The purpose of this Chapter is to present an overview of Egyptian and Indian nationalist movement. It also discusses the Pre-British socio-economic conditions, political and strategic importance which prepared the ground for British to take over Egypt and India. This study, therefore, is to analyze the precise nature of the conflict between traditional ideology and modern reality, the efforts made to meet the problem, and the difficulties encountered in the process, with the purpose of discovering the sources of past difficulties and the requisites of an equal solution.

1.1 EGYPT

Egypt was heir to a belief-system based on Islamic doctrine which had evolved over a period of many centuries parallel to the evolution of her material conditions, and which served as the foundation of her political community. The belief-system and the material conditions had been crystallized by the beginning of the Ottoman occupation, and changed very little in the next three centuries. By the
beginning of the nineteenth century, the basic character of the Egyptian government and the structure of the economy and society began to undergo very rapid change under the impact of renewed contact with Europe, while the belief-system remained frozen. An increasingly widening gap, developed between reality and ideology which undermined the existing political community and threatened to condemn Egyptian society to a permanent state of instability and tension unless the gap were bridged by means of a readjustment of the traditional belief-system or the formulation of a new one capable of serving as a foundation for a new political community.

Muhammad Ali tore down the traditional, political, social and economic structures of Egypt. He centralized power in himself. Muhammad Ali and his successors monopolized agriculture as well as industry. Foreigners enjoyed special privileges and rendered them service in the field of export-import. Abbas I was marked by outright reaction against almost everything European. But under Muhammad Said and Ismail, and particularly the latter, the efforts toward modernization were resumed with renewed vigor. Ismail's aspiration was no less than the transformation of Egypt into
a part of Europe.¹

Under Ismail, private ownership of land came to replace individual fellahin (agriculturist class). He offered to recognize absolute ownership of all lands distributed in tenure by Muhammad Ali to all those who paid six years' taxes in advance. This, and the recognition of the right of foreigners to own land marked the final break with the feudal system and the establishment of the capitalist system of landed property.²

Khadive Ismail's plan of development and modernization, placed Egypt under a heavy international debt. This debt which reached £100m., served as a pretext for the intervention of the powers. The economic opportunities opened up by all these transformations and by Ismail's lavish spending, attracted large numbers of foreigners who had an important role in the infusion of Western ideas and customs.

Ismail and Muhammed Said had obtained huge loans from the British and French at exorbitant rates to finance his vast project, and when he had exhausted his credit, Egypt fell in bankruptcy, foreign control, disturbances, and


foreign occupation. Ismail was forced in the wake of his financial embarrassment to make concessions that put definite limitations on his absolute power.

Ismail constituted a committee of British-French representatives to supervise Egypt's economy in 1876. The Public treasury, which had always been indistinguishable from the rulers' private wealth was now separated from it and both were submitted to the control of the cabinet and the British and French officials representing the creditors. The increasing intervention of the powers in Egypt's affairs generated a ferment in the army. As early as 1879 before Ismail's desposition, there were demonstrations by military officers against the foreigners and against cuts in the military establishment. 3

Jamal al-Din al-Afghani, a religious authority in the Arab world joined a job as a religious teacher in Egypt where he was seized by the idea that European imperialism presented a mortal threat not merely to the independence of Muslim countries but it was a destruction of Islam itself. Al-Afghani made his life mission to unite Muslim countries against imperialist forces. He advocated Pan-Islamism as the best means to counter these forces. As a religious teacher,

he preached to understand the function of science and technology, methods of organization and diplomacy so that European Imperialism could be challenged.

Simultaneously, Al-Afghani united all sorts of reformers, agitators and generally discontented people against the Khadivial authority. He also encouraged and supported several journalistic endeavours dedicated to opposition to the Khadive. He had prepared the ground for Arabi revolt in 1882. Al-Afghani believed that it was a religious duty of Muslims to establish a society based on brotherhood and justice, free of colonial control whereas Muhammad Abdul, another nationalist leader, believed that interpretations of the Koran could be reconciled with the world of science and progress, and that Muslim scholars should be aware of modern trends in the world. He believed that no compromise was possible with the Khadive. He preached that the gradual transformation of the mind and spirit of Egyptian must take precedence over political revolution. ⁴

The nationalist movement started when a few Egyptian army officers led by Colonel Arabi sent petition to the Minister of war protesting against the privileged position of their Turkish and Circassian colleagues and demanding

redress. The minister did not pay attention on the petition, the dis-satisfied officers led a mutiny involving a few battalions. The Arabi movement of 1879-1882 marked a large scale expression of native Egyptian discontent among the fallahin (children of agriculturist class) officers in the army before the British occupation. The Egyptian army officers protested over the delays in receiving salaries and official favouratism towards Turkish and Circassian. They supported the demands of the constitutionalists for a parliamentary assembly and adopted the slogan "Egypt for the Egyptians". They pleaded the case of the plain soldiers and championed the cause of small farmer, who was reeling under the burden of taxation. There had been wave after wave of violence, disorders, and arson which reached their climax in the massacre and looting of Alexandria in June 1882 and provided, among other things, an excuse to the British forces to intervene, crush the rebellion, and occupy the country.


In 1882 the officers led by Colonel Ahmed Arabi forced the Khadive to appoint Sami al-Barudi, the Minister of War, as Prime Minister, and their leader, Arabi as Minister of War. The government was not acceptable to the creditor states, especially Britain and France, because it tried to undermine the arrangements made by the Khadive - to guarantee their financial interests. The British had occupied Egypt with tacit consent of Khadive Twafik, following the patriotic revolt led by Arabi. The Khadive, who had concentrated all power in his own hands and used it to benefit himself and his family, feigned acceptance of the reforms demanded by Arabi, while opening the doors to the British who sought a pretext to justify an occupation of Egypt. The British soon announced that the occupation was only a temporary measure to achieve a particular objective -- the reinstatement of the Khadive. In the name of Khadive the British intended to stay indefinitely, and they continued until 1953. 8

I.1.1 CROMER'S STAND TOWARDS KHADIVE'S POLICY ON NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

Cromer, British agent ignored nationalist agitation against the British, as well as the press campaign of public derogation.

tion of Egyptian officials, instigated and supported by
Khadive. The Khadive received little assistance from either
the Ottoman Sultan or France in checking British dominance
in Egypt, and the conclusion of the entente cordiale in 1904
closed a chapter of Anglo-French rivalry in the region.
Abbas had pinned his hopes on the Ottoman and French inter-
vention to free Egypt from the clutches of British control.9

Multi-dimensional struggle started after 1906, the
resignation of Cromer was hailed as a sensational triumph
for the nationalist and their press. While Al-Mu'ayyad
concentrated on the Islamic credentials of Khadivial author-
ity bestowed by the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph, Al-Liwa empha-
sised the question of independence. For its part, Al-Jarida
maintained that nothing short of the introduction of repre-
sentative government was likely to resolve the problem of
Egypt's relations with British. Lutfi al-Sayyid sought to
steer a middle course between the radical nationalist tend-
ency of Mustafa Kamil and the distinct Islamic inclination
of Ali Yusuf.10

Mustafa Kamil and his newspaper epitomized the nation-
alist trend in the Egyptian politics. He was tireless in his
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10. P.J. Vatikiotis, The Modern History of Egypt (London: Wei-
effort to mount a forceful challenge to the British position in Egypt, looking initially to France and then to the Ottoman State. Mustafa Kamil had always refused to use Muslim fanaticism as a recruiting agent for the nationalist movement. His primary concern to free Egypt from the shackles of British domination, hence the alliance with the Khadive.¹¹

Nonetheless, the essence of Kamil's political ideology based on the slogan 'Egypt for the Egyptians' and coupled with that of complete independence¹² emphasized that Egypt could look neither to Trukey nor to France for its salvation, but only to her own efforts. The people should be associated with the work of the government and the bonds between Muslims and Copts strengthened.¹³

Sheikh Ali Yusuf, editor of al-Muayyid supported the Khadivial authority within the limits laid down by the Firmans granted by the Sultan, and to compel Britain to honour her promises of evacuation. The Umma Party which he belonged, stood for the creation of an Egyptian representative body to legislate for all matters pertaining to Egyp-


¹² Tripp. n,9, p.17.

tian interests, for free universal education with Arabic as a language of instruction, for the replacement of foreign officials by Egyptians, for the unification of the judicial system and for evacuation of the British from Egypt but disagreed on the methods of applying force, he believed that persuasion was a more effective method.14

I. 1. 2 FRENCH SUPPORT TO KHADIVE AND THE EGYPTIAN LEADERSHIP
Khadije and Comer were not on good terms, Lutfi al-Sayyid exploited the situation and established contact with the Khadije. Khadije was encouraged by France, and was looking for allies in every quarter; under his patronage Lutfi and others formed one of those 'nationalist' parties which appeared and disappeared so quickly in those days.15 Lutfi al-Sayyid, editor of Al-Jarida, set his sight on Egypt as a separate and independent nation-state in the accepted European mould. He advocated the promotion of territorial nationalism focused on the land of Egypt, based on the strength of the common elements which bound all Egyptian together, irrespective of their religion or ethnicity. He criticised Egyptians who defined their national identity in other than purely Egyptian terms, and he rejected the Pan-Islamist Contention that Egypt was the home of every Muslim

14. Ibid, pp.79-81
15. Ibid, p.87.
who decided to settle there as an 'imperialist nation'. He accused the Pan-Islamists of understanding Egyptian nationality. Next to Lutfi al-Sayyid was Saad Zaghlul founder of the Wafd Party who advocated for Egyptian independence by peaceful means, and gradual development of representative government. The British administration appeared to believe that an Egyptian intelligentsia would become a disturbing element, and so the entire educational system was geared simply to turning out a generation of clerks and minor government functionaries with minimal education. The education provided was so meager, however, that a generation of half-educated young people soon grew to plague the British administration. Their principal outlet was through the press, which flourished as one of the free channels of protest. As more and more British bureaucrats moved into important posts, Egyptians gave up all hopes of future independence. Saad Zaghlul had shifted from its original position of advocating a gradualist, almost evolutionary approach to self-government under British guidance, to a disposition as extreme in its denunciation of British tutelage as that, of the most radical nationalist. Its ideological stance served as a precursor for the wafdist movement.

