CHAPTER VIII
INDIA DURING AND AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

1. India’s War Contributions

When Britain declared war against Germany on September 3, 1939, India was automatically involved in what afterwards became a global war. Britain was naturally anxious to utilize India’s abundant resources for the prosecution of the war. Later, the proximity of the theatres of war to India’s borders increased her strategic importance.

For reasons to be noted later, the two great political parties of India, the Congress and the Muslim League, refused to co-operate with the Government in its war effort. The Indian Princes, however, stood solidly behind the Government, which had also no difficulty in securing sufficient recruits without any compulsion. It is unnecessary to describe in detail the course of the war. Suffice it to say that it took a calamitous turn for the Allies in the summer of 1940. First Norway and Denmark, and then Belgium, Holland, and France, quickly fell under enemy control. Britain’s own downfall seemed imminent, but the Royal Air Force heroically beat off the superior numbers of the German aircraft, and frustrated the plans for a German invasion of England. The entry of Italy into the war on the side of Germany was regarded as a serious menace to the Suez Canal, the “life-line” of the British Empire. It was thought possible that the enemy might be able to occupy Egypt and eventually make an attack upon India. In fact, the British Parliament passed on mid-June the India and Burma (Emergency Provisions) Act, authorizing the Governor-General, “in the event of a complete breakdown of communications with the United Kingdom, to exercise some of the powers of the Secretary of State.

At this fateful and critical moment in the history of India, Britain, her war efforts were greatly reinforced by the manpower and material resources of India. Indian troops fought with the traditional bravery in Africa and the Middle East till they were turned in favour of the Allies. The part they played in liquidating the Italian Empire in Africa was, as the Viceroy observed:
December, 1941, "of the first significance and of the greatest value." Indian troops also gave splendid assistance to the Allied cause throughout the struggle for the liberation of Europe till the final collapse of the Axis powers in that continent in May, 1945. India's contributions towards the achievement of victory were both manifold and substantial, and earned the highest praise. Lieut.-General Mark Clark, the American General in command of the Allied armies in Italy, paid the following tribute to the valour of Indian troops:

The achievements in combat of these Indian soldiers are noteworthy. They have carried on successfully in grim and bloody fighting against a tenacious enemy helped by terrain particularly favourable for defence. No obstacle has succeeded in delaying them for long or in lowering their high morale or fighting spirit.

The Fourth, Eighth and Tenth Indian Divisions will for ever be associated with the fighting for Cassino, the capture of Rome, the Arno valley, the liberation of Florence and the breaking of the Gothic Line. I salute the brave soldiers of these three great Indian divisions." General Leese, the commander of the 8th Army, and General Sir Claude Auchinleck, the Commander-in-Chief in India, spoke in the same strain.

A highly important part was also played by the Indian troops in withstanding the Japanese attack and in driving them out of the territories they had occupied on India's frontier. General Sir William Slim, Commander of the 14th Army, which completely destroyed Japan's military power in South-East Asia, bore testimony to the wonderful services of the Indians in this epic struggle. "India was," he observed in 1948, "our base, and three-quarters of everything we got from there. The best thing of all we got from India was the Indian army. Indeed, the campaign in Burma was largely an Indian Army campaign. The bulk of the fighting troops and almost the whole of those on the lines of communication were soldiers of the Indian Army, and magnificently they were trained and sent us our reinforcements." 1

The pre-war strength of the Indian Army was 182,000. By the middle of 1945 the Army numbered over 2,000,000 men although recruitment had continued all along on a voluntary basis. The casualties in the ranks of the Indian troops numbered 180,000, of whom "one in six was killed besides 6,500 merchant seamen, who were either killed or missing." In addition, bombing caused 4,000 civilian casualties. There would have been larger casualties but for

1 The Indian Annual Register, 1943, Vol. II, p. 264
2 The Statesman, Nov. 7, 1944.
3 Asiatic Review, April, 1946
the yeomen service rendered by the members of the Civil Reserv
Corps, numbering at one time 82,000.1

There was a proportionate increase in recruitment to the officer
class, including both King’s Commissioned officers and Vineyard Com-
misioned officers. The Indian Military Academy at Dehra Dun
made provision for 800 cadets, compared with 200 before the war.
and other Officer Training Schools were opened. Though there were
only 400 Indian Officers at the outbreak of the war, the number of
Indian Commissioned and King’s Commissioned officers had rose
to more than 10,000 at its close. There was a large increase in the
number of training schools of all descriptions to bring about the fully
mechanisation of the Army and secure more efficient training. The
Indian Artillery was also greatly expanded and developed. Valuable
services were rendered by the Corps of Indian Electrical and
Mechanical Engineers, formed on 1st May, 1943, for the repair, re-
covery and maintenance of the technical equipment of the Indian
Army; the Indian Signal Corps, formed in 1922 and greatly ex-
panded during this war; the Indian Army Medical Corps, formed in
1943; and the Women’s Auxiliary Corps, numbering over 10,000,
formed to release soldiers and technicians for more active duty. The
Royal Indian Navy, with its personnel raised from 1,200 officers and
men at the commencement of the war to about 30,000 by the begin-
ing of 1944, had notable services and exploits to its credit.

The Indian Air Force (started in 1932 and subsequently designated
as the Royal Indian Air Force), with strength augmented from 200
27,000, and equipped with modern aircraft, both fighters and
bombers, fought gallantly over Burma from 1942 onwards. India
also made very large contributions to the Allies in arms, ammunition,
equipment and various other kinds of war material. Special refer-
ence must be made to the Tata Iron and Steel Company and the
Steel Corporation of Bengal, which considerably assisted the war effort
by speeding up the production of steel. Indian shipyards built 2,000-
foot vessels during the war, with a total tonnage of 100,000 tons. Large
numbers of Indian railway wagons were sent to the Middle East.

The Indian States were liberal in their help. Besides supplying
more than 375,000 recruits for the fighting forces of India
provided men for technical work, and important materials, such
steel, blankets and other kinds of woollen cloths, silk for parachute
manufacture, webbing cloth, and rubber products. The total finan-
cial contributions of the States exceeded Rs. 65,000,000. About half of
the total contribution to the Viceroy’s Fund came from them.

1For this section, see (1) Statistics relating to India’s War Effor (Govern-
2. India's Participation in Efforts for Peace

Having made this immense contribution towards the achievement of victory by the Allied powers, India showed a genuine interest in the solution of the problems of tormented humanity and became actively associated with the organizations working for international security and peace. She was associated with the principal organs and specialised agencies of the United Nations Organization. She is a memorial to its charter and is an original member of it. One of her representatives became the Chairman of the Social and Economic Council of the U.N.O. and rendered much valuable assistance in the difficult initial stages. Her representatives all played very important parts in the United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

In the 1946 session of the U.N., Indian representatives took an independent line on some major issues. They succeeded in making the U.N. take up the question of the treatment of Indians in South Africa against the opposition of the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. India also tried persistently to protect the rights of politically backward peoples in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. But in 1947, on two matters in which she was directly interested, that is, her election to the Security Council and the dispute with South Africa, she did not succeed in gaining what she hoped for. She continued, however, to participate actively in the work of the United Nations. As tension developed between the two great groups of world powers, one under the leadership of the U.S.A. and Great Britain, and the other under the U.S.S.R. (Russia), India wisely proclaimed her policy of not identifying herself with either group. She also came to have her diplomatic representatives, of various ranks and designations, from Ambassadors to Consuls and Commissioners, in different countries abroad. Similarly foreign countries stationed here their representatives, diplomatic or consular.

India not only participated in many international Conferences like the Pacific Relations Conference (1934-44), the World Trade Union Conference (February, 1945), the Commonwealth Relations Conference (February-March, 1945), the World Trade Union Congress (September, 1945), the Subject Peoples Conference (London, October, 1945), and the International Labour Conference at Geneva (July, 1947), but also organized the Asian Relations Conference (New Delhi, 23rd March-2nd April, 1947). She also exchanged delegations and missions and entered into various treaties with other countries. Associations interested in India sprang up in foreign
countries, e.g. the National Committee for India’s Freedom, formed on the 25th October, 1943, with headquarters at Washington, the Australian India Association formed in October, 1943, and the Indo-Iranian Cultural Society, Teheran, founded in 1944.

3. Post-War Economic Conditions

A. Development of Industries

The social and economic effects of the Second World War on India were profound and far-reaching. No branch of economic life remained unaffected, and with the cessation of hostilities new forces were released in the social and cultural sphere, so that the country had to face various acute problems of reconstruction and readjustment. The war can indeed be regarded as marking the beginning of a new social order.

Some favourable factors, such as the growing demand for war materials both at home and from other parts of the Commonwealth; restrictions on imports, and greater care and assistance on the part of the Government with regard to industries, contributed to increased activity and output in all items of industrial manufacture except jute, matches and wheat flour. The decline in jute manufacture was due principally to lack of demand, and the fall in the production of matches to lack of raw materials, while wheat flour dropped owing to the shortage of supplies for mills, though the crops were relatively large. Petroleum and electrical power were outstanding examples of increased production. Labour shortages affected the production of coal and iron ore. Though India’s shipbuilding industry had not yet satisfied legitimate national expectations, it may be noted that shipbuilding yards were opened in Vizagapatam in 1940, and within two years 4,000 sea-going ships were repaired. In April 1947, the Reconstruction Policy Sub-Committee on Shipping recommended a planned development of Indian Shipping on economic as well as strategic considerations.

B. Economic Planning

The complex problems of modern times and the influences of the Second World War created in India, as in most other countries, an almost universal impulse towards a planned reconstruction of the entire pattern of economic life.

A National Planning Committee was constituted towards the end of 1938, at the instance of the Indian National Congress, under the
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Chairmanship of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It consisted of fifteen members together with representatives of the Provincial Governments and such Indian States as chose to join it. But this Committee languished, owing to the change in the political situation after the outbreak of the war and the resignation of the Congress Ministries, and it did not resume its work until September, 1945. Several other plans for economic reconstruction were later formulated, such as the Bombay Plan, the People's Plan, the Gandhian Plan, besides the Provincial plans, the plans of the Departments of the Central Government, plans for major industries, and plans of Indian States. Broadly speaking, the objectives of planning were “to raise the general standard of living of the people as a whole and to ensure useful employment for all” by the development of the resources of the country to the maximum extent possible, and by the distribution of national wealth in an equitable manner. Early in June, 1941, the Government of India formed a Post-War Reconstruction Committee. On the 29th October, 1946, it announced the appointment of an Advisory Planning Board, which, in its Report of January, 1947, emphatically expressed the opinion that the “proper development of large-scale industries can only take place if political units, whether Provinces or States, agree to work in accordance with a common plan.” But the state of affairs in industry continued to be disquieting for several reasons, one of which was the continuance of strained relations between labour and management.

C. Labour

The war had tremendous repercussions on labour in India. Abnormal economic conditions, largely the result of an unprecedented rise in the cost of living, caused an insistent demand for better conditions, which had mostly to be satisfied by increases in wages, grants of dearness allowances and bonuses, and the introduction of pension schemes, provident funds, and more scientific systems of payment.

