted and accredited exponents of the new spirit.

The Bengali-owned newspapers played an important part in propagating the ideas of boycott and Swadeshi. They fearlessly voiced popular feelings. At the time of the arrival of mail every village post-office was surrounded by crowds of anxious villagers. Most of them were illiterate, and they came from far and near to hear someone read the Bengali papers. Everybody looked to Calcutta for inspiration and guidance. Under the leadership of
Satis Chandra Mukherjee, the Dawn Society was functioning since 1902 as a training-ground of youths and a nursery of patriotism. The Society became in 1905 one of the most active centres for the propagation of Boycott-Swadeshi ideologies after August 7. Surendranath and Bipin Chandra inspired the students to move forward with the movement by their fiery flashes of oratory. Rabindranath also appeared on the scene as the poet of patriotism. From his pen, day after day, came out national poems and songs of inimitable words and sweetest melody. They charmed and enthralled his countrymen. Also, like the war-songs inspiring soldiers engaged in a grim battle, they fostered the spirit of revolution and kept up its fire. D. L. Roy and Rajani Kanta Sen also maintained the national spirit by patriotic poems and songs.

The agitation spread outside Bengal. In September 1905, a monster meeting was held at French Chandernagore with its Mayor M. Leon Tardival in the chair. The meeting passed resolutions for the vigorous conduct of the boycotting of British goods. A protest meeting against the Bengal partition was held even in distant Mandalay. News of meetings expressing sympathies with the Bengalees also came from Agra and Rawalpindi.

As already mentioned, the partition of Bengal was to take effect from October 16, 1905. It was generally felt that the unity of Bengal should be emphasized by some special
ceremony. Rabindranath Tagore issued to the public a Bengali letter proposing an observance of 'Rakhi Bandhan' on the day. He wrote that the sacred 'Rakhi' thread should be interchanged amongst people. The 'Rakhi' ceremony would indicate that no monarch's sword, however powerful, could cut as-under the bond of union amongst people forming one and the same race. On September 22, a public meeting was held at the Town Hall, Calcutta; the representatives of Bengal resolved to organize a Federation of the old and severed Provinces with a view to maintaining the unity and the solidarity of the Bengali race and to tighten the bonds between the Bengals after the partition takes place.

On October, the Calcutta, all the business was suspended and vehicular Traffic stopped. All the shops were closed for the whole day. From before sunrise, young men paraded the streets singing Bande Mataram song. There were processions, 'sankirtans' and patriotic songs all over the city. A meeting attended by more than 50,000 people was held at Circular Road in the afternoon in order to lay the foundation of the Federation Hall. The following proclamation was read at the meeting after the foundation stone was laid:

"Whereas the Government has thought fit to effectuate the partition of Bengal in spite of the universal protest of the Bengali Nation, we hereby pledge and proclaim that we, as a people, shall do everything in our power to counteract the evil effects of the dismemberment of our
province and to maintain the integrity of our race. So God help us." (fi)

The agitation henceforth merged into boycott (refusal to buy foreign goods) and Swadeshi movement (the promotion of indigenous industry). The Partition of Bengal created a feeling of grave discontent and deeply injured the sense of pride. There was also a galaxy of leaders, both in Calcutta and mofussil, who gave the right direction to the national upsurge, and soon this upsurge outstripped the narrow outlook which gave birth to it. Instead of merely re-uniting the divided portions of Bengal, men looked far into the horizon and regarded as their objective nothing less than the expulsion of the British who inflicted such a deep wound on their hearts.

In December, 1905, the first Indian Industrial Conference was held at Benares with R.C. Dutt as the President. In the conference Mr. Dutt made a masterly analysis of the current economic situation in India. Mr. Dutt also wrote books on the economic history of India. The revelations made by him went a great way in facilitating the success of the Swadeshi movement by preparing men's minds. Referring to his books, Aurobindo Ghose justly remarked: "Without the Economic History and its damming story of England's commercial and fiscal dealings with India we doubt whether the public mind would have been ready for the boycott. In this one instance it may be said of him that he not only wrote history but created it."(i)

With the increase of repression by the Government
increased the popular determination. The Government also set the loyal Muslims against the Hindus. It was actually an undeclared war between the Government and the people. Each side fought with the weapons it possessed: the government made full use of its organized civil and military forces, while the unarmed people fought with Passive Resistance. Psychical force was pitted up against the physical force, and soon the idea of war between the Government and the people in Bengal caught the imagination of the rest of India. People who were not likely to be much disturbed by the grievances of the Bengalees over the partition of their province were, however, inspired by the spectacle of a Province waging, single-handed, a bitter fight against the mighty Government. The newly awakened sense of nationalism and patriotism was spurred to activity and people made a common cause and a common endeavour to free their motherland. The sound of war-drums was there, and the people shook off lethargy and rushed to the battlefield.

Towards the end of 1907, Mr. Stinton, a senior Government official observed that during the last two years, disaffection had been steadily spreading throughout the whole middle class of educated and semi-educated Hindus. The outbursts which had marked the earlier period, immediately after the Partition, were stopped by prompt punishment and drastic preventive measures. But these had been successful only in keeping a show of calm. Under the surface, however,
the feelings of resentment and execration were far more
general in 1907 than in 1905. The agitation had changed in
Character and scope. At first it had been directed entirely
against the Partition. Gradually the scope had extended.
Condemnation of a particular measure grew into hatred of all
Government measures. The movement revealed its innately
seditious character.

By 1909 the boycott and Swadeshi movement merged
itself into the great national movement launching the struggle
for freedom. The question was no longer the boycott of British
goods but of British rule.

From the very beginning the students proved to be the
chief props and pillars of the Swadeshi and Boycott
movement. To take step against the students, on 10 October,
1905, the Carlyle Circular was issued threatening the students
and the heads of the educational institutions. The Carlyle
Circular created a great sensation all over the country and
was received with a chorus of condemnation. The public of
Bengal took up the challenge without any delay. Under the
chairmanship of Abdul Rassal, a public meeting was held on
October 24, 1905, in which E.C. Pal suggested the inauguration
of an independent system of National Education. This was the
genesis of the movement which led to the establishment of the
National Council of Education on June 1, 1906.

The Rangpur National School had already been set up
on November 8, 1905, exclusively under national control. In
those days, it became a symbol of successful Swadeshi.

The Government repression, though it was severe, had failed to destroy the students spirit of resistance, and had led them to look forward to a new scheme of education based on national ideals.

The Swadeshi movement in Bengal soon affected the other parts of India. The Boycott-Swadeshi Movement assumed an all-India character even towards the end of 1905. The progress of the movement was reported from 23 districts in the United Provinces, 15 towns in the Central Provinces, 24 towns in the Bombay Presidency, 20 districts in the Punjab and 13 districts in the Madras Presidency. In the Bombay Presidency the movement found its leaders in B.G.Tilak and S.M.Paranjhe as well as in Mrs. Ketkar (Tilak’s daughter) and Mrs. A.V.Joshi. In the Punjab there was three prominent leaders, viz., Gopal Ram Ganga Ram, Pandit Chandrika Dette of the Arya Samaj and Munshi Ram (later known as Swami Shraddhananda), a pleader of Jullunder and an Arya-Samajist. In the Madras Presidency Subrahmania Aiyar, P.Ananda Charlu and T.M. Neir were among the most enthusiastic advocates of the movement.

All-India nationalist leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Lala Lajpat Rai propagated the idea of national education which had already caught the imagination of the whole of India. National education during the period from 1906 to 1909 made
good progress outside Bengal, particularly in Berar and in the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras.

The Government of India was unnerved by the four-fold ramifications of Swadeshi movement—industrial, educational, cultural and political. Bamfylde Fuller, the Lieutenant-Governor of the newly created Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam completely alienated the Hindus by his ill-conceived favouritism to the Muslims. The Government was irritated by the boycott and Swadeshi and took stern repressive measures to put them down. These measures, however, more and more inflamed the people and strengthened their determination to carry on the movement in the teeth of the Government opposition.

Barisal took a very prominent part in Swadeshi movement. Under the leadership of Aswini Kumar Datta, who was revered by the local people, the District of Barisal proved to be the strongest centre of Swadeshi and Boycott movements. The Government carried on inhuman repression there. Even the uttering of Bande Mataram would make the Government mad. Barisal Conference will ever be regarded as a memorable episode in the history of the Swadeshi movement. Surendranath has rightly commented: "Bad rulers serve a useful purpose in the evolution of nations. They stir up the sleeping lion from his torpor; they stimulate public spirit and foster national unity." (14) Doubtless, the worse is the repression, the deeper is the national unity, and with its spread, this unity becomes wider.
The press severely criticised the Government. The Government first came down upon the Bande Mataram, a daily in Calcutta edited by Aurobindo Ghose. It was the chief organ of the new nationalism and the Extremist party. In the absence of evidence, Aurobindo was acquitted; but B.C. Pal refusing to give evidence was sentenced to six months' simple imprisonment.

Brahmabandhab Upadyaya, the editor of the Sandhya, was prosecuted on a charge of sedition. A written statement by him submitted to the Court contained: "I do not want to take part in the trial, because I do not believe that, in carrying out my humble share of the God-appointed mission of Swaraj, I am in any way accountable to the alien people, who happen to rule over us and whose interest is, and must necessarily be, in the way of our true national development." (\5)

The Sandhya appealed to the masses in homely language, and was never tired of repeating the view taken by the extremist nationalists. It went on proclaiming that the people wanted complete independence. It proclaimed that Swadeshi, boycott, all were meaningless, if they were not the means of retrieving complete independence.

The editor of Jugantar was also prosecuted several times.

Swadeshi Yatra (a sort of popular dramatic performance) was another production of the Swadeshi movement. To spread nationalism among the masses, its contribution can hardly be ignored.
The Muslims at the initial stage took part in the Swadeshi movement. There were, however, Muslims who were till the end supporters, initial stage took part in the Swadeshi movement. And there were Muslims who were till the end supporters, may promoters of the Swadeshi movement. Even in mofussil areas, particularly Barisal, the Muslim masses joined the Swadeshi movement. They joined Bande Mataram processions and attended public meetings addressed by Hindu leaders. The mingled shouts of Alla-ho-Akbar and Bande Mataram by both Hindus and Musalmans formed a characteristic feature of these meetings and processions.

Insidious movements were, however, set on foot under the influence of the British Government to wean away the Muslims. The Muslims soon arranged counter demonstration in support of Partition, and there were several communal riots.

However, nothing could check the strong flow of the Swadeshi movement which gradually assumed wider dimensions. Valentine Chirol remarks: "The question of partition itself receded into the background, and the issue, until then successfully veiled and now openly raised, was not whether Bengal should be one unpartitioned province or two partitioned provinces under British rule, but whether British rule itself was to endure in Bengal or, for the matter of that, anywhere in India."(16)

Gokhale wrote: "The tremendous upheaval of popular
feeling which has taken place in Bengal in consequence of the Partition, will constitute a landmark in the history of our national progress. For the first time since British rule began, all sections of the Indian community, without distinction of caste or creed, have been moved by a common impulse and without the stimulus of external pressure, to act together in offering resistance to a common wrong. A wave of true national consciousness has swept over the Province and, at its touch, old barriers have, for the time at any rate, been thrown down, personal jealousies have vanished, other controversies have been hushed: Bengal’s heroic stand against oppression of a harsh and uncontrolled bureaucracy has astonished and gratified all India, and her sufferings have not been endured in vain, when they have helped to draw closer all parts of the country in sympathy and in aspirations.

A great rush and uprising of the waters such as has been recently witnessed in Bengal cannot take place without a little inundation over the banks here and there. These little excesses are inevitable when large masses of men move spontaneously—especially when the movement is from darkness into light, from bondage towards freedom—and they must not be allowed to disconcert us too much. The most astounding fact of the situation is that the public life of this country has received an accession of strength of great importance, and for this all India owes a deep debt of gratitude to Bengal.”(1)

J. Ramsay Macdonald wrote in the Daily Chronicle:

"But Bengal is perhaps doing better than political agitation.
It is idealising India. It is translating nationalism into religion, into music and poetry, into painting and literature."

In the Bande Mataram Aurobindo wrote: "Love has a place in politics, but it is the love of one's country, for one's countrymen, for the glory, greatness, and happiness of the race, the divine 'ananda' of self-immolation for one's fellows, the ecstasy of relieving their sufferings, the joy of seeing one's blood flow for country and freedom, the bliss of union in death with the fathers of the race. The feeling of almost physical delight in the touch of the mother-soil, of the winds that blow from Indian seas, of the rivers that stream from Indian hills, in the hearing of Indian speech, music, poetry, in the familiar sights, sounds, habits, dress, manners, of our Indian life, - this is the physical root of that love. The pride in our past, the pain of our present, the passion for the future are its trunk and branches. Self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness, great service, high endurance for the country are its fruit. And the sap which keeps it alive is the realization of the Motherhood of God in the country, the vision of the Mother, the knowledge of the Mother, the perpetual contemplation, adoration and service of the Mother."(19)

The Partition was abrogated in 1911. But the march of the Swadeshi did not stop. The revolutionary activities started by Berindra and others secretly spread and obtained wider sphere. In the open sphere, the Home Rule movement conducted by Tilak and Annie Besant created a great national impetus all over India.
Tilak's devotion to the country won for him the epithet 'Lokamanya' (revered by people). Lokamanya Tilak's career was followed by the emergence of Mahatma Gandhi. Tilak died on 1 August, 1920. He was absent from India from 19 September, 1918, to 27 November, 1919, and this period witnessed the emergence of Gandhi as a great leader. Tilak, however, fully maintained his power and popularity as the greatest political leader till his death in 1920. But the year 1919, in which momentous events took place in India during Tilak's absence, really forms the period of transition between the leadership of Tilak and that of Gandhi.

Another product of the Swadeshi movement was the split in the Congress, the conflict between the Moderates and the Extremists. Progress sometimes requires antithesis. The conflict virtually gave an impetus to national urge. What happened at the Surat Session of the Congress (1907) was virtually a revelation of the impatience for a drastic step towards Swaraj. People grew impatient of bondage. That is why the Extremists reigned supreme during the period between the partition of Bengal and the advent of Mahatma Gandhi. The Moderates were reluctant to take any drastic step, for they believed, as revealed in Gokhale's speech, the country was not prepared enough for it. They had still reliance on progress through constitutional way. But the Extremists were averse to the policy of petition and persuasion which the Moderates had hitherto pursued. The Extremists scornfully described the method
of petition as mendicancy. The Government found an opportunity, and took the policy of rallying the Moderates.

The ideal of the Congress was the Colonial form of self-government, but the extremists' ideal was that of absolute autonomy. Also, the Moderates could not reconcile themselves with the boycott of foreign goods and the policy of national education. Gokhale said: "Some of the leaders of the new thought have gone so far as to talk of independence as an object of practical pursuit. .... we then owe it to the best interests of the country to resist the propaganda with all our energy and all our resources. .... it means the sure destruction or, at any rate, the indefinite postponment of all these opportunities for slow but peaceful progress which are at present within our reach. .... there is no alternative to British rule, not only now but for a long time to come, and that any attempts made to disturb it, directly or indirectly, are bound to recoil on our own heads. But the attainment of a democratic form of self-Government .... must depend upon the average strength in the character and capacity of our people taken as a whole - and our average today is far below the English average. The most important work before us therefore now is to endeavour to raise this average ...." (20) The Extremist Party, however, concentrated its whole attention upon the attainment of self-government. Aurobindo said:
"Political freedom is the life-breath of a nation; to attempt social reform, educational reform, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom, is the very height of ignorance and futility." Gokhale, however, accepted the view of the Extremists that love of the country should be the ruling principle of our lives, we should rejoice in making sacrifices for her sake, and that we should rejoice in making sacrifices for her sake, and that we should rely, whenever we could, on our own exertion.

In the Congress session held at Benares in 1905 the Moderates proposed to send a message of welcome to Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales during their forthcoming visit to India. But the delegates from Bengal opposed it; they said that Bengal was in tears, and thus would not he able to receive the Prince with a smiling face.

In the Amrita Bazar Patrika (Puja Annual 1965) under the Caption 'Twilight Year of Indian Nationalism' K.P. Biswas writes:

"Which is the twilight year of Indian nationalism, when no longer content to remain within the shell of constitutionalism, it tended towards aggressiveness and militancy? The generally accepted view is that the transformation took place in 1905-6 when the boycott movement and demonstrations in protest against Bengal Partition were participated in
by masses of angry people who thereby radically changed the old pattern of conducting political agitation by passing resolutions in Bar libraries and occasionally holding protest meetings in city and district town halls.

"But was 1905-6 something unexpected and sudden or had it been preceded by a march of events which moulded the popular mood to hail its advent or the emergence of the new? A study of different forces then let loose indicate that changes were already in the offing and the peculiar shock treatment often meted out for generating aggressive mood, was accelerating its speedy progress. The 1905-6 outburst and later the 1908-9 drama which was the culminating point of that outburst were but a natural outcome of that period of incubation.

"The early beginning of this phase should be traced in the year 1902-3, when constitutional agitation was no longer found as popular as it ever had been in the past. And something new to replace it was the mass mind although its shape to come was not defined.

"That year of 1902-3 is crowded with such events as the arrival in Calcutta of Kakuji Okakura, the Japanese idealist and exponent of the theme, 'Asia is one', to invite Swami Vivekananda to pay a visit to Japan; his meeting with Sister Nivedita who later introduced the great Japanese to Rabindra Nath Tagore and Jagadish Chandra Bose; Okakura's travel with the Swami to Bodh Gaya; the inauguration of the
Shivaji Celebration for the first time in Calcutta; Swami Vivekananda's death and the publication of his letters; growing bitter criticism of assaults, insults and humiliations of 'native' Indians by the ruling Europeans; arrest of Bal Gangadhar Tilak and his removal to jail just as an ordinary criminal; Delhi Durber preparations by Curzon and opposition to it offered by Indian critics from the press and the platform; Bodh Gaya issue and the British suspicion of Japanese-Bengali collaboration in it; the suspected Russian designs on the borders of India and the Younghusband expedition to Tibet; Russo-Japanese war and lastly Curzon's finalisation efforts to partition Bengal.

The first Shivaji celebration was inaugurated in Calcutta in June 1902. Later, Bengal discovered a national hero in Pratapaditya.

Muslim politics during this period should be dealt with at some length. Muslim attitude towards Partition has already been discussed. The 'Partition of Bengal' was at first opposed by the Muslims along with the Hindus. But a change in the Muslim feeling was brought about by Lord Curzon's visit to East Bengal. The Muslims found the Province, the Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, with a majority of Muslim populations, a source of strength and a centre of their political activity. The Aligarh Movement had emphasized the position of the Muslims as a distinct political unit, a separate nation, in the body-politic of India. But this unit had no home except the Punjab.
The addition of the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam was naturally very welcome to the Muslims. It reacted favourably upon their sentiments throughout India and quickened their political consciousness. Even those Muslim politicians who were not averse to the Congress were strongly in support of the Partition. On 30 December, 1906, in a meeting held at Dacca of the Muslim leaders of India a resolution was passed upholding the 'Partition of Bengal' as beneficial to the community and deprecating both agitation against it and the boycott movement.

In 1906 when it was announced that Lord Minto was about to appoint a committee to consider the question of extending the representative element in the Legislative council, the Muslims decided to negotiate in advance with the government in order to safeguard their rights and interests in the new legislation. On October 1, 1906, a deputation consisting of 36 members, with Aga Khan as the leader was received by Lord Minto. The deputation presented an address.

The address outlined an elaborate scheme for Muslim representation, beginning with the Municipal and District Boards and going up to the Imperial Legislative Council. Among other things the address demanded employment of a due proportion of Mohammedans in Government service, abolition of competitive examinations, appointment of Muslim judges in High Courts and Chief Courts, communal electorate for municipalities and Muslim electoral colleges for election to Legislative Councils.

In reply Minto said that he could only say to them that
the Mohammedan community might rest assured that their political rights and interests as a community would be safeguarded by any administrative re-organization with which he was concerned.

Undoubtedly, this reply heralded a new policy of British rule in India. It gave an official approval to the principle that the Hindus and Muslims constituted practically two separate nations with different interests and outlook.

Immediately after the conclusion of the session of Muhammadan Education Conference, at a meeting held on December 30, 1906, at Dacca it was resolved that a political association called All-India Muslim League should be established. A committee was also appointed to frame a draft constitution of the League. The Committee framed the rules and regulations which were accepted at a meeting held at Karachi on December 29, 1907.

The Act of 1909 embodied in substance the concessions promised by Minto to the Muslims. Not only did the Muslims receive a separate electorate but in the Council their number of members was much greater than would be warranted by the numerical strength of their population.

Thus the rift between the Hindus and the Muslims widened. Gokhale said: "It was a commonplace of Indian politics that there can be no future for India as a nation unless a spirit of co-operation of a sufficiently durable
character was developed and established between the two great communities. "Such union (the union of all communities) is no doubt the goal towards which we have to strive, but it cannot be denied that it does not exist in the country to-day, and it is no use proceeding as though it existed when in reality it does not." (21) Gokhale frankly admitted that "over the greater part of India, the two communities had inherited a tradition of antagonism, which, though it might ordinarily be dormant, broke forth into activity at the smallest provocation. It was this tradition that had to be overcome." (21)

The Hindus became eager for Muslim co-operation. But the Muslims apprehended that the Hindus' need of Muslim co-operation was only to strengthen the Hindus' struggle for freedom. To the Muslims then freedom was not an urgent necessity, for by freedom they meant Hindu suzerainty. So they entertained the spirit of exploiting this eagerness of the Hindus for Muslim support and became more truculent in their attitude.

The Muslim League showed new life and strength after the split of the Congress at Surat (1907). It demanded of the Hindus a frank recognition of the fact that communal and religious differences must be the basis of all political reforms in India.

The Hindus could, however, make an experiment by granting their demand whole-heartedly and not in a way of political policy and see if the truculence of the Muslims
could be pacified in the long run. It was the duty of our leaders to expunge at all costs the fear and suspicion of the Muslims. Gandhi once said: "As a man of truth I honestly believe that Hindus should yield up to the Mahammedans what the latter desire, and that they should rejoice in so doing. We can expect unity only if such mutual large-heartedness is displayed."(23) After freedom and with the going away of the English would have disappeared all the mischievous policies of of the English. After freedom all would have been free citizens, and the Muslims having been convinced of the good will of the Hindus would certainly have formed a healthy Indian Government with their Hindu brethren. The growth of the concept of nation would then have been perfect. Hindus' apprehension of the increase of Muslim power and derogation of their own position was really baseless, for the number of the Hindus was much larger than that of the Muslims. The Muslims had already lost their sword with the arrival of the English and with the departure of the English they would have lost their improper support, and so the Muslims would no more appear as a problem in India. The Muslim opposition during the British rule really arose out of the apprehension of the treatment from the Hindus.

The Partition of India in 1947 should have been kept off by all means. The present form of our Government is a federal form of government — a federation on a territorial basis.
In free undivided India Hindu-Muslim problems would have been no problems at all. If then acceptance of political reforms on the basis proposed by the League would have evolved into a federation on communal basis, the situation would have been probably far better than what happened as a result of Partition in 1947. It was really too late when the same offer was made to Jinnah by the Cabinet Mission (1946), for Jinnah had lost all confidence in the Hindus. The Cabinet Mission offered Jinnah the two following alternatives to choose from:

1) Pakistan as a sovereign state with the exclusion of those Districts where the non-Muslims formed a majority;

2) Pakistan, comprising the areas demanded by Jinnah, but only as a separate federation forming a part of Indian Union.

But Jinnah decided against the idea of Indian Union. He declared that the domination of the Muslims by the Hindus could not be prevented in any scheme in which they were kept together.

Referring to the unity of the Hindus and the Muslims, Muhammad Ali frankly pointed out that the Muslims could not be expected to become a martyr to the unity of India. He remarked "that it is a retrograde step in our political evolution to live at the mercy of an angelic majority."
It is not that the Muslims could always accept the British policies. In U.P. it was the practice that all petitions to the court must be written in Urdu. The Hindus protested against it, and the Government passed an order in 1900 to the effect that the Government offices and law courts should also entertain petitions written in Hindi and Devanagari script, and that in future court summons and official announcement would be issued in both Urdu and Hindi. The Muslims resented the order on the ground that it lowered the status of Urdu; they held protest meetings in different parts of the Province. The Hindus also held meetings supporting the Government order.

The annulment of the Partition of Bengal in 1911 also gave a rude shock to the Muslim faith in the British Government.

