

FREEDOM STRUGGLE IN INDIA

Author
Dr. S. NATARAJAN
Assistant Professor (T)
Department of History
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University
Tirunelveli – Tamil Nadu



DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY
DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
TIRUNELVELI – TAMIL NADU -627 012.

JANUARY - 2025

Sl.No	Unit	Content	Page No
1	I	Poligar Revolt- South Indian Revolution – Vellore Mutiny- 1857 Revolt - Queen’s Proclamation –Socio - Religious Reform Movements - National Awakening in the 19 th Century.	1-32
2	II	Indian National Movement – Origin and Growth - Moderates – Extremists – Partition of Bengal – Swadeshi Movement – Birth of Muslim League – Surat Congress – Minto-Morley Reform Act – Communal Electorate - Home Rule Movement – Montague-Chelmsford Reform Act.	33-85
3	III	Gandhian Era– Jallian Wallabagh Massacre – Non-Cooperation Movement – Swaraj Party – Simon Commission – Rise of Communist Party – Civil Disobedience Movement – Gandhi –Irwin Pact – Round Table Conference - Communal Award – Act of 1935 – Provincial Autonomy –1937 elections – Cripps Mission	86-151
4	IV	Quit India Movement – Indian National Army - Subash Chandra Bose – Simla Conference – Cabinet Mission – Mountbatten Plan – Indian Independence Act - Partition of India	152-211
5	V	Implications – Agriculture and Industry – Transport and Communication – Art and Architecture – Education - Local Self Government	212-248

References

249

Unit – I

Poligar Revolt- South Indian Revolution – Vellore Mutiny- 1857 Revolt - Queen's Proclamation –Socio - Religious Reform Movements - National Awakening in the 19th Century

Objectives

- The Poligars against British rule due to excessive taxation.
- The Vellore Mutiny of 1806.
- The Queen's Proclamation of 1858 marked the transfer of power.

The political instability that prevailed among the native rulers of Tamilnadu, favoured the British to interfere in their administration. Moreover, the success of the British in the Carnatic and Mysore wars enabled them to consolidate their position in Tamilnadu. The unnecessary political interference of the British affected the smooth working of the palayams, chieftaincies and the villages. The states which stood against the company administration were suppressed and subdued. As a result, many palayams including Sivagangai, Thanjavur, Arcot, Panchalamkurichi, Puthukottai, etc. were brought under their administration. The British even denied the legitimate rights of the polegars. The political, economic social and religious policies of the British wounded and provoked the feelings of the poligars. The affected polegars stood against the British. To consolidate their position various leagues and confederacies were formed. Among them, the Dindugal league of Gopala Nayaka, Ramanathapuram league of Maruthu Pandyan and the league of Kerala Varma were important. Meanwhile, patriotic leaders like Marudhu Pandyan, Kattahotwnan, Gopak Nayak, Varma etc. orgnsisgd the people and instilled in their minds a sense of unity and patriotic fervour and stood against the British administration. Various reasons were attributed to the historic South Indian Rebellion.

Policy of Annexation

Among the various reasons, the policy adopted by the company administration to annex the natives was the most important, cause for the South Indian Rebellion. When East India Company; was founded at Madras, Tamil Nadu was divided into a number of political divisions and was ruled by Polegars, kings and chieftains. Due to political disharmony that prevailed among, them, they acted, as enemies. Utilizing this

opportunity, the company interfered in the internal administration of the native states and annexed an extensive territory including Salem, Coimbatore, Dindugul, Wynad, Malabar, and denied their legitimate rights. The natives vehemently opposed late policy of annexation of the British and stood, against them.

Attitude of the puppet States

Among the states annexed by the British government, a few intended to continue the previous position just to maintain their status quo. Hence they accepted the supremacy of the company and paid tribute regularly to the British. In turn, the company guaranteed their protection and imposed military expenses on them. Such states were called as puppets or princely. Popular among them were Pudukkottai, Thanjavur and Travancore. Knowing the weakness of these states, the company administration unnecessarily interfered in their internal administration. So they confronted directly with the government and waited for an opportunity to fight against it.

Treaty of 1787

Muhamad Ali was the Nawab of Arcot. He signed a treaty with the British in 1787 to get its support to suppress the auxiliary powers. Based on the treaty, he surrendered his forts to the British and accepted the supremacy of the company. Moreover, the right to demolish the forts were also entrusted with that Above all, he agreed to pay four fifths of his annual revenue to the British to meet the expenses of their military operations in South India. In 1793, one more treaty was signed. By this treaty, the Nawab was compelled to grant to the company the right of collecting tribute directly from the Poligars. The provision of this treaty affected the welfare of the poligars considerably. These affected Poligars were waiting for an opportunity of fight against the British

Affair of Serfoji

Serfoji affair was another important reason for the outburst of South India Rebellion. In 1776, the East India Company restored the throne of Thanjavur to Tuljaji and gained Nagore from him. Tuljaji ruled nearly for ten years and died in 1787. After his death, his adopted son Serfoji ascended the throne. But the British, stood against this and supported Amir Singh, the son of Pratap Singh. For this action, the company received various concessions from him. Utilising these concessions, the company took over the

revenue administration of Tanjavur forcibly. This unlawful activity of the company wounded the minds of patriotic poligars and chieftains. They resisted the policy of revenue administration of the British by a military operation, the operation ended in failure. As a result, most of the Palayams were brought under their control. It enabled the British to establish their authority over an extensive area in South India.

Rise of Nationalism

The rise of nationalism gave a new dimension to South India Rebellion. The British concentrated more on the accumulation of the wealth of Tamilnadu. Exploring the illiteracy of Tamils, the British collected heavy taxes unlawfully from the natives. This exploitation affected the natives to a large extent. It awakened many of the intellectuals, who criticized vehemently the autocratic policy of the British. They used palm leaves for writing revolutionary ideas and communicated them from place to place. Their writing and activities induced patriotism among the natives. They boldly criticised and condemned the economic and political policies of the British. Induced by the patriotic fervour the natives acted against the British.

Economic exploitation

The British were keen on amassing the wealth of the natives. The civil and military officials collected huge amount illegally from the rulers and chieftains. They lent out their illegally amassed money at a huge, rate of interest to the Indians. The Indian debtors found it very difficult to repay the amount. Moreover, the British waged a number war in India against European powers, Indian states and Poligars. The British compelled the Poligars to meet the expenses of these wars. The economic exploitation of the British deteriorated the social status of the Tamils.

Method of collection of taxes

Utilising the military strength, the British collected heavy taxes from the villages unlawfully. The people of various regions including Palami, Salem, Kambam, Dindugul and Gudalur suffered the burden of over taxation. Those who refused to pay the tax were punished severely and their properties were confiscated. Again, the company sought the help of the bidder to collect the tax from the public. Accordingly, the company sold the right of levying tax in public auction. The bidder who gave the highest, rate was authorised to collect the land tax. These bidders adopted arbitrary methods to collect

taxes. Usually, they collected heavy taxes from the people and remitted only a specific amount to the company. They acted for the welfare of the foreign masters and showed less interest on the public. These intermediaries collected the tax arbitrarily even during the time of famine and epidemics. The activities of the bidder system hurt the mind of the patriots and intellectuals. Again, the company administration directed the producers to sell their commodities to the company at a low price. The trade policy and the method of collection of taxes provoked the natives who were already affected by natural calamities. The Tamil society before the arrival of British was traditional. They enjoyed various social rights and adopted numerous customs. But the policy of Europeanisation of the British affected the traditional sentiments of the natives. So the politically, socially and economically affected natives and the Poligars united together and resisted the British imperialism under the able leadership of Marudhu Pandyan, Gopala Nayak, Kattabomman and Kerala Varma. They formed regional and peninsular confederation against the British.

Course of the Rebellion a flash

Virapandya kattabomman played a vital role in the early part of the rebellion against the British. Under his able leadership, the poligars acted bravely. But he failed before the diplomacy of the British. The Fort at Panchalamkurichi was destroyed. A total of 1050 patriots including 600 troops died on the spot. After his defeat, Kattapomman got asylum at Pudukkottai. The British arrested him with the support of the Pudukkottai ruler. After trial he was executed on 17 October, 1779 at Kayathar. Due to fear after the execution of Kattabomman, his brother Oomathurai, and others fled to Sivagangai. Marudhu Pandyan, the poligar of Sivagangai gave protection to them. He was considered as one of the greatest rebel chiefs and illustrious strategists of these movements. After the execution of Kattabomman, Marudhu Pandyan, Gopal Nayak and Kerala Varma headed the rebellion. They engaged the British in wave after wave of a grim struggle. The regional leagues and the peninsular confederacies functioned effectively under their heads and caused disturbances to the British. In 1800, these patriots raised disturbances against the British in Sathyamangalam, Tharapuram, Thalamalla, Coimbatore and other places. Among them, the rebellion held at Sathyamangalam was historically important. But the British suppressed the rebellion brutally by adopting various techniques. Even

then the confederate armies made a steady resistance against the British at Page 7 of 122 Madurai, Thanjavur, Ramanathapuram Madurai, Thanjavur, Ramanathapuram and Sivagangai. They captured the fort at Vellore, Natham and Thiruvellore and besieged the weapons kept preserved by the British. The patriotic army sent to Ramanathapuram liberated major portion of the kingdom of Sethupathi. The patriotic army also defeated the British in a number of battles. Particularly, in the battle held in May 1801, patriots defeated, the "British army decisively. Encouraged by these victories more and more natives joined the revolutionary movements. This sudden change created fear among the British.

Arrival of Agnew

It was in this critical situation that the government sent an army under the command of Colonel Agnew. With a view to prevent, the onward march of Marudhu Pandyan, the army went to Sivagangai. Irritated by the activities of Marudhu Pandyan, Colonel Agnew issued a proclamation against him on 12th June 1801. History mentioned it as Agnew proclamation. It condemned the activities of Marudhu Pandyan and requested the natives to join the side of the British. Provoked by this, Marudhu Pandyan issued two proclamations against the British and the natives who supported them. The Marudhu proclamations requested the people of South. India to render their assistance to the confederate army. Copies of these proclamations were placed on the entrance of the Nawab Bunglow at Tiruchirappally and on the outer wall of the Aranganathan temple at Thiruvarangam These proclamations kindled the mind of the natives. Attracted by the provisions of the proclamations more and more people joined the confederate army. As a result, Marudhu Pandyan recruited an army consisting of 20,000 men. This army was fully utilised against the British.

On 29th May, 1801, similar rebel attacks and the company's counter attacks occurred in almost all parts of Taimlnadu. Battles were fought at Kamudi, Trippuvanam, Manamadurai, Paramakudi, Ramnad and Kalayarkoil. After the capture of Sivagangai, the British army attacked Kalayarkoii from all quarters on 30 September, 1801. The native army resisted this attack under Marudhu Pandyan, but in vain. The native army was severely defeated. Marudhu Pandyan was wounded. He was captured at Cholapuram. With full determination and vengeance the company army and officials searched the

Patriots. As a result, 773 patriots including Oomathurai, were arrested. The arrested were hanged in different places on different days without even conducting an enquiry. The remaining patriots ran away from Tamilnadu and got asylum in the neighbouring states. A few spent their time in disguise. Thus ended the tragic tale of the South Indian Rebellion. The success of the British in the rebellion enabled them to consolidate their position in South India.

Vellore Mutiny

Subsequent to the suppression of South Indian Rebellion, another revolt burst out in South India in 1806. In this revolt the affected Indian sepoys protested against the British administration. They revolted mainly to remove British administration and to establish Muslim rule in Tamilnadu. The revolt took place in the fort at Vellore in 1806. In this struggle, the sons of Tipu imprisoned at Vellore fort and the discontented sepoys in the British army participated. Scholars attributed various views to this revolt. Some viewed that it was the prelude to the great mutiny of 1857. But others viewed that it laid the foundation for the outbreak of war of independence in India. Various reasons were attributed to the outbreak of the revolt.

Causes for the revolt

Patriotism

The patriotic fervors were the main reason for the outbreak of revolt in, the fort at Vellore. The British East India Company ravaged the kingdom of Hyder Ali when he died in 1782. Tipu Sultan, the son of Hyder Ali stood against the British and resisted vehemently the imperialistic policy of the East India Company. But he was defeated and shot dead by the English forces in the battle at Srirangapatnam in 1799. Mysore was brought under the administration, of the company. The company acted rationally and captured the twelve sons and six daughters of Tipu Sultan. They imprisoned them at the fort of Vellore. The experienced soldiers of Tipu and sepoys of the dissolved palayams were later recruited in British army. They disliked the British domination. The dissatisfied soldiers and sepoys joined together and consolidated their position by maintaining secret relations with the nationalists outside the fort. They also formed a plan against the British and acted secretly. They were waiting for a suitable time to reinstate, one of the sons of Tipu on the throne.

Military Reforms

After the liquidation of the South Indian Rebellion, the company administration adopted various reforms with a view to reorganise and to modernise the newly recruited military at Madras. The government authorised the military officials to implement the reforms. They decided that the army should be smart in action and look. In order to reform the army, they implemented the orders of the government one by one. The soldiers in the army followed the traditional habit of having thick moustaches and long beards. The British officials disliked this habit. With a view to make them handsome, they were directed to remove their moustaches and beards. But the soldiers considered them as a part of their culture. Hence, they refused to remove their moustaches and beards. Those who refused to follow the government orders were treated badly. The native soldiers also had the practice of wearing traditional turbans. As part of modernisation, the officials ordered the soldiers to remove unattractive turbans. Instead, military general Agnew introduced a new turban. As it was introduced by Agnew, it was popularly known as Agnew's turban. It contained a leather cockade. The sepoys suspected that the cockades were either made up of the skin of pig or cow. Cow is sacred for Hindus and pig is unclean to Muslims. Hence they hesitated to wear the turban and threw them off. The disobedience of the sepoys provoked the army, officials. Again, to make the army smart, the army officials insisted the sepoys to wear a small plate which contained the symbol of cross. The native sepoys believed that the officials insisted 'to wear the cross mainly to convert them to their faith. Hence, the Muslim and Hindu sepoys refused to wear the symbol of cross. Finally, the military officials restricted the sepoys to wear thiruneer and namam when they were in military uniform. Orthodox Hindu and Muslim sepoys vehemently opposed this reform.

The reactions of the Government

The Indian sepoys disobeyed the government orders, refused to remove the beards and the moustaches and to wear the turban and the symbol of cross. The negative attitude of the sepoys made the government take disciplinary action against them. Those who violated the orders were taken to Madras. They were tortured severely. Due to the fear of cruel punishment, a few of them accepted to obey the orders of the government. They were pardoned. Rests of them were murdered. The affected sepoys and the public reacted

against the government due to its inhuman activities. They even started secret meetings whenever and where ever possible. Thousands of people who belonged to these secret societies, functioned, secretly against the government.

Mutiny at Vellore

The patriots made necessary arrangements to fight against the British. The sepoys secretly contacted the people of Vellore and directed them to take required steps to send war weapons from Mysore to Vellore as soon as the revolt broke out. They also contacted the people at Hyderabad. After consolidating their position, the, sepoys were waiting for a suitable day to fight against the British. At this juncture, the marriage of one of the daughters of Tipu was held on July, 1806. Many friends and relatives of Tipu attended the function. They celebrated the day grandly; Crackers and sparklers were fired. On the same day an Indian sepoy attacked a British military officer and on the 10th morning a parade was held to celebrate the Army Day. The sepoys made necessary arrangements secretly to utilise this day for the revolt. The Indian sepoys stationed at important places and besieged the fort all on a sudden. The steps taken by the government to suppress the revolt ended in failure. They shouted slogans in favour of Nawab. The sepoys removed the British flag and hoisted an old flag of Tipu Sultan. The ammunitions preserved in the stores and godowns and other provisions were taken into the custody of the native sepoys. Severe confusion and pandemonium prevailed, for over one full day.

Suppression of the revolt

The British army found it very difficult to solve the situation. This message was conveyed to the government. The government directed colonel Gillespie to rush to the spot. He rushed to Vellore from Arcot with fine artillery. He destroyed the fort, and massacred more than 800 Indian sepoys. Finally, the historic fort surrendered to the British. Many of them were taken as prisoners. Some of them were shot dead. The sons of Tipu and their relatives were punished severely, and exiled to the wild jungles of Calcutta. Thus ended the tragic mutiny of Vellore in 1806. The Military officials who rendered meritorious services to suppress the revolt, were honoured with rewards. Colonel Gillespie was given a reward of 24,500 gold coins for his timely action and help. Sergeant Bradley was presented with 2,800 gold coins. Again gifts were presented to one and all that helped the British in suppressing the mutiny. The government dismissed the

seopys, who supported the rebels. Though the mutiny was liquidated, it took more than sixty years for the British to recover the remnants of the mutiny at Vellore in 1806.

Causes Far the Failure

The historic mutiny which broke out at Vellore in 1806 failed miserably due to various reasons. The intention of the patriots was to enthrone one of the sons of Tipu on the throne. Though they made necessary arrangements, the mutiny ended in failure owing to its premature outbreak. The premature outbreak rendered the rebel leaders helpless and hopeless. The anticipated help did not reach in time. So the soldiers who fought vigorously in the beginning lost their temper at the end. Lack of able commander in chiefs and shortage of modern weapons weakened this mutiny. But on the British side, they had efficient commanders like Colonel Gillespie. They also possessed modern weapons like artillery. Moreover, strict discipline was maintained among the British soldiers. The selfish attitude of the sepoys in the native army was another cause for the failure of the mutiny. Due to the fascination of money and promotion, the Indian sepoys sold the military secrets to the British in advances. It enabled the British to defeat the Indian army without much difficulty.

1857 Revolt

The First War of Indian Independence (1857)

The Revolt of 1857 is considered as one of the most important chapters in the history of India and her people. The revolt shook the very foundations of the British rule. It began with a mutiny of the Indian Sepoys of the Company's army but soon involved the civilians, the peasantry, artisans as well as all sections of the Indian people. With a series of local risings and civil disturbances in the different parts of India, the mutiny of troops was not a rare occurrence in the history of British rule in India. The novelty of the „Mutiny“ of 1857 lay in the wide extent of the area which it covered and in its military potentiality. There was widespread discontent in the country and practically every class had grievances against the British rulers; but it is unlikely that any dissident group would have actually risen in revolt without a lead from the Company's Sepoys. The upsurge of the sepoys was so deep and strong that it attracted the entire population to join them. Ultimately the sepoy mutiny turned into a „National Revolt“.

Causes

Although the revolt began as a military rising and it appears to be a great sequel in the long series of a number of mutinies, its causes were deeply rooted in the changing conditions of the times. It drew its strength from the several elements of discontent against the British rule. After the battle of Plassey in 1757, the British captured Bengal and using it as a base they captured the entire business installations of the area and imposed their trade monopoly. But, their policies brought a very sharp reaction from the general masses consisting of the peasants, artisans, traders etc. It would not be wrong to say that the country was „ripe for rebellion“ in 1857. But the minds of the civil population of all the classes and ranks, Hindus and Muslims, princes and people were agitated and disturbed by the feelings of uneasiness and a vague apprehension. Let us go for a brief discussion of the causes of this revolt which almost swept away the British rule.

Political Cause

Dalhousie's annexations disturbed the political equilibrium in the country and created widespread discontent in the extensive regions. For this purpose, he had introduced a new policy termed as the „Doctrine of Lapse“. It was based on the presumption that the East India Company was the Supreme power in India and that all native states were subordinate to it. The Doctrine of Lapse made it obligatory on the issueless rulers of the native states to get the sanction of the company before adopting sons to inherit their respective states. By his policy Dalhousie annexed the states like Satara i

By his policy Dalhousie annexed the states like Satara in 1818, Jaipur (UP) and Sambalpur (Orissa) in 1849, Baghat (a hill state south of the Sutlej) in 1846, Udaipur in 1843, Jhansi and Nagpur in 1853 and 1854 respectively. But, the overthrow of the Nawab of Oudh (Awadh) and the proposal to remove the titular Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah II from his ancestral palace in Delhi came as a shock to the Muslims. The annexation of several Hindu states created alarm among the Hindus. Abolition of titles and suspension of pensions of the native rulers also caused discontent among them, especially the refusal to grant the pension to Nana Saheb, the adopted son of the last Peshwa Baji Rao II. This hurt the sentiments of a major portion of the Hindu population. The annexation of the

princely states was not a blow to the princely families alone. Families'' dependent upon the favour of the princes, officers attached to them, and the men who worked in the Company''s services and armed forces were all affected. Moreover, the increase of taxation in these states rudely affected the families of the sepoys, which was another reason for their resentment.

Religious Cause

The religious factors that led to the Revolt of 1857 are very important from the Indian point of view. The activities of the Christian missionaries who had introduced various religious programmes as well as welfare works often came into a conflict with Indian socio-religious practices. Therefore, a belief among the common people grew, that one of the objectives of the British rule, was to convert Indians to Christianity. As a major portion of the sepoys of the Company''s army were Indian, they were also affected by these feelings. After all they too were a part of Indian society and therefore, felt and suffered to some extent what the other Indians did.

Moreover, the socio-religious reforms of the British government created fear among the common people, violating their religious beliefs. The abolition of the custom of Sati, the legislation in support of widow remarriage and the opening of western education to girls were some of the reforms that made people suspicious. Taxation upon the lands belonging to the religious institutions viz., temples, mosques or other charitable institutions also made people furious. Hence it was obvious that both civilians and military sentiments came together when the question of their religious sentiments were at stake.

Economic Cause

British rule had resulted in several important economic changes. This was primarily due to the disturbance of the material interests caused by the ruin of indigenous industries, oppressive agrarian systems and the ramifications of a costly and sophisticated system of administration. Perhaps the most important cause of the general resentment was the economic exploitation of the British and the destruction of the village industries and handicrafts due to the one-way free trade policy of Britain.

No doubt this policy enriched the East India Company, but, it led to the impoverishment of the Indian people. The British land revenue settlements also played a

major role in this regard. To collect as much money as they could, the British introduced new land revenue systems which crossed the limits of oppression. Introduction of the Permanent Settlement in Bengal and the Ryotwari and Mahalwari systems elsewhere made the peasants destitute. Under the clauses of these settlements the peasants lost their lands and its proprietorship was handed over to the Zamindars and the so-called money lenders, a group of brokers who collected the revenue on behalf of the former. Due to these new trends the farmers lost their traditional rights over their lands and turned into mere tenants. Loss of their lands to the money lenders due to the land revenue policies of the British particularly the Ryotwari System hurt the sentiments of the peasantry and their resentment grew day by day. The impoverished condition of the farmers has been proved by the fact that between the period of 1770 to 1857, twelve major and numerous minor famines occurred in Bengal and its neighbouring areas.

The British system of law and administration also played a vital role in ruining the peasantry and craftsmen of the country. The existing corruption in the administration left no stone unturned to hit the poor and worsen the economic conditions of these people. The police, petty officials and lower law courts favoured the money lenders at the cost of peasants. If the peasants went to the law courts to seek redressal of their grievances, they were bound to be totally exploited and finally to be a bonded labourer.

Moreover, the old zamindars also lost their zamindaris, to the new class of urban-based absentee landlords due to the introduction of the zamindari or the permanent settlement and the strict manner of revenue collection by the British. The mutually beneficial relationship among the lower administrative officials compelled these groups of people to support any movement which could free them from the British Raj.

Military Cause

The first spark of the Revolt of 1857 was lit by the sepoys of the Company's disciplined and devoted army. After rendering services to the Company for so many years, why the Indian sepoys took such a drastic step against British rule is a matter of thorough analysis. First of all, the Indian sepoys were peasants in uniform. Hailing from an agrarian society these sepoys had strong feelings towards the farmers of the country. Their families back home were always dependent upon cultivation and they too were affected by the strict and harsh revenue policies of the British. The sepoys always

resented against the discrimination in the payment and promotions. An Indian sepoy could never attain the pay of an English subaltern. Moreover, the European troops took no share in the tough ordinary duties of the service and were paid a higher salary than the Indian sepoys. Such discrimination adversely affected the sepoy's morale. The derogatory behaviour meted out to the Indian sepoys was also a matter of great concern. The European officers of the army always used derogatory words, while referring to the Indian sepoys and called them as niggers.

Apart from general grievances the „Mutiny“ of 1857 was precipitated by several other factors. For instance, the General Service Enlistment Act of Lord Canning in 1856 made it compulsory for all recruits to be ready for service both within and outside India i.e., across the seas. It created wide spread resentment among the sepoys as they regarded it as a threat to their religion. Despite his valour and fighting skills the Indian sepoys were not promoted above the rank of a Subedar. The annexation of Oudh hurt the feelings of those sepoys who came from the Nawab's territory. They had some sympathy for the ruling house and many of them enjoyed petty privileges under it, which were not recognized by the new British rulers. All these led to dissatisfaction among the sepoy which manifested itself on a number of occasions in the form of mutinies before 1857

Immediate Cause

The situation among the sepoys was so tense, that they were ready to raise slogans against their masters at any moment. In an atmosphere of mounting discontent, the introduction of the new Enfield rifle precipitated the matter. The cartridges used in this rifle were greased with beef and cow fat and required biting before they could be used. Though the British authority denied this fact about the greased cartridges, sepoys were quite confident about their allegations and doubt.

A factory for manufacturing the cartridges was set up near Dum Dum (Kolkata). The Company's records tell us that a contractor undertook to supply cow's fat at the rate of four annas a seer. This matter affected not only the caste ridden Hindus but also the Muslim in the army. Now, they had a firm belief that the government was deliberately trying to destroy their religion. This led to the mutiny of Mangal Pandey, a sepoy of the native infantry stationed at Barrackpur on 29th March 1857. He attacked his senior

officer Lieutenant Baugh and severely wounded him. Thus, the resentment of the sepoys expressed itself just before the beginning of the revolt.

The revolt of 1857 began on 10 May, 1857 with the mutiny of the Sepoys at Meerut (in present Uttar Pradesh) but soon, it engulfed wide regions and the people. In fact, the participation of the feudal lords, native rulers, etc. increased the intensity of the Revolt and it was no longer confined to the sepoys alone.

At Lucknow, Begum Hazrat Mahal, the widow of Nawab Wazid Ali Shah raised the banner of rebellion. At Kanpur, Nana Saheb, the adopted son of the last Peshwa Baji Rao II, living in exile, revolted along with his lieutenant Tantia Topi. In Bihar, Raja Kunwar Singh, a zamindar of Arah became the oldest rebel leader aged 80 years. He provided the greatest support to other rebel leaders. Rani Laxmibai, widow of Raja Gangadhar Rao of Jhansi, raised the banner of rebellion. She was the bravest leader of the rebellion who fought like a true heroine. Though she was killed by the British army, Sir Hugh Rose, the commander of the British army who defeated her called her the bravest and greatest of the rebel leaders. In Assam also the message of the Revolt of 1857 was carried by Maniram Dewan, an Assamese noble and ex-chief Executive or Dewan of the Assam Tea Company.

Causes of the Failure of the Revolt

The main reasons why the revolt failed were as follows:

1. The revolt was not a national event and hence failed to leave an impact. The revolt had no effect on the southern states of India. The sepoys of Madras were loyal to the British. The sepoys of Punjab, Sindh, Rajputana and east Bengal did not join the mutiny. The Gorkhas were loyal allies of the British.
2. The British had very talented officers to lead the counter attack, some of them being Nicholson, Outram, Edwards, etc.
3. Only the rulers who had lost their throne and state joined the revolt. Many remained loyal. Sir Dinkar Rao of Gwalior and Salar Jung of Nizam did not support the rebellion, in fact, they suppressed it. The British remained grateful to the Nizams for a long time for this.
4. The battle was lopsided towards the British as they had more resources.

5. Lack of leadership and proper strategies led to the failure of the revolt. There was no proper coordination. Bahadur Shah Zafar was a coward and was concerned about his own safety. He proved to be the weakest link. There was no faith in him.
6. There was no larger vision or goal for the revolt. It was led by feudal lords who did not have any game plan but only wanted to secure their own selfish interests. They hardly had anything new to challenge the mighty British rule.
7. Since the survival of the Zamindars and moneylenders depended on the British economy, they did not support the revolt.
8. The educated middle class was not part of the revolt. The number of such people was small and they had not much say. And many of them were for British rule as they saw it as a means for the country's modernization.

Impact of the Revolt

The base of the company's hold on India was shaken by the Revolt of 1857. Thereafter, a stronger mechanism and administrative policy was placed in order to strengthen the British rule in India. The reactionary and vested interests were well protected and encouraged and became pillars of British rule in India. Following the Revolt the British adopted the divide and rule policy to weaken the backbone of India. Key positions in civil and military administration were now in the control of the British.

- The various effects of the Revolt of 1857 may be summarized as follows:
- The revolt of 1857 marked the end of British imperialism. A new policy was passed by the Queen of England which announced that the Indian States would no longer be annexed. The Nizam, Rajput, Maratha and Sikh Chiefs were applauded for their loyalty and rewarded by certificates and Sanad.
- The number of Europeans in the Army was increased from 40,000 to 65,000 and that of Indian soldiers was reduced to 1.4 lakhs from 2.38 lakhs. The ratio of Indian to English soldiers in the Bengal army was made 1:2 and in Madras to 1:3.
- After the Revolt of 1857, the British pursued the policy of divide and rule.
- The Doctrine of Lapse was withdrawn.
- In August 1858, the British Parliament passed an Act, which put an end to the rule of the Company. The control of the British government in India was transferred to the British Crown. A 15-member council of India headed by Secretary of State for

India was formed. The Secretary of State was made responsible for the Government of India.

- The British Governor-General of India was now also given the title of Viceroy, who was also the representative of the Monarch.
- The total expense of the suppression of the Revolt was borne by Indians.
- The Revolt of 1857 led to the rapid growth of nationalism among the literate Indians. The formation of various political associations, such as the East India Association (1866), Poona Sarvajanik Sabha (1867), Indian League (1875), Indian Association (1876), Madras Mahajan Sabha (1884) and Bombay Presidency Association (1885), and finally the Indian National Congress (1885) was the result of growing national consciousness.
- The Revolt of 1857 saw for the first time unity among Hindus and Muslims. So in that sense it was a historic movement.

Government of India Act, 1858

The presence of the British in India can be divided into two phases. One phase was between 1772 and 1858, during which the East India Company traded with help from British army and the second phase was from 1858 to 1947, when the British Crown ruled.

Till the revolt, the Charter Act of 1853 allowed the East India Company to rule India. After the Revolt of 1857, the British Empire ended the company's rule and proclaimed India to be part of the British crown. The East India Company was held responsible for the revolt. Even though the company tried to show how it had been of great service to the Empire, the Empire did not pay heed.

The British Empire was convinced that rule of the company had to go and hence, Lord Palmerston, the British Prime Minister, introduced the Bill for Better Government of India, in February 1858. In an address to the House of Commons, he said, 'the principle of our political system is that all administrative functions should be accompanied by ministerial responsibility to parliament but in this case the chief function in the government of India are committed to a body not responsible to parliament, not appointed by the crown, but elected by persons who have no more connection with India than consists in the simple possession of so much India Stock'.

After pointing out the drawbacks of the company and showing how this was leading to more confusion, the crown was convinced of the defects of the system. The Parliament passed the Bill for a Better Government of India in August 1858.

Results of the Revolt

The revolt of 1857 lasted only for a few months. The British mobilized then forces from Eastern (Bengal), Western (Bombay) and Southern India and suppressed the rebellion. In July 1857, British troops captured Kanpur and Bitnur where Nana Saheb was stationed. He escaped to Nepal and never came back. In September 1857, Delhi fell to the British troops. The British under General John Nicholson recaptured Delhi. The so-called last Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar who was crowned the Emperor of India by the rebels was subdued by the British. His three sons were executed before his eyes by the order of Lieutenant Hudson. Bahadur Shah Zafar was court-martialed and sentenced to life imprisonment and later exiled to Burma (Myanmar).

Lucknow was recaptured in March, 1858. Begum Hazrat Mahal who administered Lucknow in the name of her son Birjis Kadr escaped to Nepal. Jhansi was recaptured by Sir Hugh Rose on 4th April 1858 and Laxmibai fled to Gwalior. The soldiers of Gwalior joined Rani Laxmibai and Tantia Topi and continued the war against the British. But Hugh Rose followed Laxmibai there. On June 17, 1858, she was defeated and killed at Kota Ki Sarai near Gwalior. The last rebel leader who continued to resist against the British was Tantia Topi, who, because of the treachery of a Zamindar was captured by the British.

He was tried and sentenced to death on April 15, 1859. Thus, by early months of 1859 the revolt was completely suppressed by the British. There were a number of causes which led to the failure of the revolt. The revolt lacked universal support. Various sections of the society remained alienated. Zamindars, princes, merchants, the intelligentsia did not participate in the revolt. Even in the case of the sepoys, not all the regiments revolted. The revolt was confined to only a small part of North India. The other regions were quite unaware of the happening there.

The revolt lacked a central and an effective leadership. The strength and energy of the sepoys could not be channelised. The protests very soon became disorganized and directionless. Moreover, lack of unity among the rebel leaders as well as the sepoys led to

the collapse of the revolt. People who joined hands with the sepoys and the rebel leaders had different motives and interests and at times did not trust one another.

Let Us Sum Up

India was both benefited from and was harmed by British colonialism. On the negative side, the British held much of the political and economic power. The British officially adopted a hands-off policy regarding the Indian religious and social customs. Even so, the increased presence of the missionaries and the racist attitude of most of the British officials threatened traditional Indian life, but on the positive side, the laying of the world's third largest railroad network was a major British achievement. When completed, the railroads enabled India to develop a modern economy and brought unity and connected several regions. Along with the railroads, a modern road network, telephone and telegraph lines, dams, bridges, and irrigation canals enabled India to modernize. Sanitation and public health improved. Schools and colleges were founded, and literacy increased.

Queen's Proclamation

The Revolt of 1857 conformed as a jolt or a push to the British government to establish their supremacy in India. With the widespread resentment against the various British policies, people started violently blaming the British for such unfavourable policies that weren't of any use to the Indian people. Seeking to maintain an environment of Peace in the country, the Britishers decided to transfer the permanent hold of the East India Company over the country to the British Crown. Soon, Queen Victoria came to Delhi and it was decided to proclaim her as the Queen of India and from then onwards all the chiefs, princes and the people of India would be working under her authority. The Act of proclaiming Queen Victoria as the Queen of India is popularly known as the Government of India Act, 1858.

Queen Victoria's Proclamation (1858)

The aftermath of the Revolt of 1857 emerged in the transfer of the continual hold of the East India Company over the country to the British Crown. As a result, the Government of India Act, 1858 was passed, which made noticeable changes in the Indian administration. Soon, it was decided to proclaim Queen Victoria as the Queen of India

and from then onwards all the chiefs, princes and the people of India would be working under her authority.

With the Queen's proclamation, it was decided to grant the same status to the Native of India as the other subjects. Further, the declaration objectified various societal issues like racial discrimination that prevailed in the country and focused on removing all these evil of underdevelopment. Apart from this, it was also assured that the British Crown would create equality and all the people would be equal in the eyes of the law. With the extension of British rights to the Indians as well, the act was widely accepted and even regarded as the Magna Carta of India by Gandhi Ji.

Delhi Durbar and the Queen's Proclamation

It was in 1877 that Queen Victoria claimed the title of Qaisar-i-Hind in the Delhi Coronation Park. The declaration was the event of prominent talks which ensued in a massive assemblage popularly known as the Delhi Durbar. The transfer of powers was the result of the mutiny of 1857, which is also recognized as India's First War of Independence.

During the Mughal era, the Darbar was referred to as the place where a massive audience convened in front of the royalty. Generally, it was realised as the ceremony that brought the coloniser and the colonised together in one place. At Queen Victoria's proclamation, the Delhi Durbar was the place where all the people stood under the auspices and clenches of British sovereignty.

The view at the Delhi Durbar was the first time that many such prominent maharajas, nawabs and other dignitaries had gathered to pay homage to Queen Victoria for her undertaking of the Indian authority. In the commemoration of the proclamation, each of the rulers of India was delivered a gold memorial banner and a medal as a personal gift from the Queen herself. However, these gifts were considered as a present to show that the Indians were subjugated by the British Crown and were under their control for a long time.

Importance of Queen's Proclamation

1. The Queen's proclamation assured that no interference would be made by the administration in the matters of religious affairs.

2. Even if the British Crown had a hold over the Indian administration, due respects were reimbursed to the customs, usages and ancient rites of the people of India.
3. It was decided to grant the same status to the Natives of India as the other subjects, the British people.
4. The declaration objectified various societal issues like racial discrimination that prevailed in the country and focused on removing all these evil of underdevelopment.
5. The proclamation also defined the prosperity of the Indians as the strength of the Britishers and the contentment of the Indians as the security for the Monarch's power in India.

Government of India Act, 1858

The Government of India Act, 1858 was passed in a parallel setting with the Queen's proclamation in India. Under this, it was claimed that India would now be governed directly by the Britishers under their British Crown and all the authorities lay in their hands. The Government of India Act of 1858 had certain provisions. Some of them are:

1. Under this Act, the rule of the East India Company was liquidated and passed on to the British Crown.
2. The surveillance including the Board of Control and the Court of Directors were discarded by this Act.
3. The Secretary of State would act as the British MP, who would work under an advisory committee of 15 members.
4. The Secretary of State would also act as the arbitrator and the channel between the British administration in Britain and the Indian government.
5. The dual government policy, introduced by Pitt's India Act was removed by the Government of India Act, 1858.

In conclusion, to conserve a setting of peace and prosperity in the nation, the Britishers decided to substitute the continual hold of the East India Company to the British Crown. The proclamation had noticeable impacts on the East India Company and the treaties with the princes. The declaration was guided by the guiding principles of religion and justice and that there won't be any interference in Indian society, amidst

these sensitive topics. Further, the declaration objectified various societal issues like racial discrimination that prevailed in the country and focused on removing all these evil of underdevelopment.

Socio - Religious Reform Movements

Introduction

The urgent need for the social and religious reform that began to manifest itself from the early decades of the 19th century arose in response to the contact with the Western culture and education. The weakness and decay of the Indian society was evident to the educated Indians who started to work systematically for their removal. They were no longer willing to accept the traditions, beliefs and practices of the Hindu society simply because they had been observed for centuries. The impact of the Western ideas gave birth to new an awakening. The change that took place in the Indian social scenario is popularly known as the Renaissance.

Renaissance in India

The central figure of this cultural awakening was Raja Rammohan Roy. Known as the “father of the Indian Renaissance”, Rammohan Roy was a great patriot, scholar and a humanist. He was moved by a deep love for the country and worked throughout his life for the social, religious, intellectual and political regeneration of the Indians. Rammohan Roy was born in 1772 in Radhanagar, a small village in Bengal. As a young man he had studied Sanskrit, literature and Hindu philosophy in Varanasi and Persian, Arabic and Koran in Patna. He was a great scholar. Roy mastered several languages including English, Latin, Greek and Hebrew.

Social Reforms

In 1814, Rammohan Roy settled in Calcutta and dedicated his life to the cause of social and religious reforms. As a social reformer, Rammohan Roy fought relentlessly against the social evils like sati, polygamy, child marriage, female infanticide and caste discrimination. He organised a movement against the inhuman customs of sati and helped William Bentinck to pass a law banning the practice (1829). It was the first successful social movement against an age old social evil.

Rammohan Roy was one of the earliest propagators of modern Western education. He looked upon it, as a major instrument for the spread of modern ideas in the

country. He was associated with the foundation of the Hindu College in Calcutta (which later came to be known as the Presidency College). He also maintained at his own cost an English school in Calcutta. In addition, he established a Vedanta College where both Indian learning and Western social and physical science courses were offered. He also recognised the importance of the vernaculars languages for spreading the new ideas. He compiled a Bengali grammar and developed an easy and modern style of Bengali the prose.

Rammohan Roy was a pioneer of Indian journalism. He himself published journals in Bengali, Persian, Hindi and English to educate the public on various current issues. Samvad Kaumudi was the most important journal brought out by him. Rammohan Roy was a firm believer in internationalism. He held that the suffering and happiness of one nation should affect the rest of the world. He took a keen interest in the international events and always supported the cause of liberty and nationalism. He celebrated the success of the revolution in Spain in 1823 by hosting a public dinner.

Religious Reforms

Rammohan Roy struggled persistently against the social evils. He argued that the ancient Hindu texts the Vedas and the Upanishads upheld the doctrine of monotheism. To prove his point he translated the Vedas and the five Upanishads into Bengali. In 1849 he wrote, "Gift to Monotheism," in Persian. Rammohan Roy was a staunch believer in the philosophy of Vedanta (Upanishads) and vigorously defended the Hindu religion and the Hindu philosophy from the attack of the missionaries. He only wanted to mould Hinduism into a new form to suit the requirements of the age. In 1829 Rammohan Roy founded a new religious society known as the Atmiya Sabha which later on came to be known as the Brahmo Samaj.

This religious society was based on the twin pillars of rationalism and the philosophy of the Vedas. The Brahmo Samaj emphasised human dignity, criticised idolatry and denounced the social evils like sati. Rammohan Roy represented the first glimmerings of the rise of national consciousness in India. He opposed the rigidity of the caste system because it destroyed the unity of the country.

Henry Vivian Derozio and the Young Bengal Movement

The establishment of the Hindu College in 1817 was a major event in the history of Bengal. It played an important role in carrying forward the reformist movement, that had already emerged in the province. A radical movement for the reform of a Hindu Society, known as the Young Bengal Movement was started in the college. Its leader was Henry Vivian Derozio, a teacher of the Hindu College. Derozio was born in 1809. He was of mixed parentage, his father was Portuguese and his mother was Indian. In 1826, at the age of 17, he joined the Hindu College as a teacher and taught there till 1831.

Derozio was deeply influenced by the revolutionary ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity. He was a brilliant teacher and within a short period of time, he drew around him a group of intelligent boys in the college. He inspired his students to think rationally and freely, to question authority, to love liberty, equality and freedom and to worship truth. By organising an association for debates and discussions on literature, philosophy, history and science, he spread the radical ideas. The movement started by Derozio was called the Young Bengal Movement and his followers were known as the Derozians.

They condemned the religious rites, the rituals, and pleaded for the eradication of social evils, female education and improvement in the condition of women. Derozio was a poet, teacher, reformer and a fiery journalist. He was perhaps the first nationalist poet of modern India. He was removed from the Hindu College because of his radicalism and died at the age of 22.

Debendranath Tagore

Debendranath Tagore, the father of Rabindranath Tagore, was responsible for revitalising the Brahmo Samaj. Under him the first step was taken to convert the Brahmo Samaj into a separate religious and social community. He represented the best in the traditional Indian learning and the new thought of the West. In 1839, he founded the Tatvabodhini Sabha to propagate Rammohan Roy's ideas. He promoted a magazine to do a systematic study of India's past in the Bengali language. The Samaj actively supported Debendranath Tagore and the movements for widow remarriage, the abolition of polygamy, women's education and the improvement in the condition of the peasantry.

Keshab Chandra Sen

Keshab Chandra Sen carried on an intensive programme of social reform. He set up schools, organised famine relief and propagated widow remarriage. In 1872 the Government passed the Native (Civil) Marriages Act, legalising marriages, performed according to the Brahmo Samaj rites.

Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar

Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar, a towering personality of the midnineteenth century, was born in a poor Brahmin family of Bengal in 1820. He was a renowned Sanskrit scholar and became the Principal of the Sanskrit College in 1851. The Sanskrit College conferred on him the title of „Vidyasagar“ because of his profound knowledge of Sanskrit. Pandit Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar was both a scholar and a reformer. He was a great humanist and had deep sympathy for the poor and the oppressed. He dedicated his entire life to the cause of social reform which he thought was necessary for modernising India. By admitting non-Brahmin students to the Sanskrit College, he dealt a severe blow to the prevalent caste system.

Vidyasagar was a staunch supporter of women's education and helped Bethune to establish the Bethune School, the first Indian school for girls, in 1849. As Inspector of Schools, Vidyasagar opened a number of schools for girls in the districts under his charge. Vidyasagar's greatest contribution lies in the improvement of the condition of widows. Despite opposition, Vidyasagar openly advocated widow remarriage. Soon a powerful movement in favour of widow remarriage was started. At last, after prolonged struggle the Widow Remarriage Act was passed in 1856. Through his efforts, twenty-five widow remarriages took place. He also spoke vehemently against child marriage and polygamy.

Vidyasagar contributed enormously to the growth of the Bengali language and contributed to the evolution of the modern prose style in Bengali. He wrote a Bengali primer, „Varna Parichay“, which is used even today. Through his writings, Vidyasagar made the people aware of the social problems and thus helped the growth of nationalism in India.

Sri Ramakrishna Paramhansa

Sri Ramakrishna Paramhansa was one of the greatest saints of modern India. Ramakrishna was born in a poor Brahmin family of Bengal. He showed a religious bent of mind from his childhood. He had no formal education but his discourses were full of wisdom. He was the chief priest of the Kali temple at Dakshineswar near Calcutta. People from all walks of life visited Dakshineswar to listen to his discourses. Ramakrishna Paramhansa was a man with a liberal outlook. He firmly believed that there was an underlying unity among all religions and that only the methods of worship were different.

God could be approached by any form of worship as long as it was done with a single-minded devotion. He believed that service to man was service to God, for man was the embodiment of God on earth. As man was the creation of God, man-made divisions made no sense to him. Ramakrishna Paramhansa was a great teacher who could express complicated philosophical ideas in a simple language for everyone to understand. He believed that the religious salvation could be attained through renunciation, meditation and devotion.

Swami Vivekananda

Narendra Nath Dutta, better known as Swami Vivekananda, was the most illustrious disciple of Sri Ramakrishna. He was born in Calcutta in January, 1863. He graduated from the Scottish Church College and was well-versed in Western philosophy. Vivekananda was a man of great intellect and possessed a critical and analytical mind. At the age of eighteen, Vivekananda met Sri Ramakrishna. This meeting transformed his life completely.

After the death of Sri Ramakrishna, he became a „sanyasi“ and devoted his life to preaching and spreading Ramakrishna’s message to the people. His religious message was put in a form, that would suit the needs of the contemporary Indian society. Vivekananda proclaimed the essential oneness of all religions. He condemned the caste-system, religious rituals, ceremonies and superstitions. He had a deep understanding of the Hindu philosophy and travelled far and wide to spread its message.

At the Parliament of World Religions in Chicago (1893), Vivekananda spoke about the Hindu religion at length. His brilliant speech on Hindu philosophy was well received. American newspapers described him as an „Orator by Divine Right“. He

delivered a series of lectures in the U.S.A., England and in several other countries of Europe. Through his speeches, Vivekananda explained the Hindu philosophy and clarified the wrong notions that prevailed in the Western countries about the Hindu religion and the Indian culture. In India, however, Vivekananda's main role was that of a social reformer rather than a religious leader. He propagated Ramakrishna's message of peace and brotherhood and emphasized the need for religious tolerance which would lead to the establishment of peace and harmony in the country. He believed that it was the social responsibility of the better placed people to take care of the downtrodden, or the „daridra narayan“.

In 1896, Vivekananda founded the Ramakrishna Mission to propagate social welfare. It laid emphasis not on personal salvation but on social good and social service. The Ramakrishna Mission stood for religious and social reform based on the ancient culture of India. Emphasis was put on the essential spirit of Hinduism and not on rituals. Rendering social service was the primary aim of the Ramakrishna Mission. It believed that serving a human being was the same as worshipping God. The Mission opened a chain of schools, hospitals, orphanages and libraries throughout the country. It provided relief during famines, earthquakes and epidemics. A math or monastery was established in Belur near Calcutta. The Belur Math took care of the religious developments of the people

Dayanand Saraswati and the Arya Samaj

Another organisation in northern India which aimed to strengthen Hinduism through reform was the Arya Samaj. Dayanand Saraswati, the founder of the Arya Samaj in Rajkot, was born into a Brahmin family in Kathiawar, Gujarat, in 1824. At the early age of 14, he rebelled against the practice of idol worship. He ran away from home at the age of twenty. For the next fifteen years, he wandered all over India meditating and studying the ancient Hindu scriptures. In 1863 Swami Dayanand started preaching his doctrine of one God. He questioned the meaningless rituals, decried polytheism and image worship and denounced the caste system. He wanted to purify Hinduism and attacked the evils that had crept into the Hindu society.

Dayanand Saraswati believed that the Vedas contained the knowledge imparted to men by God, and hence, its study alone could solve all the social problems. So, he

propagated the motto “Back to the Vedas.” Asserting that the Vedas made no mention of untouchability, child marriage and the subjugation of women, Swami Dayanand attacked these practices vehemently. Dayanand began the suddhi movement which enabled the Hindus, who had accepted Islam or Christianity to return to Hinduism, their original faith. Dayanand published his religious commentaries in Hindi, so as to make the common people understand his preachings. The Satyarth Prakash was his most important work. The Swami worked actively for the regeneration of India.

In 1875, Swami Dayanand founded the Arya Samaj in Bombay. The Arya Samaj made significant contributions to the fields of education, social and religious reforms. After his death, his followers had established the Dayanand Anglo Vedic Schools, first in Lahore and then in the other parts of India. Gurukuls were also established to propagate the traditional ideals of education. A network of schools and colleges both for boys and girls were also established by the Arya Samaj. The Arya Samaj influenced mostly the people of northern India, especially Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Gujarat and Punjab. Although it was not a political organisation, the Arya Samaj played a positive role in creating a nationalist pride in the Indian tradition and culture.

Reform Movements in Western India

Jyotirao Govindrao Phule: Jyotirao Govindrao Phule played a prominent role in bringing about, reforms in Maharashtra. He fought for improving the condition of women, the poor and the untouchables. He started a school for the education of girls of the lower castes and founded an association called the Satyasodhak Samaj. People from all castes and religions were allowed to join the association. He was opposed to the domination of the Brahmins and started the practice of conducting marriages without the Brahmin priests.

The Prarthana Samaj: In 1867, the Prarthana Samaj was started in Maharashtra with the aim of reforming Hinduism and preaching about the worship of one God. Mahadev Govind Ranade and R.G. Bhandarkar were the two great leaders of the Samaj. The Prarthana Samaj did in Maharashtra what the Brahmo Samaj did in Bengal. It attacked the caste system and the predominance of the Brahmins, campaigned against child marriage and the purdah system, preached widow remarriage and emphasised female education. In order to reform Hinduism, Ranade started the Widow Remarriage

Association and the Deccan Education Society. In 1887, Ranade founded the National Social Conference with the aim of introducing social reforms throughout the country. Ranade was also one of the founders of the Indian National Congress.

Reform Movements in South India

The Theosophical Society and Annie Besant: Many Europeans were attracted towards the Hindu philosophy. In 1875, a Russian spiritualist named Madame Blavatsky and an American called Colonel Olcott founded the Theosophical Society in America. The society was greatly influenced by the Indian doctrine of karma. In 1886 they founded the Theosophical Society at Adyar near Madras. Annie Besant, an Irish woman who came to India in 1893, helped the Theosophist movement to gain strength. She propagated the Vedic philosophy and urged Indians to take pride in their culture.

The Theosophists stood for the revival of the ancient Indian religion and universal brotherhood. The uniqueness of the movement lay in the fact that it was spearheaded by foreigners who glorified the Indian religious and philosophical traditions. Annie Besant was the founder of the Central Hindu College in Banaras, which later developed into the Banaras Hindu University. Annie Besant herself made India her permanent home and played a prominent role in the Indian politics. In 1917, she was elected President of the Indian National Congress.

Reform movements among the Muslims: Movements for the socioreligious reforms among the Muslims emerged late. Most Muslims feared that Western education would endanger their religion, as it was un-Islamic in character. During the first half of the 19th century only a handful of Muslims had accepted the English education. The Muhammedan Literary Society, established by Nawab Abdul Latif in 1863, was one of the earliest institutions that attempted to spread modern education. Abdul Latif also tried to remove social abuses and promote the Hindu Muslim unity.

Aligarh Movement and Sayyid Ahmad Khan

The most important socio-religious movement among the Muslims came to be known as the Aligarh Movement. It was organised by Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-1899), a man described as the most outstanding figure among the Muslims. Syed Ahmad Khan was born in 1817 into a Muslim noble family and had joined the service of the Company

as a judicial officer. He realised that the Muslims had to adapt themselves to the British rule.

So, Syed Ahmad advised the Muslims to embrace Western education and take up government service. In 1862, he founded the Scientific Society to translate the English books on science and other subjects into Urdu. He also started an English and Urdu journal through which he spread the ideas of social reform. Through his initiative was established the Mohammedan Oriental College which later developed into the Aligarh Muslim University. It helped to develop a modern outlook among its students. This intellectual movement is called the Aligarh Movement.

As a social reformer, Syed Ahmad Khan campaigned against the purdah system, polygamy and the Muslim system of divorce. He emphasised the need for removing the irrational social customs while retaining the essence of Islam and encouraging a rational interpretation of the Koran. Syed Ahmad Khan believed that the interest of the Muslims would be best served through the cooperation with the British Government. It was only through the guidance of the British that India could mature into a full-fledged nation. So, he opposed the participation of the Muslims in the activities of the Indian National Congress.

Reform movements among the Parsis and the Sikhs: The Parsi Religious Reform Association was started in 1851. It campaigned against orthodoxy in religion. Religious and social movements among the Sikhs were undertaken by various gurus who tried to bring about positive changes in the Sikh religion. Baba Dayal Das propagated the nirankar (formless) idea of the God. By the end of the 19th century a new reform movement called the Akali Movement was launched to reform the corrupt management of the Gurdwaras.

Women Reformers

Pandita Ramabai: The British Government did not take the substantial steps to educate women. Still, by the end of the 19th century, there were several women who had become aware of the need for social reform. Pandita Rama bai had been educated in United States and in England. She wrote about the unequal treatment meted out to the women of India. She founded the Arya Mahila Sabha in Pune and opened the Sarda Sadan for helping the destitute widows. Sarojini Naidu: Sarojini Naidu was a renowned

poet and a social worker. She inspired the masses with the spirit of nationalism through her patriotic poems. She stood for voting the rights for women, and took an active interest in the political situation in the country. She also helped to set up the All-India Women's Conference.

Literature and the Press: Literature was used as a powerful weapon for spreading social awareness among the people. It was also used for promoting the social reforms. The social reformers made valuable contributions to literature. Bharatendu Harish Chandra, Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay and Rabindranath Tagore spread the ideas of social reform and condemned social injustice in Hindi and Bengali. Poets like Iqbal and Subramania Bharati inspired the masses. Premchand wrote about the sufferings of the poor and thus made the people aware of social injustice. Rabindranath Tagore composed the National Anthem. Bankim Chandra and Iqbal composed two other national songs *Bande Mataram* and *Saare Jahan Se Achcha*.

Growth of the Press: Most reformers started journals of their own. Through these journals and newspapers, they put forward their demands for social, economic and political changes. Thus, the press acted as a vehicle for disseminating the ideas of social transformation. **Contribution of the reform movements:** Many reformers like Dayanand Saraswati and Vivekananda upheld Indian philosophy and culture. This instilled in Indians a sense of pride and faith in their own culture. Female education was promoted. Schools for girls were set up. Even medical colleges were established for women. The cultural and ideological struggle taken up by the socio-religious movements helped to build up national consciousness. Thus, they paved the way for the growth of nationalism.