This period was marked by a growing sense of responsibility for the improvement of the lot of the ordinary worker in this country, resulting in important labour legislation. The Factories Amendment Act, passed in April, 1946, and enforced from 1st August, reduced maximum working hours per week from 54 to 48, and from 60 to 50 in perennial and seasonal factories respectively. It fixed the maximum daily hours of work at 9 and 10 respectively. The Act also prescribed uniform rates of payment for overtime work both in perennial and seasonal factories, amounting to double
the ordinary rate. According to the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act of 1946, owners of industrial establishments in British India, employing a hundred or more workers, were required to inform clearly the conditions of service and to have these duly certified by an officer appointed for this purpose either by the Central Government or by the Provincial Government as the case might be. The Workmen’s Compensation Act of 1946, amended in 1947, made workmen earning wages up to the maximum limit of Rs.400 a month entitled to compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment, and laid down a scale of compensation for workers earning between Rs.300 and Rs.400. The Indian National Government passed some important Acts regarding industrial relations, social insurance, and improvement in conditions of work. The Provincial Governments were also alive to their responsibilities in relation to labour and industries; a specific example may be mentioned the Bombay Industrial Relations Act (1946), which aimed at the regulation and rapid settlement of labour disputes by the establishment of labour courts and also of joint committees of management and labour in industrial establishments. Several other important steps were also taken by the Central and the Provincial Governments to harmonise industrial relations. At a Conference in 1947, representatives of employers, employees and the Government came to a unanimous decision to maintain industrial peace and to avoid lock-outs, strikes, and slowing down of production for the next three years. The various adjudication awards and recommendations of the Conciliation Boards also aimed at securing cordial industrial relations. For instance, the recommendations of the Board of Conciliation (1947), which investigated the causes of industrial disputes in the coalfield areas of Bengal and Bihar, were hailed as a “new deal for coal-miners”. They provided for the improvement of the conditions of a class of workers whose interests had been neglected in the past.

The war gave added strength to the labour movement and facilitated the further growth of Trade Unionism. In 1949 the National Trades Union Federation, into which the Indian Trades Union Federation (p. 954) had merged, was amalgamated with the All-India Trade Union Congress. But there was again a cleavage in the ranks of labour in India in 1941, when a new centre of organisation, called the Indian Federation of Labour, came into being. The year 1947 saw the birth of yet another organisation, under the name of the Indian National Trade Union Congress. Drawing its inspiration from Gandhian philosophy, it sought to “secure redress of grievances, without stoppages of work, by means
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of negotiation and conciliation, and failing that, by arbitration or adjudication”. This organisation, representing 557 unions of 19 industrial groups, very soon became “a force in national life”. But in spite of all this, there is still immense confusion and much ferment in the Indian labour world.

D. The Hard Lot of the Common People

The common people of India, whose condition had always been deplorable, suffered great hardships during and after the war. There was a rapid rise in the prices of all goods “thanks to ceaseless inflation following upon the endless stream of British purchases in India against sterling securities in the Paper Currency Reserve”. There was a drastic reduction in the supply of essential commodities, particularly food grains and cloth, to the civilian population. “Before the war the total available supply of cereals was more than 45 million tons. During the first half of the war period it was reduced to 43 million tons. . . . Again, as against the 6,000 million yards of cloth in supply before the war, only 3,700 million yards were available in 1942; and even two years later the supplies barely exceeded 5,000 million yards.”

The Report of the Sub-Committee on Labour of the National Planning Committee significantly remarks, “Notwithstanding all measures of control, regulation of price, Government procurement and distribution of essential supplies, like food, kerosene, sugar, and the entire rationing system applied to town after town and Province after Province, prices continued to soar. Black markets flourished, corruption knew no bounds of rank or sex.” The horrible Bengal famine of 1943, producing untold miseries for the people of that province, was undoubtedly a direct result of war conditions, but was accentuated by the “carelessness and complete lack of foresight of those in authority”, and the inordinate greed of persons in certain positions. As the Famine Inquiry Commission presided over by Sir John Woodhead stated in its Report published in May, 1945, “It has been for us a sad task to enquire into the course and causes of the Bengal famine. We have been haunted by a deep sense of tragedy. A million and a half of the poor of Bengal fell victim to circumstances for which they themselves were not responsible. Society, together with its organs, failed to protect its weaker members. Indeed, there was a moral and social breakdown, as well as an administrative breakdown”. The wounds inflicted on Bengal by this terrible calamity were very slow to heal.
E. Agriculture

Indian agriculturists and ordinary consumers were the worst sufferers by the failure of economic controls, profiteering, and widely prevailing corruption, though bigger farmers with more surplus to sell derived advantage from high prices. So far as agricultural economy is concerned, numerous problems were brought to the forefront by the Second World War—the planning of production and distribution, the provision of an adequate transport system connecting the widely separated surplus and deficit areas, maintenance of minimum stocks, effective control over costs of production and prices, and regulation of exports and imports. The Central and Provincial Governments promised to bring about an improvement in the state of agriculture and in the lot of the common people by proper agricultural planning, which would facilitate the attainment of high levels of production and prosperity.

F. Co-operation

An important part in this general improvement was assigned to co-operation. During 1945–46 the number of provincial and central co-operative banks was 614, with a total membership of 226,000. The working capital increased from Rs.60 lakhs in 1944–45 to 69.95 lakhs in 1945–46. The number of agricultural co-operative societies rose from 136,354 in 1944–45 to 146,958 in 1946, and their membership increased from 5,019,000 to 5,501,000. It was expected that they would all function fruitfully under the democratic Governments at the Centre and in the Provinces.

G. Trade

The Second World War had, of course, far-reaching effects upon India’s trade. It cut her off entirely from the continent of Europe and from Japan and the various neighbouring countries which were overrun by the Japanese, and it interfered greatly with her trade with the countries within the British Commonwealth of Nations. There was an actual decline of about 38 per cent in exports and 70 per cent in imports in 1942–43 as compared with the pre-war year 1938–39. There was, however, an improvement in India’s trading position in 1943–44 as compared with the previous year.¹ The composition

¹ Eastern Economist, July 30, 1943, p. 365.
of her export trade was also vastly altered during the war. There was an increase in the exports of manufactured goods and a decrease in those of raw materials. In 1938 manufactured articles comprised only 30.5 per cent of exports, and raw materials and food 44.3 per cent and 23.5 per cent respectively. In 1944 manufactured articles were 51.5 per cent, and raw materials and food 24.7 per cent and 22.5 per cent respectively. The figures mentioned do not include imports of food grains, etc., made on Government account, and imports of Government stores, railway stocks, etc. During 1946 the value of India's total trade amounted to Rs.500.2 crores compared with Rs.481.9 crores in 1945, there being a larger rise in exports than in imports. The import trade of India, however, soon began to revive and revert to the pre-war position. Even the imports of manufactured articles increased from 31.9 per cent in 1944 to 55.4 per cent in 1946, but certain considerations led to the issue, in May and July 1947, of import control orders intended to reduce imports. The export trade of India was slow to regain its pre-war position, owing mainly to the continuance of shortages of agricultural products and the "rising levels of consumption". On the cessation of hostilities private trade with different countries, so long suspended, could be resumed. Among the important changes in the direction of India's trade it may be noted that a favourable balance of trade was maintained with the countries of the British Commonwealth from the beginning of the war till 1945, but that there was an adverse balance in 1946. The value of both export and import trade with the U.S.A. rose. The leap in the imports of American merchandise into this country from Rs.978 lakhs in 1938-39 to Rs.87.40 lakhs in 1945-46 is very significant especially in comparison with the increase in the imports from U.K. during the same period from Rs.88.56 lakhs to Rs.101.83 lakhs. There was an adverse balance of trade with the U.S.A. in 1945, but this was altered in India's favour in 1946. The Indian Tariff Board, constituted in 1945, made some recommendations regarding the claims of various industries for protection, but these could not be implemented at once. One notable event of the year 1947 affecting the foreign trade of India was her participation in the Geneva Trade Conference at which several important economic agreements were concluded.

1 Eastern Economist, June 28, 1946, p. 1072.
2 Ibid., November 7, 1947.
3 Ibid., January 5, 1947.
5 Ibid., January 2, 1948.
4. Education and Social Progress

The reorganisation of the educational system is universally recognised to be indispensable to the progress of the Indian nation. The new-born democracy and sense of nationalism must be nourished and developed by the spread of the right type of education among all sections of the people. It should be remembered that the percentage of literacy between 1931 and 1941 rose from 8 to only about 12. In spite of the increase in the number of institutions, and the new educational measures of recent years, illiteracy still remains an appalling problem for the country.

At the request of the Government of India, the Central Advisory Board of Education submitted at the beginning of 1944 a post-war plan of educational reconstruction covering all the branches of education. It not only prescribed universal compulsory and free education for all boys and girls from six to fourteen, but also contemplated the provision of nursery schools and classes for ten lakhs of children below the age of six. It further recommended the provision of secondary schools with a view to fostering varied types of technical and vocational education suited to the aptitudes of pupils of different classes and capabilities. It also emphasised the need for granting liberal financial assistance in the form of institution, scholarships and maintenance grants, so that poverty must be no obstacle to the education of students of proved ability. As a corollary to this it stressed the need for adequate and improved arrangements for higher education, both in Universities and in professional and technical institutions of University level. The Board emphasised the necessity of "enlarging and making more practical the present provision for technical, commercial and art instruction at all levels in order to provide India with the requisite workers, executives and skilled craftsmen which the expansion of her industrial, economic and agricultural resources will inevitably demand". It also called for greater facilities for the cultural and recreational side of education to help the students "to fulfil themselves as individuals". Feeling that "a curriculum devoid of an ethical basis would prove barren in the end", it attached high importance to the training of character at all stages of education through a properly articulated combination of physical, mental and moral instruction. The Board made it clear that its object throughout was not "to plan an ideal system of public instruction, but rather to lay down the very minimum necessary to place India on an approximate level with other civilised communities", and suggested
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that the various authorities in charge of education might work out
detailed schemes to suit the particular needs of their respective areas.
The Central and Provincial Governments were not slow in
formulating plans and schemes for the development of Primary,
Secondary and University education, physical education, education
of the handicapped, and vocational (technical, agricultural and
commercial) education. The Wardha system of Basic Education,
which combines training in handicrafts with literary education, was
gradually introduced in different areas by the new Provincial
Governments. The question of replacing English as the medium of
University education was also mooted and was discussed at a meeting
of the Vice-Chancellors of the different Universities and the Minister in
charge of Education of the Central Government. The consensus of
opinion in the matter is that at this transitional stage the medium
should continue to be English for a certain period, to be gradually
replaced by the regional or the State language at the end of that period.
The Central Advisory Board in 1944 was emphatic as to the
necessity for increasing educational facilities for women, even to
the extent of making the same provision for girls as for boys.
Recognising the special role of women in children’s education, the
Board recommended that “apart from the Pre-Primary schools,
where all the teachers must be women, at least three-fifths of the
teachers in junior Basic Schools and one-half of those in senior Basic
Schools, ought to be women”. Indian women felt entitled to
greater opportunities for working on a basis of equality with men,
and many of them were already prominent in various spheres of life.
Mrs. Radhabin Subbarayan became the first woman member of the
Council of State in 1938, and in 1943 Mrs. Renuka Ray was the first
woman to sit in the Central Legislative Assembly. It is a matter of
pride for India that women leaders like Vijayalakshmi Pandit and
Rajkumari Amrit Kaur came to be actively associated as
representatives of their country with international bodies like the
United Nations and the United Nations Educational Scientific and
Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The All-India Women’s Conference
forwarded to the Constituent Assembly the Charter of Women’s
Rights, its most important features being the demand for the
introduction of universal suffrage in India’s new constitution and for
the formation of a Social Service Ministry both at the Centre and in
the Provinces.