The Muslims were further alienated from the British because of the latter's hostility to Islam as evidenced by British occupation of Egypt, Anglo-French agreement with regard to Morocco, Anglo-Russian agreement with regard to Persia, and the invasion of Tripoli by Italy. The active part taken by the British in all these incidents as well as their connivance at, if not actual support and sympathy to, the seizure of the Turkish province of Tripoli by Italy in 1911 and the loss of European provinces of Turkey in 1912, was interpreted as a definite move for the extinction of the power of Islam, both temporal and indirectly, also spiritual.

But why did not the Congress protest against these
imperialist wars as it does now frequently in the name of anti-colonialism? We may say that India's speaking against colonialism owes its origin to Nehru who had an international outlook. If the Congress then protested against all these imperialist wars, it could pave the way for unity and the two-nation theory would have found no chance of being developed.

Pan-Islamic sentiments among the Indian Muslims were predominant. But, alienated at home (India), the Muslims had to seek support and fraternity among their co-religionists. True, the Muslims came from outside; but after they conquered and settled in India they cut off connections with the outside world except pilgrimage to Mecca. When the Muslims lost their empire and came down to the level of the subjects of the English with the Hindus the future events would have been otherwise if perchance a sense had caught the Hindu mind of uniting with the Muslims freely and heartily. The Hindus could grow their culture in other ways than starting Hindu Mela, Hindu Patriot and boasting that they themselves could form a distinct nation. Hindu Mela, Hindu Patriot and Hindu literature decrying the Muslims undoubtedly filled the minds of the Muslims with doubt, fear and a sense of alienation.

Reactions of the Indians to the World War I (1914-18). India was dragged into the War without the consent of her people. But there was no open display of discontent on their part, as was the case twenty-five years later when the Government of India joined the Second World War. The ruling chiefs were,
however, eager to assist and co-operate with the Allies. The Nationalists of the Extremists and the general people did not feel any genuine sympathy for the British. Even the Congress made no secret of the fact that it demanded political reforms as a price of Indian loyalty. The general feeling of the Indians may be summed in the dictum: "England's necessity is India's opportunity." The only notable exception was Gandhi, who was loyal to the British to the core of his heart. He was genuine in his efforts to help them during the War, without any condition.

The high ideals expressed by the English and American leaders in defence of their attitude towards Germany also strengthened the general feeling of India. Woodrow Wilson declared: "We fight for the liberty, the self-government and the und dictated development of all peoples. No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live." Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister of Britain, referred to the German occupation of Britain, the "intolerable degradation of a foreign yoke," as inconceivable. His words rang in the ears of the Indians. Lloyd George declared that in the re-settlement of the German colonies the wishes of the inhabitants must be the supreme consideration. The leading English and American statesmen repeatedly declared that they were waging war "to make the world safe for democracy," and promised the right of self-determination to every nation. These solemn declarations did not fall flat on the Indian political leaders. They certainly regarded them as something
which they could exploit for serving their own ends. The demand for Home Rule was nothing more than a product of the pledges so solemnly given.

Tilak was released in 1914. His release marks a turning point. Annie Besant and others made an attempt to bring about a unity of the Moderates and the Extremists. The Extremists were admitted to the Congress after nine years in 1916. This was followed by an alliance between the Congress and the Muslim League. This Hindu-Muslim unity was achieved by accepting communal representation. The Government of India was a little perturbed, for the Hindu-Muslim Pact seemed to deprive them of the one trump card they held in their hands to stem the tide of Indian nationalism.

After their discomfiture at Surat in 1907, the Nationalists or the Extremists failed to build up any effective-organization of their own. This was mainly due to the absence of leaders. Tilak was imprisoned (1908-14) and Aurobindo retired from politics (1910). Coercive measures adopted by the Government also debarred the Nationalists from having an organization. But the force of nationalism unleashed by the Swadeshi Movement was so great that in spite of the absence of an organization its ideals rapidly spread all over India and undermined people's faith in the Moderates. India's reaction to the War and the release of Tilak brought the Nationalists into the forefronts of Indian politics and the power was transferred from the Moderates to the Extremists. The Congress had already come to be looked upon as a backwater in politics. The Nationalists therefore turned towards setting up a new
organization for achieving freedom. Mrs. Annie Besant and B.G. Tilak, two great personalities, independently conceived the idea of starting Home Rule Movement on the Irish model. There was an understanding between Besant and Tilak that Besant's field of work would cover the whole of India except the Provinces of Bombay and C.P. where Tilak's League would carry on work. Although there were two Home Rule Leagues, Besant and Tilak acted in close co-operation. The Home Rule Movement also received great impetus from the disgraceful treatment the Indians received in South African and Crown Colonies which created great excitement in India.

Tilak observed that the days for making miscellaneous demands were over. Home Rule covered all their demands.

In 1914 Besant went to England and tried to form an Indian party in the Parliament. She failed in the attempt, but by her public addresses she roused sympathy for the cause of India. She declared that "the price of India's loyalty is India's freedom." In England she conducted propaganda in favour of granting self-government to India. She set up a Home Rule League there and addressed a crowded meeting in the Queen's Hall, London.

Tilak made extensive tours about the middle of 1916 and instructed masses on Home Rule. Tilak explained Home Rule as a form of Government within the British Empire in which the rule of the bureaucracy will be replaced by an administration responsible to the people.
Tilak's homely speeches made him popular among the masses. He was almost worshipped as God. He received a royal reception wherever he went. He asked the people "to imbibe the virtues of patriotism, fearlessness and sacrifice, and held out the national hero Shivaji as their model.

Like wildfire the Home Rule Movement spread and like the Swadeshi movement in Bengal it had the religious colouring. Participation of women was, however, its main characteristic. In her Presidential Address in the Calcutta Congress in 1917 Awakening Mrs. Besant said: "The strength of the Home Rule Movement is rendered tenfold greater by the adhesion to it of large numbers of women, who bring to its helping the uncalculating heroism, the endurance, the self-sacrifice of the feminine nature. Our League's best recruits and recruiters are among the women of India, and the women of Madras boast that they marched in procession when the men were stopped, and that their prayers in the temples set the interned captives free." (24.)

The awakening of women to bringing about political change is an additional incentive to Indian nationalism. The students became conscious, the masses became attentive, and now we find the introduction of women. The credit of bringing Indian women into politics goes to Mrs. Besant. Another figure whose existence in Indian politics inspired women subsequently was Mrs. Sarojini Naidu.

The Government's hostility against the Home Rule Leagues
and desire to declare them illegal associations stirred the whole country.

Mrs. Besant was interned. A storm of indignation swept India. Protest meetings were held all over the country. Even the quietude of the Congress was disturbed. All asked for the release of Mrs. Besant and her associates. R.C. Majumdar writes: "As a matter of fact Mrs. Besant and her associates in prison served the cause of Home Rule far better than if they had been free." (15)

The Viceroy wrote to the Secretary of State that "Mrs. Besant, Tilak and others are fomenting with great vigour the agitation for immediate Home Rule, and in the absence of any definite announcement by Government of India as to their policy in the matter, it is attracting many of those who hitherto have held less advanced views. The agitation is having a mischievous effect on public feeling throughout the country." (16)

Tilak knew that it was the Home Rule agitation that had forced the Government to meet the Indian demands half-way. He also knew that it was necessary to keep this agitation alive in order to obtain substantial concessions from the Government. Even prominent Muslim leaders like Jinnah and the family of Muhammad Ali joined it. Tilak's activities were described in an official
It was a great triumph for the Home Rule Movement that the Congress session was held in Calcutta in 1917 with Mrs. Besant as the President. In her Presidential Address Mrs. Besant made a vigorous plea for immediate introduction in the British Parliament of a Bill for the establishment of self-govern ment in India preferable in 1923 and not later than 1928.

In 1918 Tilak wrote to M. Clemencean, President of the Peace Conference, requesting him to solve the Indian problems so that India might "be a leading power in Asia" and "a powerful steward of the League of Nations in the East for maintaining the peace of the world."

Mrs. Besant sent a message to the British labourers in England. She addressed them as "Fellow Democrats". She wrote: "We are demanding Home Rule as our birthright." With the following words she concluded: "Help us to become a free Commonwealth under the British Crown and we will bring our man-power to secure the World-peace. Our people have died in your war for freedom. Will you consent that the children of our dead shall remain a subject race?"

Thus we see that both Tilak and Besant interpreted
Home Rule also in terms of world-peace. It is India's characteristic to take integral view of things. India thought of internationalism even when in dire bondage. True nationalism is associated with humanitarianism, and humanitarianism with internationalism. Pandit Nehru frequently spoke in terms of internationalism even when India's freedom was the first necessity. Tagore in his 'Nationalism' vehemently denounced European 'Nationalism', for it associated itself with parochialism and self-interest. My own freedom is a necessity. Self-development is a necessity. Other nations should also have self-development in complete freedom, and it is a necessity of no less importance. At the time of 'Tarpan' the Hindus pray for salvation not only of the souls of their own departed relations, but also of all the departed souls of the World.

Tilak stressed the need of Hindu-Muslim unity, and regarded it as our immediate duty. He said: "There is a feeling in certain quarters that excessive concessions were made to our Mussalman brothers, but that was necessary to enlist their hearty support to the demand of self-government, whether that was right or wrong from the point of view of strict justice. We cannot progress without their help and co-operation .... If there is a tripartite struggle, two parties must join together to eliminate the third. In the tug of war with the British, the Muslims must throw their weight on our side. To demand fearlessly that we shall rule
ourselves in our home is our immediate duty, of one and all of us." (28) To secure the price for immediate freedom, Tilak was prepared to mortgage the future of the nation; after freedom was attained, a just and equitable settlement between the two communities would be secured.

It has been mentioned above that the Swadeshi movement gave rise to militant nationalism. The revolutionaries had to work secretly, and for that reason they were not in a position to preach and spread nationalism openly. But their own national feeling and patriotism was doubtless the deepest. They risked life and often courted death. People knew about them and their activities only when they killed an oppressive British Official, or failed in their attempts to kill any, and was brought for trial before the British court of justice. The Government purposely suppressed news about the revolutionaries, and this being the fact, they have hardly been heard of beyond the boundaries of their provinces. People loved them in the deepest of their hearts, and their death on the scaffold inspired the youths. Until there is the readiness to offer life for the sake of the country, nationalism in a subject country does not appear to have attained its true formation. The death of a young revolutionary on the scaffold made people weep in silence and curse the British; people longed for the destruction of the British and the freedom of India. These revolutionaries preached patriotism and nationalism secretly to attach members to their parties. Any way, exposed activities of these martyrs always held aloft the
honour in martyrdom and propagated new revolutionary parties. Revolutionaries created an undercurrent of strong nationalism. Songs were composed on many of these martyrs, and these songs were appealing and inspiring enough to rouse nationalism even among men of the humblest position. I remember a man in Ochre (may be, he was a revolutionary garbed as a bard) used to come to our school during our recess and sang before us, school boys, songs on the death of C.R.Das, and on the hanging of Khudiram which had taken place about 25 years back. The songs were inspiring melodiously. I can still recollect a part of the song on Khudiram:

\[ Akbar bidaya de \text{ma ghure asi.} \\
\text{Asi Bole Porbo Fansi} \\
\text{Akbar Bidaya De Ma Ghure Asi.} \\
\text{Das mas das diner pare} \\
\text{Janma niba maskir ghare} \\
\text{Chinte jadi na paris ma} \\
\text{Dekhbi galaya fansi} \]

The song is put in the month of Khudiram. Khudiram is bidding good-bye to his Motherland on the eve of ascending the scaffold: 'Mother, I take leave of Thee once. I say I shall come back, but Mother, really I won't, for I have to put on the rope of the gallows. After ten months and ten days I shall be born as the son of my mother's sister (Khudiram was brought up by his mother's sister), and if you fail to recognize me, if you are keen you will find a mark of rope round my neck.' The song is also tinged with the Hindu idea of immortality of
I remember how deeply we, the tender boys of the school, were moved. The tall tamarisk in the school compound rustled in the wind; the summer midday was hot, the man was gone, the bell was gone, yet we remained standing in a pensive mood talking to none.

The whole of Bengal wept at Khudiram's execution. Indian nationalism had one more twist and was strengthened.

Barindra (brother of Aurobindo Ghose) and his friends manufactured bombs with a view to killing the Government officials. Bankim's Anandamath and Bande Mataram formed the basis of their spirit. The first bomb was prepared with the object of killing Bamfylde Fuller, the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal, who was very oppressive. Surendranath Banerjee, the leader of the Moderates, instigated this; he even promised to raise seven to eight thousand rupees for this purpose. Prafulla Chaki, a young man of seventeen, was deputed to kill Fuller, but he did not succeed. Next, an attempt was made on his life by blowing up a train on December 6, 1907. Their next attempt was to murder Kingsford. As Chief Presidency Magistrate, Kingsford had ordered some young men to be severely flogged in the open court for minor offence. The people of Bengal felt the flogging on their own back: the whole of Bengal felt flogged in an open court. Kingsford was then transferred to Muzaffarpur (Bihar) as a judge. Prafulla Chaki and Khudiram were sent to Muzaffarpur to kill him. But they mistook the carriage of
Mr. Kennedy for that of Kingsford and killed Kennedy's wife
and daughter. When Prafulla was going to be arrested he shot
himself dead. Khudiram was arrested, tried and hanged. The
bomb incident took place on April 30, 1908. Two days later
the Muraripukur garden was searched by the police. Bombs,
dynamite and cartridges were seized. Aurobindo Ghose, Barinda
and his principal associates were arrested and charged with
conspiracy. The Public Prosecutor and the Deputy Superintendent
of Police who conducted the Alipur Conspiracy case were both
shot dead soon. Barindra and his chief associates were transport­
ed for life. Aurobindo was acquitted.

When Barindra and others were arrested and in the
Alipur Conspiracy case came out their activities, particularly
manufacture of bombs, it created a great sensation all over
the country. Very few in India could really believe before
this that there could be an organized attempt to overthrow the
British Government by means of bombs. The courage and the self­
sacrificing spirit of the young men proved to be a great
inspiration to hundreds of others. Although Barindra failed to
achieve any conspicuous success, he may claim the credit (or
discredit as some might say) of having set the revolutionary
organization in Bengal on a firm footing, and given it a
definite character and direction which it retained till the
end.

It would not be out of place to put here an incident
revealing the profound respect in which was held the
oppressed in those days. Kingsford flogged a young man named
Sushil Sen for slapping a British mounted sergeant. Now, immediately after this another young man named Sushil Sen got admission to a college. Other students showed him silent reverence taking him to be the Sushil Sen that had slapped the British sergeant and had been flogged. When Sushil Sen discovered that he had begun to enjoy special honour for reasons now obvious to him, he told me smilingly while narrating this incident of his old College days that it was really painful to him to give out that he was not the same Sushil Sen as had slapped the British sergeant, had been flogged and held in honour all over the country.

An almost universal sympathy was felt for the revolutionaries. The accused were regarded as martyrs to their country, and Prafulla Chaki and Khudiram who had lost their lives became heroes of folk songs sung all over the country. Even professional beggars substituted these for their traditional religious songs while begging from house to house. The calm indifference of the revolutionaries who were daily brought from the prison to the court-room during the prolonged trial, excited the admiration even of those who did not share their views. They chatted among themselves and laughed and cut jokes as if nothing had happened.

Narendra Gosain turned an approver. His name was cursed by all. He was murdered inside the jail by Kanai Lal Datta and Satyen Bose. The news of his death was hailed with joy all over Bengal, and Kanai Lal and Satyen Bose were regarded
as heroes and martyrs. R.C. Majumdar writes: "When Kanai Lal Datta was hanged for his crime, his dead body was carried in a funeral procession which kings and conquering heroes well might envy. Calcutta was in tears, and thousands behaved as if they belonged to Kanai's family. A dense crowd, bare-footed and with tears in eyes, thronged the street and followed the bier, which was covered with heaps of flowers and laja (fried paddy) thrown by the weeping women from the balconies of the houses on the two sides of the narrow Kalighat Road. The place of cremation was a sea of human heads. Hundreds, probably thousands, fasted the whole day and night. The Government was so much unnerved at this spontaneous demonstration, that they never, in future, allowed the dead bodies of revolutionaries to be carried in public. Indeed it may be said that Barin and his associates not only made the cult of bomb popular, but also gave it a honourable place in the struggle for freedom. One day Barin accosted in the court the Deputy Superintendent, who was later murdered, and said: "Well, uncle Alam, three bombs have brought Morley-Minto reform—more would be coming, beware!" (23) He voiced the opinion of Bengal.

The first organized revolutionary secret society in Bengal was the 'Anusilan Samiti'. It carried on its activities partly in public and partly in secret. Its early history is associated with P. Mitra who was a barrister. It was organized in Bengal in 1901. Sister Nivedita, Sare Jahan Se Acha, Chittaranjan Das, Aurobindo Ghose were associated with it. The
members were also given moral and patriotic training through regular weekly classes and general conversations by eminent men like Rabindranath Tagore, Gurudas Banerjee, B.C. Pal & others. There were various branches of the Anusilan Samity. Barindra was also once associated with this Samiti; he had been sent from Baroda by his brother Aurobindo.

Like Nivedita, another foreigner, Okakura, a Japanese, also influenced the revolutionary movement in Bengal. He emphasized the unity of Asiatic culture. He gave out that while the rest of Asia was organized to drive out the Europeans from Asia, India alone was inactive. He suggested that India must be made independent. Okakura organized a small group which included Nivedita.

There were two schools of thought among the revolutionaries. One believed in armed conflict against the British with the help of the Indian soldiers. This school pinned its faith on the development of international situation which might create a favourable opportunity and bring necessary help from outside. The other held that terrorism in the shape of murdering officials would paralyze the machinery of Government. Both, however, felt the urgent need of creating a revolutionary spirit in the country at large, so that the people may be ready to strike at the opportune moment. Military training and collection of arms in secret formed a common programme of both.

The underground movement, however, did not assume serious proportions before 1905 when the Partition of Bengal,
followed by the Swadeshi movement, stirred the political and national consciousness of Bengal to a large degree. At first the boycott of English goods made a strong appeal to the people, but as these proved ineffective in achieving the desired object, a steadily increasing number of young men turned to revolutionary activities as the only possible means to attain their end.

The Anusilan Samiti got a large number of recruits. The Samiti soon started hundreds of branches in different parts of Bengal. But as more young men joined the revolutionary Samiti, some elderly men dissociated from it. For example, B.C. Pal preached the gospel of Swadeshi, Boycott, and Passive Resistance. He was soon joined by C.R. Das.

'Bartaman Rananiti' was published in 1907 by Abinash Chandra Bhattacharyya of the group of Barindra. In this book young revolutionaries were urged to face dangers fearlessly. Still more audacious was the other adventure of this group. The group started a periodical named 'Yugantar' in March, 1906. The chief promoters of this periodical were Abinash Chandra Bhattacharyya, Barindra and Bhupendranath Datta. Abinash says that their paper was dedicated to the service of the country and was the first newspaper of the revolutionary party. The Yugantar openly preached revolution against the British Government. A book entitled 'Mukti Kon Pathe' with a number of select articles from the Yugantar was published. About this book an extract from the sedition (Rowlatt) Committee report is given below:
The book further points out that not much muscle was required to shoot Europeans, that arms could be procured by grim determination and that weapons could be prepared silently in some secret place. Indians could be sent to foreign countries to learn the act of making weapons. The assistance of Indian soldiers must be obtained. They must be made to understand the misery and wretchedness of the country .... (38)

It has already been mentioned that the Partition of Bengal proved so bitter that it awakened the masses and the aristocracy alike. We have seen that even a Moderate leader like Surendranath Banerjee wanted the murder of Bamfylde Fuller and promised to raise several thousand rupees. Maharaja Suryakanta helped the revolutionaries with money. A Munsif (Abinesh Chakravarti) resigned his post and sacrificed everything for the country. It has been mentioned that not only the professional politicians but even the big landlords led the protest and they were joined by every class of people. Nationalism in the true sense of the term is said to have taken place when not only the educated middle class but also the aristocracy and the masses feel a thirst for freedom and strive to achieve it and when a compromiser shakes off his propensity to compromise and fights.

The Alipur Conspiracy case ended with the transportation for life of Barindra, Ullaskar Datta and others. But events soon proved that even outside the circle of Barindra, the teachings of the Yugantar did not fall flat. The different forms of activities hinted at in the Yugantar were actually
carried out in practice.

A bomb was thrown at Lord Hardinge on December 23, 1912, on the occasion of his State entry into Delhi. Lord Hardinge was badly wounded. Rash Behari Bose's hand was behind this incident. The police made a vigorous search for him. But he managed to escape to Japan.

Jatin Mukherjee (alias Bagha Jatin) and his associates Chittaranjan Ray Choudhuri, Monoranjan Sen Gupta, Jitendra Chandra Das Gupta and Jyotish Pal fought with the British forces on the bank of the Buribalam in Balasore District. Jatin Mukherjee went to Balasore about the middle of 1915 to receive the German arms. A regular fight between the police and the five revolutionaries lasted for 15 or 20 minutes. Chittaranjan Ray Choudhuri was killed on the spot, and Jatin Mukherjee was mortally wounded.

"Bernhardi in his book 'Germany and the Next War' published in October 1911, had indicated the German hope that the Hindu population of Bengal, in which a pronounced revolutionary and nationalist tendency showed itself, might unite with the Muhammadans of India and that the co-operation of these elements might create a very grave danger capable of shaking the foundations of England's high position in the world." (31.)

Revolutionary organizations were also started in Bihar, Panjab, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Benares & Madras.
Revolutionary activities for India were also carried on outside India. The Indian revolutionaries realized the importance of setting up centres in foreign countries. It gave them two advantages, the advantage of foreign help and the advantage of carrying on their activities without any fear from the Indian police. Shyamji Krishna Varma was one of the earliest Indians to organize such activities. He organized in London 'Indian Home Rule Society' in 1905, and issued a journal called the 'Indian Sociologist' as its organ. Its object was to carry on political propaganda in England for the purpose of securing Home Rule for India. A group of revolutionaries was collected round Shyamji, among whom the most prominent were Vinayak Savarkar, Hardayal and Madan Lal Dhingra. The centre of their activities was the 'India House' founded by Shyamji in London.

One of the associates of Shyamji's political activities was Madam Bhikhaji Rustam K.R. Kama. She has earned undying reputation as the Mother of the Indian Revolution. In 1902 Madam Kama left India for Europe. She dedicated her life to the service of her motherland by means of revolutionary propaganda in Europe and America. She attended the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart in Germany in August, 1907. She made a fiery speech there enumerating the evils of British rule in India. She concluded her address by unfolding the
National Flag - a tricolour one in green, yellow and red.
As a protest against the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, She issued a stirring appeal to her countrymen in India and abroad. The appeal was published in the Indian Sociologist.

Sardar Singh

In the absence of Shyamji and Rana, Savarkar assumed the political leadership of the India House. In 1907 he celebrated the 50th anniversary of Sepoy Mutiny which he called the first National War of Independence. In 1908 he celebrated the 51st anniversary on which occasion he issued a patriotic leaflet which was a long document full of patriotic fervor and it breathed fiery determination to free India from the control of the British. A passage from it may be quoted as a specimen:

"We take up your cry, we revere your flag, we are determined to continue that fiery mission of 'away with the foreigners' .... for the war of 1857 shall not cease till the rebellion arrives striking the enemy into dust, elevating liberty to the throne .... revolutionary war knows no truce save liberty or death." (34)

The most important overt act of this group was the murder of Curzon Wyllie. Curzon Wyllie was murdered by Madan Lal Dhingra at a gathering at the Imperial Institute in London on July 1, 1909. Madan Lal stated: "I attempted to shed English blood intentionally and of purpose as an humble
protest against the inhuman transportation and hangings of Indian youths." Madan Lal was hanged and Savarkar was arrested. Thus the activities of the India House and of the group of Shyamji came to an end.

Savarkar was sent to India to take his trial in the Nasik Conspiracy case and on other charges. He was sentenced to two terms of transportation for life on two counts. Savarkar, on his way to India, made an attempt to escape to French territory. This historic episode bears like a romantic tale.

In America the Ghadar Party carried on revolutionary activities for India.

Towards the end of the 19th and at the beginning of this century there was a regular exodus of Panjab peasants to the outside world. Unable to earn livelihood from the small plots of land in their province, they migrated to Burma, Maleya, Singapore, Honkong, Shanghai, Australia, and to Canada and U.S.A. They were employed in large numbers in the factories and farms in America, for they were cheaper than American labour.