Impact of Reform Movements

Reform legislation and attitudinal changes among Indians were the major impact of the reform movements. In the field of emancipation of women, legal measures were introduced to abolish sati and female infanticide. Permission was given for widow remarriage and the marriageable age of girls was raised to ten years.

The various reform movements, though differing from each other, together helped in the awakening of the people to the need for change. They united the people and attacked the caste system. They contributed to the birth of Indian nationalism and tackled social evils on a national basis. People became aware of the exploitative nature of the

colonial rule under the leadership of Dadabhai Nauroji, M.G. Ranade, G.V. Joshi and R.C. Duff. They exposed the disastrous consequences of British rule on the Indian economy.

National Awakening in the 19th Century

The 19th century was a period of significant transformation in India, marked by the emergence of national consciousness among Indians. This awakening was fueled by multiple factors, including the oppressive British colonial rule, the spread of Western education, socio-religious reform movements, and economic exploitation. The British policies, particularly their economic drain of India's wealth, excessive taxation, destruction of indigenous industries, and racial discrimination, created widespread resentment among the Indian masses. The introduction of Western education and ideas of democracy, liberty, and nationalism further ignited the spirit of awakening among Indians, who began questioning British authority.

The socio-religious reform movements played a crucial role in national awakening. Organizations such as the **Brahmo Samaj**, founded by **Raja Ram Mohan Roy** in 1828, sought to eliminate social evils such as sati, caste discrimination, and child marriage while promoting rationalism and modern education. Similarly, **Swami Dayananda Saraswati's Arya Samaj**, established in 1875, propagated the idea of a purified Hindu society based on Vedic principles and denounced foreign domination. The **Theosophical Society**, led by **Annie Besant**, attempted to revive India's spiritual heritage, while **Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's Aligarh Movement** emphasized modern education among Muslims, contributing to their socio-political empowerment. These reform movements laid the ideological foundation for a united national struggle against British rule.

Western education, introduced by the British, played a paradoxical role. While it was meant to produce a class of English-educated Indians who would assist the British administration, it inadvertently created a new generation of leaders who embraced nationalist ideas. Prominent leaders such as **Dadabhai Nauroji**, **Surendranath Banerjee**, and **Gopal Krishna Gokhale** emerged from this educated class, advocating political rights and self-governance. Nauroji's famous 'Drain Theory' exposed how British policies were exploiting India's resources, while Banerjee's leadership in the **Indian National Association** prepared the ground for nationalist politics. The founding

of the **Indian National Congress (INC) in 1885** was a major milestone in India's national awakening. Initially, the INC sought constitutional reforms and self-government through moderate means, but it gradually evolved into a mass movement demanding complete independence.

The economic exploitation of India by the British further fueled nationalist sentiments. The **Permanent Settlement system** and **Ryotwari system** burdened peasants with high taxes, leading to rural distress and frequent famines. The deindustrialization of India, caused by British economic policies that favored British goods over Indian products, devastated local artisans and weavers. These economic hardships created deep discontent among the people, strengthening the demand for self-rule.

The late 19th century also witnessed the emergence of **extremist leaders** like **Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, and Bipin Chandra Pal**, who rejected the moderate approach of early nationalists and called for direct action against British rule. Tilak's famous slogan, "**Swaraj is my birthright, and I shall have it**", resonated with the masses and laid the groundwork for future mass movements. The **Swadeshi Movement** (1905) and **Boycott Movement**, initiated in response to the partition of Bengal by Lord Curzon, further strengthened nationalist fervor. These movements encouraged Indians to use indigenous goods and reject British-made products, fostering economic self-reliance and national unity.

In conclusion, the 19th century was a crucial period in India's struggle for freedom, as it witnessed the birth of nationalist consciousness. Socio-religious reform movements, economic exploitation, Western education, and political awakening played pivotal roles in shaping India's nationalist movement. The seeds sown during this era eventually led to mass uprisings and the struggle for independence in the 20th century. The national awakening of the 19th century laid a strong foundation for the later phases of the Indian freedom movement, which ultimately culminated in India's independence in 1947.

Check Your Progress

- The main causes and consequences of the Poligar Revolt in South India?
- The Vellore Mutiny of 1806 serve as a precursor to the Revolt of 1857?
- The Queen's Proclamation of 1858, and how did it impact British rule in India?

Unit – II

Indian National Movement – Origin and Growth - Moderates – Extremists – Partition of Bengal – Swadeshi Movement – Birth of Muslim League – Surat Congress – Minto-Morley Reform Act – Communal Electorate - Home Rule Movement – Montague-Chelmsford Reform Act.

Objectives

- The Partition of Bengal in 1905 by Lord Curzon
- The Surat Congress of 1907 resulted in a split between the Moderates and Extremists.
- The Montague-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 introduced the system

Rise of National Movement

Although unique to the modern world, the growth of nationalism as a phenomenon can be traced to the Middle Ages. By the Middle Ages, nation states had begun to be formed with definite boundaries. These nation states had a definite political system and a uniform law for the people inhabiting the state. People lived under the same political, social and economic system and shared common aspirations. The middle class had a significant role to play in the formation of the nation-states. In European countries like Italy and Germany, nationalism as a political ideologue emerged only in the nineteenth century. The French Revolution of 1789 ingrained the idea of nationalism and nation state. Since the nineteenth century, whenever there has been a call for a new sovereign state, violence has made its appearance. Two forces were always at work—nationalism and democracy. India as a nation was no exception to this rule. The mid-nineteenth century saw the growth of nationalism in India. Colonial rule, destruction of the old social and political order, rise of a new social class—all contributed to the development of nationalism in India. The religious and social movements also contributed to the growth of nationalism.

During this period, reform movements were largely being swayed by two important intellectual principles — rationalism and religious universalism. A rational secular outlook was replacing blind faith that had crept into tradition and custom. Universalism was not purely philosophy. It affected political and social outlook till religious particularism took root in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The main

objectives of this movement were liberal ideas, national unity, and progress. These could be achieved by removing the backward elements in traditional culture as well as the repressive elements in colonial culture and ideology. Jettisoning casteism and idolatry had to be done alongside an emphasis on reviving the vernacular languages. The plan included restoring the indigenous education system by restoring the ancient arts and medicine and reconstructing traditional Indian knowledge. The socio-religious movements were an essential part of the growing nationalist consciousness. At this point it was important to make Indians feel proud of being Indian i.e. proud of their culture and heritage. This movement succeeded in doing that. The colonial cultural hegemonization process was stopped in its tracks.

Renaissance in India has been a great causal factor in the rise of modern Indian nationalism. It may also be regarded as an attempt on the part of scores of cultural factors to revive and reassert them: a sort of defensive mechanism against the impact of an alien political power in the country. A new humanist and cosmopolitan interpretation began to prevail upon the old belief. A radical trend emerged with representatives like Anantaranga Pillai, Abu Talib, Henry Vivian Derozio, and Raja Rammohan Roy.

The Moderates

Since its inception in 1885 till the time India won its Independence in 1947, the Indian National Congress was the largest and most prominent Indian political organization. In its initial stages, the Indian National Congress was a political unit, however, in due course of time it supported the cause of social reform and human development. The Indian National Congress is said to have also provided impetus to the spirit of nationalism. In its early stages, there was unity in the Indian National Congress and it was marked by the learning of democratic methods and techniques.

The leaders of the INC believed that the British government was responsive to their needs and were willing to make changes accordingly. However, over a period of time, the Indian masses became disillusioned with the concept of nationalism. They suddenly became aware that their petitions were not as fruitful as expected and that the British subtly avoided taking any action. Even in the phase of dissatisfaction, there were some Congress leaders who believed in the methods of the British government and came to be known as moderates. Since these moderate leaders failed to produce desired results,

a new stream of leaders came up who were known as the extremists. These extremists disagreed with the traditional methods of moderates that were limited to writing petitions and conducting agitations to get themselves heard. The extremists were not satisfied with a dominion status and demanded complete independence from the British government.

Moderates

Due to the low-level of political awareness, the achievements of moderate nationalists were not immense. However, by 1907, the moderates were pushed to the background with the emergence of an extremist class in the Congress. The failure to produce any results for the welfare of the people resulted in the creation of an extremist group and the division of Congress into two factions. Leaders of moderate phase mainly came from Bombay, Bengal and Madras. For example, Badruddin Tayabji, Dada Bhai Naoroji, Pherozshah Mehta, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, K.T. Telang and Govind Ranade were from Bombay. Wumesh Chander Banerji, Anand Mohan Bose. Surendra Nath Banerji and Ramesh Chandra Dutta were from Bengal. Similarly, Subamanya Ayer, Anand Charlu, and Raghavacharya were from Madras. Very few leaders like Madan Mohan Malaviya and Pundit D. P. Dhar came from north India. These moderate leaders treated British rule as a blessing. They sincerely believed that the British rule would make India a developed democratic and liberal country. They had the illusion that the British would introduce modern institutions and remove superstitious belief. They saw England as a source of inspiration and treated English as their political guru. Many of these nationalist leaders had anglicized lifestyle. All they wanted and expected from the British was a 'reform package' for Indians.

The moderates believed in peaceful methods to get their demands across. They believed in writing petitions and peaceful protests. Though the Moderates failed to make the same impact as the extremists, they petitioned a number of reforms during this time.

1. Constitutional reforms: The Moderates demanded the expansion and reform of the existing Legislative Councils from 1885 to 1892. They demanded the introduction of the system of direct elections and an increase in the number of members and powers of the Legislative Councils. It is true that their agitation forced the Government to pass the Indian Councils Act of 1892 but the moderates were not satisfied with what was given to the people of India. No wonder, they declared the

Act of 1892 as a 'hoax.' They demanded a large share for the Indians in the Legislative Councils. By the beginning of the 20th century, the Moderates put forward the claim for Swarajya or self government within the British Empire on the model of the other self-governing colonies like Australia and Canada. This demand was made from the Congress platform by Gokhale in 1905 and by Dadabhai Naoroji in 1906.

2. Demand for economic reforms: The Congress opposed the British attempt to develop in India the basic characteristics of a colonial economy, namely, the transformation of India into a supplier of raw materials, a market for British manufactures and a field of investment for foreign capital. Moderates took note of all the three forms of contemporary colonial economic exploitation, namely through trade, industry and finance. They organized a powerful all-India agitation against the abandonment of tariff-duties on imports and against the imposition of cotton excise duties. The moderates carried on agitation for the reduction of heavy land revenue payments. They urged the Government to provide cheap credit to the peasantry through agricultural banks and to make available irrigation facilities on a large scale. They asked for improvement in the conditions of work of the plantation labourers. They demanded a radical change in the existing pattern of taxation and expenditure which put a heavy burden on the poor while leaving the rich, especially the foreigners, with a very light load. They demanded the abolition of salt tax which hit the poor and lower middle classes hard. The moderates complained of India's growing poverty and economic backwardness and put the blame on the politics of the British Government. They blamed the Government for the destruction of the indigenous industries like the traditional handicrafts industries in the country. They demanded the rapid development of the modern industries which would help in the removal of India's poverty. They wanted the Government to give tariff protection to the Indian industries. They advocated the use of Swadeshi goods and the boycott of British goods. They demanded that the economic drain of India by England must stop. Most of them opposed the large scale investment of foreign capital in the Indian railways, plantations and industries on the ground that it would lead to the suppression of

Indian capitalists and the further strengthening of the British hold on India's economy and polity.

3. Administrative and miscellaneous reforms: Moderates criticized the individual administrative measures and worked hard to reform the administrative system which was ridden with corruption, inefficiency and oppression. They demanded the Indianization of the higher grades of the administrative services; the demand was put forward on economic, political and moral grounds. Economically, the high salaries paid to the European put a heavy burden on Indian finance, and contributed to the economic drain. Indians of similar qualifications could be employed on lower salaries. Europeans sent a large part of their salaries back to England and also got their pensions in England. That added to the drain of wealth from India. Politically, the European civil servant ignored the needs of the Indians and favoured the European capitalists at the cost of their Indian counterparts. It was hoped that the Indianization of the services would make the administration more responsive to Indian needs. Morally, the existing system dwarfed the Indian character reducing the tallest Indian to permanent inferiority in his own country. Moderates demanded the separation of the judiciary from the executive so that the people might get some protection from the arbitrary acts of police and bureaucracy. They were opposed to the policy of disarming the people of India by the Government. They opposed the aggressive foreign policy against India's neighbours and protested against the policy of the annexation of Burma, the attack upon Afghanistan and the suppression of the tribal people in North-Western India. They wanted the Government to spend more money on the spread of education in the country. They also took up the cause of the Indians who had been compelled by poverty to migrate to the British colonies in search of employment. In many of these foreign lands they were subjected to severe oppression and racial discrimination.
4. Defense of Civil Rights: They opposed the restrictions imposed by the government on the modern civil rights, namely the freedom of speech and the press. Almost from the beginning of the 19th century, politically conscious Indians had been attracted to modern civil rights especially the freedom of the

press. As early as 1824, Raja Ram Mohan Roy had protested against a regulation restricting the freedom of the press. In the period from 1870 to 1918, the main political task was that of politicization of nationalist ideology. The press was the chief instrument for carrying out this task. Indian newspapers began to find their feet in 1870's. The Vernacular Press Act of 1878, directed only against Indian language newspapers, was conceived in great secrecy and passed at a single sitting of the Imperial Legislative Council. The act provided for the confiscation of the printing press, paper and other materials of a newspaper if the government believed that it was publishing seditious material and had flouted an official warning. Indian nationalist opinion firmly opposed the Act. Various public bodies and the press also campaigned against the Act. Consequently, it was repealed in 1881 by Lord Ripon. Surendranath Banerjee was the first Indian to go to jail in performance of his duty as a journalist. But, the man who is most frequently associated with the struggle for the freedom of press during the nationalist movement was Bal Gangadhar Tilak. In 1897, B. G. Tilak and many other leaders were arrested and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for condemning the government through their speeches and writings. The Natu brothers of Poona were deported without trial. The entire country protested against this attack on the liberties of the people. The arrest of Tilak marked the beginning of new phase of the nationalist movement.

Failure of the Moderates

The basic weakness of the moderates lay in their narrow social base. Their movement did not have wide appeal. In fact, the leaders lacked political faith in the masses. The area of their influence was limited to the urban community. As they did not have the support of the masses, they declared that the time was not ripe for throwing out a challenge to the foreign rulers. That was likely to invite mature repression. However, it must not be presumed that moderate leaders fought for their narrow interests. Their programmes and policies championed the cause of all sections of the Indian people and represented nation-wide interests against colonial exploitation.

Critically evaluating the work of the Moderates, it appears that they did not achieve much success. Very few of the reforms advocated by them were carried out. The

foreign rulers treated them with contempt. The moderates failed to acquire any roots among the common people and even those who joined the Congress with high hopes were feeling more and more disillusioned. The politics of the moderates was described as 'halting and half-hearted.' Their methods were described as those of mendicancy or beggary through prayers and petitions.

Moderates failed to keep pace with the yearnings and aspirations of the people. They did not realize that the political and economic interests of the Indians and the British clashed and consequently the British people could not be expected to give up their rights and privileges in India without a fight. Moreover, it was during this period that a movement started among the Muslims to keep away from the Congress and that ultimately resulted in the establishment of Pakistan. In spite of their best efforts, the moderates were not able to win over the Muslims.

The social composition of Congress remained, by and large the same till 1905. A. O. Hume tried his best to bring Muslims and peasants into the Congress fold, but with little success. The Muslim elite, especially from Aligarh, felt that they would lose from the elected councils and that the Hindus would dominate (Hindus were in majority in most places). The Muslim elite also opposed competitive examinations for the recruitment into civil services, as it was based on modern English education and the Muslims were far behind the Hindus in this field. They feared Hindu domination in the civil services too. All these factors kept Muslims away from the Congress; neither did the Congress give a serious look into inducting Muslims. This was a big mistake, as they realized in later years.

Thus, it is clear that the Congress was not only concerned with the issues of zamindars, capitalist and English educated professionals, but it also showed concern for almost all the sections of the society. The objectives of the Congress were never the reason for calling it 'moderate', rather its methods and style of functioning. The early Congress leaders believed in the constitutional method of struggle, i.e., through petitions, speeches and articles. One important reason for this was the social composition of early Congress leaders. They came from successful professional background (most of them were lawyers, journalists and academicians) and their personal life-style was anglicised.

Perhaps, the first lesson they learned from the British was how to write applications and give petitions. Moreover, politics, for most of them, remained a part-time affair

The extremists

Introduction

The Indian political scene was not reformed to a great extent by the efforts of the Moderates. This led to the rise of a new and younger group who believed that different measures need to be adopted. Revolutionary activities were seen in India and abroad. Lala Lajpat Rai, Bipin Chandra Pal and Bal Gandadhar Tilak became the face of militant nationalism in India. This unit will discuss the contribution of these freedom fighters and the Swadeshi Movement in India.

Rise of Extremism and its Causes

The closing decade of the nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of a new and younger group within the Indian National Congress, which was sharply critical of the ideology and methods of the old leadership. These ‘angry young men’ advocated the adoption of Swaraj as the goal of the Congress, which was to be achieved by more self-reliant and independent methods. The new group came to be called the extremists in contrast to the older one which began to be referred to as the moderates.

The militant form of nationalism was first found in the teachings and preaching of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee and Swami Dayananda Saraswati. Bankim Chandra Chatterjee was inspired by the Bhagavad Gita and visualized a united India. Swami Vivekananda, who was called the prophet of nationalism by Bipin Chandra Pal, added spiritual dimension to the idea of nationalism. He inspired the youth of his time, more than anyone else. The root of extremism lies in two important factors—the policies of colonial rule, and the failure of moderate leaders to attract younger generation and common people.

Factors that Led to the Rise of Extremism

Following are the factors led to the rise of extremists:

- Enlightenment of the true nature of British rule
- Civil Services examinations was disallowed
- Partition of Bengal

- The Indian Council Act, 1892, failed to introduce an elective element in India and provided for selection of some members
- Adoption of the Tariff and Cotton Duties Act of 1894 and 1896 by the Indians
- Curbing freedom of press (1904) and controlling universities through Indian University Act (1904)
- Defeat of Russia (1904-05) by Japan inspired the educated youth
- Circulation of Vernacular newspaper went up from 2,99,000 in 1885 to 8,17,000 in 1905. Some of the popular journals like Kesari (Marathi) and Bangabhasi (Bengali) opposed the moderate Congress the famine of Maharashtra in 1896.

Objectives and Methods of Extremists

The new turn in Indian politics found expression in two forms—the formation of the extremist group within the Congress and the growth of revolutionary movement in the country at large. Four prominent Congress leaders— Lokamanya Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal, Aurobindo Ghosh and Lala Lajpat Rai, defined the creed of the new group, gave articulate form to its aspirations and guided its operations. One of the earliest leaders who criticized the moderate politics systematically, in a series of articles titled ‘New Lamps for Old’ was Aurobindo Ghose. He did not like the constitutional method of struggle based on English model and attacked the soft attitude of the Congress. He told them not to take inspiration from England but to take inspiration from French Revolution (1789-99). He also suggested bringing the proletariat (working) class in the national movement. The emerging leaders in the Congress, like Bipin Chandra Pal, Ashwini Kumar Dutta, Lala Lajpat Rai and Bal Gangadhar Tilak, were not happy with the ‘prayers’ and ‘petitions’ methods. They were in favour of self-reliance, constructive work, mass contact through melas, public meetings, use of mother tongue in education and political works. They argued that ‘good government is no substitute for self-government’. The issue of Swadeshi Movement widened the gap between the moderates and the extremists. The extremists wanted to spread the movement in the entire country and complete non-cooperation with the government. Lajpat Rai and Tilak were more aggressive in their ideas and plans.

Lajpat Rai thundered ‘no national is worthy of any political status if it cannot distinguish between begging rights and claiming them’. He further argued that

‘sovereignty rests with the people; the state exists for them and rules in their name’. But the true founder of militant nationalism was Bal Gangadhar Tilak. He criticized the moderates in his unique style— ‘we will not achieve any success in our labours if we croak once a year like a frog’. He was quick to set the political goal of India, i.e., ‘Swaraj’ or self-government instead of reform in administration. He showed greater confidence and ability when he declared ‘Swaraj is my birth right and I shall have it’. He was a pioneer in many ways. He used religious symbols and festivals, like Ganesh festival since 1894, to mobilize people and he made patriotic-cum-historical cult through Shivaji festival since 1896 to inspire the youth. He even carried out the no-revenue campaign in 1896–97, during severe famine in Maharashtra. He called upon the government to take those measures of relief, which were provided under law in the Famine Relief Code. Through his paper, Kesari, he made an appeal to the people to refuse to pay taxes. He wrote angrily, ‘Can you not be bold even in the grip of death’. He also started Boycott Movement on the issue of countervailing Cotton Excise Duty Act of 1896. It should be clearly understood that the extremists’ demand for Swaraj was a demand for ‘complete freedom from foreign control and full independence to manage national affairs without any foreign restraints’. The Swaraj of the moderate leaders was merely a demand for colonial self-government within the Empire. The methods employed by the two groups (moderates and extremists) were different in their tempo and approach. The extremists had no faith in the benevolence of the British public or parliament, nor were they convinced of the efficacy of merely holding conferences. The extremists also affirmed their faith in passive resistance, mass agitation and strong will to suffer or make self-sacrifices. The new leadership sought to create a passionate love for liberty, accompanied by a spirit of sacrifice and a readiness to suffer for the cause of the country. They strove to root out from the people’s mind the omnipotence of the ruler, and instead give them self-reliance and confidence in their own strength. They had deep faith in the strength of the masses and they planned to achieve Swaraj through mass action. They, therefore, pressed for political work among the masses and for direct political action by the masses. The extremists advocated boycott of the foreign goods, use of swadeshi goods, national education and passive resistance.

Revolutionary Activities

Even the reactionary activities of the extremists school of leaders could not satisfy the Indian youth. They opposed the British with the use of violence through pistol and bomb. The revolutionary terrorist movement in India strongly affected the Congress and the British government. Revolutionary terrorist groups restricted their strengths only to remain more agile and effective. The movement, however low the number it attracted, had an impact on India: its people, the Congress and the British rulers.

Revolutionary activities in Maharashtra

The Chapekar brothers (Deodar and Balkrishna Chapekar) shot dead Lt. Ayerst in 1897 at Poona, although Rand, the president of the Plague Committee was the real target. They were arrested, convicted and hanged. Similarly, Bal Gangadhar Tilak was sentenced to jail for provoking terrorism through his writings.

Revolutionary activities in Bengal

Bengal became the hotbed of terrorist activities. In 1908, Prafulla Chaki and Khudiram Bose threw a bomb at Kennedy's carriage assuming it to be that of Kingsford, the judge of Muzaffarpur. Previously, the concerned judge had awarded capital punishment to many youths. Two ladies died in the incident and Prafulla shot himself dead before he could be captured by the police. On the other hand, Khudiram was tried and hanged.

In Calcutta, Aurobindo Ghosh organized the revolutionaries. He tried to strike terror in the minds of the British officials by killing some British officers. In Alipore conspiracy case, Aurobindo, his brother, Barinas and others were captured and tried. Namenda Gosling, the approver in the case, was shot dead. A similar fate awaited the Public Prosecutor and the Deputy Superintendent of police. Although Aurobindo was acquitted but his brother and the others were deported to Andaman. Sateen Bose and Kanai Dutta, who had killed the approver, were sentenced to death. Another revolutionary named Baghdad Jain was killed in an encounter with police in 1915. He was involved in the Dacca conspiracy case.

Revolutionary activities in Punjab

Punjab also became a centre of revolutionary activities under the leadership of Lala Hardayal, Avado Bihar, Amir Chandra, J.M. Chatterjee, etc. The revolutionary associations like 'Kitty Kinas Party' and 'Naujawan Sabha' were also set up.

Chandra Shekhar Azad founded 'Hindustan Republic Association'. It was later rechristened as 'Hindustan Socialist Republic Association'. Its leading members like Bhagat Singh, Raj Guru and Sukh Dev were sentenced to death for their involvement in the Kakori train robbery, bombing the Assembly hall and other terrorist activities. In fact, Punjab became a smouldering volcano for the British government.

The Europeans were attacked at Lahore. Several riots occurred at The Extremists Rawalpindi under the leadership of Ajit Singh.

Revolutionary activities in Madras

The youths of Madras were inspired by the visit of Bipin Chandra Pal to Madras and his inflammatory speech. Chidambaram Pillai demanded total independence for India for which he was arrested. As a protest the crowd turned violent in Tuticorin and Tirunelveli. The police opened fire to disperse the crowd. The officer who had ordered firing was killed by Vanchi Ayer.

Revolutionary activities in the rest of India

At various places in western India, the revolutionary terrorism made its presence felt. In 1909 Jackson, the Magistrate of Nasik was shot dead. He was very unpopular among the general public. The Ahmedabad bomb case and the Satara conspiracy cases were other noteworthy terrorist activities in the region.

At Dehradun, a bomb was thrown at Viceroy Lord Harding by Rasbehari Bose. Some of the Viceroy's attendants were killed. In an encounter with British police in 1931, Chandra Shekhar Azad was shot dead at Alfred Park in Allahabad

Revolutionary activities abroad

Even abroad the revolutionary activities continued in full swing. After the murder of District Magistrate Rand, Shyamji Krishna Verma of Kathiawar went to London and started Home Rule Society in due course of time.

In 1906, V.D. Savarkar went to London and joined 'Indian Society'. It promoted revolutionary terrorism. Madan Lal Dhingra, one of the members of this society, killed Sir William Curzon Willy, the ADC to the Secretary of State of India.

Among the revolutionary activities abroad, the role of Gadar Party can never be denied. Lala Hardayal, a revolutionary young man from Punjab, established Gadar Party and also published a weekly paper The Gadar. It aimed at bringing about a revolution in India to set the country free from the British. Lala Hardayal was ordered by the USA government to leave the country due to his engagement in the anti-British propaganda.

During the World War I, the Indian revolutionaries abroad approached the German government for help. They further sought help from the Muslims of Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan to overthrow the British empire in India. Sardar Ajit Singh and Sufi Amba Prasad went to the Middle East to unite the defeated Indian soldiers and garner their support.

Raja Mahendra Pratap led an Indo-German mission to Afghanistan and set up a free government there. The Komagata Maru case fanned the fire of revolutionary terrorism. This Japanese ship which took revolutionary Sikhs to Canada was denied anchoring in the port in Canada and returned to Calcutta. The passengers revolted not to board train for Punjab arranged by the British government. Some of them died due to the government's strict action. All these happenings inspired the terrorist movement in Punjab.

The revolutionary terrorists carried out political dacoities at Amritsar, Jullundur and Ludhiana in Punjab. These revolutionary activities lasted abroad till 1945 when Subhas Chandra Bose met a mysterious death. The revolutionary activities, both inside the country and abroad, could not succeed because these were confined just to the educated middle class people of India.

There were specific causes which were responsible for the failure of revolutionary activities. Some of them are: lack of sympathy from the upper class Indians; various types of organizational and financial problems coming across the revolutionaries; indifference of Indian National Congress towards the militant nationalist thought; tough and repressive measures taken by the government; and last but not the least, the appearance of Gandhiji on the scene.

Bhagat Singh, representative of the dissatisfied Indian youth who disapproved of Gandhian policies, offered revolutionary alternatives. He emerged as an extraordinary revolutionary and martyr of the Indian anti-colonial movement. He studied the European revolutionary movement and was particularly attracted to anarchism and communism. Being an out and out atheist, socialist and communist, it was not long before it dawned on him that just overthrowing the British was not enough. He realized that the socialist reconstruction of Indian society was essential, for which the workers needed to seize political power. In the words of Bhagat Singh and B.K. Dutt:

By Revolution we mean that the present order of things, which is based on manifest injustice must change. Producers or labourers, in spite of being the most necessary element of society, are robbed by their exploiters of their labour and deprived of their elementary rights. The peasant who grows corn for all, starves with his family; the weaver who supplies the world market with textile fabrics, has not enough to cover his own and his children's bodies; masons, smiths and carpenters who raise magnificent palaces, live like pariahs in the slums. The capitalists and exploiters, the parasites of society, squander millions on their whims.

This was their understanding of revolution which they expressed following the (assembly bomb case) on 6th June, 1929.

Their argument was that a 'radical change' was required and that it could only be brought about by those who realized that it was necessary to reorganize society on socialist. For this purpose, it was felt necessary to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is clear from the actions and slogans associated with the Lahore Conspiracy Case that Bhagat Singh and his comrades were followers of Communism. On January 21, 1930, they appeared in court with red scarves. The moment the magistrate was seated they raised the following slogans: 'Long Live Socialist Revolution', 'Long Live the Communist International', 'Long live the people' 'Lenin's name will never die', and 'Down with Imperialism.' The text of the following telegram was read by Bhagat Singh in court:

On Lenin Day we send hearty greetings to all who are doing something for carrying forward the ideas of the great Lenin, we wish success to the great experiment

Russia is carrying out. We join our voice to that of the International working class movement. The proletariat will win. Capitalism will be defeated. Death to Imperialism

Bhagat Singh criticized the individual terrorism that existed among the revolutionary youth of his time. He realized that there was a need for the Communist Party to work towards mass mobilization. Bhagat strongly believed that the party had to organize the workers and the peasantry. The fight for the small economic demands through the labour unions, according to him, was the best means of educating the common masses for a final struggle to achieve political power. He also felt that the Communist Party should shoulder the additional responsibility of organizing a military department.

In his own words: 'I am not a terrorist and I never was, except perhaps in the beginning of my revolutionary career. And I am convinced that we cannot gain anything through these methods. One can easily judge it from the history of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association. All our activities were directed towards an aim, i.e., identifying ourselves with the great movement as its military wing. If anybody has misunderstood me, let him amend his ideas. I do not mean that bombs and pistols are useless, rather the contrary. But I mean to say that mere bomb throwing is not only useless but sometimes harmful. The military department of the party should always keep ready all the war-material it can command for any emergency. It should back the political work of the party. It cannot and should not work independently.'

Partition of Bengal

Introduction

The year 1905 is one of the most eventful years in the history of Bengal. It would be no exaggeration to say that it was an epoch-making year, which left a profound impact on the political history of the country. It was the year in which Bengal was divided into two separate provinces. The new province consisted of Assam, the three great Bengal divisions of Chittagong, Dacca and Rajasahi and a few minor pockets. It was to be a Muslim majority province with 18 million Muslims and 12 million Hindus. The capital of this new province was to be Dacca.

Genesis of the Partition of Bengal

The origins of the Partition of Bengal are to be found in Sir Strafford Northcote's Minute of 18th January, 1868, in which Northcote pointed out that the province of Bengal was so big that the outlying portions of the province suffered due to lack of attention in times of emergency. He referred, to the Orissa famine of 1866 as furnishing evidence of the defects of the existing system of government when exposed to the ordeal of a serious emergency.[^] He suggested that Assam and possibly Orissa be separated from Bengal proper. t. Home Department (Public Branch) Despatch

In 1874, Assam, Sylhet, Cachar and Goalpara were separated from Bengal. The Bengalis accepted this transfer of the Bengali-speaking districts without demur because “public opinion was not then much of a power, and the solidarity of the Bengalee-speaking people and their growing sense of unity had not become so pronounced a factor in the public life of the province.

In 1896, the Chief Commissioner of Assam Sir W, Ward, put forward a scheme for the separation of Chittagong Division from Bengal, but his successor Sir Henry Cotton opposed the scheme in 1897 and described it as “inadvisable and impracticable.

It was, however, during the Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon that the question of the large size of the province was once again taken up. In June, 1903, Lord Curzon prepared an exhaustive Minute on the territorial redistribution in India. Part II of that Minute dealt with Bengal. On the basis of the Minute H.H, Risley, Secretary to the Government of India, addressed letters to the Governments of Bengal, Madras, the Central Provinces and Assam containing proposals for the reduced territorial jurisdiction of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal and affecting changes in the territories of other provinces to whose governments also the letter was addressed.

Rationale Behind the Partition of Bengal

The Government said that the Partition of Bengal into two provinces was purely an administrative measure. It had three aims in dividing the province. Firstly, it wanted to relieve the Government of Bengal of a part of the burden imposed upon it and at the same time it wanted to make provision for more efficient administration of the outlying districts of the province; Secondly, the Government wanted to promote the development of Assam by enlarging its jurisdiction so as to give it an outlet to the sea; and Thirdly, the

Government wanted to unite under a single administration the scattered sections of the Oriya-speaking population,[^] It was further proposed to detach Chittagong and the districts of Dacca and Mymensingh from Bengal and add them to Assam. Similarly, Chota Nagpur was also to be cut off from Bengal and to be incorporated with the Central Provinces. The Government's proposals were officially published in January, 1904.

Justification of the Partition

In February, 1904, Lord Curzon made an official tour of the districts of eastern Bengal "ostensibly with the object of ascertaining public opinion, but really to over-awe it." The Viceroy addressed public meetings at Chittagong, Dacca and Mymensingh. The meetings that he addressed were specially convened for the purpose and his audiences were mostly Mohammedans. He explained to them "that his object in partitioning Bengal was not only to relieve the Bengal administration, but also to create a Mohammedan province where Islam would be predominant and its followers in the ascendancy and that with this view he had decided to include the two remaining districts of the Dacca division in his scheme." But the "trend of feeling was sufficiently manifested by the swarms of small boys in the streets carrying placards on which was inscribed the legend, "Do not turn us into Assamese," The walls of Dacca streets were placarded with mottos containing the words: 'Pray do not sever Bengalis', "Do not divide us", "Do not flout history and nationality." The Viceroy's speeches were mostly conciliatory and explanatory in character. He told the people of Dacca that he never entertained the intention ascribed to him by the placards.[®] But before he had been very long in Eastern Bengal, Curzon had "realised that the scheme in the form it had then assumed would be unacceptable."^{^®} However, the truth about Curzon is that there never was any real desire in him "to defer to public opinion and abide by its decision. He carried out his scheme in spite of the public opposition.

To begin with, the Partition of Bengal was unpalatable to all sections of the Bengalis. "We felt that we have been insulted, humiliated and tricked. We felt that the whole of our future was at a stake, and that it was a deliberate blow aimed at the growing solidarity and self-consciousness of the Bengali-speaking population.

The Muslims for whom a province was sought to be created by the Viceroy were opposed to the measure. Nevinnson writes, "I was in haste, because I had an appointment

with the Nawab Salimulla of Dacca, certainly the most influential in the city, and perhaps in the province. For the population of Eastern Bengal, though nearly all Bengali, is about three-fifths Mohammedans, and, owing to his father's wealth, wisdom and public munificence, the Nawab is regarded by the Mohammedans as their natural leader... when the Partition was first suggested, he was as much opposed to it as any Bengali could be, and I was told that, in his simple hearted way, he described it as 'beastly'.

The 'Muslim Chronicle', an important Muslim paper of Calcutta in its editorial dated 9th January, 1904 said: "We do not recollect that there has, in the discussion of public questions ever before so much unanimity of voice as that which is raising its shout of protests against the proposed partition of Bengal. The Central Mohammedan Association of Calcutta condemned the proposed partition of Bengal at a meeting held in February, 1904. Most of the speakers at the said meeting were very important Muslim leaders of the time. They were Mir Motahar Hussain, Zamindar of Barisal; Seraj-ul-Islam Chaudhary of Chittagong, member Bengal Legislative Council; and Abdul Hamid, Editor of the 'Muslim Chronicle'. Views of the Central Mohammedan Association, thus expressed, were forwarded to the Government through its Honorary Secretary Syed Amir Husani.

Besides Muslims, a large section of Anglo-Indian press, such as the 'Statesman', 'The Englishman' and 'The Times of India' and which were recognised as semi-official organs also condemned the proposal. Even some important papers of England like 'The Times', 'Manchester Guardian' and 'The Daily News', also condemned the measure.¹⁰ "It is indeed difficult to conceive", says R. C. Majumdar, "of a more unanimous and persistent opposition to a Government measure; there is certainly no precedent in the previous history of British rule in India.

Agitation against the Partition

The Bengalis resisted the partition of their province with all the vehemence at their command. They did not accept the Government's contention that the partition of the province was an administrative measure and that the Government had no ulterior motive in it. They felt that it was a deliberate attempt on the part of the British Government to drive a wedge at the growing solidarity of the Bengali-speaking people and to create differences between the Hindus and the Muslims of Bengal. Banerjea says: "To have

divided Bengal into two provinces, keeping the Bengali-speaking population together in one province and the rest in the other, would have removed all administrative inconveniences, whatever they were, and gratified public opinion. But this would not suit Lord Curzon and his Government. For, as we believe, there was an underlying motive, which would not be satisfied with such a division of the province. There appears to be truth in the Bengali point of view that Curzon was motivated by political considerations and not administrative in dividing Bengal. From his letters to the authorities in England, it is abundantly clear that the Viceroy wanted to undermine the solidarity of the politically advanced Bengalis and at lessening the political importance of Calcutta in Indian affairs. This is amply proved by his letter dated 17th February, 1904 to the Secretary of State for India in which the Viceroy said, "The Bengalis, who like to think of themselves a nation, and who dream of a future when the English will have been turned out and a Bengali Babu will be installed in Government House, Calcutta, of course bitterly resent any disruption that will be likely to interfere with the realisation of this dream. If we are weak enough to yield to their clamour now, we shall not be able to dismember or reduce Bengal again; and you will be cementing and solidifying, on the eastern flanks of India, a force already formidable and certain to be a source of increasing trouble in future." Regarding the importance of the city of Calcutta, Curzon wrote to the Secretary of State: "Calcutta is the centre from which the Congress party is manipulated throughout the whole of Bengal, and indeed the whole of India, Its best wirepullers and its most frothy defectors all reside there. The perfection of their machinery, and the tyranny which it enables them to exercise, are truly remarkable. They dominate public opinion in Calcutta; they affect the High Court; they frighten the Local Government and they are sometimes not without serious influence upon the Government of India. The whole of their activity is directed to creating an agency so powerful that they may one day be able to force a weak Government to give them what they desire."

To deprive Calcutta of its prime position as the Centre of political activity and to weaken the influence of the 'Bengali Babus', the Viceroy wanted to create new centres of activity. He rejected the Secretary of State's plea for a Commissionership of Bihar, and opined that the proposal, if accepted, "would tend still further to consolidate the influence of Calcutta over the Bengali-speaking population."

The Viceroy also aimed at driving a wedge “between Bengali Hindus and Bengali Muslims.” The newly created province of Eastern Bengal and Assam would have a Muslim majority. During his tour of Eastern Bengal, he emphasised this aspect again and again in his speeches. Addressing a public meeting at Dacca, he traced the history of Dacca City and lamented its gradual decay and downfall. He said that his partition proposal would not only make Dacca the capital of a new province, but would also give the people of the area a preponderant voice in the administration of the province and “invest the Mohammedans in Eastern Bengal with a unity which they have not enjoyed since the days of the old Musalman Viceroys and Kings.””^ Thus, Curzon’s motives in dividing Bengal were two-fold: (1) to undermine the influence of the Bengalis and the city of Calcutta in national affairs; and (2) to undermine the growing solidarity of the Bengali-speaking people and to drive a wedge between the Hindus and the Musalmans.

The partition of Bengal was resisted by the public opinion not only in Bengal but all over the country.”^ The resistance to the measure was more pronounced, vocal and aggressive in Bengal than elsewhere. The other provinces merely demonstrated their solidarity with their Bengali compatriots and opposed the measure at the public meetings and in the press.

The people of Bengal refused to accept partition as a ‘settled fact’. The ‘Bengalee’, an important newspaper of the province edited by Surendranath Banerjea published on 7th July, 1905, a leading article under the caption : “A Grave National Disaster” which warned the Government of an impending national struggle of the greatest magnitude in case the Government did not reverse their decision. B.C. Pal, an important Bengali leader of the time, said, “The whole country with one voice have protested against it, and have prayed that the mischief may be stayed. The protest has been in vain. That prayer has not been given any heed to.”^® He added “The partition was an evil measure, the partition was a hateful measure. The Bengalis hated to be divided from their own people, the Eastern province from the Western Province . . . We have been living together for how many centuries past nobody knows; we have developed a i>eculiar culture of our own through a common language and a common literature. Belonging though, no doubt, to the wide life of Indian Hindus and Indian Moslems, yet Bengal Hinduism has its own peculiarity, as the Moslem ideal and culture of Bengal have also

their own peculiarity. Bengal has been for many centuries past a nation speaking one language, belonging to one civilisation, practically trying to develop one culture .

The agitation against the partition of Bengal emanated from the city of Calcutta. There was a public meeting at the Town Hall of Calcutta on 7th August, 1905, which was organised by the prominent leaders of Bengal like Surendranath Banerjea and Babu Ananth Bandhu Guha. The meeting was a grand success. Large number of people from all walks of life attended it. Resolutions were passed condemning the partition of Bengal and appealing to Government to repeal the same. But it did not have any effect on the Government. The Calcutta Town Hall meeting was followed by more than 2,000 public meetings in that province, attended by both the Hindus and the Muslims and differing in numbers from 500 to 5000 and sometimes even 50,000 people attended the meetings in some parts of Bengal. They all condemned the partition of Bengal and urged upon the Government to cancel it.

The apologists of the Government described the agitation against partition as “the work of political wire-pullers and political agitators. This was strongly rebutted by Gopal Krishna Gokhale, the President, Indian National Congress Session of 1905 in the following words: “To add insult to injury. Lord Curzon described the opposition to his measure as ‘manufactured’—an opposition in which all classes of Indians, high and low, uneducated and educated, Hindus and Mohammedans, had joined, an opposition then which nothing more intense, nothing more widespread, nothing more spontaneous, had been seen in the Country in the whole (history) of our political agitation.

The Government tried to suppress the anti-partition agitation by introducing repressive measures much on the Tsarian pattern. The singing of national songs and even the cry of ‘Bandh Mataram’ were forbidden. School boys were prosecuted, military and punitive police were stationed in certain areas, public meetings were forcibly dispersed and even Surendranath Banerjea, a much respected leader was man-handled and humiliated at Barisal. Referring to the Barisal incident, Rash Behari Ghosh observed; “I have no hesitation in saying that we should be less than men if we could forget the tragedy of that day, the memory of which will always fill us with shame and humiliation.

Beddes, trying to suppress the agitation, the British Government also tried to win over the Muslims to its side. We have seen that the Muslims were opposed to the

partition plan in the beginning. Lord Curzon had created a Muslim majority province, of course, without the Muslims demanding the same. He, therefore, thought it necessary to enlist the support of the Muslims to his plan. During his tour of East Bengal he had tried to impress upon his Muslim audience the benefit of partition to them. Moreover, “shortly after the partition the Government of India advanced a loan to relieve the Nawab (Salim-ullah’s) private munificence from bankruptcy a loan amounting to about £ 100,000, at what was, for India, a very low rate of interest. This benevolent action, combined with certain privileges granted to Mohammedans, was supposed by many Hindus to have encouraged the Nawab and his co-religionists in taking a still more favourable view of the partition itself.” The Nawab was made to believe that in the new province the interests of the Muslims will dominate the administration of the new province and the Nawab as their leader will occupy a unique position there. Thus, the British Government was able to win over Nawab Salimullah to its side.” “The Muslims of East Bengal”, says A. C. Mazumdar. “headed by Nawab Salimullah of Dacca saw their opportunity and took the bait. Henceforth, the Mohammedans of Eastern Bengal forgetting the broader question of national advancement and ignoring the interests of their own community in Western Bengal deserted the national cause and gradually began to secede from the antipartition agitation. Sir Bampfylde Fuller, the Lt. Governor of the new province, made certain indiscreet speeches which had the effect of setting the Muslims against the Hindus. He said that he was an incarnation of Shaista Khan, one of the Mughal Governors of Bengal under Aurangzeb, and said in jest that he had two wives, one Muslim and the other Hindu, and the Muhammadan wife was the favourite.” “The jest was taken in earnest, and the Muslims genuinely believed that the British authorities were ready to forgive them all excesses. This encouraged the Muslims and it is said that “priestly Mullahs went through the country preaching the revival of Islam, and proclaiming to the villagers that the British Government was on the Muhammadan side, that the law courts had been specially suspended for three months, and no penalty would be exacted for violence done to Hindus, or for the loot of Hindu shops or the abduction of Hindu Widows.”

Consequently, riots broke out in Eastern Bengal at places like Comilla, Jamalpur, Mymensing, etc. “These communal riots came to be almost a normal feature in some

parts of the Eastern Bengal.” Many people were killed; “temples were desecrated, images broken, shops plundered, and many Hindu idows carried off. Some of the towns were deseftcd, the Hindu population took refuge in any ‘pukka’ house (i.e, house with brick or stone walls), women spent nights hidden in tanks, the crime known as “group rape” increased, and throughout the country districts there reigned a general terror, which still prevailed at the time of my visit.

But in spite of communal riots and of the Muslims joining the British Government, the Bengalis continued to agitate against the partition. They intensified the agitation by adopting the twin weapons of ‘Boycott’ and ‘Swadeshi’ against the British manufactured goods. They adopted these weapons only after the method of constitutional agitation namely prayers, protests, appeals, petitions and conferences had failed to get the partition of Bengal cancelled. It was, therefore, realised by the Bengalis that mere public meetings, protests and petitions were not enough. Something more concrete should be done to force an obdurate Government to submit to popular will. Thus the ‘Boycott’ and ‘Swadeshi’ movements were devised and used by the Bengalis as a political weapon to realise the object.

Boycott and Swadeshi Movements:

The ‘Boycott’ movement[®] was first used as part of the freedom struggle by the people of Ireland. The idea came to India in the last quarter of the 19th century when ‘Boycott’ of foreign goods was advocated as a means for revival of Indian industries. ‘Boycott’ in Indian context meant abjuring the use of all foreign manufactured goods particularly salt, sugar, cloth etc. By ‘Swadeshi’, the use of indigenous products was recommended in place of foreign products. The Bengalis used these weapons with a two-fold object.—“first as a demonstra[⌢]tion of their deep resentment at the treatment they were receiv[⌢]ing, and secondly to attract the attention of the people in England to their grievances, so that those who were in a position to call the Government of India to account might understand what was taking place in India.” They organised numerous public meetings in which ‘Boycott’ was preached and assembled people took solemn vows not to use foreign goods. Such meetings in Bengal were followed by meetings in other provinces as well, It is said that people from all walks of life participated in the ‘Boycott’ and ‘Swadeshi’ Movements. Hari Das Mukherjee and Uma Mukherjee said that

the zamindars, the pleaders, the students, the youths, the peasants and the shopkeepers and even medical men and native army. Brahmins and priests, barbers and washermen all “played an important part in the extension of the Boycott—Swadeshi Movement.” The washermen held a meeting at Boalia in which they resolved not to wash foreign made clothes. The barbers refused to shave people who used foreign made goods. The priests in Jessore in East Bengal refused to perform Pujahs and ceremonies in the houses of people who used foreign goods. Swadeshi volunteers picketted shops selling foreign goods and tried to persuade the customers and shopkeepers alike not to sell or purchase foreign goods. These volunteers often made a bonfire of foreign made cloth and shouted ‘Bande Mataram’. Sometimes the verenthusiasm of these volunteers in preventing people from pur chasing foreign made articles resulted in police interference. Consequently, the police used the so-called “mild lathi charge” and Swadeshi volunteers were mercilessly beaten.

Cases Were

The protagonists of the Boycott and the Swadeshi move-ments used another powerful weapon against those who used foreign made goods and that was the weapon of social ostrac-ism. They would treat him as a social out-caste. They would jeer at him and insult him in the street. Boys and girls in the schools and in the neighbourhood would be advised not to play with the children of people who used foreign articles. Even some-times in Bengal it became difficult for such people to marry their sons and daughters. The result of the Boycott and Swadeshi movements was that the import of British goods fell considerably. The Government used all sorts of repression, but the Bengalis would neither bend nor break.

While the Bengalis were fighting for the annulment of the partition, the country as a whole did not watch like a silent spectator. The entire country sympathised with the Bengalis and openly sided with them. “The Parsi, the Maratha, the Madrasi, the Sindhi, and the Punjabi rose as one man with the Bengali to undo the ‘settled fact. The Honourable Mr. Krishnan Nair of Madras, feelingly observed at the Congress of 1908: “The partition of Bengal affects the whole country like a deep, bleeding and unhealing wound. So long as such a wound exists in the human body it is difficult, if not impossible, for that body to know peace or enjoy repose.” Gokhale in his presidential address at the Congress of 1905 described the Partition of Bengal as a “cruel wrong”

which had been inflicted “on our Bengali brethren and the whole country has been stirred to its deepest depths in sorrow and resentment, as it had never been the case before.” He further observed: “The scheme of Partition, concocted in the dark and carried out in the face of the fiercest opposition that any Government measure has encountered during the last half century will always stand as a complete illustration of the worst features of the present system of bureaucratic rule—its utter contempt for public opinion, its arrogant pretensions to superior wisdom, its reckless disregard of the most cherished feelings of the people, the mockery of an appeal to its sense of justice, its cool preference of service interests to those of the governed .

The Indian National Congress was opposed to the proposal of the partition ever since it came to know of it. The Congress of 1903 expressed its “deep concern” at the Government’s intention of “breaking up territorial division which have been of long standing. The Congress of 1904 at its Bombay Session protested “against the proposal of the Government of India for the Partition of Bengal in any manner whatsoever.” But when in spite of public opinion, the Government divided Bengal, the Congress registered a strong protest against the partition at its Banaras Session in 1905. It passed the following resolution

“That this Congress records its emphatic protests against the Partition of Bengal in the face of the strongest opposition on the part of the people of the province. That having regard to the intense dissatisfaction felt by the entire Bengali community at the dismemberment of their province and their manifest disinclination to accept the partition as an accomplished fact, this Congress appeals to the Government of India and the Secretary of State to reverse or modify the arrangements made, in such a manner as to conciliate public opinion and allay the excitement and unrest present among all classes of the people.

From 1905 to 1911, rarely a year passed when the Congress did not press for the annulment of the partition of Bengal. It registered its “emphatic protest against the Partition of Bengal” at its Bhowanipur Session in 1906. It desired “earnestly to impress upon the British Parliament and the present Liberal Government that it will be not only just, but expedient, to reverse or modify the partition in such a manner as to keep the entire Bengali-speaking community under one undivided administration and thus restore

contentment to so important a province as Bengal.” The Nagpur Congress of 1907 appealed “to the Government of India, and the Secretary of State for India to reverse the Partition of Bengal, or to modify it in such a manner as to keep the entire Bengali-speaking community under one and the same administration.” The Congress felt that the rectification “of this admitted error will restore contentment to the province of Bengal, give satisfaction to the other provinces and instead of impairing, will enhance the prestige of His Majesty’s Government throughout the country.” This resolution was reaffirmed at Madras in 1908. The Lahore Congress of 1909 appealed to the Government of India and the Secretary of State “not to treat the question of the Partition of Bengal as incapable of re-consideration, but to take the earliest opportunity so to modify the said Partition as to keep the entire Bengali-speaking community under one and the same administration.

The Congress of 1909 appointed a two-man deputation consisting of Surendranath Banerjea and Bhupendranath Bose to proceed to England to lay the question of the Partition before the authorities and the public there and to seek its reversal. But nothing came out of it.®® The Congress was, therefore once again seized of the matter at its Allahabad Session held in 1910 in which it submitted ‘ that the rectification of this admitted error will be an act of far-sighted statesmanship.

The Congress did not merely express lip sympathy with the Bengalis, but adopted ‘Boycott’ and ‘Swadeshi’ as its own cult. Speaking of Swadeshim, Gokhale spoke in 1905 at the 21st Congress, “You see the cradle of a New India. To speak of such a movement as disloyal is a lie and calumny We love England, with all her faults, but we love India more If this is disloyalty, we are, I am proud to say, disloyal.” Mr. C.Y. Chintamani moved the resolution at the Twenty-fifth Congress supporting the Swadeshi movement and urged upon the educated people to help indigenous industries by using their products.®® The Allahabad Congress of 1910 supported the Swadeshi movement in the following words :

“That this Congress accords its most cordial support to the Swadeshi Movement, and calls upon the people of the country to labour for its success by making earnest and sustained efforts to promote the growth of industries capable of development in this

country, and to respond to the efforts of Indian producers by giving preference, whenever practicable, to Indian products over imported commodities, even at a sacrifice.

Under the influence of the Congress, the Swadeshi and the Boycott Movements made considerable progress in the United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bombay Presidency, Punjab and the Madras Presidency. Thus, the Boycott and the Swadeshi Movements assumed an All-India character. "The progress of the movement was reported from 23 districts in the United Provinces, 15 towns in the Central Provinces, 24 towns in the Bombay Presidency, 20 districts in the Punjab and 13 districts in Madras Presidency.

B.G. Tilak, his daughter Mrs. Kelkar, S.M. Paranjpye, and Mrs. A. V. Joshi were notable leaders of the Swadeshi and Boycott movements in Bombay. The Punjab found its prominent Swadeshi leaders in Ram Ganga Ram, Pt. Chandrika Dutt of the Arya Samaj and Munshi Ram later known as Swami Shradhanand, a pleader of Jullundar and a notable Arya Samajist. The movement was propagated in Madras by Subramania Aiyer, Ananda Charlu and T.M. Nair. They were the most enthusiastic advocates of the Swadeshi and Boycott. On 1st December, 1905 at an important meeting Mr. P. Ananda Charlu, as its Chairman, Mr. Nair moved a resolution justifying Boycott as adopted by the Bengalis and characterised it as "a weapon of a weak nation against a strong nation." "From Lahore and Hardwar", said Hari Das and Uma Mukherjee, "reports came that the Pandas were refusing to accept sweet meats made of foreign sugar." Leaflets in Marathi were found pasted in public places in Poona urging men "to boycott the foreign goods in the name of religion," They added: "The Movement bore special fruits in the Bombay Presidency. The tremendous increase in the demand of indigenous goods gave a great impetus to the production in the mills of Bombay and Ahmedabad which sold about 1,00,000 bales of cloth to the merchants during August-September, 1905 and a sale six months ahead. Sadhus at Puri pledged themselves to the "propagation of Swadeshi ideology throughout India.

The Partition of Bengal roused most intense public opposition in the United Provinces, the Punjab, Madras, Bombay and Central Provinces. It was an All-India movement which roused the entire country from one corner to the other. "For the first time since British rule began", declared Gokhale, "all sections of the Indian community, without distinction of caste or creed, have been moved by a common impulse and without

the stimulus of external pressure, to act together in offering resistance to a common wrong.” The reaction of the people in different provinces to the Partition of Bengal was as under

Reaction in the United Provinces:

The people of the United Provinces did not lag behind their Bengali brethren in protesting against the Partition of Bengal. The ‘Indian People’ observed: “It is not difficult to imagine with what feeling our brethren of Bengal will receive the above (the scheme of Partition). . . . They have all but exhausted every resource of constitutional agitation in fighting against proposals which they abhor; but to no purpose. The old sense of British Justice and British respect for public opinion seems to have vanished in these days of Balfours, Brodricks and Curzons.” The ‘Advocate’ of Lucknow said that the “partition was not needed, but was pressed forward with ulterior motive,” It accused the Viceroy of carrying out the scheme of partition “in a manner most distasteful to the people” and warned the Government that partition “will not succeed in dividing a people united in sentiments”®® The ‘Citizen’ of 24th July, 1905, described the partition of Bengal as a national calamity and requested the Government to reconsider its decision and rectify the mistake.®’ The ‘Advocate’ attributed the Partition of Bengal to the Divide et impera policy of the British Government, and said that the Partition had not been liked by the people of the affected areas and it had been condemned by people from all walks of life, the landholders and the professional classes, the traders and the tillers of the soil.®® The ‘Indian People’ of 7th September, 1905 commented: “It is enough to us that a unanimous public opinion has condemned the Government’s proposals in a most unmistakable language. Bengalis regard the partition as a political measure aimed at their progress which will be productive of direful consequences. They may be right in their apprehensions or they may not be; we ourselves are convinced they are right. What then? Should the opinions, the wishes, the aspirations, the feelings, the sentiments of millions of people go for nothing at all?”