16. Tripp, n.9, p.16.
led by Zaghlul at the end of the First World War. 18

I.1.3 THE ROLE OF SYRIAN LEADERS IN EGYPTIAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT

The Syrian leaders played a very important role in Egyptian nationalist movement. Adib Ishaq, the first Syrian Journalist in Egypt, and the founder of al-Ahram, had been the mouthpiece of the early Egyptian nationalism. But Syrians stand changed immediately after the British occupation. They wanted to show their strong opposition against the British colonial policy so that they could make their position strong in every field. The moment British occupied Egypt, they shifted their loyalty towards British. Nimr was another Syrian who believed that it was impossible for Egyptians to achieve constitutional government without European help and consent. 19

I.1.4 KITCHENER'S MOVE TOWARDS NEW CONSTITUTION

In the absence of any strong leadership and party which could continue the opposition of the British colonial rule, Lord Kitchner marginalized the Khadije and his government and ruled personally through the British officials.

Kitchener promulgated a new Constitution in 1913. He

18. Tripp, n.9, p.17.
replaced the Legislative Council and the General Assembly with a Legislative Assembly of Seventeen nominated and sixty-six elected members. The new Legislative Assembly, which was designed to give agriculturalists a larger voice in the affairs of the country. In a rough-and-ready way Kitchener did manage to steer a middle course between administration and politics, and to provide a safety-valve for political activity without serious detriment to essential administrative requirements which took place during Kitchener's term of office, the seeds of the troubles which were to burst forth so violently in 1919. The Egyptian Government became more and more subservient to the British and less and less representative of any section of Egyptian public opinion. The British official community coagulated to form an aloof and unsympathetic bureaucracy with no points of social contact with any class of Egyptian society. The nationalists, who had reverted to legal methods as a result of the repression following on the murder of Butros Pasha Ghali, used the Legislative Assembly mercilessly to harass the government. The Legislative Assembly become not, as was intended, a consultative body, but an organized opposition to the Government. This opposition consisted mainly of a few new school of 'constitutional' nationalists, led by Zaghlul.

which was at first primarily anti-Khadive rather than anti-British. Abbas had, in fact, unwillingly performed a useful function for the British by splitting Egyptian nationalism into two groups, one of which, the Hizb-al-Watani, was suspected from time to time of 'under the counter' dealings with the Khadive, and the other, the Constitutionalists' which was quite prepared, for the time being, to ally itself with the British in opposition to Khadive. 21

I.1.5 BRITISH PROTECTORATE AND EMERGENCE OF THE WAFD PARTY IN EGYPT

Within few years, however, several disastrous events destroyed the improved political atmosphere. The first was the outbreak of the World War I in August, 1914; the second, the imposition of martial law by Britain; the third, Britain's reluctance to come to terms with nationalism in Egypt once the war had ended. 22 The nationalist lost their hope of getting independence in near future also, they decided to reach to an understanding with Khadive. The British government gauged the situation and disposed Khadive Abbas Hilmi on 19 December 1914, offered the throne to Prince Husayn Kamil, with the title of 'Sultan' and established a protectorate


22. Stevens, n.5, p.87.
over Egypt. In its declaration of protectorate, British assumed three functions: to replace Turkey as Suzerain over Egypt; to assume the latter's defence, and to conduct her foreign relations. President Wilson's famous declaration about self-determination for small nations had started a series of discussions among public men in Cairo, which ended in the formation of the 'wafd' (delegation) on 13 November 1918 which later came to be known as Wafd Party. The course of Post-war negotiations between Egyptians and the British was stormy. Lutfi was invited as a member of the delegation to Geneva and London to present the Egyptian case for independence while Zaghlul a leading leader in those days was refused to include in delegation to attend the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.

The Sultan was also refused to go to attend Paris Peace Conference in 1919. The British wanted to take any decision about the future of Egypt in absence of popular political leader and Sultan. In protest against the British attitude Sultan Rushdi Pasha resigned from his post on 23rd December.

---


1918. Rushdi, was invited but he refused unless Zaghlul might come with him at the same time.\textsuperscript{25} The political equations after the war has been changed when Sultan and the nationalist leaders came at one platform to oppose the British Sultan Ahmed Fouad (who had succeeded Sultan Husayn Kamil on his death in 1917) was supporting the nationalist. The delegation (Wafd) comprising Sa'd Zaghlul, `Ali Sharawi and Abdul-Aziz Fahmi, in full agreement with Rushdi Pasha expressed their demand for independence to Sir Reginald Wingate on 13 November 1918. Although the delegation was willing to accept internal independence for Egypt under the Protectorate. Zaghlul was allowed to proceed to Paris to present their case to the Peace Conference. The leadership was having a wrong impression that their cause will get a massive support in Paris Peace Conference which proved wrong once again where the Wafd was not only denied a hearing but also shocked at the recognition of the Protectorate by President Wilson and other powers. Finally, Wafd failed in her mission.\textsuperscript{26}

Milner Mission arrived in Egypt in December 1919, to investigate the causes of the late disorders in Egypt. Eventually, as Egyptians protests, violence and later,

\textsuperscript{25} Hans Kohn, \textit{A History of Nationalism in the East} (London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1929), p.204.

\textsuperscript{26} Holt. n.23. pp.341-2.
boycotts, continued, the British government became convinced that the protectorate could not be enforced. The British realized that an Anglo-Egyption treaty could only preserve the status quo. In consequence, British decided unilaterally in 1922 to provide Egypt with formal independence though limited by four British-imposed conditions: the security of communications for the British Empire, the defence of Egypt against foreign aggression, the protection of foreign interest and minorities, and the British administration of the Sudan. Hence in 1922, the Egyptian had gained only partial independence.

I.1.6 TRIANGULAR FIGHT AMONG THE KING, THE WAFD AND THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

The Constitution which was promulgated in Egypt was based on Belgian model. The year between independence and the Second World War brought a triangular struggle between the King, the Wafd and the British Government. The aim of the King was to destroy the Constitution and to restore the autocracy of the ruling family. The aim of the British was to obtain consent to the reserved points from a constitutionally

27. Stevens, n.5, p.88.

legitimate Egyptian government. The aim of the Wafd was to abolish the reserved points and to limit the powers of King. The interest of each corner of the triangle was thus sometimes closer to the first and some times to the second of the other two corners, and political alliances were therefore shortlived. During the next thirty years, King Faud and Faruq found many ways to subvert the Constitutional process and oppose the nationalist movement. Lord Lloyol, who succeeded Lord Allenby in 1925 adopted the policy of sticking to the provisions of the reserved points and to postpone as long as possible any negotiations. In a series of negotiations between 1920 and 1930, the British did not budge from their demand for the substance at the first two and the last reserved points. They had however, practically conceded the third, the protection of foreign interests, to Mohmed Mahmud in 1929. In Chaberlain-Sarwat draft of 1927, the Liberal Constitutionalists had effectively conceded the first two points, but in the Henderson-Nahas negotiations of 1930 the Wafd remained unyielding on the remaining point, the Sudan. In 1936 the Egyptian side was ready to concede this also.