Then came the economic crisis of 1907 accompanied by widespread unemployment and wage-cuts. Organized in trade unions the American workers fought back the capitalist onslaught, but not so the Indian labourers. During the incurred railway strike at Tacoma the Indians incurred the contempt and hostility of American workers. Anti-Indian sentiment became
widespread. Anti-Indian agitation was started soon. Indian lodgings at some places were attacked and looted. "The American outburst of the past few years had been directed as much against other European and Asiatic emigrants as against the Indians; but these others were free people, and their governments could be relied upon to safeguard their interests. In one case of gangsterism, against the Japs in California, the Jap Government saw that for every single dollar of damage done to its citizens ten dollars were paid, but the British Consuls and the British Ambassador refused to intervene on behalf of the Indians. For the first time it dawned upon the Indian immigrants that they were slaves." (33)

It has already been hinted in the third chapter how America tour made Swami Vivekananda feel the necessity of independence for India. Although he could overwhelm the Americans by his spiritual speeches, he received insult from some sections because he was from a slave country. His speeches in India inspiring patriotism and nationalism had received their greatest impetus from the treatment he occasionally received in America. Although his lecture tour in America took place towards the end of the 19th century, he felt in the core of his heart the helplessness of being born in a country ruled by foreigners. Swamiji was also inspired by the glamour of the independent countries like America, England and France.

In America the Indians were mainly concentrated in California, Oregon and Washington. Men like Jwala Singh,
WasaKha Singh, Santokh Singh, Sohan Singh Bhakna, Kesar Singh, Kanshi Ram and many others were making good money. But now they found that money could not buy respect for them.

Everywhere the Indians were insulted and despised. They were discriminated against in hotels and trains, parks and theatres. Everywhere hung notice-boards: "Hindus (i.e. Indians) and Dogs not allowed." An American refused to sit at the same table with Sohan Singh Bhakna; another American said to Kesar Singh, "you deserve not a job but a bullet"; still others would say: "Three hundred millions! Men or sheep!" Even friendly Americans consoled Indians by saying "Americans hate slavery – and you are slaves." Thus dawned in the minds of the Indians in America the burning sense of shame that they were slaves. They also began to realize the value of liberty and democracy. Political consciousness made them yearn for liberty. They also felt the impact of the nationalist movement in India.

The revolutionary ideas and activities which the educated Indian youths carried with them to Europe and America reached the peasants of the Punjab settled in U.S.A. Students explained to them the revolutionary papers like Indian Sociologist of Shyamji and Kama’s Bande Mataram which had unrestricted entry into U.S.A. Many well-to-do Indian settlers, some of whom have been named above, came forward to help Indian students. A fund was soon established for service at home.
The ground was thus prepared for the starting of a political organization to give guidance and direction to the movement. The Ghadar Party was founded in 1913. The weekly journal, the Ghadar, named in commemoration of the Mutiny of 1857, was published on November 1, 1913, in San Francisco.

The resolutions founding the Ghadar Party laid down its aim as the overthrow of imperialist Raj in India. This aim could be achieved only by an armed national revolution. Every member was declared to be in honour and duty bound to participate in the fight against slavery carried on anywhere in the world.

The first issue of the Ghadar declared: "Today there begins in foreign lands .... a war against the British Raj .... What is our name? Mutiny. What is our work? Mutiny. Where will mutiny break out? In India. The time will soon come when rifles and blood will take the place of pens and ink." (4)

Komagata Maru episode took place in 1914. Although it was hardly a political episode, surely this, too, left some trace on the growth of our concept of nation. Baba Gurdit Singh chartered the S.S. Komagata Maru, a Japanese ship, for carrying a large number of Panjabees to Canada. The Komagata Maru arrived at Vancouver on May 23, 1914. The immigrants were not allowed to land. The Canadian Government forced the vessel to return. The Komagat Maru arrived at the month of Hooghly and was moored at Budge-Budge on the 29th September, 1914.
A special train was waiting there to convey the passengers free of charge to the Punjab. The Sikhs refused to enter the train. They tried to march on to Calcutta in a body. They were forcibly turned back by the police. A riot ensued. Eighteen sikhs were killed and many were arrested. Indians were shocked.

Revolutionaries became very active during the First World War. The Berlin Committee in Germany, the Ghadar Party in U.S.A. and the Indian revolutionaries strove for a revolution in India during the War with help from Germany.

But, soon the role of violence was replaced by Non-violent Civil Disobedience under Gandi's guidance, and the replacement was necessary for the achievement of India's independence without partition. The violent process gradually gave ground to Non-violent Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience. The violent process proved ineffective under the social conditions then existed in India. It was not possible for all to adopt the violent process. The Muslims always kept away from the revolutionary movement. India was a vast country, and a process powerful and wide and open was required to make an all-India movement. It was felt that the killing of British officials were and there was not enough. A general rise with arms procured from foreign countries was impossible. Non-violent Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience were extensive processes and their contribution to the growth of the concept of nation was immeasurable. However, the contribution of the violent process was also not negligible.
In 1919 Mahatma Gandhi emerged as the leader of the national movement in India.

Gandhi combined in himself the dual role of a saint and an active politician. He has been called 'the most saintly among politicians' by some, and 'the most political saint' by others. Those who considered his saintliness a political means called him the political saint. But he was first a saint then a politician. We shall see that during the Second World War he expressed an utter abhorrence of war and cruelty, even if the absence of the War kept India in subjection for a longer period. That is to say, he valued morality more than independence.

Gandhi played a very important role in rousing the political consciousness of the masses. In the spread of Indian nationalism, Gandhi's contribution is unique. Gandhi gave a completion to what Tilak started. The spread of nationalism in the masses is what Tilak should have credit for. The concept of nation spread during Gandhi's time.

India has ever listened to its spiritual preceptors and aspirants, and this being the fact, Tilak and after him, Gandhi could make the large masses follow them. The masses held in deep reverence Tilak and Gandhi. They honoured Tilak by giving him the title 'Lokmanya' and Gandhi by giving him the epithet 'Mahatma'.

From 1919 under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi Indian nationalism was steadily strengthened. Every...
political event after 1919 brought country-wide sensation and the concept of nation crept even to the most illiterate peasant through the peasant's devotion to the Mahatma. Gandhi's non-violent non-co-operation was taken up by many as a spiritual creed and enabled them to undergo acute sufferings and even to meet death. Fight for freedom was taken up as a crusade. Gandhi's magic personality and saintly character which had always a great appeal to Indian masses transformed the latent energy of the people into strenuous political activity in an astonishingly short period of time. Since 1919, under the leadership of Gandhi, the Indian National Congress had developed into a fighting machine and revolutionary organization, non-violent in character but of tremendous strength and potentiality, on account of the mass support behind it.

Gandhi's contributions to the clarification and development of the concept of nation knew no bounds. His principles and actions for India's independence (fight with the British) and India's internal integrity and unity were unique and far-reaching. He was a patient fighter, fearless and calm. He knew the heart of India, and therefore well knew the art of spreading and strengthening Indian nationalism.

Gandhi had two great ends in his life to which even the freedom of India was subordinate one. One was to inculcate
in the masses the spirit of non-violence and the other was
to bring about unity between the Hindus and Muslims by a
change of heart. But at the fag end of his life Gandhi reali-
zed that the cult of non-violence never took root in the hearts
of the people. He had also the mortification to witness hatred
and hostility between the Hindus and the Muslims growing from
bad to worse every day.

The two new weapons with which
Non-violent Non-co-operation &
Civil disobedience Gandhi decided to fight for India's freedom
were Non-violent Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience. These
were the two outward manifestation of his great principle
'Satyagraha'.

Gandhi made noble efforts for the uplift of the
'Harijans' - the untouchables and the degraded classes in
Hindu society. Gandhi followed the great ideal of 'Daridra-
Narayan' preached by Swami Vivekananda and organized a crusade
against this great social iniquity. Though the actual success
attained by him may not be very great, there is no doubt that
he quickened the social consciousness of the entire Hindu
community.

Severe criticisms have been made of Gandhi's
stopping a movement (started by himself with full vigour)
whenever there was any incident of violence and resorting to a side-issue with his entire attention leaving the whole country in the lurch. In Gandhi's favour, however, it may be said that it is not wise to apply prematurely the entire strength and resources of the country, which, when fails, brings about an irreparable damage for the country. The greater the frustration, the deeper the despondency and the longer the vacuum. The upheaval of 1857-8 is an instance to the point. Besides, a despondent, exhausted people lose faith in their leader. There must be periods of rest and assimilation. Nationalism requires steady growth.

Gandhi's efforts for the uplift of Harijan were befitting to the time. In the fight for freedom all must stand on the same footing. A country's strength is not full if a section of its people is held as untouchable. The concept of nation must reach the last man so that the last man may become a fighter in freedom movement. During each period of suspension or rest allowed by Gandhi, the concept of nation permeated. His side-issue was not really an idle issue. His efforts for the uplift of the untouchables were as strenuous as his guiding people to Civil Disobedience; perhaps, the former was more strenuous than the latter, for it required greater patience. The side-issue of spinning should have been associated with a variety of economic and social services, remarked Tagore. Tagore is right.
But Gandhi probably sought a single, simple, simultaneous aim which all, even the poorest and most illiterate, should have before them during respite. It is a moral and national disciplinary measure with an economic aim of self-help.

In the struggle for freedom, next to Gandhi was Subhas Chandra Bose. His was a unique personality. He kept himself unaffected by the magic charm of Mahatma Gandhi. Bose thought that the Indian struggle had no place for mystics and vague philosophers. It is true that "outraged British sentiments, fuming and fretting over the loss of Indian Empire, have not yet forgiven Bose." The British recognised Gandhi as friend and Bose as the worst enemy.

Also, Bose's contribution to the growth of the concept of nation in India can never be overestimated. The nationalism which grew up under Gandhi's guidance found an outlet in Bose's action. Nationalism grew up in the shade of Gandhi's non-violence, and it would have hardly attained maturity if non-violence had remained to be the only means till the end. Violence and powerful opposition by the oppressed is also a mandate of the Hindu scriptures. In the Mahabharata, we see that Krishna repeatedly supplicated to the Kauravas in behalf of the Pandavas. He even solicited only five villages for Pancha Pandavas. Finally,
he had to start a crusade. The British were less afraid of Gandhi than Subhas. We could not solve the Goa issue resorting exclusively to non-violence. To settle the Hyderabad chaos our tanks had to volley. Jawaharlal had to say: "We cannot leave our frontiers unguarded." Military unpreparedness on the part of India allured China to attack India. Pakistan's aggression in August, 1965, was also the result of India's continued reluctance to wage war. True, India has ever been held in honour because of her creed of non-violence and magnanimity and catholicity. Surely, India commands an international respect, however implicit in many cases, because of her observance of righteousness even in politics. India commanded respect outside even when in bondage. But India had to be violent to be free and that rightly. Nationalism is a European term, and freedom by violence is the consummation of nationalism. Bose's I.N.A. was surcharged with the true concept of nation, and this is proved by the acute hardship borne by the Army during the war against the British.

There is a difference between the application of force by India during the British rule and after independence. During the British rule force was applied to drive away a foreign power, the British, and after independence force was applied to maintain the integrity of India and to retain India
in a free state. The force applied to Hyderabad was to maintain India's integrity, and the force applied to Goa was to get back a part of India which was kept by the Portuguese unlawfully. The force applied during the Chinese and Pak aggressions was to keep off aggressors. India has hitherto exhibited no aggression upon others' territory. India respects freedom, India also respects territorial integrity. During British rule the force applied by India for independence assumed varied forms. The revolutionaries used pistols and bombs and killed mischievous British officials secretly. They, however, dreamt of an open revolution when the country would be prepared. Gandhi's Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience were based on spiritual force. The Swadeshi movement after the Partition of Bengal in 1905 which used the weapon of boycott of the British and British goods was the same force. The force manifested during the outbreak of 1942 was violent. The I.N.A. was an armed force with spiritual enthusiasm and determination in the background. During the British rule an open and wide and therefore peaceful application of force was necessary and so Non-violent Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience worked for a long time. The question of application of force was one of practicality, of timing the application of violence.
The year 1919 marked a definite stage in the history of India's struggle for freedom. It was memorable for four outstanding events; these shaped India's future relations with Britain. These events are: i) the Rowlatt Bills and their consequence — Jallianwala Bagh massacre and barbarous enforcement of martial law in the Punjab; ii) the appearance of M.K. Gandhi of Satyagraha fame in South Africa as the political leader in India; iii) on the basis of the Montford Report the passing of the Government of India Act; iv) the revival of Pan-Islamism as a force in Indian politics.

It has already been mentioned that Lord Minto and Lord Hardinge followed the policy of reform cum repression or vice versa. In pursuance of this policy Lord Chelmsford appointed a committee to investigate the revolutionary movement and recommend legislation to suppress it. The Committee was presided over by Mr. Justice Rowlatt of U.K. It consisted of four other members, two of whom were Indians and the other two were British officials in India. The Committee prepared an account of revolutionary movement in India on the basis of the materials supplied by the Government. The Committee made a survey of the revolutionary movement in different parts of India and recommended special legislation which sought to curtail the liberty of
the people in a drastic manner. On the basis of these recommenda-
tions two bills were prepared. The one that was actually passed
into law was the Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act, 1919.
It provided for speedy trial of offences by a special Court
consisting of three High Court Judges and which could meet in
camera, and there was no appeal from the decision of this Court.
The Court could take into consideration evidence not admissible
under the Indian Evidence Act. On suspicion the Provincial
Government could order any person to furnish security or to
notify his residence, or to reside in a particular area or to
abstain from any specified act, or finally to report himself to
the police. The Provincial Government was also given powers
to search a place and arrest without warrant a suspected person
and keep him in confinement in such place and under such condi-
tions and restrictions as it may specify. The Bill was strenuous-
ly opposed throughout the country. Numerous public meetings were
held to protest against this lawless law. All the non-official
Indian members of the Indian Legislative Council opposed the
measure, and four of them resigned by way of protest. Since the
partition of Bengal such a unique opposition of Indians to a
Government measure was never witnessed. The officials alone
voted in its favour, and the bill was passed on March 18 and
placed on the Statute Book on March 21, 1919. But the most
ourious part of the whole episode is that while the new Act practically remained a dead letter, it brought into lime-light a political leader who was destined to achieve world-wide fame and distinction.

Mohandas Karamohand Gandhi was born on October, 1869, at Porbandar in Kathiawar Peninsula (Gujarat). Gandhi went to Africa (Natal) in 1893; he left South Africa for good and returned to India in January, 1915. The new principle and technique of Satyagraha which he initiated with success in South Africa formed the dominant element in India's struggle for freedom since 1919.

On his arrival in India in January, 1915, Gandhi accepted Gokhale as his political guru. Gokhale was deeply impressed by his liberal humanism (though not by his political ideas) and was keen on admitting him to the 'Servants of India Society'. But the other members of the Society did not like the idea. Gandhi thereupon set up an Ashram at Ahmedabad on the banks of the Sabarmati (1915).

Gandhi's work at Champaran.

Soon Gandhi came in conflict with the Government by taking up the cause of the peasants of Champaran in Bihar. The peasants there were being ruthlessly oppressed by the indigo-planters who were Europeans. Gandhi proceeded to
make an enquiry on the spot. He was served with a notice to quit the place. But he defied the order. He was tried in the Court on April 18, 1917. There was a huge gathering outside the Court. The case was, however, withdrawn by the Government. Gandhi proceeded with his enquiry. The enquiry revealed such staggering facts about the oppression practised by the indigo-planters that the Government abolished the iniquitous system by legislation. This was Gandhi's triumph of Satyagraha movement in India for the first time.

His work at Ahmedabad. The next scene of his activity was Ahmedabad. The mill-hands there had been agitating for an increase of pay. Gandhi advised them to go on strike. They agreed to avoid violence and took up a pledge not to resume work until their terms were accepted. For two weeks everything went well; the strikers then lost their zeal. Gandhi told the mill-hands that unless they rally and continue the strike he will not touch any food. This fast was the precursor of many that were to follow. The fast had the desired effect both upon the labourers and upon the mill-owners, and a settlement was reached after 21 days' strike.

Immediately after this Gandhi plunged himself into a Satya-graha campaign at Khed District. Vallbh bhai Patel joined Gandhi at Khed District. The dispute was between the cultivators and the
Government officials regarding the Land Revenue Rules. Gandhi advised the cultivators to resort to Satyagraha. The cultivators took pledge not to pay the revenue and suffer all the consequences. Vallabhbhai Patel joined Gandhi. The cultivators stood firm. Their fear of officials passed away. They stood up against threats of coercion and intimidation by the officials. They even faced with equanimity attachments of their property and notices for forfeiture of land. Ultimately, the Government was forced to offer terms which were acceptable to the cultivators.

Rowlatt Bills | Gandhi decided to offer Satyagraha if and hartals. The Rowlatt Bills were passed into law. One of the two bills was passed on March 18, 1919. In the meantime Gandhi had convened a conference which was attended by about twenty persons including Vallabhbai Patel and Sarojini Naidu. The Satyagraha pledge was signed by all present on February 24, 1919.

A separate body name 'Satyagraha Sabha' was established with Gandhi as its President. Its headquarters were fixed at Bombay. Bulletins were issued. Public meetings were held, and more people signed Satyagraha pledge. Gandhi also proposed that the country should observe a general 'hartal'; all the people should suspend business for a day, and observe the day as one of fasting and prayer as a preliminary to Satyagraha which is a process of self-purification. The idea was welcomed by
Rajagopalachari and others. Gandhi drafted a brief appeal.

The date of the hartal was fixed on March 30, 1919; but subsequently the date was changed to 6th April. Gandhi's appeal met with a wonderful response all over India. As the notice of change reached too late, the hartal began at Delhi on March 30. It was a unique success. To check the procession the police opened fire which caused many casualties. Similar was the case in other localities such as Lahore and Amritsar; urgent invitations by wire came to Gandhi to visit those localities. The hartal of 6th April marked out Gandhi as the all-India leader.

Gandhi himself was present in the city of Bombay where the hartal was a complete success. The Muslim citizens also joined the procession in large numbers; they took some of the Hindu leaders to a neighbouring mosque where Mrs. Naidu and Gandhi delivered speeches.

It has been said that the Delhi hartal which was held on March 30 did not pass off smoothly. There were clashes between the police and the people. The military fired upon the crowd, killing a few and wounding a large number. Swami Shraddhabananda who was held in the highest esteem all over India submitted a written statement about the happenings at Delhi. The military
used machine gun and fired indiscriminately. The Gurkhas pointed
two rifles at Swami Shraddhananda and said, "We will pierce you."
Swami Shraddhananda clad in 'sannyasee' dress said quietly: "I am
standing, fire." The dead bodies and the persons who were wounded
were removed to the Police Hospital. The English nurses said:
"They have been well served. They are rebels and we won't attend
on them."

Delhi observed the hartal also on April 6. That day
more than 10,000 people assembled, and there were more than eight
overflow meetings. Popular excitement ran very high at Delhi and
Amritsar. The local leaders invited Gandhi to visit these places,
for they expected that his presence might have a pacifying effect
on the people. But the Government thought otherwise.

Gandhi started for Delhi and Amritsar on the night of
April 7. Before the train had reached Palwal Station, about forty
miles from Delhi, he was prohibited from entering the boundary of
the Punjab as his presence was likely to disturb the peace of the
Province. Gandhi refused to get down. At Palwal he was taken out
by the police. On April 10, he was put in a train for Bombay
under police escort.

Gandhi was set free as soon as he reached Bombay. He was
told that the news of his arrest had roused the people to mad
frenzy and at Pydhuni an outbreak was apprehended every minute.
Gandhi proceeded there. The huge crowd, mad with joy, formed a procession. There was a body of mounted police, and brickbats were raining down from above. The procession was stopped by a body of mounted police who had arrived there to prevent it from proceeding further towards the Fort area. The Officer-in-charge gave the order to disperse the crowd when the crowd had almost broken through the police cordon. The mounted party charged the densely packed crowd brandishing their lances. The lances grazed the car of Gandhi when the lancers swiftly passed by. The crowd seethed. The lancers cut their way through the seething mass of humanity. Some got trampled, others were badly mauled and crushed.

Disturbances had also broken out at Ahmadabad. Rumour had spread that not only Gandhi but Anasuya Ben had also been put under arrest. The mill-hands were infuriated at her rumoured arrest. They struck work and committed acts of incendiaryism and violence. A sergeant had been done to death. The police fired on the crowd several times. Ahmadabad was placed under martial law. Gandhi proceeded to Ahmadabad. He learnt that an attempt had been made to pull up the rails near the Nadiad railway station and that a government officer had been murdered in Viramgam. Gandhi held a public meeting on April 13, and tried to bring home to the people the sense of their wrong. He declared a penitential fast of three days for himself. He also appealed to the people to go on a similar
fast for a day. He asked those who had committed acts of violence to confess their guilt and the Government to condone their crimes. But there was no response from either side; peace was, however, restored. According to Hunter Committee's Report two officials were killed, among the rioters 28 were known to have been killed and 123 wounded; probably there were other casualties; telegraph wires were cut at eight places in Ahmedabad and at fourteen places outside. In a speech at Ahmedabad on April 14, 1919, Gandhi said: "I have said times without number that Satyagraha admits of no violence, no pillage, no incendiarism, and still in the name of Satyagraha we burnt down buildings, forcibly captured weapons, extorted money, stopped trains, cut off telegraph wires, killed innocent people and plundered shops and private houses. If deeds such as these could save me from the prison house or the scaffold, I should not like to be saved." (1)

Gandhi's appeal for Satyagraha was virtually an appeal for nationalism and patriotism. Non-violence to be effective was to be wide-spread and deep, and its expanse needed the spread of the concept of nation and its depth patriotism.

Gandhi then proceeded to Nadiad. It suddenly dawned upon him that he had committed a grave error in calling upon the people to launch a campaign of Civil Disobedience. He felt that
a Satyagrahi must scrupulously obey all laws. Before one had thoroughly qualified oneself for it, one had not the right to adopt Satyagraha; Gandhi realized that his error lay in his failure to observe this necessary limitation. Gandhi said that he was guilty of a 'Himalayan miscalculation.'

As a result of these reflections, Gandhi suspended the Civil Disobedience and decided not to re-start it on a mass scale without creating a band of well-tried volunteers who could explain the conditions of Satyagraha to the people. However, there were many who were unhappy over Gandhi's decision to suspend Satyagraha.

Events were moving fast in the Punjab. The Lieutenant Governor Sir Michael O'Dwyer had exasperated the whole Province by his cruel recruiting campaigns, his ruthless suppression of the people, and insults heaped upon the educated classes. He interned hundreds of local men. He gagged the vernacular press. He prevented the nationalist papers published outside the Punjab from entering the Province. He was hated by the people for his arbitrary methods of collecting funds and forcible recruiting of men for the army.

The volcano burst out soon after the hartal of April 6. Within a week a considerable part of the Punjab was aflame. The Government adopted such measures as no civilized government in
modern times has ever been known to take against its own
subjects. A thorough enquiry was made by two Committees,
one official, provided by Lord Hunter, and another appointed
by the Congress, within a year of its occurrence; a perusal
of the two reports one to form a fairly accurate idea of the
main trends of the events. The incidents at Lahore, Kasur and
Gujranwala were more serious, and most serious were the events
at Amritsar.

At Lahore the news of Gandhi's arrest created great
excitement on April 10. All the business places and shops
were immediately closed. About 200 or 300 students while
proceeding towards the Mall were stopped by the police. They
neither moved forward nor turned back. Thereupon, Mr. Foyson,
the District Magistrate, ordered firing. Two volleys were
fired. Two or three students were killed and a few were wounded.
Even when the crowd was about to disperse fire was opened upon
them. A few died and many were injured. On the 11th April, a
meeting was held in the Badshahi mosque and the hartal was
continued. On the 12th another meeting was held in the same
place. The mosque and its approaches were surrounded by the
Military and the police. It is said a brickbat was thrown by the
crowd. Immediately nine shots were successively fired at Lala
Khusiram. Lala Khusiram was a student and he fell dead. The dead
body of Lala Khusiram was taken to the cremation ground in a procession of 50,000. The exact number of the dead could not be ascertained.

At Gujranwala the trouble started over the killing of a calf and hanging it on a railway bridge. The police were alleged to have done it by way of insulting the Hindus. On the 14th April a big crowd surrounded a train, stoned it, and burnt two railway bridges. The crowd then set fire to the telegraph office, post-office, railway station, a church and to some other Government buildings.