The progress of the anti-partition agitation in Bengal was watched with sympathy and admiration in the United Provinces. “The agitation over this partition business”, said the ‘Indian People’, “has been the most unprecedented in the annals of the history of India under the British—an agitation carried on on the most constitutional line—and the step

that our friends of the lower provinces have taken is only the natural sequence of the series of events.” The ‘Citizen’ of 9th April, 1906 said in its editorial, “We would conclude by exhorting our Bengali brethren to muster courage to carry on the agitation as vigorously and in as concentrated a manner as they have been doing splendidly so long. They have by their united action attracted attention not merely of India, but of the whole civilised world. The psychological moment has arrived when they should be ready to extend their sphere of activities to England.

The arrest and imprisonment of Babu Surendranath Banerjea at Barisal on 16th April, 1906 caused anguish, and resentment and provoked angry comments in the newspapers. The ‘Advocate’ declared that no human power could degrade Surendranath Banerjea in the eyes of his countrymen. The ‘Hindustani’ of 25th April, 1906 and the ‘Oudh Akhbar’ of 24th, 25th, 26th and 27th April, 1906 condemned the incident in the strongest possible language. “The man whom the magistrate of Barisal”, declared the ‘Indian People’, “sentenced to a fine stands higher today in the estimation of his countrymen than he did the day before the District Superintendent of Police arrested him, and men pushed one another in the struggle to take the dust of his feet. The ‘Citizen’ of 23rd April, 1906 said, “Babu Surendranath is a citizen of the empire, belonging as much to the United Provinces, the Punjab, Bombay and Madras as to the United Bengal herself. Distance, they say, lends a charm to an object. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Bengal patriot is regarded by the people in the other provinces as a veritable hero, and his actions may inspire in them a like spirit of self devotion.”* The ‘Nasim-i-Agra’ of 30th April, 1906 said that the Barisal incident had infused a new spirit in the hearts of the Indians all over the country and dispelled the illusive hopes they had in the impartialities of the British Government.’

The arrest and conviction of Surendranath Banerjea at Barisal “was followed by meetings of protest under the auspices of the Indian National Congress all over India, and gave a fresh lease of life to the agitation ‘against the partition.’”® Protest meetings were held at Allahabad under the auspices of people like Sir Tej Bahadur [Sapru, and Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya.’’ On 29th April, 1906 at the Swadeshi Bazar at Agra, a protest meeting was held under the Presidentship of Mr. Gobind Sahai, a local Barrister. These meetings condemned the treatment meted out to Babu Surendranath Banerjea at Barisal

and a telegram explaining the unprecedented state of intense alarm and indignation caused by the arrest of Surendranath Banerjea was sent to the Viceroy with a request to soothe public excitement."

The atrocities of Sir Bampfylde Fuller in Eastern Bengal were condemned in unmistakable language. The public opinion attributed Hindu-Muslim riots in East Bengal to his unwise utterances. The 'Indian People' said, "The fact is clear as day that the trouble is entirely due to the foolish speeches of Sir Bampfylde Fuller, his announcement that he was an incarnation of Shaista Khan, his senseless talk of a Hindu and a Mohammedan wife, and his systematic persecution of Hindus. Wherever he went, he set the Mohammedans against the Hindus, and his officers took their cue from him."^ The atrocities of Sir Bampfylde Fuller in Eastern Bengal were condemned in unmistakable language. The public opinion attributed Hindu-Muslim riots in East Bengal to his unwise utterances. The 'Indian People' said, "The fact is clear as day that the trouble is entirely due to the foolish speeches of Sir Bampfylde Fuller, his announcement that he was an incarnation of Shaista Khan, his senseless talk of a Hindu and a Mohammedan wife, and his systematic persecution of Hindus. Wherever he went, he set the Mohammedans against the Hindus, and his officers took their cue from him."

The Muslim opinion in the United Provinces favoured the partition and urged the Government not to annul it. The 'Aligarh Institute Gazette' said, "The partition of Bengal will prove a God-send to the Musalman residents of that province, who will now find a splendid opportunity for making rapid progress both in their education and social position." The 'Al Bashir' of Etawah in its issues of 3rd October, 1905, 10th October, 1905, 16th January, 1906, and 23rd January, 1906 observed that the partition of Bengal was good for the Muslims as it would provide them better opportunities and inducements to receive education and made a strong plea that the partition of Bengal should not be annulled. The 'RiyazulAkhbar' of Gorakhpur, 24th April, 1906 condemned the anti-partition agitation and said that the real cause of the agitation was that the Bengalis did not want the Mohammedans of that province to make progress.® The 'Zamana' of April and May, 1906 published the opinions of some prominent Muslim leaders of the time like Altaf Hussain Hali of Panipat, Zakaullah of Delhi, Maulana Shibli, Ghulam-us Saqlain, editor of 'Asr-i-Jadid', Abdul Kadir, late editor of the 'Observer' and Shaikh Muhammad

Iqbal, on the partition issue and the Swadeshi Movement. Hali admitted the usefulness of the Swadeshi Movement but urged that it should be disassociated from the anti-partition agitation, before the Musalmans could be persuaded to join the Swadeshi movement. Maulavi Zakaullah said that the Swadeshi movement was good in itself, but he too, did not favour the anti-partition agitation. Maulana Shibli said that nothing could be more beneficial to India than the Swadeshi movement provided it had not been started to intimidate the Government into complying with the demands of the Bengalis. Khwaja Ghulam-us-Saqlain thought that the Swadeshi movement was good for both Hindus and Musalmans, but did not approve of the boycott of only English goods. Shaikh Abdul Kadir wrote that a true Swadeshi movement and not a transitory outburst of patriotism in resentment against a Government measure was sure to prove a blessing to the country, provided that it was maintained with perseverance and patience. Sheikh Muhammad Iqbal admitted that the Swadeshi movement was useful to both Hindus and Musalmans, but did not like the boycott of only English goods..

These Musalman leaders while favouring the Swadeshi movement did not want it to be used as a weapon to coerce the Government to annul the partition of Bengal. The 'Rohilkhand Gazette' of 24th August, 1906 said that the question of the partition of Bengal should not be reconsidered and went so far as to advise the Musalmans to keep aloof from the Swadeshi movement.®^ The 'Mufid-i-Am' of 24th September, 1906 and the 'Tohfa-i-Hind' of 26th September, 1906 advised the Musalmans to keep away from the anti-partition agitation. The 'Agra Akhbar' of 28th September, 1906 gave the same rtuvce to its co-religionists. Thus, the Muslim opinion in the province was for the partition of Bengal, as they thought that it was benefi^l to the Muslims of that province. They did not think that the entire Bengali people both Hindus and Musalma'hs were one people and spoke the same language.

Madras;

During the course of the anti-partition agitation in Bengal Bipin Chandra Pal toured the Madras Presidency and delivered several important speeches. His visit "led to antiBritish disturbances and disorderly behaviour, particularly among students."*^^ On 31st May, 1907, a student is alleged to have insulted Major Kemp, I.M.S., the District Medical Officer of Cocanada. Major Kemp struck the youth and the result was that a mob

collected the same evening and attacked and wrecked the club where he was dining.®® On 21st June, 1907, the Government of Madras were obliged to punish several of the students of the Rajahmundry College for defying the orders of the Principal at the time of B. C. Pal's visit. On 25th July, 1907, a police constable attacked the Assistant Superintendent of Police Cocanada with a bayonet. On 30th August, 1907, a mob of students attacked the Senate House ; a Police Inspector named Bell was murdered at Rajahmundry in September, 1907 by a constable, who immediately after committed suicide. But the constable's funeral became "the occasion of a violent antiLu^^pean and anti-Government demonstration."®® Under Section 108 of the Criminal Procedure Code Chidambaram Pillay and twoK)f his associates were tried for holding seditious meetings in Tinnevely and Tuticorin. They were eventually convicted tinder Sections 124-A and 153-A of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to transportation for life.

Bombay and Central Provinces;

There were disturbances in the Bombay city in July 1908 more particularly among the mill workers in consequence of the prosecution of Bal Gangadhar 7'ilak for sedition."*^ The police and the troops had to be employed and on six different days they opened fire on the mob and according to the Government version 15 people were killed and 38 wounded. Several police officers were also wounded. The Mission House at Pandharpur was attacked and one of the Missionaries, Miss Steele was badly beaten; riots occurred in Nagpur in the course of which Mr. Jones, Principal of the Morris College was stoned.

Terrorist Activities In Bengal:

The anti-partition agitation in Bengal was peaceful and constitutional in the beginning, but when it appeared that it was not yielding any fruit, some youngmen adopted terrorist methods and used pistols and bombs indiscriminately. They made an unsuccessful attempt to blow up a train in which the Lt. Governor of Bengal was travelling and an attempt was made to murder B. C. Allen, District Magistrate of Dacca. There were some more disturbances in East Bengal in which a number of Europeans were attacked. Mr. Higgenbotham, a Missionary at Kushtia in Bengal, was attacked on 4th March, 1908 but he escaped. On 30th April, 1908, a bomb intended for the district judge, Mr. Kingsford, who was formerly Chief Presidency Magistrate of Calcutta, was thrown

by mistake into a carriage in which Mrs. and Miss. Kennedy, the wife and daughter of a European pleader, were returning home from a club at Muzaffarpur. Both the ladies died of their injuries. The Calcutta Police discovered a secret society connected with the 'Yugantar' and 'Bande Mataram', newspapers. The object of the society 'was to train youngmen throughout Bengal to murder officials by means of fire arms and explosives in the hope of ultimately paralysing the administration.' Several arrests were made in this connection and most of those arrested were the students. On 7th November, 1908, a Bangali student attempted unsuccessfully to shoot the Lt. Governor of Bengal. Two days later, Nandolal Banerji, a Sub-inspector of Police was shot dead in the streets of Calcutta and the perpetrators of this outrage could not be traced.

To swell the revolutionary funds, there were a number of political dacoities in Bengal. Eight such dacoities occurred in 1908; in 1909 and 1910, seventeen such occurrences were reported." The most daring dacoity was committed at Rajendrapur in Dacca in a running train in the Assam-Bengal railway in which a consignment of bullion was stolen by a party of armed revolutionaries who killed one of the persons guarding the consignment and wounded two others, escaping with their spoil from the train in motion.

Annulment of the Partition

The effect of the anti-partition agitation, the adoption by the people of Swadeshi and Boycott movements, supported by the Indian National Congress, and the people of the country as a whole and the terrorist activities in Bengal convinced the British Government that the Bengalis would rather break but not bend on this issue. Thus, to soothe public opinion, the British Government decided to annul the partition of Bengal and an announcement to that effect was made by His Majesty in person at Delhi on 12th December, 1911.

great was the joy and enthusiasm created by the announcement", says A.C. Mazumdar, "that after the King left, a number of youngmen, mostly Bengalis, rushed in and kneeling before the throne reverently kissed the footsteps from which the announcement had just been made." Surendranath Banerjea says that he witnessed a "wild scene of excitement" at the College Square, Calcutta. "It was quite dark-there were no lights-we could not see one another, but we could hear voices shouting with joy and occasionally

interjecting questions.” Speaking on Resolution No. 11 at the Twentysixth Congress held at Calcutta in 1911, Mr. Ambikacharan Mozumdar said: “Gentlemen, on this day of universal rejoicing when every heart in India in general and in Bengal in particular is beating in unison with reverence and devotion to the British Throne and over-flowing with revived confidence and gratitude towards British statesmanship, I will not—I dare not—recount the painful records and recall the bitter memories of the past five years. Let the dead past bury its dead. Let suspicion and distrust, malice and lancour, rage and repression—those evil spirits that revel in darkness—vanish from the land, and let cavil and calumny be hushed into silence-•• The nation of Howard and Wilberforce, of Edmund Burke, and Ewart Gladstone, of Henry Fawcett and John Bright, of Bentinck, Canning and Ripon, cannot perpetrate a wrong, and if it ever does, it will that day cease to be the greatest nation that it is on the surface of the earth

The Congress and important organs of public opinion thanked the British Government for undoing the wrong. The Congress of 1911 recorded its sense of gratitude to the Government of India for recommending the modification of the partition of Bengal and to the Secretary of State for sanctioning it. It also thanked His Majesty, the King Emperor for the same.® The ‘Leader’ of Allahabad welcomed the news of the annulment of the partition and observed “the announcement about the territorial redistribution will come to Bengal as healing balm to its gaping wounds and the Bengalis could not have wished for a more complete vindication of the justice of their cause and British statesmanship could not have wished for a more graceful and a more telling manner of vindicating its reputation for wisdom and resourcefulness.”^® The ‘Oudh Akhbar’ of 15th December, 1911, said that the announcement would cause sincere joy and pleasure to the people of Bengal.®“ The ‘Abhyudaya’ of 17th December, 1911, felt that the undoing of the partition will give the utmost satisfaction not only to the Bengalis but to all thoughtful Indians.

The Muslims were, however, unhappy that the partition had been set-aside. Nawab Mushtaq Hussain remarked that the re-union of the two Bengals would be viewed with disfavour by the Muslims who had everything to gain by the partition. Nawab Salimullah Bahadur of Dacca, in his presidential address, at the 5th Session of the Muslim League held at Calcutta in March 1912 said: "To us, the Musalmans of East

Bengal, the annulment means the deprivation of those splendid opportunities at self-improvement which we had secured by the partition. But it is not the loss of these opportunities merely,... that forms the burden of grief over the annulment of the partition. It is the manner in which the change has been brought about, without even warning, or consulting us, which adds to the poignancy of our grief.”

The partition of Bengal and the agitation against it had far-reaching effects on the Indian history and national life. The twin weapons of ‘Swadeshi’ and ‘Boycott’ adopted by the Bengalis became a creed with the Indian National Congress and they were used more effectively in future conflicts with the Government. They formed the basis of Gandhi’s non-cooperation, Satyagraha and Khadi movement. The Indians had discovered the unique value of the methods of passive resistance, Swadeshi and Boycott movements. They also had come to know that organised political agitation and public opinion can force the Government to accede to public demand

But the annulment of the partition, as a result of agitation against it, had a bad effect on the Muslim mind. The Muslim[^] did not like the Congress support to anti-partition agitation. The majority of the politically conscious Muslims felt that the Congress had supported a Hindu agitation against the creation of a Muslim majority province. It reinforced the Muslim’s belief that their interests were not safe in the hands of the Congress. Thus, they rushed more and more towards the Muslim League to safeguard their interests. The Muslims now came to the definite conclusion that they would never be treated fairly and justly by the Congress and the Hindu majority. If they wanted to safeguard their interests, they must strengthen their own organisation i.e. the Muslim League. True, a number of Musalmans continued to take part in the deliberations of the Congress, but the rank and file of the Muslims were never able to reconcile themselves to the Congress claim that it was a national organisation which looked after the interest of the Hindus and the Muslims alike. Thus, the attempt to divide Bengal failed, but the mischief aimed at i.e. driving a wedge between the Hindus and the Muslims and accentuating their differences, succeeded.

Birth of Muslim League

Background

- The communal idea that the Muslims are a separate nation was sown into the Indian political ethos first by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, a philosopher and Muslim reformist.
- Although he wanted Muslims to get educated and think in a scientific temper, he suggested aligning with the British rather than rebel against them, as most beneficial for the community. He had founded the Muhammadan Educational Conference in 1886 but this organisation stayed away from politics and desisted from even discussing it as per its own code.
- On 30 December 1906, around 3000 delegates attended a conference of the Muhammadan Educational Conference at Dhaka in which the ban on politics was removed and a motion was moved to form the AIML. The name was proposed by Nawab Khawaja Sir Salimullah Bahadur and seconded by Hakim Ajmal Khan.
- The AIML was the first Muslim political party of India.
- The idea was that the Congress Party was only catering to the needs of the Hindus. This was an erroneous idea since Congress always meant to include every community of the country and had many Muslim leaders as members.
- The founders of the Muslim League were: Khwaja Salimullah, Vikar-ul-Mulk, Syed Amir Ali, Syed Nabiullah, Khan Bahadur Ghulam and Mustafa Chowdhury.
- The first Honorary President of the League was Sir Sultan Muhammad Shah (Aga Khan III).
- The AIML was essentially a party of educated elite Muslims, at least in the beginning.
- The party's chief aim was to promote and secure civil rights for Muslims. It espoused loyalty to the British government as a means to achieve more political and civil rights.
- The objectives of the league were:
 - ✓ To create among Muslims the feelings of loyalty towards the British Government.

- ✓ To safeguard the political rights of the Muslims and to convey the same to the government.
- ✓ To prevent the rise of prejudice against other communities of India among the Muslims.
- Muhammad Ali Jinnah joined the league in 1913.
- When the Congress party was opposed to the government and fighting for the gradual establishment of an independent India, the league propounded loyalty to the government. They, in fact, provided the government with a tool to fight the growing nationalism in the country.
- Even though partition of the country was not on the minds of Indian Muslims in the early years of the league, it came into the picture after 1930. Leaders of the league began the propaganda that Hindus and Muslims are not one nation and have separate cultures and identities although they have been cohabitating for centuries.
- In 1940, Jinnah gave a speech in Lahore in which he talked of the impossibility of living as one nation. In response to this, some members of the league who were opposed to the Two-Nation Theory broke away from the party and formed the All-India Jamhur Muslim League (AIJML). The AIJML later merged with the Congress party.
- In 1937, the Muslim League was not able to form the government in any province in the provincial elections held that year as per the Government of India Act. Even in the 125 non-general constituencies out of which 59 were reserved for Muslims, the Congress managed to win 25 seats with 15 seats coming from the Muslim dominated North-West Frontier Province.
- In 1939, the Congress ministries resigned following the viceroy's declaration that made India a party to the Second World War. The league urged Muslims to celebrate December 22 as Deliverance Day.
- The party, under Jinnah, spearheaded the campaign for Pakistan throughout the 1940s and was successful in its mission of dividing the country. The country was partitioned along communal lines along with independence in 1947.

- The league was dissolved on 14 August 1947. It continues to exist in various forms as political parties in Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. In India, the Indian Union Muslim League functions as a political party with its base in Kerala and ironically, aligns itself with the Congress Party.

Surat Congress

The **Surat Split of 1907** partitioned the **Indian National Congress** into **moderates** and **extremists**, marking a **significant ideological and political division**. It had a **lasting impact** on the **Indian independence movement**, shaping **strategies, demands, and unity** within the Congress. The split reflected disagreements over approaches to achieving independence **and** leadership disputes, **influencing the trajectory** of the movement.

Causes Of Surat Split

The **Surat Split of 1907** within the **Indian National Congress** was triggered by various factors:

- **Disagreement:** The discord emerged over the continuation of four resolutions and the expansion of the movement nationwide.
- **Failure of Moderates:** When **moderates** proved unsuccessful in making significant progress, **extremists** became agitated.
- **Impatience of the Extremists:** Led by figures like **Bal Gangadhar Tilak**, extremists grew impatient with the slow progress of moderates against British rule, advocating for more radical methods to achieve independence.
- **Bengal Split Agitation Issue:** The demand for **Swaraj** (self-governance) during the **Swadeshi Movement** clashed with the moderates' desire to confine the movement to Bengal alone, intensifying the rift between the two factions.
- **International Influences:** Extremists drew inspiration from events outside India, such as the defeat of Russia by Japan and the Italian Army's defeat by Ethiopians, undermining the perceived strength of European powers.
- **Inaction of Morley:** Despite optimism among extremists regarding the appointment of a new Secretary of State, Morley, he took no action on the partition question, infuriating the extremists.

- **Leadership Dispute:** The 1907 Congress session was marred by a leadership dispute. Moderates, fearing the election of Tilak as president, shifted the session from Nagpur to Surat. Extremists favored Tilak or **Lala Lajpat Rai** as president, while moderates supported **Rash Behari Ghose**.
- **Disruption and Adjournment of the Meeting:** The initial meeting faced disruption, and when it resumed, Tilak was denied the opportunity to speak. This resulted in a physical altercation and the subsequent adjournment of the meeting sine die. British authorities seized this opportunity to control Congress activities, banning extremists from future meetings.

The Impact Surat Split

The **Surat Split of 1907** had numerous consequences for the **Indian National Congress (INC)** and the broader **Indian independence movement**:

- **Divided into two parties:** The **Indian National Congress (INC)** split in Surat resulted in the party being divided into two factions, the **Extremists** and the **Moderates**.
- **Failed Reconciliation Attempts:** **Rabindranath Tagore** made unsuccessful efforts to reconcile the moderates and extremists post-split, emphasizing the difficulty in repairing the divide within the **INC**.
- **Disqualification of Extremist Section:** Resolutions adopted at the 1908 Allahabad convention sought to permanently disqualify the **extremist section** of the Congress, further exacerbating the divide.
- **Weakened Congress:** This schism weakened Congress and impaired its ability to advocate for Indian independence.
- **Prominence of extremists:** With extremists gaining prominence, Congress gradually shifted towards a more **militant and extreme approach** to winning independence.
- **Shift in Demands:** The split led to a divergence in the demands of the moderates and extremists. Extremists called for **full independence**, while moderates advocated for **colonial self-government**.

- **Limited Impact of Constitutional Politics:** The constitutional politics pursued by the moderates, evident in the **Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909**, did not resonate with the British government, diminishing their influence.
- **Rise of Revolutionary Movements:** Neglect of the younger generation by the moderates and their focus on constitutional methods led to the popularity of **revolutionary movements** seeking more radical outcomes.
- **Divide-and-Rule Strategy:** The British government employed a **divide-and-rule strategy** to suppress militant nationalists and maintain control, capitalizing on the divisions within the Indian independence movement.
- **Dormancy of Moderate-Dominated Congress:** The moderate-dominated Congress went dormant following the imprisonment of leaders like **Bal Gangadhar Tilak**, further weakening the party.
- **Setback for Congress:** The introduction of **separate electorates for Muslims in 1909**, excluding important sections of the INC, was a setback for Congress and hindered the goal of **united national representation**.
- **Impetus for reforms:** The **Surat Split** served as the impetus for the **1909 Minto-Morley Reform**.
- **Overall Benefit to British Government:** The split ultimately benefited the British government, as it weakened the **Indian nationalist movement** and allowed them to maintain control and divide the opposition.

Moderates Vs. Extremists

Moderates:

- **Social base:** Zamindars and upper middle classes in towns.
- **Ideological inspiration:** Western liberal thought and European history.
- **Believed political connections:** With Britain to be in India's social, political, and cultural interests.
- **Loyal:** Professed loyalty to the British Crown.
- **Masses not ready:** Believed that the movement should be limited to middle-class intelligentsia; masses not yet ready for participation in political work.
- **Constitutional demands:** Demanded constitutional reforms and share for Indians in services.

- **Constitutional means:** Insisted on the use of constitutional methods only.
- **Not a comprador:** They were patriots and did not play the role of a comprador class.

Extremists:

- **Social base:** Educated middle and lower-middle classes in towns.
- **Ideological inspiration:** Indian history, cultural heritage, and Hindu traditional symbols.
- **Believed that political connections:** With Britain would perpetuate British exploitation of India.
- **Unworthy British Crown:** Believed that the British Crown was unworthy of claiming Indian loyalty.
- **Faith in masses:** Had immense faith in the capacity of the masses to participate and make sacrifices.
- **Swaraj:** Demanded Swaraj as the panacea for Indian ills.
- **Extra-constitutional means:** Did not hesitate to use extra-constitutional methods like boycotts and passive resistance to achieve their objectives.
- **Made sacrifices:** They were patriots who made sacrifices for the country.

Surat Split impact the involvement

- **Division of Support:** The **Surat Split** created divisions among the masses as they aligned with either the **moderates** or **extremists**.
- **Influence of Extremist Approach:** The extremist faction's **radical methods** appealed to those seeking assertive action, increasing **mass participation**.
- **Rise of Revolutionary Movements:** The Split contributed to the rise of **revolutionary movements**, engaging the masses in armed resistance.
- **Inspiration for Mass Movements:** The **Surat Split**, along with the **Swadeshi and Boycott Movements**, inspired **mass mobilization** and **civil disobedience**.
- **Impact on Mass Mobilization:** The Split initially hindered unified mass mobilization but allowed **local leaders** and **grassroots organizations** to emerge, leading to **widespread participation**.

Minto-Morley Reform Act

Morley-Minto Reforms. The Indian Councils Act 1909 was an Act of the British Parliament that introduced a few reforms in the legislative councils and increased the involvement of Indians (though limited) in the governance of British India. It was more commonly called the Morley-Minto Reforms after the Secretary of State for India John Morley and the Viceroy of India, the 4th Earl of Minto.

- The legislative councils at the Centre and the provinces increased in size with the Central Legislative Council – from 16 to 60 members, the Legislative Councils of Bengal, Madras, Bombay and United Provinces – 50 members each and the Legislative Councils of Punjab, Burma and Assam – 30 members each.
- The legislative councils at the Centre and the provinces were to have four categories of members as follows.
- Ex officio members: Governor-General and members of the executive council.
- Nominated official members: Government officials who were nominated by the Governor-General.
- Nominated non-official members: nominated by the Governor-General but were not government officials.
- Elected members: elected by different categories of Indians.
- The elected members were elected indirectly. The local bodies elected an electoral college who would elect members of the provincial legislative councils. These members would, in turn, elect the members of the Central legislative council.
- The elected members were from the local bodies, the chambers of commerce, landlords, universities, traders' communities and Muslims.
- In the provincial councils, non-official members were in the majority. However, since some of the non-official members were nominated, in total, a non-elected majority was there.
- Indians were given membership to the Imperial Legislative Council for the first time.
- It introduced separate electorates for the Muslims. Some constituencies were earmarked for Muslims and only Muslims could vote their representatives.
- The members could discuss the budget and move resolutions.

- They could also discuss matters of public interest.
- They could also ask supplementary questions.
- No discussions on foreign policy or on relations with the princely states were permitted.
- Lord Minto appointed (on much persuasion by Morley) Satyendra P Sinha as the first Indian member of the Viceroy's Executive Council.
- Two Indians were nominated to the Council of the Secretary of State for Indian affairs.

The reforms established Indian dominance in the Provincial but failed to do so in Central legislative bodies. Elections, mainly indirect, were affirmed for all levels of society. Special seats were also created to represent provincial landowners, tea plantations, various regional merchants, etc. Electoral rolls were drawn up requiring substantial property qualifications or otherwise honours or degrees from universities or public service. The elected Indians were also enabled to debate budgetary and complementary matters and table resolutions. The British executive, however, retained an absolute veto over all legislations. Councillors also were granted very limited powers to request information from the government. Despite the reforms, the members still reeled over electoral apportionment. The provinces were delegated electoral allocations, and administrative changes hindered harmful moves against the British rule. The separate electorates proved to be a major hindrance to coalitions.

1909-1919

The reforms of 1909 failed in their object, if that was to check the propaganda for selfgovernment. But they had the merit of securing improvement in legislative measures, not so much through actual proposals by Indian members as through the circulation of Bills for suggestions and the use of committees to examine in detail their proposals. The passing of resolutions was often fruitful; it is reckoned that of 168 resolutions passed to the end of 1917 in the imperial legislature 73 produced definite action, and the provinces showed analogous results. In the meantime, however, the government of India and the Home Government had decided on a far-reaching step, the removal of the capital of India to Delhi. No doubt, if a change were to be made, on geographical, political, and historical grounds Delhi offered the only alternative. The just demand for a larger share in the

government of the country must be met by increasing the limits of provincial autonomy and retaining the government of India, with its absolute control of the legislature, as the authority to deal with matters of imperial concern, while empowered to intervene in case of misgovernment. This involved the separation of the central government from close connexion with any province, a step which would encourage the growth of local self-government while it would follow the precedents of the United States, Canada, and Australia. It was impossible indeed to select a capital where the government could be housed all the year, but Delhi could be used from October to April, and its greater proximity to Simla would reduce the cost of transfer thither. It would be more convenient for control of the railways, posts, and telegraphs to be centrally situated, and the commerce and industry department would be in closer touch with Bombay and Karachi, and less open to the influence of Calcutta. It was admitted that the European community of Calcutta would suffer loss, and that the Bengalis might resent the transfer, but other changes would compensate the latter. It was believed that it was desirable to conciliate the Bengali resentment over the partition of Bengal, by reuniting the province, so far as this could be done without leaving, as before the partition, an unmanageable area to govern. The new policy was duly announced by the King at the durbar which marked his visit to India, and unquestionably this mode of procedure was curiously unconstitutional for a Liberal government, since it precluded the exercise by the House of Lords and the opposition in the Commons of the right of criticism of so far-reaching a change in policy. It was made effective by a series of notifications and proclamations resting on miscellaneous earlier power. Thus the creation of the governorship of Bengal by the secretary of state in council was based on the Government of India Act, 1853, the constitution of a new province on the Indian Councils Act, 1861, of the chief commissionership of Assam on the Government of India Act, 1854, while the delimitation of the boundaries of Bengal was carried out under the Indian Councils Act, 1861, and the Government of India Act, 1865. Certain further steps which were necessary were taken by the Government of India Act, 1912. It conferred on the governor of Bengal those powers which since 1833 had been added to the functions of the governors of Madras and Bombay, reserving, however, to the governor-general in council control of the high court. It made the advocate-general's membership of the legislative council

optional, as he might not conveniently be available. It provided an executive council forthwith for Bihar and Orissa, and the grant of legislative councils to provinces under chief commissionerships, Assam receiving a council on November 14th 1912 and the Central Provinces on November 10th 1913. Minor enactments included the fixing of the strength of the legislatures of Bengal and Bihar and Orissa and the recognition of the right of the governor of Bengal to succeed equally with those of Madras and Bombay according to seniority to the office of governor-general in the case of a temporary vacancy. It was also made clear that transfer of territory was possible from or to a chief commissionership. A change of wider importance removed the rule of 1793 under which promotion was restricted to officers serving in the same presidency. The changes of 1912 necessitated consequential alterations in the regulations regarding the constitution of the legislatures under the Act of 1909, and these were duly made in 1912. Under the authority of the Government of India Act, 1854, there was effected in September 1912 the transfer of Delhi from the lieutenant-governorship of the Punjab to the direct control of the governor-general, to be exercised through a chief commissioner, who exercises the functions of the commissioner of a division, financial commissioner, registrar of births, etc., and of joint-stock companies, inspector general of registration and of police. Other functions are carried out by Punjab officials. The powers of government are regulated by the Delhi Laws Act XIII of 1912, which allot some functions to the governor-general in council, some to the lieutenant-governor of the Punjab. With an area of 673 square miles, it forms a sort of enclave, similar to the District of Columbia and Washington in the United States. Finally, there should be mentioned the Indian High Courts Act, 1911, which raised to a maximum of twenty the number of judges of the High Courts, permitted the creation of further such courts-the power accorded in 1861 being thought to have been exhausted by the creation of the court at Allahabad -and permitted the appointment for a period not exceeding two years of temporary additional judges to any high court

On the other hand, the First World War substantially changed Indian expectations for representation owing to the reason that India providing substantial support for the British war effort in the form of men, materiel, money and other logistic support. The political demands emerging from India's sacrifice led Indian Secretary Edwin Montagu to announce further constitutional reforms towards responsible government in 1917, leading

to the Montagu–Chelmsford reforms (also known as Montford Reforms) followed by the Government of India Act 1919.

The Government of India Act 1919

The Government of India Act 1919 was an act of the British Parliament which aimed at increasing the participation of Indians in the administration of their country. The Act was based on the recommendations of a report by Edwin Montagu, the then Secretary of State for India, and Lord Chelmsford, India's Viceroy (between 1916 and 1921). Hence the constitutional reforms set forth by this act are known as Montagu-Chelmsford reforms or shortly Montford reforms.

Home Rule Movement

The Home Rule Movement in India marked a crucial milestone in the liberation struggle. It was India's response to the First World War. From 1916 to 1918, the movement gained momentum throughout the country. Prominent leaders such as Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Annie Besant, G.S. Khaparde, Sir S. Subramania Iyer, Joseph Baptista, and Muhammad Ali Jinnah came together. They recognised the need for a year-round national alliance.

Their primary objective was to demand self-government or home rule for the entirety of India within the framework of the British Commonwealth. This alliance was to be known as the All India Home Rule League, drawing inspiration from the Irish Home Rule League.

Home Rule Movement Causes

- The Home Rule Movement emerged as an assertive political movement. Several factors leading to the formation of the Home Rule Movement were:
 - ❖ The Government of India Act 1909 failed to meet the aspirations of Indians.
 - ❖ The split within the Congress Party in 1907 and the imprisonment of Bal Gangadhar Tilak from 1908 to 1914 resulted in a period of relative calm in the national movement.
 - ❖ Some nationalists believed that popular pressure was necessary to achieve concessions from the government. The release of Tilak and the arrival of Annie Besant sparked a revival of the national movement.

- ❖ Indian leaders were divided on whether to support Britain in the war, but Annie Besant famously declared, “England’s need is India’s opportunity. “The burden of wartime hardships, such as high taxation and rising prices, made people more willing to participate in aggressive protest movements.
- ❖ Upon his return from exile in Mandalay, Tilak recognised the necessity of rejuvenating the nationalist movement in India and acknowledged the growing significance of the Congress Party in the country’s political landscape.
- ❖ Tilak’s primary objective was to rejoin the Congress Party, from which the extremist faction led by him had previously separated.
- ❖ In the December 1915 Congress session, largely influenced by Annie Besant’s persuasion, it was decided to readmit the extremists into the party and involve them actively in the national struggle.
- ❖ However, both Besant and Tilak were unsuccessful in convincing Congress to support their proposal of establishing Home Rule Leagues.
- ❖ Besant managed to secure Congress’s agreement to engage in educative propaganda and establish local-level committees. If these conditions were not fulfilled by September 1916, she would be free to establish a Home Rule League.

Two Home Rule Leagues

Tilak and Besant recognised that the support of a Congress dominated by Moderates and the cooperation of Extremists were crucial for the success of the Home

Rule Movement:

- Failing to achieve a Moderate-Extremist agreement at the 1914 Congress session, Tilak and Besant decided to revive political activity independently.
- In early 1915, Annie Besant initiated a campaign demanding self-government for India after the war, similar to white colonies. She used her newspapers, public meetings, and conferences to promote her cause.
- The efforts of Tilak and Besant found some success at the 1915 Congress session. The Extremists were admitted to Congress, although Besant’s proposal for Home Rule Leagues was not approved. The Congress committed to an educative propaganda program and the revitalisation of local-level committees.

- Besant set a condition that if the Congress did not fulfil its commitments, she would establish her league. Due to Congress's lack of response, she eventually formed her league.
- Tilak and Besant formed separate leagues to prevent conflicts. They acknowledged that some of their supporters had reservations about each other. However, both leagues coordinated their efforts by focusing on their respective areas of work and collaborating whenever possible.

Tilak's Home Rule League

- ❖ In April 1916, Tilak established the Indian Home Rule League.
- ❖ The first Home Rule League meeting organised by Tilak took place in Belgaum.
- ❖ The league's headquarters were in Poona (now Pune).
- ❖ The scope of Tilak's league was limited to specific regions, namely Maharashtra (excluding Bombay City), Karnataka, Central Provinces, and Berar.
- ❖ The league consisted of six branches.
- ❖ The demands of the league included Swarajya (self-rule), the creation of linguistic states, and education in the vernacular language.

Besant's Home Rule League

- In September 1916, Annie Besant established the All-India Home Rule League.
- This Home Rule League was founded in Madras and had jurisdiction over the entire India, including Bombay City.
- It consisted of 200 branches spread across the country.
- Compared to Tilak's league, Besant's league had a looser organisational structure.
- George Arundale served as the organising secretary of the league.
- The main contributors to the league's work were B.W. Wadia and C.P. Ramaswamy Aiyar.

Home Rule Movement Overview

The Home Rule Movement in India marked a crucial milestone in the liberation struggle. It was India's response to the First World War. From 1916 to 1918, the movement gained momentum throughout the country.

- ❖ Prominent leaders such as Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Annie Besant, G.S. Khaparde, Sir S. Subramania Iyer, Joseph Baptista, and Muhammad Ali Jinnah came together. They recognised the need for a year-round national alliance.
- ❖ Their primary objective was to demand self-government or home rule for the entirety of India within the framework of the British Commonwealth.
- ❖ This alliance was to be known as the All India Home Rule League, drawing inspiration from the Irish Home Rule League.

Home Rule Movement Programmes

- The Home Rule League campaign aimed to promote the concept of self-government to the common people.
- The campaign had a broader appeal compared to previous mobilisations and attracted politically backward regions like Gujarat and Sindh.
- Various methods were employed to achieve the goal, including political education, public meetings, libraries, conferences, propaganda through media, fundraising, social work, and participation in local government activities.
- The Russian Revolution of 1917 provided additional support to the Home Rule campaign.
- Prominent leaders such as Motilal Nehru, Jawaharlal Nehru, Bhulabhai Desai, Chittaranjan Das, K.M. Munshi, and Muhammad Ali Jinnah joined the Home Rule agitation.
- Some Moderate Congressmen were disillusioned with the Congress' inactivity, and members of Gokhale's Servants of India Society also joined the Home Rule Movement.
- However, Anglo-Indians, most Muslims, and non-Brahmins from the South did not join as they perceived Home Rule as Hindu majority rule, particularly by the high caste.

Government's Response Towards Home Rule Movement

The government responded to the Home Rule Movement with severe repression.

- ❖ In Madras, students were prohibited from attending political meetings.
- ❖ A case was initiated against Tilak, but the high court later rescinded it.
- ❖ Tilak was barred from entering Punjab and Delhi.

- ❖ In June 1917, Annie Besant and her associates B.P. Wadia and George Arundale were arrested, leading to nationwide protests.
- ❖ Sir S. Subramania Aiyar renounced his knighthood in a dramatic gesture of protest.
- ❖ Tilak advocated a program of passive resistance in response to the repression.
- ❖ The government's actions only hardened the resolve of the agitators and strengthened their determination to resist.
- ❖ Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, commented on the government's situation, using a metaphor involving Shiva and Mrs. Besant.
- ❖ Annie Besant was eventually released in September 1917.

Home Rule Movement Significance

The Home Rule League operated throughout the year, unlike the Congress Party, which had annual activities.

- The movement gained significant support from educated Indians, with approximately 40,000 members in the combined leagues by 1917.
- Many members of Congress and the Muslim League joined the Home Rule League, including prominent leaders such as Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Joseph Baptista, G.S. Khaparde, and Sir S. Subramanya Iyer.
- The movement briefly united moderates, extremists, and the Muslim League.
- The movement helped spread political awareness to more regions in the country.
- The movement's signature achievement was the Montague Declaration of 1917:
- which recognised the inclusion of more Indians in the government and the development of self-governing institutions, ultimately leading to responsible governments in India.
- The declaration also marked a shift where the demand for home rule was no longer seen as seditious. This was the movement's greatest significance.

Home Rule Movement Failures

The reasons for the decline were as follows:

- ❖ Lack of effective organisation within the Home Rule movement
- ❖ Communal riots occurred during 1917-18.

- ❖ The Moderates who joined the Congress after Annie Besant's arrest were appeased by discussions of reforms outlined in Montagu's August 1917 statement, which stated that self-government was the long-term goal of British rule in India, and by Besant's release.
- ❖ The Extremists' talk of passive resistance deterred the Moderates from participating in activities starting from September 1918.
- ❖ The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, known in July 1918, further divided the nationalist ranks. Annie Besant herself had conflicting views on the use of the league following the announcement of the reforms and regarding passive resistance techniques.
- ❖ Tilak had to leave for England in September 1918 due to a libel case against Valentine Chirol, whose book blamed Tilak for the political agitation in India. With Besant unable to provide clear leadership and Tilak being away, the Home Rule Movement was left without a leader.
- ❖ Gandhi's fresh approach to the freedom struggle began to capture the people's imagination, and the growing momentum of the mass movement pushed the Home Rule Movement to the sidelines until it eventually faded away.

The Home Rule Movement marked a pivotal chapter in the struggle for India's independence from British colonial rule. Led by prominent leaders such as Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Annie Besant, the movement aimed to achieve self-governance and empowerment for the Indian people. It played a crucial role in galvanising the Indian population, fostering national consciousness, and paving the way for India's independence.

Montague-Chelmsford Reform Act

By 1916 all parties in India as well as Britain began to think that some changes in the structure of government were necessary. The aspirations of the Indians had also increased during this period. As a response to the political pressure in India during the war years and to buy support of Indians the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme was introduced by the British. 0.5.1 Circumstances Leading to Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms Morley and Minto could hardly have imagined that the scheme of constitutional 'Reforms', which they had evolved after three and a half years of painstaking consultations at

different levels, would cease to satisfy barely seven years later. By 1916 all parties in India, as well as Britain, began to think that some changes in the structure of the Government of India were necessary. This was largely the result of the conditions produced by the outbreak of the World War in August, 1914. The war did not pose any immediate threat to India. But being part of the British Empire, India became automatically involved. Actually fighting shoulder to shoulder with European soldiers had given new self-confidence to the Indians. They wanted recognition of their ability to rule themselves. This aspiration was reinforced by the ideas generated during the war. The American President, Woodrow Wilson had said that the war was being fought to make the world safe for democracy. A hope emerged that this would at least mean that India would be put on the road to self-government.

In this background of raised expectations, many schemes of constitutional changes were suggested. Indians themselves put forward a number of schemes. The most significant one, however, was the scheme that was Constitutional Reforms worked out and adopted at Lucknow. At Lucknow, the Moderates and the Extremists, as also the Home Rulers and the Muslim League, came together and unanimously adopted the agreement known as the Lucknow Pact (December 1916). They also jointly prepared a scheme of constitutional reforms. Amongst the British, an influential group discussed the question of structure for the government of India. Its members came forward with the idea of introducing dyarchy in the provinces. The 'dyarchy' is a form of government in which two persons, states, or bodies are jointly vested with supreme power.

The devolution of increased political power and responsibility on the Indians was simply a response to political pressure in India. It was a device to buy support of Indians. It was in these circumstances that on 20 August 1917 Lord Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, made the declaration about new constitutional reforms. It was also made clear that progress in the realization of this goal was to be made by successive stages and substantial steps in this direction were to be undertaken immediately. The time and manner of each advance was to be decided by the British Parliament. The action of Parliament in such matters would be determined in the light of the performance of Indians.

In November 1917, Montagu visited India and conferred with Chelmsford, the Viceroy, the officials of the central and provincial governments and Indian leaders. On the basis of these deliberations the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, which came to be known as Montagu-Chelmsford Report or simply as Montford Report was published in July 1918. The Declaration of August 1917 had on the whole been welcomed in India. But the scheme put forward in this Report fell far short of the expectations of Indian leaders except some Moderate leaders. Annie Besant denounced its provision relating to gradual transfer of power as ‘unworthy to be offered by England or to be accepted by India.’

In August 1918 a special session of the Congress was called at Bombay to consider this report. In this session a resolution was passed by the Congress condemning the scheme as ‘inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing.’ The Moderate leaders, on the other hand, were convinced that the proposals marked a substantial advance upon the then existing conditions and that there should be sincere appreciation of the good faith shown therein. It was on the basis of the Montford Report that the Government of India Bill was drafted and introduced in the British Parliament. It became an Act in December 1919. The Preamble of this Act was based on August 1917 Declaration..

Check Your Progress

- What were the main differences between the Moderates and Extremists in the Indian National Movement?
- How did the Partition of Bengal in 1905 contribute to the rise of the Swadeshi Movement?

Unit – III

Gandhian Era– Jallian Wallabagh Massacre – Non-Cooperation Movement – Swaraj Party – Simon Commission – Rise of Communist Party – Civil Disobedience Movement – Gandhi –Irwin Pact – Round Table Conference - Communal Award – Act of 1935 – Provincial Autonomy –1937 elections – Cripps Mission

Objectives

- The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre (1919).
- The Civil Disobedience Movement (1930)
- The Government of India Act of 1935

Jallian Wallabagh Massacre

On the exact same date in history 99 years ago, on April 13th, 1919, it occurred on the beautiful sunny afternoon of Baisakhi, which is a holy day in the Sikh faith. The day also marked the beginning of spring. Over 20000 unarmed men, females, and youngsters from different regions of Punjab came together at Jallianwala Bagh to participate in a peaceful protest in the middle of a volatile political climate. They were going to hear a public address regarding the very contentious Rowlatt Act, which was frequently referred to as the Black Act back then and is still commonly referred to by that name today. This act effectively made it permissible to imprison Indians on any fanciful or groundless notion. Jallianwala Bagh had become a central focus in the national mind of India and the rest of the globe in the span of 20 minutes, during which 1,650 rounds of gunfire were fired. Because it was the site of a terrible tragedy and had immediate political significance, Jallianwala's future as a commemoration area was nearly a certain conclusion.

Hundreds of unarmed protestors were shot and killed here by British forces headed by Major General Dyer in 1919. If your high school history textbook covered the events of 1919, including the slaughter at Jallianwala Bagh, then you will recognise this site. Plaques around the well indicate the locations from where the shooting was ordered, and another nearby memorial claims that more than 140 corpses were recovered from the pit. According to the inscription placed next to the well, its depths were filled with the remains of victims who had leapt in to escape the gunfire

Look into the martyrdom's well, where scores of people jumped to escape the gunfire but were drowned, only to be fired at. These two locations successfully resurrect this time in Indian history. Indeed, we have learnt about the horrors that took place in Jallianwala Bagh. However, you won't be able to properly time travel by just reading about a historical event. One must visit the site of the tragedy to really comprehend it and feel for the victims. Moreover, we should never forget the sacrifices they made so that we might live freely and safely in our country.

The massacre that did take place in the Jallianwala Bagh in Punjab is among the most horrifying things that comes to mind while thinking about historical occurrences. On April 13, 1919, hundreds of innocent people were mercilessly slaughtered at this terrible location by British forces led by General Dyer. These atrocities took place on the spot. A monument to those who perished in the Jallianwala Bagh massacre may be seen at this location today.

The monument is considered to be of national significance. Following the terrible events of that day, a group was formed to gather money for a monument to be dedicated to the victims of the slaughter. The site, which encompasses 6.5 acres, was purchased by the government in the year 1920, and it wasn't until 1961 that the monument, which is in the shape of a city park, was inaugurated. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the first Governor of an independent India, presided over the ceremony that marked the memorial's official opening. As soon as one steps into the garden, a wave of melancholy washes over them. The walls littered with bullet holes, the blazing light, the very well, and the other elements of the setting all represent India's fight for independence. The suffering caused by those who were slain is just beyond measure. It was a driving force in India's fight for independence from British rule. The British at the time believed that this was nothing more than an isolated occurrence. People would eventually forget about it and go on to other things. On the other hand, this event turned out to be a crucial turning point. Indian nationalists first started calling for the expulsion of the British from India during the refusal to cooperate campaign and the khilafat movement. After the tragedy at Jallianwala Bagh, political leaders began calling for Purna Swaraj, which translates to total independence. Earlier generations of politicians desired some kind of participation

in governance as well as equal rights and opportunities. What happened after that, as the saying goes, is now part of history

When I was walking around the Bagh in the morning, I couldn't help but wonder about how much of an effect such a little site, which is only approximately six acres in size, had on the psyche of the whole country of India. Why and how did individuals from cities like Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta — all of which are extremely far away from this location — become so worked up over what was going on here? After all, the majority of Indians were not linked to the deceased and in many cases were unaware of them. Furthermore, a significant portion of companions did not have any familial ties to the inhabitants of Amritsar or the Sikhs and lacked even the most basic familiarity with either group. However, for some reason, this one event — and clearly, the scale of it — brought the people together in their fight, and as a result, the greatest kingdom the globe had ever witnessed was brought to an end in fewer than thirty years, successfully bringing it back to life in the process. Both of these sites are located in the same garden. We have all learned about or read about the atrocities that occurred in Jallianwala Bagh. The bare facts of a historical occurrence, on the other hand, are not enough to effectively transport you back in time. A trip to the scene of the tragedy is required in order to really understand and empathize with those who were affected by it. And to always keep in mind that they gave their lives for us, for our freedom, and for the society that we are able to enjoy so peacefully now.

Individuals like us who were born in a more wealthy India after the country gained its independence are unable to comprehend how profoundly racist and prejudiced our country's former British rulers really. Or how detrimental their two-century-long tyranny was to the place we inhabited. White people, who considered themselves more civilized simply due to the color of their skin, kept Indians under their dominion solely on the grounds of racism, which was as shockingly horrible as Hitler's plan to create a master race. This led to the subjugation of the Indian people.

The murder area known as Jallianwala Bagh is just as emblematic of the wound the British imposed on India as, for example, the German concentration camps in Germany communism. Jallianwala Bagh is located in the same city as Auschwitz.

The steps the British government took in the wake of the massacre prove this beyond a reasonable doubt. Not until the month of December 1919 did the English people learn the full extent of the catastrophe. Michael Dwyer, County Executive of the Punjab, reportedly told General Dyer, "Your action is appropriate," as per the Lt. Governor shares this view. In spite of the catastrophe, Dyer continued to sow terror across Amritsar by issuing additional draconian decrees.

Dyer was under the impression that he did not need medical attention for the injured. He then made the astounding declaration, Definitely not. It was not part of my duties. They might have gone to any of the hospitals that were open at the time. 1 Dyer did not face any repercussions for his actions from the Board; nonetheless, he was eventually removed from his position. However, he did not go back to England as the Slaughter of Amritsar; rather, he did so as a true champion. Many people believed that he was the one who had put a stop to a revolt. The conservative as well as Individual who saved India and the Savior of the world of the Punjab. The Daytime Post was known as The Saviour of the Punjab

The heinous act that took place in a tranquil meadow in Punjab set us on the path that led inevitably to that momentous day in 1947 where India valiantly won her independence. Even now, 96 years after the slaughter, Jallianwala Bagh is considered by many nationalistic Indians to be the holiest pilgrimage site in the country. In spite of the unusual temporal uniqueness of the slaughter and the pervasive need to mourn, Jallianwala's brief existence (less than 90 years) as a commemoration and historic place has been fraught with ambiguity and contradiction. When we take into consideration all of these complexity and inconsistencies, we are confronted with challenging concerns about how the past is represented in the current. How does the Jallianwala Bagh Monument specifically symbolize, what does it stand for, and also what assertions does it make? What functions does the monument serve now, and how do they functions connect to its history?

Background

During World War I, British India contributed significantly to the British war effort by providing both men and supplies. About 1.25 million Indian troops and labourers were sent to fight in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East at this period, and the

Indian government and Indian princes supplied them with a substantial amount of food, cash, and ammunition. Although, in Punjab and Bengal, anti-colonial sentiment continued to run high. The regional government was virtually rendered ineffective after radical assaults in Bengal and subsequent uprisings in Amritsar.

The concepts for the Hindu-German Mutiny, a pan-Indian uprising against the British Raj, were compiled between 1914 and 1917. The most well-known plan proposed a nationwide uprising inside the British Indian Army in the month of February 1915. In February of 1915, the planned mutiny began. The German Foreign Office and Irish republicans backed the revolutionaries, who included Indian nationalists from Germany, India, and the United States.

The American Ghadar Party, the Indian revolutionary underground in British India, the German Foreign Office, and the San Francisco consulate all conspired to start World War I. The planned rebellion in February was thwarted when British intelligence officers broke into the Ghadarite organisation and kidnapped key members. The Indian military's reaction to mutinies in smaller units and garrisons was just as successful.

The high fatality rates, rising inflation due to excessive taxation, the devastating influenza epidemic of 1918, and the interruption of commerce caused by the war all contributed to an increase in the amount of human misery that occurred in India throughout the First World War. The drawn-out conflict exacted a heavy toll, both monetarily and in terms of the number of lives lost. Indians have been yearning for independence for a very long time, and for a very long time, Over 43,000 Indian troops had already lost their lives while fighting for Britain. In order to combat the reign of the British, Indian troops brought weapons into the country illegally. The Indian nationalist sentiment from before the war was rekindled as modest the Indian National Congress (INC) reconciled their differences and united under a single flag, while hardline factions inside the INC did the same.

General Dyer thought a brutal beating would put an end to the theories, and he was praised in Britain for preventing a terrorist strike. Investigators and historians have identified no conspiracy ties to the events in Amritsar, but such worries nonetheless shaped the British reaction. Returning British Indian Army servicemen from Europe and Mesopotamia found a country in economic decline.

After the failed mutiny attempts in 1915 and the Lahore conspiracy trials, British apprehension lingered. During the Russian Civil War, tales circulated within the armed forces about young Mohajirs who had fought for the Turkish Caliphate and later joined the Red Army. During the fight, these Mohajirs supposedly joined the Red Army. The revolution in Russia had begun to have an effect on the Indian people as well. In 1919, when Gandhi called for outrage against the Rowlatt Act, he sparked a wave of passionate agitation and protests throughout India. This alarmed the British since it coincided with the start of the Third Anglo-Afghan War. Because of railway and telegraph delays and disruptions, as well as problems with the telephone system, the situation in Punjab was rapidly deteriorating. In particular, this was correct.

The majority of army superiors believed a revolt was imminent, therefore they prepared plans for the worst. "There was a gathering of more than 15,000 people in Punjab near Jallianwala Bagh. British Commanding Officer in Punjab Michael O'Dwyer allegedly felt these were early and obvious signs of a plot for a coordinated uprising in May. This may have happened as the British army prepared to leave the highlands for the summer. The Amritsar massacre, and the responses that occurred both before and after it, were not random events, as is often believed; rather, they were the climax of a well crafted plan of retaliation established by the Punjab government to put an end to the scheme". Fear of a Ghadarite rebellion amidst an increasingly tense situation in Punjab allegedly prompted a violent British response that ultimately resulted in the deaths of thousands of people, as stated by historian James Houssemayne Du Boulay. The increasingly volatile situation in Punjab led experts to this conclusion.

Jallianwala Bagh Massacre (or the Amritsar massacre)

On April 13, 1919, thousands of Indians, the vast majority of whom were Sikhs, gathered peacefully in Jallianwala Bagh, Amritsar, to hear several prominent local leaders speak out against British colonial rule in India and the arrest and deportation of Dr. Satya Pal, Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew, and a few others under the unpopular Rowlatt Act. Attending the meeting to hear these Udham Singh and his orphanage friends were working together to provide water to the crowd. However, O'Dwyer's declaration of martial law was never made public. He had probably made some remarks about it in other parts of town before it occurred, but most people still didn't know about it. Due to the

political unrest after the tragedy in Amritsar, it was difficult for him to remain in Punjab for a lengthy period of time. According to his account, he first set foot in India in November 1885 and was then sent to Lahore, the provincial capital of Punjab. By the end of May 1919, I had finally left Lahore and the Punjab for good.