29. Ibid, p.31.
30. Richmond, n.20, p.195.
I.1.7 WORLD WAR II AND THE REVOLUTION

Mussolini's Facist Italy had become a threat to Egypt. Italian aggression in Ethiopia and occupation of Libya were too close for comfort. Consequently, the Egyptian government was willing to see the British army retain control of the Suez Canal zone. 31 The British also felt threatened because Italy may conquered Egypt. For this insurance the Wafd was by now ready to pay the price demanded. Internally, while remaining as intransigent as ever towards the palace, the Wafd had gradually toned down its opposition to British requirements. Zaghlul had held fast to the Egyptian demand for total independence, and had refused to accept any of the reserved points. But step by step the Wafdist leaders had come to accept. None of them was ready to loose whatever they had gained earlier. This was the period when the British wanted to maintain their authority by taking the Wafd into confidence whereas the Wafd leaders were firmed on their demands and afterward accepted the relaxation given by the British. 32

The Wafd Party secured a majority in 1936 general elections in Egypt. Mustafa al-Nahhas formed a Wafdist government, which successfully negotiated a treaty with Bri-


tain's foreign secretary, Sir Anthony Eden. This new Anglo-
Egyptian Treaty was immensely popular in both countries. For
Britain it guaranteed at least for twenty years a large mili-
tary base from which to defend the Suez Canal plus bases in
Cairo and Alexandria. The question of Sudan, effectively
controlled by Britain, was put on the back burner. For
Egypt, it meant a constitutional monarchy, with ministers
responsible to parliament, ambassadors in foreign capitals,
membership in the League of Nations.33

The new King Farouq was only sixteen years old in 1936
when he acceded, and a Regency Council acted for him until
1937. The internal conflict weakened the Wafd, and led an
important defection of Nuqrashi Pasha and Ahmed Maher, the
President of the Chamber, the King felt sure enough of his
popularity to dismiss Nahas and dissolve Parliament. The
Wafd could secure only 8 seats in 1938 general elections and
Liberal Constitutionalist leader Mohmed Mahmud formed a
Coalition government but it could not survive after August
1939. The new government was led by the Chief of the Royal

33. Arthur Goldschmidt Jr., A Concise History of the Middle East
(Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 1983),
p.221.
Cabinet, Ali Moher, who shared with the King.34

I.1.8 EGYPT'S LOYALTY TOWARDS GERMANY IN WORLD WAR II

World War II broke out in September 1939. Again Egypt became a vast army camp for the Western Allies, even though popular feeling was anti-British and hence pro-German. Even the King and his ministers seemed to be trying to wriggle out of the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty, because Britain had not evaluated Egypt as it had promised in 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty. The Egyptian's believed that the Axis powers were going to win and did not want to do anything to antagonise the victors.35 British pressure succeeded in forcing Ali Moher out of office in June 1940, but by then the success of the German armies in Europe and the threat of an Italian invasion of Egypt had badly weakened British prestige and much encouraged the Axis Sympatheis which were strong in King's household.36 In 1942 the British force surrounded the Royal Abdin Palace in Cairo and told King Faruq either to appoint


the Wafdist Nahhas Pasha as a Prime Minister or leave the country. King Faruq came under tremendous pressure and appointed the formerly anti-British Nahhas Pasha. The latter choose to cooperate with Britain when the danger of German victory was lifted by the defeat of General Rommel at al-Alamayn and the landing of Americans in North Africa. King Faruq dismissed the Nahhas government in 1944 and chose Ahmad Maher to form a government. On February 24, 1945, Maher was assassinated by an Egyptian.37

Nevertheless, with the end of the war, there was general agreement on demands for independence. It was no longer possible for any government to defend the 1936 treaty. Successive Prime Ministers journeyed to London to plead Egypt's case for evacuation of British forces from all of Egypt and unity of the Nile valley under the Egyptian Crown. In this crucial period there was a vacuum of political leadership in Egypt. During 1919-23, the Wafd, under Zaghul, had emerged as the representative of an independence movement accepted and supported by the masses of a yet politically undifferentiated Egyptian public, but in 1945-46 its successors stood discredited as the leaders of the nationalist movement.38 No other party or forceful individu-

al emerged to take lead. The King and his palace followers set a pace for profiteering and general personal deprivity which discredited the entire Court. There was a massive demonstration on 21 February 1947 in support of a "Day of Evacuation and Unity of the Nile Valley" resulting in 15 deaths, 120 wounded and immense damage to the British property. Noqrashi was able to reach a provisional agreement by which the British would evacuate the Canal Zone in return for a suspension of the Egyptian demand for union between Egypt and the Sudan, the future of the Sudan being left for future negotiations. The final agreement was not reached, mainly because of intrigues against Sidqi by the palace and by his political rivals-Sidqi resigned and Naqrashi took his place.39

In Summer 1947 Noqrashi brought Egypt's case against Britain before the Security Council of the United Nations, but could not alter the legal position because the 1936 treaty had given British the right to station troops in Egypt for twenty years. The Security Council did not consider the matter, it merely called on Egypt and the British to resume negotiations. This was done half-heartedly and without result, and the Anglo-Egyptian issue lost the Centre of

the stage until 1950.  

I.1.9 PALESTINE WAR: A SETBACK TO NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

The defeat in Palestine discredited Egypt's old regime: the King, the ministers, the high ranking military officers, and the democratic experiment itself. Early in 1949 Egypt had to sign an armistice with a new state of Israel. But even then there was no peace.

In an attempt to bring the country to normalcy, King Faruq called for elections in 1950. The Wafd was once again victorious, and its venerable leader, al Nahhas Pasha, assumed the Prime Ministership. Hoping perhaps to recover some of the nationalist aura that had once surrounded his party, al-Nahhas in 1951 proclaimed the abrogation of the 1936 treaty. The British government was not prepared to make concessions to Egypt. However, the abrogation of the treaty was a popular measure among the Egyptians, and armed bands of Egyptian guerrillas began to engage in skirmishes with units of the British army. In such engagement, British tanks destroyed the Egyptian police barracks at Ismailiyya, killing fifty policemen and wounding scores more. On the following day, January 26, 1952, known as Black Saturday,


the masses of Cairo retaliated for the incident with a wave of demonstrations and riots. The angry mobs did not confine themselves to the destruction of British property; they also attacked bars, cinemas, nightclubs, and exclusive boutiques, symbols of corruption and immorality of the Egyptian upper classes.42

The complete breakdown of law and order on Black Saturday hastened the end of the old rule. Although the regime managed to survive for a few more months, it was finally overthrown in the early morning hours of July 23, 1952, when a group of young military officers carried out a coup d'etat and seized control of the government. It was more than a brief military intervention; it was the replacement of one regime by another. Two of the officers involved in the Coup, Nasser and Sadat, were to govern Egypt for the next twenty nine years.43

I.2 INDIA

The liberal national leaders of India believed in nation building within the frame work of British rule. The liberal


leaders welcomed British constitutional reforms for India and also asked for social reform legislation. The liberals aimed at moving slowly towards self-government for India with the 'white' colonies of the British Empire as their model.\(^4^4\) The Indian National Congress from its earliest sessions in 1885 and 1886 pointed to Canadian and Australian self-government as the models for India.\(^4^5\) The liberals set-up associations, such as the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha in 1870, to work for the improvement of the whole Indian Society, seeking education and other social reforms through their membership of legislative bodies and organization such as the National Social Conference. They hoped to achieve their ends through the introduction of representative democratic political reforms by the National Congress, and by such methods as public meetings, and the presentation of memorials all modelled directly upon British Constitutional Politics.\(^4^6\)

The Indian nationalist movement was primarily the


\(^{45}\) Proceedings of the First Indian National Congress held at Calcutta... 1986.

product of the British policy to restore order and to reorganize the revenue system. Conditions were chaotic and the opportunities for trade were restricted by inland duties. Opening the interior for the extraction of raw materials, the establishment of an equitable land and revenue system, creation of a new class of wealthy landlords at the expense of the peasant through permanent settlement and subsequently in Madras and Bombay settlement directly with peasant cultivators under the ryotwari system, made the situation explosive against the British. 47

The rise of the new middle classes, the most significant creation of the British in India, shifted the balance of relationship of the various classes in Indian society. 48 The old aristocratic landowning classes were rapidly losing their position of status and power. The changes introduced by the British, threatened the old order, and religion particularly was thought to be in danger. Brahmins, who served in large numbers as sepoys, or soldiers, were alarmed by rumors of Christian conversion in their ranks. They feared that they would have to serve overseas and thus break the religious prohibition against leaving India. Muslim


soldiers were stirred when they discovered that the cartridge of the new Enfield rifles were greased with animal fat of both the cow and the pig, polluting to Hindus and Muslims respectively. A consciousness of power had grown up in the army which could only be exercised by mutiny, and the cry of the cartridge brought the latent spirit of revolt into action.49

The British government introduced several measures which provoked Indians as they reduced the age limit for Indians for admission to civil service from 21 to 19 years of age. Another repressive measure was the introduction of a Vernacular Press Act in 1878 by Lytton to impose censorship on newspapers published in Indian languages. Surendranath Benerjea led an all India campaign for a better representation of Indians in the Indian Civil Service. Ferozshah Mehta, an advocate from Bombay felt that the Congress should work like an Indian branch of the British Liberal Party and therefore at longerheads with the national revolutionaries, who preferred to fight for Indian independence rather than put their trust in any British Party.50

Perhaps the clearest indicator of the ambivalent role played by British rule in the growth of India's first na-

49. Hardgrave, n.47, p.20.
tionalist movement was that all of the major leaders of that movement had received some English education. Most of this elite cadre of young men studied law and were teachers, journalists. At first, they were practically all high caste, middle class intellectuals from Bengal, Bombay and Madras, living primarily in Calcutta, Bombay city, Madras and Poona.51

The liberal leaders who dominated the Congress from 1885 to 1905 had an almost unlimited faith in British democracy. "England is our political guide" Banerjea declared. Even Dadabhai Naoroji, who formulated the "Drain Theory" of India's exploitation by British economic imperialism, remained loyal to the backbone" and was the first Indian elected to the British House of Commons. As liberal leaders sought to bring somewhat greater pressure on the Government. The Viceroy denounced the Congress as reflecting only the interests of the educated middle class, who constituted a rootless, "microscopic minority" that could hardly be taken as representative of Indian opinion. The British conceived themselves to be the servants of truly representative Indian interests. The "real" India was not to be found among the effected babus of the city, in the timeless villages,

citadels of rugged peasant virtue.52

The Congress assumed a stance of constitutional opposition to the Government, but leaders such as G.K. Gokhale retained faith in the integrity and benevolence of the British tradition.53 The Ranade-Gokhale school of nationalism also insisted on the need for Indians to reform their own social and religious ideas and resolve internal conflicts as a prerequisite to political independence. They feared that unless such 'modernization' occurred within Indian society, political freedom would mean little more than a return to India's eighteenth-century regional and religious wars and the continuing subjugation of women to men and of untouchables to the higher castes.54

In its earliest phase Indian nationalist movement reflected only the big bourgeoisie - the progressive elements among the landowners, the new industrial bourgeoisie and the well to do intellectual elements. The first great wave of unrest which disturbed these placid waters in the


period 1914, reflected the discontent of the urban petty bourgeoisie, but did not yet reach the masses. The role of the masses in the nationalist movement, alike of the peasantry and of the new force of industrial working class, emerged only after the war of 1914-18. The Indian National Congress did not put a basic claim for self-government in any form that is, no basic national claim was formulated in its resolutions, but only the demand for a greater degree of Indian representation with the British System of rule. The maximum demand was for a representative institutions, not yet for self-government. The emergence of national consciousness among Indians during the nineteenth century was mainly the determination to expel the foreign rulers and to achieve self-government which should emerge from the struggle itself. To consolidate Indian people, all Indians, whatever their religion, caste or regional origins were immediately made conscious of the British rule over their land.

Lord Ripon supported their political aspirations to participate in the administration of the British Government

56. Ibid. 322.
of India, when the economic and political importance of the Indian Empire were becoming apparent. Ripon emphasized in his address to the British India Association in Calcutta that in the absence of representative institutions, the Indian Press, and the various Indian Associations should function not only as passive instruments through which the Government could ascertain public opinion on its administrative measures, but as vehicles which should exercise discriminating criticism on the policy of the Government in the interests of India.

I.2.1 IDEOLOGICAL CLASH CAUSED A DIVISION IN CONGRESS

The Congress however, continued under the control of the liberal leadership upto the death of Gokhale and Mehta in 1915, and this gave Tilak a chance to reassert his leadership. The demand for administrative reform was replaced by the call for Swaraj or self-rule. Gokhale and the liberal leaders envisaged responsible government within the British Empire -- a position wholly unacceptable to the Extremists. The Congress meeting at Surat in 1906 broke up in an uproar as the Extremists walked out, leaving the liberal leaders in


59. *Bengalee*, 13 December 1884.
full control of the organization. 60

The liberal leader's position within the Congress was strengthened by the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 and the rescission of the Bengal partition. Since shortly after the assumption of direct rule by the Crown, there had been some degree of Indian representation in government, but as Morris James argues, "whether or not the British Empire was won in a fit of absent-mindedness, such as mood seems to have had a good deal to do with the establishment of Parliamentary institutions in India..." 61 The reforms provided limited institutional access to the new Indian middle class and sought to accommodate a range of liberal demands of representation.

I.2.2 WORLD WAR I AND INTERNATIONAL PRESSURE ON BRITISH

The defeat of Russia Tsarism by Japan in war of 1904 completed the shattering of the myth of the invincibility of western imperialism in the eyes of the Asian peoples. The British introduced Defence of India Act to deal with this revolutionary groups. The Congress in each four annual sessions adopted resolutions and proclaimed its loyalty and supported the imperialist war. At the close of the war, the Delhi Session in 1918 passed a resolution and retreated

60. Hardgrave, n. 47, p. 27.
loyalty to the King and sent congratulations on the successful termination of the war.\footnote{Du\textsuperscript{ta}, n.55. pp.332-33.}

Russian Revolution brought the issues of national self-determination, and of the dissolution of the Old Empires at the forefront which embarrassed in the imperialist powers. Within five months of the fall of Tsarism the British Government issued a declaration (known as the Mantagu Declaration) which proclaimed the aims of British rule in India to be "the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realization of Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire."\footnote{Ibid, p.335.}

\textbf{I.2.3 ROLE OF GANDHIJI IN INDIAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT}

Gandhiji began his experiment with satyagraha or non-violent resistance which he translated as "soul force". It was Satyagraha that was "to revolutionize Indian politics and to galvanize millions into action against the British rule".\footnote{M. K. Gandhi, \textit{An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth} (Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1927), p.195.}

Gandhiji found sensitive gap between the predominantly urban middle class Congress and the Indian masses and shifted his attention to the villages and the peasants. He introduced Satyagraha for the first time in India by courting arrest in
support of the indigo plantation workers in Bihar in 1918. A year later, Rowlatt Bill 1919 was introduced, which extending the emergency powers assumed during the war to permit imprisonment without trial in political case, Gandhiji organized a Satyagraha Society pledged to disobey the unjust law as a symbol of passive resistance. To mobilize mass support he called for a day of fasting and hartal, or general strike, in protest against the legislation. The non-cooperation movement was launched with the call for a boycott of the impending election and the law courts, and for withdrawl from all government schools and colleges. The Congress members were asked to resign from government office and to renounce all titles. His advocacy of the Charkha and Khadi was aimed at supplanting the incomes of poor people; his manufacture of salt in illicit circumvention of the tax on his dietary staple was the most flamboyant example of his concern to increase material and social welfare.

As late as December 1919, the Congress still went on record for acceptance of the morley-Minto reforms. The final resolution reiterated the criticism of the Reforms, and the


demand for "early steps to establish full Responsible Government in accordance with the Principle of self-determination". 67

The year 1919 saw the mass wave of revolutionary unrest spread all over India. A wave of mass demonstrations, strikes, unrest, and in some cases rioting spread over many parts of India. In Punjab the arrest of two Congress leaders sparked a riot. Martial Law was proclaimed and a ban on all public meetings was imposed. Defying the ban, an estimated 20,000 people gathered at Jalianwala Bagh in Amritsar. General Dyre gave the order to fire point-blank into the unarmed masses. Dyre intended the massacre "to teach the native a lesson". 68 There had been no less than 200 strikes involving one and a half million workers in India in 1920.

Gandhi and the main body of the Congress leadership now deserted the liberal leaders because they had dragged the Congress away from the masses. Gandhi and other Congress leaders were determined to take the leadership of the rising mass movement, and for this purpose evolved the plan of "non-violent non co-operation". The new plan of non-violent non co-operation was adopted at the Calcutta special Con-
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gress in September 1920 by the alliance of Gandhi and Motilal Nehru with militant Muslim Leaders, the Ali brothers. The resolution proclaimed the policy of progressive non-violent non-co-operation inaugurated by Gandhiji, until the said wrongs were righted and swaraj established. 69

Communist Party came into existence in 1924. 70 The Communists branded Congress a Party representing bourgeois and trying to prevent mass participation in the nationalist movement. By the end of 1928, therefore, hardly a single public utility service or industry remained which had not been affected by the wave of Communist. Jawaharlal Nehru, speaking at the Bombay Presidency Youth Conference in Poona at the end of 1928 said: "we must aim at the destruction of all Imperialism and the construction of society based on co-operation which is another name for socialism. Our national ideal must, therefore, be the establishment of Co-operative Socialist Commonwealth and our international ideal a world federation of socialist states. The voice that claims freedom must be the voice of revolt. When that voice is raised,


England will bow to the inevitable."71 The session of All India Congress convened in Calcutta in 1928 and it was decided that the Congress should take up the organization of the workers and peasants as a part of its future programme of constructive work of non-cooperation.72

The liberal leaders could not control the Congress after the death of C.R. Das and the withdrawl of Gandhiji from politics in January 1925. The bond between the Hindus and the Muslims weakened. As a result communal organizations like Hindu Mahasabha and Muslim League became strong. Jinnah played a positive role to unite the Hindus and the Muslims. He persuaded the Muslim leaders who met at Delhi in March 1927 to cooperate with the Congress.73

I.2.4 SIMON COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSE OF LEADERSHIP

The Viceroy, Lord Irwin, used minatory language when he was dealing with the problem of constitutional advancement during his inaugural address of new Assembly on 24 January 1927. He said "Those who are anxious to see constitutional

72. Ibid. p.99
advance must either coerce parliament or convince it. I cannot emphasize too strongly that in this matter they are not likely to succeed in coercing Parliament, and that Parliament will resent any attempt to do so under whatever shape the attempt is made. Moreover, it must inevitably be gravely disquieted by language, which appears to be inspired by hostility not only to legitimate British interests but also to the British Connections." 74 India's reaction was totally hostile. Lord Irwin held out a threat to the Swaraj Party in these words, "If it (Parliament) sees any large section of Indian opinion, however vocal in its desire to further the cause of Indian self-government, steadily adhering to the determination to do nothing but obstruct the machinery with which India has been entrusted, Parliament is more likely to see in this evidence that the application of western constitutional practice to India may be mistaken, than proof of the wisdom of immediate surrender to India of its own responsibility." 75 Sir John Simon was appointed a Chairman of Parliamentary Commission in 1927 to review the Constitution of India. Pupul Jayakar refused to recognize the constitutional propriety of appointing an all white
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Commission as arbiters of India's destiny. Jinnah wanted that Indian should have an equal status and equal authority in the matter of enquiry and in making recommendations concerning reforms. As some Muslim members had welcomed the Commission, he told the Assembly: "There are those who want to reap a wonderful harvest for the Muslim community. I say to that: you have been fooled, and you want to be fooled again; but I refused to be fooled. On the resolution being put to vote, 68 voted against cooperation with the Simon Commission and 62 for. Thus the Assembly gave emphatic expression to its disapproval of the Commission. Motilal Nehru then took up Birkenhead's challenge to Indian political leadership to draft an "acceptable" Constitution of their own.

The Congress adopted the resolution of Swaraj or complete independence was the goal of India moved by Gandhiji at Lahore session in December 1929 under the Presidentship of Jawaharlal Nehru. Lord Irwin visited England to discuss the situation prevailing in India. Its main object was to conciliate the political parties which had boycotted the
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Simon Commission and to secure their cooperation in the plans of Government to further the processings of legislation in Parliament.\(^7\) Gandhiji and Motilal Nehru represented the Congress and Jinnah and Tej Bahadur Sapru representing the views of other political groups; met the Viceroy at Delhi on 23 December 1929 to convene the Round Table Conference to recognize Dominion Status for India. Prime Minister Ramsay McDonald listened to Jinnah rather than Nehru.\(^8\)

Then it went on to announce the two important decisions of government viz (1) to convene a Round Table Conference in London in 1930 (2) the declaration of 1917 implied that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress was to attainment of Dominion Status.\(^9\) On May 26, 1927, Irwin had written to the Secretary of State that the vocal political parties were not representative of India and therefore he did not expect an effective Parliamentary Commission. In fact he believed "the Muslims almost certainly would not boycott and this was bound to affect the decision of the Hindus."\(^10\) He asked Birkenhead to take care of the liberal

---

\(^7\) Tara Chand, \textit{n.73}, p.72.


\(^10\) Irwin Papers. Viceroy to Birkenhead, May 26, 1927.
leaders through Sinha. He assured him in another letter that the Hindu boycott could be successfully countered by a combination of the Muslims, the Princes and the liberals. 83

I.2.5 GANDHI-IRWIN PACT AND DECLARATION OF COMMUNAL AWARD

Irwin and Gandhi reached an agreement in 1930. Under the terms of pact the government agreed to stop repression and released the political leaders of the Congress Working Committee. 84 Gandhi, on his side announced the withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement and stood for the Participation of the Congress in the Round Table Conference which would discuss a scheme for a Constitution of India of which Federation was an essential part. Vithalbhai Patel, and Subhas Chandra Bose issued a statement in these terms: "The latest action of Mr. Gandhiji in suspending Civil Disobedience is a Confession of failure... We are clearly of opinion that Mr. Gandhi as a political leader has failed. The time has, therefore, come for a radical reorganization of the Congress on a new principle with a new method, for which a new leader is essential." 85 The Karachi Congress, in 1931 approved the agreement. Though disagreeing, Bose and
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Jawaharlal Nehru voted for it to preserve national unity. Jinnah was not happy with this adjustment and flew for London to discuss the minorities representation. Gandhiji stated "It would be useless for the Congress delegation, if we cannot possibly arrive at a proper communal solution, to proceed to England."

Ramsay MacDonald announced Communal Award on August 10, 1932, assuming Muslims over 50 percent of the legislative seats in Punjab and just less than half in Bengal, with other provincial ratios similar to the Lucknow Pact formula. Separate electorate was announced for the "Depressed classes" but Gandhiji averted that "Vivisection" of Hinduism by starting a "fast unto death" in his Yeravada prison in Poona. Gandhiji met with the untouchable's leader Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, and manage to reach an agreement popularly known as 'Poona Pact', on the Congress commitment on many more seats to "untouchables" than the British had been willing to vouchafe them, as long as they continued at least nominally to remain within the Hindu religious fold.

Gandhiji had suspended mass civil disobedience and opted for individual civil disobedience. Many Congress

86. The Indian Annual Register, 1931, vol.1, pp.272-73.
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leaders, however, dissatisfied with this decision. Jawaharlal Nehru, Govind Ballabh Pant, Purushottam Das Tandon and Rafi Ahmad Kidwai were of the opinion that individual satyagrah was inadequate. They wanted a peasant movement in India. Jawaharlal Nehru felt that Gandhiji did not allow others to think. 89 The Bombay Session of the Congress was held under the Chairmanship of Dr. Rajendra Prasad in October 1934. It adopted the idea of a Constituent Assembly for settling the constitution of the country. The spirit of repression which government was maintaining even after the suspension of civil resistance, and the continued detention of Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan popularly known as Frontier Gandhi offended public opinion. Realizing the violent activities may start again, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and his brother Dr. Khan Saheb was released. 90

1.2.6 GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT 1935

The Government of India Act was passed by Parliament and received the Royal assent on July 2nd 1935. Jawaharlal Nehru considered the possibility of co-operation with the British Raj a grave danger to the struggle for purna swaraj. He feared that the Act of 1935, in the name of Justice to the
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minority groups, would split the Indian nation into several religious and social compartments. 91

The Indian Legislative Assembly took into consideration the report of the Joint Select Committee of the Parliament on the motion of the leader of the House on February 4, 1935. Bhulabhai Desai the leader of the opposition, Jinnah the leader of the Independents, Aney the leader of the nationalist party, and others made scathing criticism of the recommendations. Bhulabhai stated that the report "does not either serve the purpose of reconciling the Indians or serve Government's purposes." 92 He appealed to the house in the name of self respect to reject the same constitution. Jinnah declared the scheme of federation as wholly rotten, totally unacceptable and absolutely unworkable. He moved the amendment, "As regards the scheme of Provincial Government, this house is of the opinion that it is most unsatisfactory and disappointing"; and with respect to the scheme of the Central Government, called 'All India Federation' this House is already of opinion that it is fundamentally bad and totally


unacceptable to the people of British India".93

The Government announced that the Act of 1935 would come into force on April 1, 1937. The Congress fought the elections and also formed the Government in eight provinces. It was said to be an "experiment in constitutionalism" and lasted two and-a-half years, i.e. until October 1939.94

I.2.7 WORLD WAR II AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

The World War II which was begun by Hitler on September 1, 1939, by invading Poland, extended over six years till September 1945. On 14 September 1939, a few days after Linlithgow committed India to the war, the Congress Working Committee demanded a declaration of Britain's war aims in regard to "democracy and imperialism", and of how these aims would apply to India.95 Congress was firm in her demand of Indian right to frame their own constitution through a Constituent Assembly. They could participate in the War through representation in the Viceroy's Executive Council. At the same time, Linlithgow offered the enlargement of his executive to accommodate representative Indians. Congress was not

93. Ibid. p.129.


satisfied with the denial of India's right to make its own constitution at the end of the war. By mid-November 1939 all of the provincial Congress Ministries resigned to mound a strong pressure on the British. The Congress Working Committee decided not to support the war so long as equality of status and freedom was withheld. The Committee declared that the government must define and clarify its war aim and especially proposals about India's future in unequivocal terms, and if the war was fought for the maintenance of the status quo, India would have nothing to do with it. The resolution of the Working Committee was interpreted by Zetland as an attempt to bargain power sharing. The Governor of Madras advised the Viceroy: "Personally I think we should not enter into any bargain, for if Congress do go out it will be their funeral, not ours". 96

Rajendra Prasad, the President of the Congress declared, "There is no room now left for any one to doubt that British policy remains as it always has been". Tej Bahadur Sapru, the Liberal leaders, commented: "The Viceroy's declaration is bound to cause much disappointment." 97

The British attitude was quite unaccommodating between September 1939 and December 1940. While the Congress session
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at Ramgarh was demanding complete independence, including the solution of the communal problem through a Constituent Assembly, and seriously considering the resumption of civil disobedience. On April 30, 1940, Zetland was repeating at a broadcast, "I am convinced that no lasting settlement in India will prove possible without real reconciliation between Moslems and Hindus".  

On October 11, 1940, the Congress Working Committee decided to start individual civil disobedience. On the 21st, the first satyagrahi Vinova Bhave was arrested, followed soon after by many more including Jawaharlal Nehru and Vallabhbhai Patel. Tej Bahadur Sapru made a long speech in the House of Commons on April 22, 1941 in which he censured the Congress High Command for depriving the two hundred million inhabitants of India living in seven provinces of the opportunity to build up the practice and tradition of self-government.

The British Government came under international pressure and soon after the German invasion of Russia, the Gov-

---
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ernment announced the offer of August 8, 1940. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad became the President of the Congress on 17 March 1940. The Civil disobedience movement was followed by the Quit India Movement of August 8, 1942. In consequence, the Congress was banned, all the leading Congressmen -- Gandhiji, Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad, Patel, Rajendra Prasad and others, were arrested at Bombay on 9 August 1942. The Quit India Movement was the biggest step the Congress took during the Second World War in assertion of India's moral right to independence.