Independent India honoured its womanhood by appointing
Sarojini Naidu Governor of the United Provinces, Vijayalakshmi
Pandit as Ambassador in Moscow and Washington, and Amrit Kaur
as a Minister in the Central Government.
CHAPTER IX

THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

1. Progress of Nationalism (1905-1916)

The progress of the nationalist movement forms the most important feature in Indian history during the first half of the present century. The first phase of this movement has been discussed in Chapter IV, 3. The second phase begins in 1905. During the first twenty years of its existence, the Congress passed a series of resolutions to which the Government paid but little heed, and the only notable result of its efforts was the Indian Councils Act of 1892. This failure to achieve any conspicuous success strengthened the radical section of the Congress, which assumed a more militant attitude and demanded bolder action against British Imperialism. The new spirit, which received a fillip from Japan's great victory over Russia in 1904-5, was brought to a head by an unpopular measure of Lord Curzon, viz. the Partition of Bengal, referred to above (p. 875). The destruction of the bond that united the Bengalis, under colour of providing for administrative efficiency, considerably weakened the politically advanced Bengali intelligentsia. It split them into two separate Provinces, in both of which they would be outnumbered by other elements of the population (p. 928), and kindled religious animosities, thus interfering with the growth of a true national spirit transcending creed and community. The Partition of Bengal, carried out despite the strongest opposition from Nationalists, whose leaders included both Hindus and Muslims, roused a fierce spirit of resistance among them, and gave a new turn to the political movement.

Under the guidance of leaders like Surendranath Banerjee, Bipin Chandra Pal, A. Rasul, Aswini Kumar Datta and Arabinda Ghosh, the agitation spread like wild-fire all over Bengal and even farther outside it. Mr. Gokhale, who presided over the Congress in 1906, correctly gauged the situation when he said:

"The tremendous upheaval of popular feeling which has taken place in Bengal in consequence of the Partition will constitute a
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landmark in the history of our National progress. . . . A wave of
ture national consciousness has swept over the province. . . .
Bengal's heroic stand against the oppression of a harsh and un-
controlled bureaucracy has astonished and gratified all India, and
her sufferings have not been endured in vain, when they have helped
to draw closer all parts of the country in sympathy and aspiration."

The Bengalis openly defied the Government and sought to exert
pressure upon it by the adoption of such political weapons as the
boycott of British goods, Swadeshi (use of indigenous goods), and
the spread of National Education. The Congress, held in 1900, not
only endorsed these plans, but, for the first time in its history, laid
down as its goal "the system of government obtaining in the self-
governing British colonies" which the President summed up in one
word, "Swaraj". The new spirit reflected in these changes was
sponsored by Tilak, Bepin Chandra Pal, Lajpat Rai and other
"extremist" leaders. But the "moderate" leaders like Surendranath Banerjea, Pherozeh Shah Mehta, and Gokhale did not keep
pace with it, and there was an open split between the two parties in
the Surat session of the Congress in 1907. For nine years the
Extremist section kept out of the Congress.

Much happened during these eventful years. Lord Curzon’s
policy of disintegrating Bengal and of brushing aside the claims of
the Indian educated classes to be the prophets of what they them-
selves spoke of as the "New Nationalism" bore fruit. In 1906
Nawab Salimullah of Dacca set up a permanent political organization
of the Muslims, known as the Muslim League, which supported the
Partition of Bengal and opposed the boycott of British goods. The
Government launched a campaign of repression. Large numbers of
the people of Bengal, and also their sympathisers outside, including
Tilak, were tried and imprisoned and, under an old regulation of
1818, some of the leaders were deported without trial. Peaceful
pickets were beaten and sent to jail, meetings were broken up by
the police with lathi charges, and popular outbreaks were suppressed
with severity. These measures failed to check the nationalist
movement. On the contrary, they gave rise to an underground
conspiracy to terrorise the Government by killing officials. Bombs
were secretly prepared in the outskirts of Calcutta, and the
"anarchist movement", as it came to be called, became a new factor
in Indian politics.

As the repressive policy failed in its objective, the Government
sought to "rally the Moderates" by granting the Morley-Minto
Reforms in 1909 (p. 913) and modifying the Partition of Bengal two
years later (p. 928). The Moderates were at first jubilant, but some
of the regulations under the 1909 Reforms, especially the creation of separate electorates for Muslims, were strongly disapproved by most of them. In fact, this policy, which was regarded as one of “divide and rule”, alienated the Moderates from the Government and paved the way for their union with the Radical section of the Congress at the Lucknow session in 1916.

The introduction of the separate electorate has an interesting history. It was a device adopted by the new Viceroy, Lord Minto, to win over the Muslims and set them against the Congress movement. A deputation of the Muslims, encouraged by the British officials, not by the Government itself, was induced to ask for representation as a separate community, and further pray “that their position should be estimated not merely on their numerical strength but in respect to the political importance of their community and the service it has rendered to the Empire”. Lord Minto conceded both, and we know from an entry in Lady Minto’s diary of 1st October, 1906, that this act was jubilantly hailed by British officialdom as “nothing less than the pulling back of 62 millions of people from joining the ranks of sedition—opposition”. Even the great Liberal statesman Lord Morley supported this ingenious device of “separate electorate” and “weightage” which was virtually a stab in the back at Indian Nationalism.

Ramsay MacDonald, who later became the Prime Minister of Britain, correctly diagnosed the situation when he observed that “the Mahomedan leaders are inspired by certain Anglo-Indian officials, and these officials have pulled wires at Simla and in London and of malice aforthought sowed discord between Hindu and Mahomedan communities by showing the Muslims special favour”.

The Muslim League, founded in 1906 (p. 981), was originally mainly an organization of some Muslims who emphasized the bond of religion in place of the “New Nationalism”. Its attitude was at

---

1 According to the Countess of Minto (India, Minto and Morley, p. 291), separate electorates were proposed by Mr. Gokhale. She does not, however, quote any authority in support of her statement. The following summary of a speech by Mr. Gokhale probably represents his real views:

“Mr. Gokhale stated his own position in the matter quite frankly. He had all along been in favour of special separate electorates for important minorities, but he wanted such electorates to provide not the whole of the representation to which the communities were entitled, but only so much of it as was necessary to redress the deficiencies and inequalities of general elections; and he wanted the same treatment to be extended to other important minorities such Mahomedans where necessary. Mr. Gokhale held strongly that in the best interest of their public life and for the future of their land they must first have elections on a territorial basis in which all communities without distinction of race or creed should participate, and then special separate supplementary elections should be held to secure the fair and adequate representation of such important minorities as had received less than their full share in the general elections.” Speeches of Gopal Krishna Gokhale (Natesan & Co.), p. 1138.
first exclusive, but as its numbers grew, it imbibed the nationalistic spirit which animated the country. In 1913 it adopted "self-government within the Empire" as its goal. The war between Turkey and Britain aroused strong anti-British feelings among powerful sections of Muslims and paved the way for co-operation between them and the Congress. Both the Congress and the League held their sessions at Lucknow in 1916, and concluded the famous "Lucknow Pact" by which the Congress agreed to separate electorates and the two organizations jointly framed a constitutional scheme on the basis of Dominion Status.

The year 1916 which saw the union of the Moderate and Radical sections of the Congress, and the friendly co-operation between it and the Muslim League for the common cause of India, is also memorable for the inauguration of two Home Rule Leagues, one founded by Lokâmânya Tilâk in April of that year, and another by Annie Besant five months later. These two bodies co-operated in carrying on an intensive propaganda in favour of the "Congress-League Scheme" of political reforms.

2. The Non-Co-operation and Civil Disobedience Movement

(1917-1934)

The War of 1914-18 which brought about the rapprochement between the Congress and the Muslim League also furthered the Indian cause in other ways. Indian soldiers rendered splendid service to the Empire at critical moments of the war. In acknowledging it Lord Birkenhead truly remarked: "Without India the war would have been immensely prolonged if indeed without her help it could have been brought to a victorious conclusion." England felt bound to recompense this service by political reforms in India, particularly as one of the avowed objects of the war was to secure self-determination for subject peoples and to make the world safe for democracy. Besides, the lessons of the Russian Revolution and the collapse of the Tsarist regime probably had some effect on a section of British politicians. All these factors led to the famous announcement of 1917 (p. 915) and the constitution of 1919 to which reference has been made earlier (p. 916).

The publication of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report created a split in the ranks of the Congress. It was considered in a special session of the Congress and condemned as inadequate, disappointing and unsatisfactory. Thereupon most of the leaders of the Moderate Party left the Congress, and later founded the Indian Liberal Federation. Mahâtmâ Gândhi was at first inclined to try to make
the reforms work, and the Congress decided in favour of this in December 1919. But he changed his views before a year was over. Under his inspiration the Congress adopted, in a special session held in Calcutta in 1920, the famous resolution on Non-co-operation which recommended the renunciation of Government titles and the boycotting of the Legislatures, law-courts and Government educational institutions, leading up at a later date to the non-payment of taxes. Further, the object of the Indian National Congress was now defined as the attainment of Swarajya (self-rule) by a legitimate and peaceful means. This last phrase replaced the words "constitutional means," and Swarajya was taken to imply "self-rule within the Empire, if possible, without, if necessary".

The new policy was acclaimed with enthusiasm, and received overwhelming support from the masses. As a British writer has observed, Gándhíji "not only converted the nationalist movement into a revolutionary movement, but also made it popular". The Congress gave up its old methods of constitutional agitation, and was now broad-based on the willing support of the masses. The great change was helped by some contemporary events, two of which deserve special mention, viz. the atrocities in the Punjab and the Khilafat agitation.

In 1919 the Government passed a set of new coercive measures known as the Rowlatt Acts from the name of the President of the Committee on whose report they were based. These sought to perpetuate the extraordinary repressive powers conferred on the Government during the war, for doing away with ordinary legal procedure and for authorising imprisonment without trial. Gándhí organised a passive resistance movement in protest, and "a mighty wave of mass demonstrations, strikes, unrest and rioting spread over many parts of India". The Government put down the movement with a heavy hand, the blackest stain on its record being in connection with a prohibited meeting of citizens at an enclosed place called Jalianwállá Bágh at Amritsar. Troops under General Dyer fired 1,600 rounds of ammunition into the unarmed crowd with no means of exit. Even according to official estimates 379 persons were killed, and 1,200 wounded were left untreated. Martial law was proclaimed in the Punjab; and the subsequent inquiries revealed a gruesome picture of shootings, hangings, bombing from the air, extremely severe sentences passed by the tribunals during the trials of terror.

The part played by Britain in the defeat of Turkey and the dismemberment of the Turkish empire in the First World War offended the religious and historical sentiment of the Muslims in
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caused them to adopt an aggressive anti-British attitude. The two brothers, Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, and Maulana Abul Kasim Azad organized a mass movement of the Muslims known as the Khilafat movement.

There was already widespread unrest among the industrial workers. The Bombay Mill strike affected more than 125,000 workers at the beginning of 1919 and there were no fewer than 200 strikes involving 15 lakhs of workers during the first six months of 1920. The atrocities in the Punjab stirred the whole country, and in the Khilafat movement Gandhi saw "an opportunity of uniting Hindus and Mahomedans as would not arise in a hundred years". He wholeheartedly espoused the Khilafat cause, and there was, as an official publication recorded, "unprecedented fraternalism between the Hindus and the Muslims".

Gandhi conceived the idea of channeling the powerful currents of this united mass movement so as to give the utmost impetus to the national struggle for independence. This took shape in the non-violent non-co-operation movement mentioned above. It was first adopted, though not without opposition, in the special session of the Congress held in Calcutta in September 1920, and was reaffirmed, almost unanimously, at the annual session at Nagpur in December, 1920.

The movement evoked a hearty response throughout the country. Nearly two-thirds of the voters abstained from taking part in the election to the Councils held in November, 1920, and a large number of students came out of schools and colleges. The lawyers who gave up their practices included such distinguished persons as Desabandhu C. R. Das and Pandit Motilal Nehru. An important feature of the movement was the burning of English cloths on bobbins, and a spirit of civil disobedience and passive resistance against the Government was visible everywhere. As there were nearly 30,000 political prisoners, the jail lost its terror, and imprisonment became a badge of honour. The British Government brought the Prince of Wales to India in the vain hope of quelling the traditional feeling of loyalty among the masses. But a hartal was observed all over India on the day the Prince landed in Bombay, and he had to pass for the most part through deserted streets when he visited the provincial capitals of India.

The year 1921 was thus a memorable landmark in the history of India's struggle for freedom. The Congress, in its annual session at Ahmadabad (December, 1921), not only expressed its determination to continue the programme of non-violent non-co-operation with greater vigour but took steps to organize civil disobedience.
Mahātmā Gāndhī was appointed by the Congress the sole executive authority to lead the national movement. The popular enthusiasm rose to fever heat and there was an eager expectation of a mass movement on a big scale. Gāndhiji, however, decided to confine it at first to Bardoli, a small district of 87,000 people. But even then it was suspended on account of an outbreak of mob violence at Chaurā (a small village near Gorakhpur in the U.P.) in the course of which a police station was burnt and twenty-two policemen killed. Gāndhiji's decision was received with feelings of dismay all over the country, but was endorsed by the Congress Working Committee on 12th February, 1922. In consequence some activities of the national movement had to be suspended for several years.

A new policy was adopted by a section of the Congress under the leadership of C. R. Das and Motilāl Nehru. They organized the Swarājya party and contested the next elections to the Council with a view to wrecking the reforms from within by "uniform, consistent and continuous obstruction". But in spite of some success the policy failed in its main objective.

The spirit of frustration caused by the suspension of the mass movement adversely affected the relations between Hindus and Muslims. There was no common programme to bring them together and the transformation of Turkey into a secularist State under Kemal Pasha put an end to the Khilafat movement. Other causes were also at work, and designating persons were not wanting to sow discord between the two communities. A series of communal riots broke out in 1923, and with occasional intervals continued to be almost regular features of Indian political life. The failure of the Swarājya Party was largely due to this communal discord. The Muslim League grew in power and revived the old ideas of Sir Syed Ahmad. The Congress, however, was obsessed by an uncompromising nationalist outlook, took no real measure of the magnitude and character of the communal problem, and underestimated the power and position of the Muslim League, reinforced by some Khilafat leaders who no longer took their inspiration from Mahātmā. The Congress wanted to rally the Muslim Nationalists as a counterpoise to the League, very much in the same way as the British Government wanted to rally the Moderates against the Extremists. The result was the same, for in the long run both proved equally incapable of stemming the tide of their opponents' sweeping success.

The boycott of the Simon Commission (p. 920), provided a great opportunity for the restoration of amity between the different communities and political parties. The Congress, the Muslim League...
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and the Liberal Federation, the organization of the Moderates who seceded from the Congress after 1920, all combined to frame a constitution for India. But the All-Parties Convention which met towards the end of 1928 would not concede the claims made by Mr. Jinnah on behalf of the Muslims. He therefore joined the Muslim leaders who did not see eye to eye with the Congress, and on January 1, 1929, held an All-India Muslim Conference which issued a manifesto of Muslim claims. This formed the basis of the famous fourteen demands formulated by Mr. Jinnah later in the same year.

In the Madras session held in 1927 the Congress had declared complete national independence as its goal. Nevertheless the All-Parties Convention, and later the Congress, agreed to accept Dominion Status if granted on or before 31st December, 1929. Failing this the Congress resolved to pursue its goal of complete independence and organize non-violent non-co-operation including non-payment of taxes.

In reply to the Congress demands the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, declared on 31st October, 1929, that "the natural issue of India's constitutional progress" was the attainment of Dominion Status, and further announced that a Round Table Conference of all parties would be held in London to discuss the recommendations of the Simon Commission. As this fell far short of its demands, the Congress, in its Lahore session, held in December, 1929, declared complete independence as its goal, resolved to boycott the Legislatures and the Round Table Conference, and took steps to launch a programme of civil disobedience. As the clock struck midnight on 31st December, 1929, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President of the Congress, hoisted the National Flag of India. Independence Day was celebrated all over India on 20th January, 1930. This day, on which the solemn ceremony was repeated year after year, became a landmark in the history of India's struggle for freedom.

Gandhiji started the Civil Disobedience campaign on April 6, by his famous march to Dandi in Western India to make salt on the sea-shore in defiance of the salt-law regulations. This was the signal for a mass movement on a large scale, involving mass strikes, the boycott of British goods, grave cases of terrorism such as the armoury raid in Chittagong, and the setting up of "parallel" governments in several places. The Government adopted stern measures of repression. According to official figures there were 29 cases of firing resulting in 103 killed and 420 injured, and 60,000 people were imprisoned in less than a year. Indiscriminate and merciless beating of men and women formed a feature of the repressive campaign undertaken by the Government.
The strike and the boycott hit the British community hard and the Government, unable to suppress the movement by force, adopted conciliatory measures. The Round Table Conference which met in November 1930, without any representative of the Congress, was adjourned on 2nd January, 1931, and on 4th March the famous Gāndhi-Irwin agreement was signed. By this the Congress agreed to give up Civil Disobedience and join the Round Table Conference, while the Government withdrew the repressive ordinances and released political prisoners excepting those guilty of violence.

Gāndhi ji was chosen as the sole representative of the Congress at the second session of the Round Table Conference (7th September to 1st December, 1931). But the communal question proved a baffling problem, and as no agreement was possible between Indian leaders, the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, had to make the famous Communal Award. On his return to India on 2nd December, 1931, Gāndhi ji found Government repression in full swing. His request for an interview with the Viceroy was refused, and on 1st January, 1932, the Working Committee of the Congress adopted a resolution for the renewal of Civil Disobedience and the boycott of British goods. On 4th January, Gāndhi ji was arrested. The Government declared the Congress to be an illegal body and issued a number of repressive ordinances. They were openly defied and the Government took severe measures against the resistance movement. According to Congress estimates more than 120,000 persons were arrested by the end of March, 1933, and a dismal record of "wholesale violence, physical outrages, shooting and beating up punitive expeditions, collective fines on villages and seizure of lands and property of villagers" is found in the India League Delegation Report issued in 1933.

It was at this unhappy juncture that the British Government announced its constitutional proposals (p. 922). The establishment of a separate electorate for the Depressed Classes, which formed a part of the Communal Award given by Ramsay Macdonald, provoked Gāndhi ji, then in jail, to undertake a fast. The result was the Poona Pact, which nearly doubled the number of seats reserved for the Depressed Classes, to be filled by a common joint electorate out of a panel of names originally chosen by them alone.

3. The Final Phase (1935–1947)

The Civil Disobedience campaign dragged on till May, 1934, when it was virtually abandoned by the Congress. Once more the Congress decided, as in 1922, to work the reforms introduced by the Act of
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1935 to which reference has been made above (p. 822). (It swept the polls in elections held at the beginning of 1937 so far as the General or predominantly Hindu seats were concerned. The Muslims desired to form a Coalition Ministry with the Congress in each Province, but the Congress refused to admit into the Ministry any one who did not subscribe to its creed. This decision widened the cleavage between the Congress and the Muslim League, and Mr. Jinnah, who had hitherto been favourably disposed towards the Congress, and had once vehemently protested against the view that India was not a nation, publicly declared that the "Muslims can expect neither justice nor fair play under Congress Government." This sentiment was now shared by the majority of Muslims. Mr. Jinnah became the unquestioned leader of the Muslim community, and was elected each year as President of the League, which soon rallied round it the great bulk of Muslims all over India.

The Congress formed Ministries in seven out of eleven provinces. As their administration was highly successful, the Congress rapidly grew in popularity, its membership increasing from less than half a million at the beginning of 1936 to five million by the end of 1939. But soon a "left wing" developed in the Congress, and its great strength became manifest when its leader Subhás Chandra Bose defeated even Gándhirí's nominee for the Presidency. When the moderate section ultimately forced Subhás Bose to resign, he formed a new party, the "Forward Bloc", and this open split considerably weakened the power and prestige of the Congress.

Nevertheless the Congress Ministries successfully worked the reforms, and the political situation was fairly tranquil until the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, when the Congress took exception to the fact that India was dragged into the war without her consent. A strong declaration was issued by the Working Committee of the Congress refusing "co-operation in a war which is conducted on imperialist lines". The Committee also asked the British Government to state whether their war aims included the elimination of imperialism and the treatment of India as a free nation. As no satisfactory reply was forthcoming, all the Congress Ministries resigned in October-November, 1939. When the Germans were carrying everything before them, the Congress offered more than once to co-operate in the war effort, if at least a Provisional National Government were set up at the Centre. The utmost concession on the side of the Government was contained in the...
Viceroy's statement of August 8, 1940. He refused to conceal the National Government as "its authority is denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life," which obviously referred to the Muslims. But he offered (1) to set up, after the war, a representative body to devise a new constitution for India, (2) to enlarge the Viceroy's Executive Council by nominating additional Indian members; and (3) to appoint a "War Advisory Council," consisting of representatives of British India and Indian States.