On the same day, General Dyer heard that a massive rally will be held at Jallianwala Bagh. People started trickling into the Bagh at about 2:00 in the afternoon. He received definitive confirmation from the Chief of Police, Rehill, at four o'clock that a crowd of one thousand people had collected at Greenway. Then, Mr. Lewis, the director of Crown Cinema, verified the details. 27 Dyer perceived this as a challenge to his authority. Dyer quickly ordered his attack force to assault the opposing stronghold. Both of his armoured cars were equipped with automatic guns, and he took them along. Dyer led a force of fifty rifles and forty Gurkhas armed with their traditional Kukris towards the City of India Bagh. Briggs and Anderson, two of Dyer's preferred commanders, were also there.

After seeing a sizable number of people congregating in the Valley, General Dyer realized he did not need to wait for anything. He had arrived to the Bagh with such a clear plan in his head and a resolve as strong as iron. It was quite hard to assess the number of the gathering, said Briggs. [Citation needed] I was asked by the General what I believed the figures were, and although I said that it was probably about 5,000, I think that it has been calculated to be more like 25,000. 29 Dyer, who was observing the audience from a lofty perch inside the entryway, was taken aback by the unique makeup of the attendees. Dyer did not believe that it was essential to provide the public with any kind of advance notice. Dyer arranged his forces with 25 Gurkha infantrymen on the left and 25 Baluchi marksmen on the right. All of this took place in the space of a single minute. The land on which the troops stood was elevated in comparison to the surrounding terrain in all directions. After that, the general gave the immediate order for them to begin firing. 30 The throng began to yell very immediately, but those in control assured them there was no need for alarm since the soldiers were just shooting blanks. In a short amount of time, though, they were able to see the reality of the situation as individuals started to collapse and fall. The shooting went on for 10 minutes, during which time 1650 pieces of 303 markings, VI ammunition were discharged, which works

out to 33 shots fired from each rifle by each individual. 31 Only when there was no more ammo available did they stop fire

After the fire stopped, there was nothing to be seen in any part of Bagh other than dead corpses, and this was the case everywhere. The Bagh was crammed with corpses of various people. One hundred people were severely injured, and they begged for assistance the whole time. Outside of the Bagh, there were a few corpses laying about. It just so occurred that the injured people who sought to flee were unable to live through their ordeal and passed away after making an unsuccessful effort to escape themselves. Dyer made the following testimony to the General Staff on August 25, 1919: I shot and continued to shoot until the mob dispersed. This information comes from Dyer's account. 32 There was no one there to offer them a drink of water. The folks did not have access to any kind of medical help. Even inhabitants of Amritsar who had relatives who had traveled to Bagh were unable to have the courage to go into Bagh for a long time in order to look for their loved ones. The Bagh seemed to be a little battlefield that was littered with a large number of dead bodies and those who had been injured. General Dyer and his army evacuated the Bagh, taking with them a spectacle that resembled horror on earth and the aftermath of their departure. Girdhari Lal, who was present at the incident and had a close view of it, is quoted as saying, I witnessed hundreds of individuals slain on the spot. The fact that shots were fired at the exits via which individuals were trying to flee was easily the most terrifying aspect of the whole ordeal.

India went into a state of panic as word of the tragedy made its way out of Punjab. There was a flood of criticism and condemnation directed at the British administration of India resorting to methods that were immoral, immoral, callous, treacherous, and horrific. Several additional seminars and meetings raised concerns about Dyer's action. Politicians and other criminals who had been apprehended and condemned before to or during the time of Martial Law were also called for immediate release

Historiographer Percival Spear claims that the Jallianwala Bagh massacre was the single most damaging event to IndoBritish ties since the Mutiny. When the British colonial government in India was challenged in 1857, an insurrection known as the Mutiny ensued. 34 As an example of how farreaching the effects of the tragedy were, consider that Rabindranath Tagore resigned his service in the British army after the

murders had place. In an open letter to India's Viceroy, Tagore wrote the following. The day has come when honour medals, set against the dissonant background of our debasement, make our shame clear.

Contrarily, the organization's tolerance of General Dyer's conduct was not due to the actions of a single individual but rather to a coordinated set of measures (or inaction). After requesting and receiving approval from their superiors, General Dyer was able to go on with his plans. Major General Beynon and Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the provincial lieutenant governor of the Punjab, both granted their approval. The Indian government seems to have neglected the massacre for five months until it was brought up in the Imperial Legislative Council in September 1919. They agreed to delay General Dyer's judgement until after the hearing of the Hunter Committee even though the statement requested from General Dyer by the commander in chief of the Indian Army was received on 25 August 1919 and the Hunter Committee was not a judicial body qualified to make a legal indictment or judgement. This occurred despite the fact that the Indian Army's top brass had received General Dyer's statement. Lord Midleton, a dissident supporter of the motion, attacked the administration in the following ways after a string of lost opportunities to use good judgement: A full accounting of the situation led to the Indian government deciding to increase Dyer's dictatorial powers in Punjab. He was sent to the front lines after a month. They promoted him in October, again in January of this year, and then told him in March that they would not be able to keep him on staff. Those who knew all these things but did nothing about them and let it be thought that racial humiliation and fear were tolerated while the emergency was hot are the ones who should be chastised now that public opinion has cooled and they are being accused of supporting racial humiliation and fear. Those who knew about all of these things but did nothing to stop the humiliation and fear should be held accountable.

Montagu, in his capacity as India's Secretary of State, put pressure on the Indian government to investigate the unrest, initially proposing doing so in his budget statement on May 22, 1919. If he had sought to secretly remove Dyer from leadership, he would have been criticised for acting as judge and jury before all the evidence was in. However, the Indian delegation in London exerted pressure on him since he needed their support to enact the reforms he had worked on for three years, starting with the government's

promise in 1917. The planning for these changes began in 1917. The safest method to avoid both threats and come up with a common answer is to form a committee made up of official Colonial masters and Indians who are, of course, loyal to the nation. Is there any alternative approach that would have allowed us to achieve both of these aims? On July 18th, he wired the viceroy, "You are intending to organise a committee and have urged me to appoint a chairman. I intend to make a statement before Congress to that effect." This would undoubtedly assuage the concerns of the Indian representatives there.

The Indian government announced on October 14, 1919, that it would establish an investigating panel to look into what had happened in Punjab under Edwin Montagu's directives as the head of the Department of State for India. Originally known as the Disorders Inquest, the Hunter Panel is the most common name today. Its present name honours Lord William Hunter, a former chairman who was Solicitor General of Ireland and a Senator for the Scottish Council of Justice. According to its mandate, the panel was established to investigate the causes and responses to the recent unrest in Mumbai, Delhi, and Amritsar. The commission was made up of the following individuals:

- Lord Hunter, Chairman of the Commission
- Justice George C. Rankin of Calcutta
- Sir Chimanlal Harilal Setalvad, Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University and advocate of the Bombay High Court
- W.F. Rice, member of the Home Department
- Major-General Sir George Barrow, KCB, KCMG, GOC Peshawar Division
- Pandit Jagat Narayan, lawyer and Member of the Legislative Council of the United Provinces
- Thomas Smith, Member of the Legislative Council of the United Provinces
- Sardar Sahibzada Sultan Ahmad Khan, lawyer from Gwalior State
- H.C. Stokes, Secretary of the Commission and member of the Home Department.

The Indian government's decision to remove General Dyer from his position was supported by the Hunter Advisory Board's Majority Document. In July of 1920, Winston Churchill, who was then serving as Secretary of State for War, told the House of Commons that this was the lightest kind of punishment that could have been used. 40 In

response to the criticism levelled against Dyer by the Government of India, which was then repeated by the British Panel and the Military Council, Dyer's supporters introduced bills in both houses of parliament in July 1920. If these motions had been approved, it would have been seen as tacit approval of Dyer's action and the known imperial strategy it reflected. The government's handling of the Dyer case, according to the resolution passed by the House of Lords, sets a dangerous precedent in the face of revolt. When appearing before the Hunter Working group—the commission formally ordered by the British Government to begin examining the massacre and what were quaintly characterised as additional disturbances in northern India— Dyer emphasises his uniqueness as a military commander. Dyer establishes his credibility by pointing to his years of service in the military and his accessibility to current events. The British government put Hunter in charge of their commission. 42 He starts his justification of his objectives by emphasising the military mentality with which he attacked their completion. He said, "It was no longer a question of merely dispersing the crowd; rather, it was a problem of having a sufficient moral effect, from a military point of view, not just on those who were present but, more specifically, throughout the Punjab." It's impossible to imagine this being too harsh.

An acknowledgement of creative purpose is what Dyer has done with his remarks regarding the slaughter. The term "constructive intent" is used when it can be shown that the defendant knew, or should have known, that their acts would cause harm to others

From what he said, maintaining the British military's credibility was crucial to maintaining stability in Amritsar and the rest of the Punjab. This was achieved by the use of force to establish colonial masculinity and power over the native population. Dyer, for instance, admits that he would have dispersed the throng without opening fire, but says that he didn't do so because he was afraid the mob would laugh at him. "I believed it would be doing a jolly lot of good and they would learn they were not to be evil," Dyer retorts. It's a rebuttal to the claim that, by opening fire on the mob, he did the British Raj a huge damage. In response to the criticism that he had done the British Raj a huge harm, Dyer makes this statement.

Dyer's admission that the massacre took place is consistent with the concept of constructive purpose as it is often discussed in legal contexts. By "constructive purpose,"

we mean that the defendant knew or should have known that his or her conduct were likely to cause serious bodily harm to others, if not death. 43 From what he said, maintaining the British military's credibility was crucial to maintaining stability in Amritsar and the rest of the Punjab. This was achieved by the use of force to establish colonial masculinity and power over the native population.

If we take Dyer's admission that he could have dispersed the mob without shooting on it as an example, he adds that he rejected this advice due to his fear of becoming a laughingstock in the eyes of the audience.

After admitting that he may have dispersed the crowd without firing a shot, Dyer offers an explanation. He concedes, "I could disperse them for a bit, but I thought that I would be making a fool of myself since they would all come back and giggle at me." Due to Dyer's belief in the adult-child narrative of colonial encounters, the mere possibility of this occurring would have made him feel very uncomfortable. 'I believed it would be doing a jolly lot of good and they would learn they were not to be evil,' Dyer retorts. This is in response to the claim that, by opening fire on the mob, he had done a grave injury to the British Raj. This is Dyer's response to the suggestion that he has done a terrible service to the British Raj.

Once he arrived at the Delhi General Offices, he was led to the Commanding Officer's office rather than the Military Director's. 45 The Chief of Staff agreed with the Hunter Committee's judgement, and so General Hudson, who had been waiting outside the antechamber, approached him and told him that he would be stripped of his command. Dyer claimed that he shouldn't be penalised since he hadn't been convicted, but Hudson said it was premature to make such an argument. Also, because Hudson is so upset about it all, he asked Dyer to please avoid upsetting the Commanding Officer. Dyer vowed that he would abstain from doing this. As soon as he reached the Commanding officer's desk, Monroe issued a hasty order for him to resign and told him he would not be rehired by the military. Dyer left without a word.

Three Indians, Jagat Narayan, C.H. Setalvad, and Sultan Ahmad, published a dissenting report on the Hunters Committee, demonstrating the committee's internal divisions. It seems to us that Colonel Dyer made a grave error in that he kept firing for as long as he did, which is something that the majority of the judges found to be cause for

strong condemnation. It's easy to understand why the minority view was that the martial law government's use of force was totally unacceptable. They said that despite General Dyer's and Sir Michael O'Dwyer's convictions that they had put down the rebellion, there had been no such outbreak.

War Secretary Winston Churchill and former Prime Minister H. H. Asquith both spoke out against the attack. Both Churchill and Asquith called it hideous, and the latter called it one of the most horrifying events in our nation's history. 48 On July 8, 1920, Winston Churchill delivered the following remark in the House of Representatives: Unless they had bludgeons, the crowd had little chance of survival. It wasn't aimed at anybody or anything in particular. It tried to escape as shots were fired at it to drive a wedge between them, but their efforts were fruitless. Even though there were considerably fewer exits and people were packed in so tightly together that a single bullet could easily pass by three or four bodies, people raced about in a panicked way. The area was much smaller than Tahrir Square. As the fire was concentrated in the area's middle, they fled to the edges. The firefighters then worked to direct the blaze away from the building's perimeter. As the flames were directed downward towards the ground, a large number of individuals hurriedly leapt to safety. A further eight to ten minutes of fire occurred, finally coming to a stop after all ammunition was used up. 49 Parliamentarians voted against Dyer and in favour of the Government after hearing Churchill's comments during the debate in the House of Representatives. There were a final total of 247 in favour and 37 against

The possibility of a court-martial was eliminated by a clause in the Army Act that said a person may only be tried in a military court for murder or manslaughter if it had been committed while the defendant was on active duty. Although it may be claimed that obligation in Chandigarh had really been a provider, the Current regime was of the view that both violations should always be dealt by the civil authorities if civil charges were available under the Army Act. This is due to the fact that the Army Act mandated public access to civilian matters. In spite of this, Legal Advisor Edward des Chamier issued a warning that any member of the public might file a complaint against Dyer without any kind of impediment. In such a scenario, the government may step in and dismiss the lawsuit. Montagu admitted this but was keen that more be done to examine the situation

than just have Dyer's name removed off the list of unemployed by the Commander-in-Chief in India. To organise his ideas, he wrote down the following statement: "The Government of India is proper to advise not to try Dyer, but to propose dismissal." He must be held to an even higher standard of blame than Hunter for his use of the terrorist notion. At this point, His Majesty can no longer rely on General Dyer for any kind of support. Despite his bravery on the battlefield, he has decided to leave the service because he doesn't believe in the values that drive the military

Lieutenant General AS Cobb, Montagu's General Secretary, also briefed Montagu of Dyer's personal issues. After losing his work as an officer, Dyer was entitled to collect annual unemployment benefits in the amount of 700 British pounds. He might get this advantage for as long as five years. Cobb, on the other hand, anticipated that Dyer would want to retire at some point and that, in any case (voluntary or involuntary), he would be entitled to a pension. He would no longer get his pension if he were to be dismissed from the service, which could happen only if a military tribunal found in his favour or if the Secretary of the Treasury for War made a recommendation to the King. I gave my two cents to the Department of State for War, which was adamant about its decision to push him into retirement. After much deliberation, the group determined that trying Dyer in a military tribunal was also out of the question. The group decided that Dyer should be criticised for his inaction upon learning about the Jallianwala Bagh rally and not issuing a proclamation or posting a notice. They shot for another 10 minutes and all felt that Dyer deserved criticism for starting the gunfire without warning. The committee met again, but they didn't go far further since Montagu hadn't had time to draught a negotiated solution condemning Dyer. He and Chelmsford were still arguing the Government of India's suggested and applied presentation, so the commission's draught would have to wait.

Everyone involved was able to reach an agreement on the final result. In a telegram to Montagu dated May 3, 1920, the Indian government conveyed its first reactions to the Hunter Study. Even though the Hunter Report had been available for about 2 months, this was their first public remark on the subject. They admitted in the message that the civilian courts shared some of the culpability for saying that they had done so "in such respects as to suggest that they were not going to exert surveillance or advise over the activities of the military commander." The letter clearly states that this is

to be the case. They scolded Dyer severely after deciding that the Orders prohibiting assembly should have been disseminated more widely, with special attention paid to the potential that notices had been posted in Jallianwala Bagh.

Taking a look at how the Dyer case was handled and the verdict itself shows that authorising or tolerating collective violence in bureaucracies is an organizational reaction. The Dyer case is illustrative of how organizations, an institution, such as the Government of India, that is in indebtedness to the social class that it is supposed to be serving is obligated to abide by the galaxy of obligations held by that social class. Even while individual acts of violence against Native Americans were not officially sanctioned, Curzon discovered throughout his tenure as Viceroy that such acts were seldom denounced and almost never prosecuted. When Dyer responded in Jallianwala Bagh to convey the fury of his school, it is not surprising that his classmates supported him because of it.

The attitude of the Government of India in this situation was to neither approve massacre nor subject its personnel to justice in either military or civil tribunals, as was the case with the deputy inspector who shot 65 captured Kuka rebels out of cannons in 1872. The deputy inspector had been treated with the same strict discipline. By avoiding the subject in 1920, the government had made it feasible for Dyer's supporters to try to legitimise a programme that The Times stated was dubbed by Indians preventative slaughter. Because of this, the government allowed Dyer's supporters to try to legitimate a policy. Dyer's supporters capitalised on popular sympathy for him and animosity for Secretary of State Montagu by drawing attention to the alleged violation of Dyer's rights to due process before the Hunter Committee (which was not a judicial body). It was Dyer who was made to seem like the bad guy in this scenario. Their ideology, which was metaphorically described as one of the strong hand of aggressive action by its proponents, was at odds with both British military theory and the standard operating procedure in India at the time. If it had been permitted, it would have been a watershed moment in the development of British Empire.

Non-Cooperation Movement

- This came as result of the Indian National Congress (INC) withdrawing its support for British reforms following the Rowlatt Act of 18 March 1919— which

suspended the rights of political prisoners in sedition trials, and was seen as a "political awakening" by Indians and as a "threat" by the British and the Jallianwala Bagh massacre of 13 April 1919.

- The movement was one of Gandhi's first organized acts of large-scale satyagraha (civil disobedience). Gandhi's planning of the non-cooperation movement included persuading all Indians to withdraw their labour from any activity that "sustained the British government and also economy in India," including British industries and educational institutions. Through non-violent means, or Ahimsa, protesters would refuse to buy British goods, adopt the use of local handicrafts, and picket liquor shops.
- In addition to promoting "self-reliance" by spinning khadi, buying Indian-made goods only, and boycotting British goods, Gandhi's non-cooperation movement called for the restoration of the Khilafat (Khilafat movement) in Turkey and the end to untouchability. This resulted in publicly-held meetings and strikes (hartals), which led to the first arrests of both Nehru and his father, Motilal Nehru, on 6 December 1921.
- The non-cooperation movement was among the broader movement for Indian independence from British rule and ended, as Nehru described in his autobiography, "suddenly" on 4 February 1922 after the Chauri Chaura incident. Subsequent independence movements were the Civil Disobedience Movement and the Quit India Movement.
- Though intended to be non-violent, the movement was eventually called off by Gandhi in February 1922 following the Chauri Chaura incident, in which numerous policemen were murdered by a mob at Chauri Chaura, United Provinces. Nonetheless, the movement marked the transition of Indian nationalism from a middle-class basis to the masses.

Factors leading to the non-cooperation movement

- The non-cooperation movement was a reaction towards the oppressive policies of the British Indian government such as the Rowlatt Act of 18 March 1919, as well as towards the Jallianwala massacre of 13 April 1919.

- The Rowlatt Act of 1919, which suspended the rights of political prisoners in sedition trials, was seen as a "political awakening" by Indians and as a "threat" by the British. Although it was never invoked and declared void just a few years later, the Act motivated Gandhi to conceive the idea of satyagraha (truth), which he saw as synonymous with independence.
- Motivation for Gandhi's movement was further solidified following the events of 13 April 1919, when a large crowd had gathered at Jallianwala Bagh near the Golden Temple in Amritsar to protest against the arrest of Saifuddin Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal, while others had come to attend the annual Baisakhi festival. The civilians were fired upon by soldiers under the command of Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer, resulting in killing and injuring thousands of protesters. The outcry generated by the massacre led to thousands of unrests and more deaths by the hands of the police. The massacre became the most infamous event of British rule in India.
- Gandhi, who was a preacher of nonviolence, was horrified. He lost all faith in the goodness of the British government and declared that it would be a "sin" to cooperate with the "satanic" government. Likewise, the idea of satyagraha was subsequently authorised by Jawaharlal Nehru, for who the massacre also endorsed "the conviction that nothing short of independence was acceptable."
- Gandhi derived his ideologies and inspiration from ongoing non-cooperation movements, particularly that by Satguru Ram Singh, who is credited as being the first Indian to use non-cooperation and boycott of British merchandise and services as a political weapon.
- In response to the Jallianwala Bagh massacre and other violence in Punjab, the movement sought to secure Swaraj, independence for India. Gandhi promised Swaraj within one year if his noncooperation programme was fully implemented. The other reason to start the non-cooperation movement was that Gandhi lost faith in constitutional methods and turned from cooperator of British rule to noncooperator campaigning for Indian independence from colonialism.
- Other causes include economic hardships to the common Indian citizen, which the nationalists attributed to the economic exploitation of India under colonial rule,

the hardships faced Indian artisans due to British factory-made goods replacing handmade goods, and conscription being employed by the British Indian Army to gather enough recruits during the First World War.

The non-cooperation movement

- The non-cooperation movement aimed to challenge the colonial economic and power structure, and British authorities would be forced to take notice of the demands of the independence movement.
- Gandhi's call was for a nationwide protest against the Rowlatt Act. In promoting "self-reliance," his planning of the non-cooperation movement included persuading all Indians to withdraw their labour from any activity that "sustained the British government and also economy in India," including British industries and educational institutions.
- Through non-violent means, or Ahimsa, protesters would refuse to buy British goods, adopt the use of local handicrafts (by spinning khadi, etc.), and picket liquor shops. Moreover:
 - All offices and factories would be closed;
 - Indians would be encouraged to withdraw from Raj-sponsored schools, police services, the military, and the civil service, and lawyers were asked to leave the Raj's courts;
 - Public transportation and English-manufactured goods, especially clothing, was boycotted; and Indians returned honours and
 - Titles given by the government and resigned from various posts like teachers, lawyers, civil and military services.

Gandhi's non-cooperation movement also called for the end to untouchability.

Untouchability is the practice of ostracising a group of people regarded as 'untouchables', as ascribed in the Vedic Hindu literature to persons of "high caste" or to persons excluded from the caste system resulting in the segregation and persecutions from the people regarded as "higher" caste.

- Publicly-held meetings and strikes (hartals) during the movement ultimately led to the first arrests of both Jawaharlal Nehru and his father, Motilal Nehru, on 6

December 1921. The calls of early political leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak (Congress Extremists) were called major public meetings. They resulted in disorder or obstruction of government services. The British took them very seriously and imprisoned him in Mandalay in Burma and V. O. Chidambaram Pillai received 40 years of imprisonment.

- Veterans such as Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, and Annie Besant opposed the idea outright. The All India Muslim League also criticized the idea. However, the younger generation of Indian nationalists was thrilled and backed Gandhi, whose plans were adopted by the Congress Party in September 1920 and launched that December.
- Gandhi strengthened the movement by supporting the— contemporaneous Khilafat Movement, the Muslim campaign to restore the status of the Khalifa and protest the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire after World War I. As such, Gandhi received extensive support from Indian-Muslim leaders like Maulana Azad, Mukhtar Ahmed Ansari, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maghfoor Ahmad Ajazi, Abbas Tyabji, Maulana Muhammad Ali Jauhar and Maulana Shaukat Ali.

Impact and suspension

- The impact of the revolt was a total shock to British authorities and a massive support to millions of Indian nationalists. Unity in the country was strengthened and many Indian schools and colleges were made. Indian goods were encouraged. On 5 February 1922 a massacre took place at Chauri Chaura, a small town in the district of Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh. A police officer had attacked some volunteers picketing a liquor shop. A whole crowd of peasants that had gathered there went to the police chowki (station). The mob set fire to the police chowki with some 22 policemen inside it.
- Mahatma Gandhi felt that the revolt was veering offcourse, and was disappointed with the rise of violent nature of the movement. He did not want the movement to degenerate into a contest of violence, with police and angry mobs attacking each other back and forth, victimizing civilians in between. Gandhi appealed to the Indian public for all resistance to end, went on a fast and on 12 February 1922 called off the non-cooperation movement. Gandhi was also a firm believer of STS

(struggle truce struggle). He believed that after a duration of struggle, there should be a resting phase by which they could recover the power and rise again more strong and powerful. Though this point is not mentioned but every movement lead by Gandhi was withdrawn by him after a year or two

End of Non Cooperation

The Non-cooperation movement was withdrawn after the Chauri Chaura incident. Although he had stopped the national revolt single-handedly, on 12 Feb 1922, Mahatma Gandhi was arrested. On 18 March 1922, he was imprisoned for six years for publishing seditious materials. This led to the suppression of the movement and was followed by the arrest of other leaders.

Although most Congress leaders remained firmly behind Gandhi, the determined leaders broke away, including the Ali brothers (Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Shaukat Ali). Motilal Nehru and Chittaranjan Das formed the Swaraj Party, rejecting Gandhi's leadership. Many nationalists had felt that the noncooperation movement should not have been stopped due to isolated incidents of violence, and most nationalists while retaining confidence in Gandhi, were discouraged.

Swaraj Party

Background

Under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi the Congress emerged as a great nationalist forum of all shades and opinions voicing anti-imperialist sentiments. During Gandhi's Non Cooperation movement (1920-22), its roots spread out among all classes of people. The formal acceptance of Swaraj as the goal of the Congress really converted Noncooperation into a mass movement. Gandhi's catchy slogan 'Swaraj in one year' stirred the masses of men into action. The suspension of Non-Cooperation in February, 1922 created widespread disappointment and precipitated an open division in the leadership of the Congress. The Government took advantage of the situation to take resort to a policy of repression.

The upper middle class intellectuals looked at politics from the plane of reality, and were keen to rescue the Congress and its politics from the demoralisation that had set in after the withdrawal of Non-Cooperation. These individuals wound up frustrated with Gandhi's political judgments and impulses.

Formation of Swaraj Party

The suspension of non-cooperation movement was met with an impressive measure of logical inconsistencies among pioneers of the Congress Party. While some wanted to continue non-cooperation, others wanted to end the legislature boycott and contest elections. The former were called no-changers and such leaders included Rajendra Prasad, Sardar Vallabhai Patel, C Rajagopalachari, etc. The others who wanted to enter the legislative council and obstruct the British government from within were called the pro-changers. These leaders included C R Das, Motilal Nehru, Srinivasa Iyengar, etc.

There was a split in the Congress. The No-Changers or orthodox Gandhians decried the programme of council-entry and desired the congress to follow Gandhi's constructive programme. The Pro-Changers or Swarajists wanted the constructive programme to be coupled with a political programme of council-entry. In 1922, in the Gaya session of the Congress, C R Das (who was presiding over the session) moved a proposal to enter the legislatures but it was defeated. Das and other leaders broke away from the Congress and formed the Congress-Khilafat Swarajaya Party with Das as the president and Nehru as one of the secretaries. Other noticeable pioneers included N C Kelkar, Huseyn Shaheed Suhrawardy and Subhas Chandra Bose of Bengal, Vithalbhai Patel and different Congress pioneers who were getting to be disappointed with the Congress.

The victory of the No-Changers at the Gaya Congress was short-lived. The Hindu-Muslim riots of 1923 darkened the political atmosphere. It was also clear that the civil disobedience could not be resumed as a national programme. Presently both the Swarajists and the No-Changers were occupied with a furious political battle, yet both were resolved to stay away from the appalling knowledge of the 1907 split at Surat. On the exhortation of Gandhi, the two gatherings chose to stay in the Congress however to work in their different ways. There was no fundamental distinction between the two.

The special Congress session, held at Delhi in September 1923 under the president ship of Maulana Azad allowed congressmen to contest the forthcoming elections. Annual session at Cocanada blessed the council-entry by maintaining that Non-Cooperation could be practised inside the councils also. The Congress called upon all its

members to double their efforts to carry out the constructive programme of Gandhi. Thus the split in the Congress was avoided.

Gandhi and Swarajist

After his discharge from jail in 1924, Gandhi looked to convey back the Swarajists to the Congress and re-join the gathering. Gandhi's supporters were in a greater part in the Congress, and the Congress still remained India's biggest political gathering, yet Gandhi felt it important to recuperate the gap with the Swarajists, in order to mend the country's injuries over the 1922 suspension. The Belgaum Congress, presided over by Gandhi laid the foundation of mutual trust between NoChangers and the Swarajists. He brought about an agreement incorporating the suspension of non-cooperation except in so far as it related to the refusal to use or wear cloth made out of India. It laid down that different kinds of Congress work might be done by different sections.

The constructive programme with its emphasis on the spinning wheel, Hindu-Muslim unity, prohibition and the removal of Untouchability was prescribed to congressmen as the chief means for the attainment of Swaraj. Though Gandhian noncooperation remained the Congress Party's primary strategy, actual partial cooperation in the postwar reforms thus became the alternate tactic of those Congress leaders who were less orthodox Hindu, or more secular-minded, in outlook.

Objectives and Aims of Swaraj party

The Congress-Khilafat Swarajya Party or the Swaraj Party aimed for:

- Speedy attainment of dominion status.
- Obtaining the right to frame a constitution adopting such machinery and system as are most suited to the conditions of the country and genius of the peoples.
- Establishing control over the bureaucracy.
- Obtaining full provincial autonomy.
- Attaining Swarajya (self-rule).
- Getting people the right to control the existing machinery and system of government.
- Organising industrial and agricultural labour.
- Controlling the local and municipal bodies.

- Having an agency for propaganda outside the country.
- Establishing a federation of Asian countries to promote trade and commerce.
- Engaging in the constructive programmes of the Congress.

Methods

What gave a peculiar distinction to the politics of the Swarajists was their avowed intention of wrecking the reforms from within. Michael O' Dwyer, formerly Lt. Governor of Punjab had written that to deal with 'sabotage' was much more difficult than an open rebellion. The Swarajists' methods of obstruction to all government sponsored laws were calculated to destroy the prestige of the councils which had throttled the national self-assertion and respect.

The methods of the Swarajists on the destructive side emphasised rejection of the votable parts of the budgets and rejection of proposals emanating from the bureaucracy. On the constructive side, they sought to move resolutions calculated to promote a healthy national life and displacement of bureaucracy. The General Council of the Swaraj Party laid down specific rules for the conduct of its members in the legislative bodies. They were not to serve as members on committees by official nomination.

C.R. Das summed up the methods of work inside the councils thus, "I want you to enter the Councils and to secure a majority and to put forward national demand. If it is not accepted, I want to oppose the Government in every measure, good, bad and indifferent, and make the work of the Council impossible".

Works and Achievements of Swaraj Party

The Swarajists emerged as the single largest party in the Central Assembly, Bombay and Bengal Councils while their number in the U.P. Council was not insignificant in 1923. The victory of the Swarajists at the polls strengthened their position in the congress as against the No Changers. In the absence of mass political activities in this period, the Swarajists played a significant role in keeping the spirit of Anti-British protest alive. They made it almost impossible for the British rulers to get the approval of the legislatures for their policies and proposals.

For example, in 1928, the government introduced a bill in the legislative assembly which would give it the power to expel from the country those nonIndians who supported India's struggle for freedom. The bill was defeated. When the government introduced this

bill again, Vithalbhai Patel who was the president of the assembly refused to allow it. The individuals from Swaraj Party did significant work towards India's battle for Freedom. The Swarajists exposed the weaknesses of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms. They gave fiery speeches in the Assembly on self-rule and civil liberties. The debates in the legislatures, in which Indian members often outwitted the government and condemned the government, were read with interest and enthusiasm throughout the country.

The year 1924-25 registered many victories for the Swarajists in the Legislative Assembly. They succeeded in throwing out the Budget forcing the Government to rely on its power of certification. The Swarajists in their zeal to wreck the reforms from within often succeeded in blocking the passage of the Government's Bills and other measures. They resorted to adjournment motions and asking inconvenient questions to expose the misdeeds of the alien government.

The death of C.R. Das in 1925 deprived the Swarajists of their ablest leader and their position was weakened. In 1926, the Swarajists withdrew from the council proclaiming the death of dyarchy. The Swarajist activities produced a stir in the country and achieved whatever could be achieved by their tactics under the constitution

Constructive Work

The Council Entry for wrecking reforms from within was the main, but by no means the sole, objective of the Swarajists. They also had a definite conception of socioeconomic reforms or ameliorative activities which Gandhi characterised as the constructive programme. To Gandhi the chariot of freedom struggle had two wheels-constructive programme and political campaigns. The constructive programme, as adumbrated by him, consisted of eighteen items of which the most important were Hindu-Muslim unity, removal of untouchability, prohibition, Swadeshi and boycott. The Swarajists could ill-afford to ignore the programme as they knew that some day they might have to leave the Councils and resort to civil disobedience along with those who did not go to the councils. The Swarajists lent support to the Constructive Programme but did not share Gandhi's passion and idealism in this regard.

Decline of Swaraj Party

The enthusiasm of 1924 began to wane and the years 1925-27 saw demoralisation and eventual decline of the Swarajists. Inside the legislatures, the Swarajists failed to

pursue the policy of 'constant, continuous uniform obstruction'. A substantial section of the Swarajists realised that the destructive opposition to all government measures put an end to all socially useful measures. They could not coordinate their struggle inside the Assembly with the mass freedom struggle outside. They totally relied on newspapers to carry their work and message in the Assembly to the outside world. The death of C R Das in 1925 further weakened the party. Their policy of obstructionism had its flaws and limitations.

The results of the elections of 1926 came as a rude shock to the Swarajists. Their strength in the legislative bodies went down except in the Madras where their success was signal. They suffered heavy losses everywhere. In the U.P., C.P. and Punjab, the Swarajists were routed. In fact, on the eve of the 1926 elections, The Swarajists had lost much of their ground. The party's failure to support the peasant cause in Bengal led to a loss of support of many members.

The announcement of Simon Commission in the closing months of 1927 and Lord Birkenhead's challenge to Indians to produce a constitution acceptable to all sections of society opened new political vistas in the country. The Simon Commission evoked universal boycott while Motilal, taking up the challenge of Birkenhead, prepared a constitution known as Nehru Report. The Swarajists and the No-changers began to draw closer to one another. The Calcutta Congress of 1928 resolved that in case the British Government did not accept the Nehru Report by 31 December 1929, the Congress would declare complete independence as its goal. The Council Entry programme in the changed political situation occupied a back seat and lost its relevance. The Swaraj Party now merged with the Congress as the country began to prepare for the second round of direct mass action to achieve complete independence.

Reasons for Decline

The Demoralisation and the decline of the Swaraj Party, was due to the absence of a broad ideological basis. Although the Swarajists, with their programme of Council Entry, seemed very promising in 1923 and looked like changing the course of Indian Politics, they petered out very soon, and were undeniably a spent force by 1929. Some of the reasons for its decline are as follows .

- **Rising Communal Politics** -The increasing communal tempo began to shape the course of events. The protracted Hindu-Muslim tension, presence of reactionary elements of both the communities within the party, which ostensibly professed secularism, really created a difficult situation. The Hindus felt that their interests were not safe in the hands of the Congress. The activities of the Hindu Mahasabha also weakened the Swarajist position. The Muslim alienation from the Congress became so marked that its erstwhile Muslim members fought elections as Muslims, not as Swarajists.
- **Lure of Office**- The lure of office proved to be another reason for the decline of the Swarajists. They began their career with a bang by entering councils with the declared objective of stiff resistance to the bureaucracy. The spirit of resistance soon gave way to cooperation. V.J. Patel was elected President of the Assembly and Motilal accepted membership of Sken Commission. The Policy of unqualified obstruction lost its appeal and the party showed signs of disintegration. In fact, many of the Swarajists had no faith in the policy of Non-Cooperation. Having entered the councils, they were not averse to enjoying its privileges. The Swarajist leaders accepted offices and sat on various committees.
- **Class Character**- The Swaraj Party represented the upper-middle class elements of the Congress who had always been opposed to direct mass action. They had joined the nationalist struggle to prevent it from committing itself to revolutionary mass action. They were drawn, quite unwillingly, into the vortex of Non-Cooperation movement. On the failure of the movement, they took to parliamentary politics and later seemed to be content with playing the role of constitutional opposition.
- **Internal Divisions**- The Swaraj Party was a house divided against itself. Mutual bickering and distrust eroded its credibility. Denial of tickets to some Swarajists led them to declare their candidature as independents. There were internal divisions among the Swarajists. They were divided into the responsivists and the non-responsivists. The responsivists (M M Malaviya, Lala Lajpat Rai, N C Kelkar) wanted to cooperate with the government and hold offices, whereas the non-responsivists (Motilal Nehru) withdrew from legislatures in 1926.

In spite of its decline, Swaraj party succeeded to a great extent in achieving its goals at that challenging time. The activities of Swarajists enlivened an otherwise dull political atmosphere. Their tactics of obstruction embarrassed the government while the parliamentary duels of the period constitute a brilliant page in the annals of parliamentary politics.

Simon Commission

The Simon Commission (Indian Statutory Commission), formed by the British in 1927 to review the Government of India Act 1919, sparked widespread protests due to its all-British composition. Arriving in India in 1928, it was met with protests, including the iconic “Simon Go Back” demonstrations. The commission aimed to evaluate the Act, recommend reforms and address communal representation and law and order.

However, its lack of Indian representation led to its boycott, driving nationalist sentiment. The protests influenced key developments like the Nehru Report, and intensified demands for Indian self-governance, fostering new leaders and strengthening the independence movement.

The Simon Commission, officially known as the Indian Statutory Commission, was established by the British government in 1927 to review the Government of India Act 1919 and recommend constitutional reforms. The commission was chaired by Sir John Simon and included Seven British members, sparking controversy and anger in India due to the lack of Indian representation.

Simon Commission Arrival

The Simon Commission arrived in Bombay, India, on 3rd February 1928, triggering widespread protests and public outrage. Demonstrations were organised by various political factions, including the Indian National Congress and a faction of the Muslim League led by Mohammed Ali Jinnah, both of which decided to boycott the commission. Reception in India took place with:

- Nationwide Protests: The commission’s arrival was met with massive protests across India, with Indians expressing their opposition through strikes and demonstrations.

- Black Flag Demonstrations: Protesters carried black flags and shouted “Simon Go Back,” symbolising their rejection of the commission and its exclusionary practices.
- Students and youth were at the forefront of the protests, demonstrating their commitment to the cause of Indian independence.

Simon Commission Purpose

The objective of the Simon Commission was to evaluate the Government of India Act 1919, recommend constitutional reforms, address communal representation, and assess law and order amidst rising nationalist movements.

- Evaluate the Government of India Act 1919: The commission aimed to assess the functioning of the diarchy, where certain provincial responsibilities were divided between Indian ministers and British officials.
- Recommend Constitutional Reforms: It sought to propose constitutional changes that could address governance issues and Indian demands while maintaining British control.
- Address Communal Representation: The commission aimed to evaluate and propose solutions for communal representation, a contentious issue in British India.
- Assess Law and Order: The commission was tasked with reviewing the law and order situation in light of growing nationalist movements.

Simon Commission Criticism

The Simon Commission faced criticism for lacking Indian representation, leading to a limited understanding of India’s needs, and for prioritising colonial authority over genuine reforms. The absence of Indian members meant the commission lacked a genuine understanding of India’s political climate and needs. Critics argued that the commission’s purpose was more about preserving colonial authority than offering meaningful reforms.

Simon Commission Boycott

The boycott of the Simon Commission was driven by several factors such as the absence of Indian representation, lack of genuine reforms, and a boycott call by leaders, including the INC, at the 1927 Madras session chaired by M.A. Ansari.

- **Absence of Indian Representation:** The commission did not include any Indian members, which was perceived as a clear disregard for Indian political aspirations and a sign of British indifference to Indian demands for self-governance.
- **Lack of Genuine Reforms:** Many Indians viewed the commission as a tactic to delay substantial constitutional reforms and maintain British control over India, especially after the limited changes introduced by the Government of India Act 1919.
- **Call for Boycott by Leaders:** Indian political leaders, including members of the Indian National Congress (INC), called for a nationwide boycott, mobilizing the public to protest against the commission. The decision was made in 1927 during the Madras session, which was chaired by M.A. Ansari.

Major Protest Events

- The Lahore Protest, led by Lala Lajpat Rai, saw brutal police action and his death, intensifying resistance and nationalist sentiment among students and youth.
- Lahore Protest (30th October 1928): In Lahore, a significant protest led by Lala Lajpat Rai resulted in brutal police action, leading to Rai's death on 17th November 1928 and intensifying resistance against the commission.
- Student and Youth Protests: The involvement of students and youth highlighted the growing nationalist sentiment and the widespread demand for change.

Simon Commission Impact

The Simon Commission significantly impacted India's independence movement, leading to the Nehru Report advocating dominion status and secular democracy, influencing the Government of India Act 1935, uniting the opposition, fostering new leaders, and intensifying demands for self-governance.

- **Nehru Report:** The Nehru Report (1928), formulated in response to the Simon Commission, proposed a new constitutional framework emphasising self-governance and democratic principles.
- The report called for dominion status within the British Commonwealth, marking a shift in political demands.
- It advocated for a secular and democratic framework, rejecting communal representation.

- **Influence on Future Reforms:** The Simon Commission's impact extended to future constitutional reforms, including the Government of India Act 1935.
- **Provincial Autonomy:** The act of 1935 abolished diarchy, introduced provincial autonomy, and instituted bicameralism in six of the eleven provinces, granting more powers to Indian ministers and legislatures.
- **Criticism:** Despite reforms, the act was criticised for not granting full self-governance, leading to continued demands for independence.
- **The emergence of New Leaders:** The opposition to the Simon Commission provided a platform for new leaders and movements to emerge, contributing to the broader struggle for independence.
- **Prominent Leaders:** Figures like Bhagat Singh gained prominence for their activism and resistance against colonial rule.
- **Legacy of Resistance:** The opposition inspired a new generation of leaders and activists to continue the fight for independence.
- **Strengthening of the Independence Movement:** The Simon Commission played a crucial role in strengthening the Indian independence movement, uniting diverse groups in their demand for self-rule.
- **Unified Opposition:** The boycott united various Indian political parties, including the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League, fostering a sense of national solidarity against colonial rule.

Rise of Communist Party

This course encompasses the origins of communist ideas and then their unexpected coming to power in the context of World War I.

The first half of the course, "The Specter Haunting Europe," introduces Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels as thinkers and intellectual partners who created a total ideology in answer to the challenges of modern times. Lectures consider the origins of these men, their development, and their political activism. The course also examines the vocabulary of key concepts they advanced and takes an in-depth look at the vital texts, *The Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital*.

The course analyzes a highly ironic turn of events: The fiery Paris Commune uprising of 1871 was attributed to Marx, even though his role had been marginal. By the

time of Marx's death in 1883, a growing socialist movement was mobilized to carry his ideas forward, but it did so in an atmosphere of factional infighting, even as it pledged international solidarity. World War I shattered that socialist unity of purpose, and it brought to center stage previously unknown Russian revolutionaries.

The second half of the course, "Lenin and the Founding of the Soviet Union," mines a rich paradox: If Marxists saw the backward Russian Empire as lagging in progress and an unlikely place for a modern industrial workers' revolution, why was it that communism triumphed there first? The course reveals how Russian revolutionaries fused homegrown traditions of rebellion against harsh tsarist rule with foreign ideological elements into a potent mix. Out of this context, Vladimir Lenin crafted the idea of a vanguard party of totally dedicated professional revolutionaries who could accelerate historical development and travel the road to power.

Lenin's disciplined Bolsheviks still a catalyst—a crisis that would afford them opportunity. That came in 1914, with the explosion of World War I. Amid the storms of that conflict, Lenin was allowed to travel in secret back to Russia across Germany, enemy territory, and to foment revolt in his home country. In October 1917, Lenin's Bolsheviks seized power in a coup, taking advantage of a political power vacuum. They established a new state committed to the overthrow of all world governments.

Out of necessity, the revolution was not to be limited to Russia. It relied on unleashing world revolution. The course traces the appeal of that prospect with a close biographical look at the world's most famous woman revolutionary: Rosa Luxemburg. After a failed attempt at radical revolt in postwar Germany in 1919, she was murdered and was celebrated as a martyr to the cause.

Attempts to spread revolution in Hungary and Bavaria also went down to defeat, but these failures only deferred Bolshevik hopes. At the same time, Russia was engulfed in a civil war of astonishing brutality, which pitted the Bolsheviks against a wide array of opponents. To the surprise of many, Lenin's government survived. It even set about cementing the foundations for a new civilization, with unprecedented monuments, social plans, and new traditions. When Lenin died in 1924, and his mummified body was entombed in Moscow in front of the Kremlin, the new Soviet Union was on a route to yet

more upheaval. Rivals Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky competed to lead the way into the promised future.

Defining Communism

Communism, as shaped by Karl Marx, is defined as the abolition of private property and a market seeking profit with a new system of collective control of the means of production and resources. In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and his associate Friedrich Engels announced that communism could be “summed up in a single sentence: Abolition of private property.”

Associated with this were promises of total social equality and sharing in a new stage of human societal evolution. In fact, Marx’s scheme promised liberation from history, the entire record of struggle and exploitation and suffering to date. A later formulation of Marx’s was that communism would be the stage when all of society was organized along the lines of one idea: “From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.”

A related concept to communism is socialism. Socialism involves public ownership and control of property, and it envisions a cooperative society, in opposition to capitalist notions of private property, free market, and individual choices. The meanings and association have shifted, but originally, communism was meant to signify a higher or full form of socialism. There were key moments when communists and socialists argued and clashed.

Anarchists, who denounced state structures of any variety as inevitably corrupting and constraining, also play a fascinating role in the story: Anarchism was sometimes an ally and yet often a fierce critic of communism.

Civil Disobedience Movement

Background

The abrupt withdrawal of Non-Cooperation Movement by Gandhi after the Chauri Chaura incident of February 1922 had demoralizing effect on many Congress leaders and led to a sharp decline in the national movement. The all India Congress membership went down to 106,000 in March 1923, and was only 56,000 in May 1929. The Swarajist programme of wrecking dyarchy from within petered out into council and municipal politicking. The ‘No Changer’ group which emphasised upon Gandhian Constructive

Work in villages remained scattered and kept themselves aloof from the political developments. The remarkable Hindu-Muslim unity of the NonCooperation-Khilafat days dissolved into widespread communal riots in the mid-1920s. For example, there was a violent anti-Hindu outburst at Kohat in the N.W. Frontier Province in September 1924. Three waves of riots in Calcutta between April and July 1926 killed about 138 people. In the same year there were communal disturbances in Dacca, Patna, Rawalpindi, Delhi and U. P. Communal organizations proliferated. Negotiations with Jinnah over the Nehru Report plan for an alternative constitution broke down in 1927-28 largely because of Hindu Mahasabha opposition and Jinnah's obstinacy in relation to it.

The Hindu-Muslim Unity of 1919-22 was never regained. However, there were many signs of the growth of anti-imperialist movement from 1928 onwards. These signs were visible in:

- Demonstrations and hartals in towns in the course of the boycott of the Simon Commission,
- Militant workers' movement in Bombay and Calcutta which alarmed Indian businessmen and British officials and capitalists alike,
- The revival of revolutionary groups in Bengal and Northern India (with Bhagat Singh's HSRA introducing a new secular and socialistic tone),
- Peasant movements in various regions, particularly the successful Bardoli Satyagraha led by Vallabhbhai Patel in Gujarat in 1928 against the enhancement of land revenue.

During this period, when the Congress Left was emerging under Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Bose, slogans of Purna Swaraj rather than of only Dominion Status were voiced. After much hesitation, Gandhi accepted this change in Congress creed at the Lahore session in December 1929, setting the stage for the next major round of countrywide struggle in 1930-34.

You would like to know how this new upsurge became possible, considering the extent of decline and fragmentation of the immediately preceding years. Historians of the 'Cambridge School' have tried to explain it by suggesting a direct causal link between the British policies and the ups and downs of the national movement. The appointment of the Simon Commission revived a "moribund nationalism". Irwin gave the Congress

importance by talking with Gandhi on a level of equality. But a closer look raises doubts about this entire thesis because the British policies often changed in response to nationalist pressures rather than vice-versa. For example, the all-white Simon Commission had planned a retreat even from the Montagu-Chelmsford framework in respect of the demands of Indians. But the mass upsurge of 1930 forced the British to make a promise of some sort of responsible government at the centre. Further, it was the pressure from the national movement and the heroic self-sacrifice of people which again forced Irwin to negotiate with Gandhi in February-March 1931.

Throughout 1928 and 1929 we find that political and economic tensions between British domination and a variety of Indian interests increased:

- Contradictions were enormously sharpened by the impact of the World Depression which set in from late 1929. Business groups were not happy with the British tariff policy. Lancashire textile imports were going up again, and there were growing conflicts in Calcutta between the Birlas and British jute interests, and in Bombay over coastal shipping.
- The workers facing large scale retrenchment started agitations with unprecedented militancy and organization.
- Rural tensions were sharpened by stagnation in agricultural production and by British efforts to enhance land revenue in raiyatwari areas in the late 1920s, till the Bardoli victory halted such endeavours permanently.

But socio-economic tensions did not necessarily or automatically take an anti-British turn, for the immediate oppressors would most often be Indian Zamindars, moneylenders, or millowners, groups which could have nationalist connections, or which nationalists generally tried to keep on their side. Yet a massive country-wide upsurge did take place in 1930. Let us see, why and how it happened.

Civil Disobedience, 1930 – March 1931

The Lahore Congress (1929) had left the choice of the precise methods of non-violent struggle for Purna Swaraj to Gandhi. It was resolved that a Manifesto or pledge of Independence would be taken all over India by as many people as possible on 26 January 1930. On this date civil disobedience was supposed to commence. It was declared Independence Day.

Gandhi's Efforts

Gandhi was still not sure of his plan of action. Before launching the movement he once again tried for compromise with the Government. He placed eleven points of administrative reform and stated that if Lord Irwin accepted them there would be no need for agitation. The important demands were:

- a. The Rupee-Sterling ratio should be reduced to 1s 4d,
- b. Land revenue should be reduced by half and made a subject of legislative control,
- c. Salt tax should be abolished and also the government salt monopoly,
- d. Salaries of the highest grade services should be reduced by half,
- e. Military expenditure should be reduced by 50% to be begin with,
- f. Protection for Indian textiles and coastal shipping,
- g. All political prisoners should be discharged.

To many observers this charter of demands seemed a climb-down from Purna Swaraj. Jawaharlal Nehru wrote in his Autobiography: What was the point of making a list of our political and social reforms when we were taking in terms of Independence. Did Gandhiji mean the same thing when he used this term as we did or did we speak a different language? The Government response to Gandhi's proposal was negative. Still Gandhi was hesitant. He wrote to the Viceroy:

But if you cannot see your way to deal with these evils and my letter makes no appeal to your ear, I shall proceed, with such co-workers of the Ashram as I can take, to disregard the provisions of the salt laws. I regard this tax to be the most ubiquitous of all from the poor man's standpoint. The Viceroy gave a brief reply in which he regretted that Gandhi was "contemplating a course of action which was clearly bound to involve violation of law and danger to the public peace".

Gandhi in his rejoinder said, "on bended knees I asked for bread and received a stone instead. The English nation responds only to force and I am not surprised by the Viceregal reply".

Beginning of the Movement

Gandhi took the decision to start the movement. On 12 March 1930 Gandhi started the Historic March from his Sabarmati Ashram to Dandi beach accompanied by

his 78 selected followers. There Gandhi and his followers broke the law by manufacturing salt from the sea. The Programme of the movement was as follows:

- a) Salt law should be violated everywhere.
- b) Students should leave colleges and government servants should resign from service.
- c) Foreign clothes should be burnt.
- d) No taxes should be paid to the government.
- e) Women should stage a Dharna at liquor shops, etc.

The choice of salt as the central issue appeared puzzling initially. Events quickly revealed the enormous potentialities of this choice. “You planned a fine strategy round the issue of salt”, Irwin later admitted to Gandhi. Salt was a concrete and a universal grievance of the rural poor, which was almost unique in having no socially divisive implications. With regard to food habits, the salt was a daily necessity of the people. It also carried with it the implications of trust, hospitality, and mutual obligations. In this sense it had a far-reaching emotional content. Moreover the breaking of the salt law meant a rejection of the Government’s claims on the allegiance of the people. In coastal areas where over the previous century indigenous salt production had been ruined by British imports, illegal manufacture of salt could provide the people a small income which was not unimportant. The manufacture of salt also became a part of Gandhian methods of constructive work like Khadi production. Rural Gandhian bases everywhere provided the initial volunteers for the salt satyagraha. Above all, the Dandi March and the subsequent countrywide violation of the salt law provided a tremendously impressive demonstration of the power of non-violent mass struggle.

What came to be undermined was the entire moral authority of the government and its self-image of being the paternalistic ‘ma-baap’ of the poor. An additional District Magistrate reported from Midnapur (Bengal) in November 1930 that even old villagers were talking “insolently -- the ordinary cultivator simply squatted on his haunches and laughing sarcastically said, ‘We know how powerful the Sarkar is.’”

Movement Spreads

Social boycott of police and lower-level administrative officials led to many resignations. That the British realized the gravity of the threat was revealed by the sheer

brutality of repression, as “unresisting men – (were) methodically bashed into a bloody pulp”, in the world of the American journalist Webb Miller. But the spectacle of unarmed, unresisting satyagrahis standing up to abominable torture aroused local sympathy and respect as nothing else could have done. The brutal repression invoked memories of innumerable acts of petty oppression by police and local officials, linking up the all India struggle with the lived day-to-day experience of the villagers. Sympathy quickly turned into participation, spreading the movement far beyond the fairly narrow confines. And such participation often took violent forms, with crowds of villagers attacking police parties. The Gandhian restraints had been weakened, anyway, by the early removal of most of the Congress cadres by arrests.

1. On 18 April 1930, Bengal revolutionaries inaugurated one of the most powerful and heroic epoch in the history of the revolutionary nationalist movement by seizing the Chittagong armoury, and fighting a pitched battle on Jalabad hill on 22 April. Revolutionary nationalism accompanied the whole history of Civil Disobedience in Bengal, with 56 incidents in 1930 (as compared to 47 for the decade 1919-1929). The Chittagong leader Surya Sen managed to remain underground in villages till as late as 1933, and there was the evidence of a new level of peasant sympathy. For the first time Muslims were also included in what had been a movement of educated middle class Hindu youth alone.
2. In Peshawar on 23 April 1930, the arrest of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan provoked a massive upsurge, and a platoon of Garhwali Rifles (Hindu soldiers facing a Muslim crowd) refused to open fire, an instance of patriotic self-sacrifice, non-violence, and communal unity which deserves to be better remembered.
3. The industrial city of Sholapur in Maharashtra in early May 1930 saw a textile workers’ strike, attacks on liquor shops, police outposts and government buildings, and even something like a parallel government for a few days.

The onset of the monsoon made illegal salt manufacture difficult and the Congress switched over to other forms of mass struggle, all characterised by a similar pattern of careful choice of socially non-divisive issues, followed by their broadening and radicalization through a variety of populist initiatives. The Working Committee in May 1930 sanctioned nonpayment of land revenue in raiyatwari areas, an anti-chowkidari

(village police) tax in zamindari regions (not, significantly enough, no-rent), and 'forest satyagraha': peaceful violation of forest laws restricting age-old tribal and poor peasant rights to free fodder, timber and other forest produce. The government struck back at no-tax movements through largescale confiscations of property, yet thousands of peasants heroically stood their ground, at times migrating en masse to neighboring princely states. Rural movements repeatedly went beyond the prescribed Gandhian bounds, through violent confrontation with the police at many places, and massive tribal invasions of forests in Central Provinces, Maharashtra and Karnataka. The rumour spread that the British Raj was coming to an end.