Tej Bahadur Sapru with 12 other eminent Indians, who were not attached to the Congress party, cabled on January 2, 1942 to the Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, advocating immediate conversion of the Executive Council into a truly national government, restoration of popular governments in the provinces, representation of India at the Imperial War Council through men chosen by the national government, and treatment of India on the same footing as the Dominions. But Winston Churchill who was in Washington telegraphed to Attlee on January 7: "I hope my colleagues will realize the danger of raising constitutional issues, still more of making constitutional changes, in India at a moment when enemy is upon the frontier. The idea that we should 'get more out of India' by putting the Congress in charge at this
The juncture seems ill-founded.  

I.2.8 CRIPPS PROPOSAL FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF INDIAN POLITICAL PROBLEMS

Cripps arrived in Delhi on 23 March 1942 with certain proposals of the Government for settling the Indian political problem. It was "the creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a Dominion, associated with the United Kingdom and the other Dominions by a common allegiance to the Crown, but equal to them in every respect, in no way subordinante in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs". The Cripps proposal sidelined the Congress demand of complete independence. The most serious objections to the Congress leaders were the provision for local option which implied the acceptance of Pakistan, and, the selection of state representatives by the rulers. With regard to the second part, the Indians were not supposed to get representation in Executive Council to act as Defence Member. It was
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kept reserved as a subject of future discussion.\textsuperscript{103} The Congress rejected these proposals.

On return to England Cripps opened his campaign to defame the Congress with a broadcast address as Jawaharlal Nehru, remarked: "It is sad beyond measure that a man like Cripps should allow himself to become the devil's advocate.\textsuperscript{104} Cripps blamed the Congress for playing a destructive role by demanding a change in the constitution during the war and proposing a defence set-up which would not only adversely affect the conduct of the war but would be unacceptable to the minorities. It was a time when Cripps played very shrewedly in the name of minorities and projected them against the Congress. The Congress had solemnly avowed that its aims were national and not communal, that it was prepared to form a mixed cabinet, provide safeguards and furnish guarantees for the rights of the minorities in the very frame work of the Constitution, because it realized that a discontented powerful minority was a danger to the

\textsuperscript{103} National Archive of India. Home Department Political File No.225/1942. Nehru's telegram to Krishna Menon explains Congress position; and the file No.221/42 discusses the prospects and causes of the failure of the Mission.

The Congress Working Committee expressed its inability to accept the proposals on 10 April 1942. The Police descended on the Birla House on 8 August where Gandhi and his companions were staying. Gandhiji, his secretary Mahadeo Desai, his wife Mrs Kasturba Gandhi, and Mrs. Sarojani Naidu were put into the lockup in the Aga Khan Palace at Poona. Then arrest took place all over India and a large number of congressmen were thrown into prison and the Congress was banned.

Lord Wavell, the new Viceroy rejected the demand to release political leaders until he was convinced that the Congress had withdrawn its policy of non-cooperation with the British Government and declared that the country would be run by the British and the Indians with the ultimate responsibility remaining with the British Parliament, and the governmental responsibilities would be exercise through the Viceroy's Executive Council until such time as a fresh


constitution was drawn up for India. 107 To this, Gandhiji replied saying that it was now high time that you should cooperate with the people of India through their elected representatives instead of expecting co-operation from them. 108 He declared that unless there is a change of heart on the part of the Government, he was prepared to remain as a prisoner of the Government. 109

At the end of Second World War, Britain's internal condition and world position had vastly deteriorated. It had suffered such terrible losses that its economy was in complete disarray. The British found it very tough to continue its colonial rule in India. They decided to strengthen the economy rather than involve in Indian affairs. As a result Lord Wavell made the important announcement on 19 September on behalf of His Majesty's Government in India that it was intended to convene as soon as possible the constitution making body and immediately after the elections to ascertain from the representatives of Legislative Assemblies in the provinces "whether the proposals contained in the 1942
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declarations are acceptable or whether some alternative or modified schemes is preferable". The Congress was thus riding on a wave of patriotic fervour. In order to abate the anti-British sentiment, the Secretary of State made another declaration in Parliament on December 4, 1945, assuring Indians that the Government was anxious to set up the constitution making body without delay after the elections were over.

On 1 January, 1946, Pethick-Lawrence broadcast his personal message, conveying the desire of the British people and Government "to see India rise quickly to the full and free status of an equal partner in the British Commonwealth". He added: "the problem is now a practical one, it is to work out a rational and acceptable plan of action. It must be a plan under which authority can be transferred to Indian Control under forms of government which will willingly be accepted by the broad mass of India's people so that new India will not be torn and rent by internal strife and dissensions".110 The Government had, as early as February 20, 1947, declared its intention to quit, definitely by June 1947. This date was advanced to August 15, 1947 when Lord Mountbatten declared India and Pakistan as separate independent nations.

I.3. COMPARISON BETWEEN EGYPTIAN AND INDIAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

Egypt had become a centre for the European countries in the second decade of the nineteenth century whereas the British had assumed direct control over three-fifth of India by the middle of nineteenth century. Khadive (Governor of Egypt) Mohammad Ali, Abbas I and Mohammad Said had given open support to the Europeans to establish their business in Egypt. The Khadive had accepted a huge amount as a reward for their lavish expenditure. As a result Egyptian economy had collapsed and the country became totally dependent on Europeans. Simultaneously Khadive's plan to compete with the European countries by borrowing money from them without considering country's economy was another fault on the part of Khadive to handover country's sovereignty in the hands of European countries. Apart from that Khadive Ismail built Suez Canal by borrowing money from France and Britain. Egypt never became economically strong to return the borrowed money. As a result the British and French charged interest at very high rate. The interest amount was even more than the Egyptian income. The joint protectorate was an outcome of Khadive's wrong policy in Egypt.

The nature of revolt against the colonial power in Egypt and India was entirely different in its initial stage. The revolt against the colonial power in Egypt was led by
the army officers whereas the civilians had led the nationalist movement in India. The military officers had revolted against the favouritism toward Turkish and Circassian officers in the army. Simultaneously, they revolted against the nexus between the Khadive and the colonial powers. The social reformers prepared the ground for the nationalist leaders. On the contrary, caste played a dominant role in India. A large number of soldiers had been from the Brahmin community, who were alarmed by the rumour of conversion of their religious rank. They feared that they would have to serve overseas and thus break the religious prohibition against leaving India. However, Muslim Soldiers were stirred up when they discovered that the cartridge of the new Enfield rifles were greased with animal fat of both the cow and the pig, polluting the Hindus and Muslims respectively.

The major difference between the two nationalist movements was their belief system. The Egyptian nationalist movement was primarily based on traditional set up. The leadership always searched for the solution of every problem within the perview of Islam. The leadership felt that the principles mentioned in Islam are enough to achieve independence and they were not ready at all to change their ideology, whereas the Indian nationalists were ready for any change. The leadership believed in nation building within the framework of British rule. They wanted to move slowly
towards self-government for India with the White colonies of
the British Empire as their model.

The Egyptian nationalist leaders adopted Belgian self-
government as the model for Egypt whereas the Indian National
Congress from its very first session pointed to Canadian
and Australian self-government as the models for India.

Egypt was a joint protectorate of British and the
French, whereas India was a British colony. The first organ-
ized national movement in Egypt was launched by an army
officer, Arabi Pasha in 1882 against the Turks domination
both in the civil administration and the military hierarchy
to the exclusion of the local people. Indeed, the primary
objective of Colonel Arabi's revolt against the ruling elite
was to bring an end of the prevailing unjust order. Whereas
the Indian National Congress became the symbol as well as
the chief vehicle, organizer and the representative of the
anti-imperialist or national liberation struggle. Occupation
was not annexation; the local Egyptian government (under a
royal family of Albanian origin) continued under British
tutelage, while India was fully annexed by the British. The
Egyptian national movement was to liberate the country from
the British as well as from the Khadive. Al-Afghani, a
religious teacher of Islamic civilization, taught that it
was the religious duty of Muslims to establish a society of
brotherhood and justice, free from colonial control, whereas
the Indian national movement had always been a theme scored with religious, class, caste and regional variations. Religion played a dominant role from the beginning to the independence of Egypt. However religion was deep rooted in Indian Society. The upper castes namely, the Brahmins were afraid for the survival of their religious customs because the Hindu social order was challenged by the British.

Mustafa Kamil was looking initially to France and then to the Ottoman State. His primary concern was to free Egypt from the shackles of British domination, hence the alliance with Khadive. He wanted to break the relations between the Khadive and the British, simultaneously an effort was on to bring Khadive in nationalist fold so that a joint force against the colonial powers could emerge in Egypt. The essence of Kamil's political ideology based on the slogan "Egypt for Egyptians" and coupled with that of complete independence. He emphasized that Egypt could look neither to Turkey nor to France for its salvation, but only to her own efforts. On the contrary, the Indian leadership dominated by the Congress from 1885 to 1905 had an unlimited faith in British democracy. "England is our political guide", Banerjea declared. Gokhale and the liberal leaders envisioned responsible government within the British Empire.

The British and the French ruled over the Egypt upto the end of nineteenth century. The British maintained her
dominance on Khadive to get large economic benefits in Egypt. The French were not getting adequate economic share in Egypt. As a result the French extended their support to the Khadive to check the British dominance in Egypt. The British judged the situation, and before it could go out of their hand, they signed an agreement with French in 1904. The British handed over Morocco to France and the latter withdrew its claim in Egypt. In India, within the Congress rank, however, a militant extremist wing grew impatient with gradualism of the Liberals. The demand for administrative reform was replaced by the call for Swaraj, or self-rule.