The Congress regarded this "August offer" as quite unsatisfactory, and inaugurated, in October, 1940, an individual Civil disobedience campaign under the leadership of Mahātmā Gāndhi. This deadlock continued for a year and a half. At last when the Japanese, after overrunning Malaya, were rapidly advancing to Burma, the British made a conciliatory gesture. On 8th March, 1942, Rangoon fell, and three days later it was announced that Sir Stafford Cripps, a member of the British Cabinet, would be sent out to India. Cripps virtually repeated the August offer. He promised Dominion Status and a constitution-making body after the war was over, but held out no hope of any immediate change in the government of India. The Congress as well as the Muslim League refused his offer and the Cripps Mission (March-April, 1942) ended in complete failure.

Throughout these negotiations the Congress could not count on the support of the Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah now repudiated the "democratic system of Parliamentary government on the conception of a homogeneous nation and the method of counting heads impossible in India, and publicly expressed the view that neither minority safeguards nor separate electorates could save the Muslims from the Congress raj at the centre. When the Congress Ministers in the Provinces resigned, the Muslim League observed a day of deliverance and thanksgiving throughout India.

In January, 1940, Mr. Jinnah declared that the Hindu and Muslim peoples formed two separate nations "who both must share the governance of their common motherland." Three months later, in the Lahore Session of the Muslim League (March, 1940), he declared that the Muslim nation must have a separate independent state. In other words, he now advocated the establishment of Pakistan, a federation of the Punjab, North-West Frontier or Afghān Province, Kashmir, Sind, and Bahuchistān in a sovereign state. The idea had been first brought into prominence by a group of young Muslins.

1 The name Pakistān (originally Pakistān), which means "sacred land," is derived by taking the initial letters of the first four and the end of the last name (R. Coupland, The Constitutional Problem in India, Part II, p. 199).
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the time of the Round Table Conference, but had found no support, and was characterised by Muslim leaders as "a student's scheme", "chimerical and impracticable". Even the modified proposal of Sir Muhammad Iqbal for a loose federation of Pakistan, comprising one or two Muslim states, with the rest of India, first made in 1930, and repeated in 1939, had not been widely accepted. The idea of Pakistan as a sovereign state was revived by Mr. Jinnah, and was formally endorsed by the Muslim League in 1940. From that date all attempts at reconciliation between the Congress and the League founded on this issue of Pakistan. The Government could also now plausibly refuse the Congress demand for a national government on the ground that the Muslims were opposed to it.

On August 8, 1942, the All-India Congress Committee adopted a resolution in favour of starting a mass struggle on the widest possible scale. Although the Congress had not made any actual preparations, the Government decided to strike immediately. In the early hours of the morning of August 9, all the Congress leaders were arrested and the Congress was declared an illegal body. As there was no definite organization and a great lack of leadership, violent riots and assaults and sporadic disorders, such as the cutting of telegraph and telephone lines, damaging railway tracks, stations, etc., occurred on a large scale in different parts of India. The Government again adopted strong measures of repression including firing from aeroplanes. According to official estimates more than 60,000 people were arrested, 18,000 detained without trial, 940 killed, and 1,630 injured through police or military firing during the last five months of 1942.

The outward manifestation of unrest in India was considerably reduced by these repressive measures, but the British Government was soon faced by another serious danger. Subhas Chandra Bose, who had escaped from India in 1941, made contacts with Germany and Japan. When the Japanese conquered the Malay Peninsula, a large number of Indian soldiers fell prisoners into their hands. Under an agreement with the Japanese Government, Bose, now called Netaji (Leader), organised them into an Azad Hind Fauj or Indian National Army. He inaugurated the Government of Free India at Singapore, and in 1943 his soldiers advanced with the Japanese army up to the very frontier of India.

On 6th May, 1944, Gândhi ji was released from prison on grounds of health. He held a series of discussions with Mr. Jinnah but no

1 It is, however, to be noted that some time before April, 1925, Lall Bhupat Ráí had suggested the creation of Muslim Provinces in the north-east and north-west of India to act as rest the ceaseless Hindu-Muslim bickerings and jealousies in some provinces (Mod. Rev. April, 1925, p. 489).
agreement was reached. Lord Wavell, who succeeded Lord Linlithgow as Governor-General in October, 1943, flew to London in March, 1945, and came back with the proposal that the Members of his Council, with the exception of the Viceroy and Commander-in-Chief, should be Indians selected from amongst the leaders of Indian political parties, on a basis of parity between Muslims and the so-called caste Hindus. He summoned a conference at Simla on 25th June, 1945, to select the personnel, but it broke down as the Congress and the League could not come to an agreement.

Not long after this, the Labour Party came into power in Britain. The new British Government made an earnest effort to end the political deadlock in India. They decided to hold fresh elections of Indian Councils, both Central and Provincial, to reconstitute the Viceroy’s Executive Council, immediately after the elections, with Indian members as proposed in March, and to summon a constitution-making body as soon as possible. The elections held at the beginning of 1946 resulted in a sweeping victory for the Congress in respect of the General seats and for the Muslim League in respect of Muslim seats.

The Indian National Army organised by Bose surrendered to the British after the collapse of Japan, and a number of its officers were tried in India for treason. This was a highly impolitic step on the part of the Government, as it gave the Indian people a complete picture of an organization of which they had hitherto known very little. A wave of enthusiasm swept the country, and demonstrations were held in a number of cities. On 18th February, 1946, the ratings of the Royal Indian Navy rose in open mutiny which, for a few days, assumed serious proportions.

On 19th February, the British Prime Minister announced that three members of the Cabinet would visit India “to promote in conjunction with the leaders of Indian opinion, the early realization of full self-government in India.” Later, on 15th March, he referred to complete independence as a possible goal of Indian constitution development, if Indians so chose. The Cabinet Mission arrived in Delhi in March, 1946, and held a series of conferences with the leaders of the Congress and the League. As no agreement was possible between them, the Mission issued a statement on 16th May, 1946, giving in broad outline their idea of the future government of India and laying down the procedure for framing a detailed constitution.

The Cabinet Mission recommended a federal type of government for the whole of India including the States. The Federal Government would deal with Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communication, and the other powers would be vested in the Provinces and States.
British India was to be divided into three groups of Provinces: one comprising the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistán; a second comprising Bengal and Assam, and the third the rest. The Union Constitution was to be framed by a Constituent Assembly of 296 members elected on a communal basis by the Provincial Legislative Assemblies, and the representatives of states which joined the Union, while the representatives of the three groups of Provinces were to meet separately to draw up the constitution of the Provinces in each group. Each Province was given the right to opt out of the Federal Union after the first election of its Legislative Council under the new Constitution. The Cabinet Mission further recommended the establishment of an interim National Government by the reconstitution of the Viceroy's Executive Council from among the leaders of the different parties.

On 6th June, the Muslim League accepted the Cabinet Mission's proposals, reiterating that the attainment of the goal of a complete sovereign Pakistan still remained the unalterable objective of the Muslims in India. The Congress rejected the Viceroy's proposal for an interim Government, but agreed to participate in the Constituent Assembly in order to frame the Constitution. The Cabinet Mission left India on 29th June.

The Muslim League demanded that the Viceroy should proceed with his scheme for an interim Government even though the Congress would not take part in it. Thus the Viceroy refused to do, for he had already declared that it was to be a Government of all the parties who had accepted the Cabinet Mission's plan. There were also sharp differences between the Muslim League and the Congress over the interpretation of the Cabinet Mission's plan.

After a somewhat acrimonious controversy the Muslim League formally withdrew its acceptance of the Cabinet Mission's plan. The Viceroy thereupon, in accordance with his previous declaration, reconstituted his Executive Council without any representative of the League. This complete triumph of the Congress provoked a violent reaction among separatist Muslims, and the Muslim League fixed upon 16th August, 1946, as the day of "Direct Action". On that day, while some of the supporters of the League contented themselves with demonstrations of a peaceful type, a rowdy section in Calcutta got completely out of control. A number of Hindus were killed and their houses and shops were looted and burnt. Soon the Hindus retaliated and for a number of days the streets of Calcutta were the scene of communal riots of the worst type. Neither the League Ministry, nor the Governor and the Viceroy, who were ultimately responsible for law and order, took adequate steps to stop the
hideous violence that disgraced the name of the first city of modern India.

On 2nd September, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and his colleagues were sworn in as members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. Soon after this, the Hindus of a number of villages in the district of Noakhali and the adjoining part of Comilla suffered terribly from raids organised by bands of armed men belonging to the other community. This provoked reprisals in Bihar, where large numbers of Muslims received the same treatment at the hands of the Hindus. Pandit Nehru flew to Bihar, and the Congress Ministry there took vigorous steps to suppress the disturbances.

The Executive Council of the Viceroy, under the guidance of Nehru, worked like a Cabinet and changed the whole spirit and outlook of Indian government. Lord Wavell, whose power thus became almost non-existent, now sought to bring in the League members as a counterpoise in the name of communal parity. He told Panshel Nehru that the League had agreed to join the Constituent Assembly, and reconstituted the Executive Council by including members of that organisation. The introduction of this new element destroyed the team spirit of the Council, as the League members openly repudiated the idea of collective responsibility. What was worse, the League did not join the Constituent Assembly, and Mr. Jinnah made the startling disclosure that it had never agreed to do so. It was an awkward situation for the Viceroy, and the British Government did nothing to improve it when it declared, on December 9th, that if the Muslim League did not join the Constituent Assembly, the decision of this body could not be implemented by the British Government, so far at least as it affected the Provinces with a Muslim majority. Nevertheless, the Constituent Assembly met on 9th December, 1946, without the members of the League. B. R. R. R. Prasad was elected President, and various committees were appointed to draft the different parts of the Constitution.

The tense atmosphere continued till 20th February, 1947, when the British Government made an important announcement of policy. It declared its intention to quit India by June, 1948, and appointed Lord Mountbatten Viceroy of India to arrange for the transfer of authority from British to Indian hands.

This momentous proclamation evoked hearty enthusiasm all over India, save in the ranks of the Muslim League, which once more resorted to "Direct Action." Riots broke out all over the Punjab and soon extended to the North-West Frontier Province, and elsewhere. Arson, murder and violence occurred on a large scale over a wide area. These successive communal outbreaks had a very unfortunate
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consequence. The Hindus and the Sikhs, who had hitherto been strongly in favour of a United India, now gradually came to realise its impracticability, and demanded partition of the Punjab and Bengal if the Muslims refused to join the Constituent Assembly.

Lord Mountbatten assumed office as Viceroy on 24th March, 1947, and on 3rd June broadcast the famous declaration laying down "the method by which power will be transferred from British to Indian hands". The main points of this new procedure or policy may be summed up as follows.

1. If the areas with a majority of Muslim population so desired, they should be allowed to form a separate Dominion, and a new Constituent Assembly would be set up for that purpose. But in that case there would be a partition of Bengal and the Punjab if the representatives of the Hindu majority districts in the Legislatures of those Provinces so desired.

2. A referendum would be taken in the North-West Frontier Province to ascertain whether it should join Pakistan or not.

3. The district of Sylhet would be joined to the Muslim area in Bengal after the views of the people had been ascertained by a referendum.

4. Boundary Commissions would be set up to define the boundaries of the Hindu and Muslim Provinces in Bengal and the Punjab.