The violence of the crowd took a more serious turn in Kasur. The conduct of the police provoked the people. The crowd got entirely out of control on April 12 and burnt the main post-office, Munsiff's office and an oil shed and did considerable damage to the Railway station signal and telegraph wires. They attacked a train and beat two European soldiers to death.

Even though the people were highly provoked by the order served upon the two popular leaders, Dr. Satyapal and Dr. Kitchlew, not to address public meetings, the hartals on March 30 and April 6 passed off smoothly at Amritsar. On the 9th, the huge procession of the 'Ramanwami' festival also passed off smoothly. O'Dwyer's Government issued orders on the 9th April for the deportation of Dr. Satyapal and Dr. Kitchlew, and on the 10th
morning they were quietly taken from their homes. The news spread in the city at about midday. Hartal was declared, and a crowd marched through the principal streets towards the Bungalow of the Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar to plead for the release of the prisoners. The crowd on their way came to know of the forcible repatriation of Gandhi from the borders of the Punjab. This created great commotion; nevertheless, the crowd marched peacefully. At the Railway level-crossing, called the Hall Gate Bridge, the crowd was checked, and firing was resorted to. Several people were killed and wounded. The crowd then rushed back to the city, infuriated by the sight of their dead and wounded comrades on the ground and the action of the authorities, who had dealt in this manner with a demonstration which set out with peaceful intentions.

Thereafter followed a series of brutal acts of violence on the part of the mob. Five Europeans were murdered and several buildings, including the telephone exchange, two banks, the Town Hall, and the Indian Christian Church, were attacked and set fire to and, in some instances, destroyed. A lady missionary doctor, Miss Sherwood, was set upon by the mob. She was struck with sticks and fists, and left unconscious in the street. She was subsequently rescued by some Indians, who
took her into a house and cared for her until she was restored to her friends. Later, the crowd again attempted to pass the Hall Gate Bridge, and were fired upon, with twenty to thirty casualties. The telephone wires were cut and two railway stations outside the city were attached.

On the 11th things seemed to have settled down. A big funeral procession carrying the dead bodies of the victims of police firing passed off smoothly.

Brigadier General Dyer arrived on the evening of 11th April. He immediately took command of the troops in the city. He behaved as if the city was under Martial Law, though it was not formally declared before 15th April. Nevertheless, de facto Martial Law prevailed in Lahore since the arrival of Dyer.

Jallianwala Bagh massacre: April 13, 1919.

On the 12th Dyer began his work by indiscriminate arrests and the issue of a proclamation prohibiting all meetings and gatherings. But the proclamation was not read in many parts of the city. This omission was very unfortunate as it was announced on the 12th evening that a public meeting would be held on the 13th at 4.30 P.M. at Jallianwala Bagh. Dyer was fully aware of it, but he took no step to warn the people about its illegality. He could prevent it by stationing troops at the entrance of the Bagh. Dyer arrived on the
spot with armoured cars and troops soon after the meeting had begun. He stationed his troops on a rising ground at the entrance of the Bagh, and without issuing any warning ordered the troops to fire. His troops fired into the dense crowd for ten minutes till their ammunition was exhausted or nearly so.

An account given by Valentive Chirol, by no means a friend of India, is summarized below:

Jallinwala Bagh was frequently used for fairs and public meetings and was closed in almost entirely by walls above which rose the backs of native houses facing into the congested streets of the city. General Dyer stood on a rising ground and without a word or warning, he opened fire at about 100 yards' range upon a dense crowd, collected mainly in the lower and more distant part of the enclosure around a platform from which speeches were being delivered. The crowd was estimated by Dyer at 6,000, by others at 10,000 and more, but practically unarmed, and all quite defenceless. The panic-stricken multitude broke at once, but for ten consecutive minutes he kept up a merciless fusilade, in all 1500 rounds, on that seething mass of humanity, caught like rats in a trap, vainly rushing for the few narrow exits or lying flat on the ground to escape the rain of bullets, which he personally directed to the points where the crowd was thickest. The "targets", to use Dyer's own word, were
good, and then at the end of those ten minutes, having almost exhausted his ammunition, he marched his men off by the way they came. He had killed 379 and left about 1200 wounded on the ground, for whom, again to use his own word, he did not consider it his "job" to take the slightest thought.

Lala Girdhari Lal, the Deputy Chairman of the Punjab Chamber of Commerce personally witnessed the whole incident from a house overlooking the Jallianwala Bagh. He was the first to go into the Bagh after the firing had ceased. He said: "I saw hundreds of persons killed on the spot. The worst part of the whole thing was that firing was directed towards the gates through which the people were running out. There were small outlets, 4 & 5 in all, and bullets actually rained over the people at all these gates, and .... many got trampled under the feet of the rushing crowds and thus lost their lives. Blood was pouring in profusion. Even those who lay flat on the ground were shot. No arrangements were made by the authorities to look after the dead or wounded .... I think there must have been over 1,000 dead bodies in the garden then." (2)

The very frank statement of Dyer was the most significant aspect of the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy. Dyer not only admitted all the gruesome facts but almost boasted of his achievements.
The Government of India and a section of the British people, men and women, both in India and Britain endorsed his action and rewarded him for it. But one Britisher, C.F. Andrews, described Dyer's act as "a cold and calculated massacre", and "an unspeakable disgrace, indefensible, unpardonable, inexcusable."

The cold-blooded massacre at Jallianwala Bagh finds no parallel in the annals of any civilized Government. It took place before Martial Law was declared and the administration was still, at least nominally, in the hands of the civil authority. Martial Law was proclaimed on April 15, 1919, at Amritsar, and between 15th and 24th April in five districts of the Punjab. It was withdrawn on June 11 except on railway lands.

The Hunter Committee Report leaves no doubt that there was hardly any justification for the introduction of Martial Law to control the situation.

Dyer did not take any step to look after the wounded at Jallianwala Bagh. He said that it was not his job, they might go to the hospital if they liked. But on that very day, on 13th April, he had issued a Curfew Order, that all persons must be indoors after 8 P.M. The wounded lay in their agony, the dead lay putrefying in the hot atmosphere of an Amritsar.
April might, and the vultures and jackals came to tear the flesh from the bodies of the innocent victims of this dreadful holocaust, while the anxious relatives of innocent victims remained terrified in their houses. The Curfew Order in Amritsar was maintained for weeks, and was administered with the utmost rigour.

To write these things in detail is to show how our blood boils simply on reading the description of the oppressions, and this enables us to infer almost perfectly how the people who suffered these oppressions rose to the spirit of bitter nationalism and entertained deeper anger and deeper hatred for the British. In the growth of the concept of nation in India, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre is next to the partition of Bengal in importance. The whole of India felt agony for the Punjab after the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. The oppressions carried on later by the British on the occasions of Civil Disobedience movements started by Mahatma Gandhi were almost facsimiles of Jallianwala Bagh cruelty.

General Dyer cut off the water supply and the electric supply of the city. He passed the "crawling order". For several days, everyone passing through the street in which Miss Sherwood, the lady doctor, was assaulted was ordered to crawl with belly
Dyer had a worthy colleague in Capt. Deveton. Deveton carried on oppression at Kasur. Deveton confessed that some people were made to touch the ground with their foreheads by way of making them acknowledge authority. By Deveton's orders some persons were made to get down on all four and draw lines with their noses. Some persons were lime-washed and then they were made to stand in the sun. 107 suspects were kept in a public cage without any overhead covering. Prostitutes of the town were called to witness flogging. In some cases Deveton gave lashes to schoolboys. Many villages were raided and arrests were made at night. Flogging took place in public; the victims were stripped naked to the knees and tied to telegraph poles or triangles.

A few specimens of the orders under Martial Law are noted below:

1) By 2 A.M. to-morrow all shops must be opened.

2) Walking of more than two persons abreast shall be unlawful, and no male persons shall carry a lathi.

3) Any officer may be authorized to enter any building and remove electric lights and fans for the use of the military.

Martial Law inflicted severe physical pains and mental anguish upon the people. At Lyallpur persons riding on animals
or on conveyances whenever met any Gazetted European Civil
or Military officer had to alight, persons carrying raised
umbrellas had to lower them, and all persons had to salute with
hands. In Lahore, students had to walk about 19 miles a day
in the summer sun, and some of them fainted on the wayside.

At Lyallpur Colonel O'Brien gave many evidences of his
malignant mentality. Hindus and Muslims were chained together.
This was regarded by the populace as a jibe at Hindu-Muslim
unity. Two hundred persons were convicted by summary Courts, and
received sentences of whipping, or from one month to two years'
imprisonment. 149 people were convicted, of whom 22 were sen­tenced
to death, 108 to transportation for life, and others were
sentenced from ten years downwards.

The Punjab was treated as even worse than an enemy
territory. Bombs were freely used from aeroplanes even where
there was no gathering of armed men. At Gujranwala there were
dropping of bombs and firing of altogether 255 rounds of machine
guns, apparently at close quarters. The crowd was fired on from
aeroplanes wherever found. Lt. Dodkins machine-gunned twenty
peaceful peasants working in the field. He dropped a bomb in
front of a house, simply because a man was addressing a party.

It may, however, be mentioned that Sir Edward Maclagan,
who succeeded O'Dwyer reduced the penalties imposed by various
Out of 265 sentences for transportation 2 were maintained. Out of 108 death sentences 23 were maintained. The figures of original punishments give some idea of the administration by martial law.

Lala Lajpat Rai in his Presidential Address at the Indian National Congress held in 1920 gave a vivid account of the outrages:

Baliyaram and Abdullah were forced not only to crawl on their bellies but while crawling were kicked by the soldiers with their boots and struck with the butt ends of their rifles. Even a blind man was made to crawl and was kicked. Six boys were flogged in public; one of them became senseless, and when he regained consciousness flogging was resumed. He lost his consciousness for the second time, and yet he was flogged.

The invalid wife of Manohar Lal, Bar-at-Law, and their children were dragged from their rooms, forced to take shelter in the servant's quarters and the kitchen. Manohar Lal was kept under arrest for 28 days. Manohar Lal was for some time Minto Professor at the University of Calcutta.

The Government of India tried for eight months to draw a veil over the horrible atrocities perpetrated in the Punjab. But the news of the terrible events slowly came out to other parts of India and a wave of horror and indignation swept the country.
Rabindranath relinquished his Knighthood as a measure of protest. He wrote a strong, dignified letter to the Viceroy "giving voice to the protest of the millions" of his "countrymen surprised into a dumb anguish of terror."

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya brought to light the most ugly facts about the reign of terror in the Punjab and framed 92 questions alleging specific instances of brutality for the Imperial Legislative Council. The questions sent such a thrill of horror over the whole country that the Viceroy announced the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry. The Commission of Inquiry consisted of Lord Hunter (Chairman) and five other members. Two more members were added later and the Committee began its work on October 31, 1919.

The Hunter Committee contained representatives of the Indian Military and civil services, but no nominee of the Indian representative bodies. The Hunter Committee had mainly to rely on the official documents.

The Sub-Committee of Inquiry of the Congress consisted of Gandhi, Motilal Nehru, C.R.Das, Fazl-ul-Haq and Abbas Tyabji. M. R. Jayakar replaced Motilal Nehru when the latter was elected President of the Congress.
The Sub-Committee of the Congress was appointed earlier than the Hunter Committee. The formation of the Sub-Committee of Enquiry indicates a virile drive on the part of the Congress and the growth of the country's nationalism.

On March 26, 1920, the Congress Sub-Committee submitted a unanimous report. It exposed the atrocities in the Punjab, and stated that O'Dwyer, Dyer, Johnson, O'Brien, Bosworth Smith, Sri Ram Sud and Malik Sahib Khan were guilty of such illegalities that they deserved to be impeached; the Committee suggested their dismissal.

On May 26, 1920, the Report of the Hunter Committee was issued. It was not unanimous. The Majority Report was signed by the European members and Minority Report was signed by the three Indian members.

The parting of the Indian members testifies to the fact that Indian nationalism was growing.

The Jallianwala Bagh massacre proved that the English officers had descended to a level far below that of humanity, and the English people by their support to this outrage on humanity had lost all moral claim and prestige to rule over India. It was evident that the English were animated by nothing better or higher than a naked brutal impulse. It thus became the duty of the Indians
to avenge the wrongs and insults inflicted by those who were shorn of all human instincts. This was the attitude of every Indian. This attitude inspired Gandhi, the greatest Indian of the day, to launch a campaign against the British which ultimately led to their final expulsion from India. Gandhi observed that since a single Panjabi was made to crawl on his belly, the whole of India crawled that day on her belly, and it was that humiliation which the people of India, if they claimed to be worthy sons and daughters of India, must be pledged to remove.

Reform Bill: The Moutford Report was published on 8 July, 1918. The text of the Reform Bill was, however, not issued till June 18, 1919. The Bill had a very unfavourable reception in India. A few liberal-minded Englishmen also decried the Bill. The reforms embodied in the Bill fell far short of what was recommended in the Report. The position of the ministers was made almost intolerable. Secondary Education, Higher Education and Industry were made reserved subjects. In a last effort to improve the Bill, the Indian National Congress sent a deputation to England, but it returned disappointed.

The Act of 1919 introduced a form of Government in each province which is referred to as Dyarchy. It was designed to train Indians to the working of responsible Government. Actually,
it was a sham. The Moderates stood for whole-hearted co-operation for working it. A strong section was inclined to reject it altogether. But Tilak, who dominated the Nationalist Party and the Congress suggested a middle way, 'Responsive Co-operation'. There were serious discussions in the Congress. C.R. Das in favour of rejecting the reforms. But Gandhi took the opposite view. In the Young India of December 31, 1919, Gandhi wrote that the duty then was not to subject the Reforms to carping criticism but to settle down quietly to work so as to make them a success. There was a prolonged contest, and there was an apprehension of another split in the Congress. A compromise was, however, arrived at. It was decided that an addition should be made to the resolution moved by C.R. Das to the effect that so far as might be possible they would work the reforms so as to secure an early establishment of full Responsible Government.

In fact, the final outcome was a triumph, neither of C.R. Das nor of Gandhi, but of the Responsive Co-operation formulated by Tilak.

Because of the Muslim protest against the hostile attitude of Britain towards Turkey and other Islamic States, an 'entente' between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League had been brought about.
Shortly after the outbreak of the First World War, Muhammad Ali published an article under the caption 'Evacuate Egypt'. In his article 'The Choice of the Turks' he asked the Allies to win over Turkey by making good the losses which had been inflicted on her. As a result, both the brothers were interned.

At the end of the First World War the Pan-Islamic movement gathered force.

Gandhi became the leader of the Khilafat Agitation of 1920. He held out before the Indian Muslims the sovereign remedy of Satyagraha.

Ere long the Non-co-operation movement, originally intended for undoing the wrongs inflicted upon the Khilafat, outstripped its original limitations and merged itself into a general political struggle.

Gandhi recommended Non-co-operation in his Manifesto. The Khilafat Conference which met at Madras on 17 April, 1920, adopted Gandhi's ideas. It laid down four stages in the progressive scheme of Non-co-operation: renunciation of honorary posts, titles and membership of Councils; giving up of posts under Government; giving up of appointments in the police and military forces; refusal to pay taxes.

Many notable Muslims renounced and returned their titles and adjured all co-operation with the Government.
Tilak died on August 1, 1920. Gandhi was elected the President of the All-India Home Rule League. The name of the League was altered to 'Swarajya Sabha' and the object of the Sabha was defined to be "to secure complete Swaraj in India according to the wishes of the Indian people."

A strong section headed by M.A. Jinnah and Jamnadas Dwarkadas strongly objected to the changes. However, soon the All-India Home Rule League or Swarajya Sabha lost its separate identity and unconsciously merged itself into the Indian National Congress.

Gandhi's attitude towards the Khilafat question has been criticised. It is said that he should not have been so enthusiastic over this Pan-Islamic issue.

The Pan-Islamic sentiment behind the Khilafat movement was also indicated by the mass migration of Muslims from India to Afghanistan. This planned movement started in Sindh and gradually spread to N.W.F.P. In the month of August, 1920, nearly 18000 people were on their way to Afghanistan. But the Afghan Government was inspired more by national than by Pan-Islamic sentiment, and forbade the admission of the Indian Muslims to Afghanistan.

The Ali Brothers openly said that they were Muslims first and Indians afterwards. Once wild rumours were afoot that the
Amir of Afghanistan was going to invade India. Muhammad Ali said that if the Afghans invaded India to wage a holy war, the Indian Mohammedans were not only bound to join them but also to fight the Hindus if they refused to co-operate with them.

Muhammad Ali once said that he belonged to two circles of equal size but which were not concentric; one was India and the other was the Muslim World; they were not nationalists but supranationalists.

It is sometimes said that the Pan-Islamic movement, based on the extra-territorial allegiance of the Indian Muslims, cut at the very root of the nascent Indian nationalism, and any support to the Khilafat movement, therefore should be regarded as anti-national.

Tilak's heart was not wholly in the Khilafat agitation.

It may, however, be doubtful if Gandhi's attitude towards the Khilafat question was based on an utter miscalculation. Gandhi asked the Hindus to join hands with the Muslims in their Khilafat movement. Gandhi clearly expressed that it was a chance for Hindu-Muslim unity, and the Hindus should join the Muslims in the present Muslim cause. He was not altogether wrong when he said that a chance like this for Hindu-Muslim unity might not come for a very long time. If the Hindus supported the
Muslim cause, the Muslims, too, out of gratitude might join hands with the Hindus in their efforts at bringing India's freedom. Gandhi mixed the Muslim question (Khilafat) with an all-India pursuit (Non-Violent Non-co-operation) and the Muslims could not adopt the former leaving aside the latter, for they felt the need of Hindu enthusiasm. Besides, if an all-India pressure could produce a good result, could make the English deal with the Turkish issue favourably to the Muslims, the Muslims might feel the weight of Hindu pressure and the necessity of co-operation of the Hindus in their greater interests. Gandhi's aim was not altogether wrong, although the results were not satisfactory. Gandhi was able to produce in the Muslims deeper hatred for the British, and the intensity of their anti-British feeling was not only demonstrated in mass meetings and conferences but by a still more practical test, namely the mass exodus to Afghanistan. Doubtless, this exhibits an unfavourable result. Instead of being inspired with a stronger sense of nationalism, their hatred towards the British goaded them to leave their own country for another where existed Muslim rule and the inhabitants were exclusively their co-religionists. This attitude is anti-national. To the Muslims the sense of religion and Pan-Islamism was so strong that the sense of nationalism, which places country above religion, failed to implant itself
among the Muslims for a long time. Another aim of Gandhi is also praiseworthy. Through Khilafat issue Gandhi wanted the Muslims to adopt the patriotic course of Swadeshi and the brave course of Non-violent Non-co-operation. A Hindu-Muslim conference was held at Allahabad on June 2, 1920. The meeting resolved that the Swadeshi movement should be undertaken in right earnest. In this meeting the Muslim members who adopted the resolution of Non-co-operation had really neither courage nor enthusiasm for it, and were merely goaded to this decision by Gandhi's spirited address. But, later, when in the Special Session of the Congress held in Calcutta on September 4, 1920, with Lala Lajpat Rai in the chair Gandhi moved the resolution on the Khilafat question and Non-violent Non-co-operation, many eminent Hindu leaders opposed, and the Muslims became unhappy considering this to be a departure of the Hindu leaders from the Khilafat question. Gandhi's wisdom also lies in the fact that he did not make the Khilafat question an exclusive issue; he associated with it Non-violent Non-co-operation which was a strong weapon for an all-India agitation. Although with timidity, the Muslims had to adopt the resolution of Non-co-operation and espouse an all-India cause. Some severely criticise Gandhi's action in leaving aside the recent, burning issue of Jallianwala
Bagh massacre and sponsoring a much less important issue of Khilafat. Actually, Gandhi did not forget the Amritsar massacre; his aspiration for India's freedom became much stronger. He yet more felt the necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity and the adoption of Non-violent Non-co-operation by both Hindus and Muslims. He felt that all Indians must master strong.

It has been said that in the Allahabad meeting the Muslim members who adopted the resolution of Non-co-operation had really neither courage nor enthusiasm for it. They were goaded to Gandhi's decision by his spirited address. Nehru writes: "I remember that meeting because it thoroughly disappointed me. Shaukat Ali was, of course, full of enthusiasm; but almost all the others looked thoroughly unhappy and uncomfortable. They did not have the courage to disagree, and yet they obviously had no intention of doing anything rash. Were these the people to lead a revolutionary movement, I thought, and to challenge the British Empire? Gandhi addressed them, and after hearing him they looked even more brightened than before. He spoke well in his best dictatorial vein.... This is going to be a great struggle, he said, with a very powerful adversary.... When war is declared martial law prevails, and in our non-violent struggle there will also have to be dictatorship and martial law on our side if we are to win....
Something to this effect he said, and these military analogies and the unyielding earnestness of the man made the flesh of most of his hearers creep. But Shaukat Ali was there to keep the waverers up to the mark; and, when the time for voting came, the great majority of them quietly and shamfacedly voted for the proposition — for war! " (3)

In the Bombay session (July 1921) of the Congress Gandhi vigorously supported the burning of foreign cloth by the consumers. The city of Bombay displayed great enthusiasm in it. The boycott of foreign cloth was urged, and arrangement was made at Bombay for a spectacular demonstration of burning it. On 31 July there was a gathering of some two thousand people to witness the great holocaust. The file of foreign cloth collected was ranged in an enormous circle. All sorts of foreign clothing were thrown into the pile. All the prominent provincial leaders who had gone to Bombay to attend the AICC meeting were present. Gandhi came in the evening and applied a lighted match to the pile. At once the fire leaped up and went round the circle in a few minutes, and in about a couple of hours the huge pile worth of some crores of Rupees was burnt to ashes.

Bonfires were made in other towns also, and this became a regular feature of the programme of cloth boycott. Eminent men including Rabindranath made protest against this "insensate
waste" of cloth when millions were going half-naked. Gandhi wrote in his paper, the Young India: "... I cannot help saying that destruction is the best method of dealing with foreign cloth."

Gandhi is probably right. Bonfires produced stronger effect on Indian nationalism than what would have been produced by the peaceful method of distribution of foreign cloths among the poor. In the grim fight for freedom the part that 'Rudra' ought to play cannot be ignored. For the same reason, violence, sometimes the strongest violence is necessary for a country's freedom.

The boycott of courts and educational institutions produced significant and far-reaching consequences. Men like Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das along with others devoted their whole energy and their whole time to the service of the country. Many students also gave up their studies. For the first time there was a select band of whole-time workers, both leaders and rank and file, all over the country, who made the freedom of India their goal of life. The whole country saw a new zeal and spirit to India's struggle for freedom.

Though the number of persons who renounced honours and titles was very small, it is an undeniable fact that these
titles and honours henceforth ceased to be distinctions in the estimation of the people at large.

Subhas Chandra Bose who passed the I.C.S. in 1920, resigned his post in May, 1921. P.C. Ghose (who later became the Chief Minister of West Bengal) also resigned a lucrative appointment.

The success that attended the movement for boycotting the visits of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and the Prince of Wales was spectacular.

In the Khilafat Conference at Karachim the following resolution was passed: "This meeting clearly proclaims that it is in every way religiously unlawful for a Mussalman at the present moment to continue in the British army or to induce others to join the army, and it is the duty of all Mussalmans in General, and the Ulemas in particular, to see that these religious commandments are brought home to every Mussulman in the army." (4)

Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali were arrested in September and tried on the charge of passing the above resolution. The accused were convicted on November 1, 1921 and sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment. As soon as the sentence was passed the Ali Brothers were widely cheered
by a vast crowd.

Subhas Chandra Bose writes: "We had been spoiling for a fight in Calcutta and the official notification therefore was thrice welcome to us. The general opinion was in favour of an immediate reply to the official challenge." (5)

C.R. Das, however, did not like to take any precipitate action. Das decided to begin by sending out batches of fine volunteers who would sell 'Khadi' cloth. He issued a stirring appeal for volunteers who would defy the official ban and take all the consequences. At the outset the response was not quite satisfactory; Das decided to send his only son, Chiraranjan, and his wife Basanti Debi as volunteers. As soon as Chiraranjan was arrested, the number of volunteers increased. Das sent his wife the next day with a batch of volunteers including two other ladies. Mrs. Das was taken to prison with the other ladies. As soon as the news spread there was a wild excitement in Calcutta and men and women began to pour in as volunteers. Mrs. Das had been taken to the police station; as she was stepping into the prison van, police constables came up to her and vowed that they were going to
reign their jobs the same day. There was also a sensation at a dinner party in the Government House, Calcutta, when Mr. S.N. Mallik, a leading member of the Liberal Party, left the party as a protest. The excitement grew so tense in Calcutta that the Government ordered the release of Mrs. Das and her associates at midnight and gave out that they had been arrested through mistake.

The device of Das was crowned with complete success. Thousands began to enlist as volunteers, and everyone of them was eager to court arrest. The two big prisons in Calcutta were filled with political prisoners within a few days. Then camp-prisons were opened. But they too were filled in no time. Imprisonment became a badge of distinction. The British jail had lost its terror. This was the most marked characteristic of the N.C.O. movement, and this became a permanent feature of the national struggle in future.

The repressive policy was not confined to Calcutta alone. The Government followed the repressive policy with relentless vigour in other provinces where trouble was brewing. Motilal Nehru and Lajpat Rai were arrested and put to prison. People defied Government orders and courted arrest. A wave of enthusiasm swept the country. Within a
month twenty-five thousand people were put in prison. The Government failed to realize the national character of the revolt and carried on repression. But repression merely helps the cause of the revolution. Even the Moderates who had hitherto been their staunch supporters wavered in their loyalty and showed a spirit of resentment.

The annual session of the Congress was held in December, 1921, at Ahmadabad. C.R. Das who was the President-elect of the session was in jail, and so Hakim Ajmal Khan presided. Das had already written a portion of his Presidential Address. The Address was printed and distributed at the meeting. He declared: "We break in order to build, we destroy in order to construct, we reject in order to accept."

Bardoli in Bombay and Guntur in Madras were making strenuous preparations to launch the no-tax campaign. Similar preparations were made in Chittagong, some parts of Assam, Bihar, Punjab and C.P., as well as in many districts of Southern India.

Gandhi himself went to Bardoli to lead the campaign in person. On January 30, he addressed a big Conference there emphasizing all the preliminary requisites of the coming struggle. The Conference was attended by 4000 Khaddar-clad representatives and 500 women who adopted a resolution to begin a mass Civil Disobedience under the guidance of Gandhi.
and Vallabhbhai Patel. In his paper Young India Gandhi wrote:

"Bardoli has come to a momentous decision. It has made its
final and irrevocable choice."

But a horrible crime was perpetrated on February 5, 1922, by an excited mob at a
village called Chauri Chaura, near Gorakhpur in U.P. The Police
opened fire on a procession. When their ammunition was exhausted,
they shut themselves up inside a building. The excited mob set
fire to it. The members of the Police force, twenty-two in
number, were burnt to death. At Bareilly there was another mob-
outbreak, but it was easily suppressed. These incidents created
a feeling of disgust. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya urged Gandhi
to call an emergent meeting of the Working Committee. On
February 9, Gandhi came to Bombay to see Pandit Malaviya,
Jayakar, Natarajan, Jinnah and other politicians who had been
endeavouring to bring about a Round Table Conference. They
urged Gandhi to suspend Civil Disobedience. Gandhi agreed to
do so. The Working Committee of the Congress met at Bardoli
and discussed the political situation on February 11 and
February 12. It was resolved that mass Civil Disobedience
contemplated at Bardoli and elsewhere be suspended, and this
suspension be continued till the atmosphere is so non-violent
as to ensure the non-repetition of atrocities like those of
Chauri Chaure, or hooliganism such as took place at Bombay and Madras on November 17, 1921 and January 13, 1922, respectively. All activities designed to court arrest and imprisonment and all volunteer processions, public meetings merely in defiance of Government notifications were stopped till further instructions, and a new programme of constructive work was laid down.

A distinct sign of the nourishment of nationalism was that country-wide and complicated problems were arising and that eager waitings on the part of the people for wise, momentous decisions were no longer infrequent.

The news of the suspension of the Civil Disobedience movement fell upon India as a bolt from the blue. Long after the event, Louis Fischer wrote: "At a word from Gandhi India would have risen in revolt. That word has not said; instead all the enthusiastic and sacrificing efforts were wasted or thrown away at the alter of the doctrine of non-violence."(6). Romain Rolland writes: "It is dangerous to assemble all the forces of a nation and to hold the nation, panting, before a prescribed movement, to lift one's arm to give the final command, and then, at the last moment, let one's arm drop and thrice call a halt just as the formidable
machinery has been set in motion. One risks ruining the brakes and paralysing the impetus." (7)

It is said that this frustration was the main cause of the ensuing political inertia of the masses, and their pent-up energy found an outlet in the Hindu-Muslim riots. C.R. Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru and Lala Rajpat Rai who were all in prison shared the popular resentment. Das was beside himself with anger and sorrow. Jawaharlal Nehru was also utterly disappointed.

But it is very difficult to say what would have been the effect if Gandhi had been stubborn in his Civil Disobedience movement. It is likely that the movement might lead to a harder repression by the Government and a greater defeat and a longer period of inertia. The outbreak of 1857-8 had its free play and saw its own end. We say that Outbreak of 1857-8 failed because the people of India then lacked nationalism. Likewise, we may say that nationalism, although already born, had not attained its full body in India in 1922, and so India had to wait two more decades for full-fledged nationalism and irresistible movement. The Movement that took place in August, 1942 did not take any notice of leadership, — Mahatma Gandhi and other leaders were then in jail. Nationalism was the
leader during the Movement in August, 1942. It is not known what would have been the fate of the Civil Disobedience of 1922 if Gandhi had been arrested immediately after he started the Movement. Anomaly might have taken place. There might have been disturbances and repressions and then despondency and doldrums. Sm. Vijay Luxmi Pandit made a comment in Russia to the effect that Gandhi had a greater power to create a revolution than Lenin; Virtually, Gandhi had to suppress revolution for integral success and for non-violence. Gandhi suppressed revolution, and in this way quickened the spread of nationalism in India. This suppression also intensified nationalism. True, in 1922 after the incident of Chauri Chaura when Gandhi withdrew the movement there was a country-wide resentment. This resentment was necessary for the growth of nationalism. When Gandhi called a halt, they all resented it but halted; as there was an excitement so also there was an apprehension. The country received only a reflected light of enthusiasm from Gandhi's fearlessness. There was no other leader equally ready to court physical suffering or even death. The withdrawal was probably for the better; the country held in excitement could breathe afresh. Time must be given for the maturity of nationalism and final fight.

It is sometimes said that the check resulted in Hindu-
Muslim riots. But it is very difficult to make a definite conclusion like that. Sooner or later, the riot might have taken place even if Gandhi had not suspended Civil Disobedience movement. The Muslims could not accept Non-violent Non-co-operation in the depth of their heart.

The Government realized the general feeling of repulsion against Gandhi's leadership and fully exploited it. Lord Reading decided upon his arrest which was carried into effect by the Government of Bombay on March 10, 1922. Gandhi was tried at Ahmedabad on March 18, and sentenced to six years' simple imprisonment.

The constructive programme, such as weaving and spinning, removal of untouchability etc, really fell flat upon the masses who looked upon them as merely of secondary importance.

It was, however, admitted that "no man other than the Mahatma could lift the wet blanket thrown upon most of the workers by the Bardoli and Delhi resolutions, or effectively divert the course of Congress activities into the channels marked out by these resolutions."

The first phase of the Non-co-operation movement ended. There was no chance of its revival so long as Gandhi was in jail.

In his Presidential address at the Gaya session of the
Congress held in December, 1922, C.R.Das said: "It is assumed that a movement must either succeed or fail, whereas the truth is that human movements, I am speaking of genuine movements, neither altogether succeed nor altogether fail. Every genuine movement proceeds from an ideal and the ideal is always higher than the achievement .... Was the Non-co-operation Movement in India a success? Yes, a mighty success when we think of the desire for Swaraj which it has succeeded in awakening throughout the length and breadth of this vast country. It is a great success when we think of the practical result of such awakening, in the money which the nation contributed, in the enrolment of members of the Indian National Congress and in the boycott of foreign cloth. I go further and say that the practical achievement also consists of the loss of prestige suffered by Educational Institutions and the Courts of Law and the Reformed Councils throughout the country .... Yet it must be admitted that from another point of view, when we assess the measure of our success in the spirit of Arithmetic, we are face to face with "the petty done " and the "undone vast" .... I say to our critics: I admit we have failed in many directions, but will you also not admit our success where we have succeeded?" (8)

One must be struck with two undeniable facts
if one reviews the whole course of events during the Non-co-operation movement. First, the Congress movement became a really mass movement; national awakening had not only penetrated to the people at large, but also made them active participants in the struggle for freedom. Secondly, the Indian National Congress was, almost overnight, turned into a genuine revolutionary organization. It was no longer a deliberative assembly, but an organized fighting party. Its weapons were different, but its aims, objects and animating spirit closely resembled those of the militant nationalism of the early years of the country. But there were two significant differences. It did not work in secret, and it was widely accepted almost all over India as the only party which could achieve the independence of the country. Henceforth the national energy was directed to a revolutionary programme, - non-violent, if possible, violent, if need be.

The Moplah rebellion took place in August, 1921, in the Malabar District. The main brunt of Moplah ferocity was borne, not by Government, but by the Hindus.

The Muslim and Congress leaders treated the Moplah outrage with levity, although the Moplah outrages for
exceeded in enormity those perpetrated during the Martial Law in the Punjab. The Hindu leaders showed callous attitude, and the Muslim leaders condoned the conduct of the Moplahs.

The Moplah outrage was so serious and it exposed a situation so lucidly that the leaders should have thought of Hindu-Muslim unity more deeply and found out ways by all means. The experience should have made them wiser. The leaders only temporarily eased the tension by treating the Moplah outrage with levity. This was an alarming phenomenon which pronounced caution and its pronunciation should not have been ignored. The leaders should have commenced labouring with greater magnanimity and determination to eradicate the distrust or enmity that existed between the two communities altogether. To exterminate the distrust was as important as the country's freedom; probably, the former was more important than the latter, for it had bearing on the post-freedom India. One man and only one, and that man was the Mahatma, knew this and none else. Tilak's brain caught the necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity but, probably, his heart was not fully for it; for, had it been so, he would not have started Shivaji & Ganapati festivals.
Two offshoots of Non-co-operation movement were the Nagpur Flag Satyagraha and the Bardoli No-Tax Satyagraha.

At Nagpur, on May 1, 1923, the police authorities objected to a procession carrying the National Flag, and to prohibit it promulgated section 144. The volunteers, however, disobeyed the order and were arrested and sentenced. The Movement received the blessings of the All-India Congress Committee and soon developed into an All-India Movement. Volunteers poured in from different parts of India. The Movement was guided and inspired by Vithalbhai Patel and Vallabhbhai Patel. Seth Jammalal Bajaj was also arrested in connection with it. The Government, however, ceased opposition and the matter subsided.

Bardoli No-Tax Satyagraha took place in 1928. It has already been mentioned that in 1922 Gandhi decided to launch a mass Civil Disobedience Movement in the 'taluk' of Bardoli; and he abandoned the project in view of the tragic happenings at Chauri Chaura. Bardoli launched the no-tax campaign in 1928, and it arose out of the periodical revision of assessment of the land revenue in Bombay. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was the leader of this movement. The Sardar called meetings which were attended by men, women and children who
took pledge to remain non-violent, to suffer to the utmost, and cheerfully lose everything they possessed. A new spirit pervaded the whole taluk; it was almost converted into a military camp, where fighting, sacrifice, and defiance were on the lips of everyone.

The Government tried its best to compel payment; it tried flattery, bribery, threats, fines, imprisonment, forfeiture and lathi charges. It also attempted to divide the communities. Property on a large scale was attached and sold to outsiders, as no local buyer came forward. They attached hundreds of acres of land and sold it by auction. Pathans were employed to threaten people and create an atmosphere of fear. But all this only infused more solidarity in the taluk. A strong social boycott was imposed on all Government representatives and against those who bought the attached property. But physical necessities were never denied to the opponents.

The whole of India sympathised with the struggle in Bardoli and looked with admiration on the heroes there. Women no less than men, took part in the struggle. Several members of the Legislature resigned as a protest against the repressive policy of the Government. The matter was also discussed in the
Parliament. The peasants stood firm and non-violent. After five and a half months' struggle, the Government yielded and the Governor appointed a Committee of Inquiry. All property that had been attached was restored, and village officers who had resigned were reinstated. The Committee found that the complaints of the peasants were substantially true and instead of 22 per cent. they recommended only 6 per cent. increase.

After the Non-co-operation movement was brought to an end in February, 1922, the leaders set their heads together to devise the programme of work for the future. The country had no enthusiasm for the constructive programme chalked out as a substitute, and the arrest of Gandhi left no hope for the revival of the old fighting programme. Some of the Congress leaders therefore hit upon the idea of carrying on the fight inside the legislatures set up by the Government of India Act, 1919. This idea struck C.R. Das shortly after the Bardoli resolution and when he was in the Alipur Central Jail.

Pro-changers and No-changers But there were others who opposed council entry. Soon a severe conflict between the pro-changers (swarajists) and the no-chargers took place. The Swarajists, however, gained the ground.

Now the question is whether an internal strife
like this increases or decreases the force of nationalism. It has already been discussed that thesis and anti-thesis are the two legs of progress. Professor Harold Laski remarks that those who speak of the right and left wings are apt to forget the flight of the bird. Only apparently it handicapped the growth of nationalism; the strife virtually added vitality to Indian nationalism. It was a strife between ideals, not between an ideal and its destruction.

Gandhi was released early in 1924. He devoted his whole energy to the constructive programme. He directed his main attention to the uplift of Harijans (untouchables) and promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity. His sincere efforts and personal example removed the thousand-year-old inertia of the Hindu society. A genuine movement to improve the condition of lower classes and abolish untouchability stirred the whole country. No other single man had ever done so much to wash off this black stain from the Hindu Community, and the movement made remarkable progress.

But the attempt for Hindu-Muslim unity did not meet with success. The old feud between the two communities appeared again with renewed vigour, after the brief interlude
of Non-co-operation-cum-Khilafat movement.

Gandhi in his fight for freedom adopted non-violent non-co-operation as his weapon. But soon he discovered that, however subtle and powerful might be the means, a country cannot really progress unless all of its people have among themselves a strong unity. The Hindu-Muslim feuds and the problem of untouchability were two great drawbacks. Gandhi was sure that progress was impossible unless these two drawbacks were removed. He realized that the freedom movement would be a sham if due attention was not paid to the removal of them. He also realized that the previous movements proved imperfect because of the fact that leaders had failed to notice the seriousness of these drawbacks. He saw that the Indian "nation" would certainly fail to develop properly if differences continued to exist between the Hindus and Muslims and between the upper caste and lower caste Hindus. His vision was correct. So we see that towards the end he devoted all his attention and energy to the uplift of Harijans and promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity. Virtually, the deep-rooted differences between the Hindus and the Muslims led to the development of the concept of two nations instead of one. And to speak the truth, the Hindus, as it were, the
Hindu leaders and thinkers were solely responsible by their activities at the outset for the differences getting roots. Gandhi conceived Indian "nation" as one, unified, free, peaceful and progressive nation. He, therefore, craved for unity at all costs. Freedom was being delayed for want of Hindu-Muslim unity; Hindu-Muslim unity would not only make Indian nationalism stronger but also make the struggle of the Hindus for freedom unhindered. To Gandhi the striving after unity latterly became a matter of much greater importance than the fight for freedom. His followers could hardly grasp his aim; they could only think of freedom. Even freedom of a country without its nation properly built is not complete. In disgust at the reactionary Muslims, Nehru and Sardar Patel occasionally spoke which went contrary to Gandhi's aim. Gandhi was a mountain of patience in his attempt to bring about Hindu-Muslim unity. It is, however, true that it was too late and so Gandhi's attempt showed little success.

The elections were held in November 1923. In the Central Legislative Assembly, the Swarajists numbered 48, and there was a group, under the leadership of Jinnah, consisting of 24 members who called themselves Independent. The Swarajists carried on negotiations with the Independents and a coalition
was formed that went by the name of the Nationalist Party. The Joint party achieved remarkable success for some time. But the independents soon changed their mind and were not prepared to join the Swarajists in the policy of obstruction to the full extent. In the September session (1924) of the Legislative Assembly the Independent members were organized into a regular party under the leadership of Jinnah.

The Moderate or National Liberal Party was completely routed at the election held in November 1923. There were two Hindu organizations - the Hindu Mahasabha and the All India non-Brahmin Federation. The non-Brahmins formed the Ministry in Madras and successfully carried on the administration. The Hindu Mahasabha was started as an organization for social reforms; but gradually it was diverted into politics in order to safeguard the interests of the Hindus as against Muslims and combat the tendency of the Hindu leaders to appease the Muslims by surrendering the legitimate right of the Hindus. They held very strong views against the communal electorate and weightage given to the Muslims. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the great representative of the Hindu Community, and the ablest spokesman of the Mahasabha referred to its activity in another direction which irritated the Muslims.
and gave rise to great misgivings even in the mind of the Hindu leaders. "For centuries," said Malaviya, "Muhammadans had been converting Hindus, and the Majority of the Muslims of India were converts. Numerous Christian missions were also carrying on a campaign of proselytisation. Therefore the question of having a Hindu Mission for proselytisation had become a very pressing necessity in the situation created in this country by the activities of Muslims and Christian Missions." (9)

The new organisations, the non-Brahmin federation and the Hindu Mahasabha, all showed sectarianism and therefore forebode conflict. Although it is true that in Madras the Brahmins hated the non-Brahmins, it appears to be useless to form a non-Brahmin federation for counteraction. Nationalism requires natural unity. The creation of the Hindu Mahasabha made a clear prospect of permanent antagonism between the Hindus and the Muslims. When the country needed true, unconditional and whole-hearted promise of friendliness and co-operation from the non-Muslims, both leaders and general people, to establish wider and deeper unity and stronger nationalism, to completely
expunge the doubts and fears of the Muslims who were in an appreciable minority, the establishment of the Militant Mahasabha and the defiant utterance by a notable leader of the time, Malviya, were really disheartening. Although the Mahatma's sincere attempt at unity was constantly there, the other leaders never spoke or acted in such a way as to relieve the Muslims of their fears and doubts.

The beginning of the Communist Party may also be traced to this period. The influence of Communist idea made itself felt in India shortly after the Russian Revolution in 1918. Attempts were made to organize a Communist Party in India by M.N.Roy and others since 1921. But no conspicuous success attended their efforts till the Communist Party of Great Britain took up the matter and sent some agents to India in 1926.

The Turkish Government of Kemal Pasha deposed the Sultan, abolished the institution of the Caliphate, and declared Turkey a secular State in March, 1924. Thus, the All-India Khilafat Committee became dead. The All-India Muslim League again entered the political field.
On September 9, 1924, an outbreak occurred at Kohat in N.W.F.P., a predominantly Muslim area. The Muslims looted and burnt all the shops of the Hindus. On 10th the Muslims committed wholesale plunder and incendiaryism. There was a grave danger of wholesale slaughter of the Hindus. The Deputy Commissioner and Brigade Commander were unable to prevent the raid and removed the Hindus to the cantonment. Later on the Hindus removed to Rawalpindi.

The tragedy formed a subject of discussion in the Indian National Congress, the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha. The manner in which it was treated throws interesting light on the way in which communal question was looked at by different sections of Indians. Motilal Nehru moved a resolution on the subject in the Congress; he began by saying that in Kohat a tragedy had taken place the like of which was not known in India for many years. He scrupulously avoided casting any blame on any party. He merely observed that that was not the time for them to apportion the blame upon the parties concerned. The Congress resolution deplored the incident. It urged the Mohammedans of Kohat to assure their Hindu brethren of full protection of their lives and property and invite them to return. The resolution avoided the refugees not to return except upon any such invitation and asked everybody to suspend judgement till a proper enquiry was made.
The Muslim League said that the All-India Muslim League felt it to be its duty to place on record that the sufferings of Kohat Hindus were not unprovoked, but that on the contrary the facts brought to light made it clear that gross provocation was offered to the religious sentiments of the Mohammedans and the Hindus were the first to resort to violence.

The Hindu Mahasabha expressed grief at the loss sustained by Hindus and Muslims in life and property, the burning of about 473 houses and shops, the desecration or destruction of many temples or Gurudwaras which compelled the entire Hindu and Sikh population to leave Kohat to seek shelter in Rawalpindi and other places in the Punjab.

Under the inspiration of C.R. Das the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee approved of a Hindu-Muslim Pact
in respect of Bengal. The main provisions of this Pact were as follows:

1) Representation in the Legislative Council on the population basis with separate electorates. 2) Representation to local bodies to be in the proportion of 60 to 40 in every district — 60 to the community which is in the majority and 40 to the community which is in the minority. 3) 55% of the Government posts should go to the Muslims. 4) No music before the mosque should be allowed. 5) There should be no interference with cow-killing for religious sacrifices, but the cow should be killed in such a manner as not to wound the religious feeling of the Hindus.

The Bengal Pact received severe criticism. The Pact was strongly opposed in the Delhi session of the Congress.

But the Pact was really a very wise step. India badly needed the confidence of the Muslims for her quicker march towards freedom. The delay might create a worse situation. The prime necessity was of hastening the departure of the British by winning over the Muslims at all costs. It was a danger for the leaders to keep the bulk of the Muslims alienated; it not only delayed independence, it might create despondent complicacies in future.
The Bengal Pact was strongly opposed in the Delhi session of the Congress. The effect of opposition was equally hurtful.

C.R. Das died at Darjeeling on June 16, 1925. His dead body was brought to Calcutta and cremated at Keoratala. There was a huge funeral procession on this occasion.

It has already been pointed that a huge gathering in any political meeting or a huge mourning procession after the death of a popular political leader indicates the progress of political consciousness, of devotion and of nationalism.

The Hindu-Muslim relations began to grow worse in 1925 and 1926. About sixteen communal riots occurred in 1925. The most serious riots occurred at Delhi, Aligarh, Arvi(C.P) and Sholapur. In Calcutta one of the worst communal riots broke out on 2 April, 1926, over the question of music before the mosque.

Every year witnessed communal rioting on an extensive, and, in fact, on an increasing scale.

The riots were not confined to restricted area. Almost every Province was more or less affected by it. Further, the
storm centres had a tendency to shift from the larger to smaller towns and then to countryside.

The policy of 'Divide and Rule' guided the British officials. Distinct partiality was shown by the British officials to the Muslims as against the Hindus. Lord Oliver, shortly after he ceased to be the Secretary of State for India, made the following comments: "But there are other causes of the increasing faction fighting. No one with close acquaintance of Indian affairs will be prepared to deny that on the whole there is a predominant bias in British officialism in India in favour of the Moslem community, partly on the ground of closer sympathy, but more largely as a makeweight against Hindu Nationalism."

Gandhi suspended Civil Disobedience and Non-co-operation movement in 1922, and there was a rest in the country; but this rest was removed by an action of the British Government, namely the appointment of Simon Commission in 1928.

The Government of India Act, 1919, contained a provision that at the end of ten years after its passing the working of the Reforms should be inquired by a Commission with a view to determining what further action should be taken.
to extend, modify or restrict the degree of responsible government then existing. Several attempts were made by Indian leaders to accelerate the pace of political progress by revision of the Reforms at an earlier date. But the demand was steadily refused. Suddenly on November 8, 1927, the British Prime Minister announced the decision of the British Cabinet to constitute the Commission immediately. The British House of Commons would expire in 1929, and there was a probability that the new election would return the Labour Party to power. It was held that a Labour Government would be more sympathetic to Indian demands. It was, therefore, considered safer to appoint the Commission without delay and forestall the Labour Government. Srinivas Iyenger, the President of the Congress said that when a Commission was wanted the British Government would not give it; but they would impose upon the Indian people a commission which was not wanted and when it was not wanted.

Further, the British Prime Minister announced at the same time that the Commission would be composed of seven British members of the Parliament including Sir John Simon, the Chairman. The Commission had no Indian member. The
announcement was received with profound disappointment and righteous indignation by all political leaders in India, irrespective of their party affiliations, and they unanimously decided to boycott the Commission. Never before, within a living memory, did the Indian political leaders hold a common view on such an important political issue.

Whenever the English favoured a sect or a party, the other parties or sects in India, as a natural result, moved away from the Government. But when the Government ignored all the parties and sects, India raised a unanimous cry against the British and could show undivided nationalism.

The congress claimed that the Indians were entitled to determine their own Constitution either by a Round Table Conference or by a convention Parliament. The claim was negatived by the appointment of the Commission. That was also the point of view of all the Indian political parties.

Secondly, the inquiry into fitness for Swaraj at the time when the firm claim for Swaraj was there was considered irritating. The deliberate exclusion of the Indians from the Commission was also considered an affront to Indian self-respect.

All the political parties adopted the proposal of
boycotting the Simon Commission. To make it effective the Indian National Congress suggested some practical measures. These included (1) mass demonstrations all over India on the day the members of the Commission set foot in this country, and similar demonstrations in every city on the day it was visited by them; (2) refusal of legislatures to elect their own Committees to co-operate with the Commission or helping their inquiry in any way; (3) rejection of the demand for grant in connection with the Commission, and (4) social boycott of the members of the Commission.

The boycott was made a great success. February 3, 1928, was the day of arrival of the Commission in Bombay. Complete hartal was observed in all important towns in India. Huge demonstrations marched in processions waving black flags and carrying banners with the words, "Go back, Simon." Numerous public meetings of protest were held on that day. The protest held at Bombay was the most memorable. Over fifty thousand people assembled and political leaders of different parties strongly condemned the action of the British Cabinet.

On February 16, 1928, Lala Lajpat Rai moved a resolution in the Assembly to the effect that the Assembly would have
nothing to do with the scheme of the Commission at any stage and in any form. The resolution was supported by an overwhelming majority of elected members and was passed amid cries of Bande Mataram. But the Council of State elected representatives to participate in the Joint Conference. The Government also succeeded in the various Provincial Councils with the help of the official votes in constituting Committees to co-operate with the Commission. The Nationalist members in each Council strongly opposed the motion for the appointment of Committees; they walked out and took no part in any further proceedings in connection with these committees.

The Simon Commission induced the Indian leaders to think seriously about formulating a scheme of Indian Constitution acceptable to all parties. This feeling was quickened by a challenge of Lord Birkenhead to the Swarajist party to produce a constitution which would carry behind it a fair measure of general agreement among the people of India. The Indian National Congress took up the question in its Madras session in 1927. It passed a resolution authorizing the Working Committee to draft a Swaraj constitution for India, and to place the same for consideration and approval before
a special Convention to be convened in Delhi consisting of all the All-India Congress Committee and the leaders and representatives of other organizations. The All India Liberal Federation and the Muslim League approved of the idea.

The Conference held its first meeting on 12 February, 1928, at Delhi under the Chairmanship of Dr. M.A. Ansari. Many of the organizations sent representatives to the Conference. Although many hurdles chiefly created by the difference between Hindu and Muslim points of view had to be crossed, the All-Parties Conference, which met at Lucknow from 28 to 31 August, 1928, accepted the very detailed recommendations of a Committee appointed by it under the Chairmanship of Pandit Motilal Nehru.

But this unanimity did not last long. The All-Parties' convention met in Calcutta on 22 December, 1928. The Muslims made new demands, and it was now for the first time that Muhammad Ali Jinnah emerged as the leader of the community. When the constitution drawn up by the Nehru Committee came up for discussion, Jinnah, on behalf of the Muslim League suggested three amendments. The amendments of Jinnah were lost and he left the Convention in protest.
The Sikhs also withdrew their support next day and the Convention was adjourned sine die.

Three of the amendments put forth by Jinnah on behalf of the Muslim League are that (a) the Muslims should have one-third representation on the Central Legislature, (b) in the event of adult suffrage not being granted, the Punjab and Bengal Legislatures should have Muslim representation on the population basis for ten years, (c) residuary powers should be vested in the Provinces and not in the centre.

It is evident that the amendments put forth by Jinnah were not entirely unreasonable. But the Congress did not yield. The Congress had almost till the end the deep-seated idea that it represented all the people of India including the Muslims and that no existence of a distinct party of the Muslims should be recognized. But in fact the bulk of the Muslims were antagonistic to the Congress and reactionary. The Congress should have foreseen the future growth of the Muslim reactionaries from the developments that were then taking place. The amendments put forth by Jinnah were nothing extraordinary. If the Congress had accepted them then and other subsequent proposals in a friendly attitude, the Muslims would have found few chances of being rival and antagonistic. The Partition of India would not have taken place, and no need of allowing the Muslims a separate homeland would have arisen at a later time if the Muslim proposals
had then been friendly entertained. The number of the Muslims was great, but much greater was the number of the Hindus all over India, and so the Hindus should have no apprehension in granting concessions to the Muslims. But the Muslims were a strong minority, and could oppose and undo what the Congress did for freedom, and so there was a great necessity of winning over the Muslims. To hasten the departure of the British at all costs should have been the sole aim of the Congress. The nationalist Muslims who were of wider outlook in the Congress would hardly have grown dissatisfied if the Congress had been lenient towards the League.

Jinnah now joined the more reactionary section of the Muslims led by Aga Khan and Muhammad Safi. An All-Parties' Conference of the Muslims was held in Delhi on January 1, 1929. The Conference passed a long resolution supporting the separate electorate as existing at the time.

It should, however, be remembered that eminent Muslim leaders like Dr. Ansari, Sir Ali Imam, the Maharaja of Mahmudabad and many others approved of the Nehru Constitution and the scheme for communal representation adopted in it.
Discussions and criticisms followed the publication of the Nehru Constitution. On the question of immediate grant of Responsible Government, the whole of India stood united. The younger section demurred and asked for complete independence, though the Nehru Constitution fully provided for the government of Indians, by the Indians, and for the Indians.

However, the sentiment of complete independence gradually gained ground. The Indian National Congress had declared independence is India's goal in the Madras session in 1927, and since then it was reaffirmed in the Provincial Conferences of the Punjab, Delhi and U.P. A very interesting incident may be cited here. When the question was being discussed by the U.P. Muslim All-Parties' Conference held at Cawnpur in November, 1928, and when some members opposed the goal of independence, the women delegates, from behind the Purdah, sent a written statement to the President saying that if men had not the courage to fight for national independence, they would come out of Purdah and take their place in the struggle for independence. This had the desired effect. The resolution declaring independence as goal was passed. The younger section led by Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Bose.
organized an Independence League. Nehru and Bose carried on propaganda in favour of independence.

There was a nation-wide sentiment for independence. This sentiment also found expression in the annual session of the Indian National Congress held in Calcutta in December, 1928. Gandhi, by way of compromise, suggested that the Dominion Status be accepted provided the British Parliament accepts the Nehru Constitution in its entirety within a year. In the event of its non-acceptance by December 31, 1929, the Congress will organize a campaign of non-violent Non-co-operation by advising the country to refuse taxation and in such manner as may be decided upon.

Sudden revival of revolutionary activity. Lala Lajpat Rai was severely struck by the Police on 30 October, 1928, while leading an anti-Simon demonstration at Lahore. His death on 17 November was generally believed to be due to the blow he received. The Assistant Superintendent, Mr. Saunders was assassinated at Lahore. During a sitting a bomb was thrown in the Assembly Hall at Delhi; two young men, Bhagat Singh and Batakeswar Dutt, were arrested for the crime. All over India a large number of young men were also arrested, and an All-
India Conspiracy Case was started at Lahore about the middle of 1929. Bhagat Singh was a leader of the Youth movement in the Punjab. The fearless and defiant attitude shown by him and his comrades during their trial made a deep impression on the public. Bhagat Singh and other prisoners resorted to hunger strike as a protest against their treatment in prison. There was an intense agitation throughout India when their condition became serious. All these were effects of awakened nationalism. All over the country intense Press Campaign, meetings and demonstrations were held demanding humane treatment of political prisoners. Ultimately all the hunger-strikers agreed to take food except Jatin Das who died on September 13, 1929. The news of his death produced all over India a wave of intensive grief and commotion. His dead body was removed from Lahore to Calcutta for cremation. Thousands assembled at every Railway Station to pay their homage. A very touching message was received from the family of Terence Mo Swiney, the Irish revolutionary, who met his death under similar conditions. The message ran: "Family of Terence Mo Swiney have heard with grief and pride of the death of Jatin Das. Freedom
The death of Jatin Das is also a landmark in the history of Indian nationalism.

The sacrifice of Jatin Das was not in vain, for even the Government was moved for the time being and promised to revise the regulations about political prisoners.

The death of Jatin Das also gave a fillip to the Youth movement. Throughout 1929, Youth and Student organisations grew up all over India and Conferences were held at Calcutta, Poona, Ahmedabad, Lahore, Nagpur, Amraoti, and several places in Madras. In December, 1929, an All-India Congress of students was held at Lahore; it was presided over by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.

These activities show the growth of the concept of nation. The students have now become more politically conscious and more students have been alert.

Also, throughout the year 1929, there continued widespread unrest in the labour world resulting in numerous strikes, mostly organized by the Communist Party of India.

In a tense atmosphere the Congress met at Lahore in December, 1929. It declared that the word 'Swaraj' would mean
complete Independence. Till that time, 'Swaraj' could also mean Dominion Status. In this session it was declared that all Congressmen should henceforth devote their exclusive attention to the attainment of Complete Independence for India. The Congress also resolved upon complete boycott of the Central and Provincial Legislatures. The Congress appealed to the nation to prosecute the constructive programme of the Congress. The All-India Congress Committee was authorized, whenever it deemed fit, to launch upon a programme of Civil Disobedience, including non-payment of taxes, in selected areas or otherwise.

With the growth of the concept of nation, political enterprises increase and people are emboldened.

In order to hold up the ideal of independence before the nation the Working Committee of the Congress decided that 26th of January should be observed all over India as the Purna Swaraj Day, i.e., day of full independence.

The country was eager with excitement over the Civil Disobedience movement decided upon by the Congress Working Committee.

Civil Disobedience inaugurated by Gandhi's march to Dandi for making salt.

On March 12, 1930, Gandhi left the Sabarmati Asharam on foot with 79 male
and female members and reached the sea at Dandi on April 5. It was a triumphal progress. On April 6, Gandhi and his party dipped into the sea-water, returned to the beach and picked up some salt left by the waves. The slow march over 241 miles in 24 days gave publicity to the world that it was a deliberate act of defiance to the mighty British Government. It made a profound appeal to all — both leaders and masses. It was a signal to the nation. The slow march on foot from village to village was an automatic and intensive propaganda; it roused the entire countryside to a realistic sense of the coming struggle for Swaraj contemplated by the Congress. A wide publicity was given in the press to every detail of the march, the story of the 'Pilgrim's journey to Dandi' worked up the feelings of the country as a whole, such as nothing else could.

Salt laws were broken in many places. Salt was made in pans in the cities, and mass arrests and other repressions followed. Sixty thousand political prisoners were put in jails. Indians, however, remained non-violent despite beatings, kicks and arrests.

J. M. Sen Gupta, the Mayor of Calcutta, openly read seditions literature in a public meeting, and thus defied the
law of sedition.

In Gujarat, U.P., and Midnapur District in Bengal a campaign for non-payment of taxes and land-revenue was started. In the North-West Frontier Province, the red shirt volunteers, organized by Frontier Gandhi, Abdul Gaffar Khan, followed, in a non-violent manner, an intense anti-government movement in various ways including non-payment of taxes.

Gandhi announced his intention of raiding the salt depot of Dharsana in Surat District. Gandhi, as usual, communicated his decision to the Viceroy and again requested him to remove the salt tax and the prohibition on private salt-making, otherwise he would set out for Dharsana with his followers and demand possession of Salt Works. But before he set out for Dharsana, he was arrested on May 4, 1930, and was put into prison. Abbas Tyabji took up Gandhi's place as leader of the Salt Satyagrahis. He was also arrested.

Sarojini Naidu directed the raid on May 21. 2500 volunteers took part in it. Mrs. Naidu was arrested. On Wadala Salt Depot a series of raids were made. On the 1st June nearly 15,000 persons participated in the great mass action at Wadala. Many other salt raids took place. Everywhere the
volunteers were mercilessly beaten and arrested in large numbers. Imam Saheb, Pyarelal and Manilal Gandhi had already been arrested. Most of the leaders including Jawaharlal Nehru were in prison.

Gandhi made a special appeal on April 10, 1930, to the women of India to take up the work of picketing and spinning, and the effect was almost miraculous. Thousands of women responded. Even those of orthodox and aristocratic families offered themselves for arrest and imprisonment. In Delhi alone 1600 women were imprisoned. Foreign tourists like H. N. Brailsford and G. Glocombe observed that if the Civil Disobedience movement had accomplished nothing else but the emancipation of the women of India, it would have fully justified itself. The awakening of women added to the number of civil resisters to a considerable extent. It also redoubled the energy and activities of the men and spurred them on to greater efforts and sacrifices for the country.

On August 1930, Ramananda Chatterjee, the great journalist, wrote: "The active support which women have given to the cause has surprised many. In the manufacturing and hawking of contraband salt, the picketing of liquor shops and foreign cloth shops, the distributing of propaganda
for the boycott of foreign cigarettes and cloth, the holding of meetings and processions for popularising the cause and the resisting of the attempts by the police to snatch away contraband salt and to destroy the pans for manufacturing salt— in all these activities women were taking an enthusiastic part. It is not merely the progressive section of Indian women from which the Mahatma has received recruits and supporters. Even women in villages, who belong to an older world, so to say, have been enthusiastic in their adherence to the movement. For instance, one such old world village mother has sent four out of her five sons to join it, to face imprisonment and death if need be. And she herself and her daughters have become Satyagrahis—civil resisters.

"The students have been roused. All the teachers and students of Mr. Gandhi's College have joined the movement. There have been a number of students' strikes on account of the unsympathetic attitude of the principals of some government-recognized institutions. Many students and other young men have already broken the salt law and gone to jail....

"The labouring people have grievances of their own. Since they are poor the salt tax hits them hard. They are
aware of Mr. Gandhi's sympathy for the poor and revere him for his saintliness and ascetic life. There is no question, therefore, that they are with him .... " (10)

On 21st January, 1931, the Working Committee of the Congress gave a summary of the brutal measures: "The Committee takes this opportunity to record its high appreciation of the courage and firmness with which the men and women and even the children of the country have faced Government persecution that is accountable for the imprisonment of about 75 thousand innocent men and women, numerous indiscriminate and brutal lathi-charges, various forms of torture even of those in custody, firing resulting in the maiming and deaths of hundreds of people, looting of property, burning of houses and marching of moving columns of armed Police and 'sawars' and British soldiers in several rural parts, depriving people of the right of public speech and association by prohibiting meetings and processions and declaring Congress and allied associations unlawful, forfeiting their movables and occupying their houses and offices." (11)

In making the concept of nation common suffering is a cogent factor.
In N.W.F.P. a company of Garwali soldiers refused to open fire on an unarmed peaceful crowd. They were disarmed and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, ranging from 10 to 14 years.

In celebration of the anniversary of Tilak's death a procession was taken out in Bombay on 31 July, 1930. When an order was served prohibiting it, the vast crowd of thousands squatted on the road. In spite of heavy rain, the processionists sat there thought the night. A few picked men and a hundred ladies were arrested in the morning and lathi-charge was made on the unarmed crowd. The arrested persons included Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, V.J. Patel, Srimati Kamala Nehru (wife of Jawaharlal Nehru), Srimati Mani Ben and Srimati Amrit Kaur.

Bengal yielded the largest number of prisoners in the country. The measure of boycott of British cloth was highest in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Gujarat played unique part in the drama of national emancipation. U.P. was the only Province where a general No-tax campaign was inaugurated. Both the zemindars and the tenants were called upon to withhold, in October, 1930, payment of rent and revenue. The Punjab pulled its weight along with the rest. The whole-hearted adoption of non-violence by the N.W.F. Province was no less a moral than a
political gain. In Bihar, the Chowkidari tax was withheld in large areas, and the Province suffered to the full from the imposition of Punitive Police and confiscation of large properties. In the G.P. Forest Satyagraha was successfully launched and continued, in spite of heavy fines and Police excesses. Karnataka organized a No-tax campaign which was highly creditable to the Province.

More than 800 families participated in the No-tax Campaign in the Kanara District. In the Siddapur and Ankola Talukas there were about 800 convictions including those of 100 ladies.

In Kerala the banner of Civil disobedience was kept steadily till the last day of the movement. Assam responded splendidly to the call of the Congress.

In Bengal Midnapur was specially unfortunate in the extent of repression. House-holders were imprisoned both in Bengal and in Andhra for giving shelter, food, or water to Congress volunteers, or volunteers who had been beaten and were lying helpless.

The Police entered college buildings and belaboured the students sitting in class-rooms. In Barisal, 500 persons
injured in a lathi-charge on one day. In Tamluk, the police were said to set fire to the property of Satyagrahis and their sympathisers.

On the 31st December, 1931, Subhas Babu while marching in a procession was severely beaten. He had returned from jail shortly before, after serving his term of a year for sedition.

Brutal and cowardly assaults were made on helpless prisoners in jails. Subhas Bose refers to an attack made on a number of distinguished persons including himself in April, 1930. Bose was in the front rank and was thrown down and remained unconscious for more than an hour.

A veiled Muslim lady-picketer was arrested at Ludhiana.

The First Round Table Conference was inaugurated by the King Emperor in London on November 12, 1930. However, the Conference produced little effect.

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact was signed on March 5, 1931. Gandhi saw the Viceroy on February 17, and the conversations dragged on from day to day. After a protracted negotiation, terms of settlement were drafted and Gandhi returned from the Viceregal Lodge at 2-30 A.M. on March 5. Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel and many other members did not fully approve
of the draft on one point or another, but they all ultimately gave in and unanimously approved of it. This pact, too, had little effect.

The effects of these political events may be apparently small, but their repercussions on the Indian mind and their contribution to the growth of national consciousness cannot be ignored. Expectation and frustration and excitement and criticism all added to national endeavour and urge. The Viceroy and Gandhi put their signatures on a treaty of peace, and thus put the Indian National Congress on a high pedestal. This increased the prestige and stature of the Congress. The British practically ceded to the Congress a status and authority to speak for political India, and admitted its right to be heard on all future negotiations. This was no small gain. British statesmen like Churchill fully realized that they had yielded grounds. The very fact that Gandhi, the half-naked seditions Fakir, ascended the steps of the Viceregal lodge, day after day, to carry on diplomatic negotiations with the Viceroy of India on behalf of the Congress made it clear to all that henceforth the British authority in India must take due cognizance of the great national organization which was fighting for India's
freedom. In spite of its failure to achieve the goal the Civil Disobedience movement had a great value and importance in India's struggle for Swaraj. It demonstrated the awakening of political consciousness among the masses to a degree undreamt of before. It also gave evidence of the high moral inspiration and unflinching courage, infused among the people by Gandhi, which give men strength to endure sufferings for the cause of the country. The Mahatma's call to the people for sufferings and sacrifice found a response in the hearts of men and women of India to a degree which ensured the success of India's struggle for freedom. It was no longer a question of whether, but when she would reach the goal. However one might deplore Gandhi's lack of wisdom and judgment in critical movements and inability to carry on diplomatic negotiations with the astute British politicians, there is a consensus of opinion that India must ever remember with reverent gratitude his solid contribution to the moral regeneration of India's fighters for freedom which was an inestimable asset in the impending struggle. The Civil Disobedience movement fully exposed the real nature of British rule in India in all its naked hideousness and lowered its moral prestige in the eyes of the whole world. The great poet Rabindranath said, it
was a great moral defeat for Europe, and Asia could now afford to look down on Europe where before she looked up.

The Second Round Table Conference opened on 7 September, 1931. Gandhi arrived in London on 12 September. He delivered many fine speeches, both in the Conference and outside the Conference elaborating his ideas of peace and goodwill, emphasising the unique position of the Indian National Congress as a national organization and not a party organization, explaining the need of a partnership between Britain and India as between two equal nations. He demanded that the Responsible Government must be established, immediately and in full, both at the Centre and in the Provinces. Gandhi returned to India on December 28, 1931.

The Government of India had been carrying on repression. Soon there was movement all over India. The Government made wholesale arrests of Congress workers. The Khan brothers, Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhi and Vallabhbhai Patel were all put into prison. Nearly ninety thousand men, women and children were convicted and sentenced. There was a reign of terror in 1932. Government measures were extremely repressive. Repressive ordinances, firing on crowds, raids and searches, mass arrests, beatings in lock-ups, shooting of detainees were
among the measures adopted by the Government to quell the movement.

In the Second Round Table Conference in London, Gandhi vehemently opposed the creation of a separate electorate for the Depressed Classes. He even rejected the proposal of Ambedkar to reserve a certain number of seats in the legislatures for them. In the Conference with reference to the proposal of separate electorate for the 'untouchable' he said: "If I was the only person to resist this thing, I will resist it with my life." In August 17, 1932, the Communal Award of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald was announced.

On August 18 Gandhi addressed a letter to the Premier. The letter was to the effect that he had resolved to commence fast unto death at noon on September 20, and it will cease if only the scheme is revised and a common electorate is restored.

Alarm and anxiety spread over the whole of India at the news of Gandhi's proposed fast unto death. Frantic appeals were made to him, but in vain. When the fast commenced, the whole country was stirred to its depth and the fast produced some commotion even in England. An appeal was made
over the signature of some influential persons for a special prayer throughout the country. September 20 was observed as a day of fasting and prayer. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya summoned a Conference. The Conference first met in Bombay and then at Poona. Dr. Ambedkar, the most prominent leader of the Depressed Classes, was induced to join it. After a prolonged negotiation, a settlement was arrived at on 25 September. Gandhi broke his fast on 26 September.

Henceforth Gandhi devoted his whole energy and attention to the question of untouchability and seemed to have lost interest in the political issue. The effect of Gandhi's action was that it diverted all attention from the actual fight, at least for the time being, when it was at its height. Pandit Nehru wrote that he felt annoyed with Gandhi for choosing a side issue for his final sacrifice. What would be the result on the freedom movement? Would not the larger issues fade into the background? Was this consistent with non-co-operation and civil disobedience? After so much sacrifice and brave endeavour, was their movement to tail off into something insignificant?

Nehru also felt angry with Gandhi at his religious and sentimental approach to a political question, and his frequent
references to God in connection with it.

But it is doubtful if Pandit Nehru was fully correct. In India politics devoid of religious or ethical appeal carried less weight, especially among the masses. It is also doubtful if non-violence could finally make the English magnanimous enough to grant India independence. Later on he saw that a non-violent movement regarding Goa could not bring about a success. The Indian army had to be sent there to solve a question which non-violence could not solve. It was not improbable that continuous non-violent movement would bring about exhaustion and depression as a result of repression by Government. Non-violent Civil Disobedience undoubtedly strengthened the country, but it is doubtful if it could bring the final result, freedom. Moreover, rest was needed to restore spirit and strength and for wider convulsion. Further, uniform progress required a careful and timely tackling of the question of untouchability. For integral nationalism and undivided strength the solving of the question of untouchability was really a great necessity. The new constitution of India after independence had to declare untouchability a crime. A movement based upon weak
foundation cannot last long. Pandit Nehru was in gusto to see the outward phase of the agitation, but Gandhi could see through the hidden defect and truly felt the necessity of its rectification.

Besides, Gandhi's fast was one of the factors that intensified the popular mind and was naturally one of the factors that largely contributed to Indian nationalism. People loved Gandhi dearly, and so his fast induced people to be ready for any amount of sacrifice Gandhi demanded.

The growth of the concept of Nation in India is a very slow process. Every event, the faintest factor helped its growth. Journals, newspapers, songs, poems, dramas and novels, meetings, speeches of the political leaders, repression by the Government, determination of the people, all slowly and steadily contributed to its growth. In India the concept of nation first took place in the educated persons here and there. With the spread of education it grew. It was the educated middle class that started nationalism in India. Then the students came, the masses and the women came. However, the land-holders of Bengal
made the initial start. The landholders' Society had a political colouring. Some of the signatories of the Appeal framed by Rammohan against the Press Ordinance of 1823 were landholders. Some leaders travelled over the country, gave speeches and taught the people to sacrifice for the country. Surendranath travelled over India and spoke to arouse nationalism. Tilak travelled extensively and spoke in simple arguments about the necessity of freedom. When Gandhi came from South Africa, to travel over India he made his first duty. The awakening of the masses owe largely to Tilak and Gandhi. We have seen that the gatherings at the political meetings became larger and larger, and the determination to sacrifice for the country became stronger and stronger. The sense of political unity among the Indians became deeper. The gathering at the procession with the dead body of Deshbandhu Chittaranjan is unparalleled. Deshbandhu sacrificed his all and himself for the country. All ways, violent or non-violent, helped the growth of the concept of nation. Jatin Das's fasting to death, Gandhi's fasting, all stirred the people and led the people to wider unity and stronger determination, and the concept of nation developed yet more.
In April 1930 the party and its effect of Surya Sen rose in revolution at Chittagong and inspired the people of India. Surya Sen and his friends fought with the English. The news of the Chittagong raid gave a fillip to the younger section of the revolutionaries who were already fired with enthusiasm to drive out the British from India. Recruits poured into the various revolutionary groups in a steady stream and these included women and young girls who henceforth are found assisting the terrorists as housekeepers, messengers, custodians of arms, and sometimes as comrades.

The advent of the female terrorists was another recent development. This was due to the fact that the women took an active part in picketing during the Civil Disobedience movement. 15 women were detained under the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Act.

After 1929 revolutionary activities spread in many of the Provinces of India. In U.P., the Punjab, Delhi, Bombay, Sindh, Central Provinces, Madras, Rajputana and in many other localities revolutionary activities were detected.

Then we come across the Government of India Act.
Ramananda Chatterjee, the famous journalist, wrote: “It is only the Governors who will have autonomy, so that it would be correct characterization of the Act to say: 'The Government of India Act, 1935, has provided for Gubernatorial Autonomy.'”

The Hindu-Muslim cleavage increased. Jinnah untiringly stressed the need of maintaining the unity and solidarity of the Muslims as a separate political and social unity.

There was the emergence of the new creeds of Socialism, particularly in its extreme form, Communism, in Europe. This new idea convulsed Europe. The idea had also great repercussion on India, particularly upon the younger generation. In the Congress session of 1934, the emergence of a Socialist left wing was clearly noticeable. There was a phenomenal awakening among the peasantry and the students and to some extent, among the workers.

A general election under the new Act was held in 1937. The election forced the Congress to come into close contact with the masses and this further aroused political consciousness among them.

The idea was slowly gaining ground among the Muslims.
that the Indian Muslims were entitled to full and free
development on the lines of their own culture and tradition
in their own Indian homeland. The high-priest of this new
doctrine was Muhammad Iqbal.

Jinnah became the permanent leader of the Muslim
League. The Muslim League made the final choice of the
most extreme proposal, namely, a separate State for the
Muslims.

The Muslim League seriously came out with its
theory of Two Nations in India late in 1938. The League had
started to assert that the Muslims in India were a separate
nation, and with equal emphasis the Hindu Mahasabha insisted
on the separated nationality of the Hindus. Presiding over the
Hindu Mahasabha session held at Ahmedabad in 1937 V.D.
Savarkar said: "India cannot be assumed to-day to be a
unitarian and homogeneous nation, but on the contrary there
are two nations in the main, the Hindus and Muslims in
India." (12) In October, 1938, M.A. Jinnah pointed
out that "no honest man who has studied the policy and
programme of the League can conscientiously and truthfully
say that it is anything but fully national and most
In December 1938, the Mahasabha passed a resolution declaring "that it is the only national organization in the country and that there is no other national politics than that of the Hindu Sabha". The claims of the Indian National Congress to be the national organization was challenged. The League said that the Congress was "a communal organization inimical to Muslim interests." The Mahasabha denounced Congressmen as "hурооріtеѕ" and guilty of "treachery to the Hindus." The leaders of the Congress were not unaware that there were rival currents in Indian nationalism. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in a letter written in May 1933, reviewed the non-co-operation movement of 1921 and pointed out that besides what he preferred to call real or Indian nationalism which embraced both Hindus and Muslims, there were at least two other nationalism: Hindu and Muslim. The strength of the 1921 movement lay in the fact that for a time the three separate strands ran parallel to one another. "The general Muslim outlook was thus one of Muslim nationalism or Muslim internationalism, and not of true nationalism. For the movement, the conflict between the two was not apparent." The three streams that had run parallel in 1919-21 began to flow wide apart in the thirties.
and achieved clearer articulation and became mutually exclusive. Fazlul Huq said that if Mohammed Bin Kasim, an eight-year-old lad with eighteen soldiers could conquer Sind, then surely nine crores of Muslims could conquer the whole of India. Lala Hardayal went further and said: "If Hindus want to protect themselves, they must conquer Afghanistan and the frontiers and convert them and all the mountain tribes." (17) The League and the Mahasabha showed mutually destructive attitudes. "The All-India Muslim League shall make every effort to make Urdu the universal language of India." (Resolution of the Lucknow session of the League, October, 1937). (18) The Hindu Mahasabha declared that Hindi (not Hindustani) which was based on Sanskrit vocabulary rightly deserved to be the National Language and Devanagari the National Script of Hindustan. (Resolution of the Nagpur session of the Hindu Mahasabha, December, 1938). The Sind Muslim League Conference in October, 1938 urged Muslims to wear Khadi and Swadeshi cloth manufactured by Muslim weaverers, encourage Muslim shop-keepers and secure employment for their co-religionists. The Mahasabha called upon the Hindus to purchase from Hindu shops only. (Resolution of the
Jinnah declared in 1937 that the Hindus where they were in a majority were attempting to force upon the Muslims 'Shree' lotus and 'Bande Mataram' as the national anthem and Hindi as the national language. As early as 1934 Pandit Malaviya had pointed out the danger that was implicit in the constitution of 1935 and particularly in the Communal Award.

He said: "At present we are living under one government, of course a foreign government, but what shall we get by means of this communal electorate? Not a government by the people, for the people and of the people but a government of one community over another. In the Punjab, it will be a Government by Muslims of Hindus, and in the United Provinces it will be a Government by Hindus of Muslims. It will not be a democracy. It will be a special kind of despotic Government. It will be tyranny of one community over another and it is this despotism which the communal Award seeks to instal." (17.)

The A.I.C.C. met in Bombay on August 7, 1942.

The All-India Congress Committee also sanctioned the starting of a mass struggle on non-violent lines on the widest possible scale under the leadership of Gandhi.
The Second World War began in 1939.

In August 1941, the 'Atlantic Charter' was issued. This was issued jointly by U. K. and U.S.A. as a statement of their war policy. The Charter declared, among other things, that U. K. and U.S.A. respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. The cause was heartily welcomed by all sections of Indians. But Churchill dispelled all hope and enthusiasm. On September 9, 1941, Churchill announced in the House of Commons that the Atlantic Charter had no application to India.

Singapore fell on February 15, 1942. Roosevelt, the President of U.S.A., urged upon Churchill to settle matters with India. The help of U.S.A. was then the only hope for the safety of Britain, and so Churchill could not ignore Roosevelt's advice. Still he wavered until the fall of Rangoon. Rangoon fell on March 7, 1942.

Cripps Mission. The despatch of Cripps Mission (March, 1942) was largely due to the pressure of Roosevelt. But by then India had a grown concept of nation and so Cripps's mission failed. The general feeling was expressed by the saying of Gandhi that the proposals brought by Cripps were a "post-dated cheque on a crashing bank".

After the failure of the Cripps Mission, there was a marked change in Gandhi's attitude. In an article in the Harijan on 19 April, 1942, he suggested that the safety and interest of
both Britain and India lay in orderly and timely British withdrawal from India. Gandhi wrote a series of articles elaborating his idea which was soon to crystallise into the 'Quit India' movement. On May 10, we wrote: "The time was come during the war, not after it, for the British and the Indians to be reconciled to complete separation from each other ... . I must devote the whole of my energy to the realisation of this supreme act. ... . The presence of the British in India is an invitation to Japan to invade India. Their withdrawal removes the bait. Assume, however, it does not; free India will be better able to cope with the invasion. Unadulterated non-co-operation will then have full sway." (12). On 24 May, he said: "Leave India in God's hands, in modern parlance, to anarchy, and that anarchy may lead to internecine warfare for a time or to unrestrained dacoities. From these a true India will rise in place of the false one we see." (13) He again said: "I have not asked the British to hand over India to the Congress or to the Hindus. Let them entrust India to God or in modern parlance to anarchy. Then all the parties will fight one another like dogs, or will, when real responsibility faces them, come to a reasonable agreement. I shall expect non-violence to arise out of that chaos." (14)

On 7 June Gandhi wrote: "I waited and waited until the country should develop the non-violent strength necessary to throw off the foreign yoke. But my attitude has now undergone a change. I feel that I cannot afford to wait. If I continue to wait I might have to wait till doomsday. For the preparation that I have prayed and worked for my never come, and in the meantime I may be enveloped.

(12), (13) & (14) P. 643: History of the Freedom Movement in India (Vol. III) - R. C. Majumdar
and overwhelmed by the flames that threaten all of us. That is why I have decided that even at certain risks which are obviously involved I must ask the people to resist the slavery." (14A)

The A.I.C.C. met in Bombay on August 7, 1942. The All-India Congress Committee also sanctioned the starting of a mass struggle on non-violent lines on the widest possible scale under the leadership of Gandhi.
The Committee put: "A time may come when it may not be possible to issue instructions or for instructions to reach our people, and when no Congress Committees can function. When this happens, every man and woman, who is participating in this movement must function for himself or herself within the four corners of the general instructions issued. Every Indian who desires freedom and strives for it must be his own guide urging him on along the hard road where there is no resting place and which leads ultimately to the independence and deliverance of India." (14)

After the A.I.C.C. had passed the 'Quit India' resolution at Bombay Gandhi said: "Every one of you should from this moment onwards consider yourself a free man or woman and act as if you are free .... I am not going to be satisfied with anything short of complete freedom.... We shall do or die. We shall either free India or die in the attempt."

Gandhi and other Congress leaders were removed to prison. As soon as the A.I.C.C. resolution was passed, the Government struck hard. The A.I.C.C. meeting terminated late at night on 8 August, 1942; but before the next day dawned the police
arrested Gandhi, Azad and all other eminent leaders of the Congress. Almost everyone who mattered in the Congress organization was in jail within a week. The All India Congress Committee and all the Provincial Congress Committees except in N.W.F.P. were declared unlawful organizations. The police seized the Congress headquarters at Allahabad, and the Congress funds were confiscated. Rigorous control was imposed over the publication of news and comments. Several newspapers, including the Harijan of Gandhi, had to suspend publication.

The sudden removal of all types of leaders left no responsible men to guide the mass movement announced by the A.I.C.C. But if the Government had thought that by this means they would be able to crush the movement they soon found out their mistake. They had made a profound miscalculation about the state of popular feeling. The news of the arrest of Violent popular demonstration spread over India. Gandhi and other Congress leaders led to a violent popular demonstration which soon spread over nearly the whole of India.

The cult of non-violence came to an end after Gandhi and his followers were removed to prison.

However, immediately after the arrest of Gandhi
and other leaders, peaceful and non-violent popular demonstrations in the shape of hartals and processions over nearly the whole of India took place. But the Government adopted stern measures to put them down. Not only the usual lathi-charge but firing was also resorted to in order to disperse processions. This led to violence on the part of the people. The Government soon had to face a revolt which was unarmed but most violent in character.

By 1942 Indian nationalism reached its highest point. It attained its required pervasiveness, and so the struggle of 1942 looked to no leader for its start and continuance. The great revolt of 1942 was really a soldiers' battle. The national struggle of 1942 may be termed the last fight for freedom in India against the British. Although Gandhi himself deplored the violent character of the outbreak of 1942, Sardar Patel paid a glowing tribute to it: "Never before had such widespread uprising happened in India in the history of the British Raj, as they did during the last three years. We are proud of the spirit in which the people reacted.... The leaders were all of a sudden kidnapped from the midst of the people and people acted on the spur of the moment.... Gandhiji
may not be there to guide the next struggle. Non-violence had taken no doubt deep roots, but one had to face the reality that violence was the order of the day in the whole world. It would be like the Devil quoting the scriptures, if the world outside criticized India if she switched over from non-violent to violent attempt to regain independence."(15)

The members of the Congress Working Committee were released on 15 June, 1945.

The Simla Conference opened on June 25, 1946. On July 14, 1945, the Conference met for the fifth and last time when the Viceroy (Wavell) announced that the Conference had failed. The failure of the Conference immensely strengthened now the position of the Muslim League, for it was clear that the Muslim League could make or mar the constitutional progress of India. No chance of a political career in future remained visible to a Muslim outside the League. The Muslim League became the only door through which the Indian Muslims could enter into positions. The wavering and middle-of-the-road Muslim politicians tended towards the Muslim League, and this was welcome to Jinnah.
Subhas Chandra Bose evaded the Police and left his house on 17 January, 1941. He first went to Germany. Bose's presence in Germany became well-known by the beginning of 1942. The Indian Community acclaimed him as its leader -Netaji- and greeted him with 'Jai Hind'.

The outbreak of war in the East in 1941 caused a great stirring among the Indians in South-East Asia. As by the time nationalism was completely afoot, those living in territories freed from European domination organized themselves into associations with the objects of contributing to the liberation of India. Such associations were established in towns and villages, and attained great popularity. The Indian Independence League was born out of these associations. A definite shape was given to it by Rash Behari Bose. It was mainly due to his inspiration and efforts that a Conference was held at Tokyo on 28-30 March, 1942, for the discussion of political issues. The Conference passed a resolution to form an Indian National Army under the direct command of Indian Officers for the liberation of India.

A Conference was held in Bangkok from 15th to 23rd June, 1942. It was attended by about 100 delegates. The delegates
came from Burma, Malaya, Thailand, Indo-China, Philippines, Japan, China, Borneo, Java, Sumatra, Hong Kong and Andamans. Rash Behari Bose was elected Chairman. The object of the League was the attainment of complete and immediate independence of India. One of the resolutions was the inviting Subhas Bose to Asia. Many mass meetings were also held in different localities, and there was tremendous enthusiasm among the Indians. The Conference at Bangkok was also attended by the representatives of the Indian soldiers captured by the Japanese. They had renounced their allegiance to the British and espoused the cause of their motherland. Among the high rank officers, Captain Mohan Singh first joined the I.N.A; then Shahnawaj was induced to join it. As a result of Mohan Singh's efforts, about 25,000 volunteers offered services before the Bangkok Conference. By the end of August, 1942, forty-thousand prisoners of war signed a pledge to join the Indian National Army under Mohan Singh. Also, a number of young men, without any previous military training, volunteered their services. A Military Camp was opened for training them.

The young men were impatient and thousands wanted to be trained. When they were refused either for their
unfitness or for want of accommodation, they abused the leaders and decided to form a Youth League.

Subhas Chandra Bose arrived at Singapore on July 2, 1943. On July 4, Rash Behari Bose handed over the leadership of the Indian Independence Movement in East Asia to the Young leader Subhas Bose and retired from active life. He died on January 21, 1945.

Subhas Bose was welcomed with tumultuous enthusiasm by an immense surging crowd who instinctively felt that at least the Man of destiny had come to lead them on as victors to liberate their own motherland. Subhas Bose took over the Presidentship of the Indian Independence League in the Presence of 5000 Indians who represented thirty lakhs of Indian nationals spread all over East Asia. He was hailed as Netaji as in Germany, and henceforth he was always referred to by this title. On 5 July, 1943, the formation of the Azad Hind Fauz was announced to the World. Netaji reviewed all the forces of the Fauz - the Indian National Army; he gave it the rousing war cry of "Chalo Delhi" (On to Delhi). He said: "Hark! the soil of India is calling. There, far in
the distance, across hills and dales and rivers the soil of India is calling."

Training Camps were opened for men as well as women. Commands, orders and instructions were given in Hindusthani. Women volunteered in large numbers and formed the Rani of Jhansi Regiment. Netaji addressed a series of public meetings all over Malaya and made regular Radio broadcasts addressed to Indians at home.

All the sick and physically unfit soldiers who were left behind at Taipang came to the station and lay down on rails in front of the railway engine and refused to allow the train to start unless they too were allowed to go to the front. It was only after an assurance that they would be sent up to join the regiment as soon as they recovered that they allowed the train to proceed.

The I.N.A. fought with the British with all its might. The soldiers had scanty ammunition, scanty dress. Sometimes they had no food. Sometimes they waded through knee-deep mud and jungles miles after miles. They had no medicine sometimes. Sometimes the tracks were washed away
by rain and supplies were cut. But the army of the British
was well-equipped; it had plenty of aeroplanes and threw
bombs on the I.N.A. frequently.

From Datelme the frontier of India was only 40
miles to the west, and the soldiers were very eager to
reach it. The nearest British post on the Indian side was
Mowdak. It was captured by a surprise attack during night
(May, 1944). The enemy fled in panic leaving large quantities
of arms, ammunitions and rations. The entry of the I.N.A. on
Indian territory was a most touching scene. Soldiers laid
themselves flat on the ground and passionately kissed the
sacred soil of their motherland. A flag-hoisting ceremony
was held amidst great rejoicing and singing of the Azad Hind
Fauz National Anthem.

The Japanese were satisfied of the military skill
and efficiency of the I.N.A. It is because of full-fledged
nationalism that miraculous victories on the part of the
I.N.A. were possible.

The I.N.A. troops, by the middle of June, suffered
much for lack of proper food and medicine. They had become
terribly weak. On the other hand, the British forces were
reinforced; so they took the offensive. A British Brigade,
3000 strong, supported by artillery and aeroplanes led the attack against 600 I.N.A. men, and captured all the commanding heights and strategic points around Mythun Khunon. The situation became extremely grave. The Commander of the I.N.A. Brigade issued orders to capture the heights at any cost. Showing unparalleled heroism, Lt. Mansukh Lall, commanding a platoon of 30 men, captured one of these heights. While leading his small and semi-starved force up the steep ridge, he was wounded 13 times; through exhaustion and loss of blood, he staggered and fell to the ground. His men wavered, but he rose to his feet and personally led the final assault on the height. The British forces retreated leaving the height in possession of the I.N.A.

The event recalls to our mind 'The Charge of the Light Brigade'. We perceive a distinct difference between what had happened during 1857-8 and what were happening now. Then big Indian regiments were defeated by a handful of British soldiers, whereas now small groups of Indian soldiers, ill-equipped and half-starved, were inflicting defeats upon well-equipped and stronger British forces.
This was the result of burning nationalism among the Indian soldiers. Solidarity is stronger than number, and solidarity is the outcome of nationalism.

The retreat from Kohima was disastrous. Shahnawas said that torrential rain had washed away all tracks and men had fresh tracks which soon became almost a knee-deep mass of mud in which many of the men got stuck and died there. At that time there was no transport of any type. Almost every man was suffering from dysentery and malaria and none had any strength left in him to help any one else. Men were eating horses which had been dead four days ago. There were hundreds of dead human bodies of Japanese and Indian soldiers lying on either side of the road. The British took advantage of the situation. They dropped leaflets from the aeroplanes. They held out all kinds of temptations to the weary I.N.A. men if they joined the British army. But these temptations produced no effect.

The temptations held out by the British failed to produce any effect, because men with true nationalism cannot
be allured. The I.N.A. men suffered, they died; yet they did not yield to the British allurements of comforts. They were disillusioned in the comforts of the slave. The British knew this. As they knew this, in their attempt to win the I.N.A. men over to their side they held out temptations instead of threats. That the British granted Independence to India was due to the fact that strong nationalism pervaded Indians, inside India and outside it. The strongest foe of the British was the wide-spread nationalism. The British noticed full-grown nationalism among the masses during the August movement, 1942, and they witnessed the power of nationalism among the Indian soldiers when they faced the I.N.A. India was a big country, and it was impossible for the British to dominate the country without the help of Indian soldiers. Britain had a much smaller population. But Indian soldiers surcharged with nationalism would be of no use to the British.

The Japanese retreated, and Rangoon, which was left in the hands of the I.N.A. after its evacuation by the Japanese, was occupied by the British early in May, 1945. The I.N.A. men were disarmed and made prisoners. Japan surrendered in the middle of August, 1945.
After the collapse of the Japanese army in Burma, about twenty-five thousand Indian soldiers who had joined the I.N.A. were rounded up. The military authorities brought charges against some of the officers. A Military Tribunal was constituted, and the first batch of three accused officers - a Hindu, a Muslim, and a Sikh - were put on public trial in the historic Red Fort at Delhi. So long the Indian public did not know anything of the I.N.A. But now the public came to regard them as a band of patriotic heroes fighting for the liberation of their motherland. A wave of sympathy for them swept the country. There was an I.N.A. Defence Fund. There were also I.N.A. Flag Days. The Congress took up the case of the accused. A panel of defence lawyers was set up. It included Bhulabhai Desai, Sir Taj Bahadur Sapru and Jawaharlal Nehru. The trial excited great interest throughout India. The Official evidence brought home to the Indians for the first time the magnitude of the I.N.A. organization set up by Subhas Bose and the heroic feats performed by the I.N.A men. Popular enthusiasm rose to the highest pitch when the Muslim League associated itself with the defence of the accused. There was great resentment at the persecution of the patriots. Wild
popular demonstrations were held all over the country. These were occasionally accompanied by popular outbreak of violence and the firing of the police. The Government quailed at this violent outburst of feeling. The accused were finally simply cashiered.

By the I.N.A. trial the British added fuel to Indian nationalism.

Abul Kalam Azad writes: "A most remarkable change had in the meantime come about in all the public services. During the war the Defence Forces had recruited a large proportion of young men who came from different provinces and different social classes. The earlier British practice of recruiting only from certain selected groups had been abandoned under the pressure of war needs. The young men who had now joined the Armed Forces had accepted the British at their word that after the war India would be free. This belief had moved them to make great efforts during the period of hostilities. Now that hostilities were over, they expected that India would become free.

"All the three branches of the Armed Forces - the Navy,
the Army and the Air Force - were inspired by a new spirit of patriotism. They were in fact so full of enthusiasm that they could not conceal their feelings wherever they saw any of the Congress leaders. Whenever I went during this period, the young men of the Defence Forces came out to welcome me and express their sympathy and admiration without any regard for the reaction of their European officers. When I went to Karachi a group of naval officers came to see me. They expressed their admiration for the Congress policy and assured me that if Congress issued the necessary orders, they would come over to us. If there was a conflict between Congress and the Government, they would side with the Congress and not with the Government. Hundreds of naval officers in Bombay expressed the same feeling.

"These sentiments were widespread, not only among officers but also among the ranks. I flew to Lahore in connexion with the formation of the provincial Ministry. A Gurkha regiment which was stationed in Lahore had its quarters near the aerodrome. When the soldiers heard that I was coming, they lined up in hundreds and said that they wanted to have my 'darshan'. Even policemen exhibited the same
feelings. In the history of the Indian political struggle, the police had always been the staunchest supporters of the Government. They had in fact little sympathy with political workers and often acted harshly towards them. They had also undergone a transformation of sentiment and were not behind any other group in their feeling of loyalty to the Congress.

"Once when I was passing along Lal Bazar in Calcutta, my car was held up in a traffic jam. Some police constables recognized me and reported to their barracks which were nearby. In a few minutes a large gathering of constables and head constables surrounded my car. They saluted me and some touched my feet. They all expressed their regard for Congress and said that they would act according to our orders. I remember another incident clearly. The Governor of Bengal had expressed a wish to meet me. When I went to Government House, the constables on duty surrounded my car and as I came out each man came up individually and saluted me. They all assured me that they would act according to my orders. Since I had gone to Government House at the imitation of the Governor, I did not think it proper that there should be any slogans. However, the constables
would not keep quiet, but shouted slogans in my honour. This was clear evidence that their sympathies were with Congress and that they were no longer afraid of expressing them openly. If the Government wished to punish them for their sympathy with the Congress, they were even ready for it.

"These developments were naturally reported to the authorities. Government received detailed reports and passed them on to the Secretary of State for India. The British realized that, for the first time in Indian history, the entire people was aflame with the desire for independence. Political freedom was no longer the objective of the Congress alone but of all sections of the people. Still more important was the fact that all sections of the services — civil and military — were moved by the same impulses. There was no longer anything secret about this upsurge for freedom. Men and officers of the Defence Forces declared openly that they had poured out their blood in the war on the assurance that India would be free after the cessation of hostilities. They demanded that this assurance must now be honoured." (17)
Second World War ended in 1945. In spite of victory, the British power and prestige had been diminished. The Labour Party was victorious in the General Election held in Britain in 1945. Churchill's Government was replaced by the Labour Government with Clement Attlee as Prime Minister and Lord Pethic Lawrence as Secretary of State. In an Election speech on 23 May, 1945, Attlee clearly said that they would strive earnestly to enable India to get full self-government. The Government realized that it had really no friends in the country, barring a few sycophants. There was a universal discontent against British rule. The events of 1942 proved that troubles might be caused by the people themselves even without recognised leaders and their guidance. The people's war in 1942 overstepping the limits of non-violence must have opened the eyes of the British to the terrible dangers lurking ahead. Moreover, the British apprehended that even the sepoys might turn against them. The hammering blows of Japan had shattered beyond recovery the British army and navy in the east and also the political and military prestige of the British rule in India. The politically minded people in Britain interested in Indian affairs, therefore,
thought that the best course was to quit India with good
grace. Azad has described in his 'India Wins Freedom' how

eager was Attlee to grant India freedom. The British were
now sincerely anxious to grant freedom to India, but the
Indians were slow to take it. The principal combatants now
were not the Indians and the British, but the Hindus and
the Muslims. They could not decide among themselves what
form it should exactly assume.

The Government of the Labour Party was determined
to do its utmost to promote in conjunction with the leader
in India the early realization of full self-government for
India. It was announced on 21 August, 1945, that the elections
to the various Indian Legislatures would be held in the cold
weather.

The Muslims outside the Muslim League could clearly
feel which way the wind was blowing and flocked to the
standard of the League. The number of Nationalist Muslims
who still adhered to the Congress was almost negligible.
Broadly speaking, on the eve of the election the two rival
parties, the Congress and the Muslim League, stood face to
face representing the Hindu and Muslim elements of the
population in India. The Muslim League fought on the single issue of Pakistan while the Congress announced that it would contest the elections on the issue of the immediate transfer of power. The Working Committee of the Congress met in September, 1945, and reiterated the Congress ideal of Indian unity. The members also declared that henceforth they would make direct contact with the Muslim masses and would try to win them over by assurances.

In the mean time the I.N.A. trial took place and the trial added to the popularity of the Congress.

Elections to the Central Legislative Assembly were held, and the results were known towards the end of December, 1945. The Congress won an overwhelming success in the General constituencies. The Hindu Mahasabha and other opposing candidates preferred in most cases to withdraw rather than risk defeat. The Muslim League won every Muslim seat. The nationalist Muslims forfeited their deposits in many instances. The Congress secured 91.3 per cent of the votes cast in non-Mohammedan constituencies, while the Muslim League secured 86.6 in Mohammedan Constituencies. The final figures were Congress 57, Muslim League 30, Independents 5, Akali Sikhs 2
and Europeans 8. In the previous Assembly the figures at the time of dissolution were Congress 36, Muslim League 25, Independents 21, Nationalist Party 10 and Europeans 8. The deductions made on the basis of the election to the Central Legislative Assembly was confirmed by the results of elections in the Provinces. They proved that the Congress and the Muslim League were the only two parties that counted in the country, and they dominated the Hindu and Muslim communities respectively. It is, however, noticeable that of the four Indian provinces which were to constitute Pakistan, the separate sovereign Muslim State, the Muslim League had not absolute majority in any; the Muslim League could form ministry in only two, Bengal and Sindh. Another noticeable result of the elections was the fact that a large section of the Scheduled Castes supported the Congress.

The widespread disturbances arising out of the trial of the I.N.A. prisoners created so tense a situation in India that the British Government decided to take some fresh action. On 4 December, 1945, the Secretary of State announced that a Parliamentary Delegation would shortly visit India. They would meet the Indian political leaders to learn their
people of England that India should speedily attain independence. For the views and convey in person the general desire of the first time the British Government officially declared the independence of India as their immediate goal. The British Government showed an earnest endeavour to settle the constitutional problem in India as urgently as possible. The Parliamentary Delegation of 10 members arrived in India on 5 January, 1946. Jinnah insisted on two constitution-making bodies. He also assured the Delegation that Pakistan would remain within the British empire with a British Governor-General.

Although Jinnah spoke of the Muslims as a distinct nation, the Muslims had scanty nationalism in them. They hardly developed love for the country and the Muslim League never struggled for India's independence. They could have applied their energies to the struggle for India's liberation instead of Hindu-Muslim riots. Their struggle was against the Hindus and not against the English. That they got a territory, although scattered, is due to the sheer fact that the English could not but yield to the main force of nationalism in India, sometimes called Hindu nationalism. The Muslims ought to have joined hands with
the Hindus in their struggle for freedom and could have made their demands during their march with the Hindus. The nationalist Muslims, however, wanted India's independence and considered India their homeland and that they developed nationalism was proved also by the fact that they kept off the Muslim League although they knew well that thereupon they would reduce themselves into a microscopic part of their vast community in India and isolate themselves to an enormous extent from their co-religionists in the country.

Abul Kalam Azad, Abdul Gaffar Khan and the other Muslims in the Congress made the same mistake as the Hindu leaders. They struggled for independence and they should have also spoken to the Muslim gatherings about the urgency of Hindu-Muslim unity. They were very respectable and pious Muslims, they suffered in the cause of the country's independence and they themselves carried enormous weight, and their efforts would have certainly borne fruit. After the Muslim outrages in Noakhali Gandhi moved from door to door to solace the Hindus there, and after the reprisals by the Hindus in Bihar Abdul Gaffar Khan did the same in Bihar. Likewise, when Gandhi had felt the urgency of Hindu-Muslim unity and set to
work there should have been one or more popular, pious Muslims to prepare the Muslim minds also for unity.

The Viceroy announced on 28 January, 1946, that he would establish a new Executive Council formed by political leaders and also set up a Constitution-making body as soon as possible.

Soon a great sensation was created all over India by the revolt of a section of Indians serving in the Royal Indian Navy. The trouble in the Navy began on 18 February, 1946. The cause of this revolt was the untold hardships regarding pay and food and the most outrageous racial discrimination. The army and the Air Force were also not altogether unaffected.

Cabinet Mission arrived at New Delhi on 24 March, 1946.

Jinnah argued the case for Pakistan. He said that in India the differences between the Muslims and the Hindus were far greater than those between European countries and were of a vital and fundamental character, and even Ireland provided no parallel. The Muslims had a different conception of life from the Hindus. They admired different quantities in their heroes. They had a different culture based on Arabic and Persian instead of Sanskrit origins, and their social customs were entirely different. Hindu society and philosophy
were the most exclusive in the world. Although the Muslims and
the Hindus had been living side by side for a thousand years,
one would see separate Hindu and Muslim quarters in any Indian
city. It was not possible to make a nation unless there were
essential uniting factors.

Among the other minorities the two powerful ones were
the Scheduled Castes and the Sikhs. But they were divided among
themselves and neither could present a common demand except
that they desired special provisions for safeguarding their
rights and interests. Ambedkar opposed to any Constituent
Assembly as it would be dominated by the Caste Hindus. Giani
Kartar Singh demanded a separate sovereign State where the
Sikhs would be in a dominant position. However, the Scheduled
Castes and the Sikhs virtually created no problems. Gandhi's
efforts at the uplift of Harijans also opened the eyes of the
caste Hindus. Virtually, Ambedkar and Giani Kartar Singh could
make no vital resistance to the growth of the concept of nation.
After attainment of freedom the Sikhs and the Scheduled Castes
showed no sign of disagreement.

The composition of the Interim Government proved to be
a bone of contention. Jinnah reiterated the demand for Pakistan.
On 29 July, the Muslim League rejected the Cabinet Mission Plan and decided to resort to 'Direct Action'.

'Direct Action' in Bengal was an organized anti-Hindu campaign of loot, arson and indiscriminate murder of men, women and children in broad daylight. The League Ministry had declared 16 August as a public holiday, and the worst holocaust took place in Calcutta. The inactivity of the Government rendered the Hindus desperate and forced them to organize themselves. Then followed what may be described as a Civil War between the Hindus and the Muslims. Members of each community indiscriminately killed those of the other whenever any opportunity offered itself.

Interim The Interim Government was sworn in on 2 September, 1946. The Muslim League joined it in the middle of October. But there was no Coalition Government in the real sense of the term. The League representatives refused to accept either Nehru's leadership or the convention of collective responsibility. Liaquat Ali Khan said that the Interim Government consisted of a congress bloc and a Muslim bloc, each functioning under a separate leadership.

There was no improvement in communal feelings. In
October, 1946, there was an organized attack on the Hindus of Noakhali and Tippera in East Bengal. Soon there were severe reprisals by the Hindus in Bihar.

The Muslim outrages in Noakhali brought out the real elements in the greatness of Gandhi. He voluntarily undertook the task of pacifying the Muslims in his own characteristic non-violent way. He proceeded to Noakhali and stayed there for about four months. He trudged on foot from village to village, preached the cult of non-violence to the Hindus and Muslims, and instilled courage and confidence among the thousands of Hindus who had been forced to leave their hearth and home. Gandhi's tour had very little effect on the improvement of communal relations; but its value is to be judged not by the result, but by the spirit which prompted it. Gandhi made a similar tour in Bihar also.

In 1947 violent communal riots broke out practically all over the Punjab. Street fighting went on in Lahore. Stabbing and killing soon spread to other towns such as Multan, Rawalpindi, Amritsar, etc. The trouble soon spread to N.W.F.P.

On 8 March, 1947, this dismal situation, the Working
Committee of the Congress passed a resolution foreshadowing the Partition of India.

Lord Mountbatten assumed the office of the Governor General on 24 March, 1947. He realized that a partition of India was inevitable. Certainly, it caused a great wrench of heart to the Congress leaders to give up the ideal of Indian Unity, a free India whole and entire, for which they had fought and died for more than half a century. The first to accept the idea of partition was Sardar Patel. He said that whether we liked it or not, there were two nations in India. The Muslims and the Hindus could not be united into one nation. In 'India Wins Freedom' Azad writes: "Lord Mountbatten advised that it would be better to give up a few small pieces in the north-west and the north-east and then build up a strong and consolidated India." Partition, however, mortified Azad and many others.

A proposal was made to the effect that Bengal should be made a sovereign and independent State. The Chief Minister of Bengal, Suhrawardy, and Sarat Chandra Bose, leader of the left wing of the Congress party, sponsored the scheme. This, however, received little support. The Congress and the Muslim
League organization in Bengal endorsed the proposal for creating a separate Province of West Bengal.

India was divided, and two independent Dominions known respectively as India and Pakistan were set up on the 15th day of August, 1947.

The Constituent Assembly of the Indian Union met in Delhi on the night of 14 August. It was a red-letter 'night': After the British domination for 190 years India once again became free. The Hindus of East Bengal and the Hindus and Sikhs of the West Panjab were denied enjoyment of the blessings of liberty for which they had made supreme sacrifices. Doubtless, there was sorrow in the minds of some. But gratitude has hardly any place in politics. If there were any wailings, they were drowned by the shouts of joy which heralded the liberation of the rest of India.

Nehru addressed the members in an atmosphere tense with excitement. "At the stroke of the midnight hour," said he, "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." (18)

India was partitioned in 1947, and the Partition proves that the concept of nation in India did not properly grow. Doubtless, if the concept of nation had properly developed, the Partition of India would not have taken place. The two-nation theory developed by the Muslim League had its remote origin in the behaviour of the Hindu thinkers and leaders. Hindu Mela, Hindu Patriot, the brag of Hindu nationalism, all went to give formation to Muslim nationalism in latter years.

The English defeated the Muslim rulers in India and upheld the Hindus. The Muslims, too, as a result of their defeat, kept away from the English for a long time; they kept off English education and English offices along with the English. The Hindus favoured by the English picked up English quickly and began to occupy posts in the Government offices in larger and larger numbers. The position of the Hindus soon became far superior to those of the Muslims, and the Hindus were pleased to see the Muslims, who were their rulers and oppressors, in inferior and deplorable condition. This satisfaction on the part of the
Hindus is the cause of the imperfect development of the concept of nation in India, the reason for the failure to develop one full-bodied nationalism of the Hindus and Muslims. If Gandhi had not devoted himself to the uplift of Harijans their would have arisen a third, strong rival.

Well placed and pleased, the Hindus began to ignore the Muslims. Their contempt for the Muslims soon became conspicuous in their modes of organization, in speeches, in journals in literature. Bankim who is considered a high priest of Indian nationalism is really a strong propagator of Hindu nationalism. Litterateurs must be always careful in their writings, for they have the high responsibilities for making a nation and a nation's progress. Rabindranath wrote: "Jhuti bandha ude saptam sure padite lagilo gali". This appears to be an innocent line in a poem, and the poet himself and the other Bengalees as well could hardly think that this simple, interesting, rhythmic line was strong enough to displease the Oriyas, the entire population of a Province.

Our leaders and litterateurs were careless in their action towards and comment on the Muslims. The general Hindu people also looked down upon the Muslims. This gradually alienated the Muslims. The Muslim distrust of the Hindus became the cause of many riots and Pan-Islamism. They grew more and more apprehended and suspicious as the country proceeded towards freedom under the efforts of the Hindus. They thought that if India was made free, there would prevail Hindu suzerainty in India and the Muslims would be reduced to a very humble position.
The English utilized the situation and began to favour the Muslims more and more, and the Muslims in turn resorted to the English.

The Partition of Bengal in 1905 was the first incident that warned that the concept of nation was not growing properly in India. The English dared to partition Bengal because of gradual Hindu-Muslim differences. The situation was, however, saved by the birth of the true fervour in nationalism. Yet the leaders failed to conceive the necessity of bringing about Hindu-Muslim unity at any cost for the sake of the early departure of the English. Under the enthusiastic, sacrificing and competent leaders, the other Indians made good progress in their struggle for independence. With the advent of Jinnah, the Muslim nationalism took a definite shape, and the Partition was the inevitable result.

But this dreadful thing, the Partition of India, could be avoided if the Hindus had been wise enough to understand the situations at an early stage.

With the establishment of the British rule in India, the Hindus, however superior might be their outward condition, and the Muslims were actually brought to the same level. Both became subjects of the English. The Hindus, however, got the
upper stratum. The Hindus should have forgotten all the past grievances and extended a helping hand to the Muslims for their uplift and Hindu-Muslim unity. If they had done so, the Muslim, who then occupied an inferior position, would have easily discovered genuineness in Hindu fervour and would have been glad and grateful. Instead of starting Hindu Mela, Hindu Patriot, Hindu nationalism, the leaders should have instituted other organizations whole-heartedly comprising the Muslims and started other reconciliatory pursuits. There should have been lavish Hindu contributions for the welfare of the Muslims. Funds could be raised for the education of the Muslims, schools could be started in Muslim areas. Even, in poor Muslim areas mosques or prayer pavements could be built. Sympathy for the Muslims and respect for Islam would certainly have filled the Muslim hearts with gratitude and sympathy for the Hindus. Unity at all costs should have been brought about. Unity was necessary not only for early and complete freedom, but also for one healthy nationalism and uniform national progress in India even after freedom. Instead of complete and perfect freedom Indians were presented with the Partition which resulted in a constant strife between two artificially created states with parts kept as under. This would not have taken place if the concept of
nation had properly developed. The leaders should have burningly realized the necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity and should have been enthusiastic for the attainment of this unity. Gandhi was the only person who was a true aspirant after Hindu-Muslim unity. He felt the inevitable necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity for freedom and national progress. The others realized this very little. Nehru's occasional comments frightened Jinnah. Jinnah's demands at the outset were for some seats and not for Pakistan. The leaders could have acquiesced and granted these demands in the interest of unity and freedom. Jinnah began by saying of Muslim 'minority'; Nehru said that if the Muslims formed minority they should remain silent, for, in England, the minority remained silent. Jinnah then started saying of Muslim 'nation'. Even when Jinnah said of Pakistan, the leaders were not awakened to the danger that might happen in future. Gandhi in his last attempt to thwart Partition asked Jinnah to be the first Governor General of the free India. But then it was too late, for Jinnah had lost all confidence in the Hindus, and there was the Partition.

The Hindus, by showing constant sympathy from the very beginning, could have imprinted in the Muslim minds the
idea that India was their motherland and that the Hindus were their own men. There would have been a perfect growth of the concept of nation in India if the Muslims, too, had been helped to develop the same ideas and aspirations with the other people of India as regards freedom and progress and if they had fought for independence joining hands with the other people of India and enjoyed the same freedom in an India unified and undivided.

Canada with its two warring nations, the English and the French, and Switzerland, an artificial combination of three different nations, evolved a formula of political integration. India should have also evolved some such formula to avoid division and Partition.

India's The concept of nation grows into internationalism. But it seems that in India at least internationalism is a growth simultaneous with the growth of the concept of nation, nay in India internationalism (humanism) seems to be a growth prior to nationalism. Perhaps of the humanitarian element in Indian mind, India has ever felt less inclined to resist the foreign invaders with might and main. Thousands of
of years ago, the Indian seers treated the whole world as a relation 'Basudhaibakutumbakam'; they desired peace even for a tree (Vanaspati); they prayed that all might be happy. It has already been mentioned that the mantras (incantations) of 'Tarpana' express desire for the peace and salvation not only of the souls of our departed relations but also of the souls of those that are not related to us. The word 'Sarvodaya' used by Acharya Vinoba Bhave is a word coined by Mahatma Gandhi. The word means the uplift of all, an all-round development of all — physical, mental and spiritual. It includes the entire animal world. Raja Rammohan Roy's internationalism is more perceptible than his nationalism. Gokhale, Tilak, Aurobindo, Gandhi, Nehru all spoke in terms of internationalism when demanding India's freedom. They hinted or sometimes clearly stated that India's freedom was necessary for peace and progress of the world, for freedom of the people of the world. Indian sages had always in their mind the people of the world — "Srinwantu viswe amritaasya putrah — " When Swami Vivekananda was told that, to gain hospitality, he should have clearly stated that he was not a nigger, Swamiji thundered : "Why ! Are not the Negroes of Africa my brothers ?" Ramkrishna, too, though born in an
orthodox Brahmin family and devoid of European education, thought and spoke in terms of universal spirituality. He once went to a church to witness how the Christians invoked God.

Indian colonists formed settlements in the Far East, spread Indian culture there, and formed a greater India. In the 'Discovery of India' by Nehru, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Philippines etc. have been styled the distant outposts of Indian culture.

Nationalism grows into internationalism as a natural consequence. Nationalism to be greater requires to be wider and the ultimate phase is internationalism. The Upanishads say: "Bhumiba sukham nalpe sukhamasti" - peace lies not in narrowness, but in vastness.

The entire world is going to be one state. My integral well-being can no more be found out within the limits of my own country.

Rabindranath in his booklet styled 'Nationalism' denounced parochialism and selfishness which the European nations had been practising in the name of nationalism. European nationalism included imperialism and national
aggrandizement at the expense of other peoples, and so Tagore condemned nationalism. By condemning nationalism Tagore favoured internationalism or humanism. Tagore opened his ashram of Santiniketan not with any national but with a humanitarian end in view.

In 1922 O.R. Das said: "What is the ideal which we must set before us? The first and foremost is the ideal of nationalism. Now what is nationalism? It is, I conceive, a process through which a nation expresses itself and finds itself, not in isolation from other nations, not in opposition to other nations, but as part of a great scheme by which, in seeking its own expression and therefore its own identity, it materially assists the self-expression and self-realisation of other nations as well: Diversity is as real as unity. And in order that unity of the world may be established it is essential that each nationality should proceed on its own line and find fulfilment in self-expression and self-realisation.

The nationality of which I am speaking must not be confused with the conception of nationality as it exists in Europe to-day. Nationalism in Europe is an aggressive nationalism, a selfish nationalism, a commercial nationalism, of gain and loss. The gain of France is the loss of Germany and the gain of Germany is the loss of France. Therefore, French nationalism is
nurtured on the hatred of Germany, and German nationalism is nurtured on the hatred of France. It is not yet realised that you cannot hurt Germany without hurting Humanity, and in consequence hurting France; and that you cannot hurt France without hurting Humanity, and in consequence hurting Germany. That is European nationalism; that is not the nationalism of which I am speaking to you to-day. I contend that each nationality constitutes a particular stream of the great unity, but no nation can fulfil itself unless and until it becomes itself and at the same time realise its identity with humanity." (13)

In 1925, under the heading 'Nation Building and the Critical Spirit' Ramananda Chatterjee wrote:

"Nationalism - at least in its sinister sense - has been gradually coming into disrepute, so much so that even those who believe in it in their hearts are paying lip-homage to what may be called humanism or internationalism; for hypocrisy has ever been the tribute which vice has paid to virtue.

"But we think nationalism has a good meaning also; and it is in that sense that we believe in the cult of nationalism. Let us explain ourselves. A man who tries to do
good to his family and to maintain loving and harmonious relations among its members, is not necessarily hostile to other people. He has only to be careful that his devotion to his family does not make him neglectful or inimical to the interests of his countrymen at large. On the contrary, we must perceive that the welfare of his family is dependent on the welfare of his countrymen, and shape his conduct accordingly. Similarly, nationalism or devotion to the welfare of the nation to which one belongs, does not necessarily imply hostility to the interests of other nations. On the country, as the welfare of every nation really depends on that of other nations, it is both foolish and unrighteous to seek to promote the interests of one's own nation at the expense of any other nation or nations. In fact, if humanity as it ought to be, be thought of as a grand and beautiful edifice, nations are the bricks of which it is to be built. And then bricks should be sound and well-made.
Nationalism is a great force for the people who are in bondage and are struggling for independence. After a country has been made free internationalism ought to be adopted for its integral development.

In the nineteenth century nationalism was almost universally accepted as a substitute for religion. However, in the middle of the twentieth century the best thinkers of the world are realizing that nationalism threaten to disrupt the whole fabric of civilization itself.

This principle has a tendency to disintegrate the existing states, and if this principle is strictly followed, Great Britain will be divided into England, Wales and Scotland; Switzerland will be divided into three states and Belgium into Walloon and Flemish states. Not to speak of further subdivisions, the divisions that have already been created have been severely criticized. Application of the principle of self-determination appears in most cases to be a dangerous experiment. Its result has proved to be one of the greatest curses that have fallen upon Europe. That does not, however, mean that self-determination is wrong. But it is now perfectly clear that it is an error to permit self-determination to
create a number of new states, each believing itself sovereign, without at the same time controlling the relations of these states to each other. That is a calamity as great as war itself. The small national states which were created at the end of the World War of 1914-18 soon ceased to possess effective independence, for they were forced to become mere satellites of the bigger powers in their feverish search for avenues of survival. They had to barter away the true essence of independence for the sake of military protection; their armaments, their alliances, even the internal substance of their economic life became, not the expression of their own needs, but of the will of their superior neighbours. Creation of a large number of small states, therefore, stands in the way of international harmony and co-operation. A solution between nationalist aspiration and international co-operation may be found in federating small states. The Western writers of Political Science show either nationalist sympathy or imperialist spirit. Hence much of what they have written on rights of nationalities appears to a dispassionate Indian to be the manifestation of extreme Particularism.

Again, the principle sometimes proved to be an aggressor's plea for war. Germany on the eve of her falling upon her neighbours with arms in 1939 demanded the regions
Swami Vivekananda was the first in modern times to declare: "India has a mission in the world to fulfill - the mission of spiritualising the human race." The leaders of the Swadeshi movement of 1905 reaffirmed this view. They wanted India to be free and great not for herself alone but for the whole world. Aurobindo, the high-priest of this first phase of India's freedom movement, wrote: "India must have Swaraj in order to live for the world, not as a slave for the material and political benefit of a single purse-proud selfish nation, but as a free people for the spiritual and intellectual benefit of the human race .... She is rising to shed the eternal light entrusted to her over the world. She has always existed for humanity and not for herself that she must be great." (31)

Aurobindo elsewhere wrote: "The Sun of India's destiny will rise and fill all India with its light and overflow India and overflow Asia and overflow the world." (32) He also remarked: "In fact, the true aim of the nationalist movement is to restore the spiritual greatness of the nation by the essential preliminary of its political regeneration." (33)

India's national prestige was next increased by
Rabindranath Tagore. He won the Nobel Prize in literature in 1913. His English Gitanjali created awe in the Western world. He was adored by the whole world. It was also an adoration for India.

Then comes Mahatma Gandhi who was respected by the whole world as a saint for his method of non-violence. He himself suffered but never did violently hit. Even the English were not his enemy. He wanted the British to quit India, but never craved for the downfall of the British. He was worshipped by the world for his humanism. Almost all countries, independent or in bondage, watched attentively India's freedom movement. It was a moral way. Non-violent movement was a moral method and therefore universal and appealing.

Nehru was an international figure even when India was in bondage. He spoke in terms of internationalism even when India's freedom was the first aim and pungent nationalism seemed to be the first need. On 14 August, 1947, when the whole of India was expecting an inspiring national speech, Nehru gave a speech tinged with internationalism, India's future role in world peace and progress. The Constituent Assembly of the Indian
Union met in Delhi on the night of 14 August, and in an atmosphere tense with excitement Nehru addressed the members. He said: "At the stroke of the 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."

Non-alignment is a policy for those who do not want war. It is a policy for those that labour for national development and international intimacy.

India is a secular state. The secular ideal enshrined in the constitution reflects the innate respect of the people of India for all spiritual values. That India is a secular state is also indicative of internationalism or humanism. It means that India is a country which is for all sects. If India were a Hindu state, it would mean that India excluded the Muslim world, the Christian world and the Buddhist world. By declaring India a secular state Nehru secured an international field for India.