The partition of Bengal in 1905 gave impetus to the boycott of British goods and advanced the Swadeshi movement for the use of indigenous product whereas similar to India, Huda Sharawi launched a boycott movement in Egypt. The motto was the dependency on their product rather than wasting country's economy in importation of British goods.

The situation in Egypt had gradually changed in around 1908 when the relations between the Cromer and the Khadive deteriorated. Lutfi al-Sayyid exploited the situation and established contact with Khadive. Sheikh Ali Yusuf, the leader of the Umma Party advocated that the persuasion was more effective method than to apply force. Lutfi al-Sayyid set his sight on Egypt as a separate and independent nation-State in the accepted European mould. He advocated the
promotion of territorial nationalism focussed on the land of Egypt, based on the strength of the common elements which bound all Egyptians together, irrespective of their religion or ethnicity.

Sir Eldon Gorst became British agent and Counsel General of Egypt in 1907. He was interested in implementing a gradual and limited transfer of power from the British to Egyptian hand. In the meantime the killing of a British officer at Dinshway mounted pressure on Gorst to change his previous decision. Cromer worked out a plan to take Khadive into confidence to crush the movement but he failed to convince Khadive because he had already supported the nationalist course. On similar pattern, Lord Ripon supported the political aspirations of Indian leaders to participate in the administration of the British Government of India. The Indian National Congress was dominated by the Liberal leaders till the death of G.K. Gokhale and Ferozshah Mehta in 1915. The British came under pressure after the defeat of Russia Tsarism by Japan in the war of 1914. The British colonial power got another shock when Russian Revolution supported the national self-determination and the dissolution of the old Empire.

The British administration appeared to believe that the Egyptian as well as Indian intellectual had become a disturbing element, and so the entire educational system was
geared simply to turn out a generation of clerks and minor
government functionaries with minimal education. The educa-
tion supplied was so meager, however, that a generation of
half educated young people soon grew to plague the British
administration.

The first great wave of unrest which disturbed the
British in the period 1914, reflected a discontent of the
urban petty bourgeoisie, but did not yet reach to the masses.
The role of the masses in the nationalist movement,
alike of the peasantry and of the new force of industrial
working class, emerged only after the war of 1914-18. There
had been striking similarity between the Wafd Party and the
Indian National Congress in terms of not serving interests
of the common people of Egypt and India. The Wafd Party
served the interests of the upper class of Egyptian society
whereas the Indian National Congress served the interests of
the elite section of Indian society. It became clear when
the Viceroy denounced the Congress by saying that it is re-
flecting only the interests of the educated upper, middle
class, who constituted but a rootless, "microscopio minori-
ty" that could hardly be taken as representative of Indian
opinion. The Wafd and the Congress had been criticised
because they did not touch issues of the common people. Aziz
Mirham, Ansur Fahmi, Husayn Haykal worked to bring common
people in Wafd fold but they failed in their efforts. Howev-
er, Mr. Gandhi succeeded to identify the Congress with the masses of India.

The Umma Party in Egypt, considered the formation of enlightened public opinion as the function of a political elite. Its members represented real social and economic interests; an elite of intellectuals, aristocrats, industrialists, and traders who possessed excellence in the qualifications and virtue in the civic sense. However, the leaders of this party also favoured the gradual reform and Egyptian independence based on the principle of popular sovereignty, whereas Gandhiji branded Congress Party, as a party of big bourgeoisie comprising landowners and industrial bourgeoisie. Gandhiji worked to fill the gap between the Congress Party and the masses because he wanted the masses participation in the nationalist movement through the Congress.

Egypt was a country where the nationalist movement was led not only by the native leadership but also a large number of leaders from Iran, Afghanistan, Turkey and Syria. Adib Ishaq, originally from Syria run a Journal al-Abram which became a mouthpiece of early Egyptian nationalist movement. Nimr was another Syrian leader advocated that a constitutional government could be stalled only with the help of European. Whereas except few, majority of leaders who took a lead in the nationalist movement were originally from India.
This was the period when Khadive and the British relations were not cordial. Lutfi al-Sayyid established contact with Khadive and persuaded him to work for Egyptian independence. Lutfi al-Sayyid set his sight on Egypt as a separate and independent nation-state in the accepted European mould. Lutfi criticised everybody who talked with Pan-Islamist contention and declared that Egypt is the homeland of every Egyptian who decided to stay here.

Saad Zaghlul, the founder of the Wafd Party always advocated that the independence should be achieved through peaceful means. Zaghlul had become a mass leader in real sense in 1920's. But he was not invited to present Egyptian case of independence in Geneva and London. Even Sultan Rushdi Pasha was refused inclusion as a member of the delegation. The Sultan resigned in protest against the British attitude and put a condition that he will attend Peace Conference only if Saad Zaghlul will participate. This was the beginning when Sultan and Saad Zaghlul came at one platform to oppose the British colonial powers. On the Indian front the Rowlatt Bill was introduced in 1919 which extended emergency powers assumed during the War to permit imprisonment without trial in political cases. Gandhiji launched a Satyagraha to disobey the unjust law. The non-cooperation movement was launched with the call for boycott of the impending elections and the law courts. Congress
members were asked to resign from Government offices and to renounce all titles. Charkha and Khadi was introduced to supplement the incomes of poor people.

The strong trade unions paralized the businesses in 1920s. There had been 200 strike alone in 1919, it involved one and half million workers. The British got the impression that the wave of independence had been percolated among the masses. As a result the British shifted their attitude and they declared their aim in India to be the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realization of Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire, whereas there had been no such independent trade unions in Egypt.

The Communist movement in Egypt was dominated by the Europeans and trade unions were formed by these Europeans to protect their interests in Egypt. The Communists were Egyptianized after 1920s so there was no question of mass participation whereas in India, the Communist adopted a policy of class struggle. The Communists criticised even the Congress, as a party representing bourgeoisie and trying to prevent mass participation in the national movement.

From 1919 onwards Britain undertook a slow withdrawl from its position of authority, yielding step by step before the pressure of Egyptian nationalism, whose main instrument was the Wafd party. The protectorate was ended and converted
into an alliance. Saad Zaghlul was allowed to go to Paris to put the case of Egyptian independence before the Peace Conference. A special mission under Lord Milner arrived to study the problems of Egypt in December 1919 but it was boycotted by almost the whole country. Much impressed by it, the mission, on its return to England in March 1920 began to negotiate privately with Zaghlul. It offered to recognize Egypt as an independent state and a constitutional monarchy, linked with Britain by an alliance which would grant Britain the right to maintain a force for the sole purpose of guarding imperial communications. On a similar pattern Viceroy Lord Irwin appointed a parliamentary commission headed by Sir John Simon to review the Constitution of India. Simon Commission visited India in 1927. Another proposal headed by Cripps was send to India in 1942. It was like "the creation of a new Indian Union associated with the United Kingdom but the second part of the proposal which again revolted the leadership was the provision for local option which implied the acceptance of Pakistan. The Cripps proposals did nothing but strengthened the demand of Pakistan. The leaders of Egypt as well as India boycotted the Commission. Because these proposals had provided only a subordinate positions to Egypt and India. The leaders of Egypt and India were not ready at all to accept anything less than independence. The Indian leadership showed lack of confidence in the Commis-
sion. Jayakav refused to recognize the constitutional propriety of appointing an all White Commission as arbiters of India's destiny. Several leaders including M.A. Jinnah wanted that Indian should have an equal status and equal authority in the matter of enquiry. Motilal Nehru took it as a challenge to Indian political leadership and gave an alternative by drafting an 'acceptable' constitution of their own.

The social composition of Egypt was mixed with Muslims and Coptic Christians. There had been a very cordial relations between the two communities. The communal feelings were not prevailing in Egypt. A tension grew between both the communities in 1910 when both held their separate Congress to intensify their privileges. The Coptic Christians demanded a special representation in provincial council, whereas the Muslims opposed Coptic demand by organizing a separate meeting in 1911 under the Presidency of Riaz Pasha. In contrary, the Indian society was divided on caste lines. Apart from that there had been division between the Hindus and Muslims. The caste hierarchy and communal conflict made a serious impact on the Indian nationalist movement. The British used communal card as a tool to strengthen colonial power in India. Ramsay MacDonald announced communal award on 10 August 1932 assigning the Muslims over 50 per cent of the legislative seats in Punjab and just less than half in
Bengal, with other provincial ratio similar to the Lucknow Pact formula. Separate electorate seats had been reserved for the "Depressed Classes" so that they could send their representatives in Legislative Assemblies. Gandhiji opposed the separate electorate formula and reached an understanding by offering seat adjustment with Depressed classes' leader Dr. B.R. Ambedkar.

The Wafd Party led by Saad Zaghlul and the other leaders, Ali Sharawi, Abdul-Aziz Fahmi expressed their demand for independence to Sir Reginald Wingate. Although the leadership demanded 'independence' they were willing to accept internal independence for Egypt under the protectorate, but the demand of the leaders was rejected. Eventually, as Egyptians protests, violence and later boycotts, continued, the British government became convinced that the protectorate could not be inforced. The British came to the recognition that an Anglo-Egyptian treaty that only preserved the status quo could not be negotiated. In consequence, British decided unilateraly in 1922 to allow Egypt formal independence.