5. Legislation would be introduced in the current session of Parliament for immediately conferring Dominion Status on India (or the two Dominions if partition is decided upon), without any prejudice to the final decision of the Constituent Assembly (or Assemblies) in this respect.

This historic pronouncement was received with mixed feelings by the public. The Hindus and nationalists of all persuasions deplored the vivisection of India, while the Muslims of the League were not fully satisfied with the "truncated and moth-eaten Pakistan", as Mr. Jinnah once described it.

"It was, however, generally agreed that the new scheme offered the best practicable solution of the Indian problem, so far as it could be envisaged at the moment. Accordingly both the Congress and the League accepted it, and the partition of the Punjab and Bengal was effected by two Commissions appointed by the British Government, with Sir Cyril Radcliffe as Chairman of both. The India Independence Bill, passed by the British Parliament on the 1st July, 1947, without any dissent, fixed upon 15th August, 1947, as the date of the transfer of authority. Accordingly, at midnight on 14th-15th August, a special session of the Constituent Assembly was held in Delhi. It solemnly declared the independence of India as a part of the British
Commonwealth and appointed Lord Mountbatten the first Governor-General of the new Indian Dominion.

Mr. Jinnah was chosen as the first Governor-General of Pakistan, which soon took steps to summon its own Constituent Assembly.

15th August, 1947, which saw the end of the long-drawn National Struggle against British rule is a red-letter day in the history of India, and the date will ever remain engraved in the hearts of millions of her people.
APPENDIX 1

THE INDIAN STATES IN NEW INDIA

1. General Policy

The position of the Indian States in Independent India was fore-shadowed by the Cabinet Mission, which used the following words in its statement of 16th May, 1946: "It is quite clear that with the attainment of independence by British India, whether inside or outside the Commonwealth, the relationship which has hitherto existed between the Rulers of the States and the British Crown, will no longer be possible. Paramountcy can neither be retained by the British Crown nor transferred to the new Government . . . . At the same time the States are ready and willing to co-operate in the new development of India. The precise form which their co-operation will take must be a matter for negotiations during the building-up of the new constitutional structure, and it by no means follows that it will be identical for all the States." The Cabinet Mission recommended that: "(1) There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States, which should deal with the following subjects: Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects. (2) The States should retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union."

The position was further elucidated as follows by the Cabinet Mission in its Memorandum on States' Treaties and Paramountcy presented to the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes on the 22nd May, 1946: "When a new fully self-governing or independent Government or Governments come into being . . . His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of Paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by States to the Paramount power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown and British India on the other hand, will thus be brought to an end. The void will have to be filled either by the States entering
into a federal relationship with the successor Government or Governments in British India, or failing this, entering into particular political arrangements with it or them."

The Rulers of the States agreed to accept the Cabinet Mission’s plan. Their viewpoint was shown as follows in a resolution passed by the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes on the 29th January, 1947: “(1) The entry of the States into the Union shall be on no other basis than that of negotiation, and the final decision will rest with each State . . . which can only be taken after consideration of the complete picture of the constitution. (2) All the rights surrendered by the States to the Paramount power will return to the States. The proposed Union of India will, therefore, exercise only such functions in relation to the States in regard to Union Subjects as are assigned or delegated by them to the Union. Every State shall continue to retain its sovereignty and all rights and powers except those that have been expressly delegated by it. There can be no question of any powers being vested or inherent or implied in the Union in respect of the States unless specifically agreed to by them. (3) The Constitution of each State, its territorial integrity and the succession of its reigning dynasty in accordance with the law, custom and usage of the State, shall not be interfered with by the Union or any part thereof."

But after the declaration regarding the partition of India some of the bigger States like Travancore and Hyderabad, pleaded that they could not accept the original plan to which they had given their assent, on the basis of a United India. They even thought that they were entitled to declare their independence in the changed situation, and talked of entering into treaty relations as between two sovereign States and another. The leader of the Muslim League supported this new attitude, but it did not accord with the views of the Congress leaders and other prominent politicians. In a meeting held on the 15th June, 1947, the All-India Congress Committee stated that they could not “admit the right of any State in India to declare its independence and to live in isolation from the rest of India”. “Such a declaration,” in the opinion of Mahatma Gandhi, "was tantamount to a declaration of war against the free millions of India.” Pandit Nehru said that “any recognition of any such independence by any foreign power, whichever it may be and whatever it may be, will be considered an unfriendly act”. In a statement of 17th June, 1947, Dr. Ambedkar asserted that according to certain aspects of British Constitutional Law and also International Law there were some flaws in the Cabinet Mission’s memorandum regarding lapses of Paramountcy. His view was that the States...
be sovereign States to the extent they are, but they cannot be independent States so long as they remain under the suzerainty, as they must be, either of the Crown, if India remains a Dominion, or of the successor State, if India becomes independent”.

Sardar Patel took charge of the Indian States Department created by the Government of India, on the 5th July, 1947, “to deal with matters arising between the Central Government and the Indian States”. Following his advice as well as that of Lord Mountbatten, all the States, with a few exceptions, decided, on 25th July, to accede to the Indian Union in accordance with an Instrument of Accession which provided that, pending the promulgation of a constitution by the Constituent Assembly, in which the States would be adequately represented, the Dominion Parliament would legislate for the acceding States in matters relating to Defence, External Affairs, Communications and other ancillary subjects.

The policy of the Government of the Indian Dominion regarding the States proved successful in most cases. Their relations were regulated by two processes. One was the merger of the smaller States either into a unit administered by the Central Government, or into the neighbouring Provincial administrations, as for example the merger of the Eastern States into the Provinces of Orissa and the Central Provinces, and of the Deccan States and the Gujarāt States into the Bombay administration. The other process was that of the integration of a number of States into bigger administrative combinations, as for example the United State of Mountāya (18th March, 1948), the United State of Kāthiāwār (Saurāshtra) (15th February, 1948), the United State of Rājasthān (25th March, 1948 and 18th April, 1948), the United State of Vindhia Pradesh (4th April, 1948), the United States of Gwālior, Indore and Mālāwā (Madhya Bhārat Union, 28th May, 1948), and the Patiālā and East Punjab States Union (15th July, 1948). The administration of a Union of 21 States, known as Himāchal Pradesh, and of Cutch, together having a total area of 19,061 square miles, passed under the control of the Centre.

There still remained some small States and also a few major States unaffected by the processes mentioned above. Regarding such major States the policy of the Government of the Indian Union was stated in the Dominion Parliament on the 15th March, 1948, by Mr. N. V. Gadgil (Indian Minister of Works) speaking on behalf of Sardar Patel: “There is no desire on our part, in any way, to compel or coerce them into merger or integration. If they wish to remain as separate autonomous unites, we would have no objection, but if the Rulers and the people of any of these States desire to merge
with the neighbouring Province or form a Union with the neigh-
bouring States on a voluntary basis, obviously the Government of
India cannot say 'No'. . . . It is clear, however, that in these
States, which remain separate units, there would be continuous
popular pressure for the grant of full responsible government. I
hope the Rulers of these States will appreciate the necessity of
retaining the affection and goodwill of their subjects by timely con-
cessions, rather than futile resistance to popular demands. . . . Our
policy in regard to them remains . . . their continued autono-
existence unless both the Rulers and the people desire otherwise.

Along with the modifications in the pattern of an old structure,
there took place a considerable transformation of the inner set-
ing of the States and a reorientation in the attitude and policy of the
Rulers towards their peoples. Not only did they introduce various
measures for improving the economic condition of their respective
areas, but "practically every State", as the White Paper on Indian
States, issued by the Government of India in July, 1948, noted
"announced its intention to grant full responsible government, and
in a vast majority of them power has already been transferred to the
people". The same document significantly notes that "a bloody
revolution has been brought about, on the one hand, by the operat-
ing of democratic forces unleashed by freedom, and on the other, by the
patriotic attitude of the Rulers who have been quick to appreciate
the change".

The State of Junagadh and a few adjoining States joined the
United State of Kathiawar (Saurashtra) (31st December, 1948),
Mayurbhanj merged into Orissa, Kolhapur into the Bombay Pro-
vince, and Râmpur and Banaras into the U.P. Cochin was un-
gamated with Travancore. The biggest Union of Indian States as
one of the biggest political and administrative units of India, known
as the "Greater Rajasthan Union", was inaugurated on 30th
March, 1949. It has within its fold 15 ancient Rajput States with
an area of 120,000 sq. miles, a population of about 13 million with
an annual revenue of about 10 crores of rupees. The great State
of Baroda merged into the Bombay Province on 1st May, 1949 and
Bhopal, Cooch Behar, Tripura, and Manipur passed under the Centre
administration. Thus before the end of November, 1949, the integra-
tion of Indian States was completed with the exception of Hyderabad
and Kashmir.

2. Hyderabad

A settlement with Hyderabad, which has a special position as the
biggest State in India and having a Muslim ruler over a very vast
Hindu population, raised highly intricate issues. On the 26th November, 1947, Hyderabād entered into one year's Standstill Agreement with the Indian Union to maintain the status quo which had existed before 15th August, 1947.

In the opinion of Syed Kasum Razvi, President of the Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslimin, the Standstill Agreement in no way interfered with the status of Hyderabād as an independent sovereign State, while Paramountcy was "buried deep once for all". But the Government of India felt that from considerations of defence, internal security, and economy, India would remain exposed to grave dangers with an independent Hyderabād. "An independent State completely landlocked within the heart of another is," they noted in their White Paper on Hyderabād, "an unheard of proposition."

Besides this fundamental point of divergence between India and Hyderabād, some newly arisen internal and external factors further complicated the situation. The activities within the State of the Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslimin and of the Razakars under the leadership of Kasim Razvi, and incidents on the borders of the Indian provinces of Madras, Central Provinces and Bombay, were a standing menace to peace and harmony, and caused much anxiety in the minds of responsible people in different quarters.

All negotiations between Hyderabād and the Indian Union from January, 1948, proved abortive. The Nizām's Government refused to accept the suggestion made by the Governor-General on behalf of the Government of India for Hyderabād's accession to the Indian Dominion, and also another suggestion of the Government of India for the introduction of responsible government in the State. During the final phase of the negotiations in June, 1948, a Draft Agreement was drawn up. On the 18th June, 1948, three days before his departure from India, Lord Mountbatten appealed to the Nizām to accept the Draft Agreement, but to no effect.

On the Hyderabād Government's rejection of the Draft Agreement, the Government of India put some economic pressure on the former. But this did not improve matters. The forces that worked against accession to the Indian Dominion held a position of vantage in that State and made warlike preparations, such as an increase in the State Army, the formation of irregular armies, and the smuggling of arms and ammunition from abroad with the help of foreign adventurers. Further, the growing violence of the Razakars inside Hyderabād State and in the border tracts of the Indian Union seriously menaced law and order. So the Government of India reiterated their demand for immediate disbandment of the Razakars, and also asked the Nizām to facilitate the return of the Indian troops
to Secunderabad, where they had been stationed before their withdrawal early that year according to the Standstill Agreement. The Nizam, who had already appealed to the United Nations against India, would not accept these terms. At this the Government of India informed the Nizam's Government in a final letter on 11th September that they now considered themselves free to take whatever action they thought necessary to restore law and order.

The Indian troops marched into the Hyderabad State on 13th September. The Government of India declared that it was not an "act of war" but a mere "police action" intended "to restore peace and tranquillity inside the State and a sense of security in the adjoining Indian territory." At 4.30 p.m. on 18th September 1948, Major-General El Edroos, Commander, Forces of the Hyderabad State, surrendered on behalf of the Nizam to Major-General J. N. Chaudhury, Commander of the First Armoured Division of the Indian Army. Kasim Razvi was arrested and the Razakar organization was broken up. The Laisk Ali Ministry, which had filed complaint against India before the Security Council, resigned on 17th September, and the Nizam cabled on 22nd September to the effect that he had withdrawn the Hyderabad case from the Security Council and that the delegation sent there by the outgoing Ministry had no authority to represent him or his State.

Restoration of peace and order being considered by the Indian Government the first and foremost need of the hour, the affairs of Hyderabad were placed under the control of Major-General J. N. Chaudhury, as Military Governor, to be assisted by a staff of Civil Officers. The Nizam readily accepted the new situation and offered his full co-operation. Order and tranquillity were gradually established by effective administrative measures. In December 1949 Mr. M. K. Vellodi became the Chief Minister of Hyderabad. On 26th January 1950, Hyderabad acceded to the Indian Union, of which she now forms part and parcel for all purposes.

3. Kashmir

While the Hyderabad problem seemed to be nearing solution, the situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir remained grave and critical. Situated in the extreme north of the Indian subcontinent, this State covers an area of 84,471 square miles. On the north-east it is bordered by Tibet, on the north by Chinese Turkestan (Sinkiang), and on the north-west by the Soviet Republic of Turkestan and by Afghaniistán. On its western border lies Pakistán.
and to the south it touches Pakistan and the Dominion of India. The census of 1941 recorded that the total population of the State was 4,021,615, of whom 77.11 per cent were Muslims, 20.12 per cent Hindus, and 2.77 per cent Sikhs and Buddhists. In view of geographical contiguity and the greater numerical strength of the Muslims in this State, Pakistan was naturally anxious to bring it under her influence.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir was subjected to repeated tribal raids from across and within the Pakistan area soon after the partition. On the rapid advance of the raiders up the Jhelum Valley Road, threatening even Srinagar, the Government of Jammu and Kashmir sought assistance of the Government of the Indian Dominion. On 26th October the Maharajah of Kashmir formally acceded to the Indian Union, and this step was fully approved by Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, leader of the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, an organisation enjoying a large measure of popular confidence and support in the State. The Government of India, while accepting this accession as a provisional step, expressed the view that the future of Kashmir should be decided in accordance with the popular will ascertained by means of plebiscite or referendum.

The first contingent of Indian troops reached Kashmir by air on the morning of 27th October, 1947. On 31st October, an interim Emergency Administration was formed with Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah as its head, which, with the help of Indian forces, successfully resisted tribal raids, believed to be encouraged and supported by Pakistan, whose sympathies were for the Azad Kashmir Government, an organization opposed to the new Government in Kashmir. On 31st December, the Indian Union sent a memorandum to the Security Council of the United Nations urging the latter "to call upon Pakistan (a member State), to put an end immediately to the giving of such assistance, which is an act of aggression against India." After fruitless efforts at mediation for about five months the United Nations sent a Commission to study things on the spot. This Commission reached India in July, 1948 and on 13th August, 1948, suggested a "Cease Fire" agreement between India and Pakistan. The Indian Union agreed, but the Pakistan Government was not prepared to accept the "Cease Fire" resolution without attaching certain conditions which were unacceptable to the Commission. The presence of Pakistan troops in Kashmir territory was now admitted by the Pakistan Government, and the relations between the two Dominions grew extremely strained. Happily good sense ultimately prevailed, and one minute before midnight on
1st January, 1949, a mutual "Cease Fire" agreement was concluded between the Governments of the Indian Union and Pakistan. Hostilities ceased and Admiral Nimitz was appointed U.N. Administrator for the plebiscite. It is hoped that the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir will be determined by a plebiscite held under satisfactory conditions.
APPENDIX II

THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

The Constituent Assembly, which first met on December 9th, 1946 (p. 994), took three years to complete its work, and the new Constitution was adopted and signed by the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, on November 26th, 1949. It came into force on January 26th, 1950, the twentieth anniversary of Independence Day (p. 987). It is a bulky document covering 250 printed pages, and its main provisions are given below.

A. INDIAN UNION

1. India, that is Bhārat, is a Sovereign Democratic Republic and a Union of States. These States are divided into four categories, viz.:

(A) Assam, Bihār, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh (Central Provinces and Berar), Madras, Orissa, Punjab (E. Punjab), the United Provinces,2 and West Bengal.
(B) Hyderabad, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Bhārat (p. 999), Mysore, Patiala and East Punjab States Union, Rajasthan, Saurashtra, Travancore-Cochin, and Vindhyā Pradesh.
(C) Ajmer, Bhopāl, Bilāspur, Coorg, Delhi, Himāchal Pradesh, Kutch, Manipur, and Tripurā.
(D) The Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

The first category consists of the former provinces of British India, while the second and third comprise the old Indian States, either single or integrated into unions, together with three Chief Commissionerships (centrally administered territories) of old, viz. Ajmer-Merwara, Coorg, and Delhi.

1 But it is still a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The present status of India is regulated by the "India (Consequential Provision) Bill" passed by the British Parliament, which received the Royal Assent on December 16th, 1949. This Act, while recognizing India as a Republican State, preserves for her the rights and privileges at present enjoyed by the Indians under British law.

2 The name of this Province was altered to Uttar Pradesh in January 1950.
B. FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

2. The Constitution guarantees to all citizens freedom of speech and expression, the right to assemble peaceably, and freedom of conscience and worship, subject to general considerations of public security and morality.

3. All citizens, irrespective of religion, race, caste, sex, and place of birth, shall enjoy equality before the law and no disability shall be imposed on them in any respect.

"Untouchability" is abolished and its practice in any form is forbidden.

4. No person shall be deprived of his life, property or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. The law may provide for preventive detention of a person for three months and even for a longer period, either on the recommendation of an Advisory Board, or in accordance with a law passed by Parliament.

The law authorising compulsory acquisition of property should provide for compensation.

C. THE UNION GOVERNMENT

5. The executive power of the Union is vested in the President of India, who is elected for five years by the members of an electoral college consisting of (a) the elected members of both Houses of Parliament and (b) the elected members of the Legislative Assemblies of the States.

6. There is also a Vice-President of India elected for five years by the members of both Houses of Parliament, assembled at a joint meeting.

7. There is a Council of Ministers with the Prime Minister as the head to aid and advise the President. The Prime Minister is appointed by the President, and the other Ministers are appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister. The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the House of the People.

8. There is a Parliament for the Union consisting of the President and two Houses known respectively as the Council of States and the House of the People.

9. The Council of States consists of (1) not more than 238 representatives of States, elected by the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of each State, and (2) 12 members nominated by the President on the ground of their having special knowledge or practical experience in literature, science, art, and social service.

10. The House of the People consists of not more than 500 members directly elected by the voters in the States. For this
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purpose territorial constituencies have been specially created in such a manner that there is not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population and not more than one member for every 500,000 of the population.

11. The Council of States is not subject to dissolution, but one-third of its members retire on the expiration of every second year. The House of the People, unless sooner dissolved, continues for five years. Both the Houses must meet at least twice in every year.

12. The Vice-President of India is the ex-offico Chairman of the Council of States, which elects a Deputy Chairman. The House of the People elects its own Speaker and Deputy Speaker. These officers and members of the two Houses receive salaries and allowances as fixed by Parliament.

13. A Money Bill may originate only in the House of the People and is passed even if the Council of States does not agree to it. All other Bills may originate in either House of Parliament, and are deemed to have been passed only when agreed to by both Houses, or, in case of difference, passed in a joint sitting of the two Houses by a majority of the total number of members of both Houses present and voting.

14. The President's assent is necessary before a Bill becomes law, and he may withhold his assent and return the Bill with his suggestions; but if the Bill is passed again by the Houses he cannot withhold his assent.

15. There is a Supreme Court of India consisting of a Chief Justice of India and, until Parliament by law prescribes a larger number, not more than seven other judges. It has original jurisdiction in any dispute between two or more States and between the Government of India and one or more States. An appeal lies to the Supreme Court from the judgment of any High Court in a State. A judge of the Supreme Court (or of the High Court of a State) shall not be removed from his office except after an address by each House of Parliament passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting.

D. THE STATES (CATEGORY A)

16. There is a Governor for each State appointed by the President for a term of five years and holding office during his pleasure.

17. There is a Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister at the head to aid and advise the Governor. The Chief Minister is appointed by the Governor, and the other Ministers by the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister. The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the Legislative Assembly of the State.
18. There is a Legislature in every State which consists of the Governor and the Legislative Assembly, but there is an additional House, known as the Legislative Council, in Bihar, Bombay, Madras, Punjab, the United Provinces, and West Bengal.

19. The members of the Legislative Assembly are chosen by direct election, on a scale of not more than one member for every 75,000 of the population.

20. The total number of members in the Legislative Council is not to exceed one-fourth of the total number of members in the Legislative Assembly. Of these one-third are elected by the Municipalities, District Boards and other local authorities; one-twelfth by graduates of three years' standing; one-twelfth by teachers of three years' standing; and one-third by the members of the Legislative Assembly. The remainder are nominated by the Governor and consist of persons having special knowledge or practical experience in literature, science, art, the co-operative movement, and social service.

21. The duration of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly is the same as laid down respectively for the Council of States and the House of the People in para. 11.

22. Every Legislative Assembly chooses two of its members respectively as Speaker and Deputy Speaker thereof. Every Legislative Council chooses two of its members respectively as Chairman and Deputy Chairman thereof. These officers as well as the members of the two Houses receive such salaries and allowances as may be fixed by the Legislature of the State.

23. A Money Bill may originate only in the Legislative Assembly and is passed even if the Legislative Council does not agree to it. All other Bills may originate in either House, and are deemed to have been passed only when agreed to by both Houses. But in case of difference, if the Legislative Assembly passes the Bill a second time, it becomes law without the approval of the Legislative Council.

24. The Governor has the same power of assenting to, or withholding his assent from, a Bill passed by the Legislature as possessed by the President (vide para. 14). But the Governor may also reserve such a Bill for the consideration of the President.

E. THE STATES (CATEGORIES B, C, D)

25. The main difference between the States belonging to categories A and B is that while the executive head of the former is a Governor, that of the latter is the Rajpramukh, usually the ruler of the old State (or of one of them in the case of an integration of States). The appointment of the Rajpramukh is regulated by the
agreement entered into between each such State and the Government of India. The third and fourth categories of States are administered by the Head of the Indian Union, through a Chief Commissioner appointed by him or through the government of a neighbouring State.

F. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE UNION AND THE STATES

26. Generally speaking, the Parliament may make laws for the whole or any part of India, and the Legislature of a State may make laws for the whole or any part of the State. But the Constitution specifically lays down three lists of subjects, with respect to the first of which the Parliament, and with respect to the second, the Legislature of the State, has exclusive power to make laws; and both have concurrent powers of legislation in regard to the third.

27. The Union List includes, among others, defence of India, naval, military, and air forces, arms and ammunitions, foreign affairs including diplomatic representation, war and peace, railways, maritime shipping and navigation, airways, posts and telegraphs, currency, trade and commerce with foreign countries, inter-State trade and commerce, banking, insurance, and financial corporations, regulation of mines and mineral development, regulation of labour, manufacture of salt, High Courts, certain institutions of all-India importance, certain taxes like income-tax, duties of customs, and duties of excise.

28. The State List includes, among others, police, administration of justice (except constitution of High Courts), prisons, local government, education, communication (within the State), forests, fisheries, and several taxes.

29. The Concurrent List includes, among others, criminal law, civil and criminal procedure, preventive detention for the security of the State, Trade Unions, ports, inland shipping and navigation, trade, commerce and price-control.

30. The executive power of every State is to be so exercised as to ensure compliance with the laws made by Parliament. It shall not impede or prejudice the exercise of the executive power of the Union which extends to the giving of such directions to a State as may appear necessary to the Government of India.

31. Detailed regulations are laid down for the distribution of revenues between the Union and the States, and provision is made for the appointment of a Finance Commission from time to time to revise such distribution.
G. SUFFRAGE AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP OF LEGISLATURE

32. Every citizen of India, of not less than twenty-one years of age, is entitled to vote in the elections to the House of the People and to the Legislative Assembly of the State to which he belongs.

33. No citizen of less than thirty years of age is qualified for the membership of the Council of States or the Legislative Council; the minimum age for the membership of the House of the People and Legislative Assembly is twenty-five years.

34. For a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution seats shall be reserved in the House of the People for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, in proportion to their population, and the President may nominate not more than two members of the Anglo-Indian Community to that House.

H. EMERGENCY PROVISIONS

35. The President or the Governor of a State may, when the Houses of Legislature are not in session, promulgate an Ordinance, having the same force and effect as an Act of the Legislature, if he thinks it necessary to take immediate action. Such Ordinances shall cease to operate at the expiration of six weeks from the reassembling of the Legislature, or earlier if the Legislature disapproves of them.

36. If the President is satisfied that a grave emergency exists whereby the security of India or any part of it is threatened, he may issue a Proclamation to that effect. While such a Proclamation of Emergency is in operation, the executive and legislative powers of the Union practically supersede those of the States.

37. If the President is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the Government of a State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution, he may, by Proclamation assume to himself or vest in the Parliament all or any of the powers and functions of the Government of the State.

38. The Proclamation, referred to in the two preceding para. shall cease to operate at the expiration of two months unless approved by both Houses of Parliament before that date, or in case the House of the People was dissolved at the time, within thirty days of its reconstitution.

I. MISCELLANEOUS

39. Either House of Parliament may bring a charge of Impeachment against the President for violation of the Constitution. If it
is passed by a majority of two-thirds, and is also sustained, after due enquiry, by a similar majority of the other House, the President shall be removed from office.

40. Subject to certain general restrictions which the law imposes, trade, commerce, and intercourse throughout the territory of India shall be free.

41. The Constitution provides for the appointment of a Public Service Commission both for the Union and the States, an Attorney-General for India, a Comptroller and Auditor-General of India, as well as Advocate-Generals and High Courts for States.

42. For a period of fifteen years the English language shall continue to be the official language of the Union. Thereafter the official language shall be Hindi in Devanagari script.

43. The Legislature of a State may by law adopt any local language as its official language provided that the official language of the Union shall be used for communication between two States.
GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART III

THE NAWABS OF OUDH

Mir Muhammad Nasir

Mir Muhammad Amin
NAFAKAT KHAN
Barhah-ul-mulk
(1722-1730)

Daughter - Jafar Beg Khan

Mirza Muhammad Muqim
Abu l Mousir Khan
SARFARAZ JAN
(1730-1754)

Sadr ul Din Hadar
SHI JAHUD DAULAH
(1741-1753)

Asaf ud-Daulah
(1755-1767)

Wazir Ali 1797-1798
Deposed and
succeeded by Sa'adat Ali
(1798-1814)

Glazi ud-din Hadar
(1801-1827)

'Ali Shah
(1837-1842)

Nasir ul Din Hadar
(1827-1837)

Amjad 'Ali Shah
(1842-1847)

Muns Jato

Mustafa Ali Khan Haider
(1847-1856)

Wazir Ali Shah

Soleiman Qadir

Hajja Qadir
(1857)
THE GÁIKWAR FAMILY

Dámáji I  Jhingoji
     Piláji (1721–1732)
     Dámáji II (1732–1768)

Govind Ráo  Sayáji Ráo I  Fateh Sing  Mánáji  Other

Ánand Ráo  Sayáji Ráo II
(1800–1819) (1818–1847)

Ganpat Ráo  Khande Ráo  Malhár Ráo
(1847–1856) (1856–1870) (1870–1875)
Adopted Sayáji Ráo III
(1875–1939)

THE HOLKAR FAMILY

“Cundajee”

Malhár Ráo Holkar (1728–1764)

Khande Ráo = Ahalyá Bál (1785–1795)
(killed 1754)

Malle Ráo  Mukti Bál
(1764–1766)

Tukoji Holkar
(appointed commander by Ahalyá Bál in 1767)
(1795–1797)

Kásí Ráo  Malhár Ráo

Jaswant Ráo I  Vithoji
(1798–1811)

Malhár Ráo Holkar (II)
(1811–1833)

Hari Ráo Holkar
(1834–1843)

Tukoji Ráo Holkar II
(1843–1886)

Siváji Ráo Holkar
(1886–1903)

Tukoji Ráo Holkar III
(1903–1926)

Jaswant Ráo II
(1926– )
### GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART III

#### THE BHONSLAS (Nâgpur)

Mudhoji

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bapuji</th>
<th>Parsoji</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bimbaji</td>
<td>Kanhoji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghūji I (1738–1755)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudhoji</td>
<td>Janoji</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raghūji II Vyankoji

adopted by Janoji

(1788–1816)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mudhoji</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parsoji (Appa Sāheb)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raghūji III (1818–1853)

#### THE SINDHIA FAMILY

Minā Bāi = Ranoji Sindhia = a Râjput Lady of Mâlwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jey pāt</th>
<th>Dattāji</th>
<th>Josīha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Jayappa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jankojī (killed at Pânipat almost immediately after accession to power),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mâdhava Râo (Mâhâdâji) Tukoji Sindhia (died on the field of Pânipat)

| d. 1794 |

Kedârji Jyotâba Anand Râo

Daulst Râo Sindhia

(1794–1827)

| Jankojî Râo |
| (1827–1843) |

| Jâyaji Râo |
| (1843–1886) |

Mâdhava Râo III

(1898–1925)

Jivaji Râo

(1921– )
THE DURRĀNĪ SHĀHS

Ahmad Shāh, Durrānī
(1747–1773)

∥
Timūr Shāh
(1773–1793)

∥

Humāyūn
Mahmūd
(1800–1803, 1809–1818)
Zamān Shāh
(1793–1800)
Shujā`
(1803–1809, 1839–1842)
`Ayyūb
(1818–1823)

∥
Kāmrān

∥
Jehāngīr

∥
Timūr
THE NIZAMS OF HYDERABAD

Khwaja Abid Kabj Khan (Governor of Ajmer)

Mir Shihab-ud-din, Ghazi-ud-din Khan Firdaw Jang (Governor of Gujrat)

1. Mir Qamr-ud-din, Nizam-ul-mulk Asaf Jah
Created Subahdar of the Deccan by the Mughul Emperor Farrukhsiyar, 1713.
Became practically independent 1724 (1713-1748).

|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|

(1762-1803) | (1802-1829) | |


7. Afzal-ud-daulah (1857-1869)

8. Mir Mahbub 'Ali Khan (1869-1911)

**GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART III**

**THE NAWĀBS OF ARCOT**

1. Zulfiqar 'Ālī Khān  
   Created Nawāb of the Carnatic by the Emperor Aurangzeb  
   (c. A.D. 1690–1703)

2. Dāūd Khān  
   (A.D. 1703–1710)

Agibatt: Muhammad Khān

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Muhammad Sayyid</th>
<th>Ghulām 'Ālī Khān</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sa'dat-ullah Khān I</td>
<td>(1710–1732)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Dost 'Ālī Khān</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1732–1740)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Safdar 'Ālī Khān</th>
<th>Dau. md. Ghulām</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1740–1742)</td>
<td>Dau. md. Chanda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Sa'dat-ullah Khān II</th>
<th>Murtazā 'Ālī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Muhammad Sayyid'</td>
<td>Sāhib Jada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Zada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1742–1744)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Anwār-ud-dīn Muhammad</th>
<th>Rival Chanda Sāhib. (1744–1749)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahfuz Khān</th>
<th>8. Wala Jāh</th>
<th>'Abdul</th>
<th>'Abdul</th>
<th>Nājib-ullah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1749–1795)</td>
<td>Muhammad 'Ālī</td>
<td>Rahīm</td>
<td>Wahab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Omdut-ul-Umārā</th>
<th>Amīr-ul-Umārā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1795–1801)</td>
<td>'Azīm-ud-Daulah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Ālī Husain</th>
<th>(1801–1819)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. 'Azam Jāh</th>
<th>12. 'Azim Jāh Bahādur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1819–1825)</td>
<td>'Prince of Arcot'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (1867–1874)   |                          |
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THE NAWABS OF BENGAL SUBAH

Murshid Quli Jafar Khan
(1708–1727)

Daughter = Shuja-ud-din
(1727–1730)

Sarfaraz Khan
(1733–1740)
(Mirza Muhammad, adventurers from Turkestan)

'Allivardi Khan
(1740–1756)

Haji Ahmad

Daughter (Amin Begam) = Zain-ud-din

Siraj-ud-daulah
(1756–1757)

Mir Jafar
(First time 1757–1760)
(Second time 1763–1765)

Daughter
(Patna Begam) = Mir Kasim
(1760–1763)

Najm-ud-daulah
(1765–1766)

Saif-ud-daulah
(1766–1770)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barakzai Wazirs and Amirs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jamal Khan, Barakzai</strong></td>
<td>(1747–1773)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payinda Khan</strong></td>
<td>(1773–1800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fateh Khan</strong></td>
<td>(1800–1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Other brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td><strong>Dost Muhammad Khan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>(Amir of Kabul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>(1826–1863)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afzal Khan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td><strong>Sher ‘Ali</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>(1863–1866;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>1868–1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Abdur Rahman</strong></td>
<td>(1880–1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yakub Khan</strong></td>
<td>(1879–1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td><strong>Ayub Khan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habibullah</strong></td>
<td>(1901–1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td><strong>Nasrullah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hayat</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td><strong>Amnullah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>(1919–1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nadir Shah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>(1929–1933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td><strong>Muhammad Zahir Shah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>(1933–)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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