Response of Different Sections

Urban intelligentsia's support for Gandhian nationalism was perhaps less in evidence in 1930 than during the Non-Cooperation Movement and there were few instances of lawyers giving up practice or students leaving official institutions to join national schools. Militant urban educated youth tended to be attracted more by revolutionary nationalism in Bengal, and in north Indian towns, Bhagat Singh's popularity briefly rivaled that of Gandhi himself. The most obvious weak point of nationalism as compared to 1919- 22, was of course Muslim participation which remained low, on the whole, except in Badshah Khan's NWFP and places like Delhi; for example only 9 out of 679 Civil Disobedience prisoners in Allahabad between 1930 and 1933 were Muslims. Social discontent turned communal in Dacca town and Kishoreganj village in May and during Gandhi-Irwin Pact. Unlike NonCooperation, Civil Disobedience did not coincide with any major labour upsurge. There were frequent hartals in town, but the Congress did not include industrial or communication strikes in its programme, much to the relief of British officials.

Such lags were largely made up by the massive peasant mobilization and considerable support from business groups, at least during the early months of Civil Disobedience. The movement, unlike Non-Cooperation, implied violations of law, arrests, and beating-up right from the beginning, and the number of jail goers was 92,214; more than three times the 1921-22 figure. Support from Ahmedabad mill owners, Bombay merchants and petty traders (industrialists in the city being less enthusiastic), and Calcutta Marwaris headed by GD Birla can be cited as example of the solidarity of

the Capitalists with the national movement at this stage. For example, the merchants in many towns took a collective pledge to give up import of foreign goods for some months. Combined with picketing and the overall impact of the Depression, there was a spectacular collapse of British cloth imports, from 1248 million yards in 1929-30 to only 523 million yards in 1930-31.

A novel and remarkable feature of the Civil Disobedience Movement was the widespread participation of women. The handful of postgraduate women students in 1930s still went to class escorted by their teachers, and yet there were women from far more socially conservative professional, business or peasant families, picketing shops, facing lathis, and going to jail. A U.P. Police official felt that “the Indian woman is struggling for domestic and national liberty at the same time” However, this sudden active role of women in politics did not produce any significant change in the conditions of women in or outside the family. Gandhian non-violence, after all, did not entail any drastic violation of the traditional image of women; rather, it was male action that had in some ways been ‘feminized’, through the emphasis upon self-sacrifice, acceptance of suffering, etc. The deeply religious ambience of Gandhi’s saintly image was perhaps even more crucial: joining the Congress movement was a new religious mission, and certain transgressions were permitted or even glorified in such a context, just as Mira had come to be venerated as a saint centuries back. The one form of women’s participation which came to be quite sharply condemned was an active role in direct revolutionary nationalist action, including assassination as happened several times in Bengal. Even Rabindranath Tagore, usually much in advance of others in questions of women’s roles, then wrote a novel – *Char Adhyay* (1934) – condemning such ‘unfeminine’ behavior.

Regional Variations

The recent spate of regional studies of Civil Disobedience has brought to light interesting variations and internal tensions. Gujarat - more specifically, Kheda district, Bardoli taluka of Surat, Ahmedabad, and the Gujarati business-cumprofessional community of Bombay City - had become the classic heartland of controlled mass mobilization through Gandhian satyagraha. Gandhian strategies and controls fitted in well with the interests of substantial landholding peasants like the Patidars of Kheda and Bardoli, where in the absence of big zamindaris, rent was not much of an issue. Rural

movements tended to be more uninhibited where Congress organization was weaker, or where internal zamindar-peasant divisions were quite sharp. Thus in Central Provinces, Maharashtra or Karnataka, where Non-Cooperation had made little inroads, the Gandhian ideas had the flavour and vagueness of novelty, a near millenarian flavour could still be seen, absent in the well-established strongholds like Gujarat, coastal Andhra or Bihar. In the United Provinces, District-level comparisons have brought out clearly this inverse relationship between organization and militancy. Parts of Agra district, with a strong Congress organization and few big zamindars, followed the Bardoli pattern; talukdar-dominated Rae Baraeli saw powerful pressures from the peasants. In Bara Banki, where khadi or charkha were little in evidence, local activists were preaching that land was a gift of God and could not belong to zamindars alone. In Bengal, with its relatively weak and faction-ridden Congress, a near-coincidence of class with communal divisions in the eastern districts, and the presence already of a left alternative, the pattern was even more complex. There were powerful Gandhian rural movements in parts of West Bengal like Midnapur, Arambagh sub-division, and Bankura; a Praja movement was developing among Muslim rich peasants which was aloof or hostile regarding Civil Disobedience; and in one Muslim-majority district, Tippera, Congress activists were combining agrarian radicalism with nationalism in ways branded as 'rank Bolshevism' by Government officials and local Hindu landlords.

The Truce Months: March-December 1931

Around September-October 1930, Civil Disobedience entered a second, more contradictory, phase. Pressures for no-rent were mounting as the Depression began having its major impact, and the UP Congress had to reluctantly sanction non-payment of rent in October. Incidents of poor peasant and tribal militancy and violence multiplied in many areas. At the same time, official reports began speaking of a marked decline of enthusiasm and support among urban traders, many of whom started breaking earlier pledges not to sell imported goods. Thakurdas warned Motilal Nehru that "the capacity of the commercial community for endurance" had reached its limits, and industrialists like Homi Mody denounced the "frequent hartals which dislocated trade and industry". Possibly the enthusiasm of substantial peasants in the face of ruthless British seizure of property had started flagging too. Almost all leading Congress leaders were put behind

bars. This was probably the context for Gandhi's rather sudden retreat. He initiated a talk with Irwin on 14 February 1931, which culminated in the Delhi Pact of 5 March. The pact is popularly called Gandhi-Irwin pact. The salient features of this accord were:

- I. The agreement arrived at the First Round Table Conference shall further be deliberated upon in another Round Table Conference.
- II. The Indian National Congress will withdraw the Civil Disobedience Movement immediately and effectively in all respects.
- III. The boycott of British goods would also be withdrawn forthwith.
- IV. The Government agreed to withdraw ordinances promulgated in relation to the Civil Disobedience Movement. Those political prisoners against whom there were no allegations of violence were to be set free and penalties that had not been realised were to be remitted. Indemnities would be paid to those who had suffered in the movement.
- V. The Government was neither to condone breach of the existing law relating to salt administration nor would the salt Act be amended. Nonetheless, government was to permit the collection and manufacture of salt freely to the people living within a specified area from the seashore.

The Congress working committee was divided when it met on 5 March, 1931 to discuss the results of the talks. Many people hailed it as a victory because the Viceroy had to negotiate a settlement. Others were not happy. Gandhi agreed to attend the Round Table Conference, more or less on British terms, in sharp contrast to his stand till the end of January 1931. Even Gandhiji's request for remitting the death sentence on Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev and Rajguru was turned down by the Viceroy, and they were executed on 23rd March. Civil Disobedience had died a sudden death, ending "not with a bang but a whimper", as Nehru wrote in his Autobiography a few years later.

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact had ambiguous consequences. Many others besides Nehru felt dismayed by the unexpected halt, long before attaining the proclaimed goal of Purna Swaraj, and peasants who had sacrificed land and goods at the Congress behest must have felt particularly let down. There was even a black flag demonstration against Gandhi when the Karachi Congress opened a few days after the execution of Bhagat Singh. The session, however, ratified the new policy, with Nehru, having spent some sleepless

nights, moving the key resolution accepting the Delhi agreement. More fundamentally, it can be argued that the truce meant the loss of some crucial months during which the Congress restrained no-tax and no-rent movements precisely when rural discontent was at its height, with the Depression having its initial impact, and when sheer economic distress had not as yet ruined the potential for large-scale struggle. The Congress did give the call for no-tax again, in January 1932, but by that time the psychological moment had gone.

Gandhi's entry into the Second Round Table Conference also proved a virtual fiasco. The first Conference, in January 1931, with Civil Disobedience still at large and the Congress boycotting it, had been marked by Ramsay Macdonald's novel offer of responsible government at the centre. But its two characteristics were a Federal assembly on which princes who joined would nominate their own members, and a series of "reservations and safeguards" to maintain British control over defence, external affairs, finance, and economy. Having accepted this as the framework for discussion, Gandhi as sole Congress representative at the second RTC found himself involved in endless squabbles with Muslim leaders, the Scheduled Caste representative Ambedkar who had started demanding separate electorates for untouchables, and the princes. The British watched this gleefully. The Congress had clearly been outmanoeuvred.

Yet the impact of the Pact and truce months was not entirely negative. The British, after all, had to negotiate with Gandhi on terms of equality and courtesy for the first time, and this was something deeply resented by many die-hard officials. The released Congressmen seem to have gone back to their villages and towns with undiminished confidence, almost as victors. The Congress organization expanded rapidly in the countryside, and the general mood was quite different from the fragmentation and decline after 1922. The Congress in fact was seeking to establish itself as the alternative, more legitimate centre of authority, starting arbitration courts to settle local disputes, and trying to mediate in zamindar-raiyat conflict. Meanwhile popular pressures were also building in the United Provinces, which the provincial congress eventually permitted in December 1931. A powerful anti-Maharaj movement in Kashmir under Sheikh Abdulla was an indication that political unrest was reaching out to princely states (there was to be

a revolt in Alwar two years later), even though the Congress leadership still refused to intervene in princely India.

This was the overall context for the British decision of a pre-emptive strike against the Congress, before it got any stronger, taken by the new RightWing National Government and Viceroy Willingdon in late 1931. The new policy has been described as one of Civil martial law – sweeping ordinances banning all Congress organizations on 4 January 1932 (272 of them in Bengal alone), abrogating all civic freedom without formally declaring military rule, in order to force the Congress to wage an unequal and defensive battle. On 4 January 1932, a fresh batch of Congress leaders including Gandhi and Sardar Patel were arrested. Now attempts to treat political prisoners as common criminals became more common than ever before.

1932-34: Civil Disobedience Again

Outmaneuvered and facing repressive measures on an entirely unprecedented scale, the national movement still fought on valiantly for about a year and a half. 120,000 people were jailed in the first three months - an indication, however, not so much of a more extensive movement than in 1930, but of more intense and systematic repression, for the figures soon began to decline fairly fast. Bombay city and Bengal were described as the “two black spots” by Willingdon in April 1932: Gujarati small traders were still staunchly with the Congress, and Bengal remained a nightmare partly because of sporadic agrarian unrest and more due to revolutionary nationalist activities (104 incidents, the highest ever, in 1932; 33 in 1933). Rural response seems to have been less on the whole than in 1930, though a village like Ras in Kheda was still withholding revenue in 1933, despite confiscation of 2000 acres, public whipping, and electric shocks.

As the mass movement gradually declined in face of ruthless repression, political ‘realism’ combined with economic calculations of certain sections of Indians pushed Indian big business towards collaboration with the British.

Bombay millowners concluded the Lees-Mody Pact in October 1933, aligning with Lancashire out of fear of Japanese competition. Ahmedabad businessmen and GD Birla bitterly denounced this betrayal, but Birla and Thakurdas from 1932 onwards were themselves pressing the Congress for a compromise.

Gandhi in jail not unnaturally began to think in terms of an honourable retreat. He suspended Civil Disobedience temporarily in May 1933, and formally withdrew it in April 1934. The Mahatma decided to make Harijan work the central plank of his new rural constructive programme. This was his answer to the British policy of Divide and Rule which found expression in the official Communal Award declared early in 1932 by Ramsay Macdonald. The Award provided for separate Hindu, 'Untouchable', and Muslim electorates for the new Federal legislatures, treating Hindus and Harijans as two separate political entities. Gandhi opposed this Award. He demanded reservation of more seats for Harijans within the Hindu electorate. Ambedkar accepted Gandhi's stand. Another section of Congress preferred to go back to Council politics, and so the scenario of the mid 1920s appeared to be repeating itself. The 1935 Government of India Act was considerably more retrogressive than earlier drafts, for it was drawn up at a point when the British seemed triumphant.

Aftermath

That the Government's sense of victory' had been largely illusory was, quickly revealed, however, when the Congress swept the polls in most provinces in 1937. The Congress had been defeated by superior brute force, but its mass prestige was as high as ever. The Left alternatives emerged from the logic of Civil Disobedience itself, for the Movement had aroused expectations which Gandhian strategy could not fulfill. At the level of leadership, Nehru (and, less consistently, Bose) voiced the new mood, emphasising the need to combine nationalism with radical social and economic programmes. Some Congress activists formed a socialist ginger-group within the party in 1934. Kisan Sabhas with anti-zamindar programmes developed rapidly in provinces like Bihar and Andhra. The Communists, too, were recovering from the Meerut arrests and their own folly of keeping away from Civil Disobedience, and a significant section of disillusioned revolutionary nationalists and some Gandhian activists were moving towards them

In this changed situation, the dominant groups within the Congress were able to retain control only by a series of adjustments and openings towards the left, though usually at the level of programmatic statements and not action. Thus land reforms directed towards curbing and eventually abolishing zamindari were coming to be

included in the official Congress programme by the mid-1930s, in total contrast to all earlier pronouncements. An early indication of such a shift was the Karachi declaration on fundamental rights and economic policy, made significantly just after the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. This declaration was very moderate in content, yet reductions were promised, for the first time, not only in revenue but in rent, and living wages and trade union rights also entered the Congress programme. Peasant upsurges which had constituted so much of the real strength of Civil Disobedience like the labour unrest of the late 1920s, had not been entirely futile. Though crucial political controls within the national movement remained elsewhere, much of the Congress language and rhetoric, and some actual policies, did have to take a leftward direction as a consequence of the growing assertiveness of these sections of Indian society.

Gandhi –Irwin Pact

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact was a political agreement signed on March 5, 1931, between Mahatma Gandhi and the then Viceroy of India, Lord Irwin. The pact signified a compromise, with Gandhi agreeing to suspend the movement in exchange for concessions such as the release of political prisoners and the right to produce salt.

This agreement marked a shift in British policy, acknowledging the Indian National Congress's influence, and set the stage for future constitutional negotiations, including the Second Round Table Conference.

Gandhi Irwin Pact Background

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact emerged during the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930, led by Gandhi, aiming to resist British rule through non-violent means. The course for the Pact followed was as follows:

Salt March (Dandi March):

Mahatma Gandhi and his followers defied British salt laws by marching 240 miles to produce salt, sparking widespread protests and boycotts across India.

British Response:

The British government arrested thousands of activists, including Gandhi, and imposed harsh measures to suppress the protests.

Purpose of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact:

Signed on March 5, 1931, the Pact was a truce between Mahatma Gandhi (representing the Indian National Congress) and Lord Irwin, the Viceroy of India, aimed at halting escalating conflict during the Civil Disobedience Movement.

Gandhi Irwin Pact Proposed Conditions.

The negotiations between Gandhi and Irwin were complex, with both sides presenting a range of demands and conditions. The discussions aimed to address the immediate grievances of the Indian populace while also paving the way for future constitutional reforms.

Conditions Proposed by the Indian National Congress

The Indian National Congress proposed conditions that included the release of all political prisoners, the right to produce salt, the lifting of all repressive restrictions, the return of confiscated property, and formal recognition of the Congress as a legitimate political entity.

Release of Political Prisoners:

One of the primary demands was the release of all political prisoners arrested during the Civil Disobedience Movement. The INC sought the unconditional release of all activists to demonstrate goodwill and signal the government's willingness to negotiate in good faith.

Right to Produce Salt:

The INC demanded the abolition of the salt tax and the recognition of Indians' right to produce salt freely along the coast. This demand was symbolic, as it challenged the very essence of British economic exploitation and control.

Lifting of Restrictions:

The Congress demanded the removal of all repressive laws, ordinances, and restrictions imposed on civil liberties, including the freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

Return of Confiscated Property:

The INC sought the return of lands and properties confiscated from farmers and activists during the civil disobedience protests.

Recognition of Congress as a Political Entity:

The demand for formal recognition of the Indian National Congress as a legitimate political entity was crucial for establishing the INC's role in future negotiations and governance.

Conditions Proposed by the British Government

The British government proposed conditions that included suspending the Civil Disobedience Movement, participating in the Second Round Table Conference to discuss constitutional reforms, and cooperating to maintain law and order and prevent escalation.

Suspension of Civil Disobedience:

The British government sought an immediate suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement and a cessation of all forms of protest against British rule.

Participation in Round Table Conferences:

Lord Irwin invited the INC to participate in the Second Round Table Conference in London, aiming to discuss constitutional reforms and the future governance of India.

Cooperation with British Authorities:

The British demanded cooperation from the Congress to maintain law and order and ensure that the movement did not escalate into violence or anarchy.

Gandhi Irwin Pact Outcome

The negotiations between Gandhi and Irwin were marked by concessions and compromises on both sides. While some demands were accepted, others were left unresolved, highlighting the complexity of the agreement and the challenges in bridging the gap between colonial interests and the aspirations of the Indian populace.

Gandhi Irwin Pact Demands Accepted

The British accepted some of the demands from the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, including the release of political prisoners, the right to produce salt for domestic use, lifting some repressive restrictions, and allowing Gandhi to represent the INC at the Second Round Table Conference.

Release of Political Prisoners:

The British government agreed to release most of the political prisoners who had been arrested during the Civil Disobedience Movement. This was a significant victory for the INC, as it symbolized a concession to Indian demands.

Right to Produce Salt:

The British allowed Indians to collect and produce salt for domestic use along the coast, effectively ending the salt monopoly. This acceptance was a symbolic victory for the Indian populace and validated the efforts of the Salt March.

Lifting of Restrictions:

While not all repressive laws were lifted, the British agreed to remove some of the harsh restrictions imposed on civil liberties, allowing for greater freedom of speech and assembly.

Participation in Round Table Conference:

Gandhi agreed to attend the Second Round Table Conference as the sole representative of the INC, marking a significant step towards constitutional discussions. Gandhi Irwin Pact Demands Unaccepted.

The British rejected Gandhi-Irwin Pact demands, including the abolition of the salt tax, full restoration of confiscated property, INC recognition, and immediate constitutional reforms, opting for gradual changes through the Round Table Conferences.

Complete Abolition of Salt Tax:

While the right to produce salt was granted, the complete abolition of the salt tax was not accepted by the British government, reflecting the economic interests tied to the tax revenue.

Full Restoration of Confiscated Property:

Although some properties were returned, the complete restoration of all confiscated lands and assets was not achieved, leaving many farmers and activists without restitution.

Formal Recognition of INC:

The British government did not fully recognize the INC as the sole representative body of the Indian populace, maintaining its stance of engaging with multiple political entities.

Immediate Constitutional Reforms:

The demand for immediate constitutional reforms and self-governance was not accepted, as the British insisted on a gradual process through the Round Table Conferences.

Gandhi Irwin Pact Features

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact was characterized by several key features that underscored its significance and the challenges it faced in implementation. These features highlight the nuanced nature of the agreement and its impact on the Indian independence movement.

Mutual Concessions:

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact was founded on reciprocal compromises, with Gandhi agreeing to suspend the Civil Disobedience Movement in exchange for British concessions on salt production and the release of political prisoners.

Recognition of Indian Leadership:

The pact marked a significant moment in the recognition of Indian leadership, with Gandhi negotiating as an equal partner, signalling a shift in British policy towards direct engagement with Indian leaders.

Symbolic Victories:

The acceptance of the right to produce salt and the release of political prisoners were symbolic victories for the Indian populace, affirming the effectiveness of the Civil Disobedience Movement.

Limitations and Challenges:

Despite its achievements, the pact was criticized for not addressing broader issues such as self-governance and economic exploitation, highlighting the inherent limitations of the agreement.

Impact on Future Negotiations:

The pact paved the way for future discussions, including the Second Round Table Conference, where critical issues of constitutional reform and governance would be further deliberated.

Gandhi-Irwin Pact Significance

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact marked a shift in British policy, validating Gandhi's non-violent resistance and raising political awareness among Indians. It laid the foundation for future constitutional reforms and furthered the path toward India's independence.

Shift in British Policy:

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact marked a turning point, as the British government began engaging with Indian leaders like Gandhi and acknowledged the growing influence of the Indian National Congress (INC).

Validation of Non-Violent Resistance:

The pact validated Gandhi's non-violent methods, proving that peaceful resistance could lead to significant political gains, strengthening the movement's credibility.

Increased Political Awareness:

The pact raised political consciousness among Indians, inspiring widespread support for the freedom movement and reinforcing a sense of empowerment against British rule.

Round Table Conference

There had been a series of meetings in three sessions called by the British government to consider the future constitution of India in 1930 to 1932. The conference resulted from a review of the Government of India Act of 1919, undertaken in 1927 by the Simon Commission, whose report was published in 1929. The conferences were held in London.

The Indian political community received the Simon Commission Report with great resentment. Different political parties gave vent to their feelings in different ways.

The Congress started a Civil Disobedience Movement (salt March) under Gandhi's command. The Muslims reserved their opinion on the Simon Report declaring that the report was not final and the matters should be decided after consultations with the leaders representing all communities in India.

The Indian political situation seemed deadlocked. The British government refused to contemplate any form of self-government for the people of India. This caused frustration amongst the masses, who often expressed their anger in violent clashes.

The Labor Government returned to power in Britain, and a glimmer of hope ran through Indian hearts. Labor leaders had always been sympathetic to the Indian cause. The government decided to hold a Round Table Conference in London to consider new constitutional reforms. All Indian politicians; Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians were summoned to London for the conference.

First Round Table Conference

The first session of the conference opened in London on November 12, 1930. The Round Table Conference was opened officially by King George V and chaired by the British Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald. The three British political parties were represented by sixteen delegates. All parties from India were present except for the Congress, whose leaders were in jail due to the Civil Disobedience Movement. Congress leaders stated that they would have nothing to do with further constitutional discussion unless the Nehru Report was enforced in its entirety as the constitution of India. Almost 89 members attended the conference, out of which 58 were chosen from various communities and interests in British India, and the rest from princely states and other political parties. The prominent among the Muslim delegates invited by the British government were Sir Aga Khan, Quaid-i-Azam, Maulana Muhammad Ali Jouhar, Sir Muhammad Shafi and Maulvi Fazl-i-Haq. Sir Taj Bahadur Sapru, Mr. Jaikar and Dr. Moonje were outstanding amongst the Hindu leaders.

It was agreed that federal system of government shall be adopted in India, & responsible & representative governments will be set up in provinces. This was a great achievement because the congress had suggested 'Unitary Form' of government in Nehru report. Full responsible & representative government in provinces was a good step forward for self-rule. (Secondly) the princely states also agreed to join the federation, several committees were formed to discuss different issues. The Muslims also demanded maintenance of weightage and separate electorates, the Hindus their abolition.

Eight subcommittees were set up to deal with the details. These committees dealt with the federal structure, provincial constitution, franchise, Sindh, the North West Frontier Province, defense services and minorities.

The conference broke up on January 19, 1931, and what emerged from it was a general agreement to write safeguards for minorities into the constitution and a desire to devise a federal system for the country. B. R. Ambedkar also demanded a separate electorate for the Untouchables.

Second Round Table Conference

The second RTC was held from September to December 1931. Mr. Gandhi attended as the only representative of the congress. Mr. Gandhi claimed that the Congress

represented the whole of India & that there was no minority problem in the country. Muslim & other minority leaders didn't agree. Therefore, on account of Mr. Gandhi's stubborn & unfair attitude the conference couldn't achieve much but its success was that it was declared that Orissa, Sind & NWFP will be given full provincial status with governors. The minorities issue remained unresolved.

Gandhi also demanded the enforcement of Nehru Report, but all the minorities rejected it. During the Conference, Gandhi could not reach agreement with the Muslims on Muslim representation and safeguards. At the end of the conference Ramsay MacDonald undertook to produce a Communal Award for minority representation,.

Gandhi was not ready to give right of separate electorates to untouchables. He clashed with the Untouchable leader, B. R. Ambedkar, over this issue: the two eventually resolved the situation with the Poona Pact of 1932.

Third Round Table Conference

The third session began on November 17, 1932. It was short and unimportant. Only forty-six delegates attended since most of the main political figures of India were not present (included Jinnah). The Congress was once again absent, so was the Labor opposition in the British Parliament. Reports of the various committees were scrutinized. The conference ended on December 25, 1932.

The recommendations of the Round Table Conferences were included in a White Paper. It was published in March 1933, and debated in parliament directly afterwards, after the final reading and assent, the bill reached the Statute Book on July 24, 1935.

In this conference, Chaudhary Rahmat Ali, a college student, coined the name "Pakistan" (which means "land of pureness") as the name for the Muslim part of partitioned India. He took the "P" from Punjab, the "A" from the Afghan, the "KI" from Kashmir, the "S" from Sindh and the "TAN" from Balochistan.

Salt march:

The Salt March, which took place from March to April 1930 in India, was an act of civil disobedience led by Mohandas Gandhi (1869-1948) to protest British rule in India. During the march, thousands of Indians followed Gandhi from his religious retreat near Ahmedabad to the Arabian Sea coast, a distance of some 240 miles. The march resulted in the arrest of nearly 60,000 people, including Gandhi himself.

Gandhi-Irwin Pact:

Gandhi-Irwin Pact was an agreement signed on March 5, 1931, between Gandhi, and Lord Irwin British viceroy (1926–31) of India. It marked the end of a period of civil disobedience (satyagraha) in India against British rule that Gandhi and his followers had initiated with the Salt March (March–April 1930). Gandhi's arrest and imprisonment at the end of the march, for illegally making salt, sparked one of his more effective civil disobedience movements. By the end of 1930, tens of thousands of Indians were in jail (including future Indian prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru), the movement had generated worldwide publicity, and Irwin was looking for a way to end it. Gandhi was released from custody in January 1931, and the two men began negotiating the terms of the pact. In the end, Gandhi pledged to give up the satyagraha campaign, and Irwin agreed to release those who had been imprisoned during it and to allow Indians to make salt for domestic use. Later that year Gandhi attended the second session (September–December) of the Round Table Conference in London.

Communal Award:

As a result of the Second Round Table Conference, in August 1932, the then Prime Minister of Britain Ramsay Macdonald gave his 'award' known as the Communal Award. According to it, separate representation was to be provided for the Lower Caste, Muslims, Buddhists, Sikhs, Indian Christians and Anglo-Indians. The Untouchables were assigned a number of seats to be filled by election from special constituencies in which voters belonging to the Untouchables only could vote.

The Award was highly controversial and opposed by Mahatma Gandhi, and fasted in protest against it. Communal Award was supported by many among the minority communities, most notably the Untouchable leader, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar. After lengthy negotiations, Gandhi reached an agreement with Dr. Ambedkar to have a single Hindu electorate, with Untouchables having seats reserved within it. This is called the Poona Pact. Electorates for other religions like Muslims, Buddhists, Sikhs, Indian Christians, Anglo-Indians, Europeans remained separate.

Representation of Depressed Classes

In the 1920s, when the process was set in for electoral reforms aiming at making the government more broad-based and representative, the issue of representation of the

Depressed Classes created divergent views within the local society. By the creation of new job opportunities and opening up of new channels of mobility, the colonial rule challenged the legitimacy of the existing Hindu caste system and made the Depressed Classes conscious and emboldened to assert for equality and political rights. The prevailing mood of resentment was well reflected in the presidential address of Mr.B.C.Mandal of the All India Depressed Class conference in Madras, in February 1929. He said, 'The so-called patriots of India demand political rights, but they are not ready to give social right to their own countrymen'. (The Hindu, Madras, 25th February, 1929). Among the Depressed Classes at the national level two major identifiable groups emerged in the late 1920s, one around M.C.Rajah and the other around Dr. B.R.Ambedkar. M.C.Rajah and his associates who dominated the All India Depressed Classes Association decided not to accept proposals of the Simon Commission in the absence of separate electorates. They were of the opinion that joint electorates would return only dummy representatives of the Depressed Classes backed by upper caste Hindus. However, in the ensuing struggle within the Depressed Classes to represent them in the proposed Round Table Conference in London, Ambedkar was nominated by the British government to represent the Depressed Classes. In a bid to check Ambedkar, M.C.Rajah convened an All India Depressed Classes Leaders special conference in August 1930 at Allahabad. This conference disowned the resolutions taken at the first session of the All India Depressed Classes Congress committee under the leadership of Ambedkar and declared the All India Depressed Classes as the real body. But Rajah, failing to get the British support in favour of his claim, came close to the Indian National Congress. The Indian National Congress was also seriously trying to get the support of the Depressed Classes so that the unity among Indians remains strong. Equally anxious were the Hindu Mahasabha leaders to find some way out to check the disintegration of the Hindus. In this process M.C.Rajah and B.S.Moonje, president of the Hindu Mahasabha entered into an agreement known as the Rajah-Moonje Pact in 1932, based on the principle of reservation of seats in joint electorates. Opinions among the Depressed Classes were divided over the Rajah-Moonje Pact. A section of the Depressed Classes made a statement that the All India Depressed Classes Association was not representative of the Depressed Classes of India. They expressed their support in favour of separate

electorate. Dr. Ambedkar was very much opposed to the Rajah-Moonje Pact and stated that the Depressed Classes had repudiated the Pact. Precisely we can say that the Depressed Classes had unanimity on the question of reservation of seats for them in the legislative bodies but they differed on the method of representation. In the interest of creating further rift within the Indian society in order to check the growing momentum of nationalist politics, the British government was very considerate towards the demands of the Depressed Classes. Through its policy of protective discrimination the British government tried to ensure educational facilities as well as reservation of jobs for the Depressed Classes. All these caused serious concern for the Congress leaders.

Gandhi was very much concerned about the social and material development of the Depressed Classes. To remove untouchability and to put the Depressed Classes on equal footing, Gandhi suggested constructive programmes. Gandhi directed the Congress members 'To organize the depressed Classes for a better life, to improve their social, mental and moral condition, to induce them to send their children to national schools and to provide for them the ordinary facilities which other citizens enjoy'. (Young India, 16 February, 1922). Gandhi could visualise that in the face of social oppressions suffered by the Depressed Classes, there was no option left to integrate them with the mainstream political movement without winning over their confidence through constructive programme. It is a fact that all within the Congress did not agree with Gandhi on his reformatory agenda to integrate the Depressed Classes into the mainstream nationalist politics but Gandhi succeeded in drawing the attention of the Congress towards the problems of the Depressed Classes. Along with political emancipation of India, Gandhi was very much vocal for the social emancipation of the Depressed Classes. The Social and political philosophy of Gandhi did not evoke positive response from a section of the Depressed Classes because many of them were apprehending that in the absence of the British there is the possibility of domination of the caste Hindus. Let us now understand as to what prompted the British government to announce the Communal Award.

Communal Award

As you know, the British government sent Simon Commission in 1927 to work out the possible administrative changes in order to make the legislative bodies more representative. The Indian National Congress decided to boycott the Commission on the

ground that there was no Indian representative in the Commission, whereas the Depressed Classes decided to cooperate with the Commission. The reason for cooperating with the Commission was probably to create pressure on the upper caste leaders to give legitimate political rights to the Depressed Classes. In spite of the demand for separate electorate for the Depressed Classes, the Simon Commission recommended for reservation of seats for the Depressed Classes but did not support the demand for separate electorate. Although the leaders of the Depressed Classes were not happy with the recommendations, it definitely provided them much strength to bargain for their legitimate rights. This was the time when Ambedkar emerged as the strong exponent of the rights of the Depressed Classes and he attacked the Congress for its inability to address the problems of the Depressed Classes. Ambedkar and R.Srinivasan were invited by the British government as representatives of the Depressed Classes to attend the Round Table Conference in London in 1930 to deliberate on the constitutional reforms. Instead of sympathies and good will, the Depressed Classes leadership asserted that they would not be party to any self-governing constitution for India unless their demands for equal citizenship rights, adequate representation in the legislature and services, etc. are met. Gandhi did not agree to Ambedkar's demand for political representation and said, 'with all the emphasis that I can command that if I was the only person to resist this thing, I will resist it with my life'. Gandhi's stand failed to convince Ambedkar who was asking for separate electorate. The Round Table Conference failed to resolve the issue of representation of the Depressed Classes. Then in 1932 under Lord Lothian the Indian Franchise Committee was constituted to decide on the matters concerning franchise. One of the directives given to the Committee was that in place of nomination of Depressed Classes to legislatures there would be election and for that to ascertain whether joint electorate or separate electorate would be effective for the Depressed Classes. A significant development that took place during this time was the signing of an agreement between M.C.Rajah and B.S.Moonje, leader of the Hindu Mahasabha to prove Ambedkar's position on representation of the Depressed Classes wrong. Ambedkar described Rajah as a leader of no consequence and asserted that the Rajah-Moonje pact had been repudiated by the Depressed Classes. Being challenged by M.C.Rajah, Ambedkar decided to impress upon the British government the need for special provision

for the Depressed Classes and succeeded in his mission when the British Prime Minister Ramsay Mac-Donald announced the Communal Award in August, 1932, making the provision for a separate electorate for the Depressed Classes.

The Communal Award gave the Depressed Classes voting right along with caste Hindus in the general constituencies and also an extra vote in special Depressed Classes constituencies numbering 71 for a period of 20 years. The announcement of the Communal Award was considered as a clear indication of widening the rift between the Depressed Classes and caste Hindus posing a serious challenge to the Indian nationalist movement. Gandhi, opposing the segregation of the Depressed Classes into a separate electoral group, wrote,

‘So far as Hinduism is concerned separate electorate would simply vivisect and disrupt it. For me the question of these classes is predominantly moral and religious....I feel that no penance that caste Hindus may do can, in any way, compensate for the calculated degradation to which they have consigned the Depressed Classes for centuries. But I know that separate electorate is neither penance nor any remedy for the crushing degradation they have groaned under’

Gandhi, in his letter to the British government, informed his decision for going to fast unto death unless the government withdrew the scheme of separate electorate for the Depressed Classes. He further explained that he might be wrong in taking this decision but to him the scheme of separate electorate was against the interest of the Depressed Classes. Gandhi was supportive of adequate representation of the Depressed Classes but he was not agreeable to the proposal of separate electorate. He differed strongly on this matter with the leaders of the Depressed Classes. The weapon of fast used by Gandhi aroused strong public opinion. Public meetings were organised in different places to bring the caste Hindus and the Depressed Classes together. Even the leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha appealed to their followers to demonstrate equality in religious and social matters towards the Depressed Classes. Appeal was also made to the Depressed Classes not to press for separate electorate. Gandhi confided to his close associates that the Depressed Classes would fail to understand his decision of fasting when they were granted some privileges. Ambedkar’s response to Gandhi’s decision of fast was different and he said, ‘I do not care for these political stunts. This threat of Mr. Gandhi to starve

himself to death is not a moral fight but only a political move. I can understand a person trying to negotiate with his political opponents on equal terms but I will never be moved by those methods....If Mr. Gandhi wants to fight with his life for the interests of the Hindu community, the depressed Classes will also be forced to fight with their lives to safeguard their interests.' The British government saw in Gandhi's fast a ploy to coerce the Depressed Classes in accepting the Congress view point. How the deadlock between Gandhi and Ambedkar on the issue of representation of the Depressed Classes ended is the subject of our discussion in the next section.

Government of India Act 1935

Main Features

The White Paper and the Joint Select Committee report shaping the Government of India Act 1935 dropped and altered many suggestions of the Simon Commission and the recommendations of the Round Table conferences. This confirms that 'British nation has no intention whatsoever of relinquishing effective control of Indian life and progress' (Winston Churchill). The Act retained the supremacy of the British Parliament and also the Preamble of the Act of 1919. It meant 'gradual realisation of self governing institutions' as the goal and there was no mention of Dominion status and the inclusion of provisions to attain it. All rights of amending, altering or repealing the provisions were kept with the British Parliament. The Act removed dyarchy of the provincial level but introduced it at the Central level. It also introduced safeguards operated in the interest of the British. For the first time, the wide range of subjects were classified in the three list system and assigned to appropriate level of government. This was a novel experiment.

Comments

Looking at the provisions of the Government of India Act 1935 it appears that the Joint Select Committee moved away from some of the recommendations of the Round Table Conferences and the White Paper, for example, introduction of indirect system of election for the Federal Council or the restrictions on the powers of the Federal court to preserve the supremacy of the Privy Council. The nature of safeguards, residuary powers with the Governor General, composition of the Federal legislature make it clear that the Act provided a Federal form, but lacked Federal spirit.

Provincial Autonomy

The **Provincial Autonomy** was one of the reclaiming features of this Act. The **Simon Commission** recommended including this provision in the Government of India Act, 1935. Previously, provinces did not have an Executive Council or Reserved Subjects, but this legislation added these subjects. The **system of dyarchy**, or the division of subjects into 'Reserved' and 'Transferred,' was **abolished by this Act**. With the abolition of Dyarchy in provinces, the entire provincial administration became delegated to accountable ministers, who were managed and eliminated with the aid of provincial legislatures. In this article, we will discuss **Provincial Autonomy under the Govt of India Act, 1935** which will be helpful for UPSC exam preparation.

Provincial Part of Government of India Act, 1935

- Except for law and order, the Council of Ministers has the authority to administer provincial matters.
- The power to administer law and order was in the hands of the government, which had powers superior to the Council of Ministers.
- The ministers were chosen from among the elected members of the provincial legislature and were collectively accountable to it.
- The British-appointed provincial Governors were to accept the ministers' recommendations unless they negatively affected their areas of statutory "**special responsibilities**" such as the prevention of any grave threat to the peace or tranquillity of a province, the safeguarding of the legitimate interests of minorities, civil servants' rights, and so on.
- In the event of a political breakdown, the Governor, with the Viceroy's approval, could seize total control of the provincial government.
- In fact, the governors had more unrestricted power than any British official had during the British Raj's history.
 - After the resignation of the Congress provincial ministries in 1939, the governors ruled the ex-Congress provinces directly throughout the war.
- It was widely acknowledged that the provincial section of the Act gave provincial politicians a great deal of power and patronage as long as both British officials and Indian politicians followed the rules.

Provincial Autonomy - Features

- Dyarchy was replaced by provincial autonomy.
- Provinces were given autonomy and their own legal identities.
- Provinces were freed from the secretary of state's and governor general's "superintendence and direction."
- Provinces received direct legal authority from the British Crown, and they were given independent financial powers and resources.
- Provincial governments could borrow money using their own assets as collateral.

Executive

- The Governor was to be the Crown's nominee and representative in a province to exercise authority on the king's behalf.
- Governor was to have special powers regarding minorities, civil servant rights, law and order, British business interests, partially excluded areas, princely states, and so on.
- Governor could take over and run the administration indefinitely.

Legislature

- **Separate electorates** based on Communal Award were to be established.
- All members were to be elected directly.
- **Women were granted the right to vote** on the same basis as men.
- Ministers were to administer all **provincial subjects** in a council of ministers headed by a premier.
- Ministers were made answerable to and removable by an adverse vote of the legislature.
- The provincial legislature could legislate on subjects in provincial and concurrent lists.
- The governor has the authority to:
 - refuse assent to a bill,
 - promulgate ordinances, and
 - enact governor's Acts.

Division of power

Provincial Autonomy - Division of power

The Government of India, 1935 divided the powers between the Centre and Provinces into three lists:

- Federal List (for Centre, with 59 items)
- Provincial List (for Provinces, with 54 items)
- Concurrent List (for both with 36 items)

1937 Elections

Selection of Candidates

The general procedure for the selection of candidates was that the Provincial Congress Committee would recommend names to the Congress Parliamentary Board, and the latter would have the final say in the selection. For doing so the PCCs adopted the criteria which specified that the candidate should abide by Congress discipline, and follow and work for the Congress programme. Besides these two basic qualifications, the PCCs also took into account the candidates' services to the Congress, popularity among the people, and ability to bear election expenses on their own. In spite of their sincere efforts to select the best candidates on the basis of above mentioned conditions, in certain cases caste played a role in this process. On being questioned by Maulana Azad about candidate-selection in Bihar, Rajendra Prasad wrote about the role played by caste: 'It is disgraceful for an organisation like the Congress to do so but success in the elections was our first objective, and secondly it should not be overlooked that the Congress is a widespread organisation consisting of people of all castes.'

In certain cases there were disputes over the selection. For example Sahajanand Saraswati was disturbed to see in Bihar that some persons taken in as candidates were in fact opportunists having nothing to do with the Congress earlier. Similarly, in Bombay differences arose between K.F. Nariman and Vallabhbhai Patel. In Andhra, N.G. Ranga, acting on behalf of the Andhra Ryots Association, urged the Congress candidates to sign a pledge. This pledge tied the candidates to work for the peasants' cause inside and outside the legislatures. Many Congress candidates signed the pledge but Vallabhbhai Patel denounced this move. Ranga made it clear that the pledge was in no way against the

Congress discipline, rather it strengthened the Congress organisation. Since Patel was adamant, Ranga had to withdraw the pledge.

Election Campaign

The Congress went all out to achieve victory in elections by a vigorous campaigning. Nehru advised the Congress volunteers that the Faizpur Agrarian Programme 'should find a prominent place in our election campaign'. Nehru himself toured throughout the country. Canvassing among the Allahabad villagers, he stated that 'There are only two parties in India-those fighting for the cause of the people and the other against it..... The Congress was going to the Councils to keep out Khan Bahadurs, Raja Bahadurs and Nawabs who sided with Government.' There was a common feeling gaining ground among the people that very soon Congress Raj would replace British Raj.

In Bihar the election took the turn of 'Kisan versus Zamindars'. A popular election song in the countryside was 'magar kothri mein badal janyenge' (we shall change at the polling booth)' and it was sung by those who were being forced by non Congress candidate to vote for them. In Madras, Satyamurti toured almost 9000 miles to canvass for Congress candidates. The propaganda here was to 'vote in the yellow box' as practically all Congress candidates opted for yellow coloured ballot boxes. It was quite apparent that the Justice party would lose. There was tremendous enthusiasm among the electors all over the country. However, in some regions the Congress was in a weak position as many regional parties were also in the fray. For example, in Bengal, the Praja Krishak Party was quite popular, and in a similar position was the Unionist Party in Punjab. In U.P. the landlords had hurriedly formed the Nationalist Agriculturist Party to contest elections but it could not influence the voters. Beside these regional parties the Congress had to face the challenge of the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha – parties which carried politics on communal lines. The Muslim League was strong in Sindh. In UP the Congress had an understanding with the Muslim League for forming a joint ministry.

Election Results

Elections were held on different dates in different provinces and the results were very encouraging for the Congress. Except Bengal, Punjab, and Sindh, the Congress had fared well in other regions. In five provinces it had clear majority:

Province	Total No. of Seats	Seats won by Congress
UP	228	134
Bihar	152	95
Madras	215	159
C.P.	112	70
Orissa	60	36
Bombay	175	87
Bengal	250	60
Sindh	60	8
Assam	108	35
NWEP	50	19
Punjab	175	18

In Bengal, NWFP, Assam, and Bombay Congress emerged as the single largest party, whereas in Punjab and Sindh its performance was poor. The Congress could not do well in the elections to upper houses as the franchise there was limited to the upper strata only. As far as the reserved seats were concerned, we give few examples of Congress performance (in all 11 provinces):

Out of the 38 seats reserved for labour, the Congress had contested 20 and won 18.

482 seats were reserved as Muslim seats. The Congress contested 58 and could win only 26 seats. Out of these 19 were in NWFP. The Congress could not get a single Muslim seat in Bombay, U.P., C.P., Sindh and Bengal. However, it is worth mentioning here that the performance of the Muslim League was no better. It could not get a single seat in NWFP. In Punjab it got only 2 of the 84 reserved seats.

For commerce and industry 56 seats were reserved. The Congress contested 8 and could won only 3.

For Landholders 37 seats were reserved. The Congress contested 8 and won 4. Thus, the performance of Congress in reserved constituencies was not at all satisfactory except in the labour seats. But it did well in general seats. The Congress Working

Committee gave to the people the following message on its electoral victory: 'The Congress Working Committee congratulates the nation on its wonderful response to the call of the Congress during the recent elections, demonstrating the adherence of the masses to Congress policy.'

Cripps Mission

The political mood in India was certainly becoming belligerent in the backdrop of the individual acts of defiance against the war-effort as witnessed in the individual satyagraha campaigns and the increase in the lack of faith in the British Indian Army's capability of defending the east against the aggressive onward march of Japan. There was an attempt made by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, a leading lawyer from Allahabad, to bring the Congress and the League together to resolve the existing impasse. When the attempt failed he presided over a conference called the Bombay Conference to arrive at a settlement with the government and to put across the Indian perspective. This conference was organised on 13-14 March 1941 in Bombay. It was largely attended by prominent non-Congress members many of whom had attended the Round Table Conference in London in 1931. The conference proposed that Britain should make a declaration promising India Dominion Status after the war. Secondly, in the interval, all central government portfolios should be transferred to the hands of non-official Indians. These proposals, thus, differed from the Congress proposals in that they did not demand immediate independence and they also proposed that the central executive in India should remain responsible to the Crown at least for the duration of the war. The proposals aroused considerable expectations. However, the talks with the government ultimately failed. The government refused to concede to any of the proposals. Amery, the Secretary of State scuttled the issue on Dominion Status after the war by playing the communal card. He observed that Jinnah had denounced the proposals as a trap by 'Congress wirepullers'.

In the meantime, government's policy of appeasing the minorities in Indian politics continued. It had almost acceded to the demand of the Muslim League for secession from the Indian state if the Congress was to acquire control at the Centre. At the same time, however, Britain could not risk inaction. The British War Cabinet announced certain measures for the conferment of Dominion Status on India. In the

meeting of the War Cabinet it was declared that ‘The object is 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 subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs’ (Nicholas Mansergh, p. 342). The Cripps Mission was thus formulated under the stewardship of Sir Stafford Cripps, the Lord Privy Seal in the Home Government, on 30 March 1942, as a preventive measure to thwart all attempts at withdrawal of support to Britain.

The Cripps Mission was fraught with ambiguities in terms of its purpose. Stafford Cripps, a Socialist in British politics, was ready to concede considerable ground to the demands of the Indian nationalists. For instance, in the press conference at Delhi on 28 March 1942, he went as far as to say that the Indian state had the right to secede from the Commonwealth at a future date. In his discussions with leaders like Rajagopalachari and Nehru, knowing that the basic objection of the Congress was to the emphasis attached to the ‘Dominion Status’ for India in all negotiations to discuss the post-war political status of India rather than ‘poorna Swaraj’ or complete independence as was the demand of the nationalists, he underplayed the use of the term. He explained that it had been used chiefly to silence possible objections in the House of Commons or from the dominions themselves. Cripps made it clear that it was a question of terminology not substance. However, Churchill was not so charitable or conceding. He continued to hold the view that the main problem preventing the future course of political affairs in India was not British imperialism but the aspirations of the Muslims, the Princes and the ‘Hindu Untouchables’. The imperial strategy of denying India national independence by citing the presence of ‘different sects or nations in India’ was again at work here. Due to rigidity of this kind, Stafford Cripps could not manoeuvre much. Moreover there was nothing very reassuring about Britain’s fate in the war. Singapore surrendered on 15 February and Rangoon fell to the Japanese on 8 March 1942 – a day prior to the announcement of Cripps Mission (9 March 1942). The bleakness of the possibility of Allied victory in World War II, prompted Gandhi to remark that the Cripps Mission was like a post-dated cheque upon a falling bank. The imagery drawn indicated that Britain had little to offer in the immediate situation.

The collapse of the Cripps negotiations did not disturb the equanimity of political circles in Britain. The rush to clinch the demand for a 'national government' in India following Japanese victories in Southeast Asia failed to come through. Many like Cripps and Clement Attlee, the leader of the British Labour Party and the Deputy Prime Minister in Winston Churchill Wartime Coalition Government, blamed Mahatma Gandhi's opposition to the Cripps Mission for the failure of negotiations. This was an unfair assessment of the situation. The War Cabinet in Britain and Linlithgow and the Commander-in-Chief of the British Indian Army, Wavell, had in fact earlier expressed alarm at Cripps conceding too many concessions to the Congress (Sumit Sarkar, 1983; pp. 387-88) and thus been responsible for the ultimate failure of the Mission. Five months after the announcement of the Cripps Mission, on 8 August 1942, the Bombay session of the All India Congress Committee (AICC) passed the 'Quit India' resolution and thus triggered off a movement that surpassed almost all the earlier 'Gandhian' movements in terms of widespread and popular participation.

In this Unit, we have discussed the circumstances leading towards the Quit India Movement. The declaration of the Second World War prompted the British colonial rulers to make India a part of it. Indian armies were sent to fight the enemies of the British and Indian resources were used for this purpose. This was done without taking the nationalist leadership into confidence. The Congress ministries, which were formed in the provinces in the wake of 1937 elections, resigned in protest against such unilateral decision by the colonial government. Individual Satyagraha was started in various parts of the country against this decision. In order to placate the nationalists, the British government sent the Cripps Mission to negotiate dominion status for India, but its proposals were completely rejected by the Congress. This set the stage for confrontation between the nationalists and the colonial government resulting in the launch of the Quit India movement which we will discuss in the next Unit.

Check Your Progress

- What were the causes and consequences of the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre of 1919?
- How did the Civil Disobedience Movement contribute to India's struggle for independence?

Unit – IV

Quit India Movement – Indian National Army - Subash Chandra Bose – Simla Conference – Cabinet Mission – Mountbatten Plan – Indian Independence Act - Partition of India

Objectives

- Indian National Army.
- Cabinet Mission – Mountbatten Plan.
- Indian Independence Act

Introduction

The Quit India Movement has rightly been described as the most massive antiimperialist struggle on the eve of Partition and Independence. 1942, the year that the movement was launched and the next five years witnessed unparalleled and tumultuous events in the political history of India. Sharp increase in popular nationalism, large-scale deprivation and death due to widespread famine conditions particularly the Bengal Famine of 1943, heightened Japanese aggression in Burma and Malaya, hopes of a military deliverance through the onward march of the ‘Azad Hind Fauj’ of Subhas Chandra Bose, and widening of the communal divide leading to the vivisection of the political fabric of the country were some of these developments. In this Unit, you will learn about various aspects of the Quit India Movement launched by Gandhi and the Congress to achieve freedom for India.

Nature of the Movement

This movement was projected initially as the mass civil disobedience movement of 1942. The emphasis on the ‘mass’ aspect distinguished it from the controlled and limited individual satyagrahas or civil disobedience of 1941. In nationalist historiography it has been described as the ‘third great wave’ of struggle against the British. The movement differed radically from other movements launched by Mahatma Gandhi. The Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920-22 and the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-34 were conceived as campaigns of peaceful resistance to British rule in India. Their social base had expanded gradually to accommodate wider popular participation.

However, the 1942 movement from the very beginning was a massive uprising to compel the British to withdraw entirely from India. The emphasis in the struggle was not on traditional Satyagraha but on 'fight to the finish'. It therefore represented a challenge to the state machinery. Moreover, Gandhi was now also prepared for riots and violence. His preparedness was based on his reading of the mood of the public. Gandhi had tested the mood in the limited yet symbolic campaign of Individual Satyagraha in 1941 when about 23,000 satyagrahis had gone to jail. He now conceded that the masses could take up arms in self-defence. Armed resistance against a stronger and well-equipped aggressor was to be considered a non-violent act as he observed Quit India Movement in his articles in the Harijan in March 1942. Accepting the role of individual freedom and civil liberties in the face of state's organised violence, he affirmed that "every individual was to consider himself free and act for himself".

The 1942 movement was less ambiguous in its declared objectives. It was launched to ensure the complete withdrawal of British power from India. The projected struggle had four main features: 1) It was accommodative of violence directed against the state; 2) It aimed at destroying British rule in India. Unlike earlier movements when Gandhi had asked trained satyagrahis to join the movements, anybody who believed in the complete independence of the country could join it now; 3) Students were urged to play a prominent part and to lead the movement should senior Congress leaders be arrested; and 4) The movement was to be marked by total defiance of government authority.

The difference from the earlier movements has been well-established in the rich scholarship on the movement. In the official and the non-official historiography, most of the debate centres around 'spontaneity' vs. 'organisation' argument or the degree of violence and non-violence in the 'Congress rebellion'. The government was keen to denounce Gandhi on charges of planning subversion and prepared a ground for the implementation of the Revolutionary Movement Ordinance. Intelligence reports warned of a series of acts planned by the Congress and the CSP to disrupt the smooth functioning of the war machinery. In fact, official sources had reported that the CSP workers had worked out modalities in a meeting in Allahabad in July 1941 for a radical course of action in Feb 1942. The plan of action came to be known as the Deoli Plan of Jai Prakash

Narayan because the latter had reasoned from his Deoli Jail cell that nationalist unity could be revived if Gandhi were to plan a radical course of action rather than a Satyagraha. These papers were seized and used as evidence of the revolutionary plot planned by the CSP.

As these allegations grew a secret report of 24 July 1942 warned that 15 September 1942 was being planned by the Congress as the date when the 'ultimatum' to the imperial authorities to withdraw from the country was to expire, heralding the beginning of a campaign. The report disclosed, '...it is reliably understood that Congress contemplates in the coming movement that the maximum effort will be made by open and subversive groups alike to paralyse the existing form of Government. There are to be no restrictions on the actions of those who choose in their own way to assist the Congress to achieve their end... Congress is prepared to encourage all groups to assist them in whatever way they choose and with whatever weapon they choose'. Based on such accounts the imperialist historiography charged the Congress with conspiracy. The nationalist historians on the other hand interpreted these accounts to highlight a degree of central direction and organisation in the rebellion and to depict the ascendancy of the Congress. Once the movement was formally launched on 8 August 1942 and the main leaders arrested, the focus shifted to its elemental and radical aspects. In official discourse the movement came to be conceived as the most 'un-Gandhian' of all nationalist struggles. The same aspect has been discussed by scholars such as Francis Hutchins in terms of the 'spontaneity' of the 'unfinished revolution'. It has also been described in terms of the 'greatest outburst ever' in the history of the national movement in India and yet, a 'patchy occurrence'.

Scholars have also focussed attention on the 1942 movement in order to either question or to establish the Congress ascendancy or leadership in different parts of the country. The nationalist writers have demonstrated that the nation stood united behind its leaders in 1942. And, since Gandhi had sanctioned violence in this movement most of what happened was as he had wished. In more recent times, scholars have explored the movement as it developed at the grass-roots. Paul Greenough in his work on the underground literature of the movement in Medinipur, Bengal, had observed that it was the move away from the issues, themes and symbols which Gandhi had articulated that

provided Quit India Movement with a distinctive character and lent internal tension to it. However, Gyanendra Pandey has argued that popular anger and action cannot merely be interpreted as deviation from Gandhian norms. Rather, activities in the wake of the movement may be interpreted in terms of the appropriation of the name and symbols of Gandhian nationalism for a politics that was essentially their own (Gyanendra Pandey, p. 125). In recent times numerous other accounts have also added to our understanding of the nature of the movement as it spread in different parts of the country

War and Rumours

The intensity of the movement was primarily due to conditions related to World War II (1939-45). A variety of factors such as the immediacy of the war in different parts of the subcontinent, the rapid increase in inflationary conditions, Government's preparedness to put down any resistance that might interfere with War supplies and the sharp difference of opinion among nationalist leaders and parties about the stand to be adopted in the face of the national and international crisis, affected the participation of people in the movement of 1942.

World War II and the possibility of its impact on developments in India had caught the attention of the political leadership in India and in England. Military and strategic considerations were cited to withhold political concessions to Indians. As the war progressed and as the forces of nationalism challenged the colonial systems in Asia, the Raj hardened its position further. It was relatively easy to influence opinions in Britain at this time. Evidently, India was the backbone of British defence east of Suez. Now the focus was on defending the Empire. Thus the political opinions that favoured granting Dominion status to India were overruled and the rigid and uncompromising position of Winston Churchill carried the day

In 1939-40, the imperial state trumpeted the need for stepping up the war effort. At the same time, the military defeats faced by the Allied powers in the hands of the Japanese army indicated that countries like Burma and India would be left in the lurch on the face of successful attack from Japan. This feeling grew stronger as the Japanese forces occupied Burma and raided Akyab, the region bordering Chittagong in east Bengal, twenty-five times! Refugees poured in narrating woes of war, destruction and abandonment. The retreat of the British Indian Army from Burma was tame indeed. The

British Navy did not seem strong enough to counter the Japanese in the Indian Ocean. Japanese air and naval superiority over the Bay of Bengal during 1942 made the East Coast ports of Calcutta, Chittagong, Madras and Vizag largely unusable. Thus, India faced an imminent threat on her eastern land frontier and on the almost undefended eastern seaboard at a time when the Germans were advancing in the West. That the triumph of the Japanese in South and Southeast Asia had unnerved the British military establishment is evident in the plan for the defence of north-east India, drawn up on 12 February 1942. In this the Gen. Staff had worked out a 'demolition policy' to deny the Japanese forces access to essentials. The policy involved destruction of power stations, oil installations and wireless, cable and telegraph stations. The military authorities also planned to destroy the ports of Calcutta and Chittagong and carry out the sinking of river craft and removal of railway stock as part of the demolition policy. The Denial Policy in Bengal, that involved removal of rice and other essential items and boats and bicycles from the inland areas in order to prevent Japanese intrusion, was the consequence such fears

The ill thought-out Air-raid Precautionary Schemes undertaken in areas that faced a direct military threat, the inflationary spiral and the growing shortage of food resources, exposed the hollowness of the claim of the British military preparedness. The economic situation in the interiors of the country, particularly eastern India had affected millions of people. Although scholars have pointed out that there need not always be a cause and effect relationship between economic crisis and political upheavals, yet the deteriorating economic conditions, for instance in Bengal, did affect the growing uneasiness among the people, particularly in the rural areas. It was evident that the authorities were doing very little to address their economic grievances. This was true of the jute growing areas of east Bengal. From 1940 onwards war-related developments had a scissors effect on the price of jute which crashed and the grain prices which increased.

The district officials neglected the signs of distress and permitted the export of rice from these areas. In addition, the rice and the boat denial policy resulted in the removal of nearly forty thousand tons of rice from the interiors of rural Bengal and affected the movement of large sections of population in the rice growing areas of Bengal and further reduced the supply of foodstuffs. This gave rise to an atmosphere of great

insecurity and prompted speculation and large-scale hoarding of essential goods. Items such as matches, salt, kerosene, mustard oil, sugar and finally, rice disappeared from the village markets. There was a synchronisation of rising prices and shortages with the coming of a large number of Allied troops. Thus the fears that the food reserves of the country were being depleted to feed the army were not unfounded. At the same time in mid-1942 the British had little confidence in their capacity to defend Bengal and Assam in the event of a Japanese invasion. The educated sections feared the implementation of some kind of a 'scorched earth' policy in Eastern India. Grievances springing from an acute economic crisis and the lack of any political or administrative mediation to conciliate the affected population while enforcing military imperatives such as the denial policy provided a renewed lease of life to anti-state activities.

As in the earlier phases of the national movement, rumours played a significant role in formulation of opinion regarding the onward march of the war, the British imperial policy and the fate of the British in the war. These rumours acted as a form of resistance as well as expressing a form of subaltern knowledge and understanding of the political struggle in which people found themselves. A few examples will establish the point. As the war progressed, there were rumours in the tribal areas of Central Provinces in May 1941 that the blood of the Gonds was being used to restore the limbs of the injured British soldiers (Crispin Bates, 2007, p. 158)! In Jabalpur in the same province, a rumour circulated that owing to food shortages the government was about to order a general evacuation of the city. David Hardiman's work on Gujarat has highlighted the chaos in different parts of the region following the increase in Japanese aggression in East Asia. In Dec 1941 there was a rush on banks as also a renewed hoarding of precious metals on the spread of rumours. In early 1942 many Gujarati families of Bombay fearing bombing and subsequent chaos left the city for their ancestral homes in Gujarat. These evacuees further disseminated the stories and rumours current in Bombay. Merchants and businessmen of Gujarat were apprehensive about a scorched earth policy and its devastating impact as witnessed in Rangoon when the city was evacuated. Their fears were reinforced by reports of how the British had favoured whites over coloured people during evacuation. Thus people were warned not to depend on the British in such times of crisis. By May it was feared that the Japanese fleet would soon attack the west coast of

India. This encouraged widespread hoarding of food and a sharp rise in food prices throughout Gujarat and Saurashtra. One month before the beginning of the Quit India Movement, in July 1942, the authorities in Gujarat reported a feeling of great insecurity in the villages and a big demand for weapons for self-protection.

Rumours played an important role in the dissemination of information of a certain kind in militarily vulnerable regions such as Bengal, particularly with the increase in Japanese aggression in December 1941. Rumours were afloat regarding the impending British defeat. Peasants were advised to withhold food from the forces, seamen to decline work except in coastal waters and dock workers were asked not to handle war material. The fortunes of seamen, port and dock workers were directly linked to the ups and downs of the war. Their pliability was strategically significant for the war. The state hoped for their passivity as their militancy would have spurred anti-state activities.

Preparations for Struggle

The political mainstream had responded to the war-related developments in Asia and Europe differently. While the Congress Working Committee banned participation in the war effort, it shared and supported Britain's anti-Fascist position in international politics. Thus, Britain and the Congress were on the same side as far as their anti-Fascist stance is concerned. But there were acute differences of opinion within the Congress on international developments. Subhas Chandra Bose, re-elected to the post of the President of the Congress in 1938 proposed that Britain should be confronted with the ultimatum that she should free India or face direct action and disorder. Gandhi was opposed to this. With his intervention, Bose was forced out of office in May 1939. The differences between the two leaders explain, to some extent, Gandhi's attitude towards the British in the early stages of World War II. His views were also at variance with those of Jawaharlal Nehru who favoured an immediate declaration of independence as a precondition for the Congress lending support to the war. Ultimately, the Congress Working Committee Resolution of September 1939, declared that Britain should state clearly her war aims and recognise that freedom was her goal not only in relation to the occupied and un-free European nations but in relation to India too. It must be mentioned that in the early stages of the war there were hardly any political concessions made to enlist Indian cooperation.

The international political situation altered considerably from the summer of 1940. The Axis powers grew aggressive in Britain and Europe. As India's role in imperial defence grew in importance on account of her resources, manpower and economic potential in the region east of Suez, Britain equipped herself with Quit India Movement both, a Revolutionary Movement's Ordinance to crush civil resistance and a plan to pacify the Congress with the promise of grant of political concessions. However, the offer known as Viceroy Linlithgow's 'August offer' of 1940 fell short of expectations. In the meantime, Gandhi who had insisted on non-violence in the international arena, launched an 'individual satyagraha' in 1940 against British Indian Government's war-efforts and against the prohibition to protest against it.

From the winter of 1941 and following the failure of the Cripps' Mission in March 1942, there were growing differences within the Congress largely due to war-related circumstances. After the collapse of Cripps' negotiations, the British Cabinet, including its Labour members, did nothing to demand a 'national government' in India during the course of the war. Administrative highhandedness in India, as witnessed in the continuance of Governor's authoritarian rule in the provinces, was accepted almost unquestioningly. Moreover, the British Cabinet gave Linlithgow and the government of India full support in their repression of the Quit India Movement. Their authoritarian attitude towards the Congress can be explained through their anger that Congress had sought to destroy British position in India at the time when it faced a major crisis in the war with Japan.

Political Situation in India in 1942

There were many contradictory stances and many conflicting tones in the statements and messages put out by many Congress leaders at different times and in different parts of the country a little before the beginning of the Quit India Movement. Gandhi's own language was distinctly more militant in the wake of 'the Cripps fiasco'. In May 1942 he wrote: "I waited and waited until the country should develop the non-violent strength necessary to throw off the foreign yoke. But my attitude has undergone a change. I feel that I cannot afford to wait... That is why I have decided that even at certain risks, which are evidently involved, I must ask the people to resist the slavery" (D.G. Tenukar.

By early August 1942, considerable preparations had been made to launch the movement. As soon as Gandhi's plan was known Viceroy Linlithgow geared himself up to nip it in the bud. London suggested opening of negotiations with Gandhi when Stafford Cripps had left. However, Gandhi was not open for negotiations at this stage. Popular unrest, the deterioration in the war situation and the refusal of the British to allow any involvement of the Congress in government during wartime compelled Gandhi to decide upon a more militant line. Various pronouncements were made to this effect from the summer of 1942. The first draft of such a course of action was rejected in a meeting of the AICC on 27 April. In May, Gandhi gave a speech asking Britain to "leave India to God. If that is too much, then leave her to anarchy". On 14 July, AICC adopted a resolution proposing a programme of civil disobedience if the British did not concede to their demands. Within a month of this ultimatum the All India Congress Committee session commenced on 7 August 1942 in a grand pandal of 35,000 sq. feet at Gowalia Tank Maidan in Bombay. Apprehensions due to the uncertainties of the war compelled Gandhi to begin his speech, delivered in Hindi, by saying that he did not believe that the British would be defeated, but if they were defeated they would follow a scorched earth policy as they did in Burma and Malaya. In that event Japan would have attacked India. Hence the urgency of the British quitting India". On 8 August 1942 the Quit India Resolution, modified by Nehru, was finally adopted. This is what Gandhi had to say towards the end of his speech:

'Here is a mantra, short one, that I give you. You may imprint it on your hearts and let every breath of yours give expression to it. The mantra is: 'Do or Die'. We shall either free India or die in the attempt; we shall not live to see the perpetuation of our slavery. Every true Congressman or (Congress) woman will join the struggle with an inflexible determination not to remain alive to see the country in bondage and slavery. Let that be your pledge ... Take a pledge with God and your own conscience as witness, that you will no longer rest till freedom is achieved and will be prepared to lay down your lives in the attempt to achieve it. He who loses his life will gain it; he who will seek to save it shall lose it. Freedom is not for the coward or the faint-hearted'.

The Government of India was determined to neutralise the Congress leadership. Its determination was sharpened by the danger from the Japanese in Asia. It was

militarily prepared to crush any civil disobedience movement. Thus, within hours of the launch of the 'Quit India' movement on 8 August 1942 at the All India Congress Committee session in Bombay by Mahatma Gandhi, the entire CWC leadership was arrested and taken to different prisons. The next day, Gandhi, Nehru and many other leaders of the Indian National Congress were arrested by the British Indian Government. This heralded the spread of the movement in different parts of the country.

In the early hours of 9 August Gandhi was arrested along with other leaders and was rendered temporarily incommunicado. On 9 August Congressmen still at large were Maulana Azad, Sadiq Ali, Dhayabhai Patel, Pyarelal Nair, Ram Mahohar Lohia, Achyut Patwardhan and Sucheta Kripalani. These individuals in Bombay then drew up a programme of action – the Twelve-point programme. The original programme is said to have been prepared by the Congress leaders under Gandhi's instructions or with his consent before 9 August. It began with a call for day-long hartal and incorporated all the methods of non-violent noncooperation and civil disobedience which had been employed under Gandhi's leadership since 1920. The final stage of the movement included actions such as the breaking of salt laws on a large scale, picketing of foreign cloth and liquor shops, promoting industrial strikes, holding up of railways and telegraph, calling to soldiers of the British Indian Army to come out and join the people, nonpayment of taxes and the setting up of parallel Government. (Hiteshranjan Sanyal, pp. 20-21) This was copied and circulated among people between 9 and 11 August soon after the arrest of the Congress leaders. As is evident from the kind of activities mentioned, the Twelve Point Programme was very broad in nature. It addressed the concerns of diverse sections of people. As a result several versions of this programme prepared by the CSP and lesser known outfits like the Khadi group appeared to have gained wide currency. The course of action laid stress upon militant activities. This explains the uniformity in the course of the uprising in different parts of the country despite the absence from the scene of the important Congress leaders.

A comprehensive British Intelligence report on the Quit India Movement prepared by T. Wickenden had indicated that the Congress leaders had decided to work out the details of the programme after the AICC meeting in Bombay which ended on 8 August 1942. However, the arrest of the majority of the Congress leaders between 9 and 11

August deprived the Congress of the opportunity to conduct the movement. Consequently, the initiative passed into the hands of the lowerrank of political workers, students and the common people. These groups undertook a confrontationist attitude and advocated direct and drastic mass actions. A central directorate for continuing the movement was set up after 9 August, but it took considerable time for it to establish links with the autonomous developments in different parts of the country.

Officials like Sir Reginald Maxwell (Home Member, Government of India) and Sir Richard Tottenham (Additional Secretary, Home Department) played an active role in establishing that the Congress and its leaders had organised the Quit India Movement in order to jeopardise the war efforts of the imperial government. The authorities issued a secret circular dated 17 July 1942, signed by Sir Frederick Puckle, secretary to the Government of India, which read as – “...The threat of Civil Disobedience is a direct invitation to the Japanese ... If Congress cannot get their own way... (they) will throw India to the Japanese and Germans... The object is to mobilise public opinion against the Congress. ..The National War Front should be used to the fullest to oppose proposals which can only be detrimental to the war effort. Speeches, letters to the local Press, leaflets, cartoons, posters, whispering campaigns are possible media for local publicity”. (K.K. Chaudhari, 1988, p.102) Imperial officials were therefore determined to demonstrate that any defiance of British policy in India during the war amounted to hostility towards the Allied Powers, mainly Britain. Since the USA was critical of Britain’s imperial interests in India and elsewhere it was useful to argue that the Congress was encouraging fascist forces and therefore it was justified to deal with the national movement with an iron hand. The panic-stricken government even contemplated deporting Gandhi to Aden or Nyasaland and the other main Congress leaders to Uganda or elsewhere in East Africa!

The controversial Revolutionary Movements’ Ordinance, which was intended to wipe out the Quit India Movement, was signed by the Viceroy on 12 August 1942. It was withheld from being issued in the Gazette of India because most of the provinces argued they could make do with powers under the Defence of India Rules (DIR). Martial Law was not declared because civilian officials were already equipped with plenipotentiary powers to suppress the uprising. During the war, DIR permitted the Government to take

any arbitrary action against persons and property in the name of war effort. Thus officials could now undertake punitive actions not covered by law. Indian Penal Code was to be used as a shield against any demand for enquiry into police excesses.

The government also brought into force the Special Criminal Courts Ordinance II of 1942 which was originally intended to apply to cases arising directly from 'enemy' (Axis) attack. The Ordinance was made applicable to cases arising from the disturbances from 26 October 1942. This empowered the government to short-circuit the process of criminal justice. Under this ordinance special criminal courts could be set up which would have summary jurisdiction over the suspected offenders. They could be imprisoned for a maximum duration of two years and there was very limited scope for appeal to the higher courts. The judiciary however continued to be reluctant to ratify actions by the Government. Even the London Tribune condemned atrocities by the British in Bombay – "Our armoured cars are going into action against Congress supporters in Bombay. Our political warfare has reached new inspiring heights. We proclaim a Whipping Act for the people of India. Every step taken by the Government of India since the dawn of the 9th August has been a stab in the back of the men and women who work and fight and die in the cause of freedom... The suicidal policy of the Government of India must be reversed" (London Tribune, 14 August 1942, Chaudhari, pp. 118- 119). As government repression increased, so did the saga of nationalist upsurge in various parts of the country, most significantly certain pockets in Gujarat, Satara in Maharashtra, Ballia in United Provinces, Medinipur in Bengal, and many areas in Bihar. Press censorship encouraged underground literature like the Bombay Congress Bulletin that was printed on 10 August in English, Gujarati, Marathi, Hindi and Urdu; Vande Mataram in Gujarati; Ittehad in Urdu in Bombay; Biplabi in Bengali in Medinipur

Regional Aspects of the Movement

The Quit India Movement had two phases: an initial mass movement phase from August until September, followed by a longer quasi-guerrilla insurgency phase. In the cities, strike action continued from 9-14 August in Bombay and in Calcutta from 10-17 August. There were strikes in Kanpur, Lucknow and Nagpur and violent clashes with striking millworkers in Delhi. In Patna, the police almost completely lost control over the city for two days after clashes in front of the Secretariat on 11 August. Thereafter those

activists who had not been arrested, including militant groups of students spread out from the cities to join the insurrection in rural areas. Mass participation was inspired by inflammatory underground publications, such as the Bombay Provincial Bulletin, Free India, War of India Bulletin, Do or Die News-sheet, Free State of India Gazette and the Congress Gazette which flourished after the official Congress leadership had been imprisoned and their offices, assets and printing presses seized.

In most places the movement declined within two to four weeks from 9 August 1942. This was due to both government repression through the army and the police and because the leaders responsible for guiding the movement failed to consolidate the spirit of rebellion among the people. But the quick spread and the intensity of the movement took the British Indian government by surprise. The intelligence machinery of the government had failed to warn the authorities about the likely extent of the movement. Thus during the first two weeks of the uprising the authority of the government practically collapsed over vast tracts in the United Provinces, Bihar, Bengal, Orissa, Central Provinces, Maharashtra and in some parts of the Madras Presidency

In Western India the movement was slow to grow in August 1942. But as it gained momentum it continued into 1943 and in some cases even longer. In districts such as East Khandesh, Satara, Broach and Surat large number of peasants took part in guerrilla-style attacks on government property, lines of communication, and people known to be sympathetic to British rule. The agitation was remarkable also due to the strength and duration of protest in towns such as Pune, Ahmadnagar and Ahmedabad. One commentator named Ahmedabad as 'the Stalingrad of India'! Western India also took a lead in bomb and sabotage activities. Of the 664 bomb explosions recorded in India from August 1942 to January 1944, nearly 76 per cent occurred in Bombay Presidency.

The strong bases of the Congress were Ahmedabad, Baroda and Surat cities, the districts of Kheda and Surat and the Jambusar taluka of Broach district. One important group from the viewpoint of the movement was the Gujarat Vyayam Prachark Mandal (Gujarat Society For the Propagation of Physical Training). Its leader, Chhotubhai Purani was associated with extremist nationalist organisations. He had later become an active member of the Gandhian Congress but had never fully accepted the principle of non-

violence. He founded a network of gymnasiums throughout Gujarat in which boys and young men were taught that they should train both their bodies and minds to fight the British. The boys were mostly Brahmins, Baniyas, Patidars from urban middle-class and prosperous rural families. Gandhi approved of these activities in part because Purani had refused to allow right-wing Hindu and anti-Muslim sentiments to be voiced in his gymnasiums. By 1942 there were as a result a large number of young men in Gujarat who were mentally and physically prepared to support a violent struggle against the British. It was in this explosive atmosphere that the Congress leaders launched the Quit India Movement in which the likes of Vallabhbhai supported the agitationist mood of the people whereas Morarji Desai took a more cautious approach since he believed that Gandhi's work for non-violence would be undone if popular violence was condoned and encouraged.

There were similar stories in almost all the major cities across the country. As soon as the news of the arrest of Gandhi broke, the millworkers downed their tools, the merchants closed their shops, students left their schools and colleges, and large crowds flocked the streets. In Ahmedabad, the crowds targeted policemen and anyone wearing the symbol of colonial culture like the solar topi. On 10 August about 2,000 students took out a procession. When the police tried to break it up with lathi-charges, the students counter-attacked, throwing bricks. Demonstrations and clashes with the police continued at a high pitch for another two weeks.

In Kheda, a total of ten agitators were killed by the police between 11 and 19 August. In addition to the open clashes, there was widespread cutting of telegraph wire and other minor acts of sabotage on public property. According to Sir Roger Lumley (Governor of Bombay from 1937-43), Kheda was the most disturbed district in the Bombay Presidency during August. In Baroda State, by 17 August the moderate Praja Mandal leaders were forced by popular pressure to declare their support for the Quit India Movement. On 18 August when the organisation was banned and the leaders were arrested there were turbulent demonstrations. The underground movement remained strong. Most effective were the big mass protests. Notably absent from these protests were the Muslims, who made up twenty per cent of the population of Ahmedabad and fifteen per cent of the population of Baroda. There had been a definite change in the

political loyalties of substantial sections of Muslims since the founding of the branches of Muslim League here since 1937.

Relationship between the working classes and middle class nationalist remained cordial. In 1942 there were 75 textile mills in Ahmedabad with 116,000 workers. Work in the mills was divided on communal lines – majority of the spinners were harijans, weavers were mostly patidar immigrants from north Gujarat and Muslims. Most powerful of labour unions were with Majur Mahajan Sangh which was closely connected with the Congress for over two decades. In 1942, it organised protests and strikes for the political cause and not for higher wages. Workers were persuaded to return to their home towns in times of inflation. The mill-owners were frightened that if the Japanese advanced into India, the British might destroy their textile mills as they retreated. As there was not much to gain from cooperation with the British war effort they had sympathy with the Congress suggestion that the Indian people should negotiate with the Japanese. They realised that if the Congress would form government after war it was in their interest not to alienate the party at this critical juncture. They also feared sabotage if they kept the mills open. But they did not support the Quit India Movement openly.

Protest in rural areas was the strongest in Kheda district. The most noticeable difference between rural agitation in 1942 and earlier Congress agitation in Gujarat was that this time revenue refusal was on the nationalist agenda from the beginning. Revenue collection was resumed in December 1942 only when the movement had begun to slacken. Collective fines were levied on villages which had provided violent support to the struggle. In 1932-34, the land of all the peasants who had participated in the civil-disobedience campaign was confiscated and returned only in 1938. They did not want a repeat of the ordeal. The draconian measures adopted by the authorities with show of troop strength also had a dampening impact in the rural areas. Moreover, the rich peasants had made profits due to war-time inflation and were therefore not too eager to lend support to the movement. The lower caste peasants - the Baraiyas, Patanvadiys and Thakardas – by and large remained aloof from the movement. Their belief that the Congress was primarily a Patidar party was confirmed when in 1938 the Congress government in Bombay forced them to return the land that had earlier been confiscated

due to revenue refusal during the civil disobedience movement and which they had bought at low prices.

The movement in Gujarat was not socially very radical. A very successful parallel government was nevertheless established in Ahmedabad. It duplicated the existing administrative machinery with underground leaders in charge of each municipal ward. This was the 'Azad Government'. It organised protests, levied taxes, issued information in 'patrikas', collected intelligence through a network of spies and punished certain notorious policemen. The leadership was in the hands of young Congress socialists. The parallel government drew its legitimacy from the broad mass of the Hindu middle classes of the city. No attempt was made to establish such bodies in the rural areas. Thus when rural underground activists were hounded down by the police in early 1943, the peasantry had no alternative programme to turn to. According to David Hardiman, only in the adivasi areas of south Gujarat were there indications of a more radical movement, for there the struggle was directed chiefly against Baniya moneylenders and Parsi landlords-cum-liquor dealers. Local high caste Gandhian leaders proved very sensitive to the implications of such activities, and did their best to discourage them. The Quit India Movement strengthened the hold of the Gandhian Congress over Gujarat. In 1944 Congress swept the polls in the Gujarat local elections of that year with huge majorities.

In Bihar and eastern UP as elsewhere, the cities were the first to experience action in the course of 1942 disturbances. There was, as Max Harcourt observes, intense rioting in the cities between 8-10 August. Then the focus shifted to the rural areas. Large crowds of armed villagers converged on the semi-isolated administrative centres in the localities and targeted the police posts and the local courts at the district and tehsil level. There were instances of looting of shops, godowns and residences as well. Bihar, like Bengal and Orissa, was under Permanent Settlement. Some like the Darbhanga, Bettiah or Darbhanga Rajahs were very big landlords. However, the majority were medium level landholders. Rich peasants dominated over the rest of the village population. In eastern UP villages were under the domination of Bhumihar-Brahman or Rajput-Brahman peasants who had a leading role in the 1942 movement. With the growing problem of food shortages and the tales of horror recounted by the refugees returning from different

parts of South East Asia, there was an increase in the activities organised by the Kisan Sabha which supported the Quit India campaign.

The underground movement grew very strong in Bihar and proved to be a major law and order problem for the British during 1942-44. Despite severe repression several terrorist organisations and dacoit gangs were formed in different parts of Bihar by 1943. Many of these groups had links with the Congress Socialist Party. They allied with socialist groups called 'Azad Dastas' and carried out activities in the name of the Congress. Vinita Damodaran equates these dacoit groups with Eric Hobsbawm's 'social bandits' and observes that they roamed the countryside with the support of the village population and filled the political vacuum between 1942-44. Their activities increased as Gandhi undertook a 21-day fast in prison in February 1943. In places like Muzaffarpur, Monghyr, Saran and Patna prisoners escaped from the overflowing prisons. There was a spurt in the publication of underground literature.

There was an increase in dacoities committed mainly for food. In Bhagalpur district the monthly incidence for dacoit crime in June 1943 was 310 as against a previous monthly average of 50. The targets were commonly food stores but attempts were also made to loot post offices, post bags, government treasuries and ammunition depots. These acts were often accompanied by cries of 'Gandhiji ki jai'. In Darbhanga, attacks on the local zamindar's kutcheri (office) was organised by Suraj Narayan Singh, a leader of the Congress Socialist Party who had received training in armed activity in Nepal. He was in constant contact with CSP leaders in Bombay. In Bhagalpur, dacoit gangs led by Sitaram Singh found wide support in the hands of villagers who provided food and money. Jayaprakash Narayan, one of the founder members of CSP, escaped from the prison in Nepal in November in 1942, and with the assistance of another socialist leader, Rammanohar Lohia, formed a parallel government on the Nepal border which lasted till 1944. In the neighbouring regions of Eastern UP, mainly the Ballia district, police stations were captured and a 'national government' was declared under the leadership of Chittu Pandey. In Azamgarh, the British could restore control only after massive use of troops and armed police.

The Quit India Movement in Medinipur in Bengal and the famine of 1943 are the two most significant markers of the turbulence that gripped Bengal during 1940-44.

Highhandedness by the state in the wake of World War II, administrative apathy and widespread hunger and destitution provided the context for heightened public anger and protests. District officials had earlier voiced their concern that a protest movement would gather momentum if the grievances were not promptly and effectively removed. The provincial coalition government of the Krishak Praja Party (KPP) and the Muslim League under the leadership of the premier Fazlul Huq implemented the Defence of India Rule and announced that, "There is no doubt that a mass movement capable of arousing the passions of hundreds and thousands of people during a period of war, may lead to serious consequences affecting the welfare of all sections of Indians. Such a movement cannot be allowed to spread anywhere in India to-day and not certainly in Bengal which falls within the danger zone".

Following Gandhi's arrest, the students of Calcutta like their counterparts in Bombay and Bihar vented their anger on services crucial to the war efforts. Interestingly, while the Calcutta Tramways, declared an essential service for the war period, was damaged, buses were ignored! Telegraph wires, railway lines and post offices were damaged. Masks covering the street lights as a precaution against air-raids were removed. Total collapse was prevented in the cities as the administration exploited the differences between the 'pro-war' (largely the Communists and members of the Radical Democratic Party) and 'anti-war' groups. The Priority Classes Scheme which provided for the industrial workingclass of the cities also contributed to the relative lack of continued participation in the movement by industrial labour.

In east Bengal, the movement was restricted to towns and cities. Nationalist propaganda was intense here. Warnings against train journey is provided in leaflets like 'Rail Bhraman Bipadjanak' (Train Journey's are dangerous') affected the normal functioning of such indispensable means of communication. Other leaflets like 'Why Are We Neutral in the War?' explained the position of the Congress in the war. The underground press remained very active in the Dacca Division even when the movement did not. In Mymensingh leaflets propagated that the Indian soldiers headed by Rashbehari Bose had occupied Imphal and that Subhas Bose was in Burma awaiting the moment to invade Bengal with an army of 10,000. The information was provided in anticipation because it was only in 1944 that this happened and the Indian National Army (INA)

succeeded on the Manipur front. Leaflets of this kind perhaps appeared when the regular Bengali newspapers ceased to be published. A War of Independence Bulletin published by the Assam office of Japanese-German-Indian Association advised people to withdraw from Calcutta as Bengal and Assam were to witness the first drive of the Azad Hind Fauj.

The Congress had a strong presence in Medinipur in west Bengal since the days of the Non-Cooperation Movement. It had faced additional problems in the wake of the war due to the Denial Policy and rice exports to the industrial metropolises. War-related tensions and the political receptiveness of the area had a role to play in the flaring up of an 'open rebellion' here. Hiteshranjan Sanyal's study shows how a number of established Congress leaders had initially held aloof from the Quit India Movement. Thus the initiative passed to militant young students many of whom were without distinct party affiliations but had turned towards the Forward Bloc in the late 1930s. Amidst the rising tensions in 1942, the most significant development in Medinipur was the formation of a parallel government with the formidable name 'Mahabharata Yuktarashtra: Tamralipta Jatiya Sarkar'. The government remained functional till 1944. The repression that followed took the life of Matangini Hazra, an eighty-year old political worker who was killed in a lathi-charge on September 29, 1942. Biplabi, the underground newsletter of the Jatiya Sarkar reported on atrocities on women by the military and the police mainly to stifle protest. Women were asked to take-up arms in self-defence since Mahatma Gandhi had advised the same. However, government repression remained unabated even when the region experienced nature's fury in the form of a cyclonic storm in October 1942 and as the famine progressed in 1943.

In Satara, in western Maharashtra, the Satyashodhak Samaj founded by the reformer Jyotiba Phule in the late nineteenth century provided the base and the main striking force to the Quit India movement. Here the peasantry had joined the nationalist movement in the 1930s with hardly any link with the Congress or the Left. Still Gandhi, in the opinion of Gail Omvedt, was an important symbol for all. Thus the main slogan of the 1942 movement – 'do or die' – produced the 'Prati sarkar' which she describes as the most powerful and long-lasting of the parallel governments established during the Quit India Movement.

The activities of the 'Prati Sarkar' included people's courts or nyayadan mandals as well as various types of armed activities and constructive programmes. Its last armed encounter with the police which resulted in two deaths took place after the naval mutiny in 1946. In caste terms Satara was dominated by Kunbis. Other sections of the population included the Dhangara artisan castes and the Mahars, Mangs and Ramoshis classed as a criminal tribe by the British. All these groups represented the 'bahujan samaj' or the majority and included a wide range of people across castes and classes. The first wave of activities in 1942 in Satara included sabotage, jailbreak and armed encounters with the police. People came with spears, axes and other home-made weapons and believed that they could put an end to colonial power. The govt imposed heavy fines and arrested people. 2000 people were in jail in Satara by the end of 1942.

The activists of the Prati Sarkar that was formed in early 1943, carried out both constructive as well as military and administrative tasks. They were organised into groups that were in touch with socialist groups of Bombay and established structures that included volunteer squads organised as Rashtra Seva Dal, Tufan Dal etc. The underground activists consisted of the young and educated sections of diverse castes of the 'bahujan Samaj'. Brahmans and merchants, Maratha middle-caste peasants and workers were very well-represented here. Dalits and women were under-represented. Between June 1943 and early 1944 as the movement spread here, attempts were made to build a viable and credible power structure by suppressing criminal activities including dacoity. In the middle of 1944 Gandhi gave a call to surrender since after his release from jail in May 1944, he was disturbed by the more violent underground activities. On 1 August he gave an open call for all those still underground to cease struggle and surrender. All over the country the nationalists, ranging from the disappointed socialist leadership to the loyal Congressmen, followed Gandhi's advice except in Satara.

There were certain strands common to the 1942 movement in different parts of the country. One such was the appropriation of nationalist symbols by popular classes. Wider participation of large sections of people in mainstream movements had forced the pace of these movements. This was evident earlier during the peasant movements in northern Allahabad and Awadh, among the plantation workers in Assam and during the Gudem-Rampa rising led by Alluri Sitarama Raju in Andhra in the early 1920s.

However, the enthusiasm of the general public was greater in 1942. Their sentiments were represented by socialist leaders like Jayaprakash Narayan when the bulk of the peasantry of the Prati Sarkar refused to surrender as late as August 1944 even after Mahatma Gandhi expressed his desire that those who were still underground should surrender. There were different centres of political initiative due to the preceding three decades of militant nationalist activity. There was definitely a concern over outbreak of violence. But it was attributed to the provocative action of the Government and brutal repression.

In recent times it has been argued that the history of the Quit India Movement has been neglected primarily because none of the major political parties played a central role in it. It was mainly a movement of the subaltern classes. Had the political elite been in the forefront, the campaign would have been more conservative in form. Numerous accounts have established that in the absence of conventional leadership, marginal groups proved their mettle. The national movement gained from the convergence of local and national interests. However, the socially transformative character of the movement remained incomplete.

The Quit India Movement failed to end British rule in India. Yet, this was one movement that demonstrated the will and reserve of diverse communities of Indians to withstand both the highhandedness of imperial authorities and the elitism of the Indian political class. The Quit India Movement stands apart from the earlier movements in terms of the spirit and enthusiasm that it infused in ordinary people to support indigenous institutions and structures of power. The parallel governments that such efforts produced indicate the basic difference between the 1942 movement and the earlier movements. The Non-Cooperation Movement was urban based and was supported mostly by rich peasant groups like those in Gujarat. Compared with it the Civil Disobedience campaign was more widespread. It involved many more poor peasants and was radicalised by the impact of the depression. But the Quit India Movement, as the preceding discussion demonstrates, was the most radical and violent of them all. It was supported by the poor and labouring classes, who were the hardest hit by war time inflation and food shortages. Although every major city saw action in 1942, yet in most urban areas British control was

too tight for Congress activism to last very long. By 1945 the Congress was moving in the direction of focusing its attention and energies on the 1946 elections.

Indian National Army

The Indian National Army (INA), also known as Azad Hind Fauj, was a military force formed during World War II to secure India's independence from British rule in 1942. The INA was closely associated with the charismatic nationalist leader Subhas Chandra Bose.

Japanese Army and the Indian Nationalists joined forces to create the Indian National Army. This force was established during World War II to aid India's fight for independence from British rule. In 1942, Mohan Singh created this force out of the Indian POWs of the British Army who had been captured by Japan. The INA ultimately split up, but Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose helped the organization reform.

History of Indian National Army (INA)

Before the start of World War II, Japan and Southeast Asia hosted the majority of the displaced Indian Nationalists. At the beginning of World War II in Southeast Asia, 70,000 Indian soldiers were deployed along the shore of Malaya. Numerous Indian soldiers were captured prisoners of war after the Japanese army's campaign along the coast of Malaya was successful. After Singapore fell, nearly 45,000 troops were captured on their own.

The first Indian National Army was created from these prisoners of war. Mohan Singh, a British-Indian Army officer captured during the Malayan Campaign, founded this force. There was an increase in volunteers who wished to join the INA as a result of the deplorable conditions in the PoW camps and the intense animosity towards the British army. Rash Behari Bose, an Indian Nationalist, was granted overall command of the army.

The Japanese Imperial Army, as well as those of Indian descent who lived in Southeast Asia, enthusiastically backed the INA. However, the INA was disbanded in 1942 as a result of disputes with the Japanese, particularly with Mohan Singh.

Indian National Army: First Phase

- The first phase of the Indian National Army (INA) refers to the initial period of its formation and activities during World War II.

- The INA, also known as Azad Hind Fauj, was created to achieve India's independence from British rule. This phase is closely associated with the leadership of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, a prominent nationalist leader.
- In September 1942, during the early years of World War II, Bose formed the INA with the help of the Axis powers, primarily Imperial Japan.
- The INA's first phase involved recruiting Indian prisoners of war, primarily from the British Indian Army, who were captured by the Japanese in Southeast Asia. Subhas Chandra Bose, who had earlier escaped house arrest in India, played a pivotal role in organizing and leading the INA.
- The INA's first significant military engagement occurred in 1944 when it participated in the Burma Campaign against British and Allied forces alongside Japanese forces.
- The INA's role in the conflict became a symbol of resistance against British colonial rule for many Indians.

Indian National Army: Second Phase

- The second phase of the Indian National Army (INA) is associated with its reorganization and renewed efforts during the later stages of World War II.
- This phase unfolded after the setbacks and changes that occurred following the INA's initial engagements in the Burma Campaign.
- The INA's second phase is marked by attempts to regroup, reorganize, and continue the struggle for India's independence from British rule.
- Subhas Chandra Bose, the leader of the INA, sought to address the challenges faced during the first phase.
- In 1943, Bose formed the Provisional Government of Free India in Singapore, and he declared war against the British Empire. This move aimed to symbolize the INA's commitment to the cause of Indian independence.
- The INA underwent a process of restructuring, with an emphasis on improving its military capabilities and addressing internal challenges. Efforts were made to enhance the INA's collaboration with the Japanese forces, despite occasional differences in strategic goals.

- The most notable military campaign of the second phase was the INA's participation in the Imphal-Kohima Campaign in 1944.
- The INA, alongside Japanese forces, engaged in fierce battles against British and Allied troops in Northeast India. However, the campaign did not achieve the desired success, and the INA faced a decisive defeat.
- The second phase of the INA concluded with the end of World War II in 1945. Japan's surrender and the subsequent disintegration of the Axis powers had a profound impact on the fate of the INA. With the defeat of Japan, the INA faced a loss of support and resources.
- Despite the military setbacks, the Indian National Army and Subhas Chandra Bose's efforts left a lasting impact on India's struggle for independence.
- The INA's role in challenging British rule and its association with the slogan "Dilli Chalo" (March to Delhi) became iconic symbols of the fight for freedom.
- The contributions of the INA and Bose to India's independence movement are remembered as significant chapters in the nation's history.

Subhas Chandra Bose

Bose was a staunch anti-imperialist, but he also recognized that it was the aggressive and expansionist nationalism that was in the centre of imperialism. He was a nationalist in its creative, egalitarian, and fraternal sense. But he did not favour nationalist chauvinism and its grossly discriminatory character. He felt repelled by the racism of Nazi Germany and aggression of Japan. At the same time, he adopted a pragmatic policy of taking the help of these powers to liberate his own country. His strong desire for the freedom of India led him to ignore the grossest human rights violations these countries engaged in at precisely the time he was soliciting and getting their help for his endeavour.

Bose was politically aligned with the socialists in the Congress and had many differences with Mahatma Gandhi. Firstly, while Gandhi resolutely believed in non-violence, Bose was not averse to using violence as a means to free his country. Secondly, Bose thought that industrialism and modernization would bring about regeneration of India, while Gandhi firmly thought that autonomous development of India's villages would be the salvation of the country. Thirdly, while Bose was politically radical and socialist who did not turn away from the possibility of class conflict to ameliorate the

conditions of India's poor, Gandhi believed that class struggle, because of its violent character, was unacceptable and he put his faith in the probable trusteeship of the rich to alleviate the dire conditions of the poor and oppressed. Bose was elected as the Congress President in 1938 with support from Gandhi and others. But when Bose decided to contest the election again for this post in 1939, Gandhi and his associates opposed this. Bose won against Gandhi's candidate, Pattabhi Sitaramayya. But later, owing to opposition from Gandhi and others, he resigned his post and parted ways with the Congress.

When the Second World War started, most of the Indians were not in support of the Allies because of their experiences with British colonialism. In fact, Indian leaders and people were much disturbed about not being taken into confidence before Britain declared India to be a combatant. There was also no concrete promise of any future plan for self-government. The Congress ministries resigned in protest. Even a mild-mannered Gandhi made it clear that he saw 'no difference between the Fascist or Nazi powers and the Allies. All are exploiters, all resort to ruthlessness to the extent required to compass their end'.

Bose was firmly opposed to the colonial rule and refused to accept the idea that the British should be supported against the Nazis in the War. Fearing his vocal and active opposition, the British colonial authorities arrested him in July 1940. In November 1940, he began a fast in the prison, after which he was released from the jail and put under house arrest in December 1940. From there he escaped to Afghanistan through the North-west Frontier Provinces, and then, with the help of the Soviet, German and Italian authorities, he travelled to Soviet Union, finally reaching Germany in 1941. The Second World War was seriously progressing with Hitler overrunning most of Europe outside Soviet influence. There was a pact between Hitler and Stalin which had led to their dividing the areas of influence in Eastern Europe. Bose initial confabulations with the German authorities on the possibility of releasing the Indian soldiers who had fallen into German hands after British defeat in North Africa were not successful. Hitler and his cohorts still nurtured hopes for neutralizing England and, therefore, they did not want to take a tough stand against the British and their empire in India. They also refused to declare themselves unequivocally in favour of India's independence. When Bose drafted

a declaration for Indian independence in May 1941, both the German and Italian governments kept delaying it under various pretexts.

When Germany invaded Soviet Union in June 1941, Bose's strategy suffered a serious setback. However, as the Germans and Italians still vouched to support him in his endeavour, he continued to hold hope. There was some progress also as some Indian soldiers were now trained by the German officers to make compact units to fight against the British. It was not easy to persuade the common Indian soldiers to participate in such training as they had taken an oath earlier and they also feared for their families back home. But, despite all handicaps in Germany, Bose managed to raise four battalions, consisting of about 4,000 Indian soldiers, ready to fight against the British by December 1942.

It was with this first national army that he adopted Indian tricolour as the national flag, Tagore's song 'Jan Gan Man Adhinayak' as national anthem, and the 'Jai Hind' as national greeting which would be common to all the Indians irrespective of caste and creed. These were enduring legacies from Netaji towards the unity of the country.

Despite some progress, however, the German response remained lukewarm and there were not enough recruits in Europe to raise an effective fighting force. The entry of Japan in the War in September 1940, and more aggressively in December 1941, however, changed the entire dynamic in Asia. The speedy advance of Japanese forces and defeat of the British and other European imperialist powers in Southeast Asia opened up a new vista for Bose and his strategy geared towards the liberation of India. The fall of Singapore in February 1942 enthused him enormously and he came out, for the first time, to speak on Azad Hind Radio declaring that 'The fall of Singapore means the collapse of the British Empire, the end of the iniquitous regime which it has symbolized and the dawn of a new era in Indian history' [cited in Bose, p. 213]. This radio had been in existence since October 1941 and it became the most important mouthpiece of Indian freedom movement abroad during this period.

A substantial number of Indian soldiers fighting for the British had fallen into the hands of the Japanese. It was around them, as well as the resident Indian population in Southeast Asia and other countries, that Bose's strategy revolved.

From this point, he regularly addressed his country people on the radio stirring them to take action against the British. In the Japanese victories, he found the possibilities of a mortal weakening of British imperialism which could then be pushed over the brink. He also was now very hopeful about the possibility of raising a big force of Indians to fight against the British for the liberation of India. He was in contact with the Japanese ambassador in Germany making plans to realize his goals. The Japanese were also more receptive and forthcoming about Bose's ideas. Bose wanted to move immediately in order to take advantage of British imperialism being at its lowest point during the War.

In May 1942, Hitler agreed to provide logistical support for Bose's shifting to Japan. But Hitler evaded the idea of a declaration of Indian independence. Bose was not satisfied with his meeting with Hitler but at least he secured the promise of German help in his transfer to Japan. On ideological issues and on the domestic and international policies of the tripartite powers, Bose took a very pragmatic stand. He did not even speak publicly about the extreme racist policies of Hitler. He held that 'In this fateful hour in India's history, it would be a grievous mistake to be carried away by ideological considerations alone. The internal politics of Germany or Italy or Japan do not concern us— they are the concern of the people of those countries'

Meanwhile, the political scene in India was also changing. Gandhi, apprehensive of the Japanese attacks on India, wanted that the British should immediately relinquish the power so that Indians could negotiate with the Japanese. Gandhi believed that the Japanese had nothing against India but they were hostile to the British. If the British continued to hold reins in India, the Japanese would attack and invade India. So, he wanted the British to immediately leave India and let the Indians manage their own affairs. On 8 August 1942, Gandhi gave the slogan of 'do or die' for the Indians and asked the British to immediately 'quit India' which resulted in country-wide eruptions. This major shift in Gandhi's position coincided with the immediacy and urgency of Bose's thinking about the right time to strike.

However, it was only by mid-January 1943 that the plans for his submarine journey to Japan could be arranged. In February 1943, he left the German shore to launch his fight in Asia. By then, however, the German advance was halted both in Africa against the British and in the Soviet Union. Soon, there would be a turn-around, but Bose

moved towards his goal undaunted. He still posed a threat to the British, even under the changed situation, when the Quit India Movement was crushed and the Allied forces had halted the advance of Germany.

Simla Conference, 1945

The Viceroy, Lord Wavell, had been laying the ground for a political settlement which would be in place before the War ended. The end of the War was expected to bring with it a host of intractable problems, including pent up economic discontent and a standoff between the two principal parties, Congress and the Muslim League. He was of the view that a successful settlement of the Indian question would strengthen the future security of the Empire, ensure British prestige in the East, and even lead to India remaining within the Commonwealth. The specific steps of the settlement were to secure representation of the Congress and Muslim League on the Executive Council, to put in place elected coalition ministries in the provinces and elect representatives to the Constituent Assembly.

Soon after being released from prison in June 1945, important Congress leaders headed towards Simla, the summer capital of the Raj, to participate in the Conference convened by the Viceroy. Gandhiji took the line that he did not hold any official position in the Congress and that Maulana Azad, the Congress President, would be the Congress representative. However, he, Gandhi, would be present in Simla to advise the Viceroy during the Conference, should he so desire. The Simla Conference was held at the Viceregal Lodge, the summer residence of the Viceroy, in June-July 1945. The Muslim League was represented, among others, by its pre-eminent leader, Mahomed Ali Jinnah.

The crucial point at issue at the Simla Conference was Jinnah's contention that Towards Freedom-I the Muslim League was the sole spokesman for Muslims. Congress insisted on its right to represent Muslims, including nationalist Muslims, a venerable one being Maulana Azad, the President of the Congress. The British also found it difficult to ignore the claims of the Unionist Party of the Punjab, which represented Muslim landlords of West Punjab and Hindu smallholders of South East Punjab, and had contributed handsomely to the War effort in men and money. To underscore their point of not being a mere Hindu party, Congress included in its list of members for the Executive Council, representatives from non-Hindu communities. Jinnah insisted on his position as

sole spokesman of Muslims being upheld and the Viceroy chose to ditch the Unionist allies of the British in favour of Jinnah and the League, whom they had helped during the War to make quick strides. Failure of the offer did not really put out the government: what was important was that the offer was shown to have been made.

The Simla Conference demonstrated, if a public avowal was still needed, given the government's overt espousal of the League during the War years, which the government considered its ally in the scenario that was to unfold in the post war period. However, the challenge posed by the Congress, indeed by the nationalist forces, continued to be formidable and the situation the government found itself in increasingly precarious with the rapidly eroding pillars of the state.

The **Wavell Plan** was initially introduced in **1945** at the **Shimla Conference**. It was titled after **Lord Wavell**, Viceroy of India. The Shimla Conference was held in order to reach an agreement on the Wavell Plan for Indian self-government, which called for **separate representation on communal lines**. The failure of both the plan and the conference was due to the failure of the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress to reach an agreement.

Wavell Plan - Background

- The British Empire faced numerous socioeconomic challenges as a result of the Second World War, particularly in retaining their overseas colonies. As a result, the British government saw fit to grant India the freedom it had long sought.
- The war was over, but Japan had yet to surrender. INA's heroic deeds were about to come to an end. Since the resignations in 1939, there has been a stalemate in Congress.
- In October 1943, **Lord Wavell**, who had succeeded Lord Linlithgow as Governor-General, attempted to break the stalemate in India. In March 1945, he traveled to England for consultations.
- On June 14th, he broadcasted to the people of India the British Government's proposals to end the deadlock in India, known as the Wavell Plan.

Proposals of Wavell Plan

- All members of the executive council, with the exception of the governor-general and the commander-in-chief, were to be Indians.

- Caste Hindus and Muslims were to be represented equally.
- The reconstructed council was to function as an interim government within the framework of the **1935 Act** (i.e., not accountable to the Central Assembly).
- The governor-general was to exercise his veto on ministerial advice.
- Representatives from various parties were to submit a joint list to the viceroy for nominations to the executive council.
- If a joint list was not possible, separate lists were to be submitted, with the possibility of negotiations on a new constitution being kept open once the war was won.
- The Scheduled Castes would also be represented separately, and the possibility of a new constitution would be discussed.
- The Governor-veto General's would not be abolished, but it would not be used excessively.
- The Governor-General's portfolio of external affairs was to be transferred to an Indian member of the Council.
- It was also expected that "provincial ministers in Province would return to the office and that a coalition would form."
- Congress leaders were allowed to attend the **Simla Conference in June 1945**. This marked the end of a period of confrontation that had lasted since August 1942.

Shimla Conference

- A conference of 21 Indian political leaders was invited to Shimla, the summer capital of the British Government, to discuss the provisions of the Wavell Plan.
- Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the President of the Congress at the time, was among the leaders. **Mohammad Ali Jinnah** was also present at the conference.
- Convened to agree on and approve the Wavell Plan for Indian self-government, it reached a potential agreement for Indian self-rule that provided Muslims with separate representation and reduced majority powers for both communities in their majority regions.
- However, talks came to a halt over the issue of selecting Muslim representatives.

- Jinnah stated that no non-league Muslim should be represented on the Executive Council because only the Muslim League has the authority to represent Indian Muslims.
- Jinnah also demanded that if votes were divided and Muslim members objected, a provision be added requiring a two-thirds majority to clear a vote.
- Wavell had appointed six Muslims to the Executive Council of 14, and the British had given it the power to Veto any constitutional proposal that was not in its best interests.
- However, Muslims made up only 25% of the Indian population. As a result, Congress rejected these unreasonable demands.
- The **Muslim League** refused to back down, and Wavell scrapped the plan.
- Lord Wavell concluded the Conference by declaring the talks a failure.
- The conference, and possibly the last viable opportunity for a united, independent India, was scuttled as a result.

Failure of Wavell Plan

- In essence, the Wavell Plan was an attempt to completely Indianize the Executive Council. On the basis of parity, the caste Hindus and Muslims were to be represented on it. Mahatma Gandhi objected to the term "caste Hindus."
- The Muslim League lobbied for Muslim members to be represented on the Council. As a national organization, Congress insisted on the election of representatives from all communities.
 - The conference failed because neither the Congress nor the League was willing to budge from their respective positions.
- Lord Wavell bears a portion of the blame for the failure, as does Mr. Jinnah. The fate of the conference had to be decided by three parties: the Congress, the Muslim League, and the Viceroy.
 - For the Congress, India was a single nation, but for the Muslim League, Muslims were not just a minority, but a nation in their own right.
- The viceroy's decision was to be based on this disagreement because the larger the disagreement, the longer the British rule could be extended.

- Lord Wavell formally delegated to Jinnah the power of veto-final authority over any constitutional progress in India. As a result, Jinnah became the sole representative of Muslims.
- At the same time, Wavell reversed the **Cripps mission's** proposals, which had identified INC as the sole forum for discussion with the government. As a result, Wavell established two platforms in Shimla.
 - Raise Jinnah's status to that of Gandhi.
 - Make the Muslim League the sole decider of Muslim fate in India.
 - As a result, the Muslim League benefited greatly, and they were now one step closer to establishing their own nation.
- Lord Wavell should have trusted the leaders with the composition of his own list of Executive Council members.
- Perhaps the Congress leaders could have been persuaded to accept the list in its entirety, or with minor modifications mutually agreed upon.
- He should not have allowed the league to effectively veto the entire plan, thereby obstructing progress on its own.
- It should be noted that the Viceroy had assured the Congress President that "no party to the conference could be allowed to obstruct settlement out of wilfulness," but it appears that, like Cripps, Wavell's hands were tied at the last moment.
- The tangible result of the Shimla Conference's failure was to strengthen the position of Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League, as seen in the 1945-46 elections.
- **Mr. Maulana Azad**, the Congress President, laid the blame for the breakdown squarely on Mr. Jinnah's shoulders.
- Despite Jinnah's approval of the British plan, when the Indian National Congress and All India Muslim League reconvened under the Cabinet Mission the following year, the Indian National Congress was far less sympathetic to the Muslim League's requests.

Cabinet Mission

The **Cabinet Mission** was a high-powered mission sent to India by the **Atlee government** in **February 1946**. Three British cabinet members served on the mission: (**Pethick Lawrence**, Secretary of State for India; **Stafford Cripps**, President of the

Board of Trade; and **A.V. Alexander**, First Lord of the Admiralty) to find ways and means for a negotiated, peaceful transfer of power to India.

Cabinet Mission - Background

- **Clement Atlee**, the British Prime Minister, initiated the formation of the Cabinet Mission.
- It was made up of **three members**: Lord Pethick-Lawrence, AV Alexander, and Sir Stafford Cripps.
- The then **Viceroy Lord Wavell** was involved in the process although he was not an official member.
- The Congress Party and the Muslim League, which were at odds on almost every issue at the time, had fundamental ideological differences that were preventing them from finding common ground.
- Congress desired a strong central government with few powers delegated to the provinces.
- The League sought strong safeguards for the rights of Muslims, the world's largest minority group in India.
- Because both parties had significant ideological differences and were unable to find common ground, the mission issued its own set of proposals in May 1946.

Cabinet Mission - Objectives

- To reach an agreement with Indian leaders on the creation of a constitution for India.
- Creating a constitution-making body (the Constituent Assembly of India).
- To form an Executive Council with the support of the major Indian political parties.

Arrival of Cabinet Mission

- On March 24, 1946, the Cabinet Mission arrived in Delhi. It held lengthy discussions with Indian leaders from all parties and groups on the issues of:
 - interim government; and
 - principles and procedures for drafting a new constitution that would grant India independence.

- Because the Congress and the League were unable to reach an agreement on the fundamental issue of India's unity or partition, the mission proposed its own constitutional solution in May 1946.

Proposal for Cabinet Mission

- Rejection of the demand for a full-fledged Pakistan because:
 - such a formation of Pakistan would include a large non-Muslim population—38% in the North-West and 48% in the North-East;
 - the very principle of communal self-determination would demand separation of Hindu-majority western Bengal and Sikh- and Hindu-dominated Ambala and Jalandhar divisions of Punjab.
 - deep-rooted regional ties would be jeopardized if Bengal and Punjab were partitioned;
 - partition would cause economic and administrative problems, such as the problem of communication between Pakistan's western and eastern regions; and
 - the division of the armed forces would be dangerous.
- The provinces would be divided into three sections/groups:
 - **Group A** includes Madras, the Central Provinces, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bombay, and Orissa.
 - **Group B** consists of Punjab, Sindh, the NWFP, and Baluchistan.
 - **Group C** consists of Bengal and Assam.
- At the provincial, section, and union levels, there is a three-tiered executive and legislature.
- **Provincial assemblies** were to elect a constituent assembly through proportional representation (voting in three groups: general, Muslims, and Sikhs).
 - This constituent assembly would consist of 389 members, with provincial assemblies sending 292, chief commissioner's provinces sending 4, and princely states sending 93.
- Members of groups A, B, and C were to sit separately in the constituent assembly to decide the constitution for provinces and, if possible, groups as well.

- The entire constituent assembly (all three sections A, B, and C combined) would then convene to draft the union constitution.
- A centralized command would be in charge of defense, communication, and external affairs. India was to have a **federal structure**.
- In the central legislature, communal questions were to be decided by a simple majority of both communities present and voting.
- Provinces were to have full autonomy and residual powers, and **princely states** would no longer be subject to the British government's supremacy. They would be free to enter into an arrangement with successor governments or the British government.
- After the first general elections, a province would be free to leave a group, and after 10 years, a province would be free to call for a reconsideration of the group or the union constitution.
- Meanwhile, the constituent assembly was to form an **interim government**.

Reaction of the Parties

- The Cabinet Mission's long-term plan was accepted by the **Muslim League on June 6, 1946**, and by **Congress on June 24, 1946**.
- Elections for the Constituent Assembly were held in provincial assemblies in July 1946.
- Nehru stated on **July 10, 1946**, "We are not bound by anything except that we have decided to go into the Constituent Assembly".
 - It implied that the Constituent Assembly was sovereign and would decide the rules of procedure.
- The likelihood is that there will be no grouping because the NWFP and Assam would object to joining sections B and C.
- **On July 29, 1946**, In response to Nehru's statement, the League withdrew its acceptance of the long-term plan and issued a call for "**direct action**" beginning on August 16 to achieve Pakistan.

Congress Reaction

- The Cabinet Mission Plan, according to the Congress, was opposed to the creation of Pakistan because grouping was optional; only one constituent assembly was envisaged, and the League no longer had a veto.
- Provinces should not have to wait until the first general election to break away from a coalition. They should be able to choose not to join a group in the first place.
- Compulsory grouping runs counter to the frequently stated insistence on provincial autonomy.
- The absence of a provision in the constituent assembly for elected members from the princely states (they could only be nominated by the princes) was unacceptable.

Muslim League Reaction

- Pakistan, according to the Muslim League, was implied in the compulsory grouping.
- Sections B and C should be forced to form solid entities in preparation for future secession into Pakistan.
- The League expected Congress to reject the plan, prompting the government to invite the League to form an interim government.

Reasons for Failure of Cabinet Mission

- The Congress was opposed to the idea of provinces being divided into groups based on the Hindu-Muslim majority and competing for control at the center. It was also contrary to the concept of a weak center.
- The Muslim League did not want the proposals changed.
- Since the plan was rejected, the mission proposed a **new plan in June 1946**. This plan proposed dividing India into two parts: a Hindu-majority India and a Muslim-majority India, later renamed Pakistan.
- A list of princely states that could join the union or remain independent was also compiled.
- The **second plan** was **rejected by Jawaharlal Nehru's Congress Party**. Instead, it agreed to be a constituent assembly member.

- The Viceroy convened a meeting of 14 men to form an interim government. There were five members from the Congress, five from the League, and one each from the Sikh, Parsee, Indian Christian, and scheduled caste communities.
- The League and the Congress were both given the authority to appoint five members to the Viceroy's interim council.
 - The Congress nominated Zakir Hussain as one of the members, which the League objected to, claiming that the League only represented Indian Muslims and no other party. It was boycotted by the Muslim League.
- The Congress leaders joined the viceroy's interim council, and Nehru became the leader of the interim government. The new government began the task of writing the country's constitution.
- In most provinces, including the NWFP, Congress-led governments were formed. The League formed governments in Bengal and Sind.
- The new central government was opposed by Jinnah and the League. He vowed to agitate for Pakistan and urged Muslims to demand it by any means necessary. **On August 16, 1946**, he called for a "**Direct Action Day**."
- This call sparked widespread communal rioting across the country, with 5000 people killed on the first day in Calcutta alone. Riots erupted in a number of other areas, most notably Noakhali and Bihar.
- As a result of the riots, there was a call for the country to be partitioned. **Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel** was among the first Congress leaders to recognize the inevitability of partition as a means of putting an end to the brutal violence.

Congress and the Muslim League, respectively, accepted the Cabinet Mission on June 24, 1946, and June 6, 1946, respectively. The League then withdrew from the agreement and urged direct action to secure Pakistan's independence. Following the collapse of Cabinet Mission 1946, Atlee issued a statement in which he set a date for the transfer of power and evacuation from India.

Mountbatten Plan

The Mountbatten Plan, announced on June 3, 1947, was a historic proposal that led to the partition of British India into two independent dominions—India and Pakistan. It was formulated by Viceroy Lord Louis Mountbatten, to address the growing communal

tensions and the urgent demand for independence. The plan aimed to provide a swift and peaceful transfer of power while minimizing unrest.

Key provisions of the plan included the partition of Punjab and Bengal, referendums in the North-West Frontier Province and Sylhet, and the establishment of boundary commissions. The plan was crucial in determining the political landscape of South Asia, with its implementation on August 15, 1947, marking the end of British rule in India.

Mountbatten Plan Background

- Lord Mountbatten came to India as the last Viceroy and was assigned the task of a speedy transfer of power by the then British Prime Minister Clement Atlee.
- In May 1947, Mountbatten came up with a plan under which he proposed that the provinces be declared independent successor states and then be allowed to choose whether to join the constituent assembly or not. This plan was called the ‘Dickie Bird Plan’.
- Jawaharlal Nehru (Born on November 14, 1889) when apprised of the plan, vehemently opposed it saying it would lead to Balkanisation of the country. Hence, this plan was also called Plan Balkan.
- Then, the viceroy came up with another plan called the June 3 Plan. This plan was the last plan for Indian independence. It is also called the Mountbatten Plan.
- The June 3 Plan included the principles of partition, autonomy, sovereignty to both nations, right to make their own constitution.
- Above all, the Princely States such as Jammu and Kashmir were given a choice to either join India or Pakistan. The consequences of these choices would affect the new nations for decades to come.
- This plan was accepted by both the Congress and the Muslim League. By then, the Congress had also accepted the inevitability of the partition.
- This plan was put into action by the **Indian Independence Act 1947** which was passed in the British Parliament and received the royal assent on 18 July 1947.

Key Provisions of Mountbatten Plan

The 3rd June 1947 Plan, commonly known as the Mountbatten Plan, outlined the framework for the partition and transfer of power in India. The British government

proposed several key principles aimed at addressing communal divisions and ensuring a smooth transition. These provisions laid the foundation for the creation of two independent dominions, India and Pakistan.

Key Provisions include:

Partition of India: The plan proposed the division of British India into two dominions, India and Pakistan. However, Independence for Bengal was denied. Accession of Hyderabad to Pakistan was also rejected.

- ❖ **Autonomy and Sovereignty:** Both new dominions were to be granted full autonomy and sovereignty, allowing them to draft their own constitutions.
- ❖ **Princely States:** The princely states were given the option to join either India or Pakistan, based on geographical contiguity and the wishes of their people.
- ❖ **Constituent Assemblies:** Separate constituent assemblies were to be established for India and Pakistan to frame their respective constitutions.
- ❖ **Boundary Commissions:** Boundary commissions were set up to demarcate the borders between India and Pakistan, particularly in the provinces of Punjab and Bengal.
- ❖ **Punjab and Bengal Legislative Assemblies:** These assemblies would vote in separate groups (Hindus and Muslims) on partition, with a simple majority determining if these provinces would be partitioned.
- ❖ **Sindh:** Sindh would decide its own course through a legislative decision.
- ❖ **Referendums:** Referendums would be held in the North-West Frontier Province (NWFP) and Sylhet district to determine their future.
- ❖ **Independence Date:** Independence was set for August 15, 1947.

Mountbatten Plan Response

The Mountbatten Plan received mixed reactions from various political groups. Initially, the Congress was opposed to the idea of dominion status, advocating instead for full sovereignty. However, they accepted it under the Mountbatten Plan (despite it being against the Poorna Swaraj Resolution of 1929), recognizing that it would ensure a peaceful and quick transfer of power. Additionally, Congress prioritized gaining authority to control the volatile situation in the country. On the other hand, the Muslim League welcomed the plan, as it fulfilled their demand for a separate nation, Pakistan.

However, Gandhi reacted against the partition if India envisaged in the Mountbatten Plan. He advised people not to accept the partition by heart.

Mountbatten Plan Aftermath

The Mountbatten Plan culminated in the passage of the Indian Independence Act by the British Parliament on July 5, 1947. This Act, based on the principles outlined in the Mountbatten Plan, received royal assent on July 18, 1947, and was implemented on August 15, 1947. It formalized the creation of two independent dominions—India and Pakistan—effective from the same date, marking the end of British colonial rule in the subcontinent.

The aftermath of partition, however, was marred by widespread communal violence, mass migrations, and the deepening divide between the newly formed nations. The humanitarian crisis that followed left lasting scars on both India and Pakistan.

The Indian Independence Act 1947 was a landmark piece of legislation passed by the British Parliament that paved the way for the partition of British India and the establishment of two independent dominions: India and Pakistan.

On August 15, 1947, the act effectively ended British colonial rule in the Indian subcontinent by establishing sovereignty for the newly formed nations. This legislation marked the end of decades of struggle for independence and paved the way for the birth of modern India and Pakistan.

Indian Independence Act 1947

The Indian Independence Act 1947 was an act of the United Kingdom Parliament that divided British India into two new independent dominions, India and Pakistan. The Act was passed in the British Parliament on July 5, 1947, and received Royal Assent on July 18, 1947. Modern-day India and Pakistan, including the West (modern-day Pakistan) and East (modern-day Bangladesh) regions, were established on August 15, 1947.

- The Mountbatten Plan, developed by Louis Mountbatten, India's last Governor-General, served as the foundation for the Indian Independence Act 1947.
- He had devised a plan to hand over power to the natives from the British Crown. The Act resulted from the Indians' years of struggle and resistance to the British occupation.

Indian Independence Act 1947 Background

- The background to the Indian Independence Act of 1947 is deeply rooted in the long and arduous struggle for Indian independence. After the Revolt of 1857, the early 20th century saw the rise of the Indian National Congress (INC), which played a crucial role in advocating for self-rule.
- Continued Struggle for Independence: The struggle for independence gained traction over time, culminating in events such as the Non-Cooperation Movement and the Civil Disobedience Movement. The demand for independence was further intensified during and after World War II, as the British Empire weakened and the Indian independence movement intensified.
- Role of Quit India Movement: The Quit India Movement of 1942, led by Mahatma Gandhi, was a significant effort to end British rule. However, communal tensions between Hindus and Muslims, exacerbated by British political strategies, prompted calls for a separate Muslim state. The Muslim League's Lahore Resolution of 1940, which called for the creation of Pakistan, laid the groundwork for partition.
- Failure of Cabinet Mission Plan: The Cabinet Mission Plan of 1946, which sought to keep India united while granting autonomy to provinces, failed to achieve consensus, resulting in widespread communal violence.
- Attlee's Announcement: On 20 February 1947, British Prime Minister Clement Attlee announced plans to transfer power. The announcement stated that the British Government would grant full self-government to British India by June 3, 1948, at the latest, and that the fate of the Princely States would be decided after the date of the final transfer was determined.
- Mountbatten Plan (3rd June Plan): As the situation deteriorated due to communal violence, Lord Mountbatten, the last Viceroy of India, proposed the partition plan, known as the Mountbatten Plan. The Congress and the Muslim League agreed to the plan. The plan took immediate effect when the Indian Independence Act of 1947 was enacted.

Indian Independence Act 1947 Features

The Indian Independence Act of 1947 transformed British India's political landscape. It not only divided the subcontinent into India and Pakistan but also ended British sovereignty and redefined governance structures, affecting everything from boundary demarcation to civil service appointments.

- **Partition of British India:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 divided British India into two separate dominions—India and Pakistan—each with the right to secede from the British Commonwealth if they choose.
- **End of British sovereignty:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 ended British legal sovereignty over India, transferring all powers previously held by the British government to the new dominions. It also removed the Emperor of India title from the King of England's royal titles.
- **Abolishment of Office of Viceroy:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 abolished the office of Viceroy and established a governor-general for each dominion, which the British King would appoint based on the advice of the dominion cabinet. His Majesty's Government in Britain was to have no responsibility for the governments of India and Pakistan.
- **Empowerment of Constituent Assemblies:** The Indian Independence Act of 1947 allowed the Constituent Assemblies of India and Pakistan to draft their constitutions and repeal British laws, with no new British laws applying unless adopted by the dominion legislatures.
- **Boundary Demarcation:** The Act established the borders of India and Pakistan, with a boundary commission led by Sir Cyril Radcliffe determining the division, which led to significant migrations and communal violence.
- **Abolishment of Secretary of State for India:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 abolished the office of Secretary of State for India and delegated its responsibilities to the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs.
- **Fate of Princely States:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 proclaimed the end of British supremacy over Indian princely states and treaty relations with tribal areas on August 15, 1947. It granted Indian princely states the freedom to join the Dominion of India or the Dominion of Pakistan or to remain independent.

- **Governance Structure:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 established a framework for each dominion's government. The two dominions were allowed to adopt the Government of India Act of 1935 as their interim constitution, with the flexibility to make changes as needed.
- It took away the British Monarch's right to veto or request that specific bills be reserved for his approval.
- However, this authority was reserved for the Governor General. The Governor-General would have full authority to sign any bill in His Majesty's name.
- **Governor-General Appointment:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 appointed the Governor-General of India and the provincial governors as the constitutional (nominal) heads of the states. They were required to follow the advice of the respective council of ministers in all matters.
- **Discontinuation of Civil Service Appointment:** The Indian Independence Act 1947 abolished civil service appointments and post-reservation by the Secretary of State for India. Members of the civil service appointed before August 15, 1947, would continue to receive all benefits to which they were entitled until that date.

Indian Independence Act 1947 Significance

The Indian Independence Act of 1947 ended nearly 200 years of British rule and established India and Pakistan as sovereign nations. It set the stage for decolonization, constitutional development, and global power shifts.

- **End of Colonial Rule:** The Indian Independence Act of 1947 ended nearly 200 years of British rule, leading to the creation of the sovereign states of India and Pakistan.
- **Resolution of the Communal Issue:** Partition fulfilled the Muslim League's demand for Pakistan but caused massive migrations and communal violence.
- **Influence on Decolonisation:** India's independence inspired other colonies to seek freedom, driving the broader decolonization movement in Asia and Africa.
- **Foundation for Constitutional Development:** The Act enabled India and Pakistan to draft their constitutions, with India's 1950 Constitution establishing it as the world's largest democracy.

- Changes in Global Power Dynamics: Britain's withdrawal marked the end of its empire, with India and Pakistan emerging as significant global players, reshaping post-World War II geopolitics.

Indian Independence Act 1947 Impacts

The Indian Independence Act 1947 had profound and lasting impacts, including the partition of British India, leading to mass migration and communal violence. It also marked the creation of India and Pakistan as sovereign nations.

- ❖ Partition and Violence: The Indian Independence Act of 1947 led to the partition of India and widespread communal violence, displacing millions and causing significant loss of life.
- ❖ Mass Migration: The partition triggered one of history's largest migrations, with Hindus and Sikhs moving to India and Muslims to Pakistan, creating a major humanitarian crisis with lasting effects.
- ❖ Integration of Princely States: The integration of princely states into India or Pakistan was complex, with the Kashmir issue remaining unresolved and fueling ongoing conflict.
- ❖ Constitutional Development: Both nations began drafting constitutions, with India's, ratified in 1950, becoming one of the most comprehensive globally.
- ❖ Unresolved Issues: The Act left unresolved issues, such as the Kashmir conflict and boundary disputes with China, Bangladesh, and Nepal, continuing to affect India-Pakistan relations.

Partition of India

Introduction

The British conquered India and gave it a political unity that it had enjoyed only for short periods of time in its long history. This political unification based on imperialist expansion quickened the pace of political change in India in conjunction with the spread of modern education and the growth of modern forms of transport and communications. Yet, when the British left India in 1947, the country was divided along religious lines into India and Pakistan. This has been attributed to a policy of divide and rule that the British followed. That Britain was responsible in the break-up of British India was believed by all the Indian nationalists including Gandhi; he believed that both Hindus and Muslims

ought to strive for communal harmony, which was consciously damaged by the 'third party' i.e. the British rulers. During the period of World War II, Gandhi even said that the communal problem would never be resolved until the British left India. Since the British deliberately encouraged the League and its demand for Pakistan after March 1940, Gandhi argued that Hindu-Muslim unity was a pre-requisite for fighting the British and for freedom around 1942, and also argued that the communal problem would never be settled until the British left India.

The partition of India was the product of complex processes and was the outcome of several factors and the role of the British, the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress for the division of the subcontinent. Partition was neither inevitable nor the product of sheer chance. It was not the fulfillment of destiny or the logical outcome of the two nation theory; nor was it simply an accident that was produced by a single wrong decision or failure of judgment. It was the period 1937-1947 that saw the quickening of the pace of political developments, but there were underlying differences in the levels of economic and social development of the Hindu and Muslim communities of the subcontinent that played a role. Conflicts based on class and culture got intertwined with new forms of politics and concepts of democracy and nation-states during the closing years of colonial rule.

British Policies and Partition

The British's purpose of the policy of divide and rule, for deliberately favouring one community and then the other, is to prevent the coming together of Indians against the British. The acceptance of the Muslim League demand for separate electorates in 1909 was a major divisive move that vitiated the political culture of India until independence in 1947. Some argue that the Muslim League deputation to the Viceroy in 1906 itself was a command performance and the League was set up soon after by an elite group trying to promote its interest. The British extended it to the Sikhs as well. Gandhi and B.R. Ambedkar, through a compromise in 1932 thwarted a British attempt to drive a wedge between the depressed classes and the upper caste Hindus by offering separate electorates to the former. The argument is no longer confined to the institutional mechanisms of representative government that were slowly being introduced by the British in India. Historians and anthropologists now argue that the British classification

practices encouraged the representation as well as the self-representation of Indians according to caste and religion.

The Census listed various castes and communities in India, and also counted them. The colonial practice of census and surveys thus encouraged the idea of 'enumerated communities' and led to the concept of majority and minority in different parts of the country. Fuzzy identities were replaced by hard and singular identities often forcing groups with complex and multiple identities to choose one (Cohn, Appadurai, Kaviraj). The British Orientalist scholarship played a role in the development of ideas about the peculiarities of Indian society. The codification of the laws of the Hindus led to the freezing of the dynamic nature of traditional society and culture and valorised a primarily textual and elitist upper caste conception of Hindu law and practices. The codification of Muslim Law also led to the rigid interpretation of law and reduced the role of interpretation that had been important in Muslim jurisprudence. The writing of history also shaped ideas of community that soon became the commonsense of the time. The British perception of Indian society in terms of religious and cultural differences led to the exaggeration of religious and cultural conflict.

As Gandhi had observed in *Hind Swaraj*, the Hindus and Muslims had learned to live with each other before the British established their rule in India. It was British rule that produced greater differences between the two communities. The historians focused only on the periods of conflict ignoring the much longer periods of harmony between communities. The colonial construction of the notion of communities grew more elaborate with time and the introduction of representative government and separate electorates gave the government ample opportunity to heighten this process of community formation. The logic of competition then took over and stronger notions of the boundaries of communities developed by the early twentieth century. The British were willing to go to any length to prolong their rule in India; they deliberately encouraged Jinnah's Muslim League after 1940 to weaken the national movement and thwart Congress participation in government during the war. They were willing to consider not only the partition of India but also the balkanisation of India. Their attitude towards the Indian problem was shaped by Britain's role in Asia after World War II and the emerging Cold War.

Muslim League and Jinnah

In the nationalist accounts of the partition of India, Mohammad Ali Jinnah played a prominent role in the partition process. Other nationalist historians have argued that he was alienated by the transformation of the Congress after mass mobilisation began under Gandhi after 1920. This made Jinnah the moderate nationalist and constitutionalist less relevant in national politics although he remained opposed to the hardline communal politics. Gradually the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity turned hostile and became an implacable foe of the Congress. He had opposed the Nehru report of 1928 that had advocated a unitary form of government and representation to minorities on the basis of numerical importance in different regions. There is a difference between Jinnah's fourteen points and the demand for Pakistan; Jinnah, as a liberal Muslim, was not averse to negotiations with the Congress. It was the poor performance of the Muslim League in the elections to the Provincial assemblies in 1937 that compelled him to rethink his strategy. Rejection of a coalition government with the League in Uttar Pradesh by the Congress after the former's poor showing in the elections led to a strong reaction from the League. Outright condemnation of the Congress Ministries was orchestrated by the League and the party decided to reject the notion that the Muslims could live as a minority under 'Hindu' Congress domination.

In 1940 the League declared the right of self determination of Muslim majorities in the North West and East of India. The demand for separate states within a common framework even if it meant statehood without a demand for a separate nation, as argued by Ayesha Jalal and the revisionists, fanned communal fears and animosities in the years after (Ayesha Jalal). If Jinnah did not want to divide the subcontinent, he chose an unwise policy. The communal polarisation that resulted from enthusiastic responses to the Pakistan idea undermined the cross communal alliances that were crucial to retain the Punjab and Bengal in the 'autonomous' Pakistan zones of an All India government. The virulent campaign for Pakistan got intertwined with various communal, linguistic and cultural anxieties and acquired a momentum of its own. Even if Jinnah did not want to create a separate nation state, his campaign for seven long years made it possible. The idea of using the power of the Muslim majority provinces to protect the interests of the Muslims in the Muslim minority provinces by creating a common government at the

Centre was undermined by the unrestrained propaganda in the campaign for Pakistan. It is arguable that Muslim interests would have been far better served by emphasising the rights of provinces within a loose federation rather than the chimerical ideal of Pakistan. In any case Jinnah's strategy and Muslim League propaganda rather than his hidden objectives influenced Indian political developments and led to the partition of India.

Congress and Partition

The early nationalist accounts apportioned the blame for partition exclusively between the British and the Muslim League. The Congress tried to bring under its umbrella all sections of Indian society, but separate electorates, British policy of divide and rule, the intransigence of Jinnah and the communal and reactionary grip over the League led to the partition of the subcontinent. The Congress was unable to reach out to the Muslim masses and therefore reluctantly accepted the wishes of the majority of the Indian Muslims to carve a nation for themselves. This account has been challenged by two strands in Indian history. Bipan Chandra argues that there was a Hindu tinge in the Congress and that Hindu liberal communalists like Lala Lajapat Rai and Madan Mohan Malaviya were able to create doubts about the inclusive nationalist credentials of the Congress party. However, he believes that extreme communalism was promoted by the League and that Congress failed to handle the problem (Bipan Chandra). This was both because of pressure from Hindu communalists and insufficient mass mobilisation.

A second strand argues that the Congress was substantially to blame for the partition of the country. The Congress did not have a sufficiently inclusive approach towards Muslim communities in India. The culture and ideology of the Congress party was majoritarianthe belief that the view of the majority party must prevail. It wanted to dominate public life because it was the largest party. The other argument was that even Congress's inclusive nationalism entailed the denial of Muslim identity and that any signs of Muslimness were regarded as separatist or communal. Ayesha Jalal is unwilling to accept the binary opposition between Congress secular nationalism and Muslim communalism. In her *Self and Sovereignty*, however, the distinction between a political and religious notion of majoritarianism often gets blurred and the basis for characterising individuals and political demands or movements as acceptably communitarian or unacceptably communal is often unclear. The Congress was not a party that wanted to

establish Hindu majority rule and a policy of safeguards for minorities, emphasis on fundamental rights and federalism could have taken care of the dangers of religious majoritarianism.

The argument has also been made that the Congress, particularly Jawaharlal Nehru and Vallabhbhai Patel, were supporters of a strong state and therefore preferred to have a smaller and more centralised state than a united but confederal India with the Muslim League. This was why they rejected the Confederation that was recommended by the Cabinet Mission that came to India in 1946. It is argued that the partition of the subcontinent was imposed by the central leaders of the Congress who favoured a tighter grip over the provinces and a unitary conception of nationalism (A. Jalal). Patel wanted a strong state because of the need to create a unified nation and Nehru because he favoured a policy of state backed economic growth. Although the Congress leaders did favour the strong state this was not the view of the two leaders alone. A considerable number of Congressmen and nationalists favoured a strong government for various reasons.

It has been argued that many Indian Muslims did not accept the principles of liberal individualism and believed that their representatives should belong to the Muslim community and share their values and concerns. It was not enough to represent them and their secular interests (Farzana Shaikh). In the perception of many Congressmen and Hindu nationalists, a weak centre in India had been responsible for repeated invasions and British conquest and therefore the post independence state had to be strong enough to protect its citizens and provide for their well-being. The beliefs of the leaders of the Congress and the League were not those of a handful of leaders even if there is no way of knowing how many shared such views. If indeed Jinnah and the Muslim League did not want a separate state of Pakistan the leaders of the Congress could not have forced it upon eighty million Muslims against their will.

Gandhi and Partition

The partition of India was a severe blow to the leaders of the Indian National Congress who tried to avert it till the terms for preserving unity seemed unacceptable to them. The strongest reaction to partition came from Gandhi who had worked for communal harmony for decades. He had brought a large number of Indian Muslims into the national movement by linking grievances about the treatment of the Khalifa and the

dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire with the nationalist outrage following the Jallianwala Bagh massacre at Amritsar in April 1919 and the imposition of martial law in Punjab. The Khilafat and Non-Cooperation movement brought forth Muslim participation on a scale which the Congress never managed to achieve after this. The withdrawal of the movement in early 1922 was followed by the outbreak of communal conflicts in many parts of north India stretching from Kohat to Calcutta between 1922 and 1926. The critics of Gandhi think that the use of a religious issue like Khilafat was dangerous since it encouraged extra-territorial loyalties and Pan-Islamic tendencies among Indian Muslims (B.R. Nanda). It has also been argued that Gandhi's collaboration with the Ali brothers led to Muslim mass mobilisation within India for achieving objectives within India (Gail Minault). Secular and Marxist historians consider the use of religion in politics a 'double-edged weapon' and therefore have regarded this strategy as fraught with dangerous consequences.

Gandhi believed in spiritualising politics and did not consider it essential to separate religion and politics as in the western conception of secularism. He believed in communal harmony and in Hindu-Muslim unity. His ideas and personality appealed to Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who began as a radical Pan-Islamist and became a supporter of composite nationalism. Azad was a devout Muslim who believed in communal harmony and the need to preserve the unity of the country. His role and personality is frequently contrasted with that of the westernised Jinnah who was an unconventional Muslim fighting for the rights of Muslims and a separate state using appeals to religion (Aijaz Ahmad, T.N. Madan). The argument has been advanced that it was the emphasis on secularism and modernity that led to the failure to deal with the specific grievances of the Muslim community. It is difficult to accept this in so far as the problem was really about uneven development, economic grievances and sharing of power rather than hard secularism or communitarian identities. In so far as communitarian identities are concerned the Gandhian emphasis on Hindustani in the Devanagari script had very little impact on the cultural politics of the Hindi speaking states. This was not a matter that could be understood primarily in terms of the secular-religious divide or the modernity and tradition distinction. The politics of language did play a role in the alienation of the Muslims of North India. Gandhi, Nehru and Bose despite their differences as well as

moderate nationalists and progressive writers were all in favour of Hindustani but could not make much headway.

The ideas of Gandhi were misunderstood by many and the message of communal harmony and removal of untouchability were also regarded with suspicion by orthodox and even moderate Muslims. Some Muslims felt this was a subtle way of consolidating the Hindu vote bank and reducing the bargaining power of the Muslim community (William Gould). There was some recrimination after the Khilafat-Non-Cooperation movement was withdrawn and the Ali brothers were upset by Gandhi's withdrawal of the movement. The concept of Ramrajya was not a Hindu ideal as far as Gandhi was concerned though it might have sprung from within the Hindu tradition. Many orthodox Muslims regarded this as an unacceptable ideal and preferred to express themselves in an Islamic idiom. The existence of separate electorates and fears of Hindu consolidation ensured that the Muslims never supported the Congress in sufficient numbers during the period that led up to independence and partition. After the Gandhi-Ambedkar pact of 1932 the reserved seats for the depressed Classes led moderate nationalists and Hindu nationalists to enhance their influence among the depressed classes and thus to work for Hindu consolidation especially in Bengal (Joya Chatterjee). To those who did not dwell deeply on the matter, the Gandhian and Hindu nationalist concern with Harijan uplift would appear as part of the same agenda.

The essentialist understanding is that Pakistan was the product of a longstanding difference between Hindus and Muslims in the subcontinent. The historicists have rightly focused on the changes during the last decade of colonial rule. Historians disagree on the precise reasons for the partition of the subcontinent but agree that it came about towards the end of colonial rule because of the failure of the Congress and the League to come to a settlement. The British policy of encouraging Muslim separatism and eagerness to withdraw from India after the Second World War made the partition more likely. There is a sense in which the economic and political consequences of World War II had an impact on political developments that could not be foreseen. Likewise the consequences of the demand for partition and the jostling for power in the localities speeded up the process of communal polarisation that influenced the decisions of the principal protagonists in the story of partition. In the final analysis the postwar crisis and the polarisation in society

during the last few years of colonial rule contributed to the climate in which the decision was taken in 1946-47..

The 1946 Elections and Popular Opinion

The League was able to use the British compulsion to justify a constitutional deadlock in India to build a substantial following during the period 1940-1946. The election results of 1946 gave the Muslim League the authoritative position to represent Indian Muslims that Jinnah had long wanted. The poor performance in the 1937 elections was a thing of the past and the League was in a position to drive a hard bargain. In 1937 the League was unable to gain acceptance as a coalition partner in the United Provinces but in 1946 it was able to speak for the majority of Muslims who had the right to vote at that time. The Congress too had won the majority of votes from among the non-Muslims eligible to vote- about one-tenth of the total population. The election results of 1946 surely indicated the strength of the Muslim League, reasons for the League's victory being the use of populist slogans and not merely religious appeals by the League. Fear of Hindu majority rule and the Congress also played a part in ensuring the victory of the League (David Gilmartin, Ian Talbot). The Communal polarisation had grown although the violence was to become significant only in 1946. It was the growth in the electoral strength of the League and the popularity of the notion of Pakistan that compelled the Congress to take the demands of the League seriously. The demand for Pakistan was no longer seen as a bargaining counter but a serious demand, while the supporters of the two-nation theory regarded the verdict of 1946 as a vindication of their stand. Even if Congressmen were reluctant to accept Pakistan as a demand of Muslim nationalism they were aware of the popularity of the idea. Even Gandhi felt that the demand was granted by the Congress "because you asked for it. The Congress never asked for it.... But the Congress can feel the pulse of the people. It realized that the Khalsa as also the Hindu desires it. We do not wish to force anyone. We tried hard." Gandhi was eager to avoid the division of the country and did not participate in all the discussions of the Congress about these developments during 1946. He was in Noakhali in East Bengal trying to restore harmony. He was kept informed by the Congress leaders and he did participate in some of the discussions leading upto partition.

On 14th June, 1947 Gandhi told the delegates to the AICC session that they could remove the members of the Working Committee if they believed they were acting wrongly. He did not think they were in a position to challenge and replace them and Gandhi himself did not feel that the conditions were appropriate for him to 'take up the flag of revolt' (Prayer meeting, 5th June 1947, CWMG, Vol 88, p.154 cited in S Mahajan, p.371). Gandhi was against the partition of the country but he did not want to rebel against the Congress because it had to reluctantly accept the partition of the country. He was not in favour of a mass movement against the decision to partition the country because the conditions were not conducive for such a movement and because he was not sure whether he could secure the support of the people in such an endeavour.

Cabinet Mission Plan and a Strong State

In 'Sole Spokesman', Ayesha Jalal had suggested that the Cabinet Mission Plan of 1946 was the one that came closest to what Jinnah really wanted but the Congress leadership had other plans based on the preference for a strong centre. In Self and Sovereignty, the communitarian perspective is used to understand the alienation of the Muslims from the Congress as well as the multiple identities that unitarian or singular conceptions of nationalism sought to control or delegitimise in the name of nationalism. It is important to highlight that if there had been no demand for Pakistan, no matter what the demand meant to different groups, the federal character of the polity would have been easier to preserve. Even if the Muslims of Punjab and Bengal were to demand substantial autonomy within a federation, based on the self-confidence of Muslim elite about being able to wield power at the provincial level because of their numerical preponderance, it would have been on a less communal basis. Muslim communitarian identities, as well as the multiplicity of other identities, would not have been adversely affected if a demand for provincial autonomy within a federation had been advocated by the League.

The communitarian anxieties of the Sikhs of the Punjab too contributed to communal tensions and the demand for Pakistan created higher levels of polarisation in a region that was an important contributor of manpower to the British Army in India. The tensions were more likely to spin out of control in this region where there were so many volunteer organisations and demobilised soldiers after the war ended. In the eastern region, there was communal polarisation but fewer demobilised soldiers and a weaker

‘martial’ tradition. The fear of living under a majority community was not confined to the Muslim community alone. Hindus and Sikhs in the Punjab too began to worry about their fate in a future Pakistan and a Muslim majority group in the North West was also a cause for concern. Some Sikhs demanded a separate homeland and adequate safeguards for their community

The opposition to the division of the province on religious lines was stronger in Bengal than in the Punjab. The British had deliberately promoted Jinnah’s League during the war but were reluctant to support his claim for a separate state. Their reluctance to prevent the spread of virulent propaganda helped the League gain adherents. The British also preferred the League and Wavell’s Breakdown Plan indicated a withdrawal to the North West of India away from Congress controlled areas. It is another matter that the decision to withdraw announced in 1947 and the advancement of Indian independence compelled Indians to come to a decision sooner than they would have liked and probably made partition and the violence that accompanied it more likely. Some historians believe that the British wanted to retain influence in the region after they left and therefore promoted a smaller and more pliable country like Pakistan.

The Cabinet Mission Plan was not accepted by the Congress because it gave very limited powers to a common central government for the whole subcontinent. It also created three Groups of provinces, two groups with Muslim majority provinces in the North West and North East of India. It was grouping that was a source of difficulty for the Congress. Initially the Congress was willing to accept the Cabinet Mission proposals. When it was clarified that the scheme for Groups of provinces could not be modified, Sardar Patel decided to oppose it (Nandurkar). Gandhi wanted a duly constituted court to pronounce its judgement on the different interpretations of the proposals by the Congress, the League and the Cabinet Mission itself (Interview to Preston Grover, October 21, 1946. CWMG, Vol LXXXVI, p.10). Though Gandhi was opposed to the idea of the partition of India, he also opposed the compulsory inclusion of Assam, North West Frontier Province and the Sikhs of the Punjab in the Groups that would be dominated by the Muslim League under the Cabinet Mission Plan (Instructions for Congress Working Committee,

Nehru argued that a central government was bound to increase its powers and that a future Constituent Assembly would be free to determine the future of India. Maulana Azad felt that this was a blunder since the acceptance of the Cabinet Mission proposals could have preserved the unity of India.

In order to preserve the unity of the country and restore communal harmony, Gandhi proposed that Muhammad Ali Jinnah be made the Prime Minister of India. This was a proposal he made twice- once in 1946 and the second time in April 1947. In May 1947 he wrote to Lord Mountbatten that the British should “leave the Government of the whole of India, including the States to one party” (CWMG, Vol. LXXXVII, p. 436). Mountbatten should hand over power to either the Muslim League or the Congress, grant Dominion Status, remain as Governor-General for the next thirteen months and “then leave them to their own devices” (Interview with Lord Mountbatten, May 4, 1947. CWMG, Vol. LXXXVII, Appendix. XV, pp. 549-550). These proposals were not accepted by the Congress leaders. This has been interpreted as the rejection of Gandhi’s vision or the clinching evidence for the political ambitions of the top leaders of the Congress.

It is arguable that the gestures of goodwill that Gandhi made would not have resolved the problem of sharing power between two major political parties representing two different ideologies. In any case Gandhi did not feel he could confront the Congress leaders on this question because he was not sure whether even the Hindus would be willing to follow his advice. Gandhi did not accept the idea of partition and thought that the partition should not divide the hearts of people even if the boundaries were redrawn. It was a *fait accompli* but should not be allowed to influence the ordinary people. Gandhi was “as much against forced partition as against forced unity” (CWMG, Vol. LXXXVII, p.30). Although he could not resolve the dispute between the Congress and the League or launch a mass movement, Gandhi worked for communal harmony in the riot affected areas. Even those scholars like Sumit Sarkar who believe that a mass movement against the British was possible during the last two years of colonial rule, during the winter of 1946-47, believe that Gandhi’s struggle against the blazing fires of communalism in Bengal, Bihar and Delhi was of immense significance and constituted his ‘finest hour’

Social and Economic Background

The discussion of the partition of India cannot be reduced to the intentions or decisions of a few top leaders, no matter how significant their role might have been in the closing years of colonial rule. Moreover, the notion of inflexible forces in history leading to communal polarisation and partition are also untenable. The argument of the Indian communists that there are many nations in India and that the demand for Pakistan was a nationality demand is logically consistent but does not tell us how and why it emerged during the last decade of colonial rule. Yet there is a middle level formulation about the growing support for a separate state of Pakistan or partition of Punjab and Bengal during the last few years of colonial rule. The inchoate demand for Pakistan stirred poets and propagandists who influenced the popular mood and fuelled communal tensions and anxieties. Several scholars like Mushirul Hasan, who do not subscribe to the binary opposition between Indian nationalism and Muslim communalism and separatism, believe that the propaganda of the League had a deep impact on several sections of society (Mushirul Hasan). This helped to create not only support for a separate state in the Muslim majority regions like Punjab and Bengal but also fuelled anxieties among the minorities in these regions.

The Sikhs had created their own reform movement and the Singh Sabha movement strengthened the communitarian identities of the Sikhs in the Punjab. The fear of being left defenceless, especially after the community had played a vital role in the agricultural colonisation and military service, created a vital unsettling factor. The growth of various volunteer organisations and communal polarisation undermined the cross-communal alliance created by the Unionist Party of the Punjab under Fazli Husain and Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan. The politics of the Punjab was heavily influenced by certain forms of communitarian identities – based on caste, language and religion but these were often competing and overlapping identities. Nevertheless the propaganda of the League upset this alliance and compelled those Muslims like Sikandar Hyat Khan, who believed in provincial autonomy, to accept the ideological preeminence of the League leadership. The support for Jinnah and the Muslim League may not bring back memories of the legendary Islamic hero Saladin, but the Pakistan idea had acquired considerable support

in the North West of India (Akbar Ahmad and Ian Talbot). The attitude of the Muslim landlords of Punjab was of crucial importance in the creation of Pakistan.

Ayesha Jalal has argued that although Punjabis were “especially unwilling to make concessions to rival communities” the majority of Punjabis were opposed to the partition of their province on religious lines in March 1947 (Jalal, EPW, August 8, 1998). She argues that Hindus had indicated their unwillingness to accept Muslim domination at the provincial level twice before; this was reflected in their response to Lala Lajpat Rai’s proposals in 1924 and C. Rajagopalachari’s formula of 1944 calling for the separation of Hindu majority regions in Punjab and Bengal. Jalal argues that sub-regional and class factors influenced the behaviour of individuals more than communitarian identities, but the central leadership imposed the partition of the Punjab from above. It is arguable that rival communitarian and ‘nationalist’ or communal perspectives led to a paralysis of political will or the unwillingness to come to a compromise that enabled the British government and the central leaderships of the League and the Congress to impose their will on the Punjab. This failure to come to an agreement was not the failure of a few leaders in the Punjab but of the clash of economic interests of social groups that underpinned communitarian identities and of widespread and extreme distrust of the other.

Communitarian differences were sustained by economic and legal-constitutional arrangements like the Punjab Land Alienation Act of 1900 and the district-wise enumeration of agricultural castes whose lands could not be taken away by urban moneylenders. Marxist formulations about the economic basis of communalism or the communalisation of the class struggle may seem overstated or too general but communitarian identities have always been underpinned and qualified by economic and class differences. The opposition to Hindu merchant-moneylender domination brought together the Hindu, Sikh and Muslim agrarian interests in the Punjab in the Unionist party. The Congress led popular and peasant movements but its mass base was limited. The Congress in the Punjab was weaker than in the United Provinces because it was perceived as a representative of urban Hindu groups and its Hindu Mahasabha rivals often stole the support that the Congress sought in the crucial years before partition. The Muslim League was able to destroy the support for the Unionist party by winning the

support of the landowners of western Punjab, forging an alliance with the pirs and sajjda nashins, a network that had been used by the British and the Unionist party earlier

The partition of Bengal has been regarded as a tragedy that could have been averted but for the imposition from above. Sarat Bose argued for a united autonomous Socialist Republic of Bengal and the idea also appealed to Suhrawardy who felt that the loss of Calcutta would weaken the economy of East Pakistan (Sugato Bose, Christopher Bayly and Tim Harper, pp. 292-301). Gandhi himself offered to act as Suhrawardy's honorary private secretary in May 1947 if he worked to retain Bengal for the Bengalis by nonviolent means (CWMG, Vol-LXXXVII, p. 460). Joya Chatterjee has argued that the *bhadralok* of Bengal had turned to a more Hindu nationalist position after the Communal Award of 1932 and weakened the social dominance of the upper castes in Bengal. In order to bolster their position, the *bhadralok* turned to the Depressed Castes to maintain their hold on the province. Sarat Chandra and the Hindu Mahasabha played an active role in creating a Hindu nationalist tendency. There was a strong movement by Hindus and a section of the Congress to call for the partition of Bengal in the late 1940s. This movement was popular in the eight Hindu majority districts of south-central Bengal (Joya Chatterjee, 1994). It was not the only trend in Bengal politics, but secular nationalism and socialist radicalism were not as robust as believed earlier.

Although there was the growth of a radical peasant movement in East Bengal, it had acquired a religious or communitarian perspective. Whether the peasants who supported the Krishak Praja party during the 1930s and 1940s were communal or not, they were no supporters of the Hindu landlords and the *bhadralok* (Tajul Hashmi). Some historians have argued that Muslim rent receivers were considered part of the peasant community but not Hindus in a similar economic position because of acceptance of insider exploitation (Partha Chatterjee). Anti-landlord and anti-moneylender legislation supported by the Krishak Praja party was viewed by Hindu *bhadralok* as anti-Hindu and communal. Radical initiatives were often seen in terms of their impact on specific communities. Advocates of Pakistan advised Muslim peasants during the Tebhaga movement: 'why agitate for a larger share of the crop when under Pakistan you would have it all?' For their part, the Hindu communalists reminded peasants of the plight of their co-religionists in Noakhali. The call for Direct Action by the League led to a

bloodbath in Calcutta in 1946 and killings in East Bengal strengthened fears of Muslim majority rule in a united Bengal.

There is a persistent belief that a mass movement in 1946-47 could have dissolved the communal tensions and a last anti-imperialist struggle could have helped to bring about national unity. Officers and soldiers of the Indian National Army created by Subhas Chandra Bose inspired Indians from all regions and communities, particularly in Punjab and Bengal. The postwar discontent was leading to peasant movements and protests in Bengal, Andhra and elsewhere. The grievances of the soldiers in the British Indian Army posted overseas and the mutiny of the naval ratings in 1946 led to hopes of a popular struggle against an emasculated British government in India. Although there were mass demonstrations in support of the INA officers and soldiers, the communal polarisation had also grown quite substantial. Some historians have noted the tendency of some peasant radicals to participate in communal movements. Others have observed that supporters of the INA, and some soldiers as well, were involved in communal violence during August 1946 in Calcutta.

The social discontent of the post-war period in combination with the communal polarisation did not bode well for an anti-imperialist struggle to combat the idea of Pakistan. Muslim mass contact had not worked well in the 1930s before the Muslim League had demonstrated its electoral strength. Any movement launched in a period of social tensions of the post-war years was bound to exceed the limits of non-violence prescribed by Gandhi. Therefore the option of a mass movement was not accepted by Gandhi. A movement launched by the left nationalists, with or without the support of the Congress, was unlikely to break the communal impasse produced by the fear of Hindu and Muslim majority rule. Members of the Muslim middle class and the capitalists had realised that a separate state was bound to give them a distinct advantage and they were unlikely to forego it. In Bengal not only did Muslim merchants like Ispahani favour Pakistan but the Marwaris of Calcutta also wanted to be free of Muslim domination (Claude Markovits). The left wing nationalists were too weak to influence the outcome of any mass movement and there were clear material and cultural rewards that members of the Muslim elite of Punjab and Bengal were unwilling to forego. The East Bengal assembly, however, voted against the partition of Bengal.

According to Joya Chatterjee, a section of the Hindu elite and the Congress were willing to go to any extent to escape the Muslim majority rule. They wanted to remain in power in the newly carved Hindu majority state of Bengal. At the time of the drawing up of the boundary of West Bengal, the Congress wanted to create a state “with an unequivocal Hindu majority, containing as few Muslims as possible” (J. Chatterjee, 2008, p39). In Punjab the problem of settling the demobilised soldiers would have posed a problem for peace as well as communal harmony if there was a confrontation between rival communities for dominance after the rout of the Unionist party. Therefore, the chances of a mass movement overcoming the problems posed by the demand for Pakistan were rather limited, but cannot be completely ruled out. The differences between him and the radicals and the left were too substantial for Gandhi to overlook when he suggested to the AICC that the Congress Working Committee leadership should be opposed and removed.

Check Your Progress

- What were the main causes and outcomes of the Quit India Movement of 1942?
- Describe the role of Subhas Chandra Bose and the Indian National Army (INA) in India's struggle for independence.

Unit – IV

Implications – Agriculture and Industry – Transport and Communication – Art and Architecture – Education - Local Self Government.

Objectives

- The development of transport and communication.
- The introduction of Local Self-Government under Lord Ripon in 1882.
- The British policies in agriculture led to commercialization.

To define the agriculture-industry continuum is not an easy task. For the high-income, developed countries the continuum is evident in a long, evolutionary process whereby countries that were overwhelmingly agricultural at some time in the nineteenth century were transformed into modern, industrial economies. This transformation took place even earlier in England. The transformation has been most apparent in the drastic change it brought about in the occupational composition of the labour force. However, a more fundamental feature of the economic transformation has been the growth of specialisation and increased economic interdependence between agriculture and the other sectors and among producing units throughout the economy.

This specialisation has had effects that have gone far beyond those emphasised by Adam Smith. It has, of course, facilitated increased use of capital equipment and of new sources of power, beginning with the steam engine, and these changes have multiplied the productivity of human labour. Other changes associated with the pervasive growth of specialisation and of differentiation in the roles of institutions and individuals have been even more significant than the increases in a country's capital stock and the increased scale of economic units needed to make efficient use of specialised machinery and the new sources of power. Simon Kuznets is undoubtedly right in suggesting that the most distinctive feature that sets modern economic growth apart from earlier periods of economic change is the extent to which economic activity has come to be based on science and science-based technologies. Specialised institutions - universities, research institutes^ the research and development departments of Industrial firms - and individual specialists scientists, inventors, innovating entrepreneurs - have created increasingly

productive methods for transforming resources into economically useful goods and services. And a tremendous increase in exchange, especially pronounced in the expanded exchange of intermediate products - steel of many types and forms, machines, sulphuric acid, cement, caustic soda and a host of other products - has been necessary for this growth of productivity based on specialisation and the application of scientific knowledge to economic activity.

What bearing do these interlinked changes associated with movement along the agriculture-industry continuum have on the problems of agricultural development? Let me begin to answer that question by briefly contrasting the position of agriculture in two countries at opposite ends of the agriculture-industry spectrum - the U.S. and Ethiopia. It is well known that in the U.S. only about five per cent of the country's labour force is engaged in growing crops and raising livestock. Even if we add the workers engaged in indirect agricultural production - in producing tractors, fertilisers and other inputs purchased by farmers - the percentage is still remarkably small. If we look back to the 1820's, however, we find that some 75 per cent of the U.S. work force was still engaged in agriculture. The proportion of the population engaged in nonfarm occupations at that time was obviously very small - although not quite as small as in Ethiopia today. Thus, the U.S. farm economy of 150 years ago had many of the characteristics of an agricultural sector that is still heavily oriented toward subsistence production.

The fact that farming activities were directed in large measure to satisfying the subsistence requirements of the farm household was a necessity - but it was also regarded as a virtue. A good farmer of that day was esteemed for being self-sufficient, restricting his monetary purchases to a very limited range of commodities that could not be produced within the family unit. With the expansion of both domestic and foreign markets for farm products, however, farming came to be oriented increasingly toward production for the market. By 1961, commercial sales of farm products were high enough to permit annual cash expenditures by the average farm household in the U.S. of about \$12,000, and 45 per cent of this total cash expenditure was devoted to production expenses, which do not include wages, rent and interest and tax payments as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. A considerable fraction of those farm production expenses represented intrasectoral transactions such as purchases of seed or livestock

feed from farms specialising in those lines of production. But the greater part represented purchases from the industrial sector, including outlays for the repair and operation of farm machinery. Although agricultural production continues to have some distinctive features because of its dependence on the soil and on the biological processes of plant and animal growth, the similarities between agriculture and other industries have become more important than the differences. As a result of the continuing advance in scientific knowledge and of research and development activity leading to the development of more efficient technologies, usually embodied in specialised capital equipment or other purchased inputs, increases in the productivity of agriculture and in other sectors have led to an enormous expansion in the productive capacity of the national economy. The growth of productivity In agriculture, for example, has been as dependent upon the development of more efficient techniques for the manufacture of chemical fertilisers and a wide range of Increasingly sophisticated farm equipment as on the improv-i;,,,,; of techniques employed within agriculture itself.

Turning to the opposite end of the spectrum, we have a country such as Ethiopia in which easily 85 per cent of the population is still dependent on agriculture for work and income. Agricultural productivity and per capita incomes are extremely low, and this Is in large measure inevitable given the high degree of self-sufficiency and the technologies employed in the semi-isolated village communities which are the dominating feature of the economy. Mot only Is a large fraction of farm output destined for the subsistence consumption of farm households, but most of the simple tools and other production inputs are provided within the farm household or perhaps by a village blacksmith or other local artisans, many of whom are also farmers. The specialisation that has evolved Is thus confined for the most part to the village community, and, apart from some Islands of modern agriculture, the knowledge that guides farm practices is based almost entirely on empirical insights that have been slowly and painfully acquired over many years. Very few of the farm households in these village communities are totally Isolated from the rest of the Ethiopian economy and the outside world. Some cash income is earned by sale of farm products through domestic commercial channels, but the domestic market outlets are inevitably small in relation to the number of farm units when only some 15 to 20 per cent of the population is dependent on purchased food. Probably

somewhat more important as a source of cash income for Ethiopia's farmers are the sales of coffee and other export products to consumers overseas. Nevertheless, according to a 1967 survey of farm expenditures which is probably an overestimate of the overall situation since it concentrated on provinces where coffee is grown, the total cash expenditures by the average farm household amounted to only \$130, just slightly over 1 per cent of the cash outlays by the average U.S. farm household in 1961. Only a quarter of the total represented farm production expenses, and about two-thirds of the outlays in that category were for the purchase of animals, a figure that may well reflect a bias in the sample but which is probably also inflated by the tendency to invest in livestock as a store of wealth, a tendency which is reinforced by the lack of alternative forms of financial assets.

On the other hand, the Ethiopian farmers covered by this survey allocated over 60 per cent of their cash expenditures to various consumer goods and services as a means of augmenting the very low level of consumption derived from subsistence production. In the U.S., the average farm household has pushed specialisation to such a degree that remarkably little food is produced for home consumption so that even farm households rely predominantly on purchased food. Nevertheless, purchases of food, drink and tobacco represented only 25 per cent of consumer expenditures in 1961; and the total outlay for all consumer goods and services amounted to only a third of all cash expenditures by farm households

These examples illustrate in a dramatic and somewhat extreme fashion the contrast between the high-income industrialised countries and late developing countries where the process of economic development has not yet brought about any very significant transformation of their predominantly agrarian structure. This subset of developing countries in which agriculture still accounts for some 60, 70 or 80 per cent of the total labour force and a large though smaller share of G.N.P., probably accounts for close to two-thirds of the world's population. Whatever the actual percentage may be, it is almost certainly an increasing fraction of the world total because of the rapid rates of population growth which are another distinctive feature of the late developing countries.

In our joint study of the reciprocal interactions between agricultural development and the expansion of manufacturing and other nonfarm sectors, Peter Kilby and I have

attempted to explore the ramifications of three conditioning factors which, in our view, are fundamental to an understanding of economic development and structural transformation in these countries. (This study, *Agricultural and Structural Transformation• Economic Strategies in Late Developing Countries*, is due to be published in 1975 by Oxford University Press.) The first of these conditioning factors is the simple fact of being late, a fact that creates exceedingly difficult problems but which also offers special opportunities. The principal potential advantage derives from the existence of an enormous technological backlog that contemporary developing countries can draw upon. Because of being spared the necessity of investing the time and resources that are required to produce useful knowledge, these countries have an opportunity to achieve very rapid economic growth. But that is not only an opportunity; it is also an imperative if truly disastrous consequences are to be avoided.

The existence of a large body of accumulated scientific knowledge and advanced technologies is a double-edged sword, a fact that is illustrated most dramatically by the half-completed demographic evolution that has been experienced by today's developing countries. The widespread impact of modern public health measures and other interventions — anti-malaria campaigns, mass inoculation programmes, local health centres or clinics able to dispense antibiotics and other drugs, improved transportation and the availability of free or concessional food imports to lessen the effects of drought or other calamities -- all of these have led to an unprecedented rapid reduction in mortality rates. Few would deny that this reduction in the number of premature deaths has been a great boon to the families affected. But, unlike the circumstances that characterised the demographic transition in the industrialised countries, this lowering of the death rate has not been accompanied by major changes in the structure or productive capacity of the economies. The fact that a rapid rate of growth of the total population is followed after a lag by even more rapid growth of the population of working age means that a high rate of expansion of employment opportunities outside agriculture is required in order for the nonfarm sectors to absorb more than a small fraction of the annual additions to the work force. But the experience of the past 25 years has demonstrated that even when non-agricultural production is expanding at rates of 5 or even.

The relatively capital-intensive and import-intensive character of much / of the investment that is taking place points to another dilemma. Because of being late-comers, these countries confront a large number of possibilities for increasing productivity in both industry and agriculture.. But this is a mixed blessing because of the strong possibility that many of the technologies that are borrowed will be ill-suited to their needs The contemporary industrialised countries evolved increasingly productive technologies as the frontiers of science and technical knowledge were expanded and as emerging scarcities of particular resources induced innovations to reduce demand for resources that were becoming more costly. Hence the technologies that are most readily available for transfer are by and large very capital-intensive because they were developed in response to a situation in which labour was becoming scarce and costly while capital was becoming a relatively abundant resource..

The likelihood of inappropriate technology transfer is, moreover, heightened by the distorted structure of relative prices which prevails in most developing countries as a consequence of the pursuit of a policy of import substitutio based on high levels of tariff protection, typically buttressed by foreign exchange controls, import licensing and quantitative restrictions on imports. In addition, the tariff structure and related restrictions usually have a very different Impact on capital goods as compared to final consumer goods. Because of a partial view of the development process and a strong preoccupation with the role of capital formation, governments have frequently allowed imports of machinery and other types of capital goods to enter duty free or at a very low tariff rate. At the same time, consumer goods are subject to tariff rates as high as 100 per cent or even more. It has been demonstrated that such a highly differentiated tariff structure is tantamount to subsidising the price of the capital goods that can be Imported duty free or at rates well below the average level of protection The effects of these foreign trade policies have generally been reinforced by certain other policies that have often been associated with them. Most pervasive in its effects is the practice of requiring institutional lenders, whether governmental or private, to charge Interest rates that are well below the opportunity cost of capital in these countries where capital, like foreign exchange, is an extraordinarily scarce resource. Accelerated depreciation allowances and the operation of both import and investment licensing also contribute to this underpricing of capital and

foreign exchange, relative to labour, by influencing the decisions of the modern sector firms that have preferential access to supplies of those scarce resources. The result is an inappropriately capital-intensive pattern of investment within a modern or formal sector of the economy which remains extremely small in terms of employment even though it absorbs 'a large fraction of the available resources of capital and foreign exchange.

