It was opposed to the creation of Pakistan. The creation of Pakistan was not feasible. It envisaged the creation of a united state comprising British India and the native states. Foreign affairs, defence and communication would be a subject of the Union Government and other matters would be vested in the provinces. It was also proposed that the provinces would be categorised into Class A, Class B and Class C. The Hindu majority states like Madras, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and United province, Bihar and Orissa fell in Group A. The Muslim majority provinces like the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind were grouped into B state and Bengal and Assam were to form C State. These three classes of states in collaboration with the native states would finalise the constitution of the United States. Again, it was stated that for the purpose of transfer of power a treaty would be made with England and in that treaty it would be specified that the native states would retain their sovereignty from England. The other special recommendation of the Cabinet Mission was that an Interim Government would be formed with the representatives of the different political parties. As the suggestion did not disappoint either the Congress or the Muslim League both participated in the General Election.

Communal Riots—In the Constituent Assembly out of non-Muslim 210 seats the Congress captured 199 and in the same way out of 78 Muslim seats 73 were occupied by the League. Any way, in an Assembly of 296 Congress with their friends took 220 seats. Jinnah and his party at this time demanded for a Muslim State through
'Direct Action'. His slogan now became 'Divide and Quite India'. He announced August 16, 1946 as the day of 'Direct Action' which resulted in a great killing in Calcutta for four days and the number of killed were four thousand. This communal strife engulfed the whole country and the partition of Bengal and the Punjab became inevitable.

**Demand for division of Bengal and Punjab**—Despite the communal flare-up the Congress and the League joined the Governor-General’s Council in September, 1946. But it was soon evident that was not possible for them to work together. The British Government by now realised that the power must be handed over to the Indians and the Prime Minister Attlee announced on February 20, 1947 before June 1948 the power would be transferred to the responsible government in India. The Communal riots were renewed particularly in Bengal and the Punjab. To make real this proposal Attlee sent a formidable person—Lord Mountbatten. His personality and charming appeal won the hearts of Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and other leaders of the country. On June 2, 1947 he made the historic proclamation that the Muslim populated areas might, if they so desired, form a separate state-Pakistan. He also took the question of the partition of Bengal and the Punjab. It had been decided that there would be a vote in the Provincial Assembly to decide whether the provinces should be partitioned at all or as a whole join India or Pakistan. Both the Bengal and the Punjab Assemblies voted for partition and it became necessary to decide what would be the boundary of the two new
provinces. Lord Mountbatten appointed a Boundary Commission to go into this question and asked Mr. Radcliffe to undertake the task. Mr. Radcliffe was then in Simla. He accepted the appointment, but suggested that he would start his survey in early July. He pointed out that it would be an almost impossible task to undertake a field survey in the Punjab in the heat of June and in any case July meant a delay of only three or four weeks. Lord Mountbatten told him that he was not prepared for even one day's delay and any suggestion of three or four weeks' postponement was simply out of the question. His orders were carried out. This showed an example of the quickness with which Lord Mountbatten worked. It was the dream of Jinnah to get into Pakistan the whole of the Punjab, Bengal and Assam. Even then he was satisfied with the Mountbatten Plan and accepted the proposal. In the month of July the British Government passed the Indian Independence Act. It was decided that the Indian Dominion would come into existence on August 15, 1947. The Muslim League decided that Pakistan should be constituted a day earlier on August 14, 1947. Although India was free to choose her own Governor-General as the constitutional head, the Indian leaders decided that it would be better not to make a sudden change and felt that the appointment of Lord Mountbatten would give continuity of policy and administration. It was also thought that in the initial stages there would be one Governor-General for both India and Pakistan. It was generally thought that Pakistan would be influenced by the same considerations. The Congress accordingly announced that Lord Mountbatten was their choice and expected the
Lord Mountbatten first League to select Lord Mountbatten. But at the last moment the League caused a surprise by proposing that Mr Jinnah should be appointed the first Governor-General of Pakistan. A special session of the Constituent Assembly of the Indian Union also held at Delhi on the night of August 14. The Great moment for which the nation struggled so long at last came true. Jawaharlal Nehru in his memorable address to the Constituent Assembly and to the nation said, “At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom. A moment comes which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new, when the age ends, and when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance. It is fitting that at this solemn moment we take the pledge of dedication to the service of India and her people and to the still larger cause of humanity.” The feeling of the nation was one mixed with joy and sorrow. It was indeed rejoicing to get back the Independence. It was a matter of sorrow to see the plight of millions of brothers of East Bengal and West Punjab groaning under the pressure of Pakistan to move to India to find a new home and shelter. The British, the Pakistani and the Indian historians have different views which regard to the explanation of partition—whether it was just a product of British Imperialism, or was it a product of historical process or was it inevitable. The British historians think that it is the result of hatred and apprehensions of the Muslims against the Indians. The Indian Historians blame the British for putting the Hindus and the Muslims against each other. But the fact remains that the British never created communalism, though they might have
exploited it. The modern Historians of Pakistan say what the Muslim said in the pre-partition days. It was the logical conclusion of the Hindu-Muslim relations through the centuries. According to the large majority of the Indians the partition was disgraceful since it was dismemberment of Mother India and the Muslims who used their own slogan actually as a bargaining counter, got Pakistan as an extra-gift. The large majority of the Indians still believe that the partition could be avoided, if there had been a great leader like C.R. Das who could carry both the wings with him. It is our tragedy that we did not have such a leader at that time and even Gandhiji who throughout his life fought against communalism and said “if there is partition, that will be over my dead body” accepted it against his will. It is only for the communalism that the Independence of the country was delayed. As a matter of fact, this communalism was the strongest weapon—stronger than bullets, bayonets and prison cells that the British had applied against the freedom fighter. But the real explanation is perhaps that there was no seriousness in patronising nationalism among the Indians. It has been seen that people of even comparatively low state of civilisation but having the sentiment of nationality can maintain independent political existence; but in the absence of the sentiment of Nationality a people cannot maintain it, even if they are brave, intelligent and more civilised. This was the factor responsible for the partition of India.

Gandhiji, the father of the nation was unhappy. In the conversation with the Viceroy, when Gandhiji has spoken against partition, Mountbatten said to him: “But Mr. Gandhi,
the Congress is today with me, no longer with you.” With his characteristic promptness Gandhiji replied, “But India is still with me.” On August 15, 1947 when power was transferred he stayed away at Calcutta and described the independence as a ‘sorry affair’. He decided that the Congress organisation should dissolve itself voluntarily, send all its workers on a constructive programme to build up services and panchyats from the grass-roots, teach the people what their new lights and duties were and thus lay the foundation for ‘economic, social and moral freedom’. To a question as to whether, India and Pakistan would again combine together, his advice was that we should not worry over such questions. “If the foundation of true Swaraj were laid by the masses in one country, it will undoubtedly have its influence on other countries as well,” he said, “And if the masses gained such freedom by their unaided but combined non-violent strength, what did it matter if countries remained separate as sovereign states, if that was their pleasure?”

SOME IMPORTANT EVENTS CONNECTED WITH THE RENAISSANCE AND STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

1. Indian National Congress—It was the strongest political organ of the people of India for the liberation of the country from the yoke of the British. It was founded on December 28, 1885 and its first session was at Bombay with W.C. Banerjea as its first President. Lord Dufferin, the Viceroy of India and Allan Octavian Hume, a retired English Civilian directly patronised an association like the Congress for the socio-economic welfare of the Indians. At the initial stage the Congress supported the
continuance of the British rule in India and in the first three sessions of the Congress the Viceroy and the Governors attended it. But it showed clearly that it was going to work on national lines much against the wishes of the British rulers and it was increasingly attended by the Indians. It met once a year in some cities of India in the Christmas week. In 1937 it was for the first time held in a village—Faizpur. The demand of the Congress was expansion of education, inclusion of the Indians in the central and Provincial legislatures and that the congress would petition to the British Government in London to fulfil their demands. This phase of the Congress is called 'constitutional agitation'. But as the British did not pay heed to the genuine demands, the younger section in the Congress felt that action rather than talk was necessary and in the Banaras Session of 1905 against the official resolution of 'expansion of the Indian Legislature' there was an opposition demand by the younger section for a Government 'autonomous and absolutely free of British control'. The result was that in the Allahabad Session in 1908 the constitution of the Congress was drafted and its First Article was; "the attainment of a system of government similar to that enjoyed by the self-Governing members of the British Empire by constitutional means". In 1920 Gandhiji became the leader of the Congress and he wanted Purna Swaraj or full Independence by non-violent non-cooperation with the British Government and it nearly paralysed the Government. This movement was supported by the Muslims who had a separate organisation—the Muslim League. In 1930 a greater agitation of the name of Civil Disobedience Movement was launched by Gandhiji. This was, however,
not supported by the Muslim League. The outbreak of the Second World War offered the Congress a golden opportunity to overthrow the British Government. A section of the Congress led by Subhash Chandra Bose did not believe in the programme of Gandhiji and wanted that the British be thrown away by a direct fight with the help of Germany. He broke away from the Congress and launched a programme of his own. In 1942 the Congress asked the British to ‘Quit India’. The British Government was convinced that it was no longer possible to rule over India and virtually yielded to the demand of the Congress to grant independence which came true in 1947. Thus India won her Independence through long years of labour and sacrifice of the Congress. After Independence the Congress remained the predominant political party in the country.

2. **Secretary of State for India**—One of the important creations of the Government of India Act of 1858 was the Secretary of State for India. He was a minister in the British Cabinet. As a matter of fact, all the functions which were discharged by the Board of Control in the Pre-1858 Indian administration were carried on by the Secretary of State. Thus the Secretary of State for India was a very important institution. He possessed wide powers. He was the real link between England and India. In case of veto or assent of the Crown to any Indian Act, he had to advise to Crown. He was assisted by a Council of fifteen members. The post looked advantageous for both Indian and England. But it came out that the Secretary of State was hostile to the interest of the Indians. Lord Morley and Edwin Montague the two famous Secretaries of State acted like autocrats and
influenced the Governor-General to keep side with the British interest. By the Government of India Act of 1935 his council was replaced by a body of advisers. The post of Secretary of State for India was abolished by the Indian Independence Act of 1947.

3. Ilbert Bill—Viceroy Lord Ripon's Law Member C. P. Ilbert sponsored a Bill to remove the racial difference in the adjudication by the Indian or European Judges in trying a European's case came to be known as the Ilbert Bill. According to the previous system a European could be tried only by a European Judge or a European Magistrate, except in the Presidency towns where the Europeans could be tried by the Indian also. Although no evil had resulted from the Europeans appearing before the Indian Magistrates or Judges in the Presidency towns, the Europeans raised an alarm and vehemently protested the Ilbert Bill. The Indians naturally lent whole-hearted support to the Bill. But so strong was the opposition of the Anglo-Indians that the Government had to bow to it and modified the Bill. According to the modified version, when a European was brought before an Indian Magistrate or Session Judge, he was to be heard by a Jury one half of whom was to consist of the Europeans. Thus the racial distinction which Ilbert wanted to remove not only continued but also spread to the Presidency towns. But it produced good lesson for the Indians to fight combinedly for public agitation and the lead was taken by Surendranath Banerjee who raised a National Fund and held the Indian National Conference in Calcutta in 1883. Two years later the Indian National Congress was established as a reply to the Anglo-Indian chauvinism. Thus the Ilbert Bill had
far-reaching consequences in the Nationalist Movement of India.

4. **Muslim League**—The Muslim League was the mouth-piece of the Muslims of India during the Indian Nationalist Movement. It was founded in 1906 with the initiative of Nawab Salim-UL-lah of Dacca. Its establishment was indirectly encouraged by Lord Minto II who instigated the Muslims against the Hindu-dominated Congress. Since its origin it was an organisation for protecting, upholding and promoting the political interests of the Muslim and it always relied upon the support of the British. It was only once in 1916 that it joined with the Congress in accepting the Lucknow Pact. But soon it sided with the British and demanded a security of the Muslims in the forth-coming self-government of India. The British looked upon the Muslim League as its favourite wife. Thus in the country-wide Civil Disobedience Movement the Muslim League did not participated and demanded the partition of the country. As things passed, the Muslim demand followed by Mr. Jinhaid Direct Action caused communal riots all over the country and there was no alternative for the British to hand over power to the Congress and the Muslim League separately, and the net result was the creation of Pakistan. Thus when the Congress strove for the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs and the Christians of India, the Muslim League sought the selfish interests of the Muslims alone. The partition of India was definitely a triumph of the Muslim League over the Congress.

5. **Dyarchy**—A division of power between two bodies is called Dyarchy and this type of constitutional arrangement was first incorporated in the Government of India Act of 1919, which
provided for double set-up of administration in the provinces of the British India. According to this dyarchical system certain departments like education, local self-government, public health, public works, agriculture and Co-operative Societies were ‘transferred’ for administration to the Ministers who were to be elected members of the provincial legislatures and to which they were to be responsible, while the departments of land revenue, law, justice, the police, irrigation, labour and finance were reserved for administration by Executive Councillors responsible to the Provincial Governors but not to the legislatures. This dyarchical system was meant to teach the Indians the art of administration by stages and it was certainly a reflection on their capacity to rule themselves. Again, the transferred departments were all spending branches of the administration, while the reserved departments were the revenue-making ones. Thus such an allocation naturally put the Ministers at a great disadvantages in comparison with the Councillors whose co-operation became essential for them. In fact the whole system smacked of temporary nature and never became popular with the Indians. But the British Government found it a very convenient method of keeping the control of the more important departments in the hands of Councillors appointed by and responsible only to the British Government. So in spite of its unpopularity and the difficulty of working it, the principle of dyarchy was subsequently incorporated in the Government of India Act, 1935 and extended to the Central Executive. But that Act was never fully implemented and the dyarchy at the centre was not enforced at all. The dyarchy of 1935 was buried by the Indian Independence Act of 1947.
6. *Rowlatt Acts*—The Rowlatt Committee submitted a report on the existence of undesirable and subversive elements in the country in 1917, and it recommended stringent measures to meet the situation. Accordingly two Acts were passed in 1919 and these were called Rowlatt Acts. One of the Acts provided for greater and stricter control over the Press and the other provided for the trial of political offenders by Judges without the aid of the Juries and authorising provincial government to intern all persons suspected of subversive aims. Both the Acts produced widespread unhappiness in the country which was expressed by observing *hartal* all over the country. It was in protest of these two Acts that the people of Amritsar assembled in Jallianwala Bagh where unarmed persons were fired by the British at the command of General Dyer. This led to the Non-co-operation Movement launched by Gandhi in 1920. It proved that the Rowlatt Acts were not necessary at all.

7. *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*—The Rowlatt Acts of 1919 that were passed to suppress the Indian Press and Individual Liberty produced widespread discontent. In Amritsar in an Anti-British demonstration four Europeans were killed. The Punjab Government immediately ordered the ban on any public meeting at Amritsar and gave the power to General Dyer the full control of the city. A large number of unarmed Indians gathered in a semi-enclosed space known as the Jallianwalla bagh. It was April 10, 1919. General Dyer marched with a company of ninety well armed soldiers to the Bagh, occupied with his troop, the only exist from it and without giving any warning to the assembled people who were all unarmed and among whom
there were many women and children ordered 
his soldiers to shoot to kill. 379 persons were 
killed and 1208 were injured and nobody 
looked for hospital facilities for the wounded. 
This was followed by an order of martial law 
pronulgated by Dyer. The whole country 
rang to protest and poet Rabindranath Tagore 
gave up the knighthood which was conferred 
on him. The incident was also condemned by 
the British in England. Mr. Asquith, the 
British Prime Minister called the incident “one 
of the worst outrages in the whole of our 
history”. Pressed by the public opinion of the 
world the Government instituted an enquiry 
into the matter to be conducted by Lord Hunter 
a Scotch Judge. The report of Hunter condem-
med Dyer and he was accordingly asked to resign. 
This Jallianwalla Bagh incident exposed the 
sharp claws to the British towards the Indians. 
This incident in another way encouraged the 
Indians to combine against the brute force of the 
British in India.

8. Khalifat Movement—Turkey is a 
Muslim state in Europe. During the First World 
War Turkey began to decline and was showing 
signs of extinction. The Muslims of India 
wanted the preservation of Turkey as a Muslim 
state and the continuance of the Sultan of 
Turkey as the Caliph of the Muslim world. 
Thus the Indian Muslims launched a movement 
urging upon England not to join the other 
European powers in the destruction of Turkey. 
This movement is called the Khalifhat Move-
ment, which was led by the Ali brothers— 
Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Ali both of whom 
were well-educated and good orators. They 
joined the Congress against the British. This 
was an unprecedented union of the Hindus and
the Muslims. Gandhiji availed himself of this Hindu-Muslim unity and launched the country-wide Non-cooperation Movement. But the Khalifat Movement could not meet its aim. Kamal Ataturk emerged as the leader of Turkey by deposing the Sultan and by abolishing the post of Caliph. And Turkey became a secular state. Thus the Khalifat Movement in India could not preserve the post of Caliph or Turkey as a Muslim state. But the movement without the knowledge of its leader largely contributed to the Indian Independence Movement.

9. Chauri-Chaura—It is the name of a place in Bihar and it became important since in that place a violent outbreak took place against the British in 1922. Gandhiji had given a country-wide call for non-violent Non-cooperation Movement against the British rule in 1920. But the violent incident at Chauri Chaura shocked Gandhiji so much that he immediately called off the movement. This was considered by the other members of the Congress as a serious blunder on the part of Gandhiji and Subhash Chandra Bose called this as a 'national calamity'. Lord Reading found an opportunity to put the blame of violence on Gandhiji and for that reason he arrested Gandhiji and sentenced him six years imprisonment. Thus Chauri Chaura occupies an important place in the history of Indian National Movement.

10. Simon Commission—A commission was necessary to report on the working of the constitutional experiment as established by the Government of India Act of 1919. That Commission headed by Sir John Simon was appointed in November 1927. All the Members of the
Commission were British had no Indian was included in it. This ‘all white’ nature was resented by the Indians. The Indian National Congress which was the mouth-piece of the Indian people decided to boycott it, and wherever the Commission went the people observed hartal. The British on the other hand took to repressive measures on the people on the plea that they had adopted violence during the hartal. This further alienated the Congress which in its Lahore session in 1929 declared Independence as the aim of the Congress. The report of the Simon Commission which was published in May, 1930 further disappointed the Indians since it recommended the responsible ministries only in the provinces and the central government was to be kept under the British. According to the report, this system is to continue until both the Indians and the British in a joint endeavour chalk out a federation, which the Commission itself recognised as a distant possibility. The Congress refused to accept the report. Although it was not immediately accepted by the people of India, its major recommendations were embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935.

11. Red Shirt Movement—When the Civil Disobedience Movement was launched by Gandhiji in 1930 for a country-wide non-violent uprising, the North West Frontier Province of India rose in a militant anti-British Movement under the leadership of Abdul Guffar Khan. It acted on a combined line of Pan-Islamic and Indian Nationalism. Although it spoke for non-violence, the militant frontier people found it difficult to remain non-violent. The movement is called the Red Shirt Movement, because all its supporters wore red
dresses. This exercised a profound influence in the North-West Frontier Province and through its help the Congress won the election and formed ministry there. After 1947 the North-West Frontier Province fell into Pakistan. There the Red Shirt Movement adopted a new slogan for the creation of Pakhtoonistan consisting of the tribal peoples there. This has not been successful

12. Round Table Conference—The Simon Commission was boycotted by the Indians since it did not include a single Indian as its members. There was disappointment and unrest all over the country. To conciliate Indian public opinion Viceroy Lord Irwin made a declaration on August 31, 1929 that after the publication of the report of the Simon Commission, a Round Table Conference would be held in London to draw up a new constitution for India. This was at the beginning totally discarded by the Congress and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru presiding over the Lahore session of the Congress in 1929 observed that nothing would come out of the Round Table Conference and declared full independence from the British rule as the sole aim of the Congress. Mahatma Gandhi started the Civil Disobedience Movement on April 6, 1930. The publication of the report of the Simon Commission was followed by stern repressive measures by the Government and the Congress leaders including Gandhiji were arrested. To heal the wounds of the public mind a Round Table Conference was convened in London with the representatives of all parties of India and of England. The Conference held three sessions the first from November 16, 1930 to January 19, 1931, the second from September 1 to December 1, 1931,
and the third from November 17 to December 24, 1932. It was presided over by the Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. The Congress did not send any representative in the first session. Yet, it brought for India one big victory—the executive was to be responsible to the legislature both in the provinces and the centre. In the second session of the conference Gandhiji went there as the sole representative of the Congress. This session saw the distrust of the Muslims on the Hindus and taking advantage of this, MacDonald announced a Communal Award not only to the Muslims but also to the depressed classes among the Hindus. Gandhiji was totally disappointed and went on a fast unto death which he gave up on the basis of the promise of Lord Irwin that the depressed classes would be included within the Hindu Classes which came to be known as the Poona Pact. Although it was not satisfactory, it was accepted in the absence of a better one. The third session of the Round Table Conference drew up certain constitutional measures which were incorporated in the Government of India Act of 1935.

13. Communal Award—In the second session of the Round Table Conference from September 1 to December 1, 1931 Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald taking advantage of the growing cleavage between the Congress and the Muslim league announced on August 4, 1932 the Communal Award which envisaged separate representative constituencies not only for the Hindus and the Muslims but for the depressed classes among the Hindus. It was not an award but an imposition, since the Congress never demanded it. It not only made a division between the Hindus and the Muslims but also mischievously divided the Hindus on
the basis of caste. Gandhi in protest against it went on fast unto death which was averted by Lord Irwin, the Viceroy by a promise that the division between the Hindus would be lifted and this understanding is known as the Poona Pact according to which the depressed classes would be considered an integral part of the Hindus but they would have special representation in the legislatures. Thus while the Communal Award gave the depressed classes 71 seats in the various Provincial legislatures, the Poona Pact gave them 148 and eighteen percent seats in the central legislature. The Muslim seats were not altered. Thus the Communal Award was a long step on the way to the Partition of the country.

14. Dominion Status—In 1908 the Indian National Congress did not consider wise to get complete independence of the British rule and demanded just a Dominion Status for India just like Canada under the British Crown. This original demand was not accepted at that time by the British Government which after twenty one years accepted the old demand of the Congress and Viceroy Lord Irwin on October 31, 1929 announced the Dominion Status as the natural fruit of the constitutional progress in India. But situation by that time had radically changed and the Congress flatly refused it and in its Lahore Session demanded nothing short of complete independence as its goal. But no clarification came out of the nature of the ‘Dominion Status’ for long six years and when it was actually implemented in the Government of India Act of 1935 it was far short of Dominion Status as defined in the Status of Westminster, 1931, according to which a Dominion shall have full internal sovereignty and full
autonomy in external affairs with full powers to sign treaties with the foreign countries. Thus
the Dominion Status as was embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935 failed to
satisfy the aspiration of the Indians. But under pressing needs of the Second World War the
British Government was compelled to concede independence to India and Pakistan as full-
fledged dominions defined in the statute of Westminster, 1931. In 1947 India became an
independent country but of her own accord wanted to remain a member of the Common-
wealth of Nations.

15. Mountbatten Plan—When the British Government decided to accord independence to
India a plan had to be chalked out for the transfer of power and for that purpose a man of
dynamism was necessary to be acceptable to the Indians as a whole. The new Viceroy was a
man of that outstanding merit—Lord Mountbatten. A man with grasp, farsight and under-
standing he understood the complexity and reality of the situation. He had frank discus-
sions with Gandhiji, Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Muslim league leader Mr Jinnah. After a thorough
discussion with them he finalised and announced his plan on June 3, 1947. and that the transfer
would be effected on August 15, 1947. The Important features of his plan were as follows:

1. If the people of the Muslim majority areas so desire, they would be allowed to form a
separate Dominion. A new Constituent Assembly would be constituted for that purpose.

2. In case there is partition, there will be a partition of Bengal and the Punjab if the repre-
sentatives of the non-Muslim majority districts
of the two provincial legislative assemblies so desire.

3. The legislative Assembly of Sind would decide as to whether its constitution should be framed by the existing or a new and separate Constituent Assembly.

4. "In view of its special position" a referendum would be taken in the North-West Frontier Province to ascertain whether it would join Pakistan or remain in India.

5. In case of partition of Bengal there will be a referendum in the district of Sylhet (Assam) to ascertain whether the people would join the new province of East Bengal.

6. In case of partition of the Punjab and Bengal a boundary Commission will be set up to demarcate the exact boundary line.

7. Legislation would be introduced in the current session of the Parliament "for the transfer of power in 1947 on a Dominion Status basis to one or two successor authorities according to the decisions taken under the plan. This will be without prejudice to the right of the Constituent Assemblies to decide in due course whether the parts of India which they represent will remain within the British Commonwealth."

The transfer of power was effected through the plan envisaged by Lord Mountbatten.

SOME GREAT NAMES ASSOCIATED WITH THE RENAISSANCE AND THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

Every great national movement throws up a number of great personalities who are partly its creators and partly its creations too. They
are its creators because they gave form and direction to the urges and impulses in the mind of the people. They are also its creations, because without the background and the impulse provided by the movement, their thought and action would not have taken shape or even if they did, it would have remained still-born and ineffective. Great men help to formulate and express the hopes and aspirations of an age and in doing so bring realisation within the range of practical politics. Mahatma Gandhi was no doubt the brightest of all the galaxy of stars who were the creators and creation of the Indian Independence Movement. Without the contribution of and the services of his forerunners, he could not have played the role that destiny allotted to him. Nor did he emerge like a solitary peak that thrusts upward in the midst of an unbroken plain. When the earth heaves with turmoil and unrest, a whole mountain range rises, even though some peaks may be taller than the others. Many of the giants of the Indian Renaissance and struggle for freedom are today almost forgotten names. It is, however, in the national interest we are to recognise the services of all of them. A nation that forgets the past heroes and honours only those who now stand upon the stage suffers from impoverishment of inspiration and faces the risk of sudden upheaval and change. It will be a sign of political maturity if we record the services of the stalwarts who built up and strengthened the Indian National Movement. It will be imperfect knowledge if the younger generations of today grow up without knowledge of their contribution and love and respect for their services. It is for this sole purpose that life-sketch of those figures who were associated
with the Indian Renaissance and struggle for freedom are discussed below. It is to be noted that it will only include thirteen figures only without any reflection on those who are not included for want of space.

*1. Raja Ram Mohan Roy (1772-1883)
2. Iswarchandra Vidyasagar (1820-91)
3. Bankim Chandra Chatterji (1838-1894)
4. Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902)
5. Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915)
7. C. R. Das (1870-1925)
8. Lala Lajpat Rai (1856-1928)
9. Motilal Nehru (1861-1931)
10. Mrs. Annie Besant (1847-1933)
11. M. K. Gandhi (1869-1948)
12. Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964)
13. Subhash Chandra Bose (1889-?)

1. **Raja Ram Mohan Roy**—The origin of national consciousness in India is traced to Raja Ram Mohan Roy. He is regarded as the “Aristotle” of modern Indian political thought. He was the first to start political movement on constitutional lines. In his paper *Srihad Kaumudi* public grievances found expression for the first time. Although he looked upon the British rule as necessary and beneficial for sometime to come, he had the vision of a free India in the distant future. He was in the services of the Company from 1804 to 1815. A man imbued with western outlook and versed in Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit and English. He became the herald of a new age and father of modern intelligentsia in India. He did not believe in image worship and insisted that worship should be rendered to formless True God. He, however, did not deny that he was a Hindu. He wanted

*Arrangement is on the basis of date of death*
to reform Hinduism by remaining within its fold. He was out and out a rationalist and wanted to destroy caste distinction, polygamy, the sati or the system of burning widows on the funeral pyres of their dead husbands and the subordinate status of women in the society. He wanted to remove the evils in India by the western knowledge and technology. Himself a master of Sanskrit, he wanted that the Indians would gain by the fruits of western language and culture. In 1823 the acting Governor-General Adam issued a Press Ordinance taking away the liberty of the Press. Ram Mohan started an agitation against this repressive Ordinance. This is considered as the first constitutional agitation in India. He with a few of his friends sent a Memorial to the Supreme Court and sent a petition to the King-in-Council. The free-press agitation launched by Ram Mohan is regarded as the first instance of an organised effort to rally the intelligentsia against the encroachment of the fundamental rights of the people. By the Jury Act of 1827 the Government introduced religious discriminations in the law courts. The Act provided that a Christian could not be tried by either a Hindu or Muslim Jury. Ram Mohan sent petitions to both the Houses of British Parliament protesting against this kind of religious discriminations and the petition contained the signatures of the Hindus and the Muslims alike. He was a lover of liberty and reforms all over the world. He was jubilant over the successful Spanish American Revolution of 1823 and the Revolution of France in 1830, and was happy to see the passage of the First Reform Act of 1832 in England where he had personally gone to represent the grievances of the Mughal Emperor Akbar II
who had invested him with the title Raja. He represented a new India to the British Government and was warmly appreciated everywhere. He died at Bristol in 1833. He is truly called the “father of political regeneration in India.”

2. Iswarchandra Vidyasagar—Iswar-Chandra Vidyasagar was a mighty personality who embodied the renaissance spirit of education and the nationalist impulse for social reform. He was a renowned educationist and social reformer of the nineteenth century India. Born in a poor Brahmin family in Bengal, he was educated in the Government Sanskrit College at Calcutta. He became the Principal of that college at the age of thirty five only. Although he was originally a great Sanskrit scholar, he acquired mastery over English language. He was an admirer of the Western education and culture. In 1847 his first book in Bengal Botal Panchavyameati was published and his skill in the Bengali language earned for him the fame of ‘the father of Bengali prose literature.’ He would wear dhoti and chadar and slippers and would not participate in any Government work where these dresses were not allowed. His ideas on social life were liberal and advanced. His greatest achievement is perhaps Hindu Widow Remarriage Act which the British Government had to pass under his pressures. He was charitable and benevolent and founded many schools and the Metropolitan College in Calcutta which is now called the Vidyasagar College. Although a Brahmin and a scholar of Sanskrit, his heart was a centre of western thought and philosophy. He is, therefore, called the ‘first European’ in dhoti’. He was one of the towering personalities of Bengal of the nineteenth century who significantly contributed to the reawakening of India.
3. **Bankim Chandra Chatterji**—Bankim Chandra Chatterji who is called *Sahitya Samrat* (Emperor of literature) was one of the pioneers of India's struggle for freedom. He by encouraging literary works of patriotism prepared the hearts of the Indian for a militant struggle. He was born at Kantala para of Bengal on June 26, 1838. He had the unique distinction of being the first Graduate of Calcutta University. Brought up in abundance at home and in an atmosphere of radicalism of the Young Bengal, Bankim in his early youth became an atheist but later on became religious and rationalist. His aristocracy, strong personality, wide reading and high intellectual attainment attracted around him all the distinguished men of his time. He joined the Government service and rose to the rank of a First Class Deputy Magistrate. His fame is through his writings. His first novel was *Durgeshnandini* which shows his taste of writing with Sir Walter Scott. His penetrating insight, masterly handling of moral problems and artistic symbolism are unique features of his works. Some of his great works are *Kapalkundla, Mrinalini, Brishabriksha, Indira, Chandrashekhara, Rajani*, and *Anandamath*. It is through *Anandamath* and the song therein—*Bande Mataram* that he moved the Indians to a militant action against the British rule, and for this reason he is acclaimed as the prophet of nationalism. The Rowlatt Committee Report of 1911 held his book responsible for the spread of revolutionary spirit. It is also said that Arobind Ghosh's idea of *Bhawani Mandir* has its origin in *Anandamath*. His song of *Bande Mataram* charged the whole of India with patriotic emotion. His conception of the nation was wide to include both the Hindus and the
Muslims. It is true that he used some unkind words towards the Muslims in some places of his works, but these were directed against the misrule of the Muslims of the mediaeval period. In *Sitaram* and *Chandrashekhar* he praised the generosity of the Muslims.

It is in the pattern of the Hindu Deity that Bankim Chandra conceived the Motherland. His song *Bande Mataram* cast a tremendous influence upon the freedom fighters of the country. He died on April 8, 1894. He was one of the brightest luminaries of the nineteenth century India and is the prophet of Indian nationalism. He was also a political philosopher. His ideas penetrated into the minds of the millions and brought about a significant change in the outlook of the next generation.

4. **Swami Vivekananda**—Swami Vivekananda was the torch-bearer of Indian cultural heritage to the West. He was a Hindu *Sannyasi* who won for India international prestige at a time when the country was poverty-stricken and trampled under foreign rule. He became a disciple of Ramakrishna and organised the Ramakrishna Mission. He travelled all over India and everywhere he was warmly received. In 1893 he went to Chicago to attend the World Religious conference. It is here that Vivekananda by his magnificent oratory proved before the world that Indian religion and culture deserve highest place in the world. His visit to England was equally successful. Many English men and women became his followers and prominent among them is Miss Margaret Noble known in India as Sister Nivedita. To the religious teachings of Ramakrishna he added the social service. He organised the disciples of Ramakrishna first into a body known as the Ramakrishna Mission
and made a permanent home for them at Belur near Calcutta. In 1899 he again went to the United States and established in San Francisco a centre of Vedanta studies. He toured several European countries. In 1902 at the age of only thirynine this great saint passed away. His greatness lies in the fact that in the nineteenth century when India was considered a backward country which had every thing to learn from Europe, he proved the world that India had a great religion and culture which Europe should learn. Thus he brought a sense on self-respect for the Indians. Chackrabarti Raja Gopalachari paid a tribute to him: "Swami Vivekananda saved Hinduism and saved India. But for him we would have lost our religion and would not have gained our freedom. We, therefore, owe everything to Swami Vivekananda."

5. Gopal Krishna Gokhale—Gopal Krishna Gokhale was one of the greatest nationalists of India. He comes off a Maratha Brahmin family. He started his career as a Professor of History and Economics at Fergusson College, Poona. After retirement from the teaching profession he actively participated in the Indian National Congress and presided over the Banaras Session of the Congress in 1905. He had been a member of the Bombay Legislative Council in 1902 and was then elected to represent the non-official members in the Viceroy's Legislature. It was he who in 1905 established at Poona the Servants of India Society whose members took a pledge of austerity and life-long struggle for the service of the country in a religious spirit. In the Viceroy's legislature Gokhale was the most effective critic of the Government particularly of the budget. Gokhale was called "Gladstone of India". Among the early figures in the Indian National
Congress Gokhale's position was very high. He was feared by the Government and respected by the people. In politics he belonged to the moderate groups opposed to the extremist school held by Tilak. He initiated a bill for compulsory primary education which was rejected on account of the opposition. His last great work was his recommendation in the capacity of a Member of the Indian Public Service Commission (1912-15) for a substantial increase of the Indians in the Government services. He was the leader of the Congress before the advent of Gandhiji. For nearly three decades Gokhale dedicated his rare qualities to the exclusive service of his country and his people in way which fear could lay claim to Dr. V.H. Rutherford described him "a diplomatist to his fingertips who knew how to play on the national lyre without offending the official ears". Mahatma Gandhi described him "as pure as crystal, as gentle as a lamb, as brave as a lion and the most perfect man in the political field."

6. **Bal Gangadhar Tilak**—Bal Gangadhar Tilak was one of the most famous nationalist leaders before the advent of Gandhiji. He was a man of deep scholarship. He took journalism as his profession and acted as the editor of the *Maratha* in English and the *Kesari* in Maratha language. In 1897 he started the Sivaji festival and through it he tried to revive the patriotism among the Indians. He adversely criticised the failure of the Government to combat the outbreak of the plague in Poona for which he was prosecuted on a charge of sedition. In 1907 he along with Lala Lajpat Rai and Bepin Chandra Pal organised the extremist section of the Congress which differed from the moderate section of the Congress who wanted, to get responsible
government under the British Empire. According to Tilak Congress should fight for nothing short of complete independence and with this aim in view he organised in 1916 a Home Rule League. He died in August, 1920 and three months hence the Congress at its Nagpur Session in December, 1920 declared the attainment of *purna swaraj* (complete independence) as its goal. Thus the cause for which Tilak stood was at last accepted by the Congress, though he could not live to see this event. Bipin Chandra Pal said of him: “We have always found a splendid combination of the vision of the idealist with the practical wisdom of the experienced man of affairs.” Provinda Ghose called him as the first political leader who bridged the gulf between the Present and the Past.

7. **C. R. Das**—Chittaranjan Das whose life is a landmark in the history of India’s struggle for freedom was endearingly called *Deshabandhu* (Friend of the country). He was an eminent lawyer and his success in the Arovinda case brought him to the forefront of professional and political platform. It was not before 1917 that Das came to the forefront of nationalist politics. His political career was brief but meteoric. In course of only eight years (1917-25) he rose into all India fame by virtue of his ardent patriotism, sterling sincerity and oratorical power. Patriotism was a consuming passion with him. He was a seer; he had no doubt about the final victory of the cause and the fulfilment of India’s cultural and spiritual mission in the world. In 1917 Chittaranjan played a significant role in the controversy over the election of Mrs. Annie Besant as Congress President at Calcutta Session. In 1918 both at the Congress Special Session in Bombay and at the Annual Session in Delhi Das
opposed the scheme of Montague-Chelmsford Reforms as wholly inadequate and disappointing. In 1920 he renounced his large practice at the Bar. The whole nation was deeply impressed to see this supreme act of self-sacrifice. He now threw himself heart and soul into the movement and was imprisoned in 1921. In 1922 he was elected the President of the Indian National Congress. When the Non-cooperation Movement was suspended by Gandhiji as a sequel to the Chauri Chaura incident, the whole country went into despondency. At this critical hour Deshabandhu endeavoured to give a new orientation to Indian politics through his council-entry programme i.e., “Non-cooperation from within the Council.” This was vehemently opposed by Gandhiji. As his motion was lost, he gave up the Presidentship. Thereafter he organised the Swarajya Party within the Congress, with Motilal Nehru and Abdul Kalam Azad. The Council-entry programme was approved by the Congress at the Special Session at Delhi in 1923. His policy of Council-entry was vindicated by the Government’s defeat on the budget. He not only succeeded in abolishing the Dyarchy in Bengal but also in shaking the Bureaucracy in India to its foundation. He wanted “Swaraj for the masses and not for the classes.” An advocate of communal harmony and Hindu-Muslim unity, Chittaranjan effected in 1923 the Bengal Pact between the Hindus and the Muslims. His munificence in the social field is proverbial. There are innumerable cases of his private charity. He gave up his entire property to his country’s service. Death overtook him in 1925 when he was fifty-five. He was an apostle of Indian nationalism. Mahatma Gandhi condoled his death in the words: “Deshabandhu
was one of the greatest men.” Rabindranath Tagore paid his tribute: “The best gift that Chittaranjan left for his countrymen is not any particular political or social programme but the creative force of a great aspiration that has taken a deathless form in the sacrifice which his life represented.”

8. Lala Lajpat Rai—There were three nationalists who had a radical view in the Indian National Congress unlike the moderates led by Gandhiji. These three were Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal and they came to be known as Lal-Bal-Pal. Lala Lajpat Rai was born in the Punjab. He started his career as a lawyer. In religion he was an ardent supporter of the Arya Samaj. He along with Bipin Chandra Pal and Bal Gangadhar Tilak took a leading part in changing the method of the Congress from one of petition to that of application of direct sanction. He was arrested and transported to Burma in 1907. He presided over the Calcutta Session of the Indian National Congress in 1919. In the Non-co-operation Movement launched by Gandhiji he took a prominent part and joined the boycott of the Simon Commission in 1928. He was severely beaten by the police and he died of these injuries. He wrote several books of which Unhappy India was severely condemned by the British Government. As a political leader he was loved and respected by the millions of his countrymen. Lala Lajpat Rai was called “Sher-i-Punjab” (Lion of the Punjab). His appearance was rengh and he was naturally wanting in the charms of Gokhale and the Magnetic Power of Gandhiji. But his integrity, sacrifice and persuasive power gave a special dignity to his image.
Punjab is yet to produce an all India figure of his stature.

9. Motilal Nehru—Motilal Nehru was a renowned nationalist. He was born in Delhi and was a Brahmin of Kashmir. He started his career as a lawyer in the Allahabad High Court and had a roaring practice. He joined the Indian National Movement after the inauguration of the Montford Reforms and started a journal named the *Independent* to support the cause of Indian nationalism. He gave up his lucrative practice and gave up his membership of the Indian Legislative Assembly. But he soon reconsidered the situation and along with C. R. Das he formed the Swarajya Party within the Congress, 1923 he re-entered the Assembly and was the leader of the Swarajya Party. He was a great orator and parliamentary tactician and led his party which was minority to great success in the Assembly. He twice presided over the Indian National Congress—in 1919 at Calcutta and in 1928 in Amritsar. In 1928 on behalf of the Indian National Congress he drew up a report known as the Nehru Report on the future constitution of India. He recommended the immediate sanction of ‘Dominion status’ to India. As the Government refused to accept the demand, he joined the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930 and was imprisoned. This told heavily on his body and he passed away one year after. He was not only a great son, but was the father of an illustrious son—Jawaharlal Nehru, and the grandfather of an illustrious daughter—Indira Gandhi. Thus Motilal occupies a unique place in placing three generations in the services of the nation.

10. Mrs. Annie Besant—Mrs. Annie

308
Besant was an English woman. She was a theosophist and an ardent free-thinker. She became a revolutionary socialist and was closely attached to Helena Blavatsky of Russia. She came to India in 1893 and lectured in twelve towns in South India. After that she attended the Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society at adyar in Madras. In 1894 she toured North India and delivered her lectures in eighteen places mainly on the Hindu religion and Indian culture. In 1895 she established her home at Banaras and completed her translation of the Bhagavat Gita into English. In 1898 she established the Central Hindu College at Banaras. This became one of the great educational institutions of the time and formed the nucleus of the Banaras Hindu University. In 1907 she became the President of the Theosophical Society and since then she made Adyar in Madras her permanent home. In October 1913 in a public meeting at Madras she felt the need for a Standing Committee of the House of Commons for Indian Affairs and that body should suggest how India should attain freedom. New India, a newspaper which she owned and managed was her chosen organ for her tempestous propaganda for India's freedom. She wanted 'Home Rule' for India. She wanted that after getting freedom India should remain in the British Commonwealth. She was a delegate to the Indian National Congress in 1914. In 1915 in a meeting at Bombay she explained her plan for the establishment of the Home Rule League. The people would eagerly read the editorials of the New India. The Home Rule League was started on September 1, 1916. In June, 1917 she was interned at Ootacamund. In 1917 she presided over the Calcutta Session of the Indian
National Congress. Although she was not satisfied with the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms, she suggested that it should be given a fair trial. In the Lahore Session the Congress when Gandhiji gave the call for non-cooperation Movement, Annie Besant who was a lifelong fighter on a constitutional line protested against it without success. She was a great educationist. She established the National College at Madanpalle in 1915 and the society for the Promotion of National Education in 1917 and the National University at Adyar in 1918. The strenuous works told heavily on her health and she died in 1933. She herself desired as her epitaph only the simple words: “She tried to follow Truth.” Her whole life was dedicated in searching out and following Truth. It is really a wondrous achievement for an English woman to hold key-position in a Hindu political movement.

11. M. K. Gandhi—Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, better known as Mahatma Gandhi was undoubtedly the greatest political figure of India in her Independence Movement. He started his career as a Barrister and in 1892 he went to South Africa to take a case of a Muslim businessman in South Africa. The insult which was meted to him by pulling him out from a first class railway compartment at Maritzburg marked the dawn in his mind of the determination of dedicating himself for the emancipation of the Indians from the insulting life to which they had been so long condemned in South Africa. Thus Gandhiji stayed in South Africa for the next twenty years (1893-1914) where he soon took the leadership in a movement for removing the disabilities under which the Indians there were subjected to. He took his
inspiration from the Bhagavat Gita, Tolstoy and Ruskin. It was his belief that a life must be active in the pursuit of the benefit of the community and with as little dependence on machine as possible. In 1894 he formed the Natal Indian Congress. He protested against the obnoxious law that every Indian in Transvaal had to carry an identity card on his body and organised non-violent Civil Disobedience by refusing to wear the identity card and by crossing the frontier of Transvaal in violation of the law which resulted in the abolition of the restrictions imposed upon the Indians in 1914. This was a first great success of Gandhiji and this was a training for a similar but great movement that he would launch in India against the British rule. In 1914 when Gandhiji returned to India, he was accorded a hero's welcome and was called the Mahatma (the great Soul). The Rowlatt Acts, the Jalianwala Bagh Massacre and the outbreak of the First World war enabled Gandhi to launch a Non-cooperation Movement in a non-violent way all over the country and in this way he became the leader of the Indian National Congress. In 1922 he was compelled to call off the movement since violence was practised by some of the participants in Chauri-Chaura. Gandhiji was convinced that an indisciplined people could not launch a non-violent movement. He wanted a unity among the Hindus and the Muslims and that no movement can be successful unless both the communities work hand-in-hand. But Gandhiji was successful to carry the Muslims with him only in the first phase of the movement. The Congress declared full independence as its goal. The British Government opened the doors of negotiation and convened three
sessions of the Round Table Conference in London. Gandhiji represented the Congress in the second session of the Round Table Conference. Gandhiji returned home completely dejected. The British Government sowed the seeds of communal frenzy and announced the Communal Award for the separate constituencies for the Hindus, the Muslims, and the depressed classes among the Hindus. Gandhiji went on fast unto death which was averted by the British by withdrawing separate constituencies for the depressed classes. The Civil Disobedience Movement was the second phase of the works of Gandhiji. The third phase of his work is in 1942 when the Congress asked the British to “Quit India”. A sea a popular support was behind Gandhiji. The British found it no longer possible to keep the country under shackle and decided to give back power to the Indians. The Muslim League under Mr. Jinnah wanted a Muslim State—Pakistan and Gandhiji, though initially maintained that if there is partition it will be over his dead body, the orgy of violence that ravaged the country changed him and the country was divided against the will of Gandhiji. He took intensive tours all over the riot-torn country to restore Hindu-Muslim unity. On January 30, 1948 Gandhiji was killed by the bullet of a frenzied Hindu. Thus ended the life of Mahatma. This is the second crucifixion in the history of the world—he was killed by his own people for whose redemption he lived—actually on Friday—the same day Jesus was done to death one thousand nine hundred fifteen years ago. Lord Mountbatten paid him a glowing tribute: “Mahatma Gandhi will go down in history on a par with Buddha and Jesus Christ.” His contribu-
tion was not bound to the narrow confines of India alone but on humanity as a whole. He was a precursor of Asian independence. To say in the words of Arnold Toynbee, “The generation into which I happen to have been born has not only been Hitler’s generation in the West and Stalin’s in Russia; it has also been Gandhi’s India; and it can already be forecast with some confidence that Gandhi’s effect on human history is going to be greater and more lasting than Stalin’s or Hitler’s”.

12. Jawaharlal Nehru—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the fighter-architect of Indian Republic. He was the only son of his great father Motilal Nehru. He was a Tripos of Cambridge University and was called to the Bar in 1912. In 1912 he joined the Indian National Congress as a delegate and for the first time met Gandhiji. In the enquiry conducted by the Congress on the jallianwala Bagh Massacre he worked with C. R. Das and Mahatma Gandhi and came to very close touch with Gandhiji in the Non-co-operation Movement launched by Gandhiji in 1921 and seven years after he became the General Secretary of the Congress in 1928. He presided over the Lahore Session of the Congress in 1929 which passed the resolution of complete Independence of India, and since that time he was always in the forefront of the struggle. He went to prisons several times. In 1939 he had direct clash with Subhash Chandra Bose who was compelled to leave Congress. He also differed from Gandhiji—while Gandhiji took non-violence as a way of life, Nehru took it only as a policy. In 1942 when the entire nation was in a sea of struggle against the British, Nehru was the most important leader
of the country next to Gandhiji. The British desired to hand over power to the Indians and Nehru wanted to come to some understanding with Mr. Jinnah who, however, refused to come to terms. On September 1, 1946 Nehru on the invitation of the Viceroy joined the Interim Government as its head. Since that time till his death in 1964 he was the Prime Minister of the country. Nehru was the architect of Indian Republic but he was not a narrow nationalist. He had a love for liberty for all the people of the world. He upheld the cause of peace and non-violence all over the world. Thus when Gandhiji fought for peace and non-violence in the country, Nehru went a step further and internationalised the doctrine of Gandhiji.

13. Subhash Chandra Bose—Subhash Chandra Bose, better known as the Netaji was the Garibaldi of Indian Independence Movement. Unlike anybody he really fought a war with guns and bullets against the British. Born in a middle class Bengali family, he was deeply moved by the writings of Swami Vivekananda and the revolutionary spirit of Cavour and Garibaldi of Italy. In 1920 he appeared in the Indian Civil Service Competitive Examination and stood fourth in order of merit. He did not complete the period of probation, since his mind was deeply disturbed by the developments at home and so he resigned from the Indian Civil Service and returned home. The country was at that time in a sea of agitation under the leadership of Gandhiji. Subhash Chandra met Gandhiji and C.R. Das, the latter became his political Guru. Subhash Chandra first proved his mettle in the thorough manner in which he worked for the total boycott of the Prince of Wales in Calcutta in 1921. He subsequently
proved his capacity for organisation and executive ability in the discharge of his duties as Chief Executive Officer of the Calcutta Corporation. The Government jailed him for being actively associated with the terrorists of Bengal. He was released from jail in 1927 on medical ground. In 1928 the Motilal Nehru Committee which was appointed by the Congress declared in favour of Dominion Status which was objected to by Subhash Chandra who wanted nothing short of Independence. When Gandhiji launched the Salt Satyagraha Movement in 1930, Subhash Chandra was imprisoned and was set free in 1931. He strongly protested against the Gandhi Irwin Pact and wanted the Continuance of the agitation. He was again detained but his health went so bad that he was sent to Europe for treatment. In Europe he established centres in different European capitals with a view to promoting politico-cultural contacts between India and Europe. Returning home he found the Congress forming Government in the provinces and in the Haripur Congress Session in 1938 he was elected President. He was re-elected President next year in the Tripuri Session. He was convinced that war would break out within six months and demanded that the Congress should give an ultimatum to the British and if the ultimatum was rejected the entire country would be engaged in the struggle for Purna Swaraj. But the Congress did not adopt his suggestion and so he resigned from the Congress and established Forward Bloc within the Congress. The world war broke out true to the prophecy of Subhash Chandra Bose. In March, 1940 he convened Anti-Compromise Conference at Ramgarh under the joint auspices of Forward Bloc and Kisan Sabha which demanded
a world-wide struggle against the British. Three months later he was rearrested and jailed. On January 26, 1941 he disappeared from the jail. Later on it came out that he had gone to Germany "to supplement from outside the struggle going on at home". He negotiated alliance with both Germany and Japan saying "the enemy of our enemy is our friend". His regular broadcasts from Berlin aroused tremendous enthusiasm in India—From Germany he made a perilous three-month voyage in a submarine and reached Singapore on July 2, 1943. Two days later on July 4 he took over from Rash Behari Bose the leadership of Indian Independence Movement in East Asia and organised the Indian National Army and became its supreme commander and proclaimed the Provisional Government of Azad Hind on October 21, 1943. He was hailed as Netaji by the army as well as the Indian civilian population in East Asia. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands were liberated in November and renamed "Shaheed and Swaraj Islands". The Azad Hind Fouz crossed the Burma border and stood on Indian soil on March 18, 1944. How the brave army subsequently advanced upto Kohima and Imphal, how free India's banner was hoisted aloft there to the deafening cries of Jai Hind and Netaji Zindabad how the atom bombs compelled Japan to surrender and the I.N.A. subsequently to retreat are all parts of history. Subhash was reportedly killed in an air crash over Taipeih, Taiwan (Formosa) on August 18, 1945. There is, however, no proof of it. In any case, he had not been heard of any more. The efforts of Netaji were not in vain. The I.N.A. and their story made the Indian soldiers
unhappy and the British Government could no longer rely on the Indian personnel in the army. It was also not possible to replace them by British people and so the British began to think in terms of winding up their empire from India. This was the most positive gain that Netaji and his I.N.A. contributed to the liquidation of the British Empire in India.
Constitutional development of the period

In the preceding Chapter we have seen that India won her independence on August 15, 1947. The country got her present constitution on January 26, 1950 when India became a Republic. The creation of the present constitution was not done overnight. Its growth and development is associated with the political events that have been discussed in the previous Chapters. It will be of use if we make an attempt to survey the growth of the constitution and discuss the different constitutional Acts that were at work to act as bricks and mortars towards the making of present constitution.
It has been rightly said that political science without history has no root. It is, therefore, not possible to understand the present Constitution of India unless we can trace the present system from the beginning. To begin with, we must go two centuries back when the East India Company from England came to India for trade and commerce. This Company slowly and steadily assumed all political powers. So we are to cover the constitutional history for two centuries. We shall see that the only difference between the present constitution and the constitutional documents of these two centuries is that while the present constitution is made by the people of the country, the old works were imposed by an imperial power.

One interesting thing of the constitutional history of India is that it has two divergent forces—one of increasing the imperial powers and another of increasing the political powers of the people of the country. For the purpose of our study we may divide up the constitutional history into two parts, one upto 1858 and another from after 1858 to the growth of the new constitution. The climax of the absolute Imperial power was in the Government of India Act of 1858. After 1858 the accumulated Imperial powers began to split up and it was totally decentralised with the coming of the new constitution.

The British rule in India originated in 1600 when a charter of trade in the East was granted to the East India Company by the Queen of England. The East India Company carried on trades and occupied territories at the expense of the Mughal Empire. By the end of the seventeenth century the Mughal Empire was in
the decline. In 1757 Clive by his victory in the battle of Plassey laid down the foundation stone of the British Empire. Ten years later in 1767 the Mughal Empire granted *Dewani* of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the East India Company. So the East India Company from now became the political rulers rather than mere tradesmen. By getting political powers, the officers of the East India Company indulged in corrupt practices. To remove the corruptions, the British Government had to participate in Indian administration. The result was Lord North’s Regulating Act of 1773 which provided for a Governor and a council consisting of 4 members for the administration of Bengal. This Act made the Governor-General powerless. So, came Pitt’s India Act which provided a powerful Governor-General. A Board of Control was established in London to supervise the administration of India. Then came the Charter Acts of 1833 and 1853. The Act of 1833 completely centralised administration in India. The Governor-General of Bengal was to become the Governor-General of India. The Act of 1853 separated the executive from the Legislative powers. For the first time a Legislative Council was established with 12 members. In 1857 the Sepoy Mutiny shook the British Administration to its foundation. When the revolt was suppressed, the British Government took direct interest in Indian administration. So all powers of the East Indian Company were taken away. The result was the Government of India Act of 1858 which linked up India and England under the Crown. The post of Secretary of State for India was created with a Council of 15 members known as the Council of India. The Secretary of State for India
governed Indian administration through the Governor-General. This was the climax of Imperial power in India.

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 was the beginning of a new chapter. It allowed the Indians to become members of the Council. But it was the Governor-General who would nominate them. By the Indian Councils Act of 1892 the nomination was made by the Universities, Bengal Chamber of Commerce, Provincial Legislature and District Boards. The Crown was given the powers to criticise the financial matters and to ask questions. Next came Morley-Minto Reforms and the Indian Councils Act of 1909 which provided that the Legislative Councils could vote on the budget. By the Montagu-Chelmsford report and the Government of India Act of 1919, the Central Legislature was divided into two parts—the Legislative Assembly and the Council of States. No bill could become an Act unless it was passed by both the Houses. But the Governor-General could veto all works of the Legislature. Then came the Government of India Act of 1935 which provided for two kinds of functions—one for the centre and another for the provinces. In 1947 India became a Sovereign Democratic Republic and formed a Government by the people, of the people and for the people. From that day the new constitution came into existence. The poet of the Governor-General was abolished and the post of the President was introduced. The new constitution did not break away in structure from its old traditions. It only infused a new democratic spirit in the political life of India.
Rise of Imperial Powers: (Part I)

Lord North's Regulating Act—Lord North's Regulating Act (1773) was the first Act passed by the British Parliament about the administration of the India. It is a landmark in the constitutional history of India. It transferred the powers of the East India Company to the Parliament of England. The Act made the following provisions:

1. The Act provided for the appointment of a Governor-General and a Council consisting of 4 members for the administration of Bengal. The members of the council were appointed for a period of 5 years. They could be removed only by the Crown. The Governor-General had to work in accordance with the majority opinion of the council. He could not over-ride the majority opinion of the Council.

2. The Governors of Bombay and Madras were subordinate to the Governor-General of Bengal. If they would not carry out the orders of the Governor-General in Council, they could be suspended.

3. The Act gave the right of vote for Directors to every share-holders possessing shares of £1000 for one year. The Directors were to be elected for 4 years, rather than for one year.

4. A Supreme Court was established at Calcutta consisting of one Chief Justice and three other judges. This court had powers of both giving judgment in original cases and giving judgment in cases of appeal.

5. The Act made it clear that acceptance of bribes and presents by the servants of the Company would be illegal. And any person doing this crime would be removed to England.
The Regulating Act had defects more than one. The following criticism may be levelled against this Act.

The Governor-General was at the mercy of the Council. In fact, he was ignored by the council and so in many cases he had to carry out a policy which he himself did not like.

(2) The control of Bengal over Bombay and Madras did not work satisfactorily.

(3) The Board of Directors was to be elected only by the rich share-holders. More than 1246 small share holders could not give their votes. So they had no voice in the administration.

(4) The powers of the Supreme Court were not clearly stated. A great trouble came because there was no clear-cut power of the Supreme court and the Governor-General-in Council. Again the Act did not tell which law the Supreme Court had to conduct—the Hindu laws or the Muslim laws or English laws. This made the matter most complicated.

So the Regulating Act was full of extreme defects.

Pitt’s India Act (1784)—Lord North’s Regulating Act had many defects. So, as an improvement over the Regulating Act, came Pitt’s Indian Act which made the following provisions.

(1) A Board of Control consisting of 6 members was established. But, in fact, the real power was exercised by the President of the Board. The Board of Control was given powers of supervision and control over Indian administration.

(2) The Governor-General in Council was
given the powers and authority to control and direct the provinces. The Governor-General was to be appointed by the Directors with the approval of the Crown. Under the Regulating Act the council of the Governor-General consisted of the members. But in the Pitt’s India Act the Council was to consist of 3 members.

(3) The Governor-General in Council had no right to declare war or peace without the permission of a special body called the Court of Directors.

The Act had the following defects:

**Criticism of the Act**

(1) As a result of the constant change of the members of the Council even a weak man could become the Governor-General.

(2) The President of the Board of Control could misuse his powers as he was not bound to submit his accounts to the Parliament.

(3) The relation between the Board of Control and the Court of Directors was not clear. So, it was a sort of dual control over the Indian administration. Under such an arrangement the position of Governor-General could not be happy.

**The Charter Act of 1833**—After 1830 the whole of Europe was in a mood of reforms. And so the British Parliament very naturally felt that some constitutional reforms should be done for India. And as a result came the Charter Act of 1833, which made the following provisions:

**Main provision of the Act**

(1) The centre of Indian administration was transferred from England to India. The only authority to make laws in India was the Governor-General in Council that was given the
powers to supervise and direct the civil and military affairs of the Company.

(2) The Act centralised the administration in India. The Governor-General of Bengal became the Governor-General of India and the Governors of Bombay and Madras were subordinate to him.

(3) The Act centralised the legislative works of the country. Before 1833 the powers of the Governor-General were not clear. But from now it was clear that the Governor-General in Council could make Acts for all over India. As a result, the laws passed by the Government of India were to be called Acts. Formerly the laws of Bengal, Madras and Bombay were called Regulations. Now Bombay and Madras lost their right to make their own laws.

(4) Another achievement of the Act of 1833 was that it simplified and codified the laws of India. Before 1833 the laws of India were imperfect and complex, because there were various laws, the Muslim Laws and the English Laws. A common law was now made out for all over India.

The Act had the following drawbacks.

(1) The Charter Act of 1833 did not separate the Legislative powers from the executive powers. So the system was absolute.

(2) The greatest defects of the Charter Act of 1833 was that no Indian was included in the Legislative Council. So any Act passed by the Council was without proper knowledge of the needs of the Indians.

The Charter Act of 1853—The Charter Act of the 1853 was the last of all the Charter Acts of India. It came as an improvement over the
Charter Act of 1833. The Charter Act of 1853 made the following provisions.

(1) The post of a separate Governor was created for Bengal. This was necessary to relieve the Governor-General of India of the works of Bengal.

(2) The Governor-General was given powers to nominate a Vice-President of his council.

(3) The consent of the Governor-General was necessary for all legislative proposals.

(4) The provinces were allowed to send one representative to the Central Legislative council. No work about the Province could be done if the member from the province was not present.

(5) The Council in the legislative capacity consisted of 12 members.

The Government of India Act of 1858—
The Government of India Act of 1858 is the climax of the absolute Imperial power of the British Government in India. The Act made the following provisions:

(1) The Act provided that Government of England would take direct interest in the administration of India. By this Act Indian administration passed from the hands of the East India Company to the hands of the Crown. The Crown took all responsibilities of the military and naval forces.

(2) A new post of the Secretary of State for India was created to help the Crown in Indian administration. The Secretary of State for India was assisted by a Council of 15 members known as the Council of India. This Council was to consist of people of England alone. Out of the 15 members some were nomi-
nees of the Crown and others were the representatives of the East India Company. The Secretary of State was responsible to the British parliament and he governed India through the Governor-General, assisted by an Executive Council.

(3) The Board of Control and the Court of Directors were abolished and their powers were transferred to the Secretary of State for India and his Council of India.

(4) The administration of the country was unitary and centralised. Though there were provinces with a Governor, the Governor had full control over the provinces.

(5) The parliament of England and not the Legislative Council in India took direct interest in Indian affairs. In the British Parliament Indian affairs were discussed, Bills could be introduced and criticism was allowed.

(1) The whole system was absolutely imperial. The people of India had no voice in the Government.

(2) All powers rested with one man i.e., the Secretary of State for India. As he was not responsible to the Legislative Council, his works were not in touch with the Indians.

(3) The Government of India Act of 1858 was the result of the Sepoy Mutiny and the Crown tightened the administration of India. It was the breaking point of the Imperial power. After 1858 the Imperial control began to decrease in a descending scale when at last the Imperial control was totally abolished from India in 1947.
Decline of the Imperial control and growth of people's powers (Part II)

The Indian Councils Act of 1861—The Indian Councils Act of 1861 gave the framework around which all future works of a parliament in India grew up. For the first time the Indians were included in the Legislative Council. The Act of 1861 made the following provisions:

(1) As regards the Council of the Governor-General the number was increased from 4 to 5.

(2) The Legislative Council was to be increased by no less than 6 and not more than 12 members who were to be nominated by the Governor-General. The members could be from the Indians. The function of the Council was only legislative.

(3) The Government of Bombay, Madras and Bengal were each under one Governor and each with one council.

(4) The Central Legislative Council and the Provincial Council could make laws. There was no distinction between the central and the provincial subjects. But matters of Finance, Currency, Post Office and Telegraphs were under the Central Legislative Council.

(5) The Governor-General was given the powers to nominate one President to preside over the meetings of the Council in his absence.

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 introduced for the first time Indian people in the Legislative Council. But the Legislative Councils had limited powers. It could work upon those things alone that were allowed by the Governor-
General. So, it could not criticise the policy and conducts of the Government. Even in matters of legislation the Governor-General had sweeping powers by giving 'veto' to the Bills and by issuing Ordinances which would have the same forces as Acts.

Still, the Indian Councils Act of 1861 gave the framework of the future governance of the country and the basis laid down by the Act is still in continuance even to-day. For the first time the Indians were included in the making of laws in the country. So, the Act of 1861 began a new chapter in the constitutional history of India.

**The Indian Council Act of 1892—**The Indian Councils Act of 1892 is an improvement over the Indian Councils Act of 1861. The following are the main provisions of the Act of 1892:

1. The non-official member of the Legislative Council were to be nominated not by the Governor-General but by the University, the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, Provincial Legislature and the District Board etc.

2. The Council was given the powers to discuss the annual statement of the budget and criticise the financial policy of the Government. The Council was given the right to ask questions to the Government. A previous notice of 6 days was necessary for asking questions.

3. The Legislative Council now consisted of 24 members—14 officials, 4 elected non-official and 5 nominated non-official.

4. As the freedom movement in India brought pressure upon the British, the Act of 1892 allowed election by the people. But the

329
elected members could take their seats after being nominated by the Government.

(1) The Act of 1892 could not satisfy the people of India. There was no Assembly of the people in the real sense. The few elected members could do nothing before the vast non-elected members.

(2) The Council had no full control over the budget. Again, the right of asking questions to the Government could be refused by the President of Council.

(3) The governor-General was given immense powers. He was all-in-all and the Council could not oppose him.

(4) Again, the system of election was fair. The elected members got their seats only when approved of by the Governor-General. So their seat was not a matter of right but a matter of grace by the Governor-General.

The Morley-Minto Reforms and the Indian Councils Act of 1909—The Indian Councils Act of 1862 and 1892 introduced people’s representatives in the Council and more progress in that line was made in the Indian Councils Act of 1909. The Act made the following provisions:

(1) In order to get more elected members, the size of the Legislative Council was enlarged. The council was to consist of 69 members—37 officials, 27 non-official elected members and 5 non-official nominated members.

(2) The functions of the Legislative Council were increased by allowing the members to move resolutions on the budget and almost on all matters of public interest. The members were given the right to ask questions in the Council.
Criticisms of the Act

(1) The Act failed to fulfil the desires of the people, because it did not establish a parliamentary form of Government. As the aim of the Act of 1909 was not to establish a responsible Government, the result was that the people of India were dissatisfied.

(2) The system of election was not fair. As the system of election was indirect, the people elected members of local bodies, these local bodies elected some electoral college and the electoral college elected the Provincial Legislative Council which elected the members in the Central Legislative Council. So the elected members had no touch with the people.

(3) The greatest defect of the Act of 1909 was separate representation of the Muslims in the election. So the Act of 1909 had the germ of Hindu-Muslim conflict. The ultimate result of this conflict was the partition of the country in 1947.

Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the Government of India Act of 1919—The Indians Councils Act of 1909 failed to satisfy the desires of the Indians, because it did not establish a parliamentary system of Government in the country. So, during the First World War the Indian National Congress started agitation for what is known as ‘Home rule’. As a result the British parliament offered the Government of India Act of 1919. Montagu was the Secretary of State for India and Chelmsford was the Governor-General and the Act of 1919 was based on their report. The Act of 1919 made the following provisions:

1. Dyarchy in the provinces—A sort of double government or Dyarchy was established in the provinces. The subjects of the
administration in the provinces were of two kinds—central and provincial. If a matter was of central subject, it was under the control of the Governor and his Council. The matters of provincial subjects were decided by the Governor with the aid of the ministers who were responsible to the Provincial Legislative Council.

(2) The control of the centre over the provinces was decreased—the provinces were now more free from the control of the centre. In fact, the provinces were more free in matters of administration, legislation and finance. The provincial budget was separated from the central budget and the provinces were allowed to raise revenue from their own provinces.

(3) A more representative Indian legislature—By the Act of 1919 the Indian Legislature became more representative and for the first time consisted of two Houses—the Upper House and the Lower House. The Upper House was called the Councils of States composed of 60 members of whom 34 were elected. The Lower House was called the Legislative Assembly composed of 144 members, of whom 104 were elected. The powers and functions of both the Houses were almost equal. The election was on communal basis like the Act of 1909.

Criticisms of the Act

(1) The Act of 1919 failed to satisfy the people of India. Although a double government or Dyarchy was established, the provinces were still at the mercy of the centre. It was the Governor-General who was the main key of the whole switch-board of Indian administration. It was he who alone could decide which matter was central and which matter was provincial. So, when he had special interest in any matter
he could declare it central and in that case the Provincial Legislative Assembly had nothing to do.

(2) The two kinds of subjects were not clearly defined. As a result one would touch the other. In that case, the system was unworkable.

(3) Again, the Governor was not a constitutional head and there was no collective responsibility of the ministers.

So the Dyarchy introduced in the provinces by this Act was a failure.

The Government of India Act of 1935—
The most significant Act of British India was the Government of India Act of 1935. As a matter of fact, the Act of 1935 was the basis upon which the present constitution of India grew up. The Act of 1935 had the following salient features:

Main features of the Act

(a) Federation and provincial autonomy

—(i) The unitary system of India was split up into a federation with the provinces as units.

(b) Federation and provincial autonomy

—(i) The unitary system of India was split up into a federation with the provinces as units.

(ii) The Act divided legislative powers between the provinces and the centre and the provinces had full freedom within their jurisdiction.

(iii) The Governor was appointed by the Crown and he acted on behalf of the Crown and not as an agent of the Governor-General.

(b) The Legislatures—The central Legislature consisted of two Houses—the Federal Assembly and the Council of States. The Act of 1935 clearly divided the legislative powers
between the centre and the provinces. There was a Federal (central) List in which the Federal Legislature was the only authority. There was a Provincial List in which the Provincial Legislature had full powers. There was a Concurrent List of common authority of both the centre and the provinces.

(c) **Dyarchy at the centre**—The Functions of the Governor-General who was the head of the Executive were divided into two groups. All matters like defence, external affairs and tribal affairs were within the absolute powers of the Governor-General and in other matters the ministers had full powers.

(d) **The Supreme Court**—A Supreme Court was established with one Chief Justice and other 6 Judges to give judgment in cases of conflicts between different provinces.

1. The Governor-General could 'veto' a Bill passed by the Federal Legislature.

2. He could make ordinances which had the same force as Acts. No Bill could be introduced in the Legislature without the previous permission of the Governor-General.

3. The Governor-General was not the constitutional head. So, the desires of the people of India were not fulfilled by the Act of 1935.

**The Governor-General in the Government of India Act of 1935**—According to the Government of India Act of 1935 the Union Executive consisted of the Governor-General and a Council of ministers. The ministers were the members of the Legislature and were appointed by the Governor-General. The Governor-General was appointed by the Crown for a period of 5 years. All executive works in India were
in the name of the Governor-General. He was responsible only to the Crown.

It may be remembered that the Act of 1935 introduced Dyarchy in the centre and as such there was the Governor-General and the Council of ministers in one set of powers and the Governor-General and his own Council of 3 members in another set of powers. These members were responsible to the Governor-General alone. From this it is clear that in some affairs the Governor-General was all-in-all and these were in foreign affairs, defence religion and tribal affairs. But there were other things in which the Governor-General had to act on the advice of the ministers. So, the Governor-General’s powers were of two kinds—(i) where he was all powerful and (ii) where he took the advice of the ministers.

(1) Functions where the Governor-General was all-powerful—This can be divided up into four classes—(a) executive, (b) legislative, (c) financial and (d) emergency.

(a) Executive powers—All matters like foreign affairs, defence, religion and tribal affairs were in the hands of the Governor-General. He would appoint the ministers and other high officers like the members of the Union Public Service Commission.

(b) Legislative powers—He could summon and dissolve the Union Legislature. No Bill could become an Act if the Governor-General would not give his assent. He was free to give his assent or not. He could make ordinance which had the force of an Act. Moreover, he could himself make some Acts of the name of the Governor-General’s Acts.

(c) Financial powers—No Money Bill
could be introduced in the Legislature without the previous permission of the Governor-General. Again, he would fix and decide the budget and taxes.

(d) Emergency powers—The Governor-General was given the emergency powers under the Government of India Act of 1935. The Governor-General could declare emergency and take upon himself all the functions of the Government.

(ii) Functions where he took the advice of the ministers—But there were some functions in which the Governor-General took the advice of the ministers. These functions were about social customs, marriage and divorce, settlement of land disputes, etc. In such matters the Governor-General ordinarily did not intervene and he readily agreed to the works of the Council of ministers.

It was a normal practice of the Governor-General to accept the advice of the council of ministers. But he could over-ride the ministers at his sweet will. So, it is clear that the Governor-General was not the constitutional head but real ruler of India.

The Indian Independence Act of 1947—India won her independence in 1947. For that purpose the Parliament of England made the Indian Independence Act which made the following provisions:-

1. Abolition of the British Government from India—The Act declared that with effect from August 15, 1947 the British rule in India would be over.

2. Abolition of the post of Secretary of State for India—As the British rule in India was abolished, it was, therefore, but natural
that the post of Secretary of State for India would be abolished.

(3) **The Crown no longer the source of authority—**So long as India was under the British rule, all functions of the Government of India were in the name of ‘His Majesty’. But after August 15, 1947 India and Pakistan were free from the control of the British Government.

(4) **Partition of India—**The Act of 1947 divided the country into two parts—India and Pakistan; both free and independent.

(5) **The Governor-General and the Provincial Governors to act as constitutional heads—**The Governor-General and the Governors of the provinces were made constitutional heads and not actual rulers. So, their powers to declare Ordinances were taken away. This is an improvement over the Act of 1935.

(6) **The Constituent Assembly to act temporarily as the Parliament of India—**An Assembly was held with the representative of the people to make a new constitution for independent India. The Assembly was called the Constituent Assembly.

The Act of 1947 provided that until a new parliament was created according to the rules of the new constitution, the Constituent Assembly itself, meanwhile, would make laws. So the functions of the Constituent Assembly were two-fold—to make a new constitution and to work temporarily as the parliament of India.
We have already discussed the relation of the British Governor-Generals with the contemporary powers of India while discussing the individual British statesman. But it is felt essential to have a brief resume of the relation that existed between British India and the native powers in a chronological way, though it may to a certain extent entail a bit of repetition or gerry mandering.

1. Anglo-Mysore Relation (1767-69)—Mysore offered a formidable resistance to the growing rise of the British in the later half of the eighteenth century. The relation of the British towards Mysore is one of the relations of the British towards Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan and this can be briefly stated by a resume of the four wars—the First Anglo-Mysore War (1767-69), the Second Anglo-Mysore War (1780-84), the Third Anglo-Mysore War (1790-92) and fourth Anglo-Mysore War (1799).
The First Anglo-Mysore War—When Haidar Ali rose to power in Mysore, it poised before England a source of fear so that in 1766 the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Marathas and the English forged a coalition against Haidar. It was beyond the power of Haidar to meet this united effort. So he cleverly made a pact with the Marathas and took away the Nizam from the Coalition. He then together with the Nizam attacked the English but their combined forces met with defeat at the hands of Colonel Smith in 1767 at Trinomalai Changama. But the Nizam was rather unprincipled and he swiftly abandon Haidar and rejoined the English fold. The English, concluded a humiliating peace with the Nizam. By it the English took the responsibility of paying tribute to the Nizam for the Northern Circars and entered into an offensive and defensive alliance with the Nizam. This alliance with the Nizam was of no use to the English, but it needlessly provoked the hostility of Haidar. Since the Nizam was no longer an ally of Haidar, the latter continued to fight single-handed with great vigour. He recovered Mangalore after defeating the Bombay troops and came within five miles of Madras in March 1769. On April 4, 1769 he dictated peace to the English which provided for the exchange of prisoners and mutual restitution of conquests. The alliance was also a defensive one as the English promised to help Haidar in case he was attacked by another power.

The Second Anglo-Mysore War—When in 1778 France lent her military assistance to the American colonies against England, England declared war against France. Thereupon the English in India occupied the French Settlements including Mahe, a port which was strategically
very important for Haidar Ali. Haidar protested against the English seizure of Mahe, but his protest went unheeded. The provocation thus given to him added to his revenge on the English. Thus Haidar joined hands with the French and declared war upon England in 1779. The war ended in 1784. He hurled upon the Carnatic which he swept with the broom of desolation. An English Brigade under Colonel Baillie was compelled to surrender to Haidar. Munro, the victor of Buxer retraced his steps out of panic to Madras. It was in 1780 that Haidar took possession of Arcot. Fortunately for the English Haidar had no ally to join with him. Warren Hastings took the Nizam to his side, made a treaty with Scindia and also made common cause with the Raja of Berar. This could not dampen the spirit of Haidar. Hastings sent an army from Bengal under Sir Eyer Coote who defeated Haidar at Porto Novo in 1781 and regained the British prestige. The next encounter at Polliore was inconclusive but at Sholingur-Coote he gained another minor success. The next engagement at Nagapatam and Triconomali ended for the victory of the British. But the British success did not advance far. Haidar became hopeful when the French fleet kept England busy which resulted in the capture of Triconomali by the French. Haidar got Cuddalore from the English while his son Tipu after defeating the English captured an English army in 1782. It was at this hour of victory that Haidar died.

After the death of Haidar the war was carried on by his son Tipu. The biggest handicap of Tipu was that he was deprived of the French help because in 1783 England and France patched up their rivalry by the peace of
Versailles. Thus Tipu was left alone to fight the war and he successfully captured Bednore and Mangalore. The war was dragged on for some times with the success and defeat evenly received by both. In 1784 the war was concluded by the Treaty of Mangalore. This treaty resulted in mutual restitution of conquests and prisoners of both sides.

**Third Anglo-Mysore War**—The Third Anglo-Mysore war took place during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Cornwallis. He got Guntur in 1788 from the Nizam who in return asked for troops in order to get back some of his former territories from Tipu Sultan. But this was in violation of the provision of the Treaty of Mangalore of 1784 which England had concluded with Tipu who had full rights to the districts now claimed by the Nizam. But Cornwallis did not like to dissatisfy the Nizam and wanted to give him military help, provided this was not used against any friendly power of the Company. But strangely Mysore was not included in the list of the powers of Company’s alliance. There was thus sufficient reason for Tipu to be annoyed and to make a war against England and he attacked Trivancore, a state which was in alliance with England.

Cornwallis entered into the Triple Alliance with the Nizam and the Marathas who were opposed to Tipu. The earlier campaigns of Cornwallis did not show any bright result. In 1790 Cornwallis took upon himself all responsibilities. He occupied Bangalore and defeated Tipu at Arikera but was hard hit by a shortage of supply and thus had to make retreat. The situation was, however, saved by the timely arrival of the Marathas to the rescue of
Treaty of Seringapatam closed the war

Cornwallis. Thus in 1792 Cornwallis resumed operation, occupied the hill-forts of Tipu and advanced as far as Seringapatam when the Marathas plundered the whole of Mysore. Pressed from all corners, Tipu was forced to purchase peace and had to sign the Treaty of Seringapatam in 1792. Tipu was compelled to give up half of his dominions to pay a large war indemnity. But Cornwallis preferred not to annex Mysore into his dominion and so a fourth Anglo-Mysore War was hatched up in the womb of history.

The Fourth Anglo-Mysore War—It was for Wellesley to fight the fourth and last war with Mysore. After the Treaty of Seringapatam that closed the Third Anglo-Mysore War, Tipu did not take it lying down. He tried to secure the military assistance from France and with this aim in view he sent an ambassador to the French Governor of Mauritius who welcomed the proposal. A few French volunteers also joined Tipu’s services. Wellesley asked Tipu for an explanation of his embracing France. The explanation offeredly Tipu was unacceptable. So, Wellesley, to teach Tipu a good lesson, moved his troops. He sent two armies—one army was big—sent through the Carnatic under General Harris and the other from Bombay. The Nizam also sent a big contingent under the command of Arthur Wellesley. Tipu was completely defeated at first by the Bombay army and then by Harris at Malavelli, and retreated to his capital Seringapatam which was stormed and he fell dead fighting heroically. After this event the whole Mysore state was dismembered.

Wellesley did not like either the Marathas or the Nizam to get a lion’s share in Mysore. So he restored the main and central part of the
kingdom to krishnaraja, a descendant of the old Hindu dynasty of Mysore. The son of Tipu was given pension. Kanara, Coimbatore and Serigapatam were annexed to the Company's dominion. The Marathas refused to take any share of the spoil. The Nizam who received some land ultimately surrendered it to the British in 1800. Thus at the end of the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War the entire kingdom of Mysore comes under the control of the British in India. Thus the Anglo-Mysore relation is a story of the annihilation of a state of South India by three Governor-Generals and the resistance offered by Haidar and his able son Tipu was completely smashed.

2. The Anglo-Maratha Relation—The Maratha Confederacy, once the terror of the whole country, was broken up in 1761 at the Third Battle of Panipat. Three of its members—Sindhiya of Gwalior, Gaekwad of Baroda and Holkar of Indore—still owed nominal allegiance to the Peshwa, while the Bhonsle of Nagpur had openly declared his independence and ruled over most of the territories comprising the central provinces and Orissa.

The Peshwa was still trying to recover his influence in Northern India, and for this purpose Madhav Rao Peshwa despatched in 1769 his three Lieutenants—Ram Chandra Ganesh, Mahadaji Sindhiya and Tukoji Holkar. They first settled the affairs of Malwa and afterwards dispersed in different directions. Ram Chandra went to Bundelkhand, Sindhiya to Udaipur and Holkar to Kotah and Bundi. Having realised tribute in these places they opened communications with the Mughal Emperor, the Nawab of Oudh and Nazib-ud-daulah, the Dictator of Delhi.
The Marathas were one of the most self-respecting and courageous people. Their king or Peshwa wielded great command over the whole population of Marathas. The Third Battle of Panipat in 1761 damaged the power and prestige of the Marathas. But the lost glories were soon retrieved. Madhava Rao I, the Fourth Peshwa exerted great influence in the Deccan by his successful welfare against the Nizam and Haidar Ali of Mysore. It was Mahadaji Sindhia, a Maratha chief who rose into such prominence that he was political ruler of Agra and Delhi so much so that he brought Emperor Shah Alam under his control in 1771. But the death of Madhav Rao in 1772 marked the decline of the Maratha power and gave rise to internecine feuds. The Bombay Government of the British found an opportunity to fish out in the troubled waters and took up the cause of Raghoba, an aspirant for the post of Peshwa. But this design was foiled by the Maratha army who proclaimed Madhav Rao Narayan the Peshwa in preference to Raghoba. This shattered the prestige of the British so low that they had to enter into the humiliating treaty of Wadgaon (1779). It was now time for Warren Hastings to turn his mind to the Marathas and he declared war upon them who were forced to sign the Treaty of Salbai, 1782. This war might not give anything substantial for the British. But it freed the British of any danger from the Marathas so that they could tackle other problems like those of the Nizam and of Oudh.

But although superficially there was no conflict between the English and the Marathas, the latter began to gain in strength and prestige and in 1795 this was exhibited in a victory of the Marathas over the Nizam. But the death of
Nana Fadnavis left the Marathas without a leader. The Peshwa Baji Rao II lost in prestige and reduced himself to the position of an intriguer. But when the Holkar set up a rival, Peshwa Baji Rao took the help of the British under whose guns he got back the Peshwaship by accepting the subsidiary Alliance. But the Marathas who were a proud nation did not take the measure lying down and this led to the Second Anglo-Maratha War. The war was indecisive because Wellesley was recalled at that time by his Home Government.

When the British followed a policy of non-intervention during the rule of Sir George Barlow (1805-1807) and Lord Minto (1807-1813) there was a considerable lull in the Anglo-Maratha strife. But when Lord Hastings became the Governor-General, he took up a vigorous and aggressive attitude towards the Marathas. This led to the Third and last Anglo-Maratha War (1917-19). This was a war in which Peshwa Baji Rao II, Holkar and Apa Sahib declared war against the British. The British won a decisive victory and crushed the Marathas never to rise in future and the post of Peshwa was abolished for ever. It meant the total destruction of the Maratha power. It, in fact, gave the British the absolute authority more than that of Akbar and Aurangzeb. It rung down the curtain over the Marathas in Indian history.

Causes of Fall of the Marathas—The causes of the failure of the Marathas were more than one. The disastrous defeat of the Marathas in the Third Battle of Panipat (1761) crushed their backbone and they could not exhibit a united strength any longer. It is true that the Peshwa still commanded some power and
influence, but he had little control over the forces of disintegration that had set in after the debacle at Panipat. The treaty of Bassien by which Peshwa Baji Rao II purchased the British tutelage gave rise to opposition by the other Maratha chiefs. This was the beginning of the end of the Maratha power. In such time an able leader of the capacity of Sivaji was the need of the hour.

Secondly, the Marathas made a mistake in giving up their traditional policy of guerilla techniques of war that was followed by Sivaji which had puzzled and baffled the great Mughal Emperor. Forgotten of their past tradition, the Marathas came on the open field to lay down before the oncoming invaders.

Lastly, the Maratha rulers were not having popular support. Because they were autocratic and rather oppressive upon their own subjects, as a result of which they lost the faith and confidence of the people.

The Anglo-Sikh Relation—The Sikhs were the lions of the Punjab. Their dominions were bounded in the west by the Indus, in the east by the Yamuna coming to the close vicinity of Delhi, in the north by the lower range of the Himalayas and in the south by Multan and Bhawalpur.

Guru Govinda Singh had taught the Sikhs to assume two phases of life. In times of peace and prosperity they were to take the character of Bhai (brother) by becoming meek, humble and serviceable. In days of difficulty and danger they were to act like a stiff-necked hero (sardar) who would resist the wrongs done to him and others will all might.
The Sikhs were originally a religious sect but was made into a political power by their conflict with the Afghans. In 1767 after the withdrawal of Ahmad Shah Durrani the Sikhs took possession of the land between Rawalpindi and Yamuna. Their desire for further advance was checked by the Marathas, but when the Maratha power began to decline this added new hopes to the Sikhs to rise into a great power. It was during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Minto that the British government for the first time came into conflict with the Sikhs. The rise of the Sikhs is associated with the coming a great leader—Ranjit Singh. In 1799 he got the title of Raja of Lahore. After three years he was made the master of Amritsar and he brought within his control all the Sikh misls or fraternities west of the Sutlej under his control. He slowly and gradually kept on increasing his power till he became the master of the whole of the Punjab and Kashmir. The non-intervention policy of Sir John Barlow gave Ranjit Singh encouragement to expand his authority over the Sikh chieftains who dwelt east of the Sutlej in the land between the Sutlej and the Yamuna. This region was sometimes called Sirhind which was formerly under the control of Sindhi but after the expulsion of the latter from Hindustan the land was taken over by the British. When some Sikh chiefs quarrelled among themselves and sought the protection of Ranjit Singh, this was a good opportunity for Ranjit to intervene and he crossed the Sutlej and occupied Ludhiana. This made the Sikh chiefs rather panic and they sought the intervention of Lord Minto, the Governor-General. It was the plan of Lord Minto to keep Ranjit Singh beyond the Sutlej.
and so he sent Charles Metcalfe as his envoy to Ranjit Singh. After protracted negotiation a treaty was made between Ranjit Singh and the British Government, at Amritsar in 1809. The treaty fixed the authority of Ranjit Singh beyond the Sutlej and established "permanent amity" between the Sikhs and the British. After this the British frontier advanced from the Yamuna to the Sutlej. This treaty was a sacred bond of relation for the remaining thirty years of Ranjit's life.

During the Governor-Generalship of Lord Bentinck the relation between the English and the Sikhs was made further cordial by a ceremonial visit of the Governor-General at Rupar. The new gesture established a 'Treaty of perpetual friendship' with the Sikh ruler who agreed in his turn to open better trade prospect for the English. Lord Bentinck's aim of friendship with Ranjit Singh was to thwart a Russian aggression.

The First Anglo-Sikh War—So long as Ranjit Singh was alive, the relation between the English and the Sikhs remained cordial. But his death in 1839 which resulted in the occupation of the throne by his imbecile son Kharag Singh gave rise to restlessness and revolutions all over the land. The army became all-powerful in the state. The army came to power to quell the abnormal situation. After several changes in 1845 the army acknowledged the claims of Dilip Singh and the new king was only the five years of age. The boy's regency was taken over by his mother Rani Jhindan. But she was not liking the preponderance of the army and so she wanted the army to be busy
in some fights with the British and asked the army to attack the British. The hope of victory made the army elated and they forthwith attacked the British. When the Sikhs crossed the Sutlej, the boundary line of the Sikhs, Lord Hardinge had to declare war upon the Sikhs in 1845.

It was at Mudki that the first battle was fought in which the Sikhs were beaten by the British Commander-in-chief Sir Hugh Gough. The next battle was fought at Firozshah in which after a fight that resulted in heavy casualties of the British, the Sikhs were compelled to retreat. At the battle of Aliwal the Sikhs were again defeated and were again compelled to trace back across the Sutlej. It was at Sobraon that the Final battle was fought in which the Sikhs, despite a gallant resistance were decisively defeated. The result was the occupation of Lahore by the British and the Sikhs were bowed down to purchase peace. The Treaty of Lahore compelled the Sikhs to hand over all lands on the British side of the Sutlej as well as the Jullundur Doab (the land between the Sutlej and the Beâs). The Sikhs also agreed to make a cut in their own army and to pay an indemnity of one and a half million sterling or to cede Kashmir with half a million sterling. A British force was to be stationed at Lahore for one years. In 1846 a request was made to the British and accordingly a treaty was made which transferred the administration of the Punjab under a Council of Regency consisting of eight Sikhs Sardars who were to act under the direction of the British Resident. The new arrangement provided that a British force was to be maintained at Lahore and the Sikh Government had to pay twenty two lakhs of
rupees for its maintenance. Thus the net result of the war was that the British Government secured full control over the Lahore Durbar. This was the stepping stone for the annexation of the Punjab under Lord Dalhousie.

**The Second Anglo-Sikhs War**—The administration of the province of the Punjab as arranged by Lord Hardinge did not work well. The control exercised by the British Resident was disliked by the Sikh chiefs. They would not take the First Anglo-Sikh war as final and so wanted to measure their sword once again with the British. The occasion for a rapture came soon. The Sikh Governor of Multan whose name was Mulraj was summoned by the Government of Lahore to submit all accounts of expenditure whereupon he tendered his resignation. His resignation was accepted and the British Resident sent two young British officers to put into possession a new Sikh Governor at Multan. The two officers were assassinated and Mulraj recaptured his old position by a rebellion. As the revolt was dangerous, for the peace of the British empire, Lord Dalhousie had to intervene and he declared war upon the Sikhs. In this war Afghanistan took the side of the Sikhs in the hope of getting back Peshwar.

In two engagements the British under the command of Lt. Edwards defeated the rebels and compelled Mulraj to leave Lahore and to take shelter at Multan. The British Resident at Lahore under the command of Sher Singh sent a large force to occupy Multan but Sher Singh betrayed the British and joined with the rebellion. In the battle of Chilianwala a big strife continued between the two. Although it was a drawn battle, the balance of success was on
the side of the British. The decisive battle of the war was fought at Gujarat, a town near Chenub where Lord Cough signally defeated the Sikh powers. The Sikhs fled away in despair and they were followed as far as the Afghan frontier. The war ended with the surrender of Sher Singh.

The result of the Second Anglo-Sikh War was the annexation of the Punjab and granting of a pension of £50,000 a year. The Sikhs were disarmed. The administration of the province was given to a Board of Three Commissioners which was very soon abolished and a Chief Commissioner was appointed instead to administer the province and the man chosen to do it was Sir Henry Lawrence. Thus the Punjab, a state of Ranjit Singh no longer remained an independent state but was incorporated to the British Empire.

Causes of the failure of the Sikh power—There were various factors responsible for the failure of the Sikhs in the contest against the British. First, the administration of Ranjit Singh was primarily responsible for the ultimate decline of the kingdom. He failed to curb the powers and privileges of the local chiefs and his control over the whole of Punjab was basically superficial.

Secondly, the despotic and personal character of Ranjit Singh was another factor to be reckoned with. The ministers and the officers were self-centred and they were least interested in the welfare of the state. So long as there was a strong and iron man like Ranjit Singh, the defects in the administration did not allow them a chance to raise their heads. But after his death the defects that were so long undercurrent came to the surface.
Thirdly, the disputed succession question after the death of Ranjit Singh sapped the political foundation of the Empire. The weakness and rivalry among the successors of Ranjit Singh largely weakened the political entity of the Punjab.

Fourthly, the army that was the prop of a monarchy did not remain loyal to the king and in order to remove their restlessness the army was to be engaged in wars with the British. Thus the diversion of the military power against British proved suicidal for the Sikhs themselves.

Lastly, the Sikhs were definitely inferior to the British in point of military strength and the armed strength of the British outweighed that of the Sikhs.

4. The Anglo-Afghan Relation—The Afghan policy of the British Government arose out of direct fear of a Russian advance towards India through Herat and Kandahar. The embassy of Lord Minto to Kabul and his treaty with Ranjit Singh were formulated to nullify a Russian design and it was responsible for Lord William Bentinck to keep the Sikhs under friendship.

The Afghan policy of Lord Auckland (1836-42) was also directed by the same fear of the Russian advance in Central Asia. It was about this time that Russia was making a heavy build-up in the frontiers of the petty states of central Asia and got a tremendous influence in the court of Persia. It was a matter of grave concern for Lord Auckland when a Persian army forcibly occupied Herat in 1837. The Governor-General sent Captain Burnes to Kabul on a commercial mission but with the aim of baffling the Russian scheme in Afghanistan. Kabul's ruler Dost Muhammad cordially
received the English mission and agreed to do all that the English demanded, provided the English would press upon Ranjit Singh to restore Peshwar to him. As the British were not willing to affront the Sikhs, Dost Muhammad turned to Russia and received an informal Russian agent who was accorded a warm reception and cordiality. Now there was sufficient cause for Auckland to dethrone Dost Muhammad and to replace him by Shah Shuja, a grandson of Ahmad Shah Durran who was deposed in 1809 and was in the British prison at Ludhiana. It was the hope of Auckland that as Shah Shuja was a puppet king, he would owe his restoration to British help. He would be friendly to the British and would serve the British interest in the North West Frontier. With this aim in view Auckland concluded a treaty both with Ranjit Singh and Shah Shuja.

Although the necessity for which the war was fought was by then removed, Auckland carried on his设计 in Afghanistan. The British troops were despatched through the Bolan and Khyber passes and occupied Kandahar and Gazni in 1839. Dost Mohammad left Kabul and Shah Shuja was triumphantly conducted into his capital and declared king ceremonially. Garrisons were stationed at Kandahar, Kabul and Jalalabad to maintain the British influence. Macnaghten and Burnes remained in charge of political affairs. Dost Mohammad having no other way surrendered and was sent down to Calcutta on a liberal allowance.

But the matter did not end in this way. The Afghans did not like Shah Shuja who had been installed on the throne of Afghanistan against the wishes of the people. The behaviour of Burnes and other British officers quartered at Kabul
heightened the dislike between the British and the Afghans. Burnes was cruelly murdered and the British troops were demoralised. Macnaghten, the Political Resident was compelled to sign humiliating treaty by which it was agreed that the British should leave Afghanistan and that Dost Mohammad should be released and brought to Kabul. But the Political Resident was done to death, on grounds of some suspicion. Despite all such happenings, the British entered into another treaty with the Afghan chiefs and the British forces had to withdraw from Kabul. But the withdrawal proved to be an utter failure—all the men were killed except one man.

Dr. Brydon who made good his escape to Jalalabad. Before the close of the war Lord Auckland was succeeded by Lord Ellenborough (1842-44). The Governor-General immediately took steps to revive the British prestige. He sent a strong regiment under General Pollok who relieved Jalalabad and took his march towards Kabul. The British prisoners were relieved but despite his initial victory, General Pollok with his army was forced to leave Afghanistan. Shah Shuja was murdered and Dost Mohammad was allowed to get back his throne of Afghanistan.

After this there was a lull in the British attitude towards Afghanistan for a long period. Since 1858 the foreign policy of India was largely directed by European conditions and this was specially applicable to the relation between England and Russia in the North Western border of Russia. We have seen that there was considerable lull for some years after the First Anglo-Afghan War. But the outbreak of the Crimean War (1853-56) made England and Russia hostile. At the end of the war Russia sought to compensate her losses in
the west by gains in the east. As a matter of fact, the conquest of Sind and the Punjab had brought the British Emir up to the border of Afghanistan which virtually became a buffer-state between the British empire and Russia.

Sir John Lawrence who was the Governor-General of India from 1864 to 1869 was a strict neutralist and refrained from intervening in the fratricidal war which broke out and lasted for five years after the death of Dost Muhammad. After the war was over, he recognised Sher Ali as the ruler of Afghanistan. Lawrence's policy of neutrality is acclaimed by some as 'one of masterly inactivity', while others condemned it outright. It is, however, a truism that Lawrence's policy was highly successful in isolating the Afghan Civil War from an international complications.

Lord Mayo (1869-72) who took office of the Governor-General after Sir John Lawrence was a camp-follower of his with regard to Afghan policy. One of his earliest works was to arrange a grand Durbar at Ambala in which he accorded a hearty welcome to Sher Ali. He assured Sher Ali that the British would never cross the frontier to suppress his subjects, but would give moral assistance in the form of money, arms, ammunitions and native workmen.

But when the Conservative Party was returned to power, the inactivity in the frontier was changed and the frontier policy received a new gear. The appointment of Lord Lytton (1876-80) transformed the Afghan policy from 'masterly inactivity' to 'intervention'. This was the result of two factors—the growing estrangement between the British Government and Sher Ali and the growing menace of Russia. The
main object of Lytton was the maintenance in Afghanistan of a strong and friendly power. It was the opinion of Lytton that between Great Britain and Russia Afghanistan was like "an earthen pipkin between two iron pots." He offered the proposal to Sher Ali to receive a British Resident at Herat. This added strength to the conviction of Sher Ali that the best interest of British India demanded the "disintegration and weakening of the Afghan power" and the security of Afghanistan from among the control of Russia. Sher Ali, therefore, modestly disagreed to accept the proposal on the ground that he could do so if it would grant similar facilities to Russia. Since Afghanistan rejected the offer of England, Lytton sent a stern warning to Sher Ali that the refusal would isolate Afghanistan from the alliance and support of the British Government. He looked to the Khan of Kalat and concluded a treaty which gave the British the right to occupy Quetta. This was preliminary step to warlike activities against the Amir. Matters became rather grave when a Russian envoy General Stoletoff, disregarding Sher Ali’s opposition arrived at Kabul and later persuaded the Amir to conclude a treaty of perpetual friendship. This disquieting news to Lytton compelled him to send a British envoy to Kabul. But the Amir refused to entertain the proposal and stopped British Mission sent by Lytton. This provoked the needed reason for Lytton to act and he sent an ultimatum on November 2, 1878 with the threat of a war, if the Amir did not recognise the British Mission within a stipulated time. The British troops attacked Afghanistan as the ultimatum was not headed and this led to the Second Anglo-Afghan War. In December, 1878 Sher Ali
after several defeats was forced to retire to Turkistan, where he died very soon. His son Yakub started negotiation with the British and this resulted in the peaceful conclusion of the war on May 26, 1879 by the Treaty of Gandamark. By its terms the new Amir was obliged to accept a British Resident at Kabul and to abide by the directions of the British Government with regard to his foreign powers. The British in their turn also promised to support the Amir against all foreign aggression and also to pay him annually a grant of six lakhs of Rupees. But the freedom-loving people of Afghanistan did not like the Treaty and they murdered the British Resident at Kabul. This reopened hostility. The British forces took hold of Kandahar and Yakub Khan was compelled to take refuge in India. Lytton was willing to carry on his plan of splitting up Afghanistan by separating Kandahar from Kubul. Thus the Second Anglo-Afghan War did not solve the British frontier policy. This only postponed it. In March, 1885 the British Government was roused to a temper of war as a result of the Russian occupation of Panjdeh which was situated within Afghan territories. This disaster was, however, averted mainly owing to the policy of Amir Abdur Rahman who had no mind to allow “the lion and the bear to fight with each other over the poor goat of Afghanistan.” In July, 1887 an agreement was made according to which Russia retained Panjdeh and the Amir’s possession of Zulfikar pass was confirmed. For six years there was silence in the frontier until disputes broke out again in 1892, over the claim of Russia relating to the whole of the Pamirs. Happily, a friendly understanding was achieved in 1885 and a boundary line was formally fixed
up. "This brought to an end for the time being the longstanding rivalry between England and Russia over Asiatic Empires." The England kept a firm hold on Afghanistan, and Russia directed her energy further to the east.

The Afghan Boundary Commission under the supervision of Sir Mortimer Durand framed in 1893 the demarcating line between Afghanistan and British India. This offered ample opportunities to the British to deal with wild tribal people more effectively than before. The British wanted to augment their position by building roads and by carving out from the Punjab a separate province—North West Frontier Province. Even then the frontier remained troublesome for the British. But the immediate danger was removed with the withdrawal of the Russian menace proving thereby that the final solution of the North West Frontier was basically connected with the new developments in the international affairs that led to the mitigation of the Anglo-Russian tension when both England and Russia had to make common cause against Germany.

5. Anglo-Oudh Relation—Lord Clive after the battle of Buxar entered into some relation with Oudh and thus the relation between Oudh and the East India Company may be traced to begin from 1765. In the battle of Buxar in which the Nawab fought on behalf of Mir Kasim against the British, Clive made an easy victory over Oudh. Clive was satisfied to allow the Nawab to enjoy his acquisition with the exception of Kora and Allahabad which were handed over to Emperor Shah Alam. The aim of Clive was to keep Oudh as a sort of buffer state.

But when Warren Hastings assumed office
in 1773, he divested the Emperor of the two districts since the latter had joined the Marathas. Warren Hastings sold these two districts to the Nawab of Oudh, the original owner at a price of Rs. 50 lakhs in the Treaty of Benaras in 1772. Two years latter a new treaty was concluded requiring the Nawab to give up Benaras and to agree to pay a subsidy at an increased rate for the maintenance of the British troops. Hastings' policy towards Oudh was to keep Oudh as a buffer state between the British and the Marathas.

During the time of Lord Cornwallis the Nawab of Oudh made a request to relieve him of the expense of the British troops stationed in Oudh. But Cornwallis made the concession in the form of reducing the expenditure to 50 lakhs a year. In 1797 Sir John Shore intervened in a disputed succession in Oudh. When Asaf-ud-daula, the Nawab of Oudh died he was succeeded by his illegitimate son Wazir Ali. At first Shore sanctioned the succession. But when he came to know that the new Nawab was the illegitimate son, he changed his decision and put a brother of the late Nawab Saddat Khan on the throne. By a treaty concluded with the new Nawab he took the responsibility of the defence of Oudh in return for an annual subsidy of 76 lakhs of rupees and to cede the fort of Allahabad to the company and not to hold any communication with any foreign state except the English in India. Oudh thus practically became a protected feudatory state under the company. Shore perhaps took such a vigorous policy in view of the possible danger from Zaman Shah, the ruler of Kabul who had attacked upon the Punjab. The invader was, however, to retreat to quell other dangers near his own country.
Wellesley turned his mind to Oudh as a matter of necessity to strengthen the British hold in the North Western Frontier. Although Warren Hastings had made Oudh a buffer state owing to prevailing misgovernments that province had become weak and a source of danger to the British position in India. It was every time possible for a strong power to occupy Oudh and thereby threaten Bengal. So Wellesley was determined to strengthen his grip over Oudh. He forced upon the Nawab to accept a new treaty in 1801 by which the ruler of Oudh was compelled to give up a vast territory comprising the Gorakhpur and Rohilkhand divisions together with some portions of the Doab. The other stipulation put upon the Nawab was to increase the number of the Company’s troops stationed in Oudh. Thus half of Oudh passed under the British flag. But the internal condition remained as corrupt and mismanaged as before so that Lord Cornwallis had to take up Oudh as a part of his empire.

During the time of Lord Hastings in consideration of the services rendered by Oudh in money in the war against the Gorkhas, the Nawab of Oudh was allowed to assume the title of king. Lord Bentinck, however, gave a warning to the government of Oudh that if the management of the government was not improved, it would be a sufficient cause for the British to adopt drastic measures such as had been adopted in regard to Tanjore and the Carnatic for the similar reasons. During the Governor-Generalship of Lord Auckland the Company interfered in the succession question following the death of Nasiruddin and compelled the new Nawab Muhammed Ali Shah to sign a new treaty. The treaty provided that the right
of managing the affairs of the kingdom in case of gross misrule would lie with the Company.

The relation with Oudh reached a final stage when Lord Cornwallis took office. The Subsidiary Alliance introduced by Wellesley created more evils in Oudh. The wrongs were also largely due to the mismanagement by the rulers of Oudh. The evils of the Subsidiary Alliance made the ruler disinterested towards the benefit of the people. Thus Dalhousie who is known for his aggressive designs was desirous of assuming the control and responsibility of Oudh making the ruler of Oudh a puppet. But in the light of suggestions of the Board of Directors he decided to annex Oudh. This drastic measure was enforced in February, 1856. Wazid Ali Shah, the last of the Nawab was deposed on grounds of misgovernance. In this way Oudh was formally annexed to the British Indian Empire.

6. Anglo-Sind relation (1820-43)—It was during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Minto that the political relation of the British with the Amirs of Sind was established. In 1809 Lord Minto sent an embassy to the chief Amirs and concluded a treaty "establishing eternal friendship between the contrasting parties" and providing for the exclusion of the French from Sind. This treaty was renewed in 1820. Lord William Bentinck also made a treaty in 1832 by which the rivers and roads of Sind were thrown open to the British merchants and the traders subject to the condition that no armed vessels or military stores should be allowed to go through the country. It was further stipulated that the contracting parties should not look with the eyes of greed on the possession of each
Auckland’s policy of high-handedness

other. At the time of the First Afghan War, Lord Auckland broke this treaty in the most cynical way by carrying British troops through Sind and added injury to insult by exacting a large sum of money from the Amirs. Despite such flagrant violation of a treaty and high-handedness the Amirs refrained from open hostility during the Afghan War even when the British were the tottering to fall.

But situation took a quite different turn during the time of Lord Ellenborough who intentionally provoked a war to get an opportunity to annex Sind. Vague charges of disaffection were brought against the Amirs and Sir Charles Napier was sent to Sind with full civil and military powers. He imposed a new treaty upon the Amirs compelling them to cede the greater portion of their territories and also forgo the right of minting coinage. The Baluchis rose in arms against the Governor-General’s obstinate designs. When the Baluchis attacked the British Residency, Napier got a pretext for the war which he was provoking. The army of the Amirs were defeated in two sections—at Miani and Dabo near Hyderabad. This brought Sind to the knees before the British Empire. In June, 1843 a treaty was made according to which the Amirs were expelled and Sind was annexed to the British Empire. This was the story of the annexation of Sind. The British action cannot be supported on grounds of morality.

7. Anglo-Bhutan relation—The relation of England with Bhutan may be traced back to the days of Warren Hastings. For many years little was known of this Himalayan country which was secluded and stretched along the northern frontiers of Bengal and Assam. The
land was inhabited by several thousand of Buddhists ruled over by a dual authority of Devaraja and Dharmaraja who had some sort of allegiance to Tibet.

But the perpetual annual raids of the Bhutanese in British territories compelled Warren Hastings to send a small force in 1772 to remove the anti-British attitude. This antagonism between England and Bhutan was not favoured by Tibet whose Government tried to lend support to Bhutan. To avoid a Tibeto-Bhutanese alliance Warren Hastings concluded a treaty with Devaraja and permitted the Bhutanese to carry on legitimate trade with Bengal by way of Rangpur in 1774. Even after the commercial relation was established, the political relation with Bhutan did not show any sign of improvement and disputes over boundary became frequent. A political mission was sent to Bhutan in 1815 but it failed in its object and the old quarrel over the boundary remained unaltered.

When Britain annexed Assam by the Yandaboo Treaty of 1826, this gave the British the effective control of the Duars, a slice of land that measured one hundred miles in length from Darjeeling to the borders of Assam. But the fear of raids from the side of Bhutan continued as before. In 1837 Lord Auckland despatched a mission under Captain Pemberton to secure some relief against such raids. But the mission proved abortive. Auckland had to remain silent until he occupied the Assam Duars with a promise of an annual payment of Rs. 10,000 to the Raja of Bhutan. The Government of Bhutan now came forward with explicit assurance that Bhutan would recognise the British boundary and there would be no recur-
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rence of such a raid. But the assurance did not materialise.

The British Government made another attempt for a peaceful settlement by sending one more mission under Ashley Eden in 1864. But now Tongso Ponto, Governor of Eastern Bhutan inflicted severe insult upon the British envoy. What more is that the Bhutan Government not only turned down the proposal of the British but compelled under threat of physical force to sign a humiliating treaty (March 29, 1864). This kind of obstinacy on the part of Bhutanese Government compelled Sir John Lawrence, the Governor-General to declare war (November, 1864) against Bhutan. The British aimed at occupying Bhutanese Duars in Bengal and Assam and advancing as far as possible to prevent a future aggression from the side of Bhutan. The war ended for the victory of England and Bhutan was compelled to conclude terms (November, 1865). The treaty provided for surrender by Bhutan of all claims to Bengal and Assam Duars, payment of war subsidies and establishment of regular trade between Bhutan and the British territories.

Although the peace, was made, the hostility between England and Bhutan did not go and some occasion raids from Bhutan remained a problem. This was, however, permanently solved by 1897 when the relation between England and Bhutan improved and king Devaraja was recognised by the British as the lawful ruler of Bhutan. The British Government recognised the supremacy of the Bhutanese Government in internal affairs, while the foreign relations were to be handled by the British.

Anglo-Burmese Relation—The British
had to fight three wars with Burma to get complete control over this land and incorporate it into British India.

The First Anglo-Burmese War—It was an Act of aggression on the part of Burma that compelled England to take to arms to silence the aggressors and this was the vital cause of the First Anglo-Burmese War. In the middle of the eighteenth century a Burmese chief named Alompra conquered Pegu and founded a strong dynasty. His successors extended their dominion in different directions and began to push towards the eastern frontier of India. In 1784 the Burmese came very close to Chittagong after overrunning the independent kingdom of Arakan. Several refugees in panic crossed into Indian border and the Burmese demanded from the British the surrender of these fugitives. But the British authority in Chittagong refused to accept the demand. This strained the Anglo-Burmese relation. In 1813 the Burmese occupied Manipur and in 1818 the king of Burma sent a very unacceptable letter to Lord Hastings demanding the British possession of Chittagong, Dacca, Murshidabad and Kashimbazar. But matter came to a crisis in 1822 when Burma conquered Assam and thus made the British North Eastern Frontier vulnerable. Lord Amherst considered it time to declare war in 1824. The British under Sir Archibald Campbell captured Rangoon but could not for a time proceed further due to shortage of supply and heavy rainfall. There was a heavy fight and a British detachment was defeated by the Burmese General Bandula who was later on killed in another encounter. The British arrived at Yandaboo and the capital city of Burma was
threatened, whereupon Burma surrendered and signed the Treaty of Yandabo, by the terms of which Assam, Cachar and Manipur became British protectorate.

**The Second Anglo-Burmese War**—The Treaty of Yandabo did not bring real friendship between England and Burma. The Burmese people became more and more arrogant so that in 1840 the British Resident in Burma had to leave the land. The British merchants at Rangoon were subjected to ill-treatment so that Lord Dalhousie asked compensation from Burma. The Burmese turned down the demand as a ship belonging to the king of Burma was detained by the British. Dalhousie declared war in 1852. By a brief and simple operation Burma was taken by the British. The city of Rangoon was captured and the great Pagoda was stormed. The whole province of Pegu was under British control. As the Burmese authorities refused to hand over Pegu by a formal treaty the province of Pegu was annexed, in 1852 by a proclamation.

**The Third Anglo-Burmese War**—Despite the two defeats in the two preceding wars Burma did not take the measure lying down. The relation between Burma and England began to become more and more strained. When Thibaw came to the throne of Burma, the Anglo-Burmese relation became worse. He was inclined more towards France than to England. In 1883 a Burmese Mission went to Paris and this was followed by a French envoy at Mandalaya two years hence. The crises deepened when Thibaw imposed a heavy fine on a British commercial company which was known as the British and Burma Trading Company
and even ordered the arrest of several of its officers. The inner motive behind Thibaw's action was to transfer the trading right from the British to the French. A trade treaty concluded between Burma and France in 1883 confirmed this still further. The British government took exception to it and demanded that this issue should be referred to the arbitration by the Governor-General. The Burmese Government declined to accept the demand whereupon Lord Dufferin sent an ultimatum demanding that Thibaw should receive a British envoy at Mandalaya, cancel the action against the British Company till the arrival of the envoy and not to enter into any contract with foreign country except with the permission of the British authority. When the ultimatum was unheeded to, the British declared war upon Burma. Within a brief span of twenty days Mandalaya was occupied and Thibaw was taken prisoner. He was deposed. Upper Burma was annexed and along with Lower Burma formed the new province of Burma with its Leader ratters at Rangoon. The British Indian Empire thus reached its furthest extent in the north-east. The British policy with regard to Burma was prompted by fear of France as its policy towards Afghanistan was actuated by fear from Russia.

9. Anglo-Tibetan Relation—The British relation with Tibet began in 1774 when Warren Hastings was in charge of the British East India Company. Warren Hastings sent George Bogle, a young officer of the Company, to visit the Tashi Lama who is the spiritual head of Tibet. But Bogle could not secure any advantage for the British, because Tibet since the
early years of the eighteenth century had acknowledged the suzerainty of China and as a matter of fact, the Chinese authority over Tibet was represented by the presence of Chinese Residents called Ambans at Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. China and Tibet had a joint endeavour to keep Tibet closed for the British and they succeeded in keeping out the British from Tibet till the end of the nineteenth century. The situation became different after the Third Anglo-Burmese War and in 1886 the British made a treaty with China according to which the British recognised the authority of China over Tibet and China agreed to the British annexation of Burma. The Tibetans made an attack upon Sikkim which was a British protected state but the Tibetans were easily pushed back and in 1890 the boundary line between Tibet and Sikkim was demarcated by a treaty between China and Britain. Thus upto the beginning of the twentieth century Tibet was still a forbidden country to be British.

In the beginning of the twentieth century the Dalai Lama with the help of his tutor, Dorjieff, a Russian Buddhist was willing to throw out the Chinese authority and entered into some negotiation with the Government of Russia. Lord Curzon the prancing Viceroy was seized with fear of Russian preponderance in Tibet and in order to frustrate this design he sent an expedition under Col. Francis Younghusband that entered into Tibet without any resistance in July, 1903 and made an easy victory over the ill-armed Tibetan army at Guru in March 1904 and after defeating a huge army entered into Lhasa in August, 1904. A treaty was made at the dictation of Young-
husband by which the Tibetans agreed to open for the British three trade marts within Tibet, to pay an indemnity of 75 lakhs of rupees (later on reduced to 25 lakhs repayable in three annual instalments), to allow the British to take possession of Chumbi-valley that lay between Sikkim and Bhutan until the indemnity was paid off and not to allow any foreign power to annex any part of Tibet or to make railroad without giving such facilities to the British. This forestalled the Russian expansion in Tibet but brought Chinese authority over Tibet which was so long nominal. China on behalf of Tibet paid off the indemnity of rupees 25 lakhs and the British had to vacate Chumbi Valley.

In 1906 Britain and Nepal made another convention whereby Britain agreed not to annex any Tibetan territory or to interfere in the internal administration of Tibet and in return China agreed not to allow any foreign power to interfere in Tibet of disturb the territorial integrity of Tibet. Next year Britain and Russia agreed to carry on political relation with Tibet through China. Thus Tibet was given over to China as a political gift. In 1913 when China was busy in sorting out domestic squabbles Tibet took advantage of this situation and overthrew the suzerainty of China over Tibet. Russia was equally tied with her internal troubles since 1917 and this relieved England of taking any independent policy towards Tibet and for the next thirty years the relation between England and Tibet remained cordial and peaceful. But towards the fifties of the twentieth century political situation changed. China that became a Communist State and under the leadership of Mao Tse-Tung wanted to reassert her old
authority over Tibet and accordingly the Chinese overran Tibet in 1959 and forced Dalai Lama to flee for his life to India and the National Government of India looked as silent spectator. Thus Tibet became an integral part of China and it formed the northern boundary of India.