The Indian national movement was almost stagnant after the death of C.R. Das and the withdrawal of Gandhiji from active politics in 1925. But the loss of control of Liberal leaders upon the Congress gave a chance to the reactionary forces. Hindu Mahasabha and Muslim League became strong
whereas Jinnah made every possible effort to strengthen Hindu-Muslim brotherhood. He persuaded Muslim leaders to cooperate with the Congress which was scheduled to meet in Delhi in 1927.

Congress held its session in Lahore in December 1929 under the Presidentship of Jawaharlal Nehru. Lahore Congress adopted a resolution which declared that Swaraj or complete independence was the goal of India. Indian leaders comprising Gandhiji, Motilal Nehru represented the Congress and M.A. Jinnah and Tej Bahadur Sapru representing the views of other political groups expressed their views before the Viceroy to convene Round Table Conference to recognize Dominion Status for India. Prime Minister Ramsay McDonald utilized the opportunity to support Muslim grievances so that Muslim faction should support the British. Gandhi-Irwin pact was signed in 1930. Gandhiji withdrew Civil-Disobedience Movement and stood for the participation of the Congress in the Round Table Conference to discuss a scheme for a constitution of India of which 'Federation was an essential part'. Gandhi was criticised by Vithalbhai Patel, Subhas Chandra Bose in these terms "The latest action of Mr. Gandhi in suspending Civil Disobedience is a confession of failure... we are clearly of the opinion that Mr. Gandhi as a political leader has failed."

The year between the independence and second world war
became a three sided contest between the King, the Wafd and the British Government. The aim of the King was to destroy the constitution and to restore autocracy of the ruling family. The aim of the British was to obtain consent to the reserved points from a constitutionally legitimate Egyptian government whereas the Wafd was to abolish the reserved points and to limit the powers of King. Lord Lloyd who succeeded Lord Allenby in 1925, followed a policy of interpretation of the reserved points and to postpone as long as possible any negotiations whereas the Congress was bargaining with the British between the period 1933-1939 so that the nationalist leaders got maximum relaxation while pursuing the direction of independence. The Congress sought the rights of Indians to frame their own constitution through the Constituent Assembly. The leaders rejected the offer of Linlithgow that the Indian representatives must be accommodated in his executive.

Muslim League, Hindu Mahasabha, Jan Sangh, Rastriya Sevak Sangh all stand for communal interest. These organizations never stood beyond caste, region, religion and were very orthodox in their thinking. Muslim League talked of Muslim representation whereas Mahasabha worked for Hindu consciousness. Apart from that the Muslim Brotherhood was born in Egypt during the period of intellectual ferment, partly in resistance to the secular liberal trend in the
country and partly to demonstrate that social progress was possible within the bonds of orthodox Islam. The main teaching of its founder Hasan al-Banna was to revive the purify Islam. He concluded that it was his duty to fight against foreign 'oppressor' and the egotism of political leaders and he considered that political parties should be replaced by a unified Islamic movement. The movement's weapons, he declared, were the power of faith, the power of unity; which Gandhiji also followed the same weapon but different name like mass mobilization and struggle through non-violence method.

The struggle continued in an atmosphere of tension and bitterness between 1922 and 1936. Zaghlul had held tenaciously to the Egyptian demand for total independence, and had refused to accept any of the reserved points. This was the period when the British wanted to maintain their authority by taking the Wafd into confidence. The general elections in Egypt were held in 1936, the Wafd got majority. Mustafa al-Nahhas formed a Wafdist government, which successfully negotiated a treaty with Britain's foreign secretary, Sir Anthony Eden. This new Anglo-Egyptian treaty guaranteed Britain for at least twenty years a large military base from which to defend the Suez Canal plus bases in Cairo and Alexandria. The new King Farouq was not on good terms with Nahhas. The internal conflict weakened the Wafd which
given opportunity to King to dismiss Nahhas ministry in 1937. The King started open interference in running the government in 1939. Whereas in India the Congress Working Committee demanded a declaration of Britain's war aim in regard to democracy and imperialism. By mid November 1939 all the Provincial Congress ministries resigned. The Congress Working Committee declared that the Indian people refused to cooperate in the war so long as equality of status and freedom was withheld.

World war II broke out in September 1939. Again, Egypt became a vast army camp for the Western allies. Even though popular feeling was anti-British and hence pro-German. The King and his ministers seemed to be trying to wriggle out of the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty because Britain had not evacuated Egypt as it had promised in the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty. The success of the German armies in Europe and a threat of an Italian invasion of Egypt had badly weakened British prestige whereas the hectic political activities had began in India once again in 1940. The German invasion of Russia threatened British presence in India. The Government came under international pressure and announced the offer of 8th August, 1940 popularly known as the 'August Offer'. Civil Disobedience was followed by the Quit India Movement of 8th August, 1942. British adopted a repressive measure again. In consequence, the Congress was banned, all leading
Congressmen were arrested at Bombay on 9 August 1942. The
Quit India Movement was the biggest step that took during
the Second World War in assertion of India's moral right to
independence.

At the end of the second world war, there was general
agreement on demand for independence. Prime Minister went to
London to plead Egypt's case for evacuation of British
forces from all of Egypt and unity of the Nile valley under
the Egyptian Crown. There was a massive demonstration on 21
February 1947 in support of 'Day of Evacuation and unity of
the Nile Valley'.

On 23 July 1952 a group of young army officers, who had
long been planning a coup d'etat seized the power in Cairo.
They invited Ali Maher to form a government under their
control and secured abdication of King Farouk. On June 18,
1953 the monarchy was abolished and Egypt was declared a
Republic, with Neguib as President and Prime Minister. Colo-
nel Gamel Abd'al-Nasser became Deputy Prime Minister whereas
in India, negotiations began again, as Governor General
proposed the formation of a National government. Discussions
broke down when Congress refused to recognize the Muslim
League as the sole representative of the Muslim community.
Prime Minister Atlee now announced the appointment of a
Cabinet Mission to India "to promote, in conjunction with
the leaders of Indian opinion, the early realization of full
self-government in India.” In September 1946 Nehru took office as the de facto Prime Minister of the interim government. Fearing isolation, Jinnah brought the League into government, but only to demonstrate that the Hindu and Muslim communities could not work in harmony and that the formation of Pakistan was the only solution. At this point, on February 20, 1947, the British Government declared that it intended to quit India no later than June 1948 and that Lord Mountbatten announced the independence of India in 1947.

1.4 SUMMARY

The economy of Egypt was not in a position to fulfil the financial requirement of the Khadives. They searched a new avenues of finance through inviting European countries in Egypt. Whereas the British established business relations with India and later they adopted a policy of gradual replacement of Indian business by English one.

The Egyptian national movement was initiated by the army officers whereas Indian nationalist movement was fought purely by the civilians. The Egyptian nationalist movement was different from the entire world in a sense because the leadership in the initial stage was from Afghanistan, Syria, Turkey and Iran. The Press was the medium of expression before the emergence of political parties. But the major drawback of the political parties were their dissociation
with the masses. The masses were generally ignored during the nationalist movement of Egypt.

The liberal nationalist movement was very strong in India upto 1925. The death of C.R. Das and the withdrawal of Gandhiji from active politics gave an opportunity to the communal organization, whereas in Egypt the Salafiyya movement and the Muslim Brotherhood movement with their extremist nature had a strong domination in Egyptian nationalist movement. The Indian National Congress was initially representing the elite section of Indian Society but its nature changed after 1920 when Gandhiji worked to bring masses within Congress' fold. In contrary, none of the political parties worked to mobilize masses in Egypt.

There had been hardly any trade union in Egypt. In absence of trade union common masses did not participate in Egyptian nationalist movement whereas in India, trade union movement had been very strong. There had been more than 200 trade unions in 1920's in India. It was representing more than one and half million people. The absence of trade unions gave a chance for open exploitation in Egypt, whereas in India common people directly or indirectly felt affiliated with the nationalist struggle.

The Egyptian nationalist movement was entirely different from India in a sense that the Communist party in Egypt was under the control of Europeans. The Egyptian communist
movement was replaced by the native people of 1920's. Whereas Communist movement was very strong from the beginning in India. The Communists fought for the improvement of the conditions of the working class in India. They used the concept of class struggle to break the social bond that existed in Indian society.

The British unilaterally announced Egyptian independence in 1922 with four reserved points but final independence was achieved by a military coup in 1952. There had been several round of negotiations between the Wafd Party and the British. But the Wafd used pressure tactics that they will not accept anything less than independence. Whereas communal politics was very strong in the period between 1920 to 1932. The leadership was very much ideologically divided in the later phase in India.

The defeat of Russia in Second World War by Germany threatened British colonial policy in India and Egypt. British economy was disturbed in the Second World War and she was not in a position to command India and Egypt. The British finally decided to rule over Egypt and India by inducting representatives from Egypt and India in Viceroy's Council. In the Indian case the British accepted Dominion status but it should be attached with United Kingdom. The leadership rejected these proposals. The Egyptian could not wait for longer time. As a result, the military officers
captured the country by military revolt in 1952 whereas the British handed over independence to the native people of India by peaceful means in August 1947.