A major consequence of this mix of policies is that economic growth does not lead to progress along the agriculture-industry continuum. Instead we typically witness an enormous gap, a veritable chasm, that separates a large agricultural sector still dominated by small, semi-subsistence farmers from a modern industrial sector of capital- and import-intensive enterprises which has many of the characteristics of an alien enclave.

This generalised picture of dualism between a traditional agriculture and a modern industrial sector is, of course, an oversimplification. First of all we must note that a similar dualism often exists within agriculture itself. Most of the burden of financing the inefficient expansion of a highly protected domestic industry is borne by the agricultural sector. This de facto tax is collected in part by turning the terms of trade against agriculture. Protected firms in the domestic industrial sector are the beneficiaries of the high prices that farmers must pay for consumer goods and inputs. Farmers also receive relatively low prices for their export products because of the existence of an over-valued exchange rate defended by the various curbs on imports. In addition, farmers are often obliged to pay an explicit export tax or a de facto tax represented by the frequently large difference between a marketing board's purchase price and the world price. During the past decade there has been increased awareness of this burden on agriculture, but too often the measures taken to redress the situation have favoured a sub-sector of atypically large and capital-intensive farm units at the expense of the great mass of the rural population. This consequence is obvious in the case of duty free imports of tractors and tax rebates for fuel; but it also applies in large measure to subsidised distribution of inputs and to credit made available at artificially low interest rates so that the limited supplies available from institutional sources must be allocated by some form of non-price rationing. Although farm input subsidies and low interest rates are frequently justified as being needed to help the poor farmer, in practice the larger farmers with greater wealth and political influence usually receive the lion's share of those scarce resources. In the

case of credit, the low-interest-rate policies also have adverse effects on the supply of savings and on the growth of financial intermediaries so that the typical farmer dependent on credit from non-institutional sources must pay a rate of interest even higher than warranted by the high opportunity cost of capital in a capital-scarce economy.

It is also necessary to recognize the role of firms in an informal sector engaged in small-scale manufacturing and a variety of service activities. These small-scale, labour-intensive units have many of the characteristics of agriculture as a self-employment sector in which a part of the labour force, unable to find employment in the modern or formal sector, manages to find some work and a meagre income.

I will deal very briefly with the other two conditioning factors which Kilby and I regard as fundamental to an understanding of the structural transformation process in late developing countries, I have already alluded to one of them in suggesting that the growth of productivity and output in agriculture can only be understood within the context of the interdependence between agriculture and other sectors. Certain facets of this interdependence have received considerable attention in the literature on agricultural development: (i) the need to expand production and commercial sales rapidly enough to meet the food requirements of a growing nonfarm population; (ii) the importance of achieving a net transfer of resources from agriculture to the faster growing nonfarm sectors; (iii) the role of agricultural exports as a source of expanded foreign exchange earnings to finance a growing volume of imports; and (iv) the so-called contribution of agriculture in providing a major part of the additional labour required by the nonfarm sectors. Because of the structural-demographic characteristics noted earlier, however, it is more to the point to emphasise the reciprocal contribution represented by the expansion of employment opportunities in the nonfarm sectors which initially slows the growth of the farm labour force and eventually permits a reduction in the absolute size of the work force in agriculture.

Other facets of this interdependence between agriculture and nonagriculture also have highly significant effects on development. In particular, it is essential to consider the level and composition of Intersectoral commodity flows. The extremely low level of farm cash receipts and expenditures epitomised by the Ethiopian situation illustrates the way in which the existing economic structure limits the volume of intersectoral commodity

flows. This constraint on the level of intersectoral commodity flows arises because, as noted earlier, the urban population dependent on purchased food is extremely small relative to the number of farm households. And because agricultural sales are thus limited, the farm sector's demand for manufactured consumer goods and purchased inputs such as fertiliser and farm equipment is subject to a severe purchasing power constraint. This is, of course, not a totally binding constraint. Expansion of agricultural exports can, especially in small countries, make it possible for farmers to expand their cash income at a rate considerably more rapid than would be possible with exclusive reliance on the domestic commercial market. Nevertheless, for the cash receipts accruing to the average farm household to reach a really high level requires a considerable transformation of the overwhelmingly agrarian structure of a late developing economy. This purchasing power constraint has some important implications. It means that the nature and time sequence of farm innovations and associated inputs will determine the proportion of a country's farm households that will be able to participate in the process of agricultural modernisation. And whether or not a country's agricultural strategy leads to wide participation of the rural population in technical and economic advance will, of course, exert a powerful influence on the composition of rural demand for consumer goods as well as farm inputs -- and thereby shape the pattern of industrial expansion to a considerable extent.

The final conditioning factor is closely related to the considerations that have just been mentioned. It concerns the interacting influence on the pattern of rural development of the size distribution of farm operational units and the type of technologies adopted. The average farm unit in a late developing country is inevitably small, but there can be great variation in the dispersion of farm size around the mean. For example, there is a striking difference between the relatively equal size distribution of farm operational units in Taiwan and the enormous contrast in Colombia between a very large number of small units cultivating but a small fraction of the agricultural land and a small number of very large farm holdings which account for the bulk of the cultivated area. Thus four-fifths of Taiwan's farms are within one acre of the mean farm size of three acres. In Colombia, however, only one-tenth of the farmsteads are within five acres of the mean farm size. The mean farm size of 56 acres is, in fact, a very misleading statistic. Most farm units are

much smaller, while most of the farm land is in holdings many times larger than the mean farm size; the largest one per cent of holdings are on average nearly 50 times larger than the mean farm size. Colombia is an extreme example of the concentration of land in large operational units, but whenever the expansion of agricultural production is concentrated in a sub-sector of large farms the size distribution will be quite highly skewed. To the extent that the large farms which comprise such a sub-sector dominate commercial sales of farm products, they will not be seriously constrained in rapidly expanding their use of purchased inputs of all kinds. The great bulk of the country's farm households will, however, be subject to a purchasing power constraint that will be even more binding than the structurally determined constraint discussed earlier. Hence, their ability to gradually modify their traditional farm technologies is bound to be severely restricted since most productivity-increasing innovations require some increase in purchased inputs.

What are the implications of those three conditioning factors for the choice of strategy for fostering agricultural development? I want to emphasise a few propositions suggested by these three factors which appear to deserve careful consideration in many if not all late developing countries

Clearly, one of the most demanding tasks that a successful development strategy must fulfill is to draw maximum advantage from the technological backlog while avoiding the pitfalls of borrowing inappropriate technologies, 'Getting prices right' can clearly assist in this task because a distorted structure of relative prices, especially underpricing of capital and foreign exchange, increases the likelihood that the technologies borrowed will be ill-suited to developing a country's resource endowment. There are, however, many other policy variables that exert a critical influence on both the rate and pattern of economic development.

The basic proposition that I want to stress is that an agricultural strategy that leads to the progressive modernisation of a large and increasing fraction of a country's small farms is of central importance to achieving rapid economic growth and structural change which involves the whole population in the transition from a predominantly agrarian society to a productive and diversified industrial economy. It is fairly obvious that widespread involvement of the rural population in this process of technical and economic change will bring greater benefits to the large fraction of the population dependent on

agriculture than a strategy that is concentrated on a sub-sector of large-scale farms using technologies that differ drastically from those employed by the great majority of farm units. It is less obvious,, but I believe that it can be demonstrated by historical evidence as well as logic, that a progressive modernisation strategy has significant economic as well as social advantages,

First of all, by achieving fuller mobilisation of a country's indigenous resources such a strategy minimises the agricultural sector's requirements for the particularly scarce resources of capital and foreign exchange - and thus facilitates more rapid structural transformation. A sequence of divisible innovations that can be used efficiently by small-scale farmers has the effect of complementing rather than displacing a country's relatively ,vundant labour resources. Moreover, by fostering widespread increases in the productivity of the land and labour already committed to the agricultural sector, it is possible to achieve large increases in _total factor productivity, i.e. in output per unit of total inputs. The experience of Japan and Taiwan is especially impressive in the extent to which increases in factor productivity, based mainly on divisible, yield-increasing innovations affecting millions of small farm units, has contributed to the expansion of agricultural production.

A pattern of agricultural development that promotes widespread improvement in income-earning opportunities in agriculture also leads to a relatively equal distribution of income among the rural population. As noted earlier, the composition of rural demand for consumer goods and farm inputs associated with such a pattern of income distribution can be expected to provide a valuable stimulus to the growth of domestic manufacturing output. Moreover, much of this expansion will be In relatively small firms employing technologies that are much less capital- and import-intensive than plants in the large-scale 'modern' sector which use technologies that differ only marginally from those used in high-income countries with drastically different factor proportions.

Furthermore, the pattern of structural transformation that results from widespread advances in productivity among the bulk of a country's farm households can be expected to make some highly significant contributions to the broader process of social modernisation. We must not lose sight of the fact that the transition from a low-income agrarian society to a high-income industrial economy must involve a good deal more than

changes in the economic sphere. Most obviously, if progress is not made in bringing birth rates into tolerable balance with sharply reduced death rates, disastrous consequences lie ahead. On the other hand, if the pattern of agricultural development and other factors influencing rural attitudes, motivation and behaviour facilitate a fairly rapid spread of family planning, a given rate of expansion of farm output will lead to more rapid growth of per capita income and thus a greater increase in purchasing power to be devoted to productive inputs as well as to raising consumption levels.

I will argue in a moment that a strategy of progressive modernisation is likely to accelerate the reduction of birth rates. In addition, such a strategy can be expected to generate considerable political and financial support for the expansion of education in rural areas and also for programmes to improve the health and nutrition of the rural population which supplement the effects of rising per capita incomes. I am impressed by the arguments put forward by Carl Taylor, Asok Mitra and others concerning the potential contribution of maternal and child care programmes which provide a package of health, nutrition and family planning services. It has been argued, and with a good deal of supporting evidence, that reductions in infant and child mortality, which give parents greater assurance that the children they already have will survive, are of great importance in overcoming resistance to the practice of family planning. The argument has also been advanced that the changed attitude to the future that seems to follow better health and nutrition enhances receptivity to the novel idea of consciously restricting family size. Of equal importance, however, is the fact that widespread involvement in the process of technical and economic change and the strengthening of institutions and communications networks, which are both cause and consequence of progressively modernising the agricultural sector, will have similar effects on rural attitudes toward family planning. Eva Mueller's analysis of the interrelations between socio-economic factors and the degree of acceptance of family planning among farm households in Taiwan provides considerable support for that proposition. In particular, she found that the expansion of economic horizons and the rising aspirations which have affected such a large fraction of Taiwan's farm households, though of course in varying degree, appear to have contributed very importantly to the acceptance of family planning in Taiwan. She suggests, however, that where agricultural improvement is confined to a small minority

of farmers, so that the great majority have no experience with progress and no reason to raise their sights, the changes in household preferences will be much less extensive than in Taiwan and the environment for the spread of family planning much less propitious.

Rather than elaborating further on the advantages of a strategy of progressive modernisation, I propose to consider a few of the formidable obstacles to designing and implementing such a strategy. Probably the most obvious obstacle is the opposition of politically powerful groups who see an advantage in a more dualistic pattern of development which favours a modern industrial sector and an enclave of modern, large-scale agriculture. A highly skewed distribution of the ownership of land may, of course, create a political and economic environment that is hostile to the widespread modernisation of small farm units. For that reason it is often claimed that land reform is a prerequisite for achieving such a pattern of agricultural development. I happen to be persuaded that redistributive land reform is likely to yield significant economic as well as social advantages, but needless to say, the fact that a number of my academic colleagues and I hold such a view has precious little bearing on the political realities in a particular country which will determine whether land reform is feasible or not. What I can say as an economist who has studied the problems of agricultural development for a good many years, is (that it is the size distribution of operational units, not ownership units, that is the crucial factor influencing the nature and sequence of technical innovations and thus the pattern of agricultural development. In addition, the weight of evidence seems to suggest that emphasis on rental ceilings or on the rhetoric of redistributive land reform without effective implementation is likely to be counterproductive .

Again I will make passing reference to experience in Japan and Taiwan. During the period prior to the land reforms carried out after the second World War, the widespread modernisation of small-scale farm units in those countries made a notable contribution to overall economic growth and structural change in spite of a highly skewed size distribution of ownership units. This was basically because the government's policies were effective in promoting the modernisation of the existing small-scale farming system, and the large landowners aimed at maximising their wealth by renting out their land to small-scale tenants or part-tenants rather than undertaking direct cultivation. I am mindful of the fact that the situation was one of great hardship for many tenant households. It is

certainly to be hoped that with improved opportunities for rapid economic growth and the possibility of supplementing domestic resources with loans and grants from abroad small-scale farmers in developing countries today will have an easier passage to the position which has now been reached in Japan and Taiwan where the growth of employment opportunities throughout the economy has greatly improved the returns to labour in agriculture as well as in the nonfarm sectors. I would emphasise, however, following an observation made by Clifford Geertz in comparing Japan's experience with that of Indonesia, that in Japan, and also in Taiwan, the hardships borne by the farmers were not in vain because in both countries the pervasive modernisation of the existing small-scale farming systems made a notable contribution to the transformation of the agrarian economies. I would also argue, though without pursuing the matter here⁴ the merits of a land tax which insures that a sizeable fraction of the differential rent accruing to farm land is mobilised by government units to finance investments in infrastructure and other development programmes.

It may well be that in some situations, especially in Latin America, land reform is a necessary condition for pursuing a strategy of progressive modernisation, but it would be overly pessimistic to argue that it is always a precondition. More generally, I would suggest that two other sets of problems are likely to be more difficult than the political obstacles in implementing an agricultural strategy aimed at the progressive modernisation of the agricultural sector. First are the many challenging problems of organisation and implementation which are involved in fostering technical and economic progress among millions of small-scale farmers. These are issues which have already received considerable attention at the Seminar, and I merely reiterate that they are complex and of crucial importance.

The other problem area relates to the difficulty of reaching an effective consensus on the type of agricultural strategy to be pursued, a problem which compounds the difficulty of making the decisions needed to devise and implement a coherent set of policies and programmes. It appears to me that this is a problem which applies as much to donor agencies as to the governments of developing countries.

Let me illustrate this problem by briefly sketching two alternative reactions to the challenges faced by developing countries which differ from the ideas I have advanced in

opposite ways. One response has been to argue that the problem of increasing agricultural output at a sufficiently rapid rate is so enormous and urgent that it must be regarded as an overriding concern. Thus David Hopper stated, on the basis of his considerable involvement with India's agricultural problems during the 1960's, that increased food production must be regarded as "the priority objective. In the same paper, he went on to assert "that if the pursuit of production is made subordinate to other aims, the dismal record of the past will not be altered"; and he specifically rejects the idea that tractor mechanisation should be discouraged because of what he describes as "its assumed impact on rural labour-force employment", the argument being that such policies would interfere with an increase in multiple cropping. Hopper and many others thus view the key policy issue as a choice between efficiency and equity. In emphatically opting efficiency, they dismiss goals other than the maximisation of farm output and give short shrift to the view that the efficiency of an agricultural strategy should be assessed in relation to its contribution to the multiple goals which, in my opinion, should be furthered by the modernisation of the agricultural sector. Hopper also gives little attention to the influence of the size distribution of operational units on the choice of techniques. It will be clear from my earlier remarks that I would contend that labour shortages are not likely to be a serious constraint on multiple cropping except on a typically large operational units, especially if small farmers have access to simple and inexpensive equipment of good design to ease emerging labour bottlenecks.

According to the second of these alternative viewpoints, the problem of transforming a traditional economy and achieving widespread improvements in the wellbeing of the population is not really very formidable if only the country's political leaders have the 'will' to plan the country's development appropriately. In this view, it is the cupidity and corruption of powerful vested interests that are the important obstacles to progress. Given a strong commitment to economic planning for the benefit of the whole population, the problems of low productivity and poverty could be readily overcome. My doubts about that view stem from a conviction that the most effective governmental strategy for promoting rapid and efficient agricultural development is one that emphasises changing the production possibilities available to individual farmers. Such a strategy requires a combination of (1) agricultural research that generates technical

innovations adapted to the needs of small-scale farm units with limited cash income and purchasing power; (2) farmer training programmes to assist in diffusing knowledge of more productive, scientifically based technologies; (3) investments in irrigation, rural roads and other types of infrastructure; (4) programme to improve the marketing of farm products and the distribution of inputs; and (5) appropriate and consistent policies related to prices, taxation and land tenure. Such a strategy is based on a recognition of the significant advantages of decentralised decision-making by individual farmers and the fact that the price mechanism fulfills a critical and inherently difficult communications function by harmonising decentralised decisions and by harnessing the powerful motive of profit. On my reading of the evidence available, which I confess is based more on the well-documented experience of the Soviet Union than the approach pursued in China about which we know much less, detailed planning for the agricultural sector is less effective than a strategy which concentrates on improving the technical and economic environment in which individual farmers operate.

According to another point of view, the shortcomings of the economic policies and of the past two decades, with their focus on the goal of increasing G.N.P. to the neglect of concerns about employment and income distribution, are deplored, but the emphasis is on direct measures to expand employment opportunities through massive rural works programmes and similarly large-scale programmes of nutrition intervention and other direct measures to improve the health and wellbeing of the population groups which have been by-passed as a result of development policies mainly benefiting the 'modern' sub-sectors in Industry and agriculture. As I mentioned earlier, I am persuaded that maternal and child care programmes which deliver a package of health, nutritional and family planning services to rural as well as urban areas merit high priority because the benefits of such programmes promise to be large relative to the costs. Yet, except for a few very selective activities, I am skeptical about the prospects for undertaking direct welfare programmes on a sufficient scale to have a substantial impact. In countries where poverty is a huge and pervasive problem, it seems unrealistic to expect programmes based on the redistribution of income financed by taxation of the wealthier groups to be more than a mere palliative. Hence, it is essential to promote widespread increases in

employment and in income-earning opportunities as an integral part of a country's strategy for agricultural development.

I would like to conclude my treatment of this large topic by mentioning two issues which appear to be of critical importance to the success of efforts to achieve the progressive modernisation of agriculture. It has often been emphasised that improved seed-fertiliser combinations have a key role to play because they represent a divisible innovation that can be used efficiently by small farmers, and the potential for achieving substantial yield increases is usually very great. The rapid rise in fertiliser prices during the past three or four years has, however, raised doubts about the viability of this approach in the years ahead. This issue involves a host of complex questions about fertiliser manufacturing technologies, the cost and availability of raw materials and the location of fertiliser plants. The conclusion that I draw from recent studies by the World Bank Fertiliser Study Group and other organisations is that there are sound reasons to expect fertilisers to again become an abundant and relatively low-cost input within the next four or five years. Although it seems probable that the OPEC countries will be able to continue to maintain petroleum prices at recent high levels, it seems unlikely that monopoly pricing of fertiliser exports will be possible. Especially in the case of nitrogen fertilisers, the rather wide availability of supplies of natural gas, supplies that are large relative to the amounts required for fertiliser production, and the low opportunity cost of this input in many countries make it profitable to expand production capacity even on the assumption that prices will decline considerably from current levels. There is, however, a large question whether the necessary investment decisions to expand capacity will be made rapidly enough to eliminate the present excess demand situation in a reasonably short time. There is also a danger that the current high prices will encourage governments in a number of importing countries to build smallscale, high-cost plants with the result that their farmers will be obliged to rely on expensive fertiliser from domestic sources rather than having access to low-cost imports.

The manufacture of nitrogen fertiliser, being an extraordinarily capitalintensive process that is characterised by substantial economies of scale up to a minimum capacity of at least 1,000 tons of ammonia per day, is a line of production that is particularly ill-suited to low-income countries with an abundance of labour and a severe shortage of

capital. On the other hand, a number of the petroleumproducing developing countries which have large supplies of investable funds and cheap natural gas, most of which is currently being flared, have a large comparative advantage compared to countries without natural gas and probably even in comparison with producers in Europe and North America who have access to natural gas but at higher opportunity cost.

In contrast to fertiliser production, where the end products and manufacturing techniques offer little scope for adaptation to differences in factor prices, the expanded manufacture of farm equipment in developing countries offers promise of making significant contributions to agricultural development and industrial growth. To realise this potential, however, certain conditions must be fulfilled. Increases in agricultural productivity and the growth of farm cash income must be spread widely so as to generate demand for relatively simple and inexpensive items of farm equipment that can be produced efficiently by relatively small-scale, labour-intensive and capital-saving firms which have not yet reached a high degree of technical sophistication. In some countries, notably in tropical Africa, the indigenous skills in foundry work and other metal working activities are still very limited. Some countries are making special efforts to stimulate rural industrialisation: for example, the Rural Industrial Development Centres, Village Polytechnics and Technical Institutes in Kenya. Those efforts are not likely to amount to much, however, unless the efforts to expand production capabilities by technical assistance and training are matched by an expanding demand for a widening range of products of modest but growing sophistication which can be produced by such firms.

The sharp increase in fuel prices and in the cost of tractors and spare parts seems to be having a dampening effect on the enthusiasm for the direct transfer¹ of mechanical technologies from the high-income, developed countries. By the same token, these conditions are sharpening interest in the possibility of easing labour bottlenecks and increasing the timeliness and precision with which farm operations can be performed by improving the range of animal-powered equipment and by the gradualspread of many other types of inexpensive equipment that can make a very broad contribution to increasing the productivity of farm labour and at the same time stimulate progress along the agriculture-industry continuum, leading to economy-wide increases in productivity, output and employment opportunities.

Transport

From the beginning of history, human sensitivity has revealed an urge for mobility leading to a measure of Society's progress. The history of this mobility or transport is the history of civilization. For any country to develop with right momentum modern and efficient Transport as a basic infrastructure is a must. It has been seen throughout the history of any nation that a proper, extensive and efficient Road Transport has played a major role. 'Transporters' perform one of the most important activities, at every stage of advanced civilization. Where roads are considered as veins and arteries of a nation, passenger and goods transported are likened to blood in circulation. Passenger Road Transport Service (PRTS) is an essential connected to the economic development. Transport is the essential convenience with which people not just connect but progress. Throughout history, people's progress has been sustained on the convenience, speed and safety of the modes of transport. Road transport occupies a primary place in to-day's world as it provides a reach unparalleled by any other contemporary mode of transport.

Transport (British English) or transportation (American English) is the movement of people and goods from one place to another. The term is derived from the Latin trans ("across") and portare ("to carry").

Functions of Transport

1. Transport contributes in Growth of industries whose product requires quick marketing. Perishable articles like fish and green vegetables are carried to various consumers quickly even in distant markets through transport.
2. Transport helps in increase in the demand for goods. Through transport newer customers in newer places can be easily contacted and products can be introduced to them. Today markets have become national or international only because of transport.
3. Transport creates place utility. Geographical and climatic factors force industries to be located in particular places far away from the markets and places where there may not be any demand for the products. Transport bridges the gap between production and consumption centers.

4. Transport creates time utility. Of late transport has started creating the time utility also. It has been made possible by virtue of the improvements in the speed of transport. It helps the product to be distributed in the minimum possible time.
5. Transport helps in stabilization of price. Transport exerts considerable influence upon the stabilization of the prices of several commodities by moving commodities from surplus to deficit areas. This equalizes the supply and demand factor and makes the price of commodities stable as well as equal.
6. Transport ensures even flow of commodities into the hands of the consumers through out the period of consumption.
7. Transport enables the consumers to enjoy the benefits of goods not produced locally. This increases the standard of living, an essential factor for further development of marketing and economy.
8. Transport intensifies competition, which in turn, reduces prices. Prices are also reduced because of the facilities offered by transport for large-scale production. Advantages of large-scale production is possible only due to transport.
9. Transport increases mobility of labor and capital. It makes people of one place migrate to other places in search of jobs. Even capital, machineries and equipments are imported from foreign countries through transport alone.

Means of Transport

The means of transport are classified on the basis of the way, the vehicle, the motive power used and terminals.

Pathways:

In remote villages, forest and hilly areas pathways are still an important amongst the different modes of transport. It further be subdivided into Head loads (is also known as human transport. It is used in the hilly areas where even animals cannot reach) and Pack animals (is also known as animal transport. It is used in the backward areas. The animals like horse, pony, donkey, ass, buffaloes, camel, elephant, yak, sheep etc. are used for this purpose.

Roadways:

Road Transport is one of the most important modes of transport. The history of Road Transport started from ancient civilizations. Gradually it becomes more and more

popular means of transport. Road Transport further subdivided into Vehicular Transport (Cars, Trucks, Buses, Lorries, Autorickshaws, Bullock Carts, Tongas, Tumtums, and Hand Carts etc.) and Non-vehicular Transport (Hamals, Animals like Camel, Dogs, Elephant, Horse, Mules etc.).

Tramways:

Tramway is one of the cheaper, longer, quicker and safer modes of Land Transport which is suitable in large cities. However due to certain limitations like slowness, huge investment, inflexibility etc. gradually it replaced by other means of Land Transport.

Railways:

Railway has been the pioneer of modern mechanical transport. It has brought the greatest revolution in transport. It accelerated commercial and industrial development of various countries. Until the introduction of Motor Transport, Railway had the monopoly as the Land Transport. In India, it is the principal means of transport. It carries over 80 per cent of goods traffic and over 70 per cent of passenger traffic. It provides for more than 60000 kilometers of railways all over the country.

Water Transport

Water transport is the cheapest and the oldest form of transport for heavy goods and bulk cargoes. Waterways are the natural gifts, hence it does not require large amount of capital expenditure for the construction of road and railway tracks, except canal transport, as in the case of land transport. In addition to that the cost of running is also very less.

Air Transport

Air transport is the gift of twentieth century to the world. It is the latest means of transport. The first flight in the air was made in 1903 only for twelve seconds. Successfully it was used as a means of transport after the First World War (1914-1918). The first air service was started in 1919 between London and Paris. Since then it has made notable progress and provide tough competition to Railways. Air Transport can again be subdivided into passenger and cargo.

Transportation in India

A well-knit and coordinated system of transport plays an important role in the sustained economic growth of a country. The transport system in India comprises a number of distinct modes and services, notably railways, roads, road transport, ports, inland water transport, coastal shipping, airports, and airlines. Railways and roads are the dominant means of transport carrying more than 95% of total traffic generated in the country. Although other modes such as coastal shipping and inland water transport would play a greater role, the railways and roads would continue to dominate the transport landscape in the foreseeable future.

Road Transport in India

A good road network is a critical infrastructure requirement for rapid growth. It provides connectivity to remote areas; provides accessibility to markets, schools, and hospitals; and opens up backward regions to trade and investment. Roads also play an important role in inter-modal transport development, establishing links with airports, railway stations, and ports.

India has one of the largest road networks in the world, of 33.14 lakh km, consisting of (i) national highways (NHs), (ii) State highways (SHs), (iii) major district roads (MDRs), and (iv) RRs that include other district roads and village roads. NHs with a length of 66590 km comprises only 2.0% of the road network but carry 40% of the road-based traffic. SHs with a length of about 137000 km and MDRs with a length of 300000 km together constitute the secondary system of road transportation which contributes significantly to the development of the rural economy and industrial growth of the country. The secondary system also carries about 40% of the total road traffic, although it constitutes about 13% of the total road length. RRs, once adequately developed and maintained, hold the potential to provide rural connectivity vital for generating higher agricultural incomes and productive employment opportunities besides promoting access to economic and social services.

Rail transport in India:

Railways are ideally suited for long distance travel and movement of bulk commodities. Regarded better than road transport in terms of energy efficiency, land use, environment impact and safety it is always in forefront during national emergency.

Indian Railways, a historical legacy, are a vital force in our economy. Spanning nearly two centuries Indian Railways has been serving the country with utmost pride. It was only in 1851 when the first train ran in the country for hauling construction material in Roorkee and by 16th April 1853 the first passenger train service became operational running between Bori Bunder, Bombay and Thane. Fourteen railway carriages carried about 400 guests from Bombay to Thane covering a distance of 21 miles, thus marking the formal birth of rail network in India. Since then there has been no looking back. It is interesting to note that though the railways were introduced to facilitate the commercial interest of the British it played an important role in unifying the country.

Water Transport in India:

India has a long coastline, about 90% of sea borne trade is handled via major ports of Kandla, Mumbai, Nhava Sheva, Marmagao, Cochin, Tuticorin, Chennai, Vishakapatnam, Paradwip, Haldia, Goa and Kolkata.

India is bordered by Bay of Bengal, Arabian Sea and Indian Ocean and has a coastline of more than 7,000 kms. It has an extensive network of inland waterways and seaports. The inland waterways include rivers, canals, backwaters and creeks. The total navigable length of inland waterways is 14,500 km. Inland Waterways Authority of India (IWAI) is the statutory authority in charge of the waterways in India. There are three national waterways in India: Allahabad Haldia stretch of the Ganga Bhagirathi Hooghly river, Sadiya Dhubri stretch of the Brahmaputra river system and Kollam Kottapuram stretch of West Coast Canal along with Champakara canal and Udyogmandal canal. These waterways also attract tourists from all parts of the world, thus promoting Indian travel & Tourism. There are also many hotels and resorts in these areas to cater to the lodging needs of the tourists. There are 12 major ports and about 180 minor and intermediate ports in India. With the ports handling more than 95% of the trade in India, they act as the major gateway for trade. The major ports in India are Calcutta, Haldia, Paradip, Visakhapatnam, Ennore, Chennai, Tuticorin, Cochin, New Mangalore, Mormugao, JNPT, Mumbai and Kandla.

Air Transport in India:

Air travel is a fastest means to reach in any part of the world. Domestic air services are looked after by Indian airlines and private airlines while the international

airport service is looked after by Air India. Mumbai, Chennai, Kolkata and Delhi are the four major international airports of India.

Air transport being the most modern and the quickest mode of transport has been gaining popularity. However, the exorbitant rates have made it the mode of travel of the rich or of the business community for whom time is more expensive than air travel. But the entry of private Airlines and their various schemes have reduced airfare drastically. The recent tax relaxation on air fuel and such sops will further make air travel within the reach of a greater section of the Indian Populace.

India had bilateral air services agreements with 93 countries as on May 31, 1999. Air India Limited is the major international carrier of the country. It operates services to USA Europe, the Russian Confederation, the Gulf/Middle East, East Asia, Far East and Africa. Air India owns a fleet of 26 aircraft consisting of six B-747-200, two B747-300 (Combi), seven B747-400, three A 300-B4 and eight A 310-300 aircraft. During 1998-99, Air India carried 3.15 million passengers as against 3.06 million in 1997-98.

Indian Airlines is the major domestic air carrier of the country. It operates to 57 domestic stations (including Alliance Air operations) and 17 international stations in 14 countries, viz., Pakistan, Maldives, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Thailand, Singapore, UAE, Oman, Myanmar, Kuwait, Qatar and Bahrain. Its operations, including Alliance Air cover 76 destinations including 16 abroad. The Airlines owns a fleet of eleven A-300, thirty A-320, twelve B737 and three Dornier -228 aircraft. All Boeing B-737 aircrafts are being operated by its wholly owned subsidiary Alliance Air.

The domestic scene is now dotted with private airlines as the government has now very wisely ended the monopoly of Indian Airlines. The International service is however, still the monopoly of Air India as the private operators are only allowed to operate within the country. Some of the leading domestic private airlines are Air Sahara, Jet Airways and Air Deccan. The government has been in the process of disinvestment of both Indian Airlines and Air India for the betterment of services.

Pawan Hans Helicopters Limited has been providing helicopter support services to the petroleum sector including ONGC, Oil India Limited and Hardy Exploration at Chennai. Apart from these, it also provides services to certain state governments and public sector undertakings and in the northeastern states.

Foreign airlines carrying international passenger traffic to and from India existed long before Independence. Their operations are governed by bilateral agreements signed from time to time between the Government of India and the governments of respective countries. In 1980-81, the number of such airlines was 35. It rose to 49 in 1996-97. The share of foreign airlines in India's scheduled international traffic has increased. In 1971, their share was 55.58 per cent, which went up to 65 per cent and declined to 58 per cent during 1972-75. It fell to 55.72 per cent in 1976 and further to 55.02 per cent in 1977. Between 1978 and 1990 it gradually increased and rose to 75.93 per cent. In 1996, the share was nearly 72 per cent.

The development of airports is no longer solely under the public sector; instead private participation is allowed and encouraged. An International green field airport has been developed in Cochin, Kerala, with contributions from NRIs and loans from financial institutions. Approval for the reconstruction of four Metro Airports (Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and Chennai) has been given to make them world class. New International airports are to be set up in Bangalore, Hyderabad and Goa with the help of the private sector. In the past few years, several investments have been made in the Indian air industry to make use of its vast unutilized air transport network. Many low cost air carriers have also entered the Indian market in the past two to three years.

Communication: Meaning and Concept

Communication establishes relationships and makes organizing possible. Every message has a purpose or objective. The sender intends -- whether consciously or unconsciously -- to accomplish something by communicating. In organizational contexts, messages typically have a definite objective: to motivate, to inform, to teach, to persuade, to entertain, or to inspire. This definite purpose is, in fact, one of the principal differences between casual conversation and managerial communication. Effective communication in the organization centers on well-defined objectives that support the organization's goals and mission.

Supervisors strive to achieve understanding among parties to their communications. Organizational communication establishes a pattern of formal communication channels to carry information vertically and horizontally. (The organization chart displays these channels.) To ensure efficient and effective

accomplishment of objectives, information is exchanged. Information is passed upward from employees to supervisors and laterally to adjacent departments. Instructions relating to the performance of the department and policies for conducting business are conveyed downward from supervisors to employees. The organization carries information from within the department back up to top management. Management furnishes information about how things are going, notifies the supervisor of what the problems are, and provides requests for clarification and help. Supervisors, in turn, keep their employees informed and render assistance. Supervisors continually facilitate the process of gaining necessary clarification and problem solving; both up and down the organization. Also, supervisors communicate with sources outside the organization, such as vendors and customers.

Communication is the process by which a message or information is exchanged from a sender to a receiver. For example a production manager (sender) may send a message to a sales manager (receiver) asking for sales forecasts for the next 6 months so they can plan production levels. The sales manager would then reply (feedback) to the production manager with the appropriate figures.

Implications of Communication

Communication plays a vital role in personal, professional, and societal contexts, influencing relationships, business success, and social harmony. One of the primary implications of communication is the facilitation of understanding between individuals and groups. Effective communication fosters clarity, reduces misunderstandings, and enhances cooperation. In professional settings, strong communication skills improve teamwork, leadership, and decision-making, leading to increased productivity and organizational success. Additionally, in the digital age, communication has evolved with technological advancements, enabling instant global interactions through emails, social media, and video conferencing. However, ineffective communication can lead to conflicts, misinformation, and workplace inefficiencies. In personal relationships, clear and empathetic communication strengthens bonds and resolves conflicts amicably. Moreover, communication has ethical and cultural implications, as it reflects social norms, values, and beliefs. Misinterpretations due to cultural differences may create barriers, making cultural sensitivity and adaptability essential. Furthermore,

communication is a powerful tool in governance and politics, influencing public opinion and policy-making. Media communication shapes societal perceptions and trends, making responsible communication crucial in maintaining social stability. Overall, the implications of communication extend across various spheres of life, highlighting its importance in fostering effective interactions, minimizing misunderstandings, and promoting personal and professional growth.

Implications of Art and Architecture in India

Art and architecture in India have profound implications on its cultural, social, economic, and historical landscape. Indian art and architecture, from ancient times to the modern era, reflect the diverse heritage and traditions of the country. The architectural marvels of the Indus Valley Civilization, such as the well-planned cities of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro, highlight the advanced urban planning and engineering skills of early Indian societies. The grand temples of South India, including the Brihadeeswara Temple and Meenakshi Temple, demonstrate the artistic excellence and religious devotion of their time. Similarly, the cave temples of Ajanta and Ellora showcase the integration of sculpture and painting in spiritual expression.

The implications of Indian art and architecture extend beyond aesthetics, influencing social structures and cultural narratives. Religious architecture, including Hindu temples, Buddhist stupas, and Islamic mosques, has shaped spiritual practices and communal identities. The construction of monumental structures like the Taj Mahal, Qutub Minar, and Red Fort symbolizes the grandeur of various dynasties and their contributions to India's rich architectural heritage. Furthermore, colonial architecture, as seen in structures like the Victoria Memorial and Rashtrapati Bhavan, reflects the fusion of Indian and European design elements.

Economically, art and architecture contribute significantly to tourism, generating revenue and employment opportunities. Heritage sites attract millions of visitors, fostering economic development in surrounding areas. The preservation and restoration of historical monuments are essential for maintaining India's cultural identity and ensuring their longevity for future generations. Additionally, modern Indian architecture, influenced by global trends, continues to evolve while incorporating sustainable and eco-friendly designs.

The impact of Indian art and architecture is also evident in social and political movements. Artistic expressions, such as paintings, sculptures, and murals, have been used to convey social messages and historical narratives. Traditional art forms like Madhubani, Warli, and Tanjore paintings preserve regional artistic heritage and provide livelihood to artisans. Architectural innovations, including smart cities and green buildings, demonstrate the adaptability of Indian architecture to contemporary needs. In conclusion, the implications of art and architecture in India are vast and multifaceted, shaping cultural identities, economic growth, and historical consciousness. From ancient monuments to modern structures, Indian architecture and art continue to be a testament to the country's creativity, resilience, and evolving traditions. Preserving and promoting this heritage is crucial for fostering national pride and sustaining India's rich artistic legacy.

Implications of Education in India

Education in India plays a crucial role in shaping the socio-economic and cultural landscape of the country. As a fundamental right, education has far-reaching implications for individual growth, national development, and global competitiveness. Historically, India's education system has evolved from the ancient Gurukul system, where students lived with their teachers, to modern institutions that cater to diverse fields of knowledge. The establishment of universities like Nalanda and Takshashila in ancient times reflects India's early commitment to higher learning. During the colonial period, Western-style education was introduced, leading to significant changes in society and governance. Post-independence, the Indian government prioritized education, resulting in the expansion of primary, secondary, and higher education institutions.

One of the key implications of education in India is its role in economic growth. A well-educated population enhances productivity, innovation, and technological advancements. The rise of India's IT and engineering sectors is a testament to the impact of quality education. Government initiatives such as the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, and Skill India Mission aim to improve literacy rates, vocational training, and research capabilities. Education also influences social equity by empowering marginalized communities through affirmative action policies, scholarships, and reservations in educational institutions. Women's education has led to increased workforce participation, improved healthcare outcomes, and greater gender equality.

Culturally, education fosters awareness, critical thinking, and national integration. It promotes understanding of India's rich heritage, diverse traditions, and democratic values. Schools and universities serve as platforms for fostering creativity, leadership, and civic responsibility among students. Education also plays a pivotal role in addressing social challenges such as poverty, unemployment, and population control. By promoting scientific temperament and rational thinking, education helps in combating superstitions and outdated beliefs.

However, challenges such as regional disparities, inadequate infrastructure, and outdated curricula hinder the full realization of education's potential. Rural and underprivileged areas often lack access to quality education, leading to a digital divide in the modern era. The commercialization of education and the high cost of private institutions further exacerbate inequalities in learning opportunities. Addressing these challenges requires increased investment in education, teacher training, and digital learning initiatives.

Education in India has profound implications on economic development, social transformation, and cultural preservation. By ensuring inclusive and quality education for all, India can harness its demographic dividend and emerge as a global knowledge hub. Strengthening the education sector through policy reforms, technology integration, and equitable access remains crucial for the nation's progress in the 21st century.

Local Self Government

In the contemporary times the term local government has been a major focus of all state governments of India to deal the local affairs. The success of the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) depends upon the local participation and deliberation to enhance the local democracy and development of the community as a whole. PRIs is a system where all officials and non-officials take part in the discussion as we can say this is an interaction forum which started its journey from 1990s. The democratic decentralization in India faces several challenges which have its roots since ancient period. Kautily's Arthashastra is the best example of some indications of the government affairs. The history of the PRIs can be traced back to its evolution since British times. The requirement of local self-government in rural India is to resolve local disputes. During British period, the local-self governments were regulating without constitutional provisions but had

some democratic decentralization process. This process received its special significance from Lord Ripon and Lord Mayo's seminal contribution to village panchayat for the administration of local villages in order to associate people to solve local problems (Mathew, 2013). It is possible when state governments are more concentrated on village administration. In the local self-government, the PRIs will be an important driving force for the implementation of the state-sponsored schemes. It has to be worked out from the bottom level as Aristotle and other scholars hailed the local administration system as the best possible system of governance where local interactions will take place. In democracy the decentralization is a concomitant.

However, the self-government, self-management, mutual co-operation and sharing of views are the important elements of local-government. Despite this, political equality, freedom and equity are also the essence of the local self-government. In view of the current rise of new panchayat raj institutions in postindependence there are three generations of the system (Datta, 2009). The primary focus was to boast a new local democratic set-up where public views will be considered as first priority with peoples friendly relations with local leaders and state itself. The idea of local self-government during pre-colonial period was on a trajectory way due to the lack of constitutional sanction and conceptual clarity. Lord Ripon and Lord Mayo, their figure is overwhelming because their contribution of democratic decentralization in rural India. In 1882, the Ripon's resolution to improve Indian rural political structure which the villages would be area where local power must be transformed. Since then, the local self-government has been running with local stakeholders with the help of local leaders

The article 40 of the Indian constitution envisaged about structure of panchayati raj institution. Many leaders such as Gandhi and Ambedkar located local democracy where all electorates would participate in the discussion. This vision was a major challenge for them because the Indian social structure is a caste rigidity structure where Dalits were treated as untouchable or impure (Malik, 2023, Malik, 2021). This practice became difficult to have political democracy without social equality. Therefore Ambedkar demanded political democracy would possible when there is social equality. Even he argued that in the village panchayat the landlord and upper caste have already

captured the power and panchayat will be an instrument for them to oppress the marginalized groups.

Therefore participation is a most important driving force to accelerate the local political affairs. Most of the country's local government found maximum participation through the decentralized process to strengthen the local bodies. It also realized that in countries like Canada, China, Philippines, Uganda, Honduras, Namibia, Tanzania, Nepal, Bolivia Colombia and others where the people's participation has been considered as legal participation where all stakeholders take part in the discussion (Datta, 2019). But India is no exception in this regard because having worlds populous country it needs wider participation of the people irrespective of caste, colour, creed, sex etc. in its political process.

Local self-government after Independence

The post-independent India institutionalized the local government through the Balvantrai Mehta Committee in which some believe that birth of PRIs took place through this committee in 1957. This committee recommended there must be three-tiered elective institutions Gram Panchayat at the bottom level, Panchayat samiti at the intermediate block level and Zilla Parishad at the top. This can be called the first generations of PRIs. The committee also submitted its report that PRIs would be representative bodies and increase democratic institutions in order to mobilize local resources and take all actions plans for rural development and social justice. After that, the state of Rajasthan became the first state in independent India implemented the PRIs following the Balvantrai Mehta Committee in 1957. The first generation of local self-government particularly PRIs witnessed a widespread distrust from their very inception due to centralization of power. The bureaucracy was not in the favour of power transfer with people but had to accept the panchayat raj system because of the majority political support for it.

However, in 1960s, the bureaucratization had gained immense ground and maximum focus was given to production oriented programmes to meet the increasing demand for food which increased the hold of the bureaucracy. After Rajasthan, several other states legislated their PRIs for the transfer of power and development. In 1964, the state of Odisha for the first time legislated its PRIs and gave final ratification to the village panchayats. The second generation started from 1977 when Ashok Mehta

Committee recommended two-tiered system of panchayati raj system under Janata Government to overlook the major aspects of PRIs but this recommendation has very least impact on rural development. Although the Committee's recommendations were designed to enquire the poor accomplishment of PRIs, the implementations were not accepted because of changing of the government at the central level. After struggling for about 11 years, however, the government of India immediately took the new plan in the form of the Constitutional (64th) Amendment Bill, to all the weaknesses of panchayati raj (Hirway, 1989). The objectives of the bill were to end the local corruption, seek transfer of power to the local people, and enshrine democracy at grassroots on the one hand and finish local brokers and middlemen in local politics. Unfortunately, the bill passed in the Lok Sabha but could not be approved by the Rajya Sabha in 1989. This may be called the beginning of third generation of panchayati raj. Subsequently, under the P. V. Narasimha Rao government, the congress government further reintroduced the Bill in Lok Sabha in 1991 with deletion of controversial aspects in the draft proposal. Finally the bill came to be considered as 73rd CAA, 1992 and received its final ratification in 1993 having much attention to improve local governance and giving gender justice to all sections of the individuals including transgender too.

The starting of third generation seeks to give panchayati raj a new conducive environment with prime importance to the Gram Sabha (village meeting) for effective working of PRIs for rural economic development and social justice. In this view, the state of Odisha first time introduced reservation of seats for women in PRIs keeping in mind to have gender justice through this constitutional amendment. Same as followed by all the states with their different locations varies from state to state because different states had their different PRIs legislations (Malik, 2022). So, the PRIs became more operative with constitutional status, and this was regarded as the third tier of the system of governance at the grass-roots level. Article 243(a) says a Gram Sabha may exercise such powers and perform such functions at the village level as the legislature of a state may, by law, provide. Article 243(b) defines Gram Sabha as "a body consisting of persons registered in the electoral rolls relating to a village comprised within the area of the panchayat at the village level (Austin, 1966). It is argued that if there is a constitutional base to alleviate local corruption, to increase decentralization of power, maximum participation and

minimum conflict and development of all aspects of PRIs then why the rural India is struggling for social justice and economic development. This question may be answered if we demonstrate the working of the constitutional design and its implementation at the grassroots level.

Reasons for the Decline of PRIs

The initial stage of PRIs was somehow successful but it has changed its nature when government changed from time to time at the centre. On the basis of some literature on panchayati raj, the reasons for the decline of PRIs are many but the political repercussions of electoral competition between state and PR representatives are largely responsible (Singh, 1994). During the time, state leaders and administrators were not agreed for power sharing and they took away the important development functions by amendment to relevant acts. The less efforts were made by the states to disseminate the local functional aspects. Lack of understanding about the concept and the usefulness of the system were major features for the decline of the PRIs. It has been argued that poor decentralization of power and responsibility to the rural stakeholders held responsible for the stagnation of the system. All the panchayati raj aspects were controlled by the state-level departments. Party conflict and political instability pushed the system downgrade and sometimes PRIs elections were used to postpone on flimsy grounds. The changing nature of mainstream political ideology becomes the over burden for revival of PRIs. With this crisis people of rural India lost their faith over the system and local aspirations remained a distance dream (Aslam, 1999). This not only diminished the local aspirations but also undermined the whole system. Inadequate local funds further hampered the capacity of PRIs. This climbed the stagnation ladder in some extent become possible to rethink about the revival of the system. The ideological and dominant notion of both the central and state governments is to utilize the local resources were manifested by their own organizations (Singh, 1994). These perennial political practices ended when 73rd and 74th CAA both for the panchayats and municipalities came into effect. To understand the local governance process in the light of democratic setup we need to extensive debate on constitutional amendments.

73rd Constitutional Amendment Act:

A Base for Inclusive Democracy Local government is a subject which comes under state list to furnish the local democracy at the village level. As it is a matter of legitimate claim have to be more effective governance through the 73rd CAA in the light of Indian constitution. In 1992 the local governance further wakeup with strong enthusiasm and it required how to deliver local resources and decentralize powers for success of inclusive democracy. The tendency of inclusive democracy lies in the public participation and deliberation with less conflict and more involvement in the village assembly. After the 73rd CAA various state governments have responded to the Act in diverse ways. This was a significant opportunity to boast a curious mixture of participation irrespective of gender and caste to have public inclusion in all democratic discussions. However, the local democracy completely depended upon maximum participation through the GS meeting which was the prime objective of the amendment to bring inclusive democracy more popular. At the initial stage of its inception it works well and the number of virtues identified. This gives rise to local government bridging the gap between policy formulating and executing. The main intention was to reconstitute the local self-government in the light of decentralization process from top-down management. As a result of these constitutional steps taken by the union and state governments, India further moved towards the inclusive democracy and sometimes called as 'multi-level-federalism' and it also widened the democratic base of the Indian polity.

Salient Features of Local-Self Government

In order to give special attention to local government, the amendment certainly moved towards to have important salient features for rural local-self government which have enriched in the constitution. PRIs received special status and dignity to strengthen the base of the body. With this, the basic features constitute such as regular elections, representation of the marginalised sections like scheduled castes (SCs), schedule tribes (STs) and women , devolutions of powers and adequate financial support aimed at improve the locality, and women empowerment have figured in the constitutional setup. The most important features are the Gram Sabha (GS) would the basic unit at the village level where all adult electorates take part, poverty reduction, one-third seats reserved for women, the posts of chairpersons reserved also for women, states have to provide

reservation of seats in favour of weaker sections, plan for economic development and social justice in respect of the subject described in the 11th Schedule, there must be a state finance commission and finally it also ensured the tenure of the Panchayat is fixed for five years and there must be election whenever necessary.

Working of Local Government: National Scenario

After the third generation of PRIs several states legislate their PRIs in respect of effective functioning of the local affairs. The PRIs have started working in the several states and reported several issues relating to the participation, deliberations, local funds, local corruptions, caste issues, women participation, economic development, rights, and freedom of expression respectively. Some of the studies conducted in several states to investigate the working of local government particularly in the village panchayats. The experience in the states like Rajasthan, Karnataka, West Bengal, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, and Odisha has significant experience on the working of gram panchayats. The local self-government in these states are well functioning through their state legislatures bodies. Participatory Research in Asia (1997) conducted studies in six states such as Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Haryana where the Gram Sabha meetings are held regularly, but the quorum is hardly achieved. The study teams revealed that local self-government through Gram Sabha meetings do not meet the desire of citizens even unable to serve the purpose of the significance of the village priorities. Ramesh Kumar Singh (2013) conducted a recent study on the functioning of Gram Sabha of two districts namely Patna and Rohtas in Bihar. The major concern of the paper was to explore the nature of people's participation in Gram Sabha in Bihar. For proper special coverage one block was selected from each selected district. From the selected blocks, five Gram Panchayat were selected where due representation was given to women headed Gram Panchayats. The study found that out of 800 households only 23.88 per cent reported that they regularly participate in Gram Sabha meetings whereas 33.00 per cent of responded they seldom attended the meetings. Remaining 43.12 per cent household reported that they never participated in the meeting.

The study was conducted by (Pal, 2009) on Gram Sabha meetings in only one district namely, Sirsa district of Haryana State of India with main objectives are to understand the involvement and participation of villagers in the process of their

socio-economic development. He found various issues of Gram Sabha meetings and also found attendance of villagers in the Gram Sabha meetings are slightly high due to the awareness among the villagers. Almost all the meetings in the Gram Sabah the villagers were presented but the Sarpanch were not aware regarding the Gram Sabha meetings (Pai, 1998). Several studies found that issues of social justice and internal dynamics of the village do not figure in the village meeting discussions (Datta, 1999, Menon, 1996; Sharma, 2013). The series of studies had conducted which revealed the reserving the posts for sarpanches in the panchayats for women or caste/ ethnic minorities also affects the distribution of public services at the village level (Gajwani and Zhang (2014). The study also highlighted how male persons dominate the female in the political sphere. The West Bengal study by (Ghatak & Ghatak, 1999) show that the understating of the Gram Sansad in twenty villages in 1999. This study highlighted that most of the people don't have a piece of land for cultivation but they regularly attend the meetings. The study reveals that all the issues such as road repair, installation of tube well and providing loan is the major discussion in the meeting hours. Another finding is the rich people do not attend meeting because of social prestige. Bidyut Mohanty's (2002), study reflects that impact of 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act in Odisha. Her field experience shows that about 80-90 per cent of female particularly women members regularly attend the panchayat meeting. Although the Act is a mainstay for the revival of the grassroots democracy the GPs must organise Gram Sabha meetings to revitalize the panchayats in all aspects. Her micro studies brought out the effective working of the Panchayat Raj system which has changed its tendency due to the participation of women. The experience shows that the proxy women in the panchayat were prevalent, where their husbands or brothers look after her officials activities. Recent study conducted by (Malik & Nayak, 2021) in Odisha revealed that the women find it difficult to attend regularly in the meeting as they are engage in their domestic front. Lack of participation and local funds in the villages are the major features of findings. Most importantly, human development issues such as food, education and health discussion are hardly discussed. Lack of awareness about usefulness of the Gram Sabha and their greater participation enable them to give more attention on state-sponsored schemes. Several studies have been carried out on local self-government revealed that the local corruption has been an

occupation of local representatives and growing local political instability among citizens are significant features of findings.

The above analysis of the working of the local self-government in India in general and Indian states in particular has received much criticism in their functional domain. However, the mere aspiration of local villagers still in a distance dream and there is truncate of power of local citizens in governance mechanisms. Dalits and women representatives have limited freedom to express their views and sometimes elected members of these groups don't enjoy the de facto power even in the case of women the proxy rule is circulated by male partners (Ambedkar, 1936). In additions to these issues the 73rd CAA would be the focus of the government with taking all responsibility to make government more transparent and accountable. To take these seriously the local stakeholders and legislative bodies must disseminate all constitutional mechanisms that would make local governance more active and progressive.

Check Your Progress

- How did the British policies impact agriculture and industry in India?
- Explain the significance of Local Self-Government reforms introduced by Lord Ripon in 1882.

Recommended Books

1. Bipan Chandra, *History of Modern India*, Orient Black Swan Publications, New Delhi, 2012
2. Bipan Chandra., *Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India*, New Delhi: Orient Blackswan
3. Private Limited, New Delhi, 1981
4. Bipan Chandra, Amales Tripathi and Barun De, *Freedom Struggle*, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 2011
5. Delhi, 2011
6. Bipan Chandra., *India's Struggle for Independence*, Penguin Random House, India, 2016
7. Kenneth W. Jones (eds), *The New Cambridge History of India: III.1 Socio Religious reform*
8. *Movements in British India*, Cambridge University Press, 1989
9. Ranjan Chakrabarti., *A New History of Modern India: An Outline*, Surjeeth Publications, 2019
10. Sumit Sarkar., *Modern India 1885-1947*, Macmillan India Limited, New Delhi, 2000
11. M.P. Sivagananam – Viduthali Poratathil Tamilagam – 2 Volumes (in Tamil).
12. G. Venkatesan, *History of Freedom Struggle*, V.C. Publications, 2018.

References

1. Aparna Basu, *Essays in the History of Indian Education*, Concept Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1982
2. BalaJeyaraman, *Periyar: A Political Biography of EV Ramasamy*, Rupa and Co., 2013
3. JudithMargaret Brown, *Gandhi's Rise to Power*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972.
4. Mushirul Hasan., *India's Partition: Process, Strategy and Mobilisation. (Themes in Indian History)*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1997
5. Percival Spear, *The Oxford History of Modern India 1740-1947*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965
6. Shekhar Bandyopadhyay, (ed)., *Nationalist Movement in India: A Reader*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2008.