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Preface

I have always believed that a study of the biographies of great men inspires the readers and helps them to achieve in their lives what otherwise would have been either difficult or impossible. All great men have suffered and a study of their sufferings and achievements is of very great utility in actual life. I am not concerned with those who want to live a life of ease and do not care about what happens to their country. I am concerned only with those who want themselves to become great and are in search of the methods by which others became great in spite of the hardships they had to endure in their lives. I believe that the life-story of Tilak alone can inspire millions in this country to work selflessly for the glory and greatness of their country.

This book has been written with a mission and I shall feel happy if my object is fulfilled. We require the services of thousands of Indians who can work day and night for the Motherland in the spirit of crusaders.

D-805, New Friends Colony, Mathura Road, New Delhi-14.
September 6, 1975.

Vidya Dhar Mahajan
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Raja Ram Mohan Roy has rightly been described as the Father of Indian Renaissance and the Prophet of Indian Nationalism. Behind all his ideas of social and religious reforms, there lay the thought of bringing about political regeneration of his countrymen. To quote him, “I regret to say the system adhered to by the Hindus is not well-calculated to promote their political interest. The distinction of castes, introducing divisions and sub-divisions among them, has entirely deprived them of political feeling, multitude of religious rites and ceremonies and the laws of purification have totally disqualified them from undertaking any difficult enterprise. It is, I think, necessary that some change should take place in their religion at least for the sake of their political advantage and social comfort.”

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was born in 1772 in an old fashioned but well-to-do Brahmin family in Bengal. When he was hardly 15, he wrote a pamphlet in Bengali in which he denounced idol worship. The result was that he was turned out from his family and he had to live in exile. He made the best of the opportunity and travelled far and wide and thereby gained a lot of experience and learning. He already knew Arabic and Persian and now he was able to master Sanskrit. He also picked up English, French, Latin, Hebrew and Greek. The result was that he was able to study in original the scriptures of the important
religions of the world and thereby acquire a comparative idea of various religions. That is the reason why his concept of universal religion was not based on any abstract principles, but on a profound knowledge of the various religions. From 1805 to 1814, he was in the service of the English East India Company. After his retirement, he settled in Calcutta and devoted himself entirely to the service of the people. In 1814, he started the Atmiya Sabha. In 1828, he founded the Brahma Samaj. He went to England in 1831 on a special mission to plead the cause of the Mughal Emperor of Delhi. When he was still busy on that work he died at Bristol on 27 September, 1833. He was given the title of Raja by the Mughal Emperor.

In all his activities, Raja Ram Mohan Roy was actuated by a deep love of his motherland and an intense sympathy for the ignorant and the poor. As it was not possible to raise an armed rebellion against the Englishmen, he continued to educate the public opinion and thereby encouraged political consciousness among his countrymen. He adopted all possible means to raise the morale of the people. He believed that India could progress only through liberal education covering all branches of Western learning. He gave his full support to all those who stood for the introduction of the study of English language and Western sciences in India and ultimately, he was successful in his efforts. He helped in the foundation of the Hindu College which was the best modern institution of its type in those days.

He fought for the freedom of the press. He himself founded and edited a Bengali journal called the Samvad Kaumudi which was among the earliest Indian edited newspapers. He carried on a vigorous agitation against the Press Regulations of 1823. He submitted a Memorial to the Supreme Court, in which he dwelt on the benefits of a free press. His agitation for the freedom of the press must have paved the way for the final emancipation of the press in 1835.

During his stay in England from 1831 to 1833, he agitated for reform in the administrative system in British India. He was the first Indian to be consulted on Indian affairs by the British Parliament. While giving his evidence before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, he suggested reforms in practically all the branches of Indian administration. The political ideas of the Raja were influenced by European philo-
sophers and jurists like Bacon, Hume, Bentham, Blackstone and Montesquieu. He advocated the peaceful settlement of international disputes through the mediation of a Congress composed of an equal number of members from the Parliament of the countries concerned.

In a letter to the Reformer which the Raja contributed from England some days before he died, he pointed the way to political action and wrote: "The progress that we have made in India as to the knowledge of politics, is by no means equal to that made here by the English; I, therefore, beg to observe that moderation and prudence should not be lost sight of by our countrymen. We should not be too hasty and too sanguine in raising our condition, since gradual improvements are more durable. Though it is impossible for a thinking man not to feel the evils of political subjugation and dependence on foreign people, yet when we reflect on the advantages which we have derived from our connection with Great Britain, we may be reconciled to the present state of things which promises permanent benefit to our posterity."

The Raja wrote to Victor Jacquemont that "India requires many more years of English dominance so that she might not have many years to lose while she is reclaiming her political independence." The political thinking of the Raja was conditioned by his intense faith "in the benevolence of an enlightened government" which led him to proclaim that "Indians are fortunately placed by Providence under the protection of the whole British nation." He thanked the "Supreme Disposer of the Universe for having unexpectedly delivered this country from the long continued tyranny of the former rulers and placed it under the Government of the English, a nation who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and political liberty, but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects among those nations to which that influence extends." He was a great believer in the benefits which may accrue from greater "intercourse with European gentlemen" and therefore, advocated European colonisation in India and desired the union between India and England to become permanent. However, he was no supporter of bureaucratic despotism depending on the sanction of superior force alone. The Raja could not at that
time conceive of a representative legislature, but desired that the law should reflect public opinion and for that purpose laid emphasis on a free press. He recognised aristocratic privileges and could not contemplate common people having a share in law-making even if it might be indirect.

He was moved by the sufferings of agricultural labourers and wanted the rents paid by the cultivators to be fixed. He was inspired by an intense love of liberty and some of his ideas were very much in advance of his times. His greatest contribution to the land of his birth is that he set the tone of public opinion in the country and inaugurated an era of reform which was comprehensive in its scope and embraced social, political and religious life of the country. For more than half a century after his death, the pitch of political thinking and action did not rise above the standards fixed by him.

The Raja carried on ceaseless propaganda for the abolition of the custom of Sati. The result was that Sati was banned by the Government of India in 1829.

The work of Raja Ram Mohan Roy was in the nature of preparation of his country for political advancement in the future. By removing the social and religious evils, he prepared the Indians for political consciousness. He was undoubtedly a pioneer in this field and has rightly been called the "Father of Indian Nationalism."

Prof. Max Mueller says: "The Raja was the first to complete a connected life-current between the East and the West—the inspired engineer in the world of faith that cut the channel of communication, the spiritual Suez between sea and sea land-locked in the rigid sectarianism of exclusive revelation, and set their separate surges of national life into one mighty world-current of universal humanity."
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Swami Dayanand  
(1824-1883)

Dr. Griswold, an English missionary, wrote thus in 1892: “It is evident from all this that Pandit Dayanand Saraswati was a man of large views. He was a dreamer of splendid dreams. He had a vision of India purged of her superstitions, filled with the fruits of science, worshipping one God, fitted for self-rule, having a place in the sisterhood of nations and restored to her ancient glory.”

The original name of Swami Dayanand was Mool Shankar. He was born in 1824 at Tankara in the petty state of Morvi in Kathiawar in a Samavedi Brahman family. Mool Shankar was of a rebellious temperament. Doubts arose in his mind on a Shivaratri night and those brought him into conflict with his father on the question of idol worship. He was hardly fourteen at that time. In order to avoid marriage and satisfy his inner doubts, he left his home and in spite of the best efforts of his father, he could not be traced out. For 15 years, he lived the life of a wandering scholar in search of knowledge. His search took him to the Himalayas, the Vindhyaas and the Aravalis and across the valley and along the banks of the Ganges, Jamuna and the Narmada rivers. He acquired a mastery of the Sanskrit language, its grammar, philosophy and religious literature. For about three years he studied at Mathura under Swami Virjanand, who, though blind, was a profound scholar of ancient learning and a great teacher and a rational thinker who hated
idol worship, superstitions and polytheistic ideas. He taught Swami Dayanand the philosophical interpretation of the Vedas and entrusted him with the mission to spread his teachings among the people.

The twenty years from 1863 to 1883 were a period of very hard work for Swami Dayanand. He travelled all over India. He entered into religious polemics with great scholars in various parts of the country. He carried with him wherever he went the mission of his Guru Swami Virjanand and his own mission which was to spread Vedic learning. In 1875, he established the Arya Samaj in Bombay. The Arya Samaj was established at Lahore on 24 June 1877 in the Kothi of a Muslim, Dr. Rahim Khan. Likewise, he set up Arya Samajas wherever he went.

Colonel Olcott and his companion Madame Blavatsky entered into correspondence with Swami Dayanand and asked him to accept the Theosophical Society’s diploma of a ‘Corresponding Fellow.’ Later on, they requested him to accept the Theosophical Society as a branch of the Arya Samaj. They arrived in Bombay in February 1879 and reached Saharanpur on 29 April 1879 where the Arya Samajists accorded them a good reception. Dayanand also came to Saharanpur on 1 May 1879 to meet them. There were long discussions but nothing came out of that as Olcott and Blavatsky refused to commit themselves on the question of belief in God and the Vedas. On 27 February 1883, Dayanand established the Paropkarini Sabha to guide the activities of the Arya Samajists all over the country. The same year he died of poison which was administered to him by his opponents.

Swami Dayanand wrote the ‘Satyarth Prakash’ in 1875. This book is considered to be the Bible of the Arya Samaj. It throws abundant light on the thought of Dayanand. It also contains a criticism of Islam, Christianity, Jainism and Buddhism. An attempt was made by Swami Dayanand to show that other religions had their shortcomings and the Vedic religion alone was the best. By doing so, he put the other religions on defence. Instead of trying to justify the Hindu faith from the uncharitable criticism of Christian and Muslim missionaries, he obliged them to defend their own positions.
Swami Dayanand found the Hindu Society broken up into castes and sub-castes, each of which looked down upon the others in the spirit of hatred and rivalry. Castes were determined on the basis of birth and no change was allowed from one caste to another. Any violation of the rules of castes was punished by ostracism. The life of the Shudras was intolerable. The caste system had "shut the door of competition and had given rise to class jealousies and animosities." Dayanand advocated the division of society into four classes based on character and not on birth. According to him, a Brahman could be degraded to a lower caste if the life led by him so demanded. Likewise, a Shudra could be upgraded if he led a pure life. Every individual was to be placed in a class according to his qualifications, accomplishments and character. The view of Dayanand was that the people will make progress by adopting his system as in that case the higher classes will be "in constant fear of their sons being degraded into lower classes whilst the lower classes will be prompted to exert themselves to enlist into the superseding classes." Dayanand maintained that castes were not created by God and salvation did not depend upon observing the caste system. Castes were merely social orders which were established for the better discharge of different functions. However, Dayanand, on hygienic grounds, never advocated eating out of the same dish.

The view of Dayanand was that there was no support in the Vedas in favour of the institution of untouchability. The Varna of a person was to be determined by his character, association and good and bad Samskars. Truth, self-sacrifice, knowledge of God and the Vedas and cleanliness could help a Shudra to enter into a higher Varna. Likewise, untruth, ignorance of the Vedas and uncleanness could degrade a person belonging to a higher Varna to a lower Varna. Swami Dayanand was very much upset on account of the wretched condition of the depressed classes. That was giving the Christian missionaries an opportunity to convert the untouchables to their own faith. Swami Dayanand condemned the ill treatment meted out to the lower castes and publicly declared that all men were equal and none was born to rule and none to be ruled. In this matter, Dayanand anticipated Gandhiji.

Dayanand put all the emphasis on Brahmacharya and advo-
cated the abolition of child marriage. According to him, a girl was to be married between 16 and 24 and a man between 25 and 48. Dayanand was in favour of giving equal rights to women as the happiness of a family depended upon the happiness of both men and women. His view was that women should be honoured by their parents and husbands. He was in favour of re-marriage of widows in certain circumstances.

Swami Dayanand took pride in the glorious past of India. He called Aryavarta the golden land. To quote him, "This country is such as no other country in the world can be compared with it. It is called the golden land as it produces gold and precious stones ... Though the story of the philosopher's stone is a myth, yet it is true that this country 'Aryavarta' itself is verily a philosopher's stone whose very touch converts all base metals into gold." The thinking of Dayanand was affected by the poverty of India. He believed that the foreign rule in India was the main cause of the poverty of India. For the first time in the history of India, Dayanand used the term Swarajya in 1875. He believed that after the attainment of Swarajya, India would become rich once again. Dayanand told the people that formerly they used to go abroad and were never declared as impure on that account. He put emphasis on the necessity of going abroad so that the Indians might become a fearless and bold nation. That could also increase India's trade with foreign countries and help them to become prosperous. The view of Dayanand was that a country always remains poor and miserable if "the people of the country trade only among themselves, whilst the foreigners control their trade and rule over them." In many of his lectures, he advocated foreign travel for his countrymen.

Dayanand advocated the cause of Swadeshi. He was perhaps the first prominent leader of India to do so. He found that the people of India were taking pride in using articles of foreign manufacture. In order to improve the economic condition of the people, he advocated the cause of Swadeshi goods. Dayanand advocated the Indian system of medicines also. He deplored the export of Indian currency from India to other countries on account of the import of foreign goods. According to Dayanand, the term Swadeshi had very wide meanings. It means everything indigenous, including the Government. 
Under the garb of Swadeshi, Dayanand raised the cry against British Raj because he was deeply affected by the atrocities perpetrated by the Britishers after the Mutiny.

According to Mrs. Annie Besant, Dayanand was the first to raise the slogan of "India for Indians." Raja Ram Mohan Roy also had the idea of Swarajya but that was in a limited sense. Dayanand tried to establish links with some of the rulers of the Indian states and personally travelled in the states of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Udaipur and Shahrpura and found to his amazement that the rulers were leading their lives not at all fitting his ideals. Dayanand tried to unite the various princes who indulged in petty jealousies and rivalries. He wanted that all the Rajas and Maharajas should listen to his lectures and act according to his ideas and for that purpose he went to Delhi in January 1877 when the Darbar was to be held. Maharaja Holkar promised to arrange a meeting of the princes to hear him but the same could not be accomplished due to some inexplicable reasons.

According to Dayanand, the defects of Indian character were responsible for the degeneration of the Motherland. He frankly admitted that the British rulers of India had superior efficiency, enterprise, public spirit and obedience to authority. He urged upon the people the necessity of uplifting their character. Disunity in the country must end. Differences of castes and classes must be eliminated. The people must imbibe all those qualities which have made other nations great. A nation can be built only on the character of the people who must be honest, truthful, just and enlightened. The soldier must be brave, chivalrous and loyal to his master. He must not run away from the battle-field. "All his good work is nullified by this act of cowardice. He alone wins laurels who fights faithfully."

According to Dayanand, the administration of justice should be in conformity with the Dharam-shastras. The judges must follow the eternal law of justice and decide the cases impartially. Dayanand believed that "Justice being destroyed shall destroy the destroyer. Justice being protected shall protect the protector." Justice alone was the true friend who accompanied a person even after death. Unadulterated justice will lead to Moksha. Dayanand was not in favour of the
manner in which justice was being administered in the courts of the country and he stood for the establishment of Panchayats.

Dayanand was a strict disciplinarian. He believed that punishment must be inflicted on the wrong-doer because otherwise there will be chaos in the country. The aim of punishment is to keep people steadfast in the path of virtue. The infliction of punishment deters others from committing similar crimes. However, Dayanand gave the warning that no unjust punishment should be inflicted on anyone. Unjust punishment "will cause great misery and intense suffering even after death." The punishment awarded to a person must depend upon the office held by him. The higher the office, the greater must be the punishment. "As a lion requires a severer punishment than a goat to be well-broken, similarly, the rulers (from the highest official the king to the meanest servant of the state) required a heavier punishment than ordinary people."

Dayanand was a Satyagrahi like Gandhiji, though in a different way. When Dayanand was ordered by His Highness the Raja of Kishangarh to leave his state, he refused to comply with it. He declared that he would not give up truth out of fear of the threat of the people or out of danger of going to jail. Dayanand was a realist and hence he thought that no society or polity could be built on absolute adherence to the creed of Ahimsa. Temperamentally, he was against injustice. He sanctioned every kind of protest for the redress of the grievances of the people. Those might take the form of verbal appeals or armed revolt. Dayanand was both a cooperator and a non-cooperator.

Dayanand has been described as a rationalist with an appeal to rise above the allurements of the senses. "His is the rationalism that leads man from Light to Light, from Truth to Truth, from the Comprehensible to the Apprehensible, from the Mental to the institutional, progressively towards inviolable freedom and perfection of life's manifestation." He has also been described as a utilitarian whose centre of utilitarianism was not fixed in the materialistic conception of life. "His utilitarianism represents the Vedic technique of life in which its social and secular parts meet in blending with the ethical and the spiritual, which make for richer experiences and
higher and greater realisation of life."

Dayanand claimed that though he was born in Aryavarta, he stood for the liberation of the whole of mankind. He was a great champion of the concept of world brotherhood. "Just as God is one, Truth is one, so God's religion is one and mankind is one." He was against calling the people of other countries as aliens. A sin or a vice in a Hindu was as much hateful to him as in an alien. However, the internationalism of Dayanand did not visualise any idea of a political federation of the nations of the world. It was the romantic internationalism of a preacher and prophet who dreamt of the dawn of a day when the entire world would act according to the ethical teachings of the Vedas.

At the beginning of his public career, Dayanand spoke in Sanskrit. The more he reached the masses, the more he realised the importance of the national language. As Hindi was spoken by a majority of the Indians, he chose it to be the national language. Although he was a Gujarati, he started writing and lecturing in Hindi. He realised much earlier than others that Hindi would ultimately become the national language of India. He was so much convinced of the future of Hindi that he did not think it proper to get his books translated in all the languages of India for the benefit of the inhabitants. His view was that the whole of India should have one national language which was Arya Bhasha and all people should learn it and read his books written in that language.

Dayanand was opposed to a despotic form of government. However, he was never in favour of weak and timid kings. He loved those "who are powerful conquerors of foes, who are well-read, who are endowed with noble virtues, character and disposition, who command reverence of all." According to Dayanand, "Let both the rulers and the ruled be independent of each other in the performance of their respective duties, but let them subordinate themselves to each other in all those matters that require mutual harmony and co-operation. Let not the rulers go against the voice of the people, nor let the people and ministers do anything against the wish of the sovereign." According to him, the relations between the rulers and the ruled must be the same as those
between a father and son. However, in no case, the king should be treated like God. Dayanand gave a lecture at Muradabad on the relations between the Raja and the Praja. After hearing it, Mr. Spidding, the Joint Magistrate, remarked that “Sepoy Mutiny would not have taken place had both the rulers and the ruled behaved in the manner expressed by Swamiji.” Dayanand was not in favour of calling the rulers of the country as Annadata (giver of food) because, according to him, God alone was the Annadata of all.

The attachment of Dayanand to democracy is proved in two ways. The organisation of the Arya Samaj was based on election. From the bottom to the top, the office bearers were elected ones. The introduction of the principle of election was a revolutionary step.

Dayanand was a great reformer but he differed from other reformers in certain respects. Raja Ram Mohan Roy considered the British rule in India to be a blessing for the people and he was not in favour of turning them out from the country. The same was true of Keshab Chandra Sen. Dayanand was totally against foreign rule in the country, even if it was impartial and rendered perfect happiness to the people. To quote him, “Say what you will, the indigenous native rule is by far the best.” There is a similarity between the political views of Dayanand and Ranade. Dayanand laid stress on social reform as a pre-requisite to political reform. Ranade also held that politics and social reform could not be separated. Tilak was not a social reformer but Dayanand was a revolutionary in that field. While the main task of Tilak was political, that of Dayanand was religious and social reform of the Hindu society. Dayanand did not take up any political cause directly. He wanted to purge the country of all sorts of social, religious and economic evils which were the condition-precedent for the attainment of Swarajya. Both Dayanand and Tilak were successful in carrying the nationalist movement to the masses.

In a way, Dayanand can be called a precursor of Gandhiji. There is a similarity between the two in many things. Gandhiji carried forward the movements started by Dayanand. In the matter of advocating Hindi as the national language, Dayanand went even farther than Gandhiji. Whereas Gandhiji
continued to use Gujarati both in speech and writing with his Gujarati relatives and friends, Dayanand gave up the use of Gujarati altogether and carried on all his activities through Hindi. Both of them were lovers of Ahimsa. Gandhiji discarded violence in all fields, including political. Dayanand recognised the principle of Ahimsa as taught by the Indian seers who did not condemn violence outright in all circumstances. Both Gandhiji and Dayanand stood for social reform as a pre-requisite for political reform. Both of them were advocates of purity of character. Whereas Gandhiji devoted himself chiefly to the liberation of his country from the foreign yoke, Dayanand put all his energy to liberate the people from all sorts of superstition and ignorance. By doing so, Dayanand tried to make them physically, intellectually and spiritually strong and thereby enabled them to achieve political independence. In a way, Dayanand prepared the ground for Gandhiji. If Gandhiji is called the father of the nation, Dayanand can be called “the grandfather of the nation.”

It is true that Dayanand was not a political philosopher in the strict sense of the term, but he is entitled to be considered among the political thinkers in India. He helped the cause of democracy in India, both in theory and practice. He raised the voice of Swadeshi and Swarajya. He helped the growth of Indian nationalism by the impetus he gave to the movement for a national language. He brought the sect-torn Hindus closer to one another to some extent and thereby contributed to the cause of uniting the Hindus. He declared that salvation could be achieved through one’s personal efforts and no incarnation of God could give it. His contention was that laziness and defeatism were not synonymous with renunciation. He tried to inculcate among his followers the virtues of fearlessness, courage and self-reliance. His ideal was a life of toil, action and sacrifice and not that of a recluse. He wanted Indians to fight for the betterment and uplift of his countrymen. That was the greatest contribution of Dayanand to the people of India. In the freedom struggle, it was the character of the people which counted and Dayanand did his best to develop the same. Dayanand emphasised the necessity of boldness without pride, strength without desire to exploit and devotion to Indian tradition and culture. He tried to impress
upon the people of India that they had no right to be mere critics or imitators of Europe. He inculcated among his followers a true sense of nationalism. He preached aggressive and militant nationalism. His nationalism was not a narrow creed. He was the first reformer who came into contact with the masses.

Dayanand did not stand for a comprehensive approach on Indian nationalism as it is understood today. His entire religious and political thinking was based on the Hindu scriptures and his influence was generally confined to the Hindus. The Muslims had adopted an attitude of hostility towards him. However, the Hindu nationalism which received impetus from the teachings of Dayanand remained the dominant element in Indian nationalism. Even if Dayanand stood for Hindu solidarity, he was strengthening Indian nationalism because if the Hindus could be organised properly, they could fight the British rulers of India.

About the work of Dayanand, Sir Jadunath Sarkar says, “He is a true statesman who can legislate for the future, who can set a force at work which will go on influencing the lives and thoughts of unborn generations. When the history of India’s growth comes to be written, that high rank will be adjudged to the ‘naked faqir’ Dayanand Saraswati. He rescued the heart of Hinduism from atrophy; he linked it with the spirit of eternal progression ruling the outer world; he proved that whatever is best and truest in the legacy of the ancient sages of Aryavarta is a possession open to the entire human race and not confined to any twice-born caste or the sacred soil.” Romain Rolland says, “This man (Dayanand) with the nature of a lion is one of those whom Europe is too apt to forget when she judges India. He was that rare combination, a thinker of action with a genius for leadership. He was the hero of the Iliad or of the Gita with the athletic strength of a Hercules, who thundered against all forms of thought other than his own, the only true one. He was so successful that in five years Northern India was completely changed.” (Prophets of New India, p. 100)

After comparing Dayanand with other reformers like Ranade, Vivekanand etc., Sri Aurobindo says, “Very different was the manner of the working of Dayanand.........Here
was one who knew definitely and clearly the work he was sent to do, chose his materials, determined his conditions with a sovereign clairvoyance of the spirit and executed his conception with the puissant mastery of the born worker. As I regarded the figure of this formidable artisan in God’s workshop images crowd on me which are all of battle and work and conquest and triumphant labour. Here, I say to myself, was the very soldier of Light, a warrior in God’s world, a sculptor of men and institutions, a bold and rugged victor of difficulties which matter presents to spirit. And the whole sums itself up to me in a powerful impression of spiritual practicality.”

T.L. Vaswani writes: “Not many in India today seem to be aware of Rishi Dayanand’s achievements. He found the people forgetful of their ancient heritage. He found scepticism among the educated and superstition among the masses. He found nationwide ignorance of the Aryan ideal. And he moved from place to place with the healing message of the seers and the sages of India. His lectures arrested attention. They were a challenge at once to Hindu ecclesiasticism and Western externalism. He held high the torch of the ancient wisdom at a time when India’s millions wandered in the night. Rishi Dayanand will challenge attention in the coming days. His life and message have a world value.” Again, “Rishi Dayanand was tremendously real. Therefore, I feel drawn to him. Dayanand was an inspirer of his race, a nation builder, a preacher of the Ancient Ideal. Therefore, I offer him the homage of my heart. Dayanand was a Tapasvin (ascetic), a Balbrahmachari. Therefore, I bow to him in affectionate reverence.”

Rabindranath Tagore described Dayanand as the great path-maker in modern India who through bewildering tangles of creeds and practices cleared a straight path that was meant to lead the Hindus to a simple and rational life of devotion to God and service for man. With a clear-sighted vision of truth and courage of determination, he preached and worked for our self-respect and vigorous awakenment of mind that could strive for a harmonious adjustment with the progressive spirit of the modern age and at the same time keep in perfect touch with the glorious past of India when it revealed its personality in freedom of thought and action, in an unclouded
radiance of spiritual realization.

Mahatma Hans Raj says that Swami Dayanand was a great Rishi. He had supreme faith in God. He was a great world teacher, but his high position did not prevent him from working as a lover of his country. He himself was an Indian and as such he could not but feel for his country which had fallen from a high pedestal of glory to the lowest depths of degradation.

Dr. K. M. Munshi says that Swami Dayanand was the first great architect of Modern India. His learning was stupendous and his character great. Above all, his vision was clearer and broader than is generally given to nation-makers. In the Neo-Hinduism of today, in Indian nationalism and in the methods of Mahatma Gandhi, we can trace the influence of Swami Dayanand's unerring vision and statesmanship.

C. Rajagopalachari says that Dayanand's soul rebelled against the idea of Hinduism being relegated to a status of unsuitability to modern times. His teachings have permeated widely and a stage is being reached when they can no longer form a denomination apart, but must live in the soul of Hinduism itself. The view of C. V. Vaidya is that Dayanand's tall and impressive figure, his deep learning, his ready wit, his Brahmacharya and unblemished asceticism were a great asset to him in disputatation as well as in preaching.

Ramanand Chatterji says that Dayanand wanted to realise the idea of unifying India nationally, socially and religiously. To make Indians one nation, he thought it necessary to free them from foreign rule. In order to make the people of India socially one, he tried to eliminate the differences of caste and class. To make India religiously one, he tried to substitute Vedic religion for all other religions prevalent in India. These three aims of Dayanand have borne fruit.

Dayanand was personally known to Justice Ranade and the latter wrote thus about him on the occasion of his death, "Religious fervour, ... a daring and adventurous spirit born of a confidence that a higher power than man's protected him and his work, the magnetism of superior genius ... a rare insight into the needs of the times and a steadfastness of purpose which no adverse turn of fortune could conquer, a readiness and resourcefulness rarely met with, ... true patriotism which
was far in advance of the times, and a sense of justice tempered with mercy—these were the sources of strength which enabled him to organise a great movement like the Arya Samaj."

Taraknath Das says that Dayanand’s contribution to the cause of the regeneration of Hindu society is so great that he may be regarded as one of the greatest Hindus of the nineteenth century. Through his teachings, he succeeded in infusing a new spirit into Hindu society. The Arya Samaj has done great service for the rejuvenation of Hindu society.

Principal Diwan Chand of Kanpur says that Dayanand was unquestionably the initiator of the movement for the rejuvenation of India. He was about 50 years ahead of his times. In the seventies and early eighties of the last century, he worked for Swadeshi, removal of untouchability, a common language, emancipation of women and Swaraj. He had great love for truth. All his life, he was a seeker after truth. He was a fearless propagandist. He never minced matters. He was merciless in his denunciation of vices and superstitions in all their forms. By shifting emphasis from birth to worth as determined by qualifications, functions and disposition, he placed the body politic on a truly democratic basis. He was a man of boundless energy and the source of that energy was his absolute faith in God. He felt that whatever he was doing was God’s work and he was a mere instrument for doing it. He was a great soul, a scholar, a saint and a hero—all combined in one person. He was a great son of India, one of the greatest that India had produced and nobly and well did he serve the Motherland.

Professor N.K. Sidhanta says that no student of Dayanand’s life can fail to be struck by his wonderful combination of original vision and painfully acquired learning. The story of his three years of life at Mathura from 1860 to 1863 is a romantic one. His position in the history of religions is parallel to that of Burke in politics. As a religious reformer, he is parallel to Luther because whereas Luther’s cry was “Back to the Bible,” Dayanand’s cry was “Back to the Vedas.”

K.P. Jayaswal says that Dayanand was the last Hindu social epoch-maker in the true line of the Buddha and Sankara. The present reformed and rejuvenated Hinduism is largely a gift of Dayanand. He had the humanity of the Buddha and he combined with it the preservative complex of Sankara. The Buddha
denounced the whole social structure as based on false notions of birth and caste inequality and preached a revolution. Dayanand emphasised the traditional conservative regard for the Vedas and Vedic culture but did not have the limitation of Sankara and rose above it and pronounced that the theory of caste was false, un-Vedic and un-Hindu. He was not only the greatest Indian of the nineteenth century, but he has also a high place among the modern liberators of mankind.

Dr. Gokal Chand Narang says that Dayanand was one of the greatest men of India and the greatest of his type since the time of Sankaracharya. He was physically, intellectually and morally a giant and a man who represented the best type of Vedic Aryans. As a religious teacher, he simplified the Hindu religion and Hindu scriptures. As a deep scholar of the Vedas, he realised that Hinduism as practised in modern times was anything but the religion taught by the Vedas and other books based on the Vedas. The Vedas had been buried under a heap of books which in the popular mind had taken the place of the scriptures. He removed this heap and laid bare the real scriptures of the Hindus. The second achievement of Dayanand was that he tried to consolidate the Hindus by giving them a common belief in one God, one scripture and a common mode of worship. His third achievement was the rejuvenation of the Hindu might. The Hindus had fallen into an abyss of pessimism, despondency and self-depreciation. Dayanand rescued them from this and inspired them with a sense of pride for their past glory and a hope and optimism for the future.

Durga Das says that Dayanand was one of those great men to whom India owes a deep debt of gratitude. By his deep learning, his lofty character and his steadfast adherence to what he believed to be true, he succeeded in changing the entire outlook of the Hindu society of his times. As a religious reformer, he waged a relentless war against idolatry, against priesthood and against every kind of sham and superstition believed in or practised by his countrymen. As a social reformer, he was a staunch advocate of Brahmacharya and of purity and restraint in married life. He spoke and wrote against child marriage. He drew the attention of the Hindus to the lot of child widows and encouraged their re-marriage. He encouraged the opening of orphanages and Ashramas for helpless children. By his
towering personality and incessant preaching, he created a deep stir among the Hindus and roused them out of their indifference, apathy and inertia. Dayanand was a true patriot and he succeeded in creating a love of the country among all those who came into contact with him. He did not directly concern himself with what is popularly known as politics. He believed that all the political troubles were due to want of character among his countrymen and if they became physically strong, religiously pure and socially simple, their political emancipation will follow. In his opinion, strong, honest, and truthful men with character, could not remain political slaves for long. With this conviction in his mind, he applied himself heart and soul to his religious and social work. It is true that the Arya Samaj was not a political organisation and did not take part in current politics, but every follower of Dayanand came to be known as a deep lover of his country. Dayanand was not only a unique religious revivalist and a great social reformer but was also the foremost nation-builder of his time.

C.F. Andrews says, “For Dayananda’s personality and character there may well be almost unqualified admiration. He was a puritan to the backbone, and lived up to his creed. He was a fighter, strong, virile, independent, if somewhat imperious in behaviour...... His courage in facing his own countrymen through years of contumely and persecution was nothing less than heroic. He was a passionate lover of truth.”

Madame Blavatsky says, “It is perfectly certain that India never saw a more learned Sanskrit scholar, a deeper metaphysician, a more wonderful orator, and a more fearless denunciator of any evil, than Dayanand, since the time of Sankaracharya.”

Colonel H.S. Olcott, President of the Theosophical Society, wrote about Dayanand on his death, “A master spirit has passed away from India. Pandit Dayanand Saraswati...is gone; the irressipressible, energetic Reformer, whose mighty voice and passionate eloquence for the last few years raised thousands of people in India from lethargic indifference and stupor into active patriotism, is no more.

“Do mortuis nil nisi bonum. All our differences have been burnt with the body...... We remember only the grand virtues and noble qualities of our former colleague and teacher, and late
antagonist. We bear in mind but his life-long devotion to the cause of Aryan regeneration; his ardent love for the grand philosophy of his forefathers; his relentless, untiring zeal in the work of the projected social and religious reforms; and it is with unfeigned sorrow that we now hasten to join the ranks of his many mourners. In him, India has lost one of her noblest sons. A patriot in the true sense of the word, Swami Dayanand laboured from his earliest years for the recovery of the lost treasure of Indian intellect. His zeal for the Reformation of his motherland was exceeded only by his undoubted learning. There can be but one opinion as to his knowledge of Sanskrit, and the impetus to the study of both received at his hands. There are few towns and but one province we believe—namely, Madras—that Pandit Dayanand did not visit in furtherance of his missionary work, and fewer still where he has not left the impress of his remarkable mind behind him. He threw, as it were, a bomb-shell in the midst of the stagnant masses of degenerated Hinduism, and fired with love for the teachings of the Rishis and Vedic learning the hearts of all who were drawn within the influence of his eloquent oratory. Certainly, there was no better or grander orator in Hindi and Sanskrit than Dayananda throughout the length and breadth of this land."
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Allan Octavian Hume  
(1829-1912)

Although a foreigner and a member of the otherwise much-maligned Indian Civil Service, Hume made an important contribution to the cause of India’s independence and he has rightly been called the Father of the Indian National Congress. He was revered by every Congressman. Like a father, he would sometimes scold even an elderly Congressman like Wacha, who complained about it to Dadabhai Naoroji. The reply of Naoroji was: “Trust him as one with whose scolding we must put up as we would do of an elderly brother or father. We cannot repay him adequately for what he has done and is doing for us.”

Hume was born on 6 June 1829. He inherited his attitude of fighting for the rights of the downtrodden from his father, who was a prominent Scottish reformer and patriot. He came to India in 1849 when he was just twenty, and joined the Bengal Civil Service. He was posted as a Mohurrer, a Clerk at a Police Station. Two months later, he became Naib Daroga (a Sub-Inspector), then for a short period he held charge of a small Police Station as Thanadar. After getting sufficient experience, he was promoted to the post of an Assistant Magistrate and later a Joint Magistrate and Deputy Collector of Etawah District in U. P. His hard work, administrative capability, self-confidence and sympathetic attitude towards the Indian masses brought him praise from all quarters. He earned
public praise by bringing about certain social reforms, such as popularising education, police reform, checking liquor traffic and the creation of juvenile reformatories. On account of his hard work, honesty and integrity, he was appointed Secretary in the Home Department of the Government of India in 1870. This was a very important job which could offer him opportunities for further advancement. But Hume was not interested in it. He was more interested in the agricultural development of the country and for some years past had studied the subject thoroughly and had become familiar with it. Consequently, he got himself transferred to the Department of Revenue, Agriculture and Commerce.

The interest which Hume showed in the welfare of the Indians was not approved of by his colleagues and senior officials. The result was that he was removed from his Secretaryship of the Government of India and transferred to a rather insignificant post in the Revenue Board of Allahabad. According to a letter, dated 17 June 1879, by the Private Secretary to Lord Lytton, "The decision was based entirely on the consideration of what was most desirable in the interest of public service." However, the arbitrary transfer orders perturbed many a fair-minded Englishman and all the educated Indians. There was a lot of criticism in the press. The *Pioneer* characterised the whole proceeding as "the grossest jobbery ever perpetrated". The *Indian Daily News* described the transfer as "a great wrong". The view of the *Statesman* was that "undoubtedly Hume had been treated shamefully and cruelly". The *Englishman* of 17 June 1879 expressed its views even more pungently in these words: "The plea advanced in justification of this arbitrary act was that Mr. Hume habitually, in his minutes on measures coming up for discussion in his Department, expressed his views with great freedom without regard to what might be the wishes or intentions of his superiors. If he believed a particular policy to be wrong, he opposed it without hesitation, using plain language for the expression of his views. We cannot find that any other charge has been brought against him. He is notoriously a very hard worker and government will not easily find his equal in knowledge of the special subjects dealt with in his department. But he is what according to the present Imperial phraseology is
called ‘insubordinate’; this is the alleged ground of his transfer and this is the point which to us appears most seriously to call for consideration. By ‘insubordinate,’ the government appears to mean, not that an officer refuses to obey orders, not even that he neglects to carry out in the best possible way orders which he does not himself approve of, but that he refuses to join in the cry of ‘peace, peace,’ when government says it is ‘peace’ but when it is really war.” Three years after his transfer, Hume retired from the Indian Civil Service in 1882.

When after the Mutiny spirit of revenge was very prominent among the Englishmen, Hume asked them to follow a policy of enlightenment towards the Indians. The Government did not approve of his views and activities and warned him not to persuade people to send their children to schools or contribute towards their maintenance. Hume gave a dignified reply in which he defended his action.

Hume was opposed to Abkari taxes. To quote him, “While we debauch our subjects, we do not even pecuniarily derive any profit from their ruin. All this revenue is the wage of sin, in the words of the old adage, ‘ill-gotten wealth never thrives’. And for every rupee additional that the Abkari yields, two at least are lost to the public by crime and spent by the Government in suppressing it. I, at this moment see no hope of reform, yet I have no doubt whatsoever that if I be spared, I shall live to see effaced, in a more Christian-like system, one of the greatest blots on our Government of India.”

The view of Mr. Hume was that the civil courts in the rural districts were directly responsible for the bondage of the cultivators to the money-lenders. His view was that rural debt cases should be disposed of summarily and finally on the spot by selected Indians of known probity and intelligence who were to be sent as judges from village to village to settle, with the aid of village elders, every case of debt in which any one of those inhabitants was involved. Those judges were not to be fettered by any codes or forms of procedure and they were to hear both the parties on the village platform. To quote him, “It is needless to tell anyone who knows the country, that while when you get him into court, no witness seems to me able to tell the truth, on his own village platform surrounded by his neighbours, no villager in personal questions like these seems able
to tell an untruth. Everybody knows everybody else's affairs. Let the speaker deviate perceptibly from the facts and immediately out go tongues all round, and hisses and cries of Wah, Wah, remind him that he is not in court and that that kind of thing will not go down at home."

An idea of the nobility of Hume and the feelings of love, affection and sympathy which he had for the people of India can be judged from the following lines addressed by him to the people of this country:

"Sons of Ind, why sit ye idle,
   Wait ye for some Deva's aid?
Buckle to, be up and doing!
   Nations by themselves are made!
Yours the land, lives, all, at stake, tho!
   Not by you the cards are played;
Are ye dumb? Speak up and claim them!
   By themselves are nations made;
What avail your wealth, your learning,
   Empty titles, sordid trade?
True self-rule were worth them all!
   Nations by themselves are made!
Whispered murmurs darkly creeping,
   Hidden worms beneath the glade,
Not by such shall wrong be righted!
   Nations by themselves are made!
Sons of Ind, be up and doing,
   Let your course by none be stayed;
Lo! the Dawn is in the East;
   Themselves are nations made."

After his retirement from service, Hume devoted the rest of his life to the cause of India's freedom. On 1 March 1883, he addressed a Circular letter to the Graduates of the Calcutta University, who were considered to be the most forward-looking and literate group in India at that time. He asked them to take the initiative for the freedom of their country. His appeal had the desired effect. Enlightened and leading people
from all over the country responded to his appeal wholeheartedly. An organisation called the Indian National Union was created, whose fundamental objective was to seek justice for the Indian masses through constitutional means. Hume played an important part in organising the work of the Indian National Congress, both in India and in England. He had to work very hard for that purpose. In 1894, he left India. At the farewell meeting presided over by Pherozeshah Mehta at Bombay, Hume exhorted the Indians to continue their efforts even if they met with disappointment on the way. After his departure from India, Hume settled down in Upper Norwood, a few miles from London. From there he carried on his efforts for the cause of India. Hume passed away peacefully on 31 July 1912 at Norwood. He was 84. His funeral was simple in England, but many a heart wept in India. Tributes were paid to him by the leaders and the common folk alike. In the memorial meeting held at the Town Hall, Calcutta, on 28 August 1912, Dr. Rash Behari Ghosh observed that in founding the Congress, Hume showed the highest form of courage. At the Bankipore Session, the Congress placed on record that Hume was the father and founder of the Indian National Congress. The motion was moved by Bhupendra Nath Basu and seconded by Pt. Motilal Nehru. On that occasion, Mr. Basu related how on meeting Hume after a lapse of 20 years, he bowed his head before him on the ground and took the dust of his feet. Although Hume was very old, he recognised him, embraced him and shed tears of joy.

About Hume, Pt. Motilal Nehru observed: "He taught us how to fight bloodless battles of constitutional reform. He took us by the hand; he adopted us, if I may say, as his children, and he taught us the right way to take. Well, may we, our children, and our children’s children remember the name of Mr. Allan Hume through succeeding generations with gratitude and reverence."

In 1899, G. Parameshwaram Pillai had written about him: "A man of strong feeling and profound views, he is strong in his adjectives and even vehement in his denunciations. But beneath his vehemence you perceive the swell of his soul, his sleepless humanity."

About Hume, D. E. Wacha observed: "Indians instinc-
tively recognized a commanding personality. To those who had come into close contact and intimacy with him it was manifest that he was an Agamemnon and Nestor rolled into one—such were his force of character, his sagacity and his determined will. His was a unique advocacy inspired by the noblest and most righteous thoughts. He alone knew how to charm, how to strengthen and how to teach. He is gone, but not without teaching us that though we have no wings to soar, we have feet to scale and climb, more and more by slow degrees the cloudy summits of our times."

The view of Surendra Nath Banerjea was: "Hume worked in sickness and in health for the political advancement of the people of India with a self-sacrificing zeal and a single-mindedness of purpose which will enshrine his memory in the affections of the people, and will entitle him to the deepest gratitude of the most distant generations of the Indians. His name will stand forth in the golden records of Indian history as one of the great builders of Indian national life and one of the truest promoters of Indian national union......In the muster roll of distinguished Englishmen who had laid broad the foundations of the British rule in India and had enthroned themselves in the hearts of the people, Allan Hume would occupy a prominent position. He stood as a successor and lineal descendant of the Metcalfes and Bentincks, and the great band of missionary philanthropists who had sown the seeds of their educational progress, seeds which today under the beautiful laws of evolution were bearing such splendid fruits."

Madan Mohan Malaviya paid his tribute in these words: "Hume inspired, elevated and educated those who came under his influence by the nobleness of his nature, his world-wide sympathies, his profound earnestness, his selfless, ceaseless devotion to the cause which he believed to be good and which he espoused, and by his unshakable faith that right and justice would eventually triumph. He was truly a great soul—one of the noblest Englishmen ever born. He was one of those benefactors of mankind who came to initiate movements of great potentiality for the good of their fellowmen. Hume combined in him the large-hearted love of freedom, of justice and of equality of treatment between man and man. He hated oppression and wrongdoing, and sincerely and earnestly desired
the good of all his fellowmen."

R. N. Mudholkar said of Hume in 1912 that he worked for the Congress day and night, winter and summer, through good repute and ill, to tend, to nourish the child of his affection. In the most critical and difficult period of its existence, he laboured for the Congress as no other man had done. Hume brought to bear upon his self-imposed task intense assiduity and application. He had profound love and affection for India. He applied his great faculties, his clear and penetrating vision and his literary talents with the whole-heartedness of a devotee. For the sake of India and Indians, Hume incurred the anger and hatred of men of his race, suffered obloquy and contumely and ungrudgingly bore even persecution. Abandoning all thoughts of enjoying his well-earned repose after years of hard, conscientious official work and giving up his favourite scientific pursuits which had secured him a recognition from eminent savants, he devoted his disciplined mind and his energies unstintedly to the rearing of his child, even when he was visited with one of the greatest domestic calamities which can befall a man and his heart was bleeding with a great sorrow. Men like Hume belong to all climes and to all countries. His was a pure, loving, saintly life, devoid of selfishness and pettiness. The people of India owe him gratitude, affection, love and reverence.
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Sir William Wedderburn
(1838-1918)

Though an Englishman, a member of the Indian Civil Service, Sir William Wedderburn did a lot for the cause of India's freedom and it was in recognition of his services that he was elected twice the President of the Indian National Congress. In 1889, he presided over the Bombay Session and in 1910, the Allahabad Session. We are told that in 1910 he came all the way to India "in order to remove official wedge so astutely driven between Hindus and Muslims and also if possible to heal the breach made at Surat between Moderates and Extremists." Surendra Nath Banerjea rightly says that Sir William was "a truly Indian patriot in the garb of an English official." The view of Gokhale was that "The picture of this great and venerable Rishi of modern times is a picture that is too ennobling, too beautiful, too inspiring for words; it is a picture to dwell upon lovingly and reverentially and it is a picture to contemplate in silence." Sir William took pride in calling himself "A hereditary servant of India."

He retired from the Indian Civil Service in 1887 and helped Hume in his work regarding the Indian National Congress. He identified himself with the Indian struggle for freedom from British rule. Most of his work for India was done in England and not in India. It was believed in those days that it was necessary for the success of the nationalist movement to educate the public opinion in England in favour of India and
thereby get more and more concessions from British Parliament. With that object in mind, the Indian National Congress established its regular branch in London known as the British Congress Committee. Sir William Wedderburn was appointed its first Chairman and he retained that office till his death in 1918. The Committee was required to keep the Congress in India informed of Indian affairs in England and advise about the policies that required to be formulated and the measures that ought to be taken. It was also to carry on propaganda in England to advance India politically. The Congress was spending every year a sum varying from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 50,000 on the work of the British Congress Committee. Sir William Wedderburn received annually £1,000 as his pension, and he gave the whole of that amount to the British Congress Committee for Congress propaganda. Sir William was a Member of the British Parliament for seven years and in that capacity, he left no stone unturned to further the cause of India. Sir William started a journal from England, known as India. It was through this journal that the British public opinion was mobilised in favour of Indian demands. Whenever Indian leaders visited England to carry on their propaganda, Sir William was the moving spirit and he played a vital role in making their programmes a success. He introduced them to the British public and even participated actively in the deliberations. In 1890, he declared thus in a meeting in London: “I plead for my voiceless countrymen......for liberty and justice, and if these words have any importance, any weight, any significance among Christian people, I am sure, I shall not have pleaded in vain.” He availed of every opportunity to bring to the notice of the British Parliament the evils of British administration and advocated the Congress demands for reforms. It was as a result of his efforts that a Commission was appointed by the British Government “to enquire into the administration and management of the Military and Civil expenditure in India and the apportionment of the cost of administration between the British and the Indian Governments.” Sir William himself sat on the Commission as one of its members and in that capacity, he placed before the Commission the Indian view of Indian questions.

About Sir William Wedderburn, Gokhale said that among
all the Englishmen he knew, there was none who could be put on the side of Sir William. That was what he was as an official. After his retirement, he threw himself heart and soul into his work and India held his whole heart to the exclusion of every other subject. He laboured for India in England. He fought for India in England as no other man had done. Whatever he did, he did entirely for the sake of India. For the sake of India, he went into Parliament, for her sake he made friends, for her sake he entered into hostilities and for her sake he undertook the most menial service. Nothing was too small or too laborious. His faith in the people of India was a part of his great personality. He believed in them in spite of the criticism by his countrymen. He believed in them in spite of their faults. It was on account of this faith that he was able to work through sun-shine and storm and through good report and evil report in England for decades.

Pandit Sunderlal, the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the session of the Indian National Congress at Allahabad, declared in 1910 that Sir William Wedderburn was a hereditary friend of the Indian people. Loyal to the service to which he belonged and faithful to the Government which he served, Sir William was, while in office, a friend of the people of the educated classes as well as of the masses. He did not hesitate to attend and give the benefit of his advice to the first Congress (1885) in the very city in which he was still in service. After retirement, he lived what Haldane would have called a dedicated life. No man, living or dead, Englishman or Indian, had done more than Sir William Wedderburn for the political advancement and material amelioration of India.

Acharya P. C. Ray observed in March 1918 at the Calcutta Town Hall that Wedderburn sacrificed the evening of his life, long years of well-earned ease, the friendship of old comrades of his youth and manhood and his private income in furthering the political progress of the Indians. He had chosen the right path and he went straight ahead, unmoved by the feelings of our countrymen, undeterred by the sneers of the Tory press and the Anglo-Indian clubs and an unsympathetic Secretary of State like Hamilton. He had caught a beatific vision of the day of India's liberation and towards that promised land he marched through the valley of the shadow of death. To
quote P. C. Ray: “In the muster-roll of distinguished Englishmen who have loved India with an abounding love and have served her with passionate devotion, Sir William Wedderburn will be one of the most distinguished Englishmen. How many of us, children of the soil, can claim to have exhibited in the record of their life-work, the selfless devotion, the unflinching self-sacrifice and the supreme love for India and her peoples, which have always been the dominating features in the public career of Sir William Wedderburn?"

**SUGGESTED READINGS**


Sir Henry Cotton
(1845-1915)

Sir Henry Cotton rendered meritorious services to India not only as an administrator, but also on account of his support to the nationalist movement in India. He exposed the principle of 'divide and rule' adopted by the British Government while partitioning Bengal and inciting religious feuds in the country. He did a lot to better the conditions of the people working in the Tea gardens of Assam. He worked hard for the welfare of Assam, of which he was the Chief Commissioner for many years. He generally fought for the Indian cause. His name deserves to find a niche in the annals of modern India. His two books, “New India” (1885) and “Indian and Home Memories” (1911), are a valuable source material for the study of India’s social and political developments.

At the time of the Ilbert Bill controversy in 1883-84, Sir Henry Cotton sided with the Indians and consequently, he was called “A White Babu”. He did not find any justification for giving the European British subjects a privileged position in the matter of their trials. Regarding the agitation carried on by the Europeans about the Ilbert Bill, Sir Henry Cotton observed: “The ultimate effect of the insane agitation was to give rise to a movement of the widest reaching character and scope which few at that time were able to foresee... The great Indian movement of which we now hear so much and are assuredly destined to hear much more, is due to causes intended
to produce a very different effect. The germ of a national organisation on the basis of English education had long existed, but it only sprang to life in the eighties. The Anglo-Indian agitation against Lord Ripon's government, the protests which asserted that 'the only people who have any right to India are the British', the whole attitude of Englishmen in regard to Indian interests—these things have succeeded far more in advancing the cause than any action or legislation on the lines contemplated by that Viceroy could have accomplished." He was not in the good books of the government and Lord Curzon was happy to relieve him. When he left Assam for Bombay, no Provincial Governor was accorded the demonstrations of sympathy and regret that he received. He was given an ovation in Calcutta and his marble bust was kept in the Town Hall. A replica of this bust was also preserved at the Cotton College, Gauhati.

In 1904, Sir Henry Cotton was elected the President of the Indian National Congress. In 1906, he was elected a Member of the British Parliament, and he occupied his seat up to 1910. He was at the head of a group of Members known as the Indian Group. These members put supplementary questions and tried to embarrass Lord Morley, Secretary of State for India whenever Government measures in India became too restrictive or Government policy seemed to be wrong-headed. Sir Henry Cotton served the cause of India to the end of his life.

When Sir Henry Cotton came to preside over the Bombay Session of the Congress held in 1904, he was introduced by Surendra Nath Banerjea in these words: "I have known Sir Henry Cotton for the last 30 years. I have known him as a close personal friend. I have seen him as a servant of the British Government; I have also seen him in his non-official relations; I have seen the great actor on the public stage; I have seen him in the green-room, and I will say that the one dominating principle in his life has been to serve you, the people of India; to make British rule acceptable to the people by imparting into it an element of personal sympathy and, above all, to broad-base the power of the sovereign upon the hearts and convictions of the people, by the practical recognition in the Government of the country, of such principles as are
calculated to facilitate the transition which would sooner or later take place, from a hard, cold, unsympathetic and bureaucratic regime into a regime of kindliness, of trust, of confidence, of self-Government. These have been the high ideals of Sir Henry Cotton’s public life.” Shri Banerjea further declared that if the Government were to accept their advice, “we should have claimed Sir Henry Cotton as the ruler of Bengal. He is better qualified than any to rule Bengal as he represents not only the might and the majesty, but the dignity, justice and beneficence of the British rule. He is the stout and unrelenting champion of the oppressed and the voiceless millions.”

On the same occasion, Pherozeshah Metha observed: “Is it a wonder that people have thronged from all parts of the country to greet Sir Henry Cotton in the chair? Gentlemen, he lost the Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal because he pleaded the cause of the poor coolies of Assam, but gentlemen, he has gained a larger and a grander Governorship, a greater Governorship than the Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal; he has secured the Governorship of our hearts and minds.”

When Sir Henry Cotton died in 1915, Surendra Nath Banerjea paid the following tribute to Sir Henry Cotton, Hume and Wedderburn in these words: “No other Englishmen possessed the same measure of influence over the mind of educated India. For none showed such passionate love for India and such was their devotion to the cause of Indian progress; their lives were lives of self-dedication to the interests of the land of their love and of their adoption. When the history of these times comes to be written, to them will be assigned in varying degrees a high and honourable place among those who by their labours have contributed to build up the future of our nation’s history. In the pantheon of our great men, these Englishmen will live surrounded by the veneration of distant generations.”

**SUGGESTED READINGS**


Dadabhai Naoroji
(1825-1917)

Dadabhai Naoroji was affectionately known as the Grand Old Man of India. He was universally loved and adored by the people as the Father of Indian Nationalism and the Herald of Self-governing India. His name comes first in the list of those Indian patriarchs who "beginning his connection with the Congress from its very outset, continued to serve it till the evening of his life and took it through the whole gamut of evolution, from the humble position of being a people's organ seeking redress of administrative grievances to that of a National Assembly working for the definite object of attaining Swaraj." Gokhale once observed: "If ever there is the divine in man, it is in Dadabhai Naoroji." To quote C.Y. Chintaman: "For sixty one long years in England and in India, by day and by night, in circumstances favourable and adverse, in the face of discouragement which would have broken the heart of a smaller man, Dadabhai Naoroji served the Motherland with undeviating purpose, with complete selflessness and with vitality of faith which put to shame most young men. Withal, he was the greatest of the souls and the most charitable in judgment and never made a personal enemy. In respect equally of the highest personal character and the great public services, Dadabhai Naoroji was the loftiest ideal his countrymen could set before themselves respectfully to follow at a distance." It was in recognition of his services to the.
country that he was elected the President of the Congress thrice viz., in 1886, 1893 and 1906. The fact that he was the second President of the Congress in 1886 speaks volumes about his stature in the public life of India. He was made President in 1893 as a mark of appreciation of his election to the House of Commons. He was again elected the President of the Congress in 1906 when India was in the grip of the anti-Partition agitation and there were violent differences between the Moderates and Extremists and hence the necessity of having that person as Congress President who was acceptable to both.

Dadabhai Naoroji was born on 4 September 1825 and died on 30 June 1917. During his college days he was the pride of his professors and fellow students. Academic honours crowned his career giving an indication of his vigour of intellect and clearness of thought and judgment. Professor Orlebar called him “The Promise of India” and his prophecy came out to be true. “The Promise of India” was to be in many fields, the first Indian professor, the first to found several organisations for the social, intellectual and political uplift of the people of India and the first Indian member of British Parliament, the first Indian to sit on a Royal Commission and above all, the first and foremost Indian to claim self-government for his countrymen.

He was very much influenced by the heroic idealism of William Wilberforce, Thomas Clarkson and Zachary Macaulay.

In November 1851, he started the Rast Gostiar and through its columns, he preached the gospel of truth and humanity to the people. He called upon them to fight the forces of ignorance and conservatism which impeded their progress. In cooperation with some other members, he founded the Bombay Association in 1853. In 1854, he was appointed Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the Elphinstone College, Bombay. When Dadabhai decided to give up his job as Professor and take to business, Principal Harkness called it as a fall. This happened in 1855 when Dadabhai joined the services of the Camas who had decided to set up a business firm in London with a branch in Liverpool. They invited Dadabhai to join them as a partner. Their view was that this selfless man will be an asset to them. Dadabhai was with the Camas from 1855 to 1859. In 1867, he started in collaboration
with W.C. Bonnarjee, the London Indian Society with the object of bringing Englishmen and Indians together at social gatherings and exchanging views on subjects connected with India. This Society carried on useful propaganda for more than fifty years with Dadabhai as its President until his retirement from England in 1907.

In 1873, Dadabhai gave evidence before the Fawcett Select Committee on Indian Finance. In 1874, he was the Dewan of Baroda. In 1875, he became a member of the Bombay Corporation. He played an important part in the foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885. In that session he moved a resolution praying for simultaneous examinations in England and India for the Indian Civil Service. One could see his hand in the drafting of all the resolutions passed at that session, particularly the very first resolution which approved of the proposed appointment of a Committee of Inquiry into the working of the Indian administration. In 1885, he became an additional member of the Bombay Provincial Legislative Council. At the age of sixty two, he decided to go to England to fight an election to the House of Commons and although he failed in his first attempt, he was elected to the House of Commons from the constituency of Central Finsbury as a Liberal member. He was a member of the British Parliament from 1892 to 1895.

After his election to Parliament in 1892, Dadabhai came to India to preside over the Indian National Congress in December 1893. There was a lot of enthusiasm and rejoicing throughout India. The Mail Boat carrying Dadabhai was timed to reach Bombay harbour by mid-night on 2 December 1893. The whole city was full of activity by day-break. Numerous deputations representing various organisations from different parts of India in addition to thousands of citizens of Bombay gathered with garlands in their hands at the Apollo Bunder which was decked with flags and buntings to greet Dadabhai who was revered as Rishi (sage) of India. However, the steamer was behind schedule. The disappointed crowds went back home but returned by 4 p. m. The welcome received by Dadabhai on landing at the pier and all along the route until the procession arrived at his house was one that even a royalty would well envy. The Governor of Bombay was the first to
congratulate him. Two members of the Executive Council of the Governor and the Chief Justice called on him. Numerous deputations met him in the rooms of the Bombay Presidency Association. He told the audience that his trump card was always India and that never failed to arouse interest. He also stated that he had been received in the House of Commons cordially and was supported even by the members of the Conservative Party. Dadabhai was asked whether his presence in the House of Commons was not disliked by Lord Salisbury who had attacked him at the time of his election and his reply was in the negative. He refrained from uttering a single word against Lord Salisbury and merely recalled how he was cordially invited and received warmly everywhere. On 20 December 1893, Dadabhai left Bombay for Lahore. At every station, whatever the hour of the arrival of the train, mid-night or dawn, crowds came forward with the usual floral tribute for the darshan of the Grand Old Man. He was given a special reception at the Golden Temple at Amritsar. His return journey from Lahore to Bombay evoked the same enthusiasm thus showing that even in a country divided by castes and creeds, the unity of the people was not a dream, but a stark reality.

On 22 January 1894, Dadabhai embarked for England. On arrival in London, the Chairman and members of the Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association met him at the station and gave him a "good reception".

Dadabhai had been agitating for the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into the question of Indian expenditure and ultimately he was successful. On 24 May 1895, a Royal Commission was appointed with Lord Welby as Chairman to enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council and of the Government of India and the apportionment of charges between the Government of the United Kingdom and India for purposes in which both were interested. Dadabhai himself was invited to join the Commission as a member. In 1897, he himself appeared as a witness before the Commission. He submitted several notes to the Commission. He regretted that India had been saddled with the costs incurred in suppressing the Mutiny of 1857, the expenses of the Abyssinian expedition and the whole
of the expenditure of the Frontier Wars including that of Chitral.

Dadabhai was determined that the last days of his life should be dedicated to a more intensive campaign throughout the United Kingdom demanding for India an administrative system based on British principles and for that purpose, he carried on propaganda ceaselessly. He took advantage of the presence of Wacha, Gokhale, Surendra Nath Banerjea and Subramania Aiyar in England and carried on a country-wide propaganda in favour of India. It was pointed out in those lectures that the main cause of India’s misery was the unrighteous and un-British system of Government which bled the country and was maintained by political hypocrisy and subterfuges entirely in contravention of the wishes of the British people.

In the early stages of his career, Dadabhai had sincere faith in the blessings of the British rule for India. He sincerely believed that the British would treat India as a sacred charge entrusted to them. In one of his letters to Louis Mallet, Under-Secretary of State for India, Dadabhai wrote thus on 13 September 1880: “There is a deep conviction among educated and thoughtful Natives that if there is any one nation more than another on the face of the earth that would on no account knowingly do a wrong to, or enslave, degrade or impoverish people, and who, on feeling the conviction of any injury having been unintentionally done by them, would at once, and at all reasonable sacrifice, repair the injury without shrinking, that nation is the British nation. This conviction keeps the thinking Natives staunch in their loyalty to the British rule. They know that a real regeneration, civilisation, and advancement of India materially, morally, and politically depends upon a long continuance of the British rule. The peculiarly happy combination of high civilisation, intense love of liberty, and nobility of soul in the British, cannot but lead them to the desire of the glory of raising a vast nation, instead of trampling upon them. This noble desire has found expression from some of their best men. The English people have a task before them in India for which there is no parallel in the history of the world. There has not been a nation who, as conquerors have, like the English, considered the good of the conquered as a duty, or felt it as their great desire; and the Natives of India
may, with the evil of the present drain stopped, and a representative voice in their legislation, hopefully look forward to a future under the British rule which will eclipse their greatest and most glorious day."

In his Presidential address at the Indian National Congress held in 1886, he declared that the Indians were loyal to the backbone. Similar sentiments were expressed by him in his Presidential address in 1893. To quote him: "We desire that the British connection should endure for a long time to come for the sake of our material and political elevation among the civilised nations of the world. It is no pleasure or profit to us to complain unnecessarily or wantonly about this poverty. Were we enemies of British rule, our best course would be not to cry out, but remain silent and let the mischief take its course till it ends in disaster as it must. But we do not want that disastar and we therefore cry out, both for our own sake and for the sake of the rulers." It was for that reason that he advised the Indians to cultivate the judicious harmony of loyalty to Great Britain and patriotism towards their own country.

Hyndman ridiculed what he described as a policy of spineless agitation carried on by the people of India and asked Dadabhai to follow a policy of revolting against the British Government. This was not approved of by Dadabhai who still believed that British connection with India was a blessing for both countries. Dadabhai's attitude is clear from the following statement made by him on 1 November 1898 at the Annual Dinner of the London India Society: "We still believe that the British people have a conscience. We look to them for justice and I hope the time will come, although I may not have the good fortune to live to see it, when all things will be changed and Her Majesty's best wishes realised." While carrying on agitation against the Government, Dadabhai believed that he was fighting not merely in the interests of poor India but also in the interests of the British Empire. He was never tired of warning his British friends of the danger inherent in the policy pursued by their countrymen in India. In his book entitled "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India", Dadabhai had warned the British in these words: "After having a glorious history of heroic struggles for constitutional Government, England is now rearing up a body of English-
men in India, trained up and accustomed to despotism with all the feeling of impatience, pride and highhandedness of the despot becoming gradually ingrained in them, and with the additional training of the dissimulation of constitutionalism. Is it possible that such habits and training of despotism with which British officials return from India, should not, in the course of time, influence the English character and institutions? The English in India, instead of raising India, are hitherto themselves descending and degenerating to the lower level of Asiatic despotism. Is this a Nemesis that will in fullness of time show to them what fruit their conduct in India produced? It is extraordinary how nature may revenge itself for the present unnatural course of England in India, if England, not yet much tainted by this demoralisation, does not, in good time, check this new leaven that is gradually fermenting among her people."

On 11 February 1898, Dadabhai wrote to George Freeman, "Really the prospect for the British Empire does not look very bright, if the present infatuation for keeping other nationalities under heel is persisted in. It is the most effectual way in which they are digging their own grave. At present in India they are going from bad to worse and wiping off whatever merit there was in the British name by Russianizing the system of repressing freedom of speech and the liberty of the subject." On 25 August 1898, Dadabhai wrote again to George Freeman who had referred to the growing sea power of England, "England's only strength, if she is wise enough to see it, against all Europe is in the contentment, prosperity and desire of India herself to keep up England's connection. England can then command a resource of strength that can defy all Europe...India is England's greatest friend and its greatest weakness as she would have it."

The attitude of Dadabhai towards Great Britain changed towards the end of his life. That was partly due to the fact that the British Government did not respond to the wishes of the people of India. He was also influenced by the continuous drain of Indian wealth to Great Britain and its consequences on the people.

Dadabhai was the high priest of the drain theory and for years, he carried on propaganda in its favour. He first put
forward his views in 1867 and continued at it for years. In
the paper entitled "England's Debt to India" read in 1867
in London, Dadabhai put forward the idea that Britain was
extracting wealth from India as the price of her rule in India,
that "out of the revenues raised in India, nearly one-fourth
goes clean out of the country and is added to the resources of
England" and that India was consequently "being continu-
ously bled". By 1873, he prepared the first draft of his paper
on "Poverty of India". By 1876, the drain theory was fully
crystallised in his mind and was presented in its entirety in a
revised draft of "Poverty of India". He concluded
his essay with the following words: "Owing to this
one unnatural policy of the British rule of ignoring India's
interest and making it the drudge for the benefit of England,
the whole rule moves in a wrong, unnatural suicidal groove."
Dadabhai's best exposition of his thesis is to be found in his
"Poverty and Un-British Rule in India". In this book, Dadab-
hai included all his scattered papers and pamphlets, cor-
respondence with State officials, evidence before Committees and
Commissions, speeches and addresses on the subject together
with extracts from old State papers, statutes and proclamations.
The result was a somewhat chaotic compilation—a bulky book
in a red cover containing nearly 700 pages of statements and
speeches extending over a period of nearly thirty years.

The view of Dadabhai was that the economic drain was
the real, the principal, and even the sole cause of the loss, suf-
ferings and poverty of India, all other reasons and causes
being "only red herrings drawn across the path". Dadabhai
maintained that the drain facilitated penetration and exploita-
tion of India by foreign capital. By preventing the accumu-
lation of capital within India and by thus prostrating internal
capital, the drain permitted foreign capitalists to come to the
country without having to face any indigenous competition
and thereby to monopolise and to reap all the advantages of
India's material resources. The drain also acted as the chief
source of the accumulation of foreign capital invested in India
because a large part of the drain was brought back to India
as foreign capital. Dadabhai went to the extent of declaring
that the entire evil of the drain was due to the excessive employ-
ment of Englishmen in Indian administration. To quote him,
“The sole cause of this extreme poverty and wretchedness of the mass of the people is the inordinate employment of foreign agency, the Government of the country and the consequent material loss to and drain from the country.” Again, "It is a question of life and death to the country. Remove but this one evil and India will be blessed in every way."

Dadabhai made a comparison between the British rule in India and previous rulers of this country. It was pointed out that although the Mughals and the Marathas plundered the people of India, their wealth remained within the country and was spent inside it. Individual citizens might suffer or be oppressed and deprived of their wealth, but the country as a whole did not lose, the loss of one citizen being the gain of the other. As regards the British rule, Englishmen took wealth out of the country and spent it abroad. Under the old rulers, even if the burden of taxation was very heavy, the economic effects were not as disastrous for the people as the effects of taxation under the British because then all the money realised from taxes was spent in India. In the case of the British Government, the same was sent out of India. Even when invaders like Nadir Shah came, they looted the country and went back immediately and the loss of wealth was temporary. In the case of British rule, the drain was a part of the existing system of Government and was therefore ceaseless and continuous, increasing from year to year. The wounds kept perpetually open and the drain was like a running sore. The former rulers of India were like “butchers” chopping irregularly here and there but the mechanised efficiency of England was cutting the very heart of the country almost with sharp surgical knives. To quote Dadabhai, “The lot of India is a very sad one. Her condition is that of a master and slave; but it is worse; it is that of a plundered nation in the hands of constant plunderers with the plunder carried away clean out of the land. In the case of the plundering raids occasionally made on India before the English came, the invaders went away and there were long intervals and security during which the land could recuperate and become again rich and prosperous. But nothing of the kind is true now. The British invasion is continuous and the plunder goes right on with no intermission and actually increases and the impoverished Indian nation has no opportunity
whatever to recuperate."

The drain theory expounded by Dadabhai referred to the vast amount of wealth taken away from India in different forms such as pensions to British officers, payments to the war office for the maintenance of British troops in India, the expenses of the Government of India in England, earnings sent by British professional classes from India etc. To quote Dadabhai, "This drain consists of two elements—first, that arising from the remittances by European officials of their savings and for their expenditure in England for their various wants both there and in India; from pensions and salaries paid in England and from Government expenditure in England and India. And the second, that arising from similar remittances by non-European officials. As drain prevents India from making any capital, the British by bringing back the capital which they have drained from India itself, secure almost a monopoly of all trade and important industries and thereby further exploit and drain India, the source of the evil being the official drain."

Efforts were made by Dadabhai to calculate the exact amount of drain from the country. In 1867, he estimated the drain to be £8 million. In 1870, he calculated it at £12 million. In 1897, he put the figure at about Rs. 359 crores for the ten years from 1883 to 1892. In 1905, he declared that Rs. 51.5 crores worth of Indian produce was being drained out of India annually.

Dadabhai presented to the Secretary of State a memorandum on what he described as the moral poverty of India. He pointed out that the same drain which was responsible for the material exhaustion of India was also responsible for the moral loss to her of the experience and wisdom acquired by the members of the services in the execution of their duties. To quote him: "Europeans occupy almost all the higher places in every department of Government directly or indirectly under its control. While in India, they acquire India’s money, experience and wisdom; and when they go, they carry both away with them. Thus India is left without, and cannot have, those elders in wisdom and experience who, in every country, are the natural guides of the rising generation in their national and social conduct and of the destinies of their country; and a sad, sad loss this is! There may be very few social institu-
tions started by Europeans in which Natives, however fit and desirous to join, are deliberately and insultingly excluded. The Europeans are, and make themselves, strangers in every way." Again, "Beyond the positions of Deputy Collectors or Extra Commissioners or similar subordinate positions in the Engineering, Medical and all other services (with a very few somewhat better exceptions), all experience and knowledge of statesmanship, of administration or legislation, of high scientific and learned professions are drained away to England when the persons possessing them give up their service and retire to England."

The view of Dadabhai was that India needed industrialisation on a large scale. Industry was limited by capital. The drain of India's wealth to England entitled her to demand capital from England on easy terms for the development of trade and industry. The infant industries in India were smothered in the name of free trade. If the drain of wealth was brought within reasonable limits, India was prepared to accept the doctrine of free trade.

Dadabhai invited British capital for the development of the resources of India but he pleaded that the Indians should be helped in doing so and not handicapped as was actually the case. To quote him, "For some time, therefore, and till India, by a change in the present destructive policy of heavy European agency, has revived, and is able to help herself in a free field, it is necessary that all great undertakings which India herself is unable to carry out for developing the resources of the country, should be undertaken by the State, but carried out chiefly by native agency and by preparing Natives for the purpose. Then will India recover her blood from every direction. India sorely needs the aid of English capital; but it is English capital that she needs, not the English invasion to come also and eat up both capital and produce."

The drain theory changed the attitude of Dadabhai towards the British Government in course of time. He began to say that the beneficial, benevolent and philanthropic nature of British rule was in reality a myth. He attributed the lack of industrial growth and the poverty of the people of India to the economic drain. He criticised the benefits of security of life and property and law and order as guaranteed by the
British Government. In 1904, he described the British rule as barbaric and in 1906 he declared that India stood for Swaraj.

Dadabhai was always ready to give every one his due. As a matter of fact, he was sometimes blamed for over-doing it in case of the British people and officials. While condemning Lord Curzon for his anti-Indian statements, he told the people of India that they had to be grateful to him for what he had done during the early period of his administration, particularly in the matter of his firm stand against the brutal treatment of the Indians by Europeans.

Dadabhai had robust faith in the youth of India. While his colleagues in India were getting impatient with what appeared to be Extremist views and rebellious attitude of young Indians in some places, he wanted more and more of them to come forward and hold aloft the torch of freedom. His view was that time had come to organise the activities of the youth to the cause of the Motherland. Missionaries were wanted everywhere to serve India and to propagate the gospel of freedom. This idea was put forward by him in a concrete form in a letter to Gokhale: “Each province should furnish a band of young, well-educated men to become the missionaries of this work and to devote themselves under suitable organization to do it. Side by side with the work to be done in India there must be vigorous propaganda in England. We cannot accomplish our object by working only in India or only in England. They are two halves and by their combination only can the whole work be done...The tide is with us. The English people and press are beginning to understand the wrongs of India. Asia is waking up. The Isles of the East are becoming the Isles of the West and we may fairly expect that our emancipation is not far off. My one word is—never despair.”

Dadabhai ended his Presidential address to the Indian National Congress at Calcutta in 1906 with these words. “I do not know what good fortune may be in store for me during the short period that may be left to me, and if I can leave a word of affection and devotion for my country and countrymen, I say: ‘Be united, persevere and achieve self-government so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine
and plague, and the scores of millions that are starving on scanty subsistence may be saved, and India may once more occupy her proud position of yore among the greatest and civilised nations of the world."

Dadabhai was a tireless worker. As his tongue was alert and active, so was his brain. Hardly a week passed when he did not write to friends or the press his criticism of the administration or to ventilate a grievance or to correct a wrong impression propagated by the rulers about the national movement.

On his birthday on 4 September 1906, a representative of The Tribune called on him and asked him the secret of his good health. Dadabhai attributed the same "to life-long abstinence, to avoiding tobacco, to eschewing spices and condiments and to working hard. I breakfast at 8.30 a.m. and then I write at home until it is time to go to office. From 11 until 7.45, I labour there, after which I dine. I walk for about an hour and then continue my work until mid-night."

While unveiling the portrait of Dadabhai on 24 November 1900, Justice Ranade described him as the best product of British education. In learning and industry, especially in industry, Dadabhai had no equal. To quote him: "Englishmen should feel proud of Dadabhai as a unique figure in Indian history."

Birdwood paid the following tribute to Dadabhai: "Dadabhai Naoroji is a man in whom mind has the complete mastery of matter and who, it might be said, cannot be killed until he no longer desires to live...In all my visits to him he has shown no thought of himself; all his thoughts, with all their clearness, insight and interests and play of dialectics and fancy, have been on his life's work, which seems ever before him, as not knowing a past or a future, but only by abiding present. And so, sitting and talking with him, one feels of him that even in the article of death, it would not be the death of what was really and truly Dadabhai Naoroji, but translation—a quick shift to immortal conditions."

While conferring the degree of Doctor of Laws on Dadabhai in 1916, Dr. D. Mackichan, Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University, paid him the following tribute: "Men of all shades of political opinion were quick to discern the transpa-
rent honesty, the simplicity of purpose, the unselfish patriotism of the man who sought to interpret to Great Britain the needs and aspirations of his countrymen. British political life is peculiarly sensitive to character. While in this University we do not concern ourselves with politics, we are deeply concerned with character, and today we pay the tribute of our admiration to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's patience under adversities and disappointments, to his unwearied perseverance in the maintenance of his convictions and to the unselfish love of his country and nation which inspired him throughout his many conflicts."

In a letter dated 19 February 1929, George Lansbury wrote about Dadabhai in these words: "He was foremost in his championship of Home Rule for Ireland and for the great measure of social reform which at that time the Radical party was putting forward. I am quite sure that had he been younger and was now living in this country, he would have been one of the foremost men in the Labour Party. I hope one of these days we shall find another such as he standing for Parliament and standing on the broad basis of international Socialism."

On the death of Dadabhai, Narayan Chandavarkar, a great admirer of his political guru, paid a warm, affectionate tribute to the life and character of the dear departed sage of India in these words: "If we take stock of his life and his example, may I not say with perfect justice and truth that in his career, in all he did, in all he suffered, and in all he taught, he was the Prophet Zoroaster's religion personified, because he was the man, more than anybody else, of pure thought, of pure speech and of pure deeds... The sun that rose, just ninety-three years ago, over India is set, but I say, it is set to rise again in the form of regenerated India, for Dadabhai lived and worked for us with a devotion which must remain for all of us an inspiring example."

Gokhale paid his tribute in these words: "What a life it has been! Its sweet purity, its gentle forbearance, its noble self denial, its lofty patriotism, its abounding love, its strenuous pursuit of high aims—as one contemplates that, one feels as though one stood in a higher presence." In one of his speeches in Madras in 1908, he described him as "the foremost
Indian of our times, the man without self or stain, our aged chief who bears on his head the snow of years, but carries in his heart the fire of youth." To Gokhale's mind, "he was one of the most perfect examples of the highest type of patriotism that any country has ever produced." In his later days, Dadabhai was criticised for using language which could create a feeling of resentment among the members of the ruling class. To such critics, the reply of Gokhale was that Dadabhai stood in the position of a teacher not only to his countrymen but also to the rulers of the land. A teacher need not overlay truth with soft and plausible expressions. Gokhale declared that whether Dadabhai used mild or bitter words, "our place is round his standard. Whoever repudiates Dadabhai, he is none of us: whoever tries to lay rude and irreverent hands on him, strike him down."

Justice Ranade once said of Dadabhai that he was only one in three hundred millions. Pherozeshah Mehta said in a letter to the Bombay Gazette in January 1869 that "if I were called upon to point out the man most deserving to be styled the Sir Philip Sydney of the Indian Renaissance, I would unhesitatingly single out Professor Dadabhai..." To Dadabhai, Gandhiji once said, "Please chide me if I go wrong, please put me right; I am like your son in every respect".

It is said that no Indian leader started an institution, an organisation or movement without consulting him. Gokhale asked for his blessings before launching his "Servants of India Society" in 1905. Annie Besant asked for his blessings before starting the "Indian Home Rule League" in 1915. He enjoyed the rare distinction of being visited by Viceroy and Governors who paid him their homage on account of his selfless service to his country. Digby compared him to John Bright stating that "Mr. Naoroji had done that for Indian politics which steam power had accomplished for traction purposes." A glowing tribute was paid to Naoroji by Wedderburn in these words on the occasion of his saying good-bye to England for the last time: "For half a century he has kept alive among Indians the belief that in the end England will be true to her own tradition; that she will make of India a trusted partner... like Edmund Burke he has never lost faith in the ancient and inbred integrity" of the British people.
V. S. Srinivas Sastri once quoted a British newspaper’s portrait of Naoroji in these words. “If Mr. Naoroji had changed his name to Mr. Brown or Mr. John no one would know him to be a Parsee. But Naoroji is a puzzler for the British elector...If physiognomy be any indication of intellectual merits, Mr. Naoroji is shrewd and penetrating with a large leaven of benevolence. His ample beard and moustache are plentifully sprinkled with white. He wears a pair of gold-rimmed spectacles which he frequently adjusts when he makes a point. He sometimes looks over his glasses with a humorous smile and gay twinkle in his bright eyes which speak volumes for his keen sense of fun. The regulation frock coat fits him like a glove and a better platform figure it would be difficult to find.”

Justice B. J. Wadia, as a law student, coined a nice epigram out of Dadabhai’s name. To quote him, “His very name carried with it the attributes of a great patriot: ‘Dada’ (father) of all India by universal consent, and Bhai (brother) of those who suffer and live under suffering, the first of India’s sons working for the Naoroj (New Day) of India’s liberty and emancipation.” Masani suggests that this epigram might perhaps have gained in brilliance if, taking cognizance of the suffix ‘Ji’ (Lord) the speaker had designated Dadabhai as the lord of the New Day (Naoroj) of ampler life.

C. Y. Chintamani says, “Dadabhai cleared the jungle and laid out the broad tracks upon which public activities continued to run for long years.”

**SUGGESTED READINGS**
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Mahadev Govind Ranade
(1842-1901)

The one peculiar thing which strikes about Ranade is that although he was throughout in Government service, he was able to play an important part in the political, social, economic and cultural life of the country. Whether he was a Sub-Judge, a Magistrate or a Judge of the High Court, he still took part in the political activities of the country. He was one of the founders of the Indian National Congress and took part in its proceedings year after year. He was interested in politics, education, history, economics and social reforms. He was a historian who gave an honoured place to the Maratha Empire in the context of Indian history. He was a pragmatic economist who refused to apply Western standards to the Indian conditions. He was one of those who realised the importance of industrialisation in a poor and undeveloped country like India during the last decades of the nineteenth century. He was the maker of great men. Being himself great, by his influence and example, he inspired others to follow him in his footsteps. Throughout he never gave in to emotions, sentiments, prejudices or passions. His greatest asset was intellectual integrity, and his whole work was transfused by the high intellectual qualities of clear and rational thinking. As a Judge, he did not believe in living in the ivory tower of judicial detachment. Every minute of his life he was conscious of the problems facing his country. He was all the time trying to find out
ways and means to tackle them.

He was born on 18 January 1842 in a Chitpawan Brahmin family and died on 16 January 1901. He was a student of Elphinstone College and was the first Master of Arts of the Bombay University. He was a favourite student of Dr. Harkness and Sir Alexander Grant, Principal of the Elphinstone College. It was said of him that he was the only student of the College who could think on his own. He was enrolled as an Advocate, but he never practised in the courts. He joined Government service and worked as a Magistrate, Small Causes Court Judge, Sub-Judge and a Judge of the High Court. He did not belong to the category of the Judges who came to the Bench after a long and successful practice at the Bar.

In November 1871, Ranade came to Poona as First Class First Grade Subordinate Judge on a salary of Rs. 800 a month. He made a name for himself as a Judge on account of his honesty, hard work and integrity. Mankar says of Ranade: “His judgments, remarkable for patient and minute enquiry, exhaustive treatment of every case that came before him, careful examination of every document filled in it, lucid statement of facts, just appreciation of evidence, elaborate exposition of the various bearings of the question at issue and cogency of arguments adduced in support of the decisions finally arrived at, often won the admiration of the High Court.”

As soon as he came to Poona, Ranade became a member of the Sarvajanik Sabha. By and by, he gathered the reins of the affairs of the Sabha into his own hands and for the following twenty-two years, he was its very life and soul. In 1874, Ranade sent through the Sabha, to the British Parliament and to the chief government officials and to the newspapers, copies of a petition regarding responsible self-government. It was proposed in the petition that India should have representatives in the British Parliament in London and Indian questions should be settled with their consent. The number of representatives was to be eleven and every one who paid at least Rs. 50 in taxes was to have the right of voting in the election of representatives. To show that popular opinion favoured the demand, Ranade secured thousands of signatures from the people. He knew that the Government would not at once grant the demand, but to his mind, the chief value of such an effort con-
sisted in the fact that it was to be a first step in the people's political education. His aim was to get the ideas of self-government underlying his petition considered and discussed so that the ferment of national aspiration might enter into the people's lives.

When the resolution on local self-government was passed by the Government of India in 1882, Ranade stated that "a State paper more liberal, life-inspiring and instinct with true statesmanship can hardly be conceived and has certainly not been seen for many years in India." He further observed: "The primary object of the Government of India's scheme is to give political and popular education to the people, but efficiency in the local administration cannot be lost sight of. Efficiency and economy in local administration is in fact one of the elements of political agitation which has to be taught as much as anything else, for no agitation in the art of self-government can be of the slightest permanent value which does not provide at the same time for efficiency and economy in local administration."

When Ranade came to Poona, he associated himself with the Prarthana Samaj which had been founded in 1870. When Swami Dayananda visited Poona in 1875, Ranade supported him. He showed him every respect and not only helped him to secure an opportunity for propounding his ideas, but also attended those meetings.

In 1880, his claims for advancement to the position of Thana Sessions Judge were passed over on account of his connection with the popular cause. On that occasion, the then Chief Justice Sir Michael Westrop wrote to Ranade: "Your writings come in the way of your promotion. If you want promotion, spare these great efforts." Ranade's reply was: "I am thankful to you, Sir. So far as my wants are concerned, they are few and I can live on very little. Concerning my country's welfare, what seems to be true that I must speak out." However, in 1881, Ranade was appointed Presidency Magistrate at Bombay. In 1885, Lord Reay, Governor of Bombay, appointed him to the position of Law Member of the Bombay Legislative Council. Ranade was Law Member again in 1890 and 1893. In 1886, the Government of India set up a Committee to examine its expenditure and to suggest ways of
retrenchment. Lord Reay who had become Ranade’s friend, secured his appointment to this Committee as a representative of the Bombay Government. When K.T. Telang died as a Judge of the High Court of Bombay, there was a vacancy and in spite of opposition from various quarters, Ranade was appointed a Judge of the High Court of Bombay and he continued to occupy that position till he died in harness on 16 January 1901.

On his death, Chief Justice Sir Lawrence Jenkins referred to Justice Ranade as a “profound and sympathetic Judge possessed of the highest perceptive faculties and inspired with an intense desire to do right. His opinion was of the greatest value to his colleagues and his decisions will stand in the future as a monument of his erudition and learning”. According to Mr. Justice Candy, Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University, Ranade “had the patience of the saints; he was entirely free from guile or hypocrisy and everyone was spontaneously drawn to him.”

Tilak was a great critic of Ranade, but in spite of that, on his death he wrote an obituary in which he compared Ranade to Swami Vidyaranya and called him “the omniscient Madhava”. To quote Tilak, “The first characteristic of Ranade was that he believed in an all-sided and not lop-sided development of the nation. He was endowed with a mature and comprehensive intellect which examined all aspects of any question and reached correct conclusions. He was clearly of the opinion that we are backward in every way—religiously, socially, industrially, educationally, politically and unless we improve in all these respects we would not come in line with the civilised nations. Night and day, he was engrossed in active work connected with the improvement of our condition in one or the other or several of these fields. It was not only Maharashtra that occupied his mind, though that was his immediate arena of activity, but the whole of India. He was fully conscious that every Indian who had the equipment of Western education had this public responsibility and he set an ideal example by his own efforts for thirty years for all to follow.

“It is wholly erroneous to suppose that Ranade could achieve all this with comfort and ease. No. His course of action was fraught with dangers and difficulties and Government knew full well that if anybody was educating the people in
Maharashtra to work for public weal and agitate for redress of public grievances it was Ranade. It was not for nothing that he was transferred from Poona to Nasik and from there to Dhulia. Why, it was even strongly held during the governorship of Sir Richard Temple that the Sarvajanik Sabha which he promoted and of which he was the soul, was a seditious body. Ranade pushed through all these troublesome times with calm, courage and amazing equanimity of mind. Any one of lesser grit and pluck would have been broken and would have succumbed. Quiet courage was his most extraordinary quality and that is why his ceaseless industry was crowned with success in Bombay Presidency in the form of great popular awakening. One has only to think of other parts of the country where a man like Ranade was not born. If there is some pushfulness in the public life of Maharashtra and if its publicists are fearlessly expressing themselves on matters of public interest, there can be no manner of doubt that it is the result of Ranade’s ceaseless and painstaking work for over 25 years.

“If Ranade’s great intellectual and moral attainments could not be harnessed by the British Government to a greater purpose than work as a judge of the Bombay High Court, that is no fault of his. It is the fault of the system of administration. Had he lived a few years more, there was a fair prospect of his openly pursuing the activities he had initiated in the way Dadabhai and Hume had done but that was not ordained by the Almighty. Otherwise why should we have been compelled to write his obituary instead of organising a golden jubilee celebration?”

Ranade was a great social reformer. He helped Malabari in his efforts to get a law passed laying down the minimum age at which girls might be married. When the Indian National Congress was founded at Bombay in 1885, the leaders felt that the national movement should not be exclusively political, but side by side with the political questions, matters relating to the social economy of the country should also be considered. In accordance with this view, Raghunath Rao and Ranade gave addresses on social reform at the meeting of the first Congress. As the Congress decided that social matters should not be a part of its functions, it was decided to start a separate movement called the Indian National Social Conference and the first
Social Conference was held at Madras in December 1887. Its meetings were held at the same time and at the same place where the Congress was held. Ranade explained the position of the Social Conference vis-a-vis the Congress in these words: "The Congress leaders have granted us permission to carry on in their camp our propaganda on our own responsibility." The object of the Social Conference was to stimulate and strengthen the forces of reform by bringing together every year in mutual consultation representatives of the various associations and movements which scattered all over India, were struggling with the social evils prevalent in India. Unifying of the social movement in India was an achievement of great importance. Raghunath Rao was the Secretary, but Ranade was the guiding hand and the inspiring mind. Every year when the Social Conference met, Ranade gave an address in which he summarised the reports that had come to him from the Social Reform Associations all over India.

Ranade called upon the State to raise the age of consent from 10 to 12. There was opposition to the proposal not only from the orthodox people, but also from some of the social reformers and particularly from Tilak and his followers. Professor W.B. Patwardhan says: "For twenty or thirty years, he was practically the life-breath of the reform movement. He organised the movement, focussed the various forces and spasmodic activities of individual reformers; he shaped it anew, and reconciling it with the past soldered it with all that was noble and precious in our heritage. He established a continuity where all seemed to be broken up and confused. License was over and its place was taken by chastened liberty. Revolution yielded place to evolution. Disruption ceased and a process of slow organic growth set in. He secured the health and well-being of the spirit of reform and was content to let alone the form it manifested itself in."

Ranade did a lot of work in the political field. For the last quarter of the 19th century, his was the inspiring and dominating mind at the back of most of the political movements carried on by the Indians. H.P. Mody points out that Ranade was among the "Seventy-two good men and true, the foremost among India's intellectuals who on the fateful morning of the 28th December 1885 sat down together to carve out a future
for their country." Hume who is known as the Father of the Congress, used to call Ranade as his "Political Guru". By his weighty and well-informed utterances, Ranade stimulated thought and moulded opinion. His advice was eagerly sought by all sorts of political leaders.

Ranade's view was that although India was not in a position to make its will directly effective, much could be done indirectly by bringing pressure to bear on the British Parliament. He always urged that full use be made of the existing means of getting their wishes respected without waiting for the day when they could have the power to choose their own representatives. The policy advocated by him was that the Indian nationalists should form a connection with the British Liberal Party, win its sympathy and through it get Indian grievances brought before British Parliament. In 1876, he collected money to assist the candidature of Henry Fawcett, a politician who was favourably inclined towards India. In 1885, Ranade took much interest in the preparation for the work of a deputation of Indians who were being sent to bring Indian affairs to the notice of the British electorate and he himself prepared the rough draft of a leaflet that was to be distributed among the electors.

Gokhale claimed to follow the spirit of Ranade. He called him his guru and held him in an almost religious reverence. His long and intimate association with Ranade tempered the steel of his mind and character. From Ranade he learnt to base himself upon realities and to accept the way of hard study. He imbibed his master's width of view, balance of mind and moral fervour. About the relationship of Ranade and Gokhale, Professor J.R. Raju says: "The story of this friendship is one of the most beautiful romances of modern Indian history. For years they were engaged together in the close study of the progress and destiny of nations, the inner meaning of public events, the far-off results of action, the discipline of failure, service and sacrifice and the infinite play of human motive and passion, not only in profound treatises of political philosophy, but also in the ephemeral effusions of the daily press and in ponderous Government publications. Surely, there is no fairer sight on earth than the close communion of two such kindred spirits and it has brought untold blessings in its train
on us all."

There are three things which must impress anybody who studies Ranade’s political writings and addresses. Those are his frank recognition of his country’s weaknesses, his fearless exposure of government faults and his hearty approval of the British connection. Ranade deplores Indian’s lack of unity and inability to work harmoniously together for common ends. He also deplores the lack of enterprise and perseverance and the tendency to be easily elated and too easily depressed. His view was that people were too prone to shout catchwords of which they did not really understand the significance. There was also a tendency to attach too much importance to the past and to praise extravagantly and without proportion the days of old. He saw the danger of such an attitude as that was likely to deaden the mind to present duty. He asked the people to understand the need of hard work in place of merely praising their past. To quote him: "We should learn to be men, stalwart, puritan men, battling for the right, not indifferent nor sanguine, trustful but not elated, serious but not dejected, this is the change in the character that has to be accomplished."

Ranade criticised the Government in his writings and addresses. He criticised the land administration and indicated what he regarded as better methods. He reviewed very frankly the administrative records of the various Viceroyos and Governors. His view was that the Government of India tended to be too much centralised and too little adaptable to the varying local circumstances. To quote him: "One code, one law, one measure, the same taxation, the same routine forms, a fondness for uniformity as an end in itself—this is the besetting sin of the administration."

Although Ranade was conscious of the many defects in the attitudes, policies and actions of the Englishmen, he was a loyal upholder of the British connection. He found in it a great moral purpose. He saw in it the coping stone of the long disciplining process referring to it as “the discipline afforded us by the example and teaching of the most gifted and free nation in the world, whose rules guarantees to us a long continuance of these favourable conditions.” He believed that Britain had been entrusted by God with a great mission in India. He once wrote: "The whole rationale of British rule in India is its
capacity and its providential purpose of fostering the political education of the country on the largest scale in the civil and public activities." Even when there was bitter controversy against this view, Ranade maintained that the good sense and justice of the British character would acknowledge the rightness of India's claims. To quote Ranade: "With a liberated manhood, with buoyant hope, with a faith that never shirks duty, with a sense of justice that deals fairly to all, with unclouded intellect and powers fully cultivated, and lastly, with a love that overleaps all bounds, renovated India will take her proper rank among the nations of the world, and be the master of the situation and of her own destiny. This is the goal to be reached—this is the promised land. Happy are they who see it in distant vision; happier those who are permitted to work and clear the way on to it; happiest they who live to see it with their eyes and tread upon the holy soil once more."

There is no ground for saying that Ranade was a confirmed pro-British and he wanted India for ever to be chained to the British yoke. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar is of the definite view that this charge is false and without foundation. After referring to the address of Ranade at the Social Conference held at Lucknow in 1899 on which this charge is based, Dr. Ambedkar says that far from casting any reflection upon his self-respect, the whole address testifies to his wisdom and sagacity. To quote Dr. Ambedkar: "The first thing he wanted to convey was that the conquest of India by Britain has given India the time, the opportunity and the necessary shelter for rebuilding, renovating and repairing her economic and social structure, to refit herself for bearing the strain of any foreign aggression when she does become free. The second thing Ranade wanted to convey was that India's going out of the British empire before she had solidified herself into a single nation, unified in thought, in feeling and charged with a sense of a common destiny, was to invite chaos and disruption in the name of independence."

Ranade was a great patriot and a great social servant. He was a leader who by his voice and many-sided and fruitful activities laid broad and deep foundations for the structure of Indian freedom. The view of Dr. T.V. Parvate is that Ranade was a combination of all the three—politician, statesman and prophet—without ever having any of the possible blemishes of
a politician. His functioning in all these roles was faultless. He is rightly remembered as one of the most prominent of the founders and promoters of Indian National Congress.

Ranade was a great economist. In 1890, he formed the Industrial Association of Western India. At the first Conference held in the same year, he delivered his address entitled “The Industrial Conference.” In 1892, he delivered at the Deccan College, Poona his address on Indian Political Economy which has become one of the landmarks in the history of Indian economic thought. Ranade was in sympathy with the Swadeshi Movement started in India, but did not approve of some of its activities. His conviction was that foreign capital was required by India and would not do her any harm. For this view he was criticised in the following words: “Mahadev, in singing the praises of foreign capital, is a traitor to his country.”

According to Ranade, the poverty of India was due to many causes and the chief among them was the dependence of the majority of the people of India on agriculture. He criticised the railway policy of the Government of India because Railways had made competition with Europe more hopeless over large areas and facilitated the conveyance of foreign goods to an extent not otherwise possible. This policy had also killed local indigenous industries and made people more helpless than ever before by increasing their dependence on agriculture as their single source. He wrote in 1893: “The great Indian Dependency has come to be regarded as a plantation, growing raw produce to be shipped by British agents in British ships, to be worked into fabrics by British skill and capital and to be re-exported to the Dependency by British merchants to their corresponding British firms in India and elsewhere.”

The other causes of India’s poverty were lack of capital, the wretched system of credit and the congestion of population in certain areas. Regarding lack of capital, he states that the difficulty was not one of absolute lack of capital, but the lack of proper arrangement for bringing available capital into the hands of those who need it and could use it to advantage. The credit system enabled the money-lenders to flourish at the cost of the people. As there was congestion of population in certain areas, land could not give adequate livelihood to all. His view was that the people of India lacked the spirit of enterprise. They
were not ambitious and the Indian social life was not organised with a view to success in wealth-production. Ranade did not attribute the poverty of India to what is known as the economic "drain" of the country. According to him, "So far from complaining, we have reason to be thankful that we have a creditor who supplies our needs at such a low rate of interest."

Ranade suggested certain remedies to remove the poverty of the people of India. In this connection, he put the greatest emphasis on the growth of Indian manufactures and commerce. To quote him: "What we have to do is to learn by organized co-operation to compete with the foreigner, and take in as much raw produce from abroad as we need, and work it up here, and to send in place of our exports of raw produce the same quantities in less bulky but more valuable forms, after they have undergone the operation of art manipulation and afforded occupation to our industrial classes." Ranade called upon the government to encourage and develop industries in India and he criticised the government for its lack of initiative in this connection. His view was that the State should help in the planning and development of new industries. He wanted the government to advance loans to Indian entrepreneurs at low rates of interest and also help them in the choice of industries and the selection of location.

About Ranade's contribution to Indian economic thought, P.K. Gopalakrishnan says: "Mahadeo Govind Ranade was the first economist who laid down the conditions of economic progress for India and showed a whole range of possible policy to achieve this progress. The importance of Ranade was that of a very great scientific pioneer. He succeeded more than anybody else in India in isolating the chief categories of Indian economic life. He left to his successors many unsolved problems, but he also indicated ways in which they might be solved. Thus not only early Indian economic thought but modern Indian economics also with its interest in problems of economic development could claim Ranade as its founder."

Ranade was a great historian. He was the author of "The Rise of Maratha Power" (1900), an essay on "Mints and Coins of the Maratha period" (1889) and "Introduction to the Satara Rajas and the Peshwa's Diaries" (1900).
Gokhale regarded Ranade as his guru and so looked up to him as sanctioned by ancient Hindu traditions. He quoted his views in his speeches and always found wisdom in them. In his poetic zeal he declared Ranade to be an inspired person and an incarnation of the Supreme Being. He went to the extent of saying that if Ranade had been born two or three centuries earlier, he might have been reckoned among the saints of Maharashtra like Eknath and Tukaram. Gokhale says: "It is no exaggeration to say that young men who came into personal contact with him felt as in a holy presence, not only uttering nothing base but afraid even of thinking unworthy thoughts while in his company." Again, "He was one of those men who appear from time to time in different countries and on different occasions to serve as a light to guide the foot-steps of our weak and erring humanity." Gokhale tells us that Ranade readily found out the real workers in the country and also encouraged them in every possible manner. To quote Gokhale: "He had a wonderful faculty in this respect and as a result he was to many young men scattered all over the country, like the central sun from whom they derived their light and warmth and round whom they moved, each in his own orbit and at his own distance. The feeling of devotion that he was able to inspire in such men was most marvellous and to those young workers who were privileged to come in intimate personal contact with him, his word was law and his approbation their highest earthly reward."

About Ranade, G.V. Joshi says that Ranade was undoubtedly one of the greatest and most representative Indians of his time. He was a distinguished scholar, a profound thinker and a philosophical writer. As a leader of thought, he had perhaps no equal. India had no greater worker, no abler or more zealous champion of her cause than Ranade. His splendid tolerance, his unrivalled attainments, his learning, his scholarship, his balanced mind, his clear judgment, his capacity for comprehensive views, his indomitable energy and his indefatigable industry, marked him out as a leader of men. His high character, his absolute honesty of purpose, his boundless patriotism, his lofty ideals, his moderation, his patience and his exalted sense of duty, inspired confidence and won for him the enthusiastic attachment and devotion of his fellow workers
and followers. For full thirty years and more, he was in the very forefront of national life. His work was unceasing, embracing in its wide range the entire field of our national activity. Ranade did all this work not simply from patriotic motives, but as a religious work and with religious zeal. With him life was a duty, the holy gift of God, to be religiously employed in His service. Ranade was a most zealous and devoted patriot. He loved India with an intense and passionate love and laboured all his life for her welfare. He was much more than a mere patriot or nationalist. His sympathies and views were broader and he followed a higher ideal. He always seemed to feel that he was in the presence of the Almighty, a humble servant doing his appointed task as best as he could and with the light of faith that was vouchsafed to him. Ranade had a profound religious conviction that India was the Promised Land and the Indian people were God’s Chosen People marked out for special divine favour. It was this conviction that inspired and hallowed his life-long work in her service. He believed that in the fullness of time, India would once more be permitted to resume her proper place in the van of the world’s life, and her high task entrusted to her. Ranade was no inspired prophet or seer, but it was his intense faith and hope that impelled him to do the work that demands our attention and admiration. He was one of our greatest reformers. His many-sided activities carried on for more than 30 years represent our highest ideals and our deepest aspirations.

M.R. Jayakar calls Ranade not only a Proteus of human talents but also a Proteus of human tempers. He had great patience and sympathy with youngmen and their pursuits. He was one of the loftiest Indians living in his time. His practical shrewdness always enabled him to value a rising youngman at his true worth. He believed to keep up a friendly contact with varying types of youngmen in the hope of turning them to account at the right moment. The powers and energies that nature had given him were most generously used by him. With the insight and intuition of a master-mind he could easily discover what subject could occupy his attention for public good from time to time.

About Ranade, Dinshaw Wacha says: "Ranade donned the white robe of the peaceful teacher and strenuously strove with
all the great ability at his command, to enlighten his less enlightened countrymen in their arduous and Herculean work of regeneration. As such he was indeed a beacon light, shedding its light far and wide and showing the straight path which should in the fullness of time, bring all to the great goal of national unity and national progress. It is as a teacher that Ranade will be best known and his memory cherished by many a generation to come. He was one of those brave but unassuming standard-bearers in the vanguard of the early Indian patriots who held aloft the banner in which is inscribed in letters which are imperishable, the motto of Liberty and Progress."

In 1895, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta spoke of Ranade’s “great talents and varied accomplishments which are devoted to the service of his country with an untiring zeal and an unflagging perserverance which are equalled only by the simplicity of his heart and the nobility of his mind.”

Speaking on the Gokhale anniversary in 1936 at the Madras Branch of the Servants of India Society, Srinivasa Sastri made the following observation about Ranade: “Ranade was an unrivalled figure and he had what few leaders have, the marvellous gift of attracting young and promising men and giving that turn to their minds and hearts which renders them great instruments of public welfare. He was an eminent statesman and, precluded as he was from direct participation in the daily work of politics, his figure could always be seen in the intimate discussions of the Subjects Committee of the Congress. Every difficulty was referred to him. At every crisis he would interpose with his great authority and the Congressmen of those days, giants though they were, were proud to acknowledge that many a time Mr. Ranade kept them straight on the road of progress.”

C.Y. Chintamani says: “Ranade was mighty in intellect, a man of prodigious industry and of vast and various learning; a profound thinker; an ardent patriot. Handicapped as he was by having been in Government Service all his life, he was a keen political worker, a religious reformer and a still more ardent social reformer, one of the greatest authorities on Indian economics, a great educationist, the inspirer and instructor of younger men who flocked to him. With all these rare
accomplishments Ranade was the most modest, simple, courteous, unassuming of men, full of piety and the humility which is the invariable accompaniment of true greatness."

N.C. Kelkar says: "Ranade was a master not only of Poona and Maharashtra but the whole of India. There was no corner of India which did not look upon him as the great teacher because of his learning, political acumen and patriotism. There was no public man in India who did not bow to him at the mere mention of his name. He stood on the elevated rock of the unremitting public service. Without caring too much for the frowns of Government or the favours of the people, he stuck to the path he had carved out for himself. He had a number of friends among Englishmen but he never refused to join their socials and clubs and hobnob with them. Yet he never gave offence to any one of them. He preserved his self-respect intact by his cautious and discreet and correct conduct."

About Ranade Sri Aurobindo says: "If a foreigner were to ask us what this Maharatta economist, reformer, patriot precisely did that we give him so high a place in our memory, we should find it a little difficult to answer. We should have to point to those activities of a mass of men in which his soul and thought were present as a formless former of things, to the great figures of present day Indian life who received the breath of his spirit. And in the end we should have to reply by a counter question, 'What would Maharashtra of today have been without Mahadev Govind Ranade and what would India of today be without Maharashtra?'"

About Ranade, Sir C.P. Ramaswami Aiyar says: "We have now achieved independence, largely as a result of methods and policies intrinsically different from those of Ranade and Gokhale and the so-called Moderate School. The combative period of non-co-operation and Satyagraha have now been succeeded by the era of planning and large scale industrialisation and astronomically expanding financial commitments and outlays. Public administration has become a specialised branch of knowledge as also has business management of private enterprise. In the present era, the lessons taught by Ranade and his disciples, like Gokhale and D.E. Wacha, and the Poona economists and historians, are not only timely, but topical."
“Politics is an unending struggle and it is, too often, a game of the second best. It is still true that compromise is of the essence of political transaction. In the game of present-day politics, apart from the management of crowds and caucuses and groups and deft bargaining, India has a great deal to learn. We need a great deal more of organisation, and organisation needs continuous loyalty to principles more than to persons as well as unity of impulse and instructed aspiration. We cannot afford to forget those patriots, those path-finders, those light-bearers, who put India on the sure and certain road to self-fulfilment by their study, reflection and research. Politics had been transformed with the inauguration of Mahatma Gandhi’s great and irresistible programme of mass appeal for which Dr. Besant and Tilak paved the way. As a result of the very transformation and its fulfilment, we have arrived at a stage in our political and economic progress when consolidation, organised and fruitful research and instructed thought and comprehensive planning are not superfluous, but essential. Ranade is, therefore, neither out of date nor functionless. He speaks to us today as an invaluable guide, warner and inspirer.” (Biographical Vistas, pp. 164-5).

SUGGESTED READINGS


Badrudin Tyabji
(1844-1906)

Badrudin was not only a great lawyer and great judge but also a great nationalist. All efforts on the part of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and Amir Ali to wean him away from the Congress failed. He not only presided over the third session of the Indian National Congress held at Madras in 1887, but also continued to associate himself with it throughout his life. No wonder that when he died in 1906, his death was mourned by the people of India belonging to all walks of life.

Badrudin was born in Bombay on 8 October 1844 in a family of merchants who had traditions of foreign travel and education. His father Tyab Ali was a very successful businessman. Badrudin passed his Matriculation examination from the London University and later on joined the Middle Temple. In 1867, he was called to the Bar. He set up his practice at the High Court of Bombay as the first Indian Barrister of that place. Within a very short time, he was able to go to the top in the legal profession. It was he who established the traditions of the English Bar for Indian Barristers and won prestige and honour for his nation. In 1871, he took part in the municipal affairs and the agitation for the enactment of the Municipal Law. When the elective principle was first introduced in Bombay, he stood for election to the municipality of Bombay in 1873 and continued to be elected to that body till 1883 when he was elected with a strength of votes higher than
that of his colleagues. At the same time, he devoted his
energies to various other public matters like famine relief and
employment of Mussalmans in public services. He wrote in
the papers on public matters such as the Turkish question and
the humiliating and discriminatory treatment meted out to
the Indians. In 1882, he gave very valuable evidence before
the Hunter Commission on education. In the same year, he
was elected a member of the Legislative Council. He was the
first in the batch of Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherozeshah Mehta
and Telang to be so elected. He served in the Legislative
Council for 5 years from 1882 to 1886.

When the Ilbert Bill was introduced in the Legislature, there
was a lot of hue and cry against it from the Europeans. On
28 April 1883, a meeting was held in the Town Hall of Bombay
to discuss the Bill and to give lead to the country. On that
occasion, the first and principal resolution in support of the
Bill was moved by Badruddin who declared, "I think I have
been present at great many public meetings, on various impor-
tant occasion, some of these in this very Town Hall but I do
not remember to have ever witnessed a larger, a more influential
or a more representative gathering than I see before me. We
have met together for the purpose of discussing calmly and
dispassionately—and I trust without loss of dignity to our-
selves or injustice to others the proposed amendments to the
Code of Criminal Procedure. Gentlemen, whatever may be
the feelings excited elsewhere, whatever may be the causes
which have given rise to those feelings, whoever may be respon-
sible for them, I think we, the citizens of Bombay, have
indeed good reason to congratulate ourselves upon the
comparatively serene atmosphere in which we have the good
fortune to live. Gentlemen, I am one of those who think that
strong, passionate or abusive language is the surest sign of a
bad cause, and so convinced am I of the truth of this saying,
that I should indeed be sorry if a single word, expression or
sentiment dropped this evening either from my own lips, or
from those of any other speaker that could be justly held to
cause offence to any section of Her Majesty's subjects, and
especially to that European community, with whom it should
be our constant aim to live in peace and harmony, and if
possible, on terms of friendship, and to whom in spite of recent
occurrences we must always look up with more or less of respect, esteem and even admiration. But gentlemen, if I thus counsel moderation it is certainly not because I do not feel indignant at the unparalleled insults that have been offered to our whole Indian community at a great public meeting held in the Metropolis, but because I am anxious that our countrymen should afford a striking, a memorable example of forbearance and self-restraint even under the most trying circumstances."

In a warm and closely reasoned speech, Badruddin demonstrated the absurdity of the European contention and observed that if the native magistrates and judges were not sufficiently acquainted with the habits and customs of the European community, especially the lower classes, then every European judge in India ought to be at once deprived of his jurisdiction over the natives of this country. If the Indian members of the Covenanted Civil Service who had spent years in England and who freely mixed with the best classes of the European community in India were incompetent to try European offenders on account of their imperfect knowledge of the habits of the accused, it followed that the European judges, fresh from England and not knowing a word of the language, must be still more unfit to try the natives of this country. He further declared that it was the height of injustice to the whole of Indian community to declare that even the best of Indian magistrates and judges were not fit to try cases against the Europeans. "It is insulting to us, first because it brands the ablest, the highest and the most distinguished of our judicial officers with a galling and perpetual mark of inferiority. It is insulting to us because it draws an invidious distinction between the European and the native members of the same Covenanted Civil Service. It is insulting to us because it exalts the European British subjects into such superior being as to declare that even the highest of our judicial officers shall be incapable of imprisoning him a single day or fining him a single rupee and it is insulting to us because it degrades our own countrymen to such a depth as to declare, in the very next breath, that the same incompetent and unfit magistrates and judges who are incapable of trying even the most trivial case of assault against an Englishman, are yet fit and competent to try millions of our own countrymen for the gravest charges and even to condemn them to death."
In spite of total support in favour of the Bill by the Indians, the Europeans demanded the total abandonment of the Bill. It was at this stage that Badruddin came forward to bring about a compromise. He went to Calcutta, stayed with W. C. Bonnarjee and conferred with all Calcutta leaders. On 1 January 1884, Badruddin called on Lord Ripon and had a long conversation with him. He realised clearly that if a compromise was not arrived at, it would mean not only the abandonment of the whole Bill but the resignation of Lord Ripon himself. He therefore strongly exerted his influence and tried to persuade his friends in Calcutta and Bombay not to agitate further. On his return to Bombay, he was informed by W. C. Bonnarjee that the people had quieted down and were going to have a meeting in support of the compromise.

Soon after the passing of the Ilbert Bill in April 1884, Badruddin took up the agitation against the restriction of 19 years for candidates competing in the examination for the Indian Civil Service in London. Originally, the age fixed was 22. Then it was reduced to 21 and now it was further reduced to 19. This reduced the chances of the Indian to enter the Indian Civil Service by passing successfully the Indian Civil Service examination in London at the age of 19. Addressing a meeting of the East India Association, Badruddin made one of his great and important speeches. Referring to the handicaps placed by the Government in the way of the Indians who wanted to enter the Indian Civil Service, he observed, “How was it possible for him to do so if the Government in spite of all their promises—in violation of the solemn pledges—continued to interpose artificial barriers, with the certain result, if not with the direct object, of debarring our countrymen from even attempting to pass into the Civil Service by the only honourable means open to them, viz., the competitive examination. Gentlemen, is it not a mockery for the Government in one breath to declare that all appointments are open to the natives of India and in the very next breath to formulate rules which render it impossible for ninety-nine out of a hundred eligible candidates from even attempting to compete with their English rivals?”

When it was decided that Lord Ripon would leave India towards the end of December, 1884, a meeting was held on
29 November 1884 in the Town Hall of Bombay to decide upon the manner in which farewell was to be given to him. The meeting was memorable for the public enthusiasm it created. The great Hall was crowded. Crowds thronged the streets carrying banners bearing affectionate greetings “Ripon dear, never fear,” “Beloved Viceroy”. Badruddin was the first speaker at that meeting and he moved the principal resolution expressing a deep sense of gratitude on behalf of the people of Western India to the Viceroy for his eminent services to the country. Badruddin declared that Lord Ripon had completely identified himself with the best interests of the country and had come up to the ideal of a perfect Viceroy, as no other Viceroy had done. He had ruled exclusively for the benefit of India. To quote Badruddin: “Gentlemen, I ask you, the representatives of every caste, colour and creed and composing our vast Indian community—you, the representatives of every shade of public opinion in this country—you, who are acquainted with the inmost thoughts that agitate or gladden the breasts of our countrymen—I ask you, has India ever been so tranquil, has she ever been so happy, has she ever been so devoted to Her Majesty’s throne as during Lord Ripon’s Vicerealty? Gentlemen, during His Excellency’s reign, we have almost forgotten that we are living under a foreign Government.”

Badruddin was very anxious that Lord Ripon should be given a befitting farewell. It is stated that there were some heavy December clouds and some rains and an English member of the Bombay High Court Bar whose sympathies were otherwise, remarked, “You see Tyabji, how angry the heavens are”. “Yes,” said Badruddin. “They are angry that Ripon is going. The clouds are sad and weeping.” Lord Ripon arrived in Bombay on 17 December by a special train. He was greeted by banners carrying slogans like these: “God Bless,” “Long Live”, “Beloved Viceroy”, “Saviour of India,” “True Friend”, “Ripon, conqueror of Indian hearts”, “Remember poor Indians”, “Long Live the Marquis and Marchioness of Ripon” and “Ripon dear, do not fear.” Badruddin was one among those who welcomed him when Ripon got down from the train.

For a long time, Badruddin had resisted the advice of his
friends like Pherozeshah Mehta, K. T. Telang and Ranade to take part in the political life of the country but ultimately he was dragged into the same. He was one of the founders of the Bombay Presidency Association in January 1885. Although he could not attend the first session of the Indian National Congress in Bombay, he assured his friends in the Bombay Presidency Association that "when a political question was involved", the Muslims were "one with their Parsee and Hindoo brethren". Three weeks before the Calcutta session in 1886, W. C. Bonnarjee suggested the name of Tyabji as the President of the Indian National Congress. However, ill health prevented Tyabji from going to Calcutta. In 1887, the violent opposition of Syed Ahmad Khan to the Indian National Congress made the Congress leaders decide to choose a Muslim President and their choice again fell on Badruddin Tyabji. Hume told Tyabji that all the Congress Standing Committees were "unanimous in their desire that you should preside over the coming Congress." Tyabji was "not only the best, but the only possible man for the post" and he was called to it "by the unanimous voices of your fellow countrymen". As Tyabji was to be the symbol of Muslim support for the Congress, Amir Ali tried to dissuade him from accepting the invitation of the Congress by requesting him to attend a Muslim conference which the Central National Mahomedan Association was then planning as a supplement to the Mahomedan Educational Conference. Amir Ali tried to impress upon Tyabji that the programme of the Muslim Conference would be "extremely moderate and suited to our own progress" and it would not discuss "high politics". However, Tyabji was not persuaded. If the Muslim Conference of Amir Ali was to be a rival to the Congress, he was against it.

On 26 December 1887, Badruddin was duly elected President of the Indian National Congress and thereafter he addressed the assemblage. Badruddin was at pains to repudiate the various allegations made against the Indian National Congress. As to the charge that there was no sense in the speeches of the Congress leaders, he declared: "I have carefully read the proceedings of both the Congresses and I have no hesitation in declaring that they display an amount of talent, wisdom and eloquence of which we have every reason to be proud."
As to the position of Mohammedans, he said: "I must honestly confess to you that one great motive which has induced me in the present stage of my health to undertake the great responsibilities of presiding over your deliberations has been an earnest desire on my part to prove as far as in my power lies that I at least not merely in my individual capacity but as representing the Anjuman-i-Islam, do not consider that there is anything whatever in the position or the relations of the different communities of India—be they Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsees or Christians—which should induce the leaders of any one community to stand aloof from the others in their efforts to obtain those great general reforms, those great general rights which are for the common benefit of us all and which I feel assured have only to be earnestly and unanimously pressed upon the Government to be granted to us." As to the allegation that the Congress consisted of only the "educated natives", Badruddin said: "Now if it is intended to be conveyed that we are merely a crowd of people with nothing but our education to commend us, if it is intended to be conveyed that the gentry, the nobility and the aristocracy of the land have kept aloof from us, I can only meet that assertion by the most direct and the most absolute denial. To any person who made that assertion I should feel inclined to say, come with me into this Hall and look around you and tell me where you could wish to see a better representation of the aristocracy not only of birth and of wealth, but of intellect, education and position, than you see gathered within the walls of this Hall. But gentlemen, if no such insinuation is intended to be made, I should only say that I am happy to think that this Congress does consist of the educated natives of India. Gentlemen, I for one, am proud to be called not only educated but a native of this country." Badruddin maintained that it was the educated natives who were most loyal as they could best appreciate the blessing of an enlightened Government by reason of their education. To charge them with disloyalty was a "most frightful and unjust condemnation of the British Government itself." Badruddin gave the following advice to all those assembled there: "Be moderate in your demands, be just in your criticism, be accurate in your facts and you may rest assured that any proposals you may make to our rulers will be received with
that benign consideration which is the characteristic of a strong and enlightened Government."

About the Presidential address of Badruddin, the *Times of India* wrote: "Few Presidential addresses have equalled the one which Mr. Badruddin Tyabji delivered on that occasion, in the lucid arrangement of facts and cogent reasoning, and it was acknowledged on all hands to be an oratorical effort of high order in the history of that movement."

The *Indian Patriot* described in these words the manner in which Badruddin conducted the proceedings of the Madras session of the Congress: "The genial smile that played upon his lips added a charm to his word of command, and his inviting presence and gentleness of manner inspired enthusiasm and love in all who had to obey his command. He had in an eminent degree the qualities of a born leader of men. A fine presence, great talents and attainments, courage, wisdom, sincerity of manner, gentleness of disposition and a capacity to love all without difference of race or colour. Such men cause no strife or bitterness but strengthen the feelings of love and brotherhood. They excite no jealousy, no opposition. They bring peace and goodwill to all and smoothen the rough experiences of life."

Salem Ramaswamy Mudaliar proposed a vote of thanks in these words: "The way in which the whole session had been brought to a satisfactory conclusion is quite a crown of glory to our President, for the success we have achieved, has been mainly due to the ability, tact and good judgment—and above all—good temper which our President has shown in discharging his duties."

In these connection, G. A. Natesan wrote: "The unanimous choice of the country for the place of President fell on Mr. Badruddin Tyabji. Never was choice better justified. Three speeches stand out in the memory as giving that session its peculiar glory. Rajiah Sir T. Madhav Rao's address of welcome was couched in diction, which suggested the cunning of Taj Mahal chisellers, which an Anglo-Indian journal declared was 'such as few persons in the continent of Europe ever speak'. For pure dash and brilliancy nothing in the whole range of Congress oratory can equal the short speech by which Mr. Surendra Nath Bannerjea carried the Arms Act. Inferior to
neither in weight nor impressiveness, but superior to both in
dignity and grace of delivery, was Mr. Tyabji's presidential
address. The present writer still cherishes as one of his most
precious intellectual possessions the memory of the scene where
as a mere stripling he stood behind a vast crowd, drinking in
with rapture every word as it reached him, clear and apt—so
apt, he thought—which beamed with earnestness, good humour
and perfect self-possession."

This is what the *Hindu* of Madras wrote about the Madras
Session of the Congress: "It was a most memorable one in
many respects, on account of the eminence and unimpeachable
standing of the persons who took part in it, and also because
of the deep impression which it had upon the mind of the
public, Indians as well as Anglo-Indians......and in Badruddin
Tyabji the Congress had the good fortune to light upon a
President who not only by virtue of his acknowledged position
in the Mahommedan Community, but by his rare tact in the
management of men and his power of eloquence raised the
prestige of the national movement and conducted its proceed-
ings to a brilliant result. For the moment, even adverse
Anglo-Indian opinion was hushed. The address which was
delivered as President by Mr, Badruddin was a masterly per-
formance, and for force and effectiveness has never been
surpassed by any other Presidential speech......"

The uncompromising hostility of Syed Ahmad Khan and
Amir Ali forced Tyabji to develop his own views about the
Congress. According to him, there were certain questions
which affected all Indians alike, whether Hindu, Parsee or
Muslims. For the Muslims, "the proper course is to join the
Congress and take part in its deliberations from our own
peculiar standpoint." In his presidential address to the third
Congress, Tyabji stated that although the Muslim Community
had its own peculiar, social, moral and educational and even
political difficulties to surmount, yet there were some "general
questions affecting the whole of India". Tyabji maintained
that many Muslims recognised this and supported the Con-
gress. There were 79 Muslim delegates at the Madras session
to prove his point. He admitted that some Muslims were
keeping themselves away from the Congress but he hoped that
was due simply to "certain special and local temporary causes"
and applied "only to a part of India". It was under his
presidency that a rule was passed which laid down that no
subject to which all the delegates of any community, as a body,
were opposed should be brought before the Congress without
reference to whether the opposers constitute the majority or
minority. Tyabji then approached the Muslim leaders who
were opposing the Congress. He told them that the aims of
the Congress "are and must be for the benefits of all communi-
ties, and any proposition that is disliked by the Mahommedans
as a body must be excluded from it." In February 1888,
Tyabji wrote to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, "We can as little stop
the Congress as we can stop the progress of education. But
it is in our power by firm and resolute action to direct the
course the Congress shall take and my strong conviction is that
the Musalmans can by united action confine the Congress to
such topics only as they may deem desirable or safe for discus-
tion. Take for instance the question of the Legislative Council.
If the Musalmans as a body do not like that the members
should be elected, they could easily modify the proposition so
as to suit their own interests. My policy, therefore, would be
to act from within rather than from without. I would say to
all Musalmans 'act with your Hindu fellow subjects in all
matters in which you are agreed but oppose them as strongly
as you can if they bring forward any proposition that you may
deem prejudicial to yourselves. We should thus advance the
general progress of India and at the same time safeguard our
own interests." However, this had no effect on Sir Syed
Ahmad Khan or his followers.

In 1895, Badruddin Tyabji was appointed a judge of the
High Court of Bombay. As a judge, he weighed the scales
impartially between the various parties, irrespective of their
rank or status, race or religion. Even a poor litigant could
hope to get justice at his hands. He possessed a complete
mastery of facts and law and could deliver an elaborate judg-
ment from a few notes. He did not bother about legal
abstractions. He cared more for equity and substantial justice.
He was both fearless and dignified on the Bench. As a judge,
he won laurels not only from the Indian public but also from
the Privy Council.

Tyabji was a man of very wide interests in life. He rendered
meritorious services to the citizens of Bombay as a member of the Bombay Corporation. To begin with, he was the Secretary of the Anjuman-i-Islam of Bombay and later on became its President. Through his own efforts, he was able to make it a powerful institution in Western India. Through it, he tried to educate the Muslim community to a better way of life. He tried to weaken the hold of the Zenana system on the Muslim community. His daughter gave up Purdah and went to England for higher education. Men and women, young and old, of the Tyabji family were foremost in the social life of Bombay. They brought together at their residence the people of different communities and religions.

The death of Badruddin on August 1906 in England was a great shock to his countrymen. They were aware of the great loss which the nation had suffered. Congress President Ananda Charlu observed that Tyabji’s life was one “of sturdy honesty, of unflinching manliness and of a patriotism, which no narrow, pietistic, sectarian considerations ever put any check on.” His was an honoured name associated with those of Pherozeshah Mehta and Telang.

The Madras Standard wrote: “Throughout this ancient land the death of Mr. Justice Tyabji will be deeply mourned as a national loss. He belonged to a generation which is fast disappearing. He was one of a group of Indians whose careers are now inseparably bound up with the history of their motherland. Men like Bonnerjeea, Telang, Ranade, Tyabji and Bose were among the makers of Modern Indian History. Their outlook was so wide and their hearts so large that they recognised no artificial division of Indian society, but looked at India as a whole, and worked for its elevation. They had their own religious beliefs and had to adapt themselves to and improve their environments—but their memory and their work are a common heritage which the present and future generations will deeply cherish as a sacred and inspiring possession. Mr. Justice Tyabji was one of the greatest sons of India. He was imbued with the true spirit of modern culture and modern civilisation. No one had a clearer, truer and deeper insight into the needs and requirements of India of his time, and no one laboured more strenuously and with greater courage and steadfastness of purpose for the attainment of his objects. He
found himself amidst a dense mass of ignorance and prejudice which most of his co-religionists had neither the courage nor the resource to face. He equipped himself for the difficult task and tackled the problem of progress of the Mahommedan community with a boldness, freedom from reserve, earnestness and zeal which could not be surpassed.

"His aim was Indian unity—a united India. He had the sagacity to see and the energy, capacity and patriotism to work for a brighter and more prosperous future for India. His mental horizon was so wide that he could see the action and interaction of the human forces in the struggle for a more healthy existence, from a standard higher than that of most of his countrymen. He moved in his own selected orbit uninfluenced by the glamour of the crowd or the insinuating glamour of power. He was one of the most powerful advocates of his time. He proved himself by his patience, judicial calmness and profound legal scholarship one of the greatest judges that ever adorned the Bombay High Court. His judgment was a model of lucidity and clear cut arguments. Some of his oral judgments were like specimens of high oratorial efforts and of legal argument and logical marshalling of facts.

"He was a great Indian patriot, acknowledged public leader, social reformer, redoubtable champion of Indian interests, a persuasive public speaker—one who, both in private life and in public life has left behind him a high and unblemished character, which Indians of today may take to their hearts so that they and those that come after them may profit by it."

At a condolence meeting held in Bombay on 10 November 1906, Pherozeshah Mehta observed: "He was to me a life-long friend and close and intimate as his friendship was, it remained unbroken, without a hitch or disturbance, upto the date of his death......I thank God that I was associated with such a Mahommedan as Badruddin and such a Hindu as Telang because I thus came to recognise that however good we might determine to be there was a higher plane in which we ought to forget all our differences and distinctions of caste and creed and religion......We came to work for the people, not as Hindus, Mahommedans or Parsees, but as soldiers in the public cause,
standing side by side, doing our best to further according to our lights, the interests, the development and the welfare of the common country to which we belonged and which we love.” Praising the Presidential speech of Badruddin at the Congress session of 1887, Pherozeshah Mehta said: “The words of wisdom he then spoke might be read with advantage by every Hindu, Mahommedan and Parsi upto the present day. I think people cannot do better than peruse the wise and sagacious advice Mr. Badruddin gave on that great occasion.”

At the same meeting, Sir Dinshaw Wacha declared: “He appeared to have been a born statesman. The more I knew him and the more I heard from his lips many an observation on the condition of the country, its administration and the right and proper duties of ourselves as citizens, the deeper that conviction grew upon me. Had his Kismat been cast elsewhere, say in a great native state, Hindoo or Mahommedan, I am perfectly certain that Mr. Tyabji would have risen to fill the highest post. He would have been another Sir Salar Jung. There were in him all the great qualities which contribute towards the making of an eminent statesman—talents of a high order—political sagacity, tact, judgment, suavity of manners and above all catholic sympathy.” Referring to the Anjuman-i-Islam, he said: “It will forever stand as an imperishable monument of his great social work.....In the entire community of Mahommedans in India he was recognised as a towering personality and a power and an influence for good. His heart beat in unison with the aims and aspirations of our national organisation, while his head had clear conception of the ultimate triumph of those objects. In his death, therefore, India loses one of her best sons, a pillar of progress, justice, freedom, toleration and catholic sympathy. It is to be feared, it would be long before the country discovers another Tyabji.” Wacha described Badruddin as “a great soul, of lofty sentiments, disinterested patriotism and deep sympathy—pure in faith and winningly sweet courtesy, noble and kind.”

On another occasion, Pherozeshah Mehta observed: “His noble example would remain forever as a sign-post for future generations that will show them the way to work conscienti-
ously, unselfishly and with self-sacrifice for the progress and the political advancement of their mother country.”

SUGGESTED READINGS

Sir Pherozeshah Mehta
(1845-1915)

Sir Pherozeshah Mehta was one of those stalwarts who were associated with the Indian National Congress from its very birth. He had the good fortune to play a leading role in moulding the policy and programme of the Congress for about three decades. He was the leader of the Moderates and he fought to the last against the Extremists. He was their target at the Surat Session of the Congress in 1907. He controlled the Congress so successfully that so long as he lived, there was no chance for the Extremists to re-enter the Congress.

Pherozeshah Mehta was born in 1845. He was a very precocious boy. He graduated at the age of 20 and within 6 months passed his M.A. with honours. He was very much inclined towards the study of history and English literature. Through his brilliance, he came to the notice of Sir Alexander Grant who got for him a travelling fellowship for training at the Bar. This helped Pherozeshah Mehta to study law in England for four years. It was during his stay in England that he came into intimate contact with Dadabhai Naoroji, W.C. Bonnerjee and Badruddin Tyabji. This association continued for decades in India. While in England, he was very much influenced by the ideals and dogmatics of Liberalism and it is these ideals which afterwards governed his public career and political conduct.

On his return from England, he started practice in the High
Court of Bombay and soon made a mark in the profession. It was rumoured in 1889 that he would be raised to the Bench of the High Court of Bombay on the death of Mr. Justice Nana-\bhai Haridas, but unlike Tyabji and Telang, Pherozeshah Mehta "kept himself free to the last" to serve the Motherland unfettered and to fight for the causes he had made his own.

Pherozeshah Mehta took keen interest in the affairs of the city of Bombay and did a lot for the people of Bombay. It is rightly said that he made Bombay "a little kingdom" and made it the pride of India. It was due to his efforts that the Acts of 1872 and 1888 were passed for the city of Bombay and those Acts gave a lot of freedom to the Corporation of Bombay. The Act of 1888 is known as the Magna Carta of Municipal freedom. It was in recognition of his services to the city of Bombay that the statue of Pherozeshah Mehta was erected in front of the Municipal Office of Bombay. He was known as the "Lion of Bombay".

Pherozeshah Mehta was one of the founders of the Bombay Presidency Association in January 1885 and he took active part its affairs so long as he lived. In 1886, he became a member of the Bombay Legislative Council. He was a formidable speaker who was not afraid of any body. However, H.P. Mody, his biographer, points out that it was not "until he found the admission into the Supreme Council, that his brilliant intellect and remarkable powers of debate obtained their proper field of exercise and disclosed to the public the full force of his personality." Few equalled him and none excelled him. However, he had to leave the Imperial Council on grounds of health in 1900.

Pherozeshah Mehta played an important part in the Indian National Congress from the day of its foundation to 1915, the year of his death. He was one of those who had a hand in the foundation of the Indian National Congress and he was one of the hosts for the first meeting in December 1885 in Bombay. He presided over the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1890. He could also have presided over the Lahore Session of the Congress in 1909 but for the fact that he held himself back at the last hour. He was the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Congress for the sessions held in Bombay in 1889 and 1904. He occupied such a high position in the Congress
that whatever he decided was actually carried out.

Pherozeshah Mehta had faith in the sense of justice of the Englishmen. To quote him: "I have no fears but that English statesmanship will ultimately respond to the call. I have unbounded faith in the living and fertilizing principles of the English culture and English education." He held the view that "All the great forces of English life and society, moral, social, intellectual, political, are, if slowly, yet steadily and irresistibly, declaring themselves for the choice which will make the connection of England and India a blessing to themselves and to the whole world for countless generations. I appeal to all true Englishmen—to candid friends as to generous foes—not to let this prayer go in vain." However, he gave a warning that "England must raise India to her own level or India will drag her down to hers." Mehta was always ready to cross swords with Governors and Viceroys who were opposed to the national cause.

Pherozeshah Mehta was a great educationist. He was not only a member of the Senate of the University of Bombay but he actually took keen interest in higher education. He was a pioneer of Swadeshi concerns. He gave to Bombay its first Indian daily in English in 1913 with B.G. Horniman as its editor. In 1913, he made an historic pronouncement on the South African Indian question that no subject of the Crown could be denied the right of free entry and access in any part of the Empire. Wherever Pherozeshah Mehta was, his presence was felt. In his day, he was sometimes called an autocrat, if not a despot. While conducting the affairs of the Congress, he had his way and was not prepared to accommodate others. It was on account of his attitude that the Surat Split took place in the Congress in 1907. He ruled the Congress till his death in 1915. He died as "the greatest political leader of his day". He was a giant among men. Lord Willingdon described him as "a great Parsi, a great citizen, a great patriot and a great Indian." Pherozeshah Mehta claimed himself to be "an Indian first and Parsi afterwards."

D.E. Wacha compared Pherozeshah Mehta to Gladstone. According to him, the following words which Lord Selborne had applied to the career of Gladstone, equally applied to Pherozeshah Mehta: "It does not lie in his great accomplish-
ments, his wonderful ability and his extraordinary eloquence, though all these things do demand our admiration. But the people understand him. They know that he has profound sympathy with them, that he has nothing at heart but duty to promote their interests according to his honest views of them, and whether he judges rightly or wrongly about this question or that—and, of course, all of us are liable to error and none pretend to infallibility—they know that he is a man actuated only by the purest motives and that he presents the highest example of public integrity."

The view of C.Y. Chintamani was that "what has been said of the oratory of Gladstone by James Bryce is applicable to Mehta as well." Bryce had observed thus about Gladstone: "There was a lively imagination, which enabled him to relieve even dull matter by pleasing figures, together with a large command of quotations and illustrations. There were powers, of sarcasm, power however, which he rarely used, preferring the summer lightning of banter to the thunderbolts of invective. There was admirable lucidity and accuracy in exposition. There was art in the disposition and marshalling of his arguments, and finally—a gift now almost extinct—there was a delightful variety and grace of appropriate gesture. But above and beyond everything else which enthralled the listener, there stood out four qualities. Two of them were merits of substance—inventiveness and elevation; two were merits of delivery—force in the manner, expressive modulation in the voice."

Srinivasa Sastri paid the following tribute to Pherozeshah Mehta: "He was richly endowed by nature who made him in one of her generous moods—gave him a most handsome and impressive exterior, a look and a countenance which you could not fail to see a second or even a third time if you had the opportunity, a powerful voice, consummate abilities, vast learning, great acquisitions in the sphere of constitutional and political law, great courage of heart, high-hearted endeavour for the public welfare, a spirit which stood up for his own honour and that of his country whenever they were assailed and which enabled him to stand up face to face with the highest amongst the authorities of the land."

About Pherozeshah Mehta, H.P. Mody says: "Pherozeshah Mehta had a presence which easily picked him out from a
crowd, and dress and manner alike added a touch of distinction. His style of living and the Turkish cap he affected so impressed a hotel manager that he thought the distinguished visitor was the Shah of Persia!"

Gokhale once observed that “Mr. Mehta, to a great extent, is a happy combination of the independence and strength of character of the late Mr. Mandlik, the lucidity and culture of Mr. Telang and the originality and wide grasp of Mr. Ranade.” Mehta was incomparable in his indifference to personal advancement, in his readiness to advance his rivals, in freedom from hypocrisy and conceit, in grasp and vigour of intellect, in his wide culture, in his fearless, resolute and unswerving independence, in his impressive presence and powerful personality. Mr. Mehta knew how to order his loyalties to different associations. The Agha Khan says: “In a land of divisions of caste and religion, of race and occupation, of provincial interests and religious differences, Sir Pherozeshah in his very life, perhaps unconsciously, showed the greatest synthesis of patriotism and particularism.” A of Parsis, he was yet an Indian of Indians. A Bombayite, he was a torch bearer of Indian nationalism.

SUGGESTED READINGS


Mehta Papers : This collection is in the possession of Sir Homi Mody, Bombay. Microfilm copy, National Archives of India and University of Cambridge.

In the words of Mahatma Gandhi, “Sir Pherozeshah had seemed to me like the Himalaya unscalable; the Lokmanya like the ocean one could not easily launch forth on the Sea. But Gokhale was as the Ganges. It invited one to its bosom. In the sphere of politics, the place that Gokhale occupied in my heart during the lifetime and occupies even now has been and is unique.” No wonder, Mahatma Gandhi called Gokhale as his “political Guru” and also wrote a book entitled, “Gokhale, My Political Guru”. Lokmanya Tilak described Gokhale as the diamond of India, the jewel of Maharashtra and the prince of workers. The view of Hoyland is that Gokhale was a constructive statesman of the first rank, a harbinger together of the East and West. He was an idealist and a prophet of the new era of inter-racial goodwill and co-operation.

Gokhale was born in 1866 and he died on 18 February 1915. He was a precocious child. He became a graduate at 18, a Professor at 20, a member of the Bombay Legislative Council at 22, a member of the Supreme Council at 36 and President of the Indian National Congress at 39. He was lucky to have come into contact with Justice Ranade at an early age and he imbibed the spirit of his master and never wavered from the path of moderation and sweet reasonableness. He joined the Deccan Education Society and very soon became the Principal of the Fergusson College. He worked there for about 20 years
on a nominal salary of Rs. 70 a month. In 1897, he appeared before the Welby Commission. He criticised the Salt Tax on the ground that the poor were hit by it. He disapproved of the policy of the Government of India in excluding the Indians from higher posts. He denounced the partition of Bengal. He persuaded Mahatma Gandhi to come to India from South Africa. He played an important part in the passage of the Minto-Morley Reforms and considered them as “large and generous concession” by the Government to the people of India. He was in favour of “adequate, real and genuine” representation for the Muslims in the Councils. He did not bother whether the Hindus got more seats or the Muslims. He criticised the military policy of the Government of India. He was in favour of the grant of Commissions to the Indians and the provision of facilities for their naval and military training. His heart went out for the starving, shrunken and shrivelled-up peasants who worked from dawn to dusk to earn their scanty meals.

Gokhale was a Moderate. He was in favour of constitutional methods for the realisation of the goal of national independence. He had no faith in revolutionary methods and both in his private talks and public discussions, he tried to expose the futility of the revolutionary means. He emphasised the consequences of lawlessness on the future Government of the country. He was of the opinion that memorials, petitions, representations and peaceful demonstrations against actions of the Government were the only legitimate means to protest against the Government. To quote him: “It is not through sudden or violent cataclysm but only successive steps that our goal is to be reached.”

The position of Gokhale was a very difficult one. The Extremists in India dubbed him as a “faint-hearted Moderate” who was prepared to be a willing tool in the hands of the British Government. The reactionaries described him as a “seditionist in disguise”. Lord Minto doubted his constancy. Even Lord Morley was not completely free from prejudice against him. However, he firmly believed that the situation required “not the policeman’s baton or the soldier’s bayonet but the statesman’s insight, wisdom and courage.” Gokhale was neither a revolutionary nor a reactionary. He hated both
the extremes. He was a constructive statesman who understood and fought for the rights and liberties of the people of India but at the same time he was not prepared to ignore or belittle the difficulties of the Government of India. That is the reason why he supported the Indian Press Act, 1910 in the Supreme Council. It is rightly said that Gokhale "interpreted popular aspirations to the Viceroy and the Government's difficulties to the Congress". The people criticised his moderation and the Government criticised his extremism. His role was that of a unifier and a reconciler. His attitude can be best put in these words: "The Englishman who imagines that India can be governed much longer on the same lines as in the past and the Indian who thinks that he must seek a destiny for his country outside this Empire, of which, for better or worse, we are a part—both alike show an inadequate appreciation of the realities of the present situation."

Wolpert has attempted a comparison of Gokhale and Tilak. According to him, Gokhale was an optimist and an idealist. He believed in the progressive perfectability of all mankind through the agencies of education, accurate dissemination of information and social and material amelioration. While putting forward the demands of the people, he was eminently practical, moderate and constructive. His leadership was evolutionary and international in approach and aspiration. He refused to concede any fundamental antipathy at the root of the relationship between India and England. As a matter of fact, he put emphasis on the interdependent and harmonious aspects of their cultures and mutual goals. He worked hard for ensuring to the people of India equality of opportunity and treatment in their relations with Englishmen. On the other hand, Tilak was less concerned with equality than with liberty. He shared neither Gokhale's catholic aspirations, nor his evolutionary inclination. He saw the moat rather than the bridge between his world and that of the West. While Gokhale was syncretic, Tilak was chauvinistic. Instead of international harmony, he preached the national evolution. His tactics were to agitate and to organise the masses, to voice the frustration and discontent of the down-trodden and to depict the foreigner as the single cause of the too many miseries of the Indians. He rallied his forces by devious means and directed them in techniques
-other than frontal assault. He adhered to no dogmatic revolutionary theory. He outlined no long-term programme of action or social reorganisation. His ultimate goal was independent India and his immediate goal was to secure the reins of political power. He was neither squeamish nor doctrinaire about the methods he employed so long as they helped to further his ends. He saw no inherent contradiction in providing ethical and philosophical justification for political assassination, racial and religious antipathy or the use of duplicity on the one hand, while declaring his loyalty to the British rule and promising to co-operate with the Government on the other. In rallying support, he did not scruple against appealing to prejudice or mass anxiety. He stimulated the revival of Hindu religious consciousness. He attacked scientific innovations and social reforms as the hand-maids of a foreign ideology and foreign religion. (Tilak and Gokhale, pp. 300-302.)

According to Wolpert, the reason why Tilak and Gokhale differed in their attitude towards British rule in India was primarily due to their own lives. Tilak had to fight throughout his life against the machinery of British justice in India. He had no faith in the law-courts of the country as he was invariably convicted and punished by them. Though he pleaded innocent when tried, most of the verdicts went against him. He came to the obvious conclusion that no matter what he said or did, the official opinion had branded him as a sedition-monger once for all and this must have convinced him that until India had won independence, he and his party could not hope to get justice. On the other hand, Gokhale had many happy memories of his contacts with the British Government and the Englishmen. He had access to rooms in British society which were for ever closed to Tilak in the same way as the jail cells in which Tilak spent many years of his life were not included in the experiences of Gokhale. It was on account of their divergent experiences, that their attitudes towards the British Government differed.

Wolpert sums up by saying that both Tilak and Gokhale set a standard of service in public life and of labour in the national cause which rarely has been matched. In many respects Indian society has evolved and will continue to evolve along lines of an uneasy compromise between the dreams of
each of them. Choosing independence as Tilak would have done, the Republic of India has in Gokhale fashion, retained strong ties of fraternity with England through her membership of the Commonwealth. Like-wise, within the nation as well as the progressive westernisation along liberal lines of constitutional development may be pointed out as a part of living tradition of Gokhale while militancy, resurgent Hinduism, regional and communal sensitivity, class consciousness and social conservatism can be seen as something of the heritage of Tilak (Ibid, p. 303).

John S. Hoyland in his "Life of Gopal Krishna Gokhale" published in 1933 has compared Gokhale with Cavour in these words: "They were both 'masters of the possible' setting before themselves limited objectives, using the existing machinery, however defective, for the attainment of those objectives and when they were obtained, going forward one step more to some other practical and limited objective. They were both inherently constitutionalists, i.e., men who perceived that revolutionary methods, even if they succeed for a time in realising the popular will, have, as their inevitable ultimate results, a reaction which may carry things backward. In consequence both of them were anathema to the hot-heads in their respective hands. The followers of Mazzini hated Cavour even more than they hated the Austrians and it is perhaps true that some Indian extremists hated Gokhale worse than they hated the British."

While introducing Gokhale on the occasion of the Congress Session at Banaras in 1905, R.C. Dutt addressed the audience in these words: "Gokhale's services are known to all of you, and to many of you, better than to myself. Many of you, who have come from the Bombay Presidency know what a selfless life Gokhale has led; how he was first educated by that prince of educators, the late Ranade; how he devoted years of his life to that noble institution which we know as Fergusson College; and how after some travels in Europe, he made his name as a politician by the historic speech which he made on the occasion of the budget discussion in the Viceroy's Council some years ago. Gentlemen, I do not know how you received that speech; but when for the first time I read that speech, I felt within myself that that was the coming man for India. The power of eloquence,
the power of debate, the great moderation and the lucid statement of facts, which characterised that splendid speech in the Viceroy’s Council showed that we had at last got a champion, who would do justice to his country and countrymen. Year after year we have watched the proceedings of the Viceroy’s Council and I think I am reflecting the opinion of every one of you present, when I say that our cause could not have found a more eloquent, a more upright, and a more able advocate than in Gokhale. I shall not forget to mention the services which Gokhale lately rendered by his splendid series of speeches in England at a time when the old Government was crumbling down and when the new Government was being formed. You may have heard and read in the papers some accounts of the efforts which Gokhale made to represent our cause, the cause of all India, before all classes of the English community, from the merchants of Lancashire to those people who are about to hold the reins of the Empire. I believe that the fruit of these endeavours we shall see before long.”

About Gokhale, T.V. Parvate says: “A graduate at 18, professor and associate editor of the ‘Sudharak’ at 20, editor of the Quarterly Journal and Secretary of the Sarvajanik Sabha and Secretary of the Provincial Conference at 25, Secretary of the National Congress at 29, leading witness before an important royal commission at 31, provincial legislator at 34, Imperial legislator at 36, President of the Indian National Congress at 39, national envoy to the Imperial Government and founder of institutions at 40, a recognised Leader of Opposition in such Indian parliament as obtained in those days till his death, trusted tribune of the people and a man of truth, rectitude and character in whom the rulers confided at all times and, above all, a patriot whom Mahatma Gandhi himself regarded as his master and a perfect man in the political field—what a truly marvellous and brilliant career and beyond anybody’s emulation!”

On his death, K. Natarajan, Editor of the Indian Social Reformer, wrote, “It is not too much to say that never before in the history of this country, have intellect and character such
as those of Gokhale, been devoted to the furtherance of secular aims in a spirit of renunciation."

**SUGGESTED READINGS**


Surendranath Banerjea was one of the greatest orators India has produced. He had a wonderful memory from which he could reproduce page after page without any mistake. He was elected twice the President of the Indian National Congress. He was the first Indian to qualify himself for the Indian Civil Service by appearing in the open competitive examination in London. It is unfortunate that he left the Congress in 1918 and set up a new organisation known as the Indian National Liberal Federation and became its President. He fought the first elections under the Montford Reforms and became a Minister of Local Self-Government. In 1921, he was knighted. The man who had made history as “Surrender Not” fell from the high place occupied by him in national life and there was general jubilation in 1923 when he was defeated in the elections. He could not adapt himself to the changed times.

Surendranath Benerjea was born in 1848 in a Brahmin family. He was a brilliant student throughout. He was a prizeman every year, in school, in the college and in the university. He went to England at the age of 20 and passed the open competitive examination of the Indian Civil Service. However, his name was removed from the list of successful candidates in the Indian Civil Service on grounds of a discrepancy in age. He was not prepared to take the decision lying down. He moved the Queen’s Bench, fought his case
and won. On 22 November 1871, he started his official career as Assistant Magistrate at Sylhet. He had hardly worked for more than a year when he was again disqualified on account of some technical offence. He again went to England to fight his case but he was officially informed that he had been dismissed from the Indian Civil Service. Thus disappointed, he decided to complete his study of law so that he could be called to the Bar. However, he was refused admission on the ground that he had been dismissed from the Indian Civil Service.

It was in these circumstances that Surendranath Banerjea came back to Calcutta in June 1875. There was a sense of disenchantment and there was nothing to sustain him. He strongly felt that he had suffered because he was an Indian, “a member of a community that lay disorganised, had no public opinion and no voice in the counsels of their Government.” He also felt that the personal wrong done to him was “an illustration of the helpless impotency of our people.”

At the instance of Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, Surendranath Banerjea joined the Metropolitan Institution as Professor of English. Later on, he joined the Free Church College on the invitation of the Principal of that College. In 1882, he took over charge of a high school which became the nucleus of the Ripon College.

Surendranath Banerjea believed in “the play of a living magnetism between the teacher and the taught.” He also believed that while politics was “more or less ephemeral”, educational work had in it “the elements of permanent utility.”

Surendranath Banerjea became a hero of the student community. His oratory was instrumental in attracting thousands of students to the meetings addressed by him and they were willing to carry out his orders and suffer for their actions. Banerjea put before them the ideals of Mazzini who had played an important part in bringing about the unification of Italy.

Surendranath Banerjea had a hand in the establishment of the Indian Association in 1876. When in 1877, the maximum age limit for the Civil Service Examination was lowered from 21 to 19, there were loud protests in India. The Indian Association organised a national protest against the Government. A big public meeting was held at Calcutta. Surendranath Banerjea went on a tour of India and with the object of creat-
ing a strong public opinion against the measure, addressed meetings at Agra, Lahore, Amritsar, Meerut, Ambala, Delhi, Kanpur, Lucknow, Banaras and Aligarh. The tour was a great success. He was welcomed everywhere.

The Indian Association also carried on agitation against the Arms Act and the Vernacular Press Act and in favour of the protection of the tenants from oppression by the Zamin-dars. The Indian Association also played an important part in the controversy regarding the Ilbert Bill. Banerjea had criticised the action of Mr. J. F. Norris, a judge of the Calcutta High Court, who had insisted on the production in his court of an idol of Saligram for identification. He was tried for contempt of court and put in jail.

Surendranath Banerjea played an important part when the first meeting of the National Conference was held in Calcutta in 1883. In 1885, he sent invitations for the second National Conference as the Secretary of the Indian Association. Although he had been ignored by the sponsors of the first meeting of the Indian National Congrees held in 1885, Surendranath Banerjea showed his magnanimity of mind by agreeing to merge the National Conference into the Indian National Congress.

Surendranath Banerjea understood the importance of the Press and no wonder he decided to use it “as a great instrument of propagandism”. In 1879, he became the proprietor and Editor of the The Bengalee. In 1900, he made it a daily. His association with The Bengalee ended in 1920 when he became a Minister.

Surendranath Banerjea rose to the greatest heights in life while working in the Congress. There was no other Congress-man who was so regular in attending all the meetings of the Congress, held from year to year. He was the Congress President in 1895 at Patna and in 1902 at Ahmedabad. He attended all the sessions except two.

Surendranath Banerjea was a great parliamentarian. From 1893 to 1901, he sat in the Bengal Council. From 1913 to 1918, he was a member of the Imperial Legislative Council. In 1909 and 1918, he went to England in connection with the coming reforms.

Surendranath Banerjea belonged to the Moderates School
of thought in the Congress. He stood for the broadening of the basis of the British Government in India and not complete independence of the country. His view was that the English civilisation was "the noblest which the world had ever seen." It was the emblem of a union between England and India. He was proud of the fact that the Indians were the citizens of a great and free empire. He held the view that the rights of the Englishmen were our rights, their privileges our privileges and their Constitution as our own Constitution. He believed that India would in fullness of time find its place in the great confederacy of the free states English in their origin, English in their character and English in their institution. To quote Surendranath Banerjea: "Let us work...with unwavering loyalty to the British connection.... Then will the Congress have fulfilled its mission—justified the hopes of those who founded it; one who worked for it not by the supersession of British rule in India, but by broadening its basis, liberalizing its spirit, ennobling its character, and placing it upon the unchangeable foundations of a nation's affections. It is not severance that we look forward to—but unification, permanent embodiment, as an integral part of that great Empire which has given the rest of the world the models of free institutions......covered the world with free states. Places, hitherto the chosen abode of barbarism are now the home of freedom. Wherever floats the flag of England, there free Governments have been established. We appeal to England gradually to change the character of her rule in India, to liberalise it, to shift its foundations, to adapt it to the newly-developed environments of the country and the people, so that, in the fullness of time, India may find its place in the great confederacy of free states, English in their institutions, rejoicing in their permanent and indissoluble union with England, a glory to the mother-country, and an honour to the human race. Then will England have fulfilled her great mission in the East, accomplished her high destiny among nations, repaid the long standing debt which the West owes to the East, and cover herself with imperishable renown and everlasting glory." Again, "To England we look for guidance. To England we look for sympathy in the struggle. From England must come the crowing mandate which will enfranchise our peoples.
England is our political guide and our moral preceptor in the exalted sphere of political duty. English history has taught those principles of freedom which we cherish with our life-blood. We have been fed upon the strong food of English constitutional freedom."

In his retirement after 1923, Surendranath Banerjea wrote his autobiography entitled "A Nation in Making." It is truly "a sumptuous and varied banquet" to the man who has an appetite for good political literature.

Srinivasa Sastri gives his estimate of Surendranath Banerjea in these words: "In the long roll of Indian patriots there is hardly a name so large and conspicuous as Surendranath's. A few shone more brilliantly and with purer lustre, but none excelled him in magnitude or spread of illumination. In steady periods and glittering phrases he formulated the ideal of Indian nationality and taught the full meaning and scope of Indian patriotism. Surendranath was the morning star that heralded the dawn of our public life." B. C. Pal says, "The one fact that stands out, above all things else in the life and work of Surendranath Banerjea, is that he occupies a front place among that glorious band, headed by Raja Ram Mohun Roy, whom history will proclaim to the future generations of this and other lands as the REGENERATORS OF MODERN INDIA."

**SUGGESTED READINGS**


Banerjea, S. N. : Speeches and Writings (Madras.)
Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya
(1861-1946)

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya joined the Congress in 1886 and remained its member all his life. His public life extended over 60 years. He was a great parliamentarian. He was elected the President of the Indian National Congress in 1909 and 1918. For many years, he was a member of the Central Legislature and he was returned practically unopposed. It looks strange that he was elected twice its President by the Indian National Congress and thrice its President by the Hindu Mahasabha. He was a member of the Swarajist Party but later on left it and formed the Nationalist Party when he found that the Congress was not safeguarding the interests of the Hindus. As a Congressman, he was a conservative. To begin with, he was friendly disposed towards the British Empire, but later happenings changed him completely.

He possessed enormous physical and mental energy. This is evident from his many-sided activities. He lived four strenuous careers: lawyer, politician, educationist and reformer. As an achievement of one man, the Banaras Hindu University is a miracle. It will go down to posterity as an enduring monument to his greatness. It projects in its magnificent form the greatness of its founder. The greatest gift of Malaviyaji was his power to persuade people to part with their money for a
great cause. His power of effective appeal to the emotions of the people was unsurpassed. He laid the siege with dogged tenacity and there was no escape until the indemnity was paid. He collected funds in millions and there was not a breath of suspicion against him even though the accounts were seldom published. People had complete faith in his integrity. He was rightly called the prince of beggars.

Malaviyaji believed in the philosophy of plain living and high thinking. He abstained from alcohol, tobacco, meat etc. He looked like a visitor out of Tretayug, a legend in the flesh, a glorious reminiscence of the days of Ramchandra.

Many reasons have been advanced for his success. In the first place, his appeal was not to modern culture but to primitive emotions. His roots were in the past. His conservatism enabled him to keep a firm hand on the masses as well as on the purse of the Marwaris. He did nothing which could make him unpopular. Secondly, his success was due to his capacity for keeping friends. He would not, if he could help it, lose the regard of the meanest creature alive. Recrimination found in him no response. Perhaps, he never said a wounding word in life, certainly not to any one's face. He ignored attacks. He did not criticise. He merely stated. His critics could not help being moved by the deference he paid to their opinions. He pleased people by discussing their most trivial affairs which were nearest their hearts. His own views were tentative till the others proved them. He talked to his subordinates as if he was consulting them and they surrendered to him. He never provoked others. He was the most accessible and cordial of men and he talked with great apparent candour.

It was said of Tacitus that he seemed to aim at putting a book into a chapter, a chapter into a page and a page into a sentence. Of Malaviyaji, it could be said that he aimed at putting a sentence into a page and a page into a chapter. The result was that his rising to speak was a signal for a general exodus from the chamber and his telegrams assumed the length of leading articles. When he started talking, he saw no reason to stop. There was no end to his oratory. Sometimes his preliminary observations lasted an hour although he generally left for a meeting with the determination not to speak. No man could wander more widely from his subject without losing
the thread.

Malaviyaji was an orthodox Hindu but he was extremely tolerant and catholic where the susceptibilities of others were concerned. The only reason why he did not go the whole hog with Gandhiji in his undiluted nationalism was his fear that in trying to boost and favour the Muslims, the British may unduly repress the Hindus. His views were shared by such powerful stalwarts as M.R. Jayakar, N.C. Kelkar and Aney.

Malaviyaji was known for his spirit of toleration. Mahatma Gandhi once wrote about him thus: “His toleration is really beyond compare.” He had a heart “large enough to accommodate even his enemies.” This is what Malaviyaji wrote to Mahatma Gandhi in May 1924 on the question of Moplah relief: “I agree with every word of what you have written about helping the Moplah women and children. Where is the merit in a man who returns good for good? The wise call him only good who does good to the evil-doer. They alone are good who do good to those that do harm to them; and these good souls adorn the earth, for it is better for their birth.”

Among our public men, Malaviyaji was, even more than Mahatma Gandhi, an example of all that is best in Hindu culture and the very pattern of Hindu Dharam. C.Y. Chintamani went to the extent of saying that Malaviyaji was Dharmatma.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Malaviya, Madan Mohan : His Life and Speeches. Madras.
R.C. Duttoccupied a unique position. He was a great intellectual, nationalist and administrator. He presided over the Lucknow Session of the Indian National Congress held in 1899. He made himself famous by making the statement that “There is no better way of creating sedition than by suppressing free discussion in newspapers and meetings.” He is famous for his Letters to Lord Curzon and his *Economic History*. The former fixed the public opinion in India and nobody cared to consider the answers of Lord Curzon. “That settles it” was the general feeling. Without his *Economic History* and its damning story of England’s commercial and fiscal dealings with India, the public mind would not have been ready for the boycott movement. He did a lot of pioneer work which helped the growth of the nationalist movement in the country.

He was born in 1848 and he joined the Indian Civil Service in 1869 after coming out successful in the competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service held in London. He was posted in Bengal where he worked as Joint Magistrate, Magistrate and Commissioner. He was the first Indian to serve as a District Magistrate for a long period. He was also the first Indian to be appointed Commissioner of a Division. That created a great deal of flutter in the Anglo-Indian circles and the question of his appointment went up as far as the India Office. In 1897, he resigned from the Indian Civil Service,
nine years before he was due to retire. Many reasons have been
given for his resignation. One reason was his failing health.
Another reason was that he wanted to devote himself whole-
heartedly to literary pursuits which he always called his “first
love”. Another reason was that he wished for greater indepen-
dence and larger opportunities of striving for that progress in
self-government and those liberal reforms for which the time
was ripe. His long experience in administration had convinced
him that the British rule in India could be more efficient and
more popular by the admission of the people to a share in the
control and direction of the administration. He felt an irresis-
tible impulse to take part in national endeavour to secure this
share for his countrymen.

After retirement, R.C. Dutt settled down in London to
carry on his literary activities and create public opinion in
England in favour of India. The London University College
created a Chair in Indian History and appointed him to that
Chair. During 1898-9, he delivered lectures on the history,
civilization, religion and literature of ancient India. In 1904,
he became the Revenue Minister of Baroda. In 1907 he was
appointed a Member of the Royal Commission on Decentrali-
sation. On his return to India in March 1909, he was appoint-
ed the Dewan of Baroda but he died before the year ended.

R.C. Dutt wrote both in English and Bengali. In 1872, he
published his first book entitled “Three Years in Europe”. In
1875, he published “The peasantry of Bengal” in which he
depicted the sufferings of the raiyats in Bengal. In 1877, he
published a short history of Bangali Literature under the title
of “Literature of Bengal.” During 1889-90, he published
“History of Civilisation in Ancient India” in three volumes. In
1902, he published “Economic History of India under early
British Rule” (1757-1837). Two years later, he published “The
Economic History of India in the Victorian Age”. In 1894, he
published selections from Indian poetry rendered into English
verse. He published his translations of the Mahabharata and
the Ramayana in 1899 and 1900. He wrote six novels in Ben-
gali. Four of them were historical dealing with events com-
prising a century of Mughal rule from the reign of Akbar to
that of Aurangzeb. During 1885-87, he published the Bengali
translation of the Rig Ved. He also published nine volumes
of Hindu Shastras consisting of the text and their Bengali translations. As a recognition of his services to the Bengali literature, he was elected the first President of the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad (Academy of Bengali Literature).

R.C. Dutt took keen interest in the welfare of the peasantry of India. He addressed to Lord Curzon a series of letters in 1900 regarding the Land Tax in the different provinces of India which he considered as a question of “life and death” to the Indian cultivator. To quote him: “The impoverishment of an Indian Province under British administration is a more serious calamity than any defeat or disaster which had been known in the history of British Rule in India.” In his speeches delivered in England, he told his gatherings that in ancient days “the land belonged to the nation, not to any privileged class.” After the establishment of British rule, the “ancient form of village self-government” had “unfortunately perished under the too centralised system of British administration... Landlords have taken the place of these communities”. After the establishment of British rule, there came into existence the arbitrary enhancement of land tax without the right of appeal to the courts. That led to results harmful to the peasants.

In his second reply to Lord Curzon’s Land Resolution in March 1902, R.C. Dutt stated: “The cultivators paying the land tax live in a state of perpetual uncertainty, they do not know on what grounds the state will claim enhancement at the next settlement; they do not comprehend to what extent the enhancement will be made... In the recent Malabar settlement, the assessment was raised 85 per cent at Palghat, 55 per cent at Calicut, 84 per cent at Kurumbranad and 105 per cent at Walanadu. Such enhancements must deaden agricultural enterprise and keep the cultivating population in a state of chronic poverty.” In his other letter, R.C. Dutt pleaded for the removal of the rule according to which half the net produce was being realised as land revenue. He suggested one-fifth of the gross produce as land revenue. R.C. Dutt wrote, “No impartial observer of India, no prejudiced critic in India can think of the wretched and almost universal poverty of the vast population of India without a feeling of misery and sorrow or can read of the frequent and fatal famines of that country without a feeling of pain and of humiliation.”
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Tilak was the father of the Indian freedom struggle, the maker of the Indian National Congress and one of the architects of modern India. He was a great fighter, whose relentless struggle against British imperialism made him a hero in the eyes of his countrymen and the most hated man among the British bureaucrats. He symbolised all that was the best and greatest in India's culture. He was the first Indian leader to impress upon men of learning and light in the country that unless they had the support of the people, they would not attain their objective. Constitutional agitation alone could have no effect on the British Government. He tried to organise the people under the banner of the Congress and made it a real spokesman of the people. It was he who first brought the politics and the common man together. He inaugurated national festivals and functions to awaken the people to national pride, national self-respect and national honour. He was the first leader to use the word Swaraj. He organised the people and set them on their march. He possessed all the qualities of a great leader, *viz.*, boldness in thought and expression, ability to take quick decisions, fearlessness and sincerity of purpose. He was a terror and nightmare to the British Government. At every trial, his influence spread wider and his personality loomed large on the political horizon of India. India will always remain grateful to Tilak for the
deathless struggle he launched for the deliverance of his countrymen from political bondage and endless sacrifices and sufferings he made to the cause of his motherland.

Tilak was born on 23 July 1856 and he died on 1 August 1920. He was associated with the foundation of the Deccan Education Society and the Fergusson College. He started two newspapers, the Kesari and Maharatha. He started anti-cow killing societies, Akharas and Lathi Clubs with the object of creating among the people of Maharashtra a manly spirit so that they might be able to sacrifice themselves for the freedom of the country. He organised the Ganapati festival with a view to infuse among young men both religious and patriotic fervour. The Ganapati festival became more and more popular every year and it brought millions of Maharashtrians together on the same platform. It created among them the feelings of oneness. Tilak also started the Shivaji Movement in 1895 with a view to inspire the youth of India to follow the example of Shivaji and liberate India from the political bondage of the foreigner. On the occasion of the Shivaji festival, there were lectures, fencing with lathies, processions, kathas and singing parties.

In 1897, Tilak was arrested for sedition and sentenced to 18 months’ rigorous imprisonment. The jury which tried him consisted of six Europeans and three Indians. All the Europeans convicted him while all the Indians found him not guilty. Tilak was asked to apologise but he refused to do so. It is for this reason, it is said, that the year 1897 is a great landmark in the history of the movement for India’s freedom. The meek and mild Indian praised by Rudyard Kipling died in 1897 and his place was taken by an Indian who was defiant and challenged foreign rule—an Indian vibrant with new life and dreaming new dreams of liberty and independence.

In 1908 again, Tilak was tried for sedition and sentenced to 6 years’ imprisonment. The jury which tried him consisted of seven Europeans and two Indians. As in 1897, all the Europeans held him guilty and all the Indians acquitted him. The result of this conviction was that Tilak was put in the Mandalay jail from 1908 to 1914.

When Tilak came back from Burma in 1914, the First
World War started. He asked the people of India to help the British Government in the hope that the Government would reciprocate. However, when he did not find any response, he began to attack the Government. He openly asked the people not to help the Government in its war efforts.

Tilak was opposed to the policy of mendicancy followed by the then leaders of the Indian National Congress. He wanted the Congress to learn to defy authority. The Congress must be ready to make sacrifices for winning freedom for the country. He did not want the people to be violent but if peaceful methods could not bring about independence for the country, there was to be no hesitation in using violence. To quote Tilak: “I admit that we must ask for our rights, but we must ask with the consciousness that the demand cannot be refused. There is great difference between asking and petitioning. If you are prepared to fight in the event of your demand being turned down, be sure you will not be refused. Protests are of no avail. Mere protests, not backed by self-reliance, will not help the people. The days of protests and prayers have gone. Do not rely much upon the sympathy of the rulers.”

At a public meeting in Calcutta, Tilak declared that the people should learn to be self-reliant. “It is impossible to expect that our petitions will be heard unless backed by firm resolution............(The) three P’s—Pray, Please and Protest—will not do unless backed by solid force. Look to the examples of Ireland, Japan and Russia and follow their methods.”

It was Tilak who taught the people of India the philosophy of defiance. If the Government was not prepared to concede willingly, any methods could be used to make the Government do what the people wanted it to do. He gave to the people of India the slogan: “Swaraj is my birthright and I shall have it.” He was convinced of the fact that no power in the world could withhold from the people of India the right to independence. People looked upon Tilak as “the man who is to expel the British from India.”

The task before Tilak was a Herculean one. On the one hand, he had to fight against Indian leaders, such as Ranade, Bhandarkar and Pherozesbah Mehta, and on the other, the might of the British Government in India. He had to fight
the old guard in the Congress single-handed with arguments, facing their attacks, putting forth fire and over-powering their opposition at every session of the Congress. He had to battle against the Government with his pen, press and platform. He had to educate the people to stand up for their rights and compel the Government to redress their grievances. The fight against the Moderates in the Congress continued till Tilak ultimately triumphed towards the end of his life. It must have been a terrible sight to see the Moderates siding with the Government against Tilak. There was not a word of protest against the Government from the Moderates when Tilak was awarded 6 years imprisonment in 1908. Such was the bitterness between the two groups.

Tilak did not make a fetish of non-violence. To risk life for the cause of one’s country is the greatest sacrifice one can make. Tilak acknowledged the fact that the revolutionaries were fighting selflessly for their country and he never discouraged or disparaged them. Tilak himself never planned a national insurrection in the manner of the revolutionaries. However, if such a revolution was started by them, Tilak would certainly have supported them. Tilak considered even an armed revolt as constitutional. He often said that he would join a revolt provided there was a possibility of success. Tilak’s relations with the revolutionary leaders were cordial and godfatherly. He advocated equally both sides of the freedom struggle, revolutionary and constitutional. Tilak was an eminent scholar of Sanskrit and he possessed mathematical and astronomical genius. He could have dominated any assembly of learned men in the world. His vast knowledge made him a ready speaker, a walking encyclopaedia. He was a pioneer in the field of Indian journalism. His lucid, forceful, pure and direct style struck the leaders and burnt in their hearts. His writings, his lectures, his methods, his agitations and his movements were all inspired by the noble mission of Swaraj. His name stands high in the world among the liberators of nations, such as Mazzini, Washington and Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

On his death, Mahatma Gandhi paid the following tribute to Tilak: “His patriotism was a passion with him. He knew no religion, but love of his country. He was a born democrat.” He had an iron will which he used for his country.
His life was an open book. His tastes were simple. His private life was spotlessly clean. He had dedicated his wonderful talents to his country. No man preached the gospel of Swaraj with the consistency and insistence of Lokmanya. For us he will go down to the generations yet unborn as a maker of modern India. They will revere his memory as of a man who lived for them and died for them.”

C. V. Raghavachariar, the Congress President in 1920, described Tilak as “a great son of India whose manhood was a life of selfless suffering in our country’s cause in a spirit of dedication rarely surpassed in the annals of national struggles for freedom.” Jawaharlal Nehru described Tilak as “Father of India’s revolution”.

About Tilak, Aurobindo wrote thus: “The Congress movement was for a long time purely occidental in its mind, character and methods, confined to the English-educated few, founded on the political rights and interests of the people read in the light of English History and European ideals, but with no roots either in the past of the country or in the inner spirit of the nation. Mr. Tilak was the first political leader to break through the routine of its somewhat academical methods, to bridge the gulf between the present and the past, and to restore continuity to the political life of the nation. He developed a language and spirit and he used methods which Indianised the movement and brought into it the masses.” Aurobindo further says that Tilak was a born leader of Maharashtra. He was the incarnation of the Maratha character, Maratha qualities and Maratha spirit. He occupied a position in his province which had no parallel in the rest of India. He was not a demagogue. His speeches were made of hard and straight thinking. He was a man of serious and practical action. He was entirely a democratic politician who could both awaken the spirit of the masses and also respond to their spirit. He moved among his followers as one of them in perfect equality. He was always able to unite all the classes of men behind him. He was the leader not only of the educated but also of the merchant, the trader, the villager and the peasant. All Maharashtra understood him when he spoke or wrote. All Maharashtra was ready to follow him when he signalled them.

About Tilak, Swami Shraddhanand observed: “Maharaj
Tilak occupies an exalted position among the pioneers of political workers who were the first to preach the doctrine of political unity. What other hero has suffered so much in the service of motherland as this illustrious person has done? Will not the soldiers constituting the army for the service of the motherland bow down before the mandate of the weather-beaten General?

About Tilak, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar says that Tilak was primarily a man of action whose chief characteristics were selflessness and courage. He was resentful of superficial criticism of Indian scriptures and institutions. He was intolerant of the British Government's patronising attempts at social uplift and even more intolerant of those Indians who followed the European lead. No wonder, he came to be known as the champion of orthodoxy. Tilak had an inherent passion to work for Swadeshi and Swaraj. He was one of the first to proclaim that India should attain complete independence and be free from all outside interference in politics and in the ordering of her social life. He was so impatient to get Swaraj that he was prepared to use any means to achieve it. He was equally willing to support a revolt by the Indian princes. He was anxious to connect Tilak with the murder of Rand and Chirol, in fact tried to connect the writings of Tilak with the murder of Jackson but Tilak did not favour terrorism and actions like political dacoities and conspiracies. Tilak was no more than a militant constitutional agitator and therefore, not useful to the secret society missions that had sprung up in Bengal. "As a scholar, as a teacher, as a great champion and loyal defender of his associates and followers, as an inflexible patriot and as a man of action ceaselessly bent on his goal, determined on every sacrifice in the achievement of that goal and in the main, thinking more of the end than of the means, Tilak 'The father of Indian Unrest' as one of his critics dubbed him, was a unique phenomenon. He can be classified along with men like Cromwell, Robespierre, Mazzini and Bolivar. In truth, in their ruthless patriotism and their religious training and background and their revolutionary fervour, Crom-
well and Tilak closely resembled each other. The history of
Indian freedom cannot be written without assigning to him a
prominent place in the hierarchy of those who wrought for
the liberation of the country.” (Biographical Vistas, pp.
166 and 175).

About Tilak, Shri M. C. Chagla says: “He brought politics
to the masses, proclaimed that Swaraj was his birthright and
inaugurated an open conspiracy for the attainment of what he
considered was the birthright of the people.”

The view of M. A. Buch is that Tilak brought “political
philosophy in India from heaven to earth, from the Council
Hall or the Congress mandap to the street and the market.
Politics so far was comparatively a feeble affair, it lacked life:
It is the great merit of Tilak that he put a new self-confidence,
a new self-assertiveness into his people...It was reserved for
Tilak to make both the Government and professional politi-
cians look for a new power, viz., the people. It was one of
the standing arguments of the official party that the Congress
did not represent the people. Tilak cleverly turned the tables
on the Government by boldly identifying himself with the
masses. Tilak’s attempt to democratise the political movement
and bring it home vividly into the consciousness of the average
man, infused a new life and vigour into the movement and
gave it a very different character.” (Rise and Growth of Indian
Militant Nationalism, p. 25).

Subhas Chandra Bose paid the following tribute to Tilak:
“I knew that Lokamanya Tilak was one of the greatest men
produced by India in recent times. I had often tried to con-
template the loftiness of his character and to comprehend the
versatility of his intellect. I had often pondered over the my-
stery of his rich and wonderful personality; but I confess
that not till I was thrust inside the stone-walls of Mandalay
jail did the magnitude of his greatness reveal itself to me. I had
the privilege of living for two years under the shadow of that
wooden cage—it was not a masonic building—where Lokamanya
Tilak lived in complete isolation for nearly six years. And
until one has lived in Mandalay jail for some time it is not
possible to realise the soul-killing atmosphere and the inhu-
man conditions to which Lokamanya had been subjected dur-
ing his incarceration. Words fail to express the greatness of
one who could come out of this ordeal triumphant, whose soul could break through the parched stones of Mandalay jail and blossom forth in richness and grandeur. Lokamanya alone could rise above such dismal surroundings and convert the dark and dreary hours into one long *tapasya*, the consummation of which manifested itself in his sublime creation 'Gita-Rahasyam'.

Dhananjay Keer has attempted a comparison of Tilak with Gandhi. According to him, both belonged to the masses. Both were short in stature, thin in build, muscular and simple in appearance, simple in habits. Both were ascetics and altruists. Both were lawyers. However, Gandhi had conducted cases in courts, but Tilak never practised law. Both had phenomenal energy and were fearless. Both were effective speakers. Both appealed to the masses. Both tried to help recruitment. Gandhiji was a holder of the Kaiser-i-Hind Medal conferred on him by the British Government for his meritorious services during the War. Gandhiji was respected both by the Government and the people: Tilak was the most hated man in India by the bureaucrats, feared by the Moderates and suspected by the Muslims. Gandhiji was called Mahatma, Tilak was called Lokamanya. The models for Gandhiji were Christ and Buddha. The model for Tilak was Lord Krishna. Both loved the Gita, but their methods differed. Gandhiji would say: “My method is not Tilak’s method.” Tilak made people fearless and self-respecting. Gandhiji turned the people against the Government in his own way. Tilak said that he worked within the law. But Gandhiji said he wanted to break oppressive laws. Tilak touched on the problem of the Untouchables when it was inevitable, but Gandhiji had in his Ashram an untouchable family. Both believed in the Chaturvarnya. Tilak had opposed the Age of Consent Bill. Gandhiji said that any sensible legislation in the direction of raising the age of consent would have his approval. Gandhiji assessed more correctly the urgent necessity of the removal of untouchability, of women’s education, of improving the lot of the working classes and the necessity of a just solution to the grievances of the non-Brahmans. The moral courage of both was supreme. Tilak was a scholar-statesman; Gandhiji an ascetic statesman, Gandhiji’s father was a
statesman, a Dewan. Tilak hailed from the Chitpavan Brahman community having a tradition of politics and public service. Gandhiji enriched the Gujarati language, Tilak enriched the Marathi language. Both were journalists and men of mission. (Lokamanya Tilak, pp. 438-9).

Tilak has often been compared with Gokhale. Both of them were contemporaries, but both of them were poles apart. Gokhale was the admirer of the West. He was persuasive, conciliatory and constructive. On the other hand, Tilak was an admirer of India’s past. He was rugged in personality, provocative in expression, a stickler for rights and a relentless fighter. The speeches of Gokhale were polished. Those were full of logic. Tilak with his terse and forceful Marathi writings and his speeches were the delight of the Maharathas. The comparison between Gokhale and Tilak is the comparison between Gladstone and Disraeli. While Gokhale asked for concessions, Tilak demanded his rights. Gokhale made requests while Tilak made demands. Tilak was convinced that nothing would come out of moderation and the British must be squeezed and not cajoled.

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya has compared Tilak and Gokhale in these words: “Tilak and Gokhale were both patriots of the first order. Both had made heavy sacrifices in life. But their temperaments were widely different from each other. Gokhale was a moderate and Tilak was an Extremist, if we may use the language in vogue at this time. Gokhale’s aim was to improve the existing constitution; Tilak’s was to reconstruct it; Gokhale had necessarily to work with the bureaucracy; Tilak had necessarily to fight it. Gokhale stood for co-operation wherever possible and opposition wherever necessary. Tilak was inclined towards a policy of obstruction. Gokhale’s primary concern was with the administration and its improvement; Tilak’s supreme concern was the nation and its upbuilding. Gokhale’s ideal was love and sacrifice; Tilak’s was service and suffering. Gokhale’s method sought to win the foreigner; Tilak’s to replace him. Gokhale depended upon others’ help; Tilak upon self-help. Gokhale looked to the classes and the intelligentsia; Tilak to the masses and the millions. Gokhale’s arena was the Council Chamber; Tilak’s forum was the village mandap. Gokhale’s objective was self-
government for which the people had to fit themselves by answering the tests prescribed by the English; Tilak's object was Swaraj which is the birthright of every Indian and which he shall have without let or hindrance from the foreigner. Gokhale was on a level with his age; Tilak was in advance of his times."

In his biography of Tilak, Dhananjay Keer has also attempted a comparison of Tilak and Gokhale. According to him, Gokhale was Ranade's political heir. He derived inspiration from Ranade who believed in social equality and social justice but who welcomed British rule as a divine dispensation. Tilak was self-luminous and self-made. Gokhale criticised the Government in a parliamentary vein, whereas Tilak agitated against it and faced imprisonment. Gokhale sought interviews with the spokesmen of the British Government and its representatives in India and interpreted the aspirations of the people, impressing upon them the necessity of introducing reforms. He cooperated with the Government where desirable and opposed it where necessary. Gokhale said to the British Government: "We can understand your difficulties, but these measures are neither proper, nor justifiable. It is not good for a Government to violate its pledges to the people and flout their aspirations. This will anger them. So, Sir, open your eyes to the realities and grant our demands." Tilak fought with Government and said: "These are the rights of the people and they must have them." Gokhale tried to understand the difficulties of the rulers. Tilak wore the rebel robe and always guarded the interests of the people at any cost. Gokhale's genius being parliamentary and of constitutional nature, his field of action was confined to the Council Chambers, British Parliamentary Committees and lecture halls. Tilak's field of action spread from the press to mass meetings. The medium of expression of the one was English, whereas that of the other was Marathi, the mother-tongue of the people. One was the man of the classes and the intelligentsia, the other was a man of the people. Gokhale became a C.I.E. and was respected by the Government. He objected to his being described as a Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, while the Government branded Tilak as its inveterate foe, and yet he was the idol of the people.
Both Tilak and Gokhale were teachers in their early life. Neither was ever a Government servant. Both were life-long servants of the people. Both wore turbans. Gokhale’s dress more or less inclined to that of modern times. Tilak’s dress essentially belonged to the old order and was simple. He was rather indifferent to his dress. The one was a parliamentary type of orator, the other was a simple, but effective speaker. Gokhale was a studious man, whereas Tilak was an eminent scholar. By temperament, Gokhale was gentle, polite and full of human kindness, a politician who probably never uttered a wounding word in his life. At an obscene expression uttered in his presence, he would hang his head in shame. By temperament, Tilak was kind, but his thoughts often verged on extremism or revolution and his pen was vitriolic. He did not take notice of an obscene expression if uttered by his colleagues in his presence. The view of Tilak was that as long as the private character of a man did not affect his public work, they need not look into his private character. The motto of one was love and service, that of the other was action and suffering. The goal of Gokhale was self-Government for India within the British Empire, whereas that of Tilak was Swaraj.

Gokhale worked untiringly to reform the Government. Tilak fought endlessly to replace it. Gokhale said that rebellion, aiding or abetting a foreign invasion and resort to crime, barring these three things, all else was constitutional. Tilak once observed that “the only constitution we have is the Penal Code.” He sometimes said that if there appeared even a 50 per cent chance for the success of an armed rebellion, he would resort to it, trusting God to give success to the extent of the remaining half. Gokhale represented a type of statesmen who are useful in a free country for its development, consolidation and democracy. Tilak represented the type of a revolutionary leader, whose role was to win back the independence of the nation. Gokhale said of Tilak that had he been born during Peshwa rule, he would have won new territories. (Lokamanya Tilak, pp. 229-231).
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Bipin Chandra Pal belonged to the famous Trio known as Bal-Pal-Lal (Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai). Sri Aurobindo characterised B.C. Pal as “one of the mightiest prophets of nationalism” and called him “perhaps the best and most original thinker in the country” of his time. He was a man of mission. He was a great publicist and a magnificent orator. He was destined to become the chief propagator of the Swadeshi Movement of 1905. He had an original and soul-stirring message to deliver to his country. If Sri Aurobindo was great as a writer, B.C Pal was great as an orator. It was on account of the part played by him in the Swadeshi Movement that Prof. Binoy Kumar Sarkar has described him as “the father of the Bengalee revolution”. Prof. Sarkar says: “It was Pal more than anybody else who constructed the revolutionary political philosophy of Young Bengal and succeeded in annexing Madras or South India to that creed. The radical rationalism which likewise cemented the alliance of Bengal with Bombay and the Punjab was more the creation of Pal than of Ghosh.” (Villages and Towns as Social Patterns, pp. 629-30).

B.C. Pal was born on 7 November 1858 in a common middle class family in Sylhet (now in Bangladesh). He was a self-made man in the true sense of the term. He began his career as a Headmaster of a High School in Cuttack. He also
started a High School in Sylhet and served there for five years. Later on, he served as Headmaster of a High School in Bangalore. He also worked as the Librarian of the City Library in Calcutta. In 1876, he was initiated into the Brahmo Samaj by Pandit Sivanath Sastri.

He was inspired in his youth by his political Guru, Surendranath Banerjea. He began to take interest in politics even in the early eighties of the last century. He attended the Congress session held at Madras in 1887 and gave an inspiring lecture in support of the repeal of the Arms Act. However, his chief preoccupation was the missionary work on behalf of the Brahmo Samaj. During 1898-1900, he visited England and America as a spokesman of the Brahmo Samaj. There he delivered many fine speeches on Indian thought and culture. On his return to India, he started on 12 August 1901 his famous English weekly the *New India*. To begin with, it was intended to be a vehicle of cultural propaganda, but later on it became the mouth-piece of resurgent Indian nationalism. At the beginning, *New India* concentrated on the economic and educational problems of the country.

It is not correct to say that immediately after his return from England, B.C. Pal set himself to propagate radical political thought in the country. The fact is that even after that, B.C. Pal continued to have faith in the justice and generosity of the British. He shared the views of other Moderate leaders of the Congress.

A change was witnessed in the tone of *New India* from the beginning of 1904. That was due to the official announcement in December 1903 that Bengal was going to be partitioned. An Anti-Partition agitation was started against the arbitrary decision of the Government and *New India* took active part in it. The result was that *New India* was changed from a predominantly cultural magazine into a political organ. Like a true leader of men, B.C. Pal flung himself headlong into the agitation. He emphasized the futility of the old methods of agitation through prayers, petitions and protests. B.C. Pal wrote thus in the 21 December 1904 issue of *New India* : "The belief that England will of her own free will help Indians out of their long established civil servitude and establish those free institutions of Government which she herself values so much was once cheri-
shed, but all hope has now been abandoned. What India really wants is a reform in the existing constitution of the state so that the Indians will govern themselves as other nations do, follow the bend of their own national genius, work out their own political destiny and take up their own legitimate place, as an ancient and civilised people in the nations of the world.”

The Anti-Partition agitation going on in the country reached a very critical stage when the Government announced its final decision regarding the partition of Bengal on 19 July 1905. B.C. Pal threw himself heart and soul into the Swadeshi Movement and towards the end of 1905, he emerged as the greatest leader and architect of the national movement. Both through his writings and public orations, he drove home the new gospel of liberty. His eloquence had no parallel in those days. He infused into the boycott movement a dynamic and revolutionary spirit. Although originally the boycott was intended to be an instrument of retaliation against British commerce in the country, it was developed by B.C. Pal as an all-comprehensive programme of non-cooperation with the British Government. He declared that the boycott movement was not a mere economic movement, it was also a protest against the British rule. He also declared that time had come to realise clearly the utter futility of the policy of begging and petition-making before the Government. He advocated the policy of self-help in the political field for securing the natural rights belonging to the Indians.

B.C. Pal was a great platform orator. He delivered excellent and persuasive speeches both in English and in Bengali. The voice of B.C. Pal played a decisive role in the partition agitation. He was the best orator of his times and he was considered as the arch-seditionist in India. When the leaders were divided on the question of national education, B.C. Pal supported it and created great enthusiasm among the people to boycott the educational institutions run by the Government. The propaganda of B.C. Pal was not confined to Calcutta alone but was also carried to the mofussil towns. He carried everywhere the gospel of boycott, Swadeshi, national education and Swaraj and worked as the greatest exponent of the new spirit prevailing in the country at that time. Wherever he went, his lectures left a very powerful impression on the people.
Towards the close of 1905 there emerged in the country an Extremist Bloc of which B.C. Pal was perhaps the foremost exponent and leader. He openly condemned the policy of mendicancy of the Moderates. When the Moderates tried to see Lord Minto, the latter refused. This refusal was cited by B.C. Pal as an illustration of the utter helplessness of the people of India. Instead of condemning the brutalities of bureaucracy at Dacca, Rangpur, Barisal and Madaripur, B.C. Pal welcomed them because repression was sure to stimulate the patriotic feelings of the people and fortify their convictions. B.C. Pal was opposed to any constitutional agitation which was being advocated by Surendranath Banerjea and other Moderates. On 3 March 1906, B.C. Pal told a Calcutta audience that the hour for fine speeches was gone and time had come for action and self-sacrifice for the salvation of the country. He declared on 18 March 1906 that he had no faith in Lord Morley or any Feringi.

In May 1906, B.C. Pal addressed many meetings on Swadeshi and national education and called upon the people to carry on the boycott of British things and institutions. He condemned the demoralising and illusory policy of begging at the door of the Government. He appealed to the Muslims to join the Hindus in order to force the British Government to yield to the demands of 30 crores of Indians. The Extremists headed by B.C. Pal and Upadhyay Brahmobandhab were growing daily into a great force to be reckoned with. The first issue of the Bande Mataram was issued on 6 August 1906. B.C. Pal advised the people of India to learn politics and tactics of war from Japan if they aspired for political independence. To quote, “Indian money is taken away by Feringis, while the people starve for want of money. The Indians would never starve if Feringis were not allowed to take away money from India. They could not govern India or stay in it if the Indians did not co-operate with them. If revenue was not paid by the Raiyats to Feringis, what would they do for it? They could not do anything; they could not kill Indians wholesale. The Indians should not be afraid of jail and they must be ready to go to any jail at any moment shouting only Bande Mataram.”

B.C. Pal preached to his audiences the gospel of Swaraj or self-government as the ultimate goal of India’s political struggle.
The Partition issue went into the background and the question of Indian Swaraj outside the British Empire came to the forefront. B.C. Pal declared that even if the Partition of Bengal was nullified, the national movement was not to stop until India got Home Rule in the true sense of the term.

B.C. Pal canvassed support for Tilak as the President for the coming Congress session in December 1906. He was opposed to the Moderate proposal to send another memorial to Lord Morley on the issue of Partition. The Moderates were alarmed and they solved the problem by inviting Dadabhai Naoroji to become the President.

B.C. Pal was in favour of democratising the Congress in such a way that the masses could take part in its work. His view was that if the Congress was to function as a dynamic institution, the “rings” of vested interests in the Congress must be broken. Those “rings” were small coteries of educated lawyers who dominated the public life within their respective spheres of influence.

B.C. Pal excelled everybody in carrying the message of the new movement to every nook and corner of the country. The view of the Intelligence Department was: “The chief of the itinerant demagogues was Bipin Chandra Pal who did more to inflame the minds of the masses against the Government than anybody else.” In January 1907, B.C. Pal went on the most memorable propaganda tour of his career travelling extensively in the various parts of India. He visited Rangpur, Dinajpur, Allahabad, Banaras, Noakhali, Barisal, Dacca, Silchar, Cuttack, Vizagapatnam, Cocoannada, Rajahmundry, Madras and Jessore. Wherever he went, he gave voice to the ideals of the Extremist party which had already got the upper hand in Indian politics. He compared the Bengalees with percussion caps which themselves inexpressive, caused explosion by coming into contact with powder and shock. “The Feringis thought that if the percussion caps were applied to the power so plentiful in the Punjab and the Central Provinces, the whole of India would be on fire.” During his tour, B.C. Pal carried the gospel of boycott, Swadeshi, Swaraj and national education to various parts of India. He not only defined the Swaraj or devised ways and means to achieve it but also sketched in outlines the would-be constitution of free India of the future. There should be a
President of the Indian Republic occupying the same position as that of the American President. The provinces of British India were to become separate states, with one Central Government like that of the United States. The native states were to form separate states under the same Central Government.

When B.C. Pal reached Madras in the beginning of May 1907, he was given a big welcome. On the next day, he spoke on “The Gospel of Swaraj” in which he declared that India will not be satisfied with a shadowy self-Government as demanded by the Moderates. There could be no compromise between self-Government for India and overlordship of England. The speeches of B.C. Pal in South India had a tremendous impact. Srinivasa Sastri wrote: “Babu Bipin Chandra Pal burst into full fame in Madras as a preacher of the new political creed. For several days on the sands of the beach, he spoke words hot with emotion and subtly logical which were wafted by the soft evening breeze to tens of thousands of listeners invading their whole souls and setting them aflame with the fever of a wild consuming desire. Oratory had never dreamed of such triumphs in India; the power of spoken word had never been demonstrated on such a scale.” According to an official report, B.C. Pal was responsible for wide-spread unrest in South India.

In September 1907, B.C. Pal voluntarily courted imprisonment in connection with the prosecution of the *Bande Mataram*. He was summoned to the court as a witness to identify a letter under his signature written on 26 May 1907 to some one connected with the *Bande Mataram*. B.C. Pal refused to answer any question on the ground that the prosecution was “unjust and injurious to the cause of popular freedom.” The result was that B.C. Pal was prosecuted for contempt of court and awarded six months simple imprisonment. In this connection, Upadhyay wrote thus in the *Sandhya*: “This imprisonment of Bipin Chandra will be recorded in history, will remain graven on the hearts of men and women generation after generation.” Sri Aurobindo observed in this connection: “This country will not suffer by the incarceration of this great orator and writer, this spokesman and prophet of nationalism nor will Bipin Chandra suffer by it. He has risen ten times as high as he was before in the estimation of his countrymen and he will come out of prison with his power and influence doubled. Nationalism has
already become the stronger for his self-immolation and posterity will judge between him and the petty tribunal which has treated his honourable scruples as a crime."

The six months spent by B.C. Pal in prison brought about a great change in his personal life and also in the destiny of the national movement. Upadhyaya Brahmanbandhab passed away while the case was still pending. Leekat Hussain, another champion of Swadeshi, was rotting in the jail for disobeying the orders of a magistrate. The nationalist papers like *Yugantar*, *Bande Mataram*, *Sandhya* and *Barisal Hitaishi* were in trouble on account of the action taken by the Government. All political meetings and processions had been banned by the Government. The Government also tried to win over the Moderates. The Muslims were promised special favours and set against the Hindus. The split in the Congress in 1907 made the Congress ineffective. In this political stalemate, the release of B.C. Pal from Jail on 9 March 1908 was welcomed by all patriotic persons in India. The people of South India celebrated his release by holding meetings, processions, illuminations and fire-works. During his journey towards Calcutta, B.C. Pal was honoured and garlanded at almost every station on the way. When he reached Calcutta, he was received at the Howrah station by thousands of his countrymen. In the evening, he was offered a sum of Rs. 5,000/- at a reception held in his honour.

As regards the effect of jail life on B.C. Pal himself, he discovered in his cell a deeper meaning of India's battle for freedom. He saw in the national movement a manifestation of the Divine Will, the working of a mightier force which had so long been ignored. India's freedom was meant not only for herself, but also for the sake of the world. To quote him: "We are fighting not for ourselves, not for India alone, nor even for Asia, but for England, Europe and the whole world. The issues of this struggle involve the emancipation of India and the salvation of humanity." B.C. Pal wrote thus on 7 May 1908: "We have preached boycott, we have advocated national education, we have induced people to take the Swadeshi vow, all this is true; and we do not hesitate to accept our full share of responsibility for the real and rational results of these preachings...The charge against us is that we have openly preached a gospel of racial hatred and animosity and have tried to excite the feelings
of the people against the Government in this country. We absolutely repudiate the truth of the first and the implications of the second part of this accusation. Ours has never been a message of hatred or antipathy. We have preached isolation from the foreigner; it is true; but not hatred of him. We have asked people to avoid, so far as possible, every association with him, but we have never asked or hinted that they should cultivate any feelings of enmity towards the alien administrators and exploiters of their country."

On the arrest of Sri Aurobindo on 2 May 1908, B.C. Pal was invited to join the editorial board of the Bande Mataram. In that capacity, he gave out a call ringing with sincerity and fervour to his countrymen for a most enthusiastic and self-immolating sacrifice for the Motherland. He continued to work as editor till August 1908 when he left for England on a mission of foreign propaganda sponsored by Shyamji Krishna Verma. B.C. Pal was required to deliver 45 lectures in return for Rs. 1,000/- a year.

While in England, B.C. Pal lived among the most enlightened and advanced sections of the British people and delivered a large number of speeches in London and other towns. In those lectures, he condemned the policy of violence and terror. During 1906-8, B.C. Pal had been a powerful exponent of Swaraj for India outside the British Empire, but the major trend of his speeches in England during 1908-11 was his effort to reconcile the highest national aspirations of the Indians with the Imperial system of Great Britain. In September 1911, he declared that if a choice was to be made between "absolute but isolated sovereign independence for India" and "an equal co-partnership with Great Britain and her colonies in the present association called the British Empire", he would definitely prefer the second. Such a co-partnership was to be established on the recognition of India's right to freedom and equality with Great Britain. The British Government in India was to be reconstituted in such a manner as to extend the freest possible scope of self-fulfilment to Indians within the framework of the British Empire. This was obviously a climb-down on the part of B.C. Pal so far as India's political destiny was concerned. This change in his views can be attributed to the study of the world politics at first hand in London which was the very centre
of Europe at that time. That can also be attributed to the developments in India after 1908. There was repression everywhere. Not only the leaders were arrested one by one but many laws were passed to crush the national movement in the country. The *Yugantar, Bande Mataram* and *Navshakti* were suppressed one after the other. On 11 December 1908, the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act was passed by the Governor-General in Council for the speedy trial of certain offences and for prohibition of associations dangerous to public peace. Many associations were declared illegal. The arbitrary law of deportation was frequently resorted to. The result was that the Swadeshi movement became weak and the number of Moderates began to increase. This change in the political scene in India had its effect on the thinking of B.C. Pal.

During his stay in England, B.C. Pal brought out a fortnightly magazine called *Sawarj*. He published another magazine called *Indian Student*. While in England B.C. Pal came into contact with Indian Revolutionaries abroad who wanted that he should join them and help them in the working out of their programme. Instead of obliging them, B.C. Pal declared himself definitely against violent outrages and the efficacy of bombs. That led to differences between him and Shyamji Krishna Varma, the revolutionary who had invited B.C. Pal to England. The financial position of B.C. Pal became precarious and ultimately he left London for India in September 1911 with passage money, advanced most probably by C.R. Das. As soon as he landed at Bombay, he was arrested by the police, convicted on the same day and sentenced to one month simple imprisonment under S. 124-A of the Indian Penal Code.

After his return from England, B.C. Pal became a Moderate like his political Guru S.N. Banerjea. He was no more the visionary and idealist of the past. He came to believe that “The world is governed by money.” He even opposed the policy of non-cooperation advocated by Gandhiji. The result was that he became out of tune with the people. His popularity began to decline. At the Barisal Conference held in 1921 which was presided over by him, the audience refused to hear him. His old charisma was gone and he died in 1932 in the midst of grinding poverty, almost unwept, unhonoured and unsung.

The view of Prof. B.K. Sarkar is that the political death of
B.C. Pal took place in 1921 and the provincial conference of Bengal held at Barisal was the denouement of the tragic end of his life.

In an essay, Shri B.K. Chatterji described B.C. Pal as the Danton of Bengal. That was due to his maddening eloquence and oratorical fanaticism. He was a fire-eater and fire-spitter. There was fearlessness in his speeches. He knew how to electrify the audiences with his words. He was an ultra-idealist.

About B.C. Pal, Sir C.P. Ramaswami Aiyar says that he led a dedicated life and what specially signalized him was the staunchness of his faith and his unbending adherence to truth as he saw it. He adopted a life of poverty and was singularly free from personal ambition. In him we find embodied many diverse and rare qualities. He was a stern realist although his realism was accompanied by deep religious convictions and yearnings. He was a born rebel but in spite of that he preached adherence to the law and the Constitution. He started as a nationalist and ended as an advocate of federation and internationalism. In his writings and speeches, he revealed himself as one who lived in the light of ancient racial traditions. He was a strong man who could stand alone and yet fight for unity and toleration. "Such men are the salt of the earth and we do well to cherish and perpetuate their memory." (Biographical Vistas, pp. 196-7).

About B.C. Pal, Dr. B.C. Roy says that B.C. Pal came to his house with his four children, all dressed as Sanyasis. He was the man who was prepared to make all kinds of sacrifices and his subsequent life proved it to be so. He was a born orator. Even the aged and the wise listened to him with respect. He was always prepared to convince them "not by magic, but by logic". The tragedy of his latter days was not peculiar to Bengal. It was the fate of most public men all over the world. He made great sacrifices for his love of his country, truth and God. It was perhaps on account of his great sacrifices and strong convictions that he lived in splendid isolation from his erstwhile colleagues and friends during the last few years of his life. He never yielded to any one in his devotion to truth and God and to his country. With him, service of the country was a religion and a service to God.

Lord Ronaldshay says about B.C. Pal that "his pen played a
not inconsiderable part in the social and political ferments that have stirred the waters of Indian life” during his period. According to Sir Francis Younghusband, Pal was “of fine disposition as well as of high intellectual attainments.”

SUGGESTED READINGS


Pal, B.C. : Brahma Samaj and the Battle of Swaraj in India.


Lala Lajpat Rai was one of the foremost leaders of modern India. He took a prominent part in the political, social, religious, literary and cultural developments of his times. He has rightly been called “Sher-i-Punjab” (Lion of the Punjab). The Punjab cannot boast of any other leader of his stature. He earned a name for himself on account of his selflessness, fearlessness and love for his country. He lived a life of dedication and died while serving the cause of his country.

Lala Lajpat Rai was born on 28 January 1865 in the village Dhudike in Ferozepure District. His father’s name was Munshi Radhakishan. He was a school teacher. He was a voracious reader and a writer in Urdu of considerable merit. He was very much attached to Islam and hated Hinduism and was a Muslim except in name. He was a great admirer of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. Lala Lajpat Rai also came under the influence of Islam in his early life on account of his father. Gulab Debi, Lajpat Rai’s mother, came from a family in which Sikhism was in favour. She was an orthodox Hindu lady.

Lala Lajpat Rai was a bright student in the school, but his weak constitution and ill health interfered with his studies. The poverty of his parents also stood in the way of his education. In 1880, he passed the Entrance examination of the Calcutta University as well as that of the Punjab University College and joined the Government College, Lahore in February 1881. He
also joined the Law School. He had to leave studies within two years of joining the college because his parents could not afford to support him. In 1883, he passed the first law examination which enabled him to obtain a licence to practise as Mukhtar.

Lala Lajpat Rai was merely 16 when he went to Lahore and he stayed there for two years. First of all, he came into contact with Pandit Shiv Narain Agnihotri who at that time was a Brahma leader of the Punjab. It was under his influence that Lala Lajpat Rai became a member of the Brahma Samaj in 1881. However, at the Government College, Lahore, Lajpat Rai came into contact with Pandit Guru Dutt Vidyarthi and Lala Hans Raj who influenced his life and ideas in a decisive manner and they became intimate friends. To quote Lajpat Rai: “In the beginning of that year (1882) my friendship with the late Pandit had developed into an intimacy. One result was that my outlook began to take on a nationalistic colour. The soul nurtured on Islam in infancy and beginning adolescence by seeking shelter in the Brahma Samaj began to develop a love for the ancient Hindu culture in the company of Guru Dutt and Hans Raj.” His study of Indian history also created in him a sense of pride in the old heritage of Hindu India. The Hindi movement also had a deep impression on him. The controversy among the three groups in the Brahma Samaj also weakened his admiration for it and he was attracted more and more towards Arya Samaj on account of its nationalistic outlook. In December 1882, he joined the Arya Samaj and within a very short period, he became one of the front rank leaders of the Samaj. He was drawn to the Arya Samaj on account of its nationalistic outlook, social reform programme and its educational mission. It prepared him for the larger and more vital field of politics. About his stay at the college, Lajpat Rai wrote: “It was in those two years I became wedded to the idea of Hindu nationality. It was in those two years I learnt to respect the ancient Aryan culture which became my guiding star for good. It was in those years that I fixed the mission of my life not merely in theory but by practical work for it and that mission continues unchanged to this day.”

In 1884, Lajpat Rai shifted from Jagraon to Rohtak where his father was serving at that time. In 1886, he passed the
Pleaders' Examination and shifted to Hissar to practise as Vakil in the District Court. He worked at Hissar for 6 years and within a very short period, he came to occupy a position among the three top lawyers of the District. At Hissar, he took active part in the work of the Arya Samaj. He was elected a member of the Municipal Committee of Hissar and also worked as its Honorary Secretary. In 1892, he shifted to Lahore to practise in the Punjab Chief Court.

Lajpat Rai was very much impressed by the Madras session of the Congress held in 1887. He was also impressed by the two pamphlets of Hume entitled "Old Man's Hope" and "Star in the East". Shortly before the Allahabad session of the Congress, Lala Lajpat Rai published his "Open Letters" to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in a Urdu weekly, the Kohinoor of Lahore. Lajpat Rai had been a great admirer of Sir Syed whom he considered to be a broad-minded person. However, he was upset when Sir Syed declared that the interests of the Hindus and Muslims clashed and could not be reconciled at all. In his Open Letters, Lajpat Rai maintained that the Congress wanted to promote the same ideas which Sir Syed had advocated before the Congress was founded. He criticized Sir Syed and asked him to explain the reasons for the change. The Open Letters created a stir in political circles and Hume published an English version of them in a pamphlet. The result was that when Lajpat Rai went to Allahabad to attend the fourth Congress he received a warm welcome. He was given the honour of supporting the first resolution on the expansion of the Council of the Governor-General and the Provincial Legislative Councils. He also attended the fifth Congress held in 1889 and was given an opportunity of supporting the resolution on Council Reform and a larger representation for Indians in the legislature. He believed that there should be no distinction among the members of the different communities in regard to political privileges. He declared: "I am a Hindu; in the Punjab the Hindus are in a minority and so far as I am concerned I should be quite content to be represented by any good Mahomedan or Sikh member." However, in order to remove the fears of the Muslims, he supported the resolution providing for separate representation for the Muslims.

After the Bombay session of the Congress, the interest of
Lajpat Rai waned in the Congress and during the next fourteen years, he virtually took no active part in the Congress work except attending its annual meetings at Lahore in 1893 and 1900. The Bombay Congress had left an unfavourable impression on his mind. His feeling was that the "Congress leaders care more for fame and pomp than for the interests of the country." Lajpat Rai did not like the holiday aspect of the annual meetings of the Congress which he called "the annual national festival of educated Indians". He had no love for what he called "holiday patriots". He felt that the main motive of the Congress leaders was to enjoy the powers and privileges formerly enjoyed by the alien rulers. The Congress was a movement "of reform, not of liberty" and Lajpat Rai did not expect much good to come out of its activities.

On the other hand, Lajpat Rai found more scope for constructive work outside the Congress. He became the President of the College Party of the Arya Samaj and did a lot for the D.A.V. College, Lahore. He collected a lot of money to strengthen the financial position of the College and the Arya Samaj. In 1902, he tendered evidence before the Universities Commission set up by Lord Curzon. His plea was that the Senate and the Syndicate should be fully representative of the teachers and the educationists and Government officials should not be nominated to them. He did a lot of useful work in connection with famine relief work in 1896-97 when there was famine in the Central Provinces and again in 1899-1900 when there was a famine in the Punjab, Rajputana, Kathiawar and the Central Provinces.

In 1896, Lajpat Rai published short biographies of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Shivaji. In 1898, he wrote biographies of Swami Dayanand and Sri Krishna. Mazzini was considered by Lajpat Rai as his political guru. The first three books were written by him with the object of infusing patriotic sentiments in the youth of the Punjab. The view of the Punjab Government was that in writing those books, Lajpat Rai's "motive was purely political, the object being to propagate sedition. The author specially in the lives of Mazzini and Shivaji dwells largely on the evils of a foreign yoke and the desirability of attaining national freedom at any sacrifice."

Lajpat Rai attended the Lahore session of the Congress in
1900 and called upon the Congressmen to devote more attention to constructive work. He was ready to take part in politics but the programme of the Congress was not in line with his own ideas. He still found the Congress involved in theoretical discussions and unwilling to adopt bold and constructive policies. On the eve of the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1901, he called upon the Congress to shed off its festive character and undertake serious business instead of utterances of “plausibly-worded platitudes and well-disguised commonplaces”. Shortly after the Calcutta session of the Congress, he declared that the basic problem of India could not be solved by speeches or resolutions only. What was needed was that the people should be ready to make sacrifices for the cause of the country. He disapproved of the policy of begging for rights.

In 1905, Lajpat Rai went to England as a Congress delegate to do propaganda in favour of India. During his stay there, he found that the Liberal Party was not interested in advancing the cause of Indian freedom and the British voters were generally ignorant and indifferent towards the Indian affairs. He came back to India fully convinced that the political salvation of India could not come from outside and the people of India had to fight their battle for freedom themselves. To quote him: “You can at times successfully appeal to the humanity and benevolence of individuals but to hope for justice and benevolence from a nation is hoping against hope. The rule of a foreign democracy is, in this respect, the most dangerous.”

On 3 August 1905, Lajpat Rai addressed a letter to Babu Ganga Prasad Verma of Lucknow in which he wrote, “unless you are prepared to change the nature of your (Congress) movement in this direction, you are not likely to make any progress towards political freedom at all and I am sure that if the Congress will not take the initiative in this matter, some other movement may have to be set up to do the same and then the Congress will dwindle into insignificance.”

At the Banaras session of the Congress held in December 1905 under the presidentship of Gokhale, Lajpat Rai and Tilak opposed the resolution of welcome to the Prince of Wales. Lajpat Rai also addressed the Banaras Congress while supporting the resolution of protest against the repressive policy of the
Government in Bengal. He congratulated Bengal for starting a new political era for the country. He called upon Congressmen not to behave as beggars in future and show manliness in their fight for freedom of the country. He emphasized the necessity of “a band of earnest missionaries to work out the political regeneration of the country.”

The political creed of Lajpat Rai was the same as that of the Extremists but he did not approve of their attacks on the Moderates. His view was that if the Moderate leaders did not change with the times, “their leadership itself would be in danger”. He did not approve of the controversy in connection with the Presidencieship of the forthcoming session of the Congress at Calcutta in December 1906. While he blamed the Extremists for their rigid attitude, he also blamed the Moderate leaders for their unreasonable suspicions about Tilak. He welcomed the election of Dadabhai Naoroji as President of the Calcutta session. He respected both Tilak and Gokhale and took pride in enjoying the goodwill and friendship of the leaders of the two groups. He exercised a moderating influence between the Extremists and the Moderates and thereby averted a rift in the Congress in December 1906.

The view of Lajpat Rai was that the unrest prevailing in the Punjab at that time was due to the unjust administrative and legislative measures of the Punjab Government. However, the Government blamed the Punjab politicians for the unrest. With a view to impress the people with its strength, the Punjab Government struck and arrested in May 1907 Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh. Both of them were deported to Mandalay Jail under Regulation III of 1818. Lajpat Rai and his countrymen were kept in the dark as to the reasons which prompted the Government to deport him to Mandalay. Both the Extremists and the Moderates joined in the protest against the deportations. Tilak wrote in the Kesari: “If the rulers adopt this Russian method, then the subjects in India will have to imitate the subjects in Russia.” Gokhale criticised the Government in these words: “We certainly do not want disorders in the land, but the reforms which the Viceroy and the Secretary of State are contemplating will lose their meaning for us if they cannot be had without the deportation out of India of such earnest and high-minded workers in the country’s cause as Lala
Lajpat Rai." It appears that the agitation had the desired effect. Lord Minto felt that the orders of deportation were hasty and unjust. He wrote to the Secretary of State: "Lajpat Rai is undoubtedly a man of high character and very much respected by his fellow countrymen and if when I was asked to arrest him, I had known what I do now, I would have required much more evidence before agreeing." The result was that orders were passed for the release of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh and they came back to Lahore on 18 November 1907.

On his return from Mandalay, Lajpat Rai became a national hero. He was at the height of his popularity and his name was suggested for the Presidentship of the Congress to be held in December 1907. It is true that the Moderates like Gokhale had great personal regard for Lajpat Rai but they were not prepared to take the risk of having a man like him as the Congress President. Lajpat Rai would have accepted the Presidentship if the same was offered to him unanimously. As the Moderates had chosen Rash Behari Ghosh as the Congress President for Surat, Lajpat Rai declared that he would be the "last person to allow himself to be made the reason or the occasion of any split in the national camp". He wrote to Gokhale: "I am prepared to heartily co-operate with you in your noble efforts to preserve harmony in the national ranks but I am afraid my voice is not likely to prove more effectual than yours. However, I shall do my best and I hope that our joint efforts might at any day reduce the number of irreconcilables." Lajpat Rai played the role of a peace-maker between the two groups at the Surat Congress. When in spite of his efforts, the split came, he decided to remain with the Moderates and declared that he would continue to fight under the flag of the old Congress. At the same time, he continued his efforts to bring about a compromise between the Moderates and the Extremists. He appealed to the Moderates not to expose the Extremists to persecution by the Government. He also appealed to the Extremists "not to be impatient on the slowness of age and the voice of practical wisdom".

It is true that Lajpat Rai attended the Allahabad meeting of the Convention Committee held in April 1908 and signed the new creed of the Congress, but he soon drifted away from it. His political views were not in harmony with the Mode-
erates. He felt that the ouster of the Extremists from the Congress was a menace to the Congress itself. He even questioned the representative character of the Congress. He was opposed to separate electorates and he criticised the Moderates for having accepted them.

Lajpat Rai came back to the Congress in 1912 and at the Bankipur session of the Congress, he advocated the cause of the Indians in South Africa. He did the same in December 1913 when the Congress met at Karachi.

The Karachi Congress decided to send a delegation to England to present the views of the Congress on the reform of the India Council. Lajpat Rai was one of the members of the delegation and in that capacity he reached London in May 1914. While he was still in England, the World War I broke out and he was forced to stay there. After finishing his book on the Arya Samaj, Lajpat Rai decided to go to the United States and was forced to stay there till the end of 1919.

During his stay in the United States, Lajpat Rai did his best to inform the enlightened Americans about the conditions in India. He was able to create a favourable atmosphere for the cause of India's freedom. He wrote many pamphlets and books on different aspects of the Indian problem. The names of some of the books written by him during his stay in the United States are “Young India, An Interpretation and History of the Nationalist Movement from within”, “England's Debt to India”, “Political Future of India” and “Problem of National Education for India”. In October 1917, Lajpat Rai started the Indian Home Rule League of America with the object of supporting the Home Rule Movement in India and fixed its headquarters in New York. In January 1918 was started a monthly organ of the League with Lajpat Rai as Editor. In 1919, he started the Indian Information Bureau in New York to serve as a publicity organisation on behalf of India. He attached great importance to organised propaganda abroad to win sympathy and support for India but he did not believe that the salvation of his country could come from outside.

During his stay in the United States and Japan, he came into contact with Indian Revolutionaries who aimed at revolution in India with the help of German arms and funds. They made many efforts to win over Lajpat Rai to their side. The
German Government was also anxious to win over Lajpat Rai. However, he refused to associate with the revolutionaries. It is true that Lajpat Rai had no faith in the promises made by the British Government but at the same time he did not believe that an alliance with Germany would do any good to the Indian cause. He had no faith in secret organisations and violent revolutions. He believed that terrorism was "not only futile but sinful".

He left New York on 24 December 1919 and reached Bombay on 20 February 1920 via London, Paris, etc. When he came back to India after 6 years, he was received at Bombay by Tilak, Jinnah and Annie Besant. A hero’s welcome was given to him when he reached Lahore 5 days later.

Although Lajpat Rai was not satisfied with the reforms in 1919, he was in favour of "working the Reforms in a genuine spirit of co-operation" provided that was made possible by the Government. However, he was suspicious about the intentions of the bureaucracy which was responsible for the enactment of the Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act, 1919 in March 1919. That Act gave arbitrary authority to the executive in times of peace. The citizens of India were deprived of their rights to an open trial, the assistance of a lawyer and the safeguards provided under the Evidence Act and other laws of the country. With the passage of time, the chances of reconciliation between the Congress and the Government became less and less. The Hunter Committee Report was divided on racial lines and the Government accepted the views of the European majority. The House of Lords also passed a resolution in favour of the action of General Dyer. He was also praised by the Anglo-Indians and the British public. Lajpat Rai wrote to a friend: "I sincerely believe that we cannot afford to have chaos and disorder in our country at this stage of our evolution. There are elements in India who may rise equal to the occasion if any disorder does appear but still I would prefer ordered progress with the certainty of getting complete responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Commonwealth in the near future than run the risk of being thrown into a whirlpool of opposing and contending forces."

In July 1920, Lajpat Rai was elected to preside over the special session of the Indian National Congress to be held in
September 1920 at Calcutta. The object of that session was to devise measures for the redress of the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs and decide upon the attitude of the Congress towards the new reforms. Even before the special Congress met in September, Lajpat Rai repudiated the reforms and advocated the boycott of the new Councils. His view was that the acceptance of the majority report of the Hunter Committee by the Government of India and the Secretary of State was “the virtual denial of the principles on which the Reforms Scheme is based”. As no action was taken against the officers who were responsible for the atrocities in the Punjab, Lajpat Rai concluded that there was no change of heart on the part of the Government. Lajpat Rai was in favour of the boycott of the Councils but not that of the law courts, educational institutions, foreign goods, etc.

At the Calcutta session of the Congress, Lajpat Rai had remained neutral on the question of Non-cooperation but at the Nagpur session, he gave his full support to the resolution of Mahatma Gandhi on Non-cooperation. Having accepted its programme, Lajpat Rai took an active part in the Non-cooperation Movement. As the President of the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee, he directed the Non-cooperation movement in the Punjab and also went on a tour of India to spread the ideas of Non-cooperation. The Government took action against him and he was arrested along with Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das. He was arrested on 3 December 1921 and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment under the Seditious Meetings Act. He did not offer any defence. He was released on 31 January 1922 but was re-arrested as soon as he came out of the prison gates and sentenced to two years rigorous imprisonment.

When the Non-cooperation Movement was suspended by Mahatma Gandhi as a result of the Chauri Chaura incident, Lajpat Rai did not approve of his action. In the words of Lajpat Rai, Mahatma Gandhi’s decision “burst upon a confiding, expectant and hopeful country like a bomb-shell. The shock was too sudden, cataclysmatic and unexpected”. Lajpat Rai criticised Mahatma Gandhi for pitching his standard of non-violence very high which could not be realised in actual practice. Personally, Lajpat Rai had no ideological belief in non-violence but he participated in the Non-cooperation Move-
ment because that was the only way to fight against the foreign rulers.

Lajpat Rai sided with men like C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru who believed in Council-entry. In a letter addressed to C.R. Das written from Lahore jail, Lajpat Rai had written, "Politics is a changing game and I do not believe in any inflexible, cut and dried scheme good for all times and under all circumstances." On his release in August 1923, Lajpat Rai tried to avoid a split in the Congress on the question of Council-entry. He recommended that those who were in favour of Council-entry should be allowed the "Liberty of conscience and action". The elections in the Punjab in 1923 were virtually run by Lajpat Rai for the Swarajists. He was himself elected to the Central Assembly in December 1925 and in January 1926, he joined the Swarajist Party. However, he was opposed to "uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction" and a policy of indiscriminate walk-outs from the legislature. He was in sympathy with those who advocated responsive co-operation. He did not want a split in the Swarajist Party and he tried to bring about reconciliation between the two groups. In March 1926, he opposed Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya's move for organising a united Nationalist Party with the programme of responsive co-operation with the Government.

On account of the communal situation in the country, Lajpat Rai busied himself to tackle the same. He had always believed that the Hindus and Muslims would join hands in their struggle for independence against the alien rulers. He had also believed in a composite Indian nationality. He had written thus in 1914: "The Arya Samaj has to remember that India today is not exclusively Hindu. Its prosperity and future depend on the reconciliation of Hinduism with that greater ism, the Indian nationalism—which alone can secure for India its rightful place in the comity of nations. Anything that may prevent or even hinder that consummation is a sin for which there can be no expiation," He was happy to find friendly relations between the Hindus and Muslims in 1920 when he came back from the United States. However, as a result of his association with the Khilafat leaders in the jail, he came to have certain doubts about Hindu-Muslim unity. After a lot of thinking, Lajpat Rai came to the conclusion that the solution
of the communal problem lay not in mixing or reconciliation of the two communities but in their integration. To quote him: "What we aim at is not the merging or the absorption of the one into the other, but the integration of all into one whole, without in any way injuring or lessening each group individually." He also realised the necessity of "a definite and abiding understanding about the position which the communities have to occupy in the future government of the country." With that object in view, Lajpat Rai, in collaboration with Dr. M.A. Ansari, drafted the "Indian National Pact". However, nothing came out of it on account of the bitter relations between the Hindus and the Muslims at that time. On 9-10 September 1924 there occurred a very serious Hindu-Muslim riot at Kohat in North-West Frontier Province. About 150 Hindus were killed or wounded and the entire population of 4,000 Hindus had to be evacuated for safety to Rawalpindi. The Kohat tragedy was a great disappointment for Lajpat Rai to whom the Hindus of the North-West Frontier Province looked for help. Lajpat Rai attended the Unity Conference and served on the National Panchayat. However, there could be no unity unless the "Kohat wounds" were healed. Lajpat Rai did not agree with Mahatma Gandhi that the Hindus of Kohat should have died defending their lives and temples and they were guilty of cowardice in not doing so.

Lajpat Rai contributed in November-December 1924 a series of 13 thought-provoking articles to the Indian Press on the subject of Hindu-Muslim unity and in those articles he discussed the historical, religious, social, economic, political and psychological causes of the conflict between the Hindus and the Muslims. He stood for purging politics of religion and rationalisation of religion. He was opposed to separate communal electorates which, in his view, were bound to result in the division of India in the long run. He did not approve of the policy of appeasement of the Muslims. He advised the Congressmen not to compete with the Government in the matter of winning over the Muslims by offering them more and more favourable terms. Lajpat Rai did not stand for a communal settlement which involved the surrender of the legitimate rights of the Hindus.

He advised the Hindus to organise themselves so that they
could stand on their legs at the time of communal riots. He supported the Shuddhi and Sangathan Movement among the Hindus. He started the All India Achhut Uddhar Sabha with a view to improve the lot of the depressed classes. He also joined the Hindu Mahasabha. However, he would not allow the Hindu Mahasabha to enter politics. As President of the Hindu Mahasabha in 1925, Lajpat Rai declared that “the Hindus had no political aim of their own separate from those of his countrymen of other faiths.” He condemned the talk of Hindu Raj or Muslim Raj. In 1926, he opposed the idea of the Hindu Mahasabha running its own candidates for the legislatures. To quote Lajpat Rai: “I am in favour of organising the Hindu community, strengthening and solidifying it religiously, socially and economically, but I do not favour the idea of the Hindus setting up a separate political existence of their own.” Lajpat Rai had no respect for those who criticised other religions. When the publisher of Rangila Rasul was acquitted by the Lahore High Court in 1927, he declared him to be morally guilty.

By 1919, Lajpat Rai had come to accept socialistic ideas but he did not believe in the teachings of Karl Marx. He did not want the mere substitution of the rule of property and privilege in place of foreign imperialists and capitalists. He stood for an era of equal opportunity and equal justice for all. To quote him: “We are a friend neither of the landlord nor of the capitalist. We believe that the ryot and the working men in India as elsewhere are being exploited and robbed by the classes in possession of the means of production and distribution. We would whole-heartedly support any scheme which would open a way to a just and righteous distribution of wealth and land in India and which would ensure the ryot and the working man his rightful place in the body politics.” Lajpat Rai did not believe that the lot of the ryots would improve even when the politically-minded classes of India came to power. In spite of that, he supported the demand for self-Government because that alone could improve the lot of the common man in India. He believed that the struggle for genuine democracy would start only after India had won independence. He advocated unity among the people to win freedom. Lajpat Rai did not believe that “a country should go
through the capitalistic mill before the proletariat comes to its own.” He wanted to avoid the evils of the class war. He stood for a classless society without class war. He was a “humanitarian socialist” and not a scientific socialist. In 1924, he joined the Independent Labour Party in London. In December 1920, he presided over the first Indian Trade Union Congress which met at Bombay. On that occasion, he declared: “Militarism and Imperialism are twin children of capitalism. They are one in three and three in one.” In 1926, he attended the International Labour Conference at Geneva as a representative of the Indian working class. In the Central Assembly also, he tried to organise a labour group to advocate the cause of the working classes.

On 24 August 1926, he resigned from the Swarajist Party. That was partly due to the fact that he was essentially an independent in politics and independents are not good party men. Before he was elected to the Central Assembly, he had often criticised the Swarajist Party and disapproved of its policy of continuous obstructions. The Swarajists were adamant about their walk-outs. Lajpat Rai insisted that the Swarajist Party should attend the Monsoon Session, particularly the debates on the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill and the Communal Resolution, but the Swarajist Party refused to oblige him. The result was that Lajpat Rai decided to leave the Swarajist Party. He organised the Independent Congress Party in collaboration with Pandit Malaviya. The new Party was opposed to the walk-outs programme of the Swarajists and the Congress policy on the communal question. He stood for communal amity but not in favour of achieving that at the cost of the legitimate interests of the Hindus.

When the Simon Commission was appointed, Lajpat Rai declared that he was “not going to associate with the Commission in any shape or manner”. He wanted the boycott of the Commission to be irrevocable. Even if a few Indians were appointed on the Commission, he would not support or co-operate with the same. The reason was that he was in favour of the Indians framing their own Constitution and with that object in view he suggested the convening of a Round Table Conference of 100 eminent Indians of all communities to draft the Constitution of a free India. He led a vigorous campaign
against the Commission both in the press and from the platform. On 16 February 1928, he moved in the Central Assembly his resolution refusing co-operation to the Commission "at any stage or in any form" and the resolution was carried. He welcomed the Nehru Report and moved a resolution in appreciation of it. He accepted the goal of dominion status as outlined in the Nehru Report. He was not in favour of cutting off the British connection. What impressed him most in the Nehru Report was the provision for joint electorates throughout India. He declared: "Those who will oppose it will practically oppose Swaraj and may be justly described as the enemies of India." He criticised those Hindu leaders of the Punjab who were against the Nehru Report.

On 30 October 1928, Lajpat Rai led a mass demonstration against the Simon Commission in front of the Lahore Railway Station and he was brutally assaulted by the police with lathis. The demonstration was peaceful and the police attack was unprovoked. It was deliberately aimed at Lajpat Rai. Leaders like Dr. Satya Pal, Dr. Gopi Chand Bhargava, Raizada Hansraj and Dr. Mohammad Alam tried to protect Lalaji but the British officer concentrated his attack on him. At a public meeting held the same evening at Lahore, Lajpat Rai spoke with bitterness about the action of the police officials and warned the Government about the possible consequences in these words: "I want to say from this platform that every blow that was hurled at us this afternoon, was a nail in the coffin of the British Empire. Nobody who has seen that sight is likely to forget it. It has sunk deep into our soul. We have to avenge ourselves of this cowardly attack, not by violently attacking them but by gaining our freedom. I wish to warn the Government that if a violent revolution takes place in this country, the responsibility for bringing it about will fall on such officers as misbehaved themselves this afternoon. Our creed still stands and we are pledged to a struggle of peaceful non-violence. But if the Government officers continue to behave like this, I would not wonder if the young men were to go out of our hands and do whatever they choose with the object of gaining the freedom of their country. I do not know whether I shall be alive to see that day. But whether alive or dead, if that day is forced on them by the Government, my spirit from behind
will bless them for their struggle.” Jawaharlal Nehru says that Lajpat Rai “felt angry and bitter; not so much at the personal humiliation as at the national humiliation involved in the assault on him.” Lajpat Rai did not survive the assault very long and he died on 17 November 1928.

On his death, Mahatma Gandhi paid his tribute in these words: “Lala Lajpat Rai is dead: Long live Lalaji. Men like Lalaji cannot die so long as the sun shines in the Indian sky. Lalaji means an institution. From his youth he made his country’s service religion and his patriotism was no narrow creed. He loved his country because he loved the world. His nationalism was internationalism...... His activities were multifarious. He was an ardent social and religious reformer. Like many of us he become a politician because his zeal for social and religious reform demanded participation in politics...... It is impossible to think of a single public movement in which Lalaji was not to be found. His love of service was insatiable. He founded educational institutions. He befriended the suppressed classes. Poverty, where found, claimed his attention. He surrounded young men with extra-ordinary affection. No young man appealed to him in vain for help. In the political field he was indispensable. He was fearless in the expression of his views. He suffered for it when suffering had not become customary or fashionable. His life was an open book. His extreme frankness often embarrassed his friends; it also confounded his critics. But he was incorrigible.”

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya paid his tribute in these words: “I am too deeply distressed by the news of the death of Lala Lajpat Rai to be able properly to express the sense of loss the country has sustained by the passing away of a patriot, statesman, educationalist and journalist of his calibre. It is a misfortune to the country that a publicist so widely honoured, whose aim in life was to serve the country and the community of which he was an ornament in the best possible way, should have died just at a time when the need for his wise and sober guidance was the greatest. Lala Lajpat Rai loved his country intensely and worked for it incessantly and unselfishly. His pure patriotism, his robust independence, fearlessness, sincerity and earnestness, easily won for him the respect which he so widely enjoyed.”
Moti Lal Nehru paid his tribute in the following words: "The sudden passing away of Lala Lajpat Rai is a great national calamity. He was one of those outstanding personalities whose place it is impossible to fill. It would indeed be difficult to find another man with public activities covering such a wide field as those of the remarkable man whose loss India is mourning today. His earnest patriotism did not allow his inexhaustible energy to any particular channel, but found avenues for useful work in almost every department of life which goes to build up a nation...... His great sacrifices, his terrible sufferings in the cause are well-known, but nothing deflected him from the path of duty...... He was a great man, a good man and true."

Subhash Chandra Bose paid the following tribute: "With the death of Lala Lajpat Rai passes away one of the foremost champions of Indian nationalism. Since the days of Lal, Bal, Pal, Lalaji remained a conspicuous and active figure in the political arena. He moved abreast of the times, but he did not lose contact with those of his countrymen who could not keep pace with him. His death today is a national calamity of the first magnitude and that is why the whole of India is mourning. Providence so willed that before he left us, he made a gift of all his properties to the nation."

Lalaji was a fiery speaker. C.Y. Chintamani says: "As a public speaker I think of Lloyd George and Lajpat Rai together. They had equal capacity for rousing indignation of the masses. I have heard few speeches which can be placed by the side of Lajpat Rai’s speeches in Urdu in the thrilling effect they produced upon the mass mind; some of his Urdu speeches could only be compared to Lloyd George's oration at Lime House and Mile End."

Lajpat Rai was a great journalist. He founded the Bande Mataram, an Urdu Daily and the People, an English Weekly. He also had a hand in starting the Panjabee. Although he did not formally own it or edit the same, its policy was controlled by him. He regularly contributed to it and often wrote its editorials also. In November 1921, Lajpat Rai founded the Servants of the People Society which has done a lot of useful work for the country. Its inauguration ceremony was performed by Mahatma Gandhi.

Lajpat Rai believed that Swaraj without Swadeshi would
be a mirage. He promoted the establishment of indigenous industries, banks, insurance companies, etc. The Punjab National Bank and the Lakshmi Insurance Company were two of his major creations.

Every moment of his life was spent in selfless service. He was an all-rounder. He was foremost in every useful activity of his time. He possessed a towering personality. He was always active. His spirit was exceedingly restless. He was here, there and everywhere. To himself he never gave any rest and allowed none to others. He was brave to the extent of being reckless. He never fled away from danger. In fact, he always went out of the way to invite danger. His frankness was proverbial. He always spoke and wrote exactly what he felt even if that embarrassed his friends and gave a handle to his enemies. Two things he could never tolerate and those were humbug and treachery. By his word and deed, he always appealed to the conscience of the people. He lived a hero’s life and died a martyr’s death.
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Sri Aurobindo Ghose
(1872-1950)

It is true that the work of Aurobindo Ghose in the political field did not last for many years, but it must be acknowledged that he exercised tremendous influence on the nationalist movement in the country. His speeches and his writings went straight to the hearts of the people. He painted before his countrymen their old glory and called upon them to strive for higher ideals. His was a life of supreme sacrifice. In the words of Dr. Karan Singh, “He was largely responsible for imparting an esoteric and spiritual significance to the national movement, for placing before it the inspiring ideal of complete independence, for invigorating the spirit of India by a reassessment of the true bases of her great cultural heritage, for expounding a practical system whereby the goal of independence could be achieved and for placing the whole movement in the broader context of internationalism and the ideal of human unity.”

Sri Aurobindo was born on 15 August 1872 at Calcutta. His father Krishnadhan Ghose was an eminent physician and his mother, Swarnalata Devi, was a poet and writer of short stories. At the age of seven, he was sent to England for studies. From 1884 to 1889, he was in St. Paul’s School in London. In 1889, he won the Senior Classical Scholarship of £ 80 per year, tenable at King’s College, Cambridge. He had a brilliant career at the Cambridge University, and he passed the first
part of the Classical Tripos Examination in 1892 in the first class. He also won the Rawley Prize for Greek Iambics and other college prizes. He was the Secretary of the India Majlis. In 1890, he passed the Indian Civil Service examination, but failed in the riding test. He joined service under the Maharaja of Baroda in 1893 and remained there upto 1905. In 1895, he went to the Baroda College to teach English and French. He was appointed Professor in 1900, Vice-Principal in 1904 and he acted as Principal next year on a salary of Rs. 700 per month.

During his service in the Baroda State, Aurobindo wrote a series of articles entitled "New Lamps for Old" in an Anglo-Marathi paper called Indu Prakash. The very first two articles made a sensation and frightened Ranade and other Congress leaders. Ranade warned the proprietor of the paper that if that went on, he would surely be prosecuted for sedition. The original plan of the series was consequently dropped but Aurobindo continued to write in a modified tone. His last article appeared in the Indu Prakash on 6 March 1894. In these articles, Aurobindo not only criticised the Congress policy of "prayer, petition and protest", but also made a direct and virulent attack upon the British. Aurobindo openly declared that independence could not be attained through the charity or condescension of the foreign masters. India must depend on her own limitless reservoir of inner strength and Power. To quote him, "Our actual enemy is not any force exterior to ourselves, but our own crying weaknesses, our cowardice, our selfishness, our hypocrisy, our purblind sentimentalism." According to him, India should not pay any heed either to the opinion of the Anglo-Indians, or the British sense of justice, but "to our own reviving sense of manhood, to our own sincere fellow-feeling-as far as it can be called sincere with the silent and suffering people of India. I am sure that eventually the nobler part of us will prevail—that when we no longer obey the dictates of a veiled self-interest but return to the profession of a large and genuine patriotism, when we cease to hanker after the soiled crumbs which England may cast to us from her table, then it will be that sense of manhood to that sincere fellow-feeling that we shall finally and forcibly appeal."
Owing to their disobedience to the circulars prohibiting the students from attending meetings, several students had been expelled from government high schools and aided schools in Bengal. The nationalist leaders took up the responsibility of educating those youngmen. With that object in view, they established in Calcutta the National Council of Education and also started the National College in Calcutta. Sri Aurobindo was requested to take up the principalship of the new college. He resigned his post in the Baroda State and became the Principal of the Calcutta National College on a salary of Rs. 75/- a month. He held that post till 2 August 1907 when he resigned as his association with the college was not considered to be in the interests of the institution. In his farewell address to the students of the Calcutta National College. Sri Aurobindo observed: "There are times in a nation's history when Providence places before it one work, one aim, to which everything else, however high and noble in itself, has to be sacrificed. Such a time has arrived for our Motherland when nothing is dearer than her service, when everything else is to be directed to that end. You will study for her sake, train yourselves body and mind and soul for her service. Work that she may prosper. Suffer that she may rejoice. All is contained in that one single advice."

While in Calcutta, he worked hard for the independence of his country. His idea was "to capture the Congress and to make it an instrument for revolutionary action instead of a centre of a timid constitutional agitation which would only talk and pass resolutions and recommendations to the foreign government. He openly advocated non-cooperation and passive resistance. He advocated even open revolt all over the country. His plan included a boycott of British trade, the substitution of national schools for government institutions, the creation of arbitration courts in place of the ordinary courts of law, the creation of volunteer forces which were to be the nucleus of an army of open revolt and other actions that would expedite the freedom of the country. He wrote many articles aimed at "destroying the shibboleths and superstitions of the Moderate Party such as the belief in British justice and benefits bestowed by foreign government in India, faith in British law courts." According to him, however benevolent and beneficent a foreign
rule might be, it could not be a substitute for a free and healthy national life.

Sri Aurobindo prepared his plan for Bhavani Mandir. India, Bharati, Bhavani was a power and personality and not just an extensive geographical area. He composed the following Hymn to Durga to help the youth of India to invoke the Shakti that should make them a new people:

"Mother Durga!...We, born from thy parts of Power,
We the youth of India, are seated here in thy temple.
Listen, O Mother, descend upon the earth, make thyself manifest in this land of India...

"Mother Durga!...In the battle of life, in India’s battle, we are warriors commissioned by thee; Mother, give to our heart and mind a Titan’s strength, a Titan’s energy, to our soul and intelligence a god’s character and knowledge.

"Mother Durga! We are thy children, through thy grace, by thy influence may we become fit for the great work, for the great Ideal. Mother, destroy our smallness, our selfishness, our fear...

"Mother Durga! India lies low in selfishness and fearfulness and littleness. Make us great, make our efforts great, our hearts vast, make us true to our resolve. May we no longer desire the small, void of energy, given to laziness, stricken with fear...

"Mother Durga! Slay the enemy within, then root out all obstacles outside. May the noble heroic mighty Indian race, supreme in love and unity, truth and strength, arts and letters, force and knowledge ever dwell in its holy woodlands, its fertile fields, under its sky-scaping hills, along the banks of its pure-streaming rivers...

"Mother Durga! Enter our bodies in thy Yogic strength...
O Mother, descend upon earth, make thyself manifest in this land of India."

Sri Aurobindo blended India’s traditional mythology, European revolutionary history and the inspirations of awakened India. The matter was politics, but the language was that of religion. To quote him, “The work of national emancipation is a great and holy yajna of which boycott,
swadeshi, national education and every other activity, great and small, are only major or minor parts. Liberty is the fruit we seek from the sacrifice and the Motherland the goddess to whom we offer it; into the seven leaping tongues of the fire of the yajna we must offer all that we have, feeding the fire even with our blood and lives and happiness of our dearest and nearest; for the Motherland is the goddess who loves not a maimed and imperfect sacrifice, and freedom was never won from the gods by a grudging giver."

Sri Aurobindo was arrested in 1907 for having published certain articles in the Bande Mataram. On that occasion, Rabindra Nath Tagore wrote the following poem:

"O Aurobindo, Rabindranath bows to thee!
O friend, my country's friend, O voice incarnate, free,
O India's soul! No soft renown doth crown thy lot,
Nor pelf or careless comfort is for thee...
Where is the coward who will shed tears today, or wail.
Or quake in fear? And who'll belittle truth to seek
His own small safety?...the spirit of Bharatland,
A poet, hath placed upon thy face her eyes afire
With love, and struck vast chords upon her vibrant lyre,
Wherein there is no note of sorrow, shame or fear...
Amid this song triumphant, vast, that encircles me,
O Aurobindo, Rabindranath bows to thee!"

Sri Aurobindo was first released on bail and then acquitted. The prosecution was not able to prove that Sri Aurobindo was the editor of Bande Mataram. However, his arrest, trial and acquittal made him one of the foremost leaders of the Extremist Party of the Indian National Congress. He led the party at the Bengal Provincial Conference at Midnapur where he had a vehement clash with the Moderate Party. He became for the first time a speaker on the public platform, addressed large meetings at Surat and presided over the Nationalist Conference there. He led the party again at the session of the Provincial Conference at Hooghly. The Moderate leaders were shocked to find that the people refused to listen to their "great and tried leaders and clamoured against them", but obeyed a "youngman new to politics".
Sri Aurobindo decided at this time to take of a charge Bengali Daily, Nava Shakti. Before the paper could see the light of the day, Aurobindo was arrested on a number of charges. His arrest was followed by a large-scale arrest of Bengalee revolutionaries. Aurobindo was arrested on 5. 5. 1908 and he was an under-trial upto May 1909 in the Alipore jail. The Government was convinced that Aurobindo was the brain and soul of the revolutionary movement and did all that it could to get him convicted. Aurobindo was defended by C.R. Das. While concluding his arguments, C. R. Das addressed the court in these words: “My appeal to you is this, that long after the controversy will be hushed in silence, long after this turmoil, the agitation will have ceased, long after he is dead and gone, he will be looked upon as the poet of patriotism, as the prophet of nationalism and the lover of humanity. Long after he is dead and gone, his words will be echoed and re-echoed, not only in India, but across distant seas and lands. Therefore, I say that the man in his position is not only standing before the bar of this Court, but before the bar of the High Court of History.” The result was Aurobindo was acquitted and released from jail on 6 May 1909.

Coming out of jail, Sri Aurobindo found the political situation in the country most depressing. Tilak was in the Mandalay jail. The other great leaders were in prison or had been deported. The Moderates as usual played their timid game. The Terrorists invited more repression. The Extremists were feeling disheartened. In spite of it Aurobindo tried to continue his struggle, but very few people turned up at his meetings. He had also trouble with the Congress leaders of Bengal. He was not disheartened. He started two new weekly papers, the Karmayogin in English and Dharma in Bengali. He put emphasis on the eternal and universal religion of humanity called Sanatana Dharma. His aim in the Karmayogin and Dharma was to look at all the problems of life from the spiritual angle. The articles in the Karmayogin lacked nothing of the force and logic of the earlier editorials in the Bande Mataram. Sri Aurobindo affirmed that India’s freedom, unity and greatness were necessary as much to her as to the world at large. He stated the “case” for Swaraj on moral and spiritual grounds. To quote him, “We find a oureaucra-
tic administration, we wish to make it democratic; we find an alien government, we wish to make it indigenous; we find a foreign control, we wish to render it Indian... Our ideal of patriotism proceeds on the basis of love and brotherhood and it looks beyond the unity of the nation and envisions the ultimate unity of mankind. But it is a unity of brothers, equals and free men that we seek, not the unity of master and serf, of devourer and devoured."

Throughout the later half of 1909, rumours of Sri Aurobindo's impending arrest or deportation persisted. He was considered to be the public enemy No. 1. In February 1910, he took a boat and went to Chandannagar and from there, he went to Pondicherry in April 1910. It was there at Pondicherry that he spent the rest of his 40 years of life. While in Pondicherry, he "dropped all participation in any public and political activity and refused more than one request to preside at sessions of the restored Indian National Congress and made a rule of abstention from any public utterance of any kind not connected with the spiritual activities or any contribution of writings or articles, except what he wrote afterwards in the Arya."

Later on, Aurobindo himself wrote a note on his political life and pointed out that there were three sides of his ideas and activities. To quote him, "First, there was the action with which he started a secret revolutionary propaganda and organisation of which the central object was the preparation of an armed insurrection. Secondly, there was a public propaganda intended to convert the whole nation to the ideal of independence which was regarded, when he entered into politics, by the vast majority of Indians as unpractical and impossible, an almost insane chimera. It was thought that the British Empire was too powerful and India too weak, effectively disarmed and impotent even to dream of the success of such an endeavour. Thirdly, there was the organisation of the people to carry on a public and united opposition and determining of the foreign rule through an increasing non-co-operation and passive resistance."

Aurobindo took the first step when he sent a young Bengali soldier of the Baroda army, Jatin Banerji by name, as his lieutenant to Bengal with the programme of preparation and
action. To quote Aurobindo, "The idea was to establish secretly, or as far as visible action could be taken, under various pretexts and covers, revolutionary propaganda and recruitment throughout Bengal. This was to be done among the youth of the country while sympathy and support and financial and other assistance were to be obtained from the older men who had advanced views or could be won over to them. Centres were to be established in every town and eventually in every village." It is true that Aurobindo did not succeed in organising the whole movement in the country, but his idea was taken up and the revolutionary movement spread all over the country.

Aurobindo gave a philosophy of Swaraj. His view was that India could not live her own life without interference from foreign government if she was subordinate to a foreign empire. To quote him, "It is only with the essential preliminary of a true political life that a people can fully realise its destiny." Again, "Political freedom is the life and breath of a nation." According to Aurobindo, Swaraj was "the fulfilment of the ancient life of India under modern conditions, the return of the Satyayug of national greatness, the resumption of her great role of teacher and guide, self-liberation of the people for the final fulfilment of the Vedantic ideal in politics. This was the true swaraj for India." Swaraj could not be obtained by talking but by "the living of Swaraj by each man among us that will compel swaraj to come." Utter renunciation and self-abandonment were the pre-requisites for winning freedom. No sacrifice was too big for the attainment of Swaraj. A free India had a mission for the world. "The world needs India and needs her free. The work she has to do now is to organize life in terms of Vendanta, and that is a work she cannot do while overshadowed by a foreign power and a foreign civilization. She must live her own life and not the life of a part or subordinate in a foreign empire."

Aurobindo advocated the theory of passive resistance in his "Open Letter to my countrymen". To quote him, "Our methods are those of self-help and passive resistance......The policy of passive resistance was evolved partly as the necessary complement of self-help, partly as a means of putting pressure on Government. The essence of this policy is the refusal of
co-operation so long as we are not admitted to a substantial share and an effective control in legislation, finance and administration. Just as ‘No representation, no taxation’ was the watchword of American constitutional agitation in the eighteenth century, so ‘No control, no co-operation’ should be the watchword of our lawful agitation—for constitution we have none—in the twentieth. We sum up this refusal of co-operation in the convenient word ‘boycott’, refusal of co-operation in the industrial exploitation of our country, in education, in government, in judicial administration, in the details of official intercourse.”
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Annie Besant
(1847-1933)

Very few people in India today have any idea of the magnitude or significance of the contribution made by Annie Besant to the all-round progress of this country during her 40 years of unceasing activity in almost every sphere of life. She was gifted with a colossal intellect and organisational capacity of a high order, courage of conviction which defied every threat and obstacle in her path. All these were placed by her without stint or hesitation at the disposal of India. In categorical terms, she described Britain's duty towards India in these words: "We cannot now simply try to throw off our vast responsibility; we cannot, having seized India, now fling it aside. What is our duty towards this great land and how may we best remedy our crimes in the past? The answer comes in one word: 'Liberty'. Train India for freedom; educate India for self-government. Do not only proclaim that Indians shall be eligible for the high places of the State: place them there."

Annie Besant was born and brought up in England. She was married to a clergyman, but she was forced to leave her husband at the age of 25. Before coming to India in 1893, she worked with Mr. Bradlaugh and fought successfully to improve conditions of work of the English girls who were working in the match factories.

She came to India in 1893, as a member of the Theosophical Society and for about 20 years she confined her activities
to religious, social and educational fields. She identified herself with the movement of Hindu revivalism. She translated the *Bhagavad Gita* in English. She condemned early marriage and forced widowhood in Hindu society. She stood for equality for women in India. She started the Central Hindu School and College at Banaras which later developed into the Banaras Hindu University.

On the eve of the First World War, she felt that the time had come for her entry into active politics. On 11 June 1914, she made a vigorous plea in London on behalf of India. She concluded a lengthy statement with the following words: "India asks only that she shall be recognised as a nation, shall be given self-government and shall form an integral part of the Empire, composed of self-governing communities. She asks no more than this."

To build up a vigorous movement for Home Rule, Annie Besant started a daily paper in Madras called *New India* in July 1914. Through the columns of *New India* and *The Commonweal*, she gave expression to her views on the politics of the country. When action was taken against *New India* and the security was forfeited, she filed a petition in the High Court against the orders of the Presidency Magistrate. She knew that the sections of the Indian Press Act, 1910, were so sweeping that she was bound to lose the case. All the same, her previous experience in England prompted her that constitutional battles should be fought out with persistence with a view to arouse public opinion against the obnoxious laws which put restraints on the freedom of the individual or the press. With the same object she appealed to the Privy Council against the orders of the High Court.

In 1916, she started the Home Rule League and established its branches throughout the country. Large quantities of propaganda literature were distributed. She travelled all over the country and called upon the people to wake up from their slumber.

There were persistent reports of the impending action against her and two of her lieutenants in the Home Rule League, B. P. Wadia and George Arundale. In the middle of June 1917, Lord Pentland, the Governor of Madras, decided to come down to Madras from Ootacamund for a final attempt
to persuade her to give up the Home Rule campaign. He told her personally, "I have come down in order to show my great consideration for you and to speak to you myself and give you an opportunity of consideration." She asked him, "What am I to consider?" He replied, "That is for you to decide, but you might like to consult your friends." She then asked him, "Am I to be interned? Sir Reginald Craddock (the Home Member) had stated that no one was to be interned without a full statement of the offence for which he was to be interned and without being given a full opportunity for explanation or defence. I did not think at the time that it was true because some of my own friends had no such opportunity. But I am very grateful to Your Excellency for proving it to be false." The Governor declined to be drawn into a discussion. She then told him, "I can only act according to my conscience and leave the rest to God. I have nothing to regret in anything I have written or anything that I have said: and unless Your Excellency tells me what you wish me to consider, I am at a loss to know what to suggest." She asked the Governor whether it was true that he wished to deport her to England. The reply of the Governor was: "Only for the period of the War". The Governor gave the further assurance: "I will give you a safe conduct to England to take you through." She declined the offer. The Governor made it clear that if she did not give up the Home Rule campaign, he will have to stop all her activities including those of a non-political character because he could not discriminate between one form of activity and another. The reply of Annie Besant was: "You have all the power and I am helpless; and you must do what you like. There is just one thing which I should like to say to Your Excellency and that is that I believe you are striking the deadliest blow against the British Empire in India." She was interned but released after three months. She became a heroine in the eyes of the Indians and she was elected the President of the Indian National Congress in 1917.

She was in favour of Swadeshi but she did not want the same to be used as a political weapon. She was opposed to the boycott of British goods. She was in favour of Home Rule for India but she was not prepared to cut the connection between India and Britain. She did not approve of the
Non-cooperation Movement of Mahatma Gandhi and so parted company with the Congress.

At the end of the First World War, she declared in London before the Joint Parliamentary Committee that India could not accept for all time a Constitution framed for her by the British Government in London. Working on this concept of India framing her own Constitution, she proceeded with the task of framing a Bill for the future governance of India which would have the broad-based support of all political parties. She attended the Belgaum Congress and attempted to have the doors of the Congress opened to all parties but failed. In January 1925, when the All-Parties Conference met in Delhi, she placed her report on the Bill before the Swaraj Sub-Committee of the Conference. Though the report as a whole was not accepted by the Conference, many of the changes introduced subsequently in the Bill owed their origin to that report. After the Bill had been finally re-shaped in India at the National Convention at Kanpur in April 1925, Annie Besant attended a meeting of the Working Committee of the Congress in Calcutta at the end of May 1925 at Gandhiji’s suggestion. There was no quorum of the meeting. As C. R. Das was not well, she went to Darjeeling to obtain his approval for the Bill. In February 1926, she attended a private conference of about 40 members of the Central Legislature in Delhi for considering the Bill. The measure described later as “The Commonwealth of India Bill” was supported by several leading Indian statesmen including Mr. M. A. Jinnah. After it had gone through its first reading in the House of Commons, Annie Besant made vigorous efforts to secure general support for it. The Private Bill did not get beyond the stage of first reading in the House of Commons. However, the work on the Commonwealth of Indian Bill was a great help to the authors of the Nehru Report.

The daily life of Annie Besant was full of many acts of kindness. Whoever it might be and whatever the form of help that was sought, she never refused. Countless people all over the world still remember her with warm gratitude.

It is true that she did not realise her dream of seeing India free before her death but many of the things she urged with all her love for India are being learnt the hard way by the Government of India, e.g., the dangers implicit in indiscipline
and the resort to Civil Disobedience as a form of mass protest. Her place among the builders of modern India is one that time only will brighten.

About Annie Besant, Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar observed: "The average Indian of today does not fully realise the deep debt of gratitude that he owes to Dr. Annie Besant for the selfless and tireless enthusiasm with which she toiled for the regeneration of the country she adopted as her own and for her services for the educational, social and political progress of India's teeming millions. With her rich and variegated experience, Dr. Besant contributed in several ways to awaken India to her own greatness. As the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru once said, to the younger generation of to-day, she is perhaps just a name but to his generation and to an earlier one, she was a tremendous figure who influenced the men of her time greatly and there could be no doubt that in India's journey for freedom her part was a considerable one." (Biographical Vistas, p. 90).

According to K. S. Venkataramani, "Her life is the greatest adventure in peace one has known in quest of Truth. She is the most sincere humanitarian of the century. Her mystic glands continually pour into the stream of her compassionate blood an aching affection for humanity and a fevered throb for the well-being of man. She has lived her strenuous eighty years of life in the highest moods of a creative rapture and unrest of work. Has any one, man or woman, a finer record of selfless and devoted work to present before the Maker or to one's own generation?"

C. R. Reddy says, "In what direction was not Mrs. Besant great, in what field not the pioneer, tiller and sower? She poured new life into every department of life and culture and into all the races and countries of the world. Education, social reform, aye, even forbidden sex, labour and radical movements, political evolution of dependent peoples into Statehood and nationhood and self-respect, a closer organisation of warring nations into mutual understanding and sympathy and a cooperative global order—in the encyclopaedia of human endeavour, has anyone shown greater dynamic drive and foresight than Mrs. Besant? She grew with the years and grew beyond them and kept on growing. Old age forsooth. Every
year was a new age with her and no nonage."
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Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das
(1870-1925)

Chittaranjan Das was a great patriot. He loved his country passionately and was ever ready and willing to make any sacrifice for her. He gave up overnight his princely practice at the Bar and changed from one of the richest men in India to one who had hardly anything which he could call his own. With his sympathy for the poor, he declared that Swaraj must mean a richer and better life for the masses of India and not merely the acquisition of additional rights for some privileged classes. He brought to the Indian national struggle a poet's passion and a lawyer's analytical mind. It was not surprising that his services and renunciation won the hearts of the people throughout the country. Barrister C. R. Das became Deshbandhu Chittaranjan. It is one of the tragedies of Indian politics that Deshbandhu died in the prime of his life. He was hardly 55 at the time of his death.

C. R. Das was born on 5 November 1870. He was called to the Bar in 1893. To begin with, he devoted himself to literary activities, but later on got himself completely absorbed in the practice of law. It was the Alipore Bomb Conspiracy Case which brought him to the fore-front in the Calcutta Bar. His reputation as a patriot and a lawyer spread throughout the country. He took up the defence of the accused in the
Delhi Conspiracy Case. He also appeared in the Alipore Trunk Murder Case of 1918. He was praised for his skill, courage and integrity as a lawyer. The secret of his success lay in the extreme care with which he prepared his cases. He hunted up all the references and weighed all the facts. He analysed with utmost care and ingenuity the statements of the witnesses, documents and circumstantial evidence. He was possessed of an iron will and he never yielded ground either to the Judges or to his adversaries. There was not the slightest trace of sycophancy in his pleadings or the faintest suggestion of fear in the presence of authority. He stood up like a man and spoke with such sincerity and conviction that even those Judges who were initially hostile to him, were won over.

C. R. Das was interested in politics even during his student days. Probably it was on account of his political activities that he was not taken in the Indian Civil Service. In his professional life, politics played an important part and some of his outstanding successes as a lawyer were in political cases. Patriotism was the guiding force of his literary works. From his earliest days in politics he fought for Swaraj for the masses and not for a handful of upper class men and women. His country recognised his great qualities of head and heart and gave him the title of Deshbandhu or “Friend of the Country”.

C. R. Das was associated with B. C. Pal. He was opposed to the policy of mendicancy of the Moderates who controlled the Indian National Congress at that time. In his speech delivered at Darjeeling on 16 October 1905, he declared: “The chief reason for which the Swadeshi movement is desirable appears to me that it provides the first step towards the path of self-reliance of the Bengali nation. For the same reason it is my firm conviction that our national progress depends upon the success of this movement. The histories of the world have proved that no nation can help another. As every person has to work out his future through his personal exertion, so is the case with a nation. It has to depend upon its own strength for achieving freedom. But if you depend on another nation, even in thousands of years you will not find the path of real freedom.”

At the Barisal Bengal Provincial Conference held in 1906, he drafted the main resolution. He advocated a policy of self-
reliance. In April 1917, he was invited to preside over the Bengal Provincial Conference held in Calcutta. In his address he blamed our political assemblies for their failure to call upon the common people, the tillers of the soil, to join them. It was purely a bourgeois policy which was not based on democratic principles. The political agitation in India was unreal, as it was divorced from the intimate touch of the people who formed the backbone of the country. In his address, he demonstrated how with the progress of British rule, the people of India had imitated some of the worst European vices, sacrificed our former lives and vigour and in its place adopted a life of ease and luxury. In his opinion, it was Bankim Chandra Chatterjee "to whom the true nature of the Mother was first revealed. It was he whose eyes were first blessed by the blessed vision of the Motherland." His message was a call to self-reliance. He was no enemy of the West, but he felt that unless India could meet the West as an equal there could be no permanent friendship between the two.

C. R. Das gave up his practice in 1920. This was done in accordance with the Nagpur resolution of the Congress. At that time, he was at the top of the legal profession in India. His enormous income enabled him not only to live in comfort but also to exercise power in all spheres of social life. On this occasion, the Maharatta of Poona wrote: "The heartiest congratulations of the whole of India are due to Mr. Das for the courageous self-sacrifice which he has displayed in renouncing his legal practice in obedience to the Congress Resolution. We call it courageous self-sacrifice for obvious reasons. Mr. Das is the foremost barrister in Bengal and his earnings are worthy to be envied by princes. Das has been recklessly liberal in spending money in charity. Scores of poor families have always found in him their true friend and benefactor and we know that only the anxiety of those that depend on his money had so long kept Das at the Bar after the Calcutta Congress of September 1920. The nation already admired the services of the man but now he has become the true servant of the nation with nothing but its welfare before his eyes. He appears to have at present concentrated his energies on the solution of the education problem in Bengal by founding a National College at Calcutta. We wish him every success in his under-
taking and assure him that the sympathy and appreciation of his country are always his as he treads the path of self-abnegation."

After giving up his practice, he devoted himself wholeheartedly to the political struggle in the country. His house was converted into a political institution, a place for consultation, organisation and propaganda. Day and night he immersed himself in the political agitation. On 10 December 1921 he was arrested. On that occasion, he gave the following message to the crowd assembled: "If our object be noble, don't worry about the consequences. The fire that has been kindled in the land is not likely to be extinguished. The result rests in the hand of God. Be strictly non-violent in your work and your object will be achieved. Men and women of India, this is my message to you. Victory is in sight, if you are prepared to win it through suffering."

C. R. Das was opposed to the acceptance of the Reforms of 1919 on the ground that those were inadequate and unsatisfactory. Although he opposed Mahatma Gandhi's resolution on non-cooperation in September 1921, he was converted later on and supported the non-cooperation movement wholeheartedly. It was on account of his influence and devotion that the non-cooperation movement was a success in Bengal. Calcutta observed complete hartal when the Prince of Wales visited that city in 1921.

C. R. Das did not approve of the suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement by Mahatma Gandhi in 1922. He presided over the Gaya Session of the Congress held in December 1922. Throughout the year 1923, he was busy lecturing all over the country. In a lecture in the Deccan during his campaign in 1923, he observed: "Am I a rebel? I would rather rebel against the Congress and any institution in India if I felt that the realisation of the demand of Swaraj makes it necessary. I want Swaraj. I want my liberty. I am prepared to fight. I have not been a coward at any time in my life. I am prepared to lay down my life. Begin today, test me and I shall prove if I can come to your standard."

C. R. Das was a great realist and strategist. When he found people frustrated over the withdrawal of the non-cooperation movement, he put forward the programme of Council Entry.
He started the Swarajist Party in collaboration with Motilal Nehru and Lajpatrai. In spite of opposition in the beginning, he was able to have his way. The Swarajist Party did a lot of useful work under his leadership. A Conference of the All-India Swarajist Party was held on 16 August 1924 in Calcutta. All the important leaders of the party attended it. Addressing the Conference, C. R. Das said: "Whatever name you may give to it—non-cooperation, responsive non-cooperation, responsive cooperation—I want to have my programme put absolutely clearly. We will not shrink from destroying any system which stands against our system. We will not shrink from telling the Government, 'Until and unless you recognise our legitimate rights, we will try to destroy your system of Government. We cannot build our system without destroying your system.' Not that there is a particular pleasure in destruction, but we cannot build unless we remove something which stands in our way." He concluded with an appeal for support to the Party: "I appeal to you—I make no appeal to the bureaucracy or to the Secretary of State—I appeal to you: stand fast by the principles which the Swarajists have put forward before the country. We will act, but give us breathing time. Do not overwhelm us with criticism and questions. I have thought and thought about it for the last twenty years of my life and now I have devoted the rest of my life to the cause of my country. Believe in me and I tell you God willing, I shall not die before I have accomplished my object."

C. R. Das was against political assassinations. On 29 March 1925 he issued a manifesto in which he declared that he was opposed to the principle of political assassination, and violence in any shape or form. It was absolutely abhorrent to him and to his party. He considered it as an obstacle to political progress. It was also opposed to our religious teaching. As a question of practical politics, if violence was to take root in the political life of our country, that was to be the end of our Swaraj for all times to come.

Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das died on 16 June 1925 at Darjeeling. His dead body was brought to Calcutta where lakhs of people gathered to pay him their last homage. Mahatma Gandhi was among those who carried his dead
body to the cremation ground. A condolence meeting was held at Calcutta and Mahatma Gandhi was the only speaker. On that occasion, Mahatma Gandhi said that Deshbandhu was one of the greatest of men. He dreamed, thought and talked of freedom of India and of nothing else. He was fearless. He was brave. His love for the young men of Bengal was boundless and even his adversaries admitted that there was no other man who could take his place in Bengal. His heart knew no difference between the Hindus and Musalmans. He bore no ill-will even against the Englishmen. The body of Deshbandhu had perished, but his name would remain immortal. His services and sacrifices were matchless.

C. R. Das was a practical idealist who knew how to combine what is desirable with what is possible. He was never a slave to slogans. He knew that in the political struggle there must be changes in strategy and tactics from time to time. He did not allow any false sense of pride to stand in the way of such changes. As a realist he knew that when freedom is sought through the methods of negotiation and compromise, it can come only in gradual stages. He repeatedly declared that it was the task of statesmanship to consolidate every gain and use it as a base for further advance towards the goal.
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Moti Lal Nehru was not only one of the greatest lawyers of the country but also a great patriot who gave up all his fortune for the sake of his country. He was twice the President of the Indian National Congress, in 1919 and 1928. He was a follower of Mahatma Gandhi. He began as a Moderate but the terrible happenings in the Punjab in 1919 completely changed all his love and admiration for the British and their institutions into bitterness and he became an ardent advocate and fighter for India's freedom. He gave up his practice of law in 1920 and devoted the rest of his life for the cause of India's freedom.

Pandit Moti Lal Nehru was born on 6 May 1861 and he died on 6 February 1931. Upto the age of 12, he was taught only Persian and Arabic under Qazi Sadruddin, the tutor of the Raja of Khetri. He did not show any remarkable brilliance as a student at school and in the college. He seldom applied his sharp intelligence to formal studies, so much so that he missed taking his B.A. degree probably under the impression that the same was not necessary for his advancement. As a student, he was known for his turbulence. However, when he joined law he did wonderfully well. He won a gold medal in the High Court Vakils' Examination. After serving his period of apprenticeship for 3 years in the law courts of Kanpur, he set up practice at Allahabad where
he was destined to win fame as a brilliant lawyer with a fabulous income. He was a civil lawyer and he made a great name at the Bar for the brilliance and thoroughness of his advocacy. Although he did not have the eloquence of an orator, he was so persuasively logical in his arguments that, as Ben Jonson said of the speaking of Francis Bacon, "his hearers could not cough or look aside from him without a loss."

Moti Lal Nehru was overburdened with cases. In November 1905, he wrote to his son Jawahar Lal Nehru who was in England at that time: "Clients! Clients! Clients! One small brain to cope with half of the work of the High Court." The litigants insisted on his taking up their cases and cheerfully paid any fees he demanded. He took up the Lakhna Estate case in 1894 and it remained with him for more than 30 years. The Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court observed that "No lawyer in the world could have done that case better than Pandit Moti Lal had done it." Moti Lal Nehru generally handled big and complicated cases. He prepared a memorandum of claims on behalf of Raja of Khetri in his dispute with the Jaipur State. When he went to England in 1899, he showed that document to Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, an Indian member of the House of Commons. Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree was very much impressed with the document and wondered if the same had been drawn by Sir Edward Clark. Moti Lal Nehru accepted the compliment with thanks.

Moti Lal Nehru charged big fees for his cases. In the Dumraon case, he was paid Rs. 2 lakhs in 8 months. It is said that money rained upon him and also went out in torrents. However, all his fabulous income ended when he decided to give up his practice on an appeal from Mahatma Gandhi. Cars, horses and carriages disappeared from Anand Bhawan. There was a drastic reduction in the number of servants and the kitchen establishment was cut down to the barest minimum. He himself took to handspun and hand-woven cloth. The Anand Bhawan became the national property. Moti Lal Nehru never regretted the sacrifice. Writing to Mahatma Gandhi in 1921, he wrote: "What a fall my countrymen! but really, I have never enjoyed life better." He described his attitude to money thus: "No man in his senses can for a moment doubt the supreme contempt I have always had for
money. My whole life is an illustration of this. I have so far been sought by it and have now forcibly closed my doors in its face.” When Mahatma Gandhi appealed for funds on behalf of the “poor spinners”, Moti Lal Nehru reminded him about the offer he had made in 1920. He had promised to contribute Rs. one lakh every year to the Tilak Fund if he was allowed to continue his practice. “But you refused to be bribed, as you then put it.” Chief Justice Sir Grimwood Mears paid a compliment to Moti Lal Nehru as a lawyer in these words: “When I had the pleasure of meeting him I understood the reasons for the affection with which he was regarded...He had a profusion of gifts; knowledge came easily to him, and as an advocate he had the art of presenting his case in its most attractive form. He had an exquisite public-speaking voice and a charm of manner which made it a pleasure to listen to him. With his wide knowledge of reading and the pleasure that he had taken in travel he was a very delightful companion, and wherever he sat at a table that was the head of the table and was the centre of interest.”

Moti Lal Nehru was a lover of life. He did not stand for abstinence or asceticism. He was superlatively elegant in his food, drink and dress. He considered it a weakness to save money. A lot of money was spent on the upkeep of his house known as Anand Bhawan which was bought in 1900 for Rs. 19,000/-. It was a large mansion, situated in a spacious compound and contained all the conveniences and comforts. There were carriages, cars, stables and swimming pools. There were three kitchens where the choicest foods were cooked to suit the most fastidious tastes. The hospitality of Moti Lal Nehru was proverbial. Princes and pro-consuls shared his exquisite food and wine. Almost every evening, friends congregated at his house where wine flowed as freely as the talk. As a child, Jawaharlal Nehru once saw his father drinking a glass of claret. Horrified by its red colour, he ran to his mother and told her that his father was drinking blood. Anand Bhawan was truly an abode of beauty and happiness. Moti Lal Nehru was as royal in his bounty as in his appearance.

There were stories about the fabulous income of Moti Lal Nehru. At the height of his prosperity, he was supposed to have sent his clothes to the laundries in Paris. It was believed
that life in prison was made as comfortable for him as though he had been living in his own house. Sir Harcourt Butler, the Governor of U.P., was his friend and he was stated to have sent regular supplies of champagne to him in prison. Arthur More, former Editor of the *Statesman* of Calcutta, says that the story was true. To quote him, "His (Moti Lal’s) first morning in prison, an A.D.C. from Government House arrived at luncheon time with a half bottle of champagne wrapped in a napkin and every single day of his imprisonment this was repeated."

Arthur Moore tells us that this fact was narrated to him by Moti Lal Nehru himself. Moti Lal Nehru was asked by Aldous Huxley whether it was a fact that Sir Malcolm Hailey, Governor of U.P., provided him with maple furniture and drinks when in prison, and Moti Lal Nehru replied: "No, it is not true. But in the good old days rivers of champagne must have flowed between us." It is stated that Lieut. Col. Martin, Superintendent of the Yervada prison, was surprised when while stating his needs, Moti Lal Nehru asked for some porridge, eggs and fish, bread and butter, some soup, a fowl and a little pudding. That was the food he wanted for himself and Dr. Syed Mahmud.

Moti Lal Nehru first attended the Calcutta session of the Indian National Congress in 1906. He joined the group of the Moderates and was a critic of the Extremists led by Tilak. In his presidential speech at the first U.P. Provincial Conference on 29 March 1907, Moti Lal Nehru said: "I do not subscribe to most of the doctrines of my Extremist friends...At the same time, I look upon the Extremists as only the natural outcome of the present condition of things." He admired Gokhale whose political sagacity deeply impressed him. Long after the death of Gokhale, he recalled his brilliance and his extraordinary insight into the British Government’s fiscal manipulations in India. He shared the belief of the Moderates in the inevitability of this country’s freedom and deprecated all talk of "direct action". He declared: "The heart is a fool; the only safe guide is the head."

Moti Lal Nehru was present at Surat in 1907 when the split took place in the Indian National Congress. He was the President of the U.P. Provincial Congress Committee for 7 years. Since 1910, he was a member of the U.P. Legislative
Council. He joined the India Home Rule League when Mrs. Annie Besant was interned in June 1917. The Pioneer called him "Brigadier-General of the Home Rule League."

There occurred a great change in him after 1919. The happenings in the Punjab in 1919 completely disillusioned him. The Jallianwala Bagh massacre was a great eye-opener for him. He was appointed the Chairman of a Committee whose function was to investigate into what had happened in the Punjab during the Martial Law regime. Mahatma Gandhi, Madan Mohan Malaviya and C.R. Das were also members of this Committee. His intimate association with Mahatma Gandhi during these days and the exposure of the misdeeds of the Englishmen in 1919, changed the rest of his life and Moti Lal Nehru decided to follow Mahatma Gandhi. While presiding over the annual session of the Congress at Amritsar in December 1919, Moti Lal Nehru pleaded with the Liberals to join the forces of nationalism for liberating the country from foreign rule. He told them that the "lacerated heart" of the Punjab enjoined upon them to do so.

In 1919, Moti Lal Nehru started a paper called Independent which continued up to 1923. In a message for his paper, Motilal Nehru wrote that the Independent would lay bare the soul of the Indian nation. He condemned the methods of "cabal, camera and camerilla" and despaired opportunism. He pledged his paper to "the eternal truth that while on the one hand natural rights of mankind cannot be withheld to be doled out in little bits with a high-minded generosity", they could neither be vindicated in an atmosphere of social and religious fissures.

In 1907, he described the British Parliament as the "final arbiter of India's destinies", but in 1919, he became a champion of the rights of the people of India. He regretted the omission of a charter of rights from the Government of India Act, 1919. To quote him, "No Constitution can meet our needs unless it is accompanied with a guarantee and a clear declaration of our elementary rights which have recently been so ruthlessly violated in the Punjab. No Indian can be blind to the fact that the protection of our fundamental civic liberties is a matter of the most urgent consequences. No statesman can shut his eyes to the supreme moral necessity of
securing the faith of the Indian people in the inviolability of their rights of citizenship...It is obvious that all these traditional rights have been set at naught in India by the combined operation of the Indian Defence of the Realm Act, the numerous repressive measures on our Statute Book and the cult of Martial Law. History teaches us that wherever the liberties of a people have been placed at the mercy of an executive possessing the power to enact all the laws it wanted, the advent of self-Government has been preceded or accompanied by a statutory declaration of rights. This is what we find in most of the continental Constitutions of Europe and in the American Constitution."

The view of Moti Lal Nehru was that a declaration of rights was essential for the dignity and status of citizens. It was an antidote to the exercise of arbitrary power. Moti Lal Nehru pointed out that the exercise of irresponsible authority was a grave danger to civilization. To quote him, "It is for England to learn the lesson and put an end to conditions which permit these occurrences in her own dominion. If our lives and honour are to remain at the mercy of an irresponsible executive and military, if the ordinary rights of human-beings are denied to us, then all talk of reform is a mockery. Constitutional reform without free citizenship is like rich attire on a dead body. Better to breath God's free air in rags than be a corpse in the finest raiment."

Motilal Nehru was a great lawyer but he did belong to the positivist school of law. He demanded a moral backing for the laws. He was of the view that if a law was unjust, a citizen had the right to disobey it. In his presidential address at Amritsar in 1919, Moti Lal observed, "It is the right of every man to refuse to obey any law which goes against his conscience and to which he cannot with due regard to truth submit, and to suffer the consequences for such disobedience. This is specially so where the laws are passed against the will of the people. We shall not be free or desire freedom unless we have these qualities in ample measure."

In the same presidential address, he outlined his picture of an independent India. To quote him, "We must aim at an India where all are free and have the fullest opportunities of development; where women have ceased to be in bondage and
the rigours of the caste system have disappeared; where there are no privileged classes or communities; where education is free and open to all; where the capitalists and landlords do not oppress the labourers and ryots; where labour is respected and well paid and poverty, the nightmare of the present generation, is a thing of the past."

Moti Lal Nehru had a secular approach to Indian politics. He believed in the separation of religion from politics. He had no special love for the ancient Hindu culture. In his presidential speech at the first U.P. Provincial Conference in March 1907, he stood for "conciliation and mutual concession". In his presidential speech at the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1928, he observed: "Religion as practised today is, however, the greatest separatist force. It puts artificial barriers between man and man and prevents the development of healthy and co-operative national life. Not content with its reactionary influences on social matters, it has invaded the domain of politics and economics and affected every aspect of our life. Its association with politics has been to the good of neither. Religion has been degraded and politics has sunk into the mire. Complete divorce of one from the other is the only remedy."

Like Ranade and Mahatma Gandhi, Moti Lal believed that social reforms and political freedom must go together. In his presidential address at the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1928, he laid the following programme for the country:

1. Popularising the communal solution agreed to at the All Parties Conferences in the country by intensive propaganda in the press and on the platform and organising village to village lectures.

2. Organising similar propaganda in regard to the resolutions of the Delhi Unity Conference and the Madras Congress with such improvements as this Congress might make on communal matters other than those dealt with by the Conferences.

3. Work among the untouchables and depressed classes.

4. Organisation of labour, agricultural and industrial.

5. Other village organisations.

6. Popularising Khaddar and boycott of foreign cloth.

7. Campaign against social customs which retard social intercourse and national growth, more especially against the
Purdah and the other disabilities of women.
8. Intensive campaign against the drink and opium curse.
9. Publicity.

Motilal Nehru was the only senior Congressmen who gave his unqualified support to Mahatma Gandhi when he brought forward his famous boycott resolution at the Calcutta session of the Congress held in September 1920. Till his last day, he took part in all the non-cooperation movements and cheerfully courted imprisonment. When Gandhiji’s call for sacrifice came in the first Non-Cooperation Movement, Moti Lal Nehru was one of the earliest to join after giving up his enormous practice at the Bar. Both Moti Lal Nehru and C.R. Das were together in a Calcutta prison and they were willing to accept the compromise solution offered in 1921 by Lord Reading, Viceroy of India, through Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. The Viceroy was willing to give virtual autonomy in the field of provincial administration with the door opening towards a measure of Central responsibility, in case the Congress withdrew its boycott of the visit of the Prince of Wales to India. Moti Lal Nehru and C.R. Das were not willing to continue the boycott of the new legislatures. After a strenuous fight within the Congress, Moti Lal Nehru led the Swarajist Party in the Central Assembly after the second general elections in 1924. Gandhiji reconciled himself to the Swarajist Party as the legislative wing of the Congress.

The role of Moti Lal Nehru as the leader of the Swarajist Party in the Central Assembly was different from the part played by Vithalbhai Patel as its President. Moti Lal Nehru was an accomplished parliamentarian. He had all the necessary equipment to make himself a formidable leader of the Opposition in the Central Assembly. His speeches were delivered persuasively and with great lucidity. He delivered staggering blows at the bureaucracy when the occasion demanded it. In spite of it, he commanded great respect as much from the Treasury Benches as from the other sections of the Central Assembly. His speeches were always fair and constructive. He maintained his life-long association with the members of the European community. Sir Alexander Muddiman, the Home Member of the Government of India, was socially on the best of terms with him.
As the Leader of the Opposition in the Central Assembly, Moti Lal Nehru performed his task with extraordinary skill and succeeded in making a thorough exposure of British pretensions. His strategy was as pragmatic as it was clever. In most of his speeches in the Assembly, Moti Lal Nehru did not demand complete independence for India. He was contented with very much less than that. In his speeches during 1924-25 in the Central Assembly, Moti Lal Nehru put forward the concept of a Round Table Conference. He asked the Government, to follow the procedure adopted in the case of Australia and South Africa. It appears that the first instinct of Ramsay MacDonald as Prime Minister of England was the direction urged by Moti Lal Nehru. Moti Lal Nehru moved a resolution in the Central Assembly urging the Government of India to constitute "in consultation with the Central Legislative Assembly, a Convention, a Round Table Conference or other suitable agencies, adequately representative of all Indian, European and Anglo-Indian interests, to frame, with due regard to the interests of minorities, a detailed scheme for the prior approval of the Legislative Assembly before submission to the British Parliament for adoption as a statute." The dissolution of the Central Assembly was to follow the preparation of such a Constitution so that a newly elected legislature might have its approval before the submission of the scheme to the British Parliament for its sanction. In the course of the debate, Moti Lal Nehru observed: "We have come here to offer our cooperation, non-cooperators as we are, if you will care to cooperate with us. That is why we are here. If you agree to have it, we are your men: if you do not, we shall like men stand upon our rights and continue to be non-cooperators." There was no common ground between the Government and the Congress and the Government was not prepared to accept the right of India to make her own constitution without reference to the British Parliament. The proposal of Moti Lal Nehru was carried by 76 votes to 48 and the opponents consisted only of the entire bloc of 26 members, the representatives of British commerce and a small number of members nominated by the Government. One of the strongest supporters of Moti Lal Nehru was Mr. M. A. Jinnah. Moti Lal Nehru marshalled his forces inside the Central Assembly with
vigour and skill.

During the twenties of the 20th century, the opportunities for quickening the progress of the country towards full freedom were very much limited. Under the circumstances, Moti Lal Nehru never neglected any opportunity of moving in to a position of comparatively greater vantage or strength. He nearly accepted a place on the Muddiman Reforms Committee in 1924. In June 1925, he was nominated as a member of the Skeen Commission which enquired into the possibility of the Indianization of the army in India and he also served on it for a brief period.

After the death of C.R. Das in June 1925, the Swarajist Party became weak. Moti Lal Nehru could not tolerate opposition. He referred to the Maharashtra group of responsi-vist Swarajists, N. C. Kelkar and M. R. Jayakar, as the diseased limbs and the necessity of cutting them off. The result was that the Maharashtra leaders left the Swarajist Party. In 1930, Moti Lal Nehru joined the Salt Satyagraha as he was disgusted with the unfruitful and negative debates in the Central Assembly. There were also internal factions and disruptions in the Swarajist Party.

Moti Lal Nehru was the Chairman of a Committee which produced what is known as the Nehru Report. The Report was in many ways an improvement on the Commonwealth of India Bill. It recommended dominion status as a compromise measure of maximum agreement among the constituent parties. It also recommended a federal union between the provinces and the Indian states. It was a great achievement against formidable odds. There were too many conflicting views and it was a Herculean task to reconcile them. The Report was attacked by men like Subhash Chandra Bose, Jawahar Lal Nehru and Srinivasa Aiyengar who were the champions of complete independence for India instead of dominion status as recommended in the Nehru report. Moti Lal Nehru was prepared to accommodate Mr. Jinnah so far as special rights for the Muslims were concerned in the provinces in which they were in a minority but not so in Bengal and the Punjab where they formed a majority of the population.

Moti Lal Nehru's health was shattered in the jail and he died on 6 February 1931. He was not lucky to see India free
but left behind a son who became the first Prime Minister of free India. Moti Lal Nehru will always have an eminent place in the list of those who laboured hard for India’s freedom. He possessed courage of a type which is rare, courage not only to fight the British but also courage to differ from Mahatma Gandhi and also from his son Jawaharlal Nehru on certain occasions. He was not a great orator but certainly he was a fine advocate. He knew how to make a point. Religion did not appeal to him. He hated hypocrisy and humbug and could not suffer fools. He was a man of great vivacity, with a fund of anecdotes and a considerable amount of wit and humour. He was an engaging conversationalist. He was a high-spirited patriot. He was a realist in politics. He was a man of strong determination. He was a man with strong likes and dislikes. He was dogmatic and proud. He had a tremendous zest for life and good living. In his youth, he burnt the candle at both ends and a bit in the middle. He was a handsome man with a fine presence. There was something Roman in his carriage and in the proud tilt of his head. He was fierce and inflammable by temperament. His laughter swept like a gale through his house. Nature was prodigal in her gifts to him.

Jawahar Lal Nehru has paid the following tribute in his Autobiography to his father. “I miss his noble presence in a world full of pettiness and weakness. I look round in vain for that grand manner and splendid strength.”
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Rabindra Nath Tagore
(1861-1941)

Tagore was great as a poet, great as a philosopher, great as an educationist and great as a humanitarian. He not only wrote or spoke poetry, but lived in poetry throughout his life. Through his writings he put before his countrymen the great mission of liberating their country from foreign yoke. He was the greatest interpreter of India’s nationalism. He kept aloft the flame of defiant patriotism in an atmosphere of natural simplicity. His greatest contribution to India was the Vishwa Bharati University at Shanti Niketan.

Tagore was born on 7 May 1861. His father’s name was Maharshi Devendranath. His mother died when he was 14. He was married on 9 December 1883.

Tagore took a leading part in the partition agitation. He drew up a programme for the day earmarked for partition, which carried such intense sentimental appeal that it became the annual ritual of the Bengalees. According to the programme, the day of the partition was to be observed as a day of mourning by Bengalees. There was to be no cooking in the Bengalee homes. The patriotic Bengalees were to take bath in the Bhagirathi as the first thing in the morning on that day and then tie the Rakhi on the wrist of fellow Bengalees. On that occasion, Tagore composed a special song which ended with the refrain: “Let all the brothers and sisters of every Bengalee home be united in heart, O God.”
When the National Council of Education was set up in 1906 in Bengal, Tagore was associated with it. He had a hand in shaping its educational policy and preparing a course of studies for it. He was put in charge of the Bengalee language and literature department of the institution. However, his association with the anti-partition movement did not last long. He did not approve of the adoption of methods like the boycott of the schools, British goods etc., and hence left the movement. According to him, the boycott of schools amounted to a negative sacrifice leading to non education. Likewise, the programme of the boycott of the British goods was a negative one. In a letter written to his friend C. F. Andrews in 1920, Tagore wrote: “Swadeshi, Swarajism, ordinarily produce intense excitement in the minds of my countrymen, because they carry in them some fervour of passion generated by the exclusiveness of their “rage. It cannot be said that I am untouched by this heat and movement. But somehow, by my temperament as a poet, I am incapable of accepting these objects as final. They claim from us a great deal more than is their due. After a certain point is reached, I find myself obliged to separate myself from my own people with whom I have been working.”

After leaving the political movement, Tagore divided his time between his two interests, literary activities and the educational institution at Shanti Niketan. An English edition of the Gitanjali was published towards the end of 1912 and an introduction to it was written by W. B. Yeats. Through it Tagore was introduced to the people of the West. The publication of the English version of Gitanjali marked an important turning point in his life. The book was selected for Nobel Prize in Literature in November 1913. The people of the West discovered in Tagore one of the greatest literary figures of the world. He became a world figure in his own right.

In 1916, Knighthood was conferred on him by the King Emperor. However, he gave up the same in 1919 in connection with the tragedy of Jallianwala Bagh. While giving up Knighthood, Tagore addressed a letter to the Viceroy on 29 May 1919, in which he expressed his sentiments in these words: “The enormity of the measures taken by the Government of the Punjab for quelling some local disturbances has, with a rude shock, revealed to our minds the helplessness of our position
as British subjects in India. The disproportionate severity of the punishments inflicted upon the unfortunate people and the methods of carrying them out, we are convinced, are without parallel in the history of civilized Governments, barring some conspicuous exceptions, recent and remote. Considering that such treatment has been meted out on a population, disarmed and resourceless, by a power which has the most terribly efficient organisation for destruction of human lives, we must strongly assert that it can claim no political expediency, far less more justification.” Again, “The time has come when badges of honour make our shame glaring in the incongruous context of humiliation, and I, for my part, wish to stand, shorn of all special distinctions by the side of those of my countrymen who, for their so-called insignificance, are liable to suffer degradation not fit for human beings.”

Tagore started his school at Shanti Niketan in 1901. He started the work of setting up a University at Shanti-Niketan in 1918 and the University was opened on 22 December 1921. It was given the name of Vishwa Bharati. The primary function of the new University was to present to the outside world the representative learning of India. The view of Tagore was that there should be one specific institution where the composite culture of India could be presented to the outsider. He had great admiration for India’s cultural heritage and sincerely felt that there was a genuine desire for contact with it on the side of educated people outside. It was, therefore, India’s duty to send to the outside world an invitation for taking a share of her culture and the proposed university could take upon itself this specific function. Tagore’s main objective is indicated even in the name of the university. In coining its name, Tagore was inspired by a Vedic phrase which means a place where the entire world nestles together. The idea was that the new institution should be so developed that people from different parts of the world could be attracted to it for the exchange of spiritual wealth. According to him, “Universities should never be made into mechanical organisations for collecting and distributing knowledge. Through them the people should offer their intellectual hospitality, their wealth of mind to others and claim their proud right in return, to receive gifts from the rest of the world.”
In 1930, Tagore delivered Hibbert Lectures in England. He became India's spiritual ambassador and carried the mission of India to the various parts of the world.

When in 1932, Mahatma Gandhi wanted to undertake a fast unto death on the issue of the Communal Award, he decided to consult Rabindra Nath Tagore whom he called his Gurudeva. Before commencing the fast, Gandhiji sent a letter to Tagore asking for his approval and the latter sent a wire communicating his consent. The view of Tagore was that it was worth sacrificing Gandhiji's precious life for the sake of India's unity and her social integrity. However, he expressed the "fervent hope" that people would "not callously allow such national tragedy to reach its extreme length."

A word must be said about the humanism of Tagore. According to him, the best way to seek complete union with God was to seek contact through man. By the realisation that man is that manifestation of God which is closest to oneself, one can forge a link through the intellect, establish an emotional link by loving fellow human-beings and serve God in incarnate form by serving mankind in general. Tagore found his God in man. It became his conviction that one could realise God in the completeest form only through man. Through man alone God is accessible simultaneously by the path of knowledge (Jnana), love (Bhakti), and service (Karma). Man is the centre of interests because he manifests to man God in the most effective form. There is no point in looking for God in temples and offering Him flowers and burning incense there. He should seek Him among the common men. The man of piety should meet his God in toil and sweat. Mankind in general should be the object of love and service. God is specially manifest among the under-privileged classes. The labourer engaged in making roads, the farmer growing crops and in general people who lived literally by the sweat of the brow and from the lowest strata of society represented Him in a more significant way. God should not be looked for among the well-to-do classes favoured by fortune, but among the poorer classes. Tagore says:

"He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the path-maker is breaking stones."
He is with them in sun and in shower and his garment is covered with dust. Put off thy holy mantle and even like him come down on the dusty soil."

Tagore's humanism stemmed from his living faith in God and drew its inspirations from religion. The urge to offer service to God was both strong and universal. By linking piety with humanism, it provided a stronger inspiration than Western humanism. It harmonised piety to its cause.

Tagore, the great apostle of peace and universal brotherhood, passed away on 7 August 1941. He was one of the greatest of Indians. On one occasion, Subhash Chandra Bose paid the following tribute to Tagore: "With the voice of eternity you, Sir, have all along given passionate expression to the hopes and aspirations of our regenerate nation. Yours has been the message of undying youth. You have not only written poetry and produced art, but you have also lived poetry and art. You are not only India's poet but you are also the poet of humanity."

An idea of the lofty idealism of Tagore can be had from the following lines from the Gitanjali:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high,
Where knowledge is free
Where the world has not been broken
Up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth:
Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection:
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of habit:
Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever widening thought and action:
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father,
Let my country awake."

Nehru compared Tagore with Gandhiji in these words: "Tagore and Gandhi have undoubtedly been the two outstanding and dominating figures of India in this first half of the twentieth century. It is instructive to compare and contrast
them. No two persons could be so different from one another in their make-up of temperaments. Tagore, the aristocratic artist, turned democrat with proletarian sympathies, represented essentially the cultural tradition of India, the tradition of accepting life in the fulness thereof and going through it with song and dance. Gandhi, more a man of the people, almost the embodiment of the Indian peasant, represented the other ancient tradition of India, that of renunciation and asceticism. And yet Tagore was primarily the man of thought, Gandhi of concentrated and ceaseless activity. Both, in their different ways, had a world outlook, and both were at the same time wholly Indian. They seemed to represent different but harmonious aspects of India and to complement one another.
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Subhash Chandra Bose was one of the most fearless leaders of the Nationalist movement in the country. Although he did not live long, he was able to accomplish a lot. He was twice elected the President of the Indian National Congress. He was the founder of the Forward Bloc. He was also the founder of the Indian National Army and it is he who led the Indian armies to free India from foreign yoke during the Second World War and raised the battle-cry of "Delhi Chalo".

He was born on 23 January 1897 and had a mysterious death in 1945. He had a brilliant educational career at the Calcutta University. He began his life as a Vedantic mystic and roamed about in the cities of Northern India in quest of a spiritual Guru while he was still a college student. He went to England where he graduated from Cambridge and later on stood fourth in the Indian Civil Service Examination in 1920. In deference to the wishes of his family including those of his brother Sarat Bose, he joined as a probationer and continued as such for seven months, but he was continuously trying to persuade his family to let him resign. Ultimately, in April 1921, he resigned from the Indian Civil Service.

He became the Principal of the National College started by C.R. Das. When C.R. Das became the Mayor of Calcutta, he was appointed the Chief Executive Officer of the Calcutta Corporation. However, he was arrested and deported to
Mandalay in Burma where he was from 1925 to 1927. Even when he was in the Mandalay jail, he was elected a member of the Bengal Legislative Council.

At the Calcutta Session of the Indian National Congress held in December 1928 and presided over by Moti Lal Nehru, Subhash Chandra Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru confronted Gandhiji and Moti Lal Nehru on certain issues. Subhash Chandra Bose stood for complete independence of the country. With great difficulty the resolution in favour of Dominion Status was carried in the Calcutta Session.

It is rightly said that of all the stalwarts of India's freedom struggle, Subhash Chandra Bose came least under the influence of Gandhiji and his teachings. He stepped into the void created by the death of C.R. Das in 1925 and carried on the tradition of differing from Gandhiji even on principles. As a matter of fact, there was not much in common between Gandhiji and Subhash Chandra Bose except their whole-hearted devotion to the cause of India's freedom. Non-violence was an article of faith with Gandhiji but it was only a weapon for Subhash Chandra Bose to be used or discarded according to the necessity of the situation. Subhash Chandra Bose had points of contact with the left-wing of the Congress. In one respect he was very much different from Jawaharlal Nehru. Subhash Chandra Bose did not bother about the danger to peace from the growth of Fascism and Nazism in Europe. As a matter of fact, he was always willing and ready to get collaborators from anywhere to overthrow the British authorities in India. On a visit to Europe just before the beginning of the Second World War in September 1939, Subhash Chandra Bose made an unsuccessful attempt to secure the help of Hitler for the freedom movement in India. Later on, he actually got Germany's help against Great Britain.

Subhash Chandra Bose presided over the Haripura Session of the Congress held in 1938. However, Gandhiji was not happy over some of the behind-the-scene activities reported to him from Bengal. Subhash Chandra wanted to be elected President of the Congress second time in 1939. However, the members of the Congress Working Committee including Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad and Acharya Kripalani made public declarations against the candidature of Subhash Chandra
Bose. Gandhiji openly declared that Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya was his choice for the Presidency. In spite of that, Subhash Chandra Bose won the election by a margin of 95 votes. This was too much for a man like Mahatma Gandhi who was a father symbol to the Congress. It is true that Subhash Chandra Bose did preside over the Tripuri Session of the Congress held in 1939, but that led to a conflict between Subhash Chandra Bose on the one hand and Mahatma Gandhi and other Congress leaders on the other. The so-called Pant Resolution was passed which required that Subhash Chandra Bose must select the members of the Congress Working Committee in consultation with Mahatma Gandhi. Finding no co-operation from the other Congress leaders, Subhash Chandra Bose resigned from the Congress Presidency. In May 1939, Subhash Chandra Bose started a new party known as the Forward Bloc. When the Second World War started in September 1939, he put pressure on the Congress leaders to demand from the British Government a declaration of their war aims. He wanted the Congress to take full advantages of the difficulties of the British Government. Subhash Chandra Bose was one of the first against whom action was taken under the Defence of India Rules. After spending some time in detention, he decided to warn the authorities that a fast unto death was imminent unless he was released without delay. The Bengal Government took the risk and he was interned in his own house in Calcutta. In 1941, he disappeared all of a sudden and the Government of India was not able to trace him. He managed to escape to Afghanistan and from there to Italy and Germany. From Berlin, he began a vehement propaganda campaign against the British Government and continued his broadcasts for several years from various places. In June 1943, he went to Japan. On 5 July 1943, he announced the formation of the Indian National Army. On assuming the command of the Indian National Army, he issued a proclamation in which he observed: "This is for me a matter of joy and pride, because for an Indian there can be no greater honour than to be the Commander of India’s Army of Liberation. But I am conscious of the magnitude of the task that I have undertaken and I feel weighed down with a sense of my responsibility. I pray that God may give me the necessary
strength to fulfil my duty to India under all circumstances however difficult or trying they may be. I regard myself as the servant of 38 Crores of my countrymen who profess different religious faiths...It is only on the basis of undiluted nationalism and perfect justice and impartiality that India’s Army of Liberation can be built up. We must weld ourselves into an army that will have only one goal, namely the freedom of India, and only one will, namely to do or die in the cause of India’s freedom. When we stand, the Azad Hind Fauj has to be like a wall of granite; when we march, the Azad Hind Fauj has to be like a steam-roller.” In the course of a few weeks, Subhash Chandra Bose got recognition for his Provisional Government from Japan, Germany, Italy and other regimes allied to them. From Japan he received the assurance of “whole-hearted co-operation so that the struggle for liberating India would ultimately be crowned with success.” Thailand expressed “full sympathy with the high aspirations of the freedom-loving Indians.”

On 18 March 1944, the Indian National Army crossed the Burma border and stepped on Indian soil in Manipur. With pride, Subhash Chandra Bose addressed his soldiers in these words: “Inspired by the righteousness of our cause, we have encountered the numerically superior and better equipped but heterogeneous and dis-united forces of the enemy and defeated them in every battle. Our units, with their better training and discipline and unshakeable faith in India’s freedom have established their superiority over the enemy whose morale deteriorated with its defeat....With their blood sacrificed, these heroes have established traditions which the future soldiers of free India shall have to uphold.”

Just when an advance of Imphal was about to begin, nature went against Subhash Chandra Bose and the Indian National Army. Torrential and unseasonal rains converted the region into a quagmire and retreat became inevitable. There was shortage of supplies. There was harassment by American bombers. The soldiers of the Indian National Army fell back first on Mandalay, then on Rangoon and finally made for Bangkok. Desertions became frequent and Subhash Chandra Bose was forced to issue orders for summary trial and death in all cases of cowardice and treachery. At this time, Germany
surrendered and the Soviet Union declared war against Japan. Subhash Chandra Bose was killed in an air-crash on 18 August 1945. His ambition to hoist the flag of free India on the Red Fort at Delhi was not fulfilled during his life-time.

Subhash Chandra Bose believed that propaganda must be carried on in foreign countries in favour of India’s freedom. He also believed that India could not be freed without foreign help. This view was not shared by Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel and others. As a matter of fact, independence of India was actually achieved without any foreign help.

It is wrong to say that Subhash Chandra Bose was a quisling or a Fascist. He was every inch a patriot. He loved his country passionately and was prepared to do anything for the sake of liberating her. The quote him, “All my life I have been the servant of India and until the last hour of life, I shall remain one. My allegiance and loyalty has ever been and will ever be to India alone, no matter in what part of the world I may live.” He gave India the slogan of “Jai Hind”. He will be always remembered with gratitude by his countrymen for his patriotic love of freedom and dauntless courage.

Subhash Chandra Bose was the most prominent among the Radicals in the country. Nehru felt nearer to Subhash Chandra Bose than to others, though not close enough. Subhash Chandra Bose was a man of action. He was intensely interested in international affairs. Next to Gandhiji and Nehru, he was the most courageous, fearless and self-sacrificing patriot in the country. If occasion required, he was willing to march to the gallows with a smile on his face. Unlike Nehru he was deeply religious. Unlike Gandhiji, he was willing to encourage violence if that could yield the most effective results. While he had the utmost regard for Nehru, he was somewhat jealous of him too. He wanted a Nehru-Subhash axis to be established but if only Nehru could break away from the old guard. Nehru felt that in the existing circumstances that was not possible. Subhash felt so much dissatisfied with Nehru’s role in the Congress Working Committee that he went to the extent of saying that Nehru was behaving like a stooge of the old guard.

Subhash Chandra Bose had all the makings of a benevolent
dictator; dedicated, fearless and strict as a disciplinarian. He loved wearing uniform. He was a born leader. He shared with his men their sufferings. He was with them wherever there was risk. He shared with them the rigours of camp life and partook of the simple rations of his followers and even slept with them on the bare floor. It is unfortunate that such a great man was lost to free India at a time when she needed him the most. He is supposed to have been killed in mysterious circumstances which are the subject of enquiry by a Commission headed by Justice G.D. Khosla.
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Mahatma Gandhi has rightly been called the Father of the Nation. He was in every sense of the word the creator of Modern India. It was under his leadership that India won her independence. It is true that Tilak had anticipated him by advocating a policy of strong action against the British Government instead of a policy of mendicancy as advocated and followed by the Moderates in India. However, it cannot be denied that it was under Gandhiji that the nationalist movement in India became a mass movement and not a movement of the mere intelligentsia of India. He followed various methods to achieve his objective. He started the Non-Cooperation Movement. He also started the Civil Disobedience Movement. He violated the laws of the country. It was under him that the Congress passed the ‘Quit India’ Resolution. He fasted. He courted arrest. He defied the might of the British Empire. However, by doing all this he made the nationalist movement a mass movement and thereby brought about the independence of the country. Nagendra Nath Gupta says in this connection: “The movement led by Mahatma Gandhi has brought into prominence some of the greatest men that India has known in recent times, men who would be considered great in any country at any time. If Mahatma Gandhi is the Prophet, they are undoubtedly his apostles. The National Movement in India may easily be divided into two phases, one
before Mahatma Gandhi had joined the Indian National Congress and the other after he became the most conspicuous figure in it. In the earlier stage, Congressmen confined themselves to agitation and oratory, to ever-repeated assertion of their birth-right to Home Rule, severe criticism of governmental action, and constitutionalism and reformism. Only the very greatest of them risked and sacrificed everything for achieving their goal. The rank and file were passive on-lookers and on-hearers so to say. This might have gone on for any number of years without any prospect of freedom for India. Then came Mahatma Gandhi with his experience of the Transvaal, his spiritual outlook, his gentle nature and his inflexible will. There were willing hearts in India waiting for his call and they at once realised the nature of the struggle that lay ahead of them. Since then the struggle for national freedom in India has grown ever wider and today it comprehends the entire nation. It has been a glorious record which is being added day after day, of sacrifice and suffering of women that vied with men in offering themselves as sacrifices at the altar of liberty. The old caution and timidity have disappeared for ever; the prison has lost its hardships and degradation, and there are no signs of hesitation or reluctance to suffer. Men or women are filled with the spirit of martyrdom and the determination to win by suffering what was hitherto accomplished by violence.”

Mahatma Gandhi was unique as an individual, often unpredictable in his reactions to problems, baffling to his colleagues and followers, but always, whether in triumph or in defeat, the embodiment of serenity and poise. By temperament Gandhiji was constructive and accommodating in his policies and outlook. He was a great teacher, a practitioner of truth, a political leader and a moral genius. He is compared to Francis of Assisi for his simple life and love of fellow creatures. He is also compared to St. Paul, St. Augustine, Socrates, Mazzini, Garibaldi, Rousseau, Buddha and the first of Jains. He was a complete man who did not turn his back on life. He broke cultural and economic tyranny. He expounded the economics of the poor. He taught a new medicine and a new hygiene. He restored to us our inheritance. He made Swadeshi a symbol of self-reliance, a habit and not a doctrine. He was a great journalist and he edited some of the greatest journals that were ever published. He fought against
untouchability. He experimented with his life and he died practising that harmony which is beyond all conflict. The Indian Revolution may have begun with Raja Ram Mohan Roy. But it was Gandhiji who gave it a direction. The Indian Revolution was for a long time the Gandhian Revolution.

The original name of Mahatma Gandhi was Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. He was born on 2 October 1869 at Porbander in Kathiawad and was shot dead at New Delhi on 30 January 1948 at the age of 79. His father was a Dewan of a petty state in Gujarat. He went to England for qualifying himself for the Bar. On return, he practised law in Bombay.

Gandhiji went to South Africa in connection with professional work on behalf of a Mohammedan firm. His stay in South Africa was the formative period of his political life. It was in South Africa that he put into practice his weapon of Satyagraha. He also developed self-confidence among his countrymen to lead a struggle. It was in that Dark Continent that he taught his countrymen to give up fear, resist evil by truth, and never to yield and strive to rise to the full stature of manhood.

Gandhiji's opportunity came in 1906 when the Asiatic Registration Act was passed by the Government of South Africa. That Act required all Asiatics to register themselves and give their thumb impression. That involved a measure of humiliation which was impossible for the Indians to put up with. Gandhiji not only protested against this enactment but also led a deputation to England. However, all that brought about no change. Under the leadership of Gandhiji, the Indians refused to get themselves registered or give their thumb impressions. The result was that thousands of them were sent to jail. Gandhiji himself was awarded two months' imprisonment. As the movement was a novel one and the Government found itself helpless, a compromise was arrived at. The Indians agreed to get themselves registered voluntarily and Gandhiji was the first to offer himself for registration. However, the struggle had to be started once again as the Transvaal authorities refused to carry out their part of the agreement. There was a lot of resentment in India against the treatment of the Indians. Then the invasion of Transvaal took place. Two thousand men marched into the Transvaal under the leadership
of Gandhiji. The march was a great landmark. It was the march of truth against untruth, of justice against injustice and of non-violence against violence. A Commission of Inquiry was set up and ultimately the hated Asiatic Act was cancelled. The Poll-tax was replaced. Marriages among the Indians were recognised.

Having won his laurels in South Africa, Mahatma Gandhi came to India in 1914. At that time he had complete faith in the love of justice of the Englishmen. No wonder, he appealed to the Indians to help the British Government unconditionally. It was after 1918 that doubts arose in his mind regarding the ideals of the British rule. The passing of the Rowlatt Bills in the teeth of opposition by the people, had profound influence on his mind. It became his firm faith that the British rule in India was Satanic.

In 1915, Gandhiji had said: "As a passive resister, I discovered that the British Empire had certain ideals with which I have fallen in love and one of those ideals is that every subject of the British Empire has the freest scope for his energies and honour and whatever he thinks is due to his conscience. And I have found that it is possible for me to be governed least under the British Empire. Hence my loyalty to the British Empire." To the Viceroy, he wrote thus in 1918: "If I could make my countrymen retrace their steps, I would make them withdraw all the Congress resolutions and not whisper 'home rule' or responsible government during the pendency of the War. I would make India offer all her able-bodied sons as a sacrifice to the Empire at this critical moment; and I know that India by this very act, would become the most favoured partner, and racial distinctions would become a thing of the past." In the same strain was his advice to his countrymen in which he exhorted them "to fight unconditionally unto death with Britain for victory and agitate simultaneously, also unto death if we must, for the reforms which we desire." The Rowlatt Act, the Punjab disorders and the Khilafat agitation, however, completely shattered his belief in the justice and good faith of England. In a letter to the Viceroy written in August 1920, he wrote: "Events that have happened during the past month have confirmed me in the opinion that the Imperial Government have acted in the Khilafat matter
in an unscrupulous, immoral and unjust manner, and have been moving from wrong to wrong in order to defend their immorality. I can retain neither respect nor affection for such a government. Your Excellency's light-hearted treatment of official crime, your exoneration of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Mr. Montagu's Despatch, and above all the shameful ignorance of the Punjab events and the callous disregard of the feelings of Indians betrayed by the House of Lords have filled me with the gravest misgivings regarding the future of the Empire, have estranged me completely from the present government and have disabled me from rendering, as I have hitherto wholeheartedly rendered, my total cooperation." Elsewhere in the same letter he wrote: "In European countries condonation of such grievous wrongs as the Khilafat and the Punjab would have resulted in a bloody revolution by the people. They would have resisted, at all costs, national emasculation. Half of India is too weak to offer violent resistance and the other half is unwilling to do so. I have, therefore, ventured to suggest the remedy of non-cooperation which enables those who wish to dissociate themselves from Government, and which if unattempted by violence and undertaken in an ordered manner must compel it to retrace its steps and undo the wrongs committed, but while I pursue the policy of non-cooperation, in so far as I can carry the people with me, I shall not lose hope that you will yet see your way to do justice."

In January 1921, Ghandhiji wrote thus in Young India: "The difficulty of Englishmen lies really in believing that their rule is wholly an evil for India, i.e., it has made India worse in everything that counts. India is poorer in wealth, in manliness, in godliness and in her sons' power to defend themselves. It is sinful to conquer with evil. There is no meeting ground between good and evil, God and Satan. I have considered for thirty years, and been driven to the conclusion that British rule in its present form has proved a curse to India.

"I consider that I would be less than truthful if I did not describe as Satanic a government which has been guilty of fraud, murder and wanton cruelty, which still remains unrepentant and resorts to untruth to cover its guilt."

Mahatma Gandhi had successfully used the weapon of Satyagraha in South Africa and he decided to use the same in
India. To quote him, "I have no doubt that the British Government is a powerful Government, but I have no doubt also that Satyagraha is a sovereign remedy." He experimented with it in Champaran in Bihar, in Ahmedabad and in Kaira in Gujarat. Under the Tinkathia system in Champaran, the peasants were bound by law to grow indigo on 3/20 of their land and send the same to the British planters at prices fixed by them. They were liable to unlawful extortion and oppression by the planters. Gandhiji took up their cause and ultimately succeeded in removing their grievances. The Champaran Mission of Mahatma Gandhi was an event of utmost importance in the history of India. It was an humanitarian crusade which affected a large number of persons who were being crushed under an unjust economic system. It removed a great social injustice. It infused into the minds of poor ryots the spirit of fearlessness and regard for honesty. Although primarily humanitarian in its aims, the Champaran Mission helped the rise of nationalism. It infused into the minds of the down-trodden peasants of Champaran a spirit of awakening which was indispensable for the growth of nationalism. Mahatma Gandhi says in his autobiography: "The Champaran struggle was a proof of the fact that disinterested service of the people in any sphere ultimately helps the country politically."

The mill-workers of Ahmedabad went on a strike against the mill-owners who had refused to pay them higher wages. As a result of the intervention of Gandhiji, the mill-owners agreed to raise the wages by 35 per cent. In the Kaira district, the crops failed in 1918, but the officers insisted on full collection of land revenue. Gandhiji organised peasants to offer Satyagraha. They refused to pay land revenue and were prepared to suffer. Even those who could afford to pay refused to pay. The Government was ultimately forced to surrender and a settlement was made with the peasants. These experiments in Satyagraha brought Gandhiji into close contact with the masses, the peasants in rural areas and workers in urban areas. Gandhiji was the only leader whose personal identification with the rural masses was total and complete. He fashioned his own personal life along ways familiar to the villagers and he spoke a language they could easily understand. He became the symbol of the poor and the down-trodden. He
was a true representative of India.

About the India of his dreams, Gandhiji wrote: "I shall work for India in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country in whose making they have an effective voice, an India in which there shall be no high class or low class of people, an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony... There can be no room in such an India for the curse of untouchability... Women will enjoy the same rights as men... This is the India of my dreams."

When the Rowlatt Bills were passed in spite of unanimous opposition from the Indians, Gandhiji decided to oppose them with Satyagraha. He started a Satyagraha Sabha and devised a pledge to disobey those repressive laws. A general hartal all over the country was called for 6 April 1919. The hartal was a unique success but the police fired on the crowds and many persons died. When Gandhiji was on his way to Delhi, he was forcibly taken back to Bombay. Mahatma Gandhi himself was a member of the Committee which investigated into the happenings in the Punjab during the Martial law regime in 1919, particularly the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy. He alone could effectively control the wave of deep indignation that swept over the country.

Mahatma Gandhi took a leading part in the Khilafat agitation started by the Muslims in India. The view of some persons is that the action of Mahatma Gandhi was ill-conceived and retrograde because it did not achieve Hindu-Muslim unity and for a time it introduced religion into politics. However, there are others who believe that the Khilafat movement provided an opportunity for the national leadership to convince the Muslims that the nation was equally concerned with the problems affecting the Muslims. It was but proper that the opportunity was availed of. The Khilafat movement brought the urban Muslims into the national movement. It was also responsible for the wide-spread enthusiasm and sense of involvement that prevailed among all sections of the people at that time. There was nothing wrong in principle in the national movement espousing a cause which affected only one section of the community. There was a predominant element of anti-imperialism in both the national and Khilafat movements.

Tilak died in August 1920. In September 1920, a special
session of the Congress was held at Calcutta. When Gandhiji proposed the boycott of Legislative Councils, C. R. Das declared: "These (reforms) are not gifts of the British Government. Reforms have been wrung out of the hands of the British Government. I want to make the Council an instrument for the attainment of Swaraj and to use the weapon which is in the hollow of your hands to bring about the full, complete Swaraj." He would enter the Councils not to help but to embarrass the Government. It was to be a form of non-co-operation from within. Lala Lajpat Rai was against the boycott of schools. B.C. Pal advised cautious preparations. However, Moti Lal Nehru turned the scales in favour of Gandhiji. A compromise was arrived at. The boycott of schools and courts was to be gradual. The candidates for elections were to be withdrawn and the voters were to refuse to vote. A final decision was to be taken at the Nagpur session of the Congress. The result was that the Congress did not participate in the first general elections held under the Government of India Act, 1919.

The Nagpur session revolutionised the structure of the Congress organisation by giving it a new constitution. There was also a fundamental change in the outlook and policy of the Congress. Membership of the Congress was not to be a passive act but a lively commitment for which sacrifices were demanded. The Congress became an instrument of political socialisation.

All the Congress candidates having withdrawn from elections, the emphasis fell on the boycott of courts by lawyers, of educational institutions, foreign cloth and liquor shops. C.R. Das said: "Education can wait, Swaraj cannot." A large number of students left their schools and colleges. Teachers resigned in large numbers. National colleges like the Jamia Millia Islamia and the Kashi, Bihar and Gujarat Vidyapeeths were set up. Acharya Narendra Dev, Rajendra Prasad, Zakir Hussain and Subhash Chandra Bose taught in these national colleges. A complete boycott of foreign cloth was achieved by 30 September 1921. The Government resorted to repressive measures. Public assemblies and processions were banned. C.R. Das accepted the challenge and disobeyed the orders of Government. To quote him: "I feel the handcuffs
on my wrists and the weight of iron chains on my body... The whole of India is a vast prison. What matters it whether I am taken or left? What matters it whether I am dead or alive?” C.R. Das and his wife were arrested. There were so many arrests that the prisons of Calcutta overflowed. Jail became “a holy place of pilgrimage”.

There was violence at some places, particularly at Chauri Chaura and Mahatma Gandhi decided to withdraw the Non-co-operation movement. Subhash Chandra Bose called it a “national calamity”. Jawahar Lal Nehru expressed his “amazement and consternation” at the decision. Gandhiji took a lot of time to explain his decision to his followers. He told Jawahar Lal Nehru that “If the thing had not been suspended, we would have been leading not a non-violent but essentially a violent struggle. The cause will prosper with this retreat. We have come back to our moorings.” Gandhiji knew that if the Indians followed a path of violence, the armed power of the British Government was enough to destroy them.

Gandhiji had not been arrested so far on account of the fear of the consequences. However, after the withdrawal of the movement, Gandhiji was arrested on 10 March 1922 and he was charged with spreading disaffection against the Government. Gandhiji was tried at Ahmedabad. He pleaded guilty to the charge and made a long statement in the court in which he explained at length his own transformation from a loyal supporter and even an admirer of the British to an uncompromising critic and opponent of the British rule in India. To quote him: “I came reluctantly to the conclusion that the British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before, politically and economically. A disarmed India has no power of resistance against any aggression... She has become so poor that she has little power of resisting famines. Little do town-dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do they realize that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for the exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures, can explain away the evidence that the
skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye...In my opinion, administration of the law is thus prostituted, consciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiter. The great misfortune is that Englishmen and their Indian associates in the administration of the country do not know that they are engaged in the crime I have attempted to describe. I am surprised that many Englishmen and Indian officials honestly believe that they are administering one of the best systems devised in the world, and that India is making steady, though slow progress. They do not know that a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organized display of force on the one hand, and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation or self-defence on the other, have emasculated the people and induced in them the habit of simulation.” Again, “Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is the last article of my faith. But I had to make my choice; I have either to submit to a system which I consider has done irreparable harm to my country or incur the risk of the mad fury of my people bursting forth when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad; I am deeply sorry for it; and I am, therefore, to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty. I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen.” Judge Broomfield who tried the case acknowledged the fact that “in the eyes of millions of your countrymen you are a great patriot and great leader.” But he sentenced him to 6 years imprisonment.

It is a mistake to conclude that the first Non-co-operation movement was a total failure. It certainly contributed to an awakening of the masses to the economic problems facing the country and their political cause, namely, imperialism. Even the unsophisticated villagers began to feel that Swaraj was the sovereign remedy for their ills. They felt a new sense of freedom in participating in the national struggle. The fear of the British Raj was conquered. Ordinary people, men and women, rich and poor, showed their willingness and ability to endure hardships and punishment in defiance of Government.
Out of this movement was born a new sense of self-esteem which wiped out the humiliation of retreat. The failure of the movement did not matter because it was merely temporary. To quote Gandhiji: "The fight that was commenced in 1920 is a fight to the finish, whether it lasts one month or one year or many months or many years."

Mahatma Gandhi continued to dominate not only the Congress but also entire politics of the country. His position was absolutely unchallenged. He conceived of the plan of resisting the salt tax in India. It was a master-stroke of political strategy. No one in the country, not even the poorest, was exempt from the payment of duty on salt. His famous march to Dandi for defiance of the salt laws was symbolic of the historically established principle of "no taxation, without representation." It is compared to the American action of throwing into sea the tea-chests lying in the Boston harbour in the 18th century. The Dandi march reflected the resistance of an entire nation to the denial of freedom. The result was the declaration by the British Prime Minister at the end of the first Round Table Conference that the status of a Self-governing Dominion would be conferred on India.

The Government of India was forced to come to terms with Mahatma Gandhi and thus Gandhi-Irwin pact was signed in March 1931. Mahatma Gandhi went to London as the sole representative of the Congress to attend the Second Round Table Conference in 1931. However, he came back empty-handed on account of the attitude of the British Government and Mr. M. A. Jinnah. Mahatma Gandhi was arrested on his return from England and later on the civil disobedience movement was withdrawn. Mahatma Gandhi continued to dominate the politics of the country. When Subhash Chandra Bose tried to defy Mahatma Gandhi in 1939, he was forced to resign from the Congress Presidency. Mahatma Gandhi played an important part in the passing of the Quit India Resolution. He was arrested and imprisoned along with the other members of the Congress Working Committee. Even from jail, he continued to vindicate the righteousness of his cause. He went on fast and the Government was forced to release him. Mahatma Gandhi was opposed to the partition of India and he did his best to avert the same. He personally went to see
M.A. Jinnah and went to the extent of calling him Quade-i-Azam. Ultimately, he had to submit because the circumstances in the country left no other alternative.

There were riots in the country at the time of the transfer of power in India. The result was that when India won her freedom in August 1947, Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, was not in New Delhi to participate in the celebrations. He was in Noakhali with the Muslims. It appeared to him that Hindu-Muslim unity was more important than the celebration of the independence of the country. The few months that he survived after the independence of India in August 1947 and his murder on 30 January 1948, he was all the time busy in trying to help the Muslims in India so that they could live in peace. This was not liked by some people and they brought about his murder. Mahatma Gandhi's insistence on the transfer of Rs. 550 million to Pakistan also inflamed some elements in India. The result was that Nathu Ram Vinayak Godse from Poona shot Mahatma Gandhi while he was walking to his prayer meeting on the evening of 30 January, 1948. On that occasion, Jawahar Lal Nehru spoke thus on the All India Radio: "Friends and comrades, the light has gone out of our lives and there is darkness everywhere...Our beloved leader, Bapu as we called him, the Father of the Nation, is no more. Perhaps I am wrong to say that...for the light that shone in this country was no ordinary light. The light that has illumined this country for these many, many years will illuminate this country for many more years, and a thousand years later, that light will be seen in this country and the world will see it and it will give solace to the innumerable hearts." The New York Times wrote about Gandhi: "He left as his heritage, a spiritual force that must in God's good time prevail over arms and armaments and the dark doctrines of violence."

Mahatma Gandhi believed in non-violence but his non-violence was not that of the weak and the timid but that of the brave. He put forward a very lofty ideal of non-violence which it is difficult to try and practise and it may be that so long as men are what they are, it can never be tried on crucial moments. Mahatmaji put his concept of non-violence in these words: "I do believe that where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. Thus when
my eldest son asked me what he should have done had he been present when I was almost fatally assaulted in 1908, whether he should have run away and seen me killed or whether he should have used his physical force which he could and wanted to use, and defend me, I told him that it was his duty to defend me even by using violence. Hence it was that I took part in the Boer War, the so-called Zulu Rebellion and the (1914) War. Hence also do I advocate training in arms for those who believe in the method of violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain witness to her own dishonour.

"But I believe that non-violence is definitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment. Forgiveness adorns a soldier. But abstinence is forgiveness only when there is the power to punish. It is meaningless when it pretends to proceed from a helpless creature. A mouse hardly forgives a cat when it allows itself to be torn to pieces by her."

Mahatma Gandhi has been highly praised for his technique of Satyagraha. It is pointed out that if war debases, Satyagraha ennobles while accomplishing the same end. C.E.M. Joad wrote: "Gandhi is a moral genius and his method belongs to the coming generation. He has announced a method for the settlement of disputes which may not only supersede the method of force, but as man grows powerful in the art of destruction, must supersede it, if civilization is to survive." About Satyagraha Romain Rolland observed: "Mr. Gandhi's Satyagraha experiment is the sole chance now existing in the world of effecting transformation of humanity without violence. If this fails, there will remain no other issue in human history but violence."

Gandhiji was both a man of action and thought. He was all the time busy in his mission. He was dictating letters to his innumerable admirers all over the world. He was writing for the Harijan. He was giving interviews to innumerable people who came to see him from all parts of the world.

Mahatma Gandhi loved all. He believed in non-violence both in thought and action. There was no hatred in his mind against anybody, including the British. To quote him: "Hatred will kill the real national spirit. For my part I don't want the
freedom of India if it means extinction of England or the disappearance of the Englishmen. My love of nationalism is that my country may become free, that if need be the whole of the country may die so that the human race may live. There is no room for class hatred. Let that be our nationalism."

Mahatma Gandhi dramatized his ideas by his articles, speeches, declarations and personal example. He not only dramatized causes but also dramatized himself. While others held meetings of protest against the Rowlatt Bill, Mahatma Gandhi called a Hartal or a general strike. While others walked out of the Assembly to show their defiance of authority, Mahatma Gandhi walked miles to the sea in 1903 to break the salt laws. The result was that he was able to concentrate the attention of his followers on what he was doing.

Mahatma Gandhi put great emphasis on communal unity. He believed that both the Hindus and Muslims must live as brothers and sisters in the country and in his efforts to do so, he lost his life also. When after the Khilafat movement in India, the relations between the Hindus and Muslims became bitter on account of the atrocities committed by the Muslims over the Hindus in various parts of India, Mahatma Gandhi went on 21 days' fast in September 1924 as a penance. The communal situation deteriorated in India in 1946 and 1947 as a result of the policy of Direct Action followed by the Muslim League. The Calcutta Killing took place in August 1946. Something worse than that happened in Noakhali. There were repercussions in Bihar and Garhmukteswar (U.P.). Then there were riots in Rawalpindi, Lahore, etc. When the Partition of India took place in August 1947, there was a whole-sale killing of the Hindus and the Muslims by one another. All this was painful to Mahatma Gandhi. No wonder, when the Indians were celebrating independence on 15 August 1947, Mahatma Gandhi was in Noakhali. Bare footed, he walked from village to village and tried to restore peace to that area. He did not care for his life which could be finished at any time by any fanatic. After restoring peace there, he came back to Bihar and persuaded the Hindus to take back the Muslims who had left their homes in fear. After that he went to Calcutta and although he was mobbed by the Hindus he was able to stop the fury of the people against the Muslims. It was the fast of.
Mahatma Gandhi for 72 hours that brought about the change in the atmosphere in Calcutta. In the words of Lord Mountbatten: "What fifty thousands well-equipped soldiers could not do, the Mahatma has done. He has brought peace. He is one-man Boundary Force." After Calcutta, Mahatma Gandhi came to Delhi where Hindus were determined to turn out the Muslims from the capital of India. Lakhs of Hindu refugees had come to Delhi from West Pakistan and they clamoured for turning out the Muslims from Delhi to make room for them. They would certainly have succeeded if Mahatma Gandhi had not come to Delhi. Mahatma Gandhi refused to allow the Hindus to turn out the Muslims. He went on fast and demanded that the Hindus must allow the Muslims to live in Delhi. The pledge was given and the mosques of the Muslims were restored to them and they were allowed to live in peace.

Mahatma Gandhi was a great social reformer. He took up the cause of the depressed classes in India and devoted the whole of his life to that noble mission. He asked the Hindus to give up their old prejudices against the depressed classes. He asked them to open their temples for their worship. He himself lived in their quarters. Instead of calling them depressed classes, he gave them the name of Harijans or the people of God. He started a newspaper entitled *The Harijan* and himself edited the same during his life-time. He regarded untouchability as a curse to Hindu Society and the same was abolished in the Indian Constitution framed after the Independence of India. He believed that one of the methods of improving the lot of the poor Indians was to stop the habits of drinking in the country and that is why he advocated a policy of prohibition. He was not ignorant of the fact that the policy of prohibition was bound to result in the loss of crores of rupees to the revenues of the Government but he was prepared to make the sacrifice in the higher interests of the country as a whole. He advocated the rights of women and stood for giving them equal status with men. Among his followers were not only men but also women and some of them occupied very high places in the country.

Gandhiji believed that the present system of education was not suitable to a poor country like India. He was in favour of a more utilitarian system of education. It was under his
guidance that the Wardha Scheme of education was adopted. The children were to get not only the knowledge of the three R's but also learn some art which was to help them while studying.

Mahatma Gandhi stood for Swadeshi. As a matter of fact, this was one of the weapons in his armoury against the British. He believed that he would be able to bring the British to knees by persuading the Indians to boycott foreign goods. The stopping of the Manchester and Lancashire mills was bound to hit the Englishmen economically. Swadeshi was bound to save millions of rupees to the people of India. Mahatma Gandhi put the greatest emphasis on the use of Khadi as that was bound to add to the income of the poor.

Mahatma Gandhi was not in favour of whole-sale industrialization of the country on the lines of the West. As a matter of fact, he advocated the establishment of cottage industries. He rightly believed that cottage industries could go a long way in raising the standard of the poor on the countryside. The starting of more mills was bound to result in capitalism and greater inequality of wealth. The lot of the poor was not going to improve thereby. Mahatma Gandhi was a friend of the labourers and he always supported their legitimate claims. However, he was opposed to the method of strikes as that was not in the interests of the country as a whole.

Mahatma Gandhi was known all over the world and no wonder tributes were paid to the greatness of this saint of Sabarmati by all kinds of people. The view of Lord Halifax was: "I suppose there can be few men in all history who by their personal character and example have been able deeply to influence the thought of their generation." According to Sir Stafford Cripps: "There has been no greater spiritual leader in the world in our own times." Romain Rolland wrote: "Mahatma Gandhi has raised up three hundred millions of his fellowmen, shaken the British Empire and inaugurated in human politics the most powerful movement that the whole world has seen for nearly two thousand years." Louis Fischer says: "The symbol of India's unanimous wish for freedom is Mahatma Gandhi. He does not represent all of India but he does reflect the will of all India for national liberation. A great man is like good sculpture made of one piece. A great man lives a single-
tracked life. Lincoln was great, he lived for the union. Lenin was great, he lived in order to raise Russia out of the feudal mire. Churchill is great because all of his acts have been directed towards the preservation of England as a first class power. And in the same way Gandhi is great because every single act that he performs is calculated to promote the one goal of his life—the liberation of India. He is not the man, he has no intention and never had to rule India or administer India. His function ends when he frees India.” Again, “Gandhi is the father of India’s defiance and its symbol. Gandhi walks to sea to make salt in defiance of the British. It becomes a popular pilgrimage. The idealism of the youth spills into it. So does the leaderless nation’s yearning for a leader. Gandhi had given his followers the elation of standing up to a foreigner who is the master in their house.”

According to Percival Spear: “For nearly thirty years Congress was dominated by Gandhi, and India was influenced more by him than by any other single man. It is not too much to say that the destiny of India was modified and the world itself influenced by this single personality. An unimpressive figure with a reedy voice, an ingratiating manner, and an astute expression concealed a character of great charm and baffling complexity. Gandhi was one of those men who concealed thought in the volume of his speech and meaning in the wealth of explanation. He was always explaining himself and was never understood. He convinced those whose attention was caught by one fact or other of his character in turn that he was a fanatic, a visionary, a consummate tactician, a saint, a prophet, or a trickster. To this day he remains an enigma; the only fact of which we can be quite certain is the magnitude of his influence upon the people and events of his time and afterwards.”

About Gandhi, Edward Thompson says: “He is a superb judge of other men. His humanity is one of the profoundest things that history has seen. He has pity and love for every race, and most of all for the poor and oppressed.”

About the work of Mahatma Gandhi, Jawahar Lal Nehru wrote, “Reactionary or revolutionary, he has changed the face of India, given pride and character to a cringing and demoralised people, built up strength and consciousness in the masses and
made the Indian problem a world problem." Commenting on the impact of Mahatma Gandhi on Indian politics, Jawahar Lal Nehru observed: "And then Gandhi came. He was like a powerful current of fresh air that made us stretch ourselves and take deep breaths, like a beam of light that pierced the darkness and removed the scales from our eyes, like a whirlwind that upset many things but most of all the working of people's minds. He did not descend from the top; he seemed to emerge from the millions of India, speaking their language and incessantly drawing attention to them and their appalling condition. Get off the backs of these peasants and workers, he told us, all you who live by their exploitation, get rid of the system that produces this poverty and misery."

Dr. Rajendra Prasad gives his estimate in these words: "Mahatma Gandhi's contribution to Indian politics has been immense. The Indian National Congress had been in existence for thirty years when he returned to India from South Africa in 1915. The Congress had aroused and organised national consciousness to a certain extent; but the awakening was confined largely to the English educated middle-classes and had not penetrated the masses. He carried it to the masses and made it a mass movement. Mahatma Gandhi's movement operated both horizontally and vertically. He took up causes which were not entirely political but which touched very intimately the life of large masses of people." Again, "Mahatma Gandhi's greatest contribution, however, does not consist in making the masses of India politically self-conscious and organising them on a scale they had never before been organised. To my mind his greatest contribution to Indian politics and perhaps to suffering humanity in the world at large lies in the unique method which he has prescribed and employed for fighting wrongs. He has taught us how it is possible for us to successfully fight the mighty British Empire without arms; he has given us and the world a moral substitute for war. He has lifted politics from the plane of sophistication and untruths, where at its worst it degenerated into low intrigue and at its highest could not rise beyond diplomatic circumlocutions and secret diplomacy, to the pitch of a high idealism in which the end, however noble, can in no circumstances justify recourse to means which are not pure and immaculate. He
has placed truth on its pedestal of glory even in politics, no matter how harmful its effect appears to be at the moment. His frankness and deliberate exposure of ugly or weak spot in ourselves to our so-called enemies has confounded both friends and opponents alike. But he considers our strength lies not in concealing our weakness but in knowing and combating it. The rigorous observance of non-violence, even where temporary advantages may apparently be gained by ignorance or mitigating it, has been recognised by experience to be not only the straightest course but also the wisest policy. It was the moral and spiritual fervour of his teachings which at once caught the imagination of the people, who saw and recognised that when all was dark around he showed us the way out of our misery and slavery. When we were feeling utterly helpless, he made us realise our own strength through truth and non-violence."

About Gandhiji, C. G. Shah says: “The Indian people, under his leadership, became heroic, audacious fighters for national freedom, courtiers of jails and receivers of hail-storms of bullets of the imperialist enemy. Gandhiji injected the people with deep hatred for the Satanic British Government and with an unquenchable thirst for national freedom” (Marxism, Gandhism and Stalinism).
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Watson, Francis: Gandhi.
Vallabhbhai Patel was the most powerful person in the Congress. It is true that he was not the most loved, but it is equally true that he was the most feared among the top Congress leaders. He was a man of iron will. With him the country came first, Vallabhbhai second, Congress third and there was no fourth. He was ruthless in enforcing discipline. He was not afraid of taking action against Congressmen, big or small, chopping off the dead wood, throwing out of office and even out of the Congress men accused of corruption and indiscipline. Dr. Khare, Chief Minister of C.P. and K.F. Nariman of Bombay suffered because they opposed Sardar Patel. He was a typical party boss who was generous to friends and ruthless to opponents. He was not a super man and was not endowed with superlative brains. However, he was a statesman who was gifted with the rare quality of shrewdness and pertinacity in his approach to the problems. In spite of his stern exterior, he possessed a generous heart. He was very much devoted to Mahatma Gandhi but he did not compromise his deeply-felt convictions. He accepted Mahatma Gandhi's non-violence not as an infallible way of life but in the circumstances of India as the only available weapon to compel British withdrawal from the country. When India became free, he was the first to advocate the creation of a strong defence force to guard her integrity and sovereignty. He won
for himself a glittering page in the history of India as a great annexationist and unifier. Only Sardar Patel could accomplish the unique feat of merging the 500 odd mutually exclusive and fiercely self-regarding principalities into the wider unity of India. The sacrifices made by the princes were great and it was a tribute to the vision and sagacity of Sardar Patel that his relations with the Indian rulers were cordial. This bloodless revolution was accomplished at a time when the armed forces of India were dangerously inadequate.

It is rightly said that Vallabhai Patel was not born great, but he rose to greatness by his dedicated service to the Motherland and his management of men and matters. The rise of Sardar Patel was not exactly meteoric like that of Pandit Moti Lal Nehru and C.R. Das. Moti Lal Nehru and C.R. Das were men of wealth, influence and high connections. They enjoyed large legal practices and hobnobbed with Viceroyys and Governors which was regarded as a sign of great prestige. They were also men of culture who had read widely, travelled extensively and knew the outside world intimately. Moti Lal Nehru and C.R. Das appeared suddenly on the scene with a dash and brilliance which dazzled the people momentarily. Their contribution to political life was valuable and they made great sacrifices and suffered much in the cause of the country, but their work lacked the quality of enduring substance and sustained effort. Sardar Patel did not possess their sparkling brilliance but the people found in him a new leader of quiet courage. He was invited to address meetings and preside over conferences by all kinds of organisations all over the country. People wanted to see him in person and hear from his own lips the secret of his success.

Sardar Patel was a hard-headed realist and he owed no allegiance to vague ideological theories. He maintained an objective attitude and judged each question on its merits. He was concerned more with the digestion of reforms than with the initiation of new theories. He told the people: "Whether in political or in economic matters let us face the issues as realists, as men of responsibility and practical outlook. If this is done, we shall solve our problems much quicker and much more effectively than if we engaged ourselves in perpetual wrangles about rights and wrongs of one principle or another
of different issues...Let us postpone mutual bickerings and fault-finding until we can afford this pastime. Today these will not avail us. They will only prevent us from taking action, positive and constructive, which is the need of the hour."

Born and bread on the land, his heart was always with the peasants. He revived their spirit and taught them to take pride in themselves. He led them to victory in the Bardoli Satyagraha and they affectionately called him "Sardar". He did not display aristocratic graces or indulge in intellectual subtleties. Dressed in home-spun Kurta and Dhoti, with a scarf thrown round his shoulders, Sardar Patel had the dignity of a leader of men. His firm chin and mouth showed that he was a man of inflexible purpose. He could read the hearts of men as an open book. Rugged in appearance, he looked as if he had been hewn out of rock and rock-like he stood when the storms blew over him. He was blunt, forthright and decisive. He possessed the patience of mother earth.

Vallabhbhai Patel was born on 31 October 1875 and he died on 15 December 1950. His father had taken part in the revolt in 1857 and had come all the way from Gujarat to Delhi. His first love was law and as a matter fact, he was recognised as a very good criminal lawyer. When he came into contact with Mahatma Gandhi in 1917, he was living in a style which was then considered to be appropriate for a fashionable and successful young Barrister. However, he left Ahmedabad to participate in the Peasant Satyagraha in Kaira against the unjust and arbitrary demands of the Government of Bombay. When he took part in the Satyagraha, he gave up his foreign dress and along with it the comfortable life he was leading before. He lived with the workers, sharing the plain food of the Ashram they had established, sleeping on the ground, doing everything himself including the daily washing of his clothes and walking long distances in the villages. He did all this without feeling that he had left behind for good his lucrative practice with all its comforts and was making a great sacrifice. He acted as the chief lieutenant of Mahatma Gandhi in the Ahmedabad labour strike of 1918. In 1923, he was put in charge of the Nagpur Flag Satyagraha.

Vallabhbhai was the President of the Ahmedabad
Municipality from 1924 to 1929. During his tenure of office, the Municipality of Ahmedabad earned the reputation of being a model Municipality. It asserted its freedom of action without interference by Government officers and took vigorous action to meet the needs of the city. It made plans in advance and pursued them with earnestness. The elected members and the officers of the Municipality worked together as a team closely knit by common interests. To Vallabhbhai this period was one of training in public life and administration.

Vallabhbhai Patel was opposed to Council Entry and he observed thus at the Gaya Session of the Congress: "I am not a leader; I am a soldier. I am the son of a peasant and do not believe that we can gain independence by merely talking. We shall not be able to fight the Government on its own ground. Once we enter the legislature, the people will lose their enthusiasm for independence and the Congress will lose the confidence of the people. It will indeed be ruinous to the Congress. It is only when the Congress announced its policy of non-co-operation that it began to be supported by agriculturists, labourers and women. That is so because it is only such activity which gives scope for participating in the national struggle and for making sacrifices. The Government knew well before the reforms the nature of the people with whom it had to deal. The reforms were drawn up with reference to their strong and their weak points. Even if you conducted your campaign for a hundred years through the legislatures, you will not get independence."

Vallabhbhai was popularly known as "Suba (Governor) of Gujarat". Gandhiji called him "King of Borsad". It was Patel who saved the Taluka of Borsad of the nightmare of dacoits and organised the villagers to be self-reliant. He fought their battle and the people were so happy that Patel's word was law for them.

Mahatma Gandhi put Vallabhbhai in charge of the Bardoli Satyagraha in 1928. Vallabhbhai felt that the peasants must present a united front to the Government. Therefore, he appealed to all communities and sections to join the movement. There was tension between the Hindus and Muslims all over India but in Bardoli, Vallabhbhai with the help of Abbas Tayabji, was able to persuade the Muslims to join hands with
the Hindus. The Imam Saheb of Bardoli blessed the struggle and asked all Muslims to rally under the leadership of Vallabhbhai to fight the Government. Brahmins and untouchables, Patidars, Baniyas, Muslims, Parsis and Hindus, all joined the Satyagraha. Women also joined. Vallabhbhai knew that without their help and co-operation the Satyagraha may not be a success. He knew that it is the women who were to bear the hardship if the Government decided to attach the cattle and household effects of the people. He appealed to women to keep the morale of men and inspire them to fight to the bitter end. He warned them they might have to suffer and they might be compelled to leave their houses and live in the camps. They should be prepared to bear the hardships cheerfully and thereby teach a lesson to the Government not to treat the peasants like dumb, driven cattle. He gave them special seats in the meetings addressed by him. His simple, homely but fiery words went straight to their hearts. He gave them a feeling of equality and dignity and they joined the movement with eagerness and played a vital role in it.

Vallabhbhai knew that the Government will leave no stone unturned to crush the Satyagraha movement and therefore he lost no time in organising the people for the fight. He went from village to village, sleeping in the peasants' homes and sharing their meals. He cut jokes with them and aroused their dormant spirit to fight for their freedom. He organised his forces on a military pattern. An atmosphere of war was created in the Taluka. Camps manned by trained workers were opened at different centres to discipline, guide and enthuse the people. 250 trained volunteers were collected from all over Gujarat and were posted at different camps. An appeal was made for funds and donations poured in not only from Gujarat but from all over India.

In order to maintain the morale of the people of Bardoli, he told them: "The sons of the peasants have nothing to fear. They must have confidence that the land of their forefathers will remain as theirs. No one can unjustly deprive the peasant of his land and get away with it. If Government forfeits the land in this manner, it will be clear that there is no Government in this country. It will then be robbers with whom we shall be dealing. I say let the robbers come. There will be
greater fun in their rule than in the rule of these foreign Baniyas. Do not be afraid of any one."

There was a lot of resentment against the Government officers and there was the possibility of an outbreak of violence against them. With a view to keep the people calm in spite of sufferings and provocations, he addressed them in these words: "I know that it is a hard task for you to remain all day long in your homes, cooped up with your family and your cattle. You are ready to tell the Government to take away your cattle and your utensils. But I ask you to bear pain in an understanding spirit and to be firm in your resolve. Without this we shall not succeed in our fight against a powerful Government. Make it impossible for any charge of violence to be levelled against us. Let every one work with the utmost restraint. Even if you have a just cause for anger be patient... Even if they take away from you the thing most dear to you, keep quiet. Do not lose courage. Smile, dignity, courage, politeness, patience and self-control are qualities which are not easy to attain. Through this fight, I pray to God, that these qualities may be acquired by the agriculturists of this taluka... Despair has made the Government like red-hot iron. The people are the hammer which can mould the hot iron to any shape they desire. But the hammer cannot do this if it also gets red-hot in contact with the iron. Keep cool, if you desire victory over the Government."

The iron determination of Vallabhbhai Patel and the total co-operation of the people resulted in the success of the Bardoli Satyagraha. This made Patel famous as the champion of the peasants. After the Bardoli settlement, the Sardar of Bardoli emerged as the Sardar of India and his reputation spread all over the country. There were invitations from all over the country requesting him to preside over the meetings and address the people. People flocked to him to have his Darshan. They wanted to see the man who had won the battle against the Government. Mahatma Gandhi gave him the title of Sardar and he came to be known by that name affectionately.

The Bardoli struggle was significant in many ways. It demonstrated to the world that truth and non-violence cannot be crushed. It compelled the mighty government to yield with-
in a fortnight of the pledge. It was a victory for both the Satyagrahis and the Government and that is why both Gandhiji and Vallabhabhai Patel congratulated the people as well as the Governor. Lala Lajpat Rai wrote: “The settlement of the Bardoli dispute between the Government and the cultivators of Bardoli is a notable triumph of the popular cause, but it is creditable to the Government as well. It is a moral victory for truth and justice and conclusively shows that Government is susceptible to the pressure of public opinion, if properly organized and backed by the sanction of a contingency which may lead to unpleasant results. Determined and organized agitation accompanied by readiness to sacrifice and suffer does tell in the long run.” It was a landmark in the history of our freedom movement. It gave a new meaning and significance to the history of Satyagrahia in India and paved the way for the future bigger struggle. In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, “Bardoli became a sign and symbol of hope and strength and victory of the Indian peasant.” It projected the personality of Sardar Patel and proved his organising capacity, ability to lead people, thoroughness in handling a situation, his unfailing tact and his uncanny judgment of men. “The Sardar of Bardoli emerged from this struggle as the Sardar of India.”

Along with Mahatma Gandhi he took a leading part in Salt Satyagraha and the Civil Disobedience Movement. In 1931, he was elected the President of the Indian National Congress and he presided over its Karachi Session. He was in jail from 1932 to 1934. He was the Chairman of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee of the Indian National Congress from 1935 to 1940. His actual role in that position has been described in these words: “He was the Fuehrer of the Congress Parliamentary regime, both de jure and de facto. He wielded immense power and directed, solo, the knotty administration of his immense jurisdiction. The ministers danced to his tune and quaked at his name.” Sardar Patel was not prepared to tolerate indiscipline from any quarter. When there was a fight between Mahatma Gandhi and Subhash Chandra, Sardar Patel sided with Mahatma Gandhi. About Patel, John Gunther wrote: “He is the party boss par excellence. He is the Jim Farley, the ruthless party fixer and organizer.” Once Gandhi has determined the line to take, it is Patel who rams it through.
He is the creator of the political machine and he virtually controls eight Congress ministries."

Sardar Patel condemned the British attitude of questioning the fitness of the people of India to rule themselves in order to justify their demand for independence. To quote him: "We are being asked if we are fit for independence. We are told to settle with the Muslims, that is, with the Muslim League. If we do succeed in coming to an agreement with them, we shall probably be told, 'Go and settle with the Indian Princes'. When that happens: no doubt they will say: 'What about the Europeans who have so many interests in the country and who have invested so much money?' They wish to prolong the differences in this country...They maintain that 'as long as you two fight, God has placed a solemn trust on us for protecting the minority community'. We said that you agree to give whatever a Constituent Assembly, composed of representatives of all the people, recommend. If you accept that we shall do our best to come to an agreement with the Muslims." Addressing the people in 1940, Sardar Patel told them, "There is no power on earth which can destroy national spirit. The British Government asks, what will happen to us if they leave the country? Surely this is a strange question. It is as if a watchman said to his employer, 'what will happen to you if I leave?' The answer will be: 'You go your way. Either we shall engage another watchman or we will learn to keep watch ourselves.' But this watchman of ours does not go away and even keeps on threatening his employer."

Addressing the people of Kathiawar, Sardar Patel once said, "Wherever I go, I hear the cries of rebellion. But I have never heard of rebellion being initiated by those who merely shout, however loud. It is the silent workers who carry out rebellions. My advice to you is to work more and speak less. There is no shortage of leaders in India. What we need is soldiers and may God give to the youth of Kathiawad the moral strength to be good soldiers."

Sardar Patel was in favour of accepting the Cripps Proposals if those were suitably amended to meet the situation in the country. He was sorely disappointed that Cripps who called himself a friend of India, should try to persuade the Congress to accept his scheme which was wholly inadequate and unsatis-
factory. In a speech at Ahmedabad, he observed: "Congress spent two weeks examining very carefully the British scheme, but it led to nothing; for even the few initially acceptable suggestions Sir Stafford made were withdrawn in the end...I could only draw the conclusion that the draft proposals were made to perpetuate British rule even after the War. It was this attitude, in fact, which drove Congress to ask Britain to quit India. Cripps never seemed to realize that if India were to resist external aggression effectively, her people should have the fullest freedom and independence."

Speaking on "Quit India" resolution on 8 August 1942, Sardar Patel said: "We must consider carefully wherein lies our duty. Whether you are asked or not, whether there arises an occasion or not, let there be no question of your being not ready. Do not ask what is the programme of work. This struggle will be an all-embracing one and the Congress will welcome non-payment of taxes, civil disobedience, and such other direct actions as will obstruct the Government in their administration. Let the railwaymen refuse to work on the railways, let the Post and Telegraph workers go on strike and let the Government servants give up their services...You must proceed on the assumption that Mahatmaji and your leaders will immediately be arrested. If Gandhiji is arrested, you have within you the strength of compelling the British to surrender within 24 hours. You have been shown all the ways of achieving it. Do implement these suggestions. If all those who assist in the Government administration stand aside, the administration must necessarily break down...Take up the message of the Congress and Mahatmaji and make the name of your country great." He was arrested on 9 August 1942 and kept in the Ahmednagar Fort up to June 1945.

Regarding the Cabinet Mission Scheme (1946), the view of Sardar Patel was that it would set India on the slippery slope of fragmentation. The two Groups of states, the Western comprising Punjab, Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan and the Eastern consisting of Assam and Bengal would probably exercise their option of seceding from the Union. India would then have Muslim majority states on both sides. The scheme would lead to the balkanisation of India. He felt that the formation of an interim Government would be impossible so
long as the Muslim League was given a monopoly of nomination of Muslim members. The Congress would never agree to that subtle way of implementing the two-nation theory.

Sardar Patel played an important part in reconciling the naval Ratings who had raised the standard of revolt in February 1946. The city of Bombay was in danger of being blown to bits by the naval vessels anchored in the harbour. 3,000 Indian naval ratings had revolted on account of the discriminatory treatment given to them and forced the British personnel to quit. They took charge of 20 naval vessels. There were sympathetic strikes of ratings in Karachi, Madras and Calcutta. On 21 February 1946, 1,000 men of the Royal Indian Air Force in Bombay also struck work. The Communists of Bombay incited the ratings to fire on the Bombay city unless their demands were conceded. Their argument was: "What does it matter if the city is destroyed? It is bulging with war profits made by businessmen while the armed forces were shedding their blood." The situation was grave and tempers ran very high. At this critical moment, Sardar Patel appealed to the ratings to seek a peaceful settlement of their disputes. He advised the workers of Bombay not to go on strike and they obeyed. The leaders of the ratings sought his advice privately and there were heated discussion in the Marine Drive flat where Sardar Patel was staying. He told them frankly that their method of seeking redress of their grievances was not proper and they would never succeed in that manner. He pledged to them the support of the Congress on the condition that they surrendered unconditionally and trusted the Congress to get them their due. He promised them that he would do his utmost to prevent victimization. The result was that the ratings surrendered on 23 February 1946 and thus the situation was saved. Many of the grievances of the ratings were removed later on.

Jawahar Lal Nehru owed his appointment as Prime Minister to his election as President of the Congress in May 1946. Actually Sardar Patel had been nominated by 12 Provincial Congress Committees out of 15. Only 3 of them had supported Nehru. In the ordinary course of events, Sardar Patel was the obvious choice. Maulana Azad persuaded Mahatma Gandhi to ask Sardar Patel and Acharya Kripalani
to withdraw their candidature. It was pointed out that the transfer of power was imminent and Nehru would be able to get along better with the British with whom he had greater affinity of thought and culture than any other Congress leader. Moreover, Nehru had great pull with the left wing in the Congress and Gandhiji was keen on keeping them under control. He believed that the right wing led by Sardar Patel would always be with the Congress but the Leftists were a turbulent and uncertain factor. Sardar Patel could refuse nothing to Gandhiji although he could not forget that on two previous occasions in 1929 and 1939, he had similarly missed the Presidentship of the Congress. He knew that the election in 1946 was crucial but he made way for Nehru at the bidding of Gandhiji. Moreover, the very thought of contesting the election against Nehru was abhorrent to him. He wanted to build a strong and united India and so long as he had the opportunity to do so, it did not matter to him what office he held. On 24 August 1947, he was appointed Deputy Prime Minister. The majority of the members of the Cabinet, the Working Committee and the All India Congress Committee looked up to Sardar Patel for guidance and direction and he felt that he would be able to carry out his programme without any hindrance. He was confident that the Cabinet would always support him. Nehru could busy himself with international affairs and Sardar Patel would have a free hand in internal matters. As Minister for Home Affairs, States and Information and Broadcasting, Sardar Patel had a formidable concentration of power in his hands. He also had full control over the Congress Party machine and its volunteer organisations. Through them, he kept a careful eye on and personal touch with the state Ministries as also Party activities in the states. The integration of the Indian states widened the scope of his activities.

When Jawahar Lal Nehru was asked to form the interim Government in September 1946, Sardar Patel was put incharge of the Home Department. When the Muslim League joined the interim Government, it was keen on taking charge of Home Affairs. Lord Wavell was also inclined to agree to this and requested Sardar Patel to surrender that forthwith. Instead of doing so, Sardar Patel offered his resignation. Lord Wavell
knew that would be followed by the resignation of all Congress members of the interim Government and consequently he withdrew his request and the Congress agreed to offer the portfolio of Finance to the Muslim League. Sardar Patel played an important part in the negotiations between the British Government and the Indian leaders in 1946 and 1947. After 3 June Plan 1947, a very serious situation was created. Sardar Patel was in charge of law and order and the Muslim League were determined not to maintain it. It was a Herculean task on the part of Sardar Patel to maintain law and order in the country.

Sardar Patel was opposed to the partition of India but the circumstances created by the Muslim League and the British bureaucracy in India were such that the partition of the country became unavoidable. In November 1949, Sardar Patel told the members of the Constituent Assembly: “I agreed to partition as a last resort, when we should have lost all. Five Muslim League members had established themselves as Ministers of the Interim Government with the sole object of partitioning the country... We decided that partition should be agreed upon the terms that Punjab and Bengal should be partitioned... Mr. Jinnah did not want a truncated Pakistan but he had to swallow it. I made a further condition that in two months’ time power should be transferred and an Act should be passed by Parliament during that time, guaranteeing that Britain would not interfere with the question of the Indian States. We will deal with the question... Let paramountcy be dead.”

When India became free on 15 August 1947, Sardar Patel was happy at the consummation of his life’s work but he was also conscious of the heavy responsibility which the people of India had to bear in future. It was in their hands to make or mar their future. Addressing the people, he said: “Let us not forget in this hour of joy the stupendous responsibilities and obligations which freedom brings in its wake. Our primary duty is to guard zealously our freedom against dangers from within and without. We have to ensure that the humblest amongst us has the same stature as the tallest in the land, that labour gets its legitimate share of its product, that the millions in villages obtain a just return for the sweat of their brow, and that the State discharges adequately its elementary duty of feeding, clothing, housing, educating every son and daughter
of the motherland. It has now been given to us by Providence to fashion our country's destiny according to our cherished ideals and aspirations. If we fail the motherland, the blame will not lie at others' door. Indeed, there are enormous difficulties and almost insuperable obstacles in our way; but it is for us to overcome them."

Sardar Patel played a leading role in the Constituent Assembly. With Jawahar Lal Nehru, he shared the leadership of the Assembly. He was the Chairman of the Fundamental Rights Sub-Committee, the States Constitution Sub-Committee and the Minorities Sub-Committee. On account of his long experience in organisation and administration, his integrity of purpose and his patriotism, Sardar Patel was heard with respect and his shrewd common sense and realistic outlook were appreciated. He conducted negotiations with the minorities one by one and was able to satisfy them all. He believed in a strong judiciary, independent of the executive.

Sardar Patel believed that "An efficient, disciplined and contented service assured of its prospects as a result of diligent and honest work is a sine qua non of sound administration under a democratic regime even more than under an authoritarian rule. The service must be above party and we should ensure that political considerations either in its recruitment or in its discipline and control are reduced to the minimum if not eliminated altogether." Sardar Patel had a quick eye for merit and he would judge the potentialities of each officer and he knew what use he could make of him. From his officers, he demanded fidelity and integrity and in return he gave them his trust. He appealed to the services to give up their bureaucratic attitude. He handled them sympathetically and inspired them to work for the country. The services responded to him and gave him respect and affection. He became their leader and their champion.

Sardar Patel successfully tackled the problem of the Indian States. In this he was helped by Lord Mountbatten and V.P. Menon. The States Ministry was set up under Sardar Patel. An appeal was made to the Indian States to join the Union of India. The result was that a large number of States joined India even before 15 August 1947. Junagarh gave some trouble but the people revolted and ultimately that State also joined
the Indian Union. Kashmir joined the Indian Union when the tribal invaders from Pakistan attacked her. Sardar Patel gave many warnings to the ruler of Hyderabad but without any effect. Speaking at Junagarh, Sardar Patel declared: "If Hyderabad is to be saved, it must effect a radical change in its methods and policies... If Hyderabad wishes to be heard it must follow bravely and courageously the popular will, otherwise Hyderabad’s fate will sooner or later be the same as that of other rulers and dynasties who had attempted to thwart the popular will only at the cost of their existence." Speaking at Dehra Dun on 29 June 1948, Sardar Patel said: "The question of Hyderabad can be solved peacefully if the Nizam would shed the utter medieval conception of his rule through a ruling caste chosen almost entirely from a militant minority and accept the democratic method of consulting and acting in conformity with the wishes of the people expressed through their representatives and would recognise the inevitability of the consequences of action and interaction of geography and economic and other compelling forces in the relationship between Hyderabad and India." As there was no other alternative, the police action against the State started on 13 September 1948 and within three days the Nizam surrendered. On 1 November 1948, Hyderabad acceded to the Indian Union.

As a result of the efforts of Sardar Patel, the political map of India was completely changed. Out of 554 States, 216 were merged in the provinces, 310 were consolidated into six Unions, five were put directly under the Centre as Chief Commissioners’ provinces, 21 Punjab Hill States formed the Himachal Pradesh and two States were made into separate provinces. It is rightly pointed out that as a result of Partition in 1947, India had lost 3.6 lakh square miles of territory with a population of 81.5 million. By the integration of the States, India acquired 5 lakhs square miles of territory with a population of 86.5 millions. Michael Brecher rightly points out that integration of the States was "Patel’s master achievement. Nehru’s role was secondary but none-the-less important. He set the objectives in general terms. Patel achieved them with consummate skill." In his book on Nehru, Geoffrey Tyson writes: "If the integration of several hundred princely States had not been carried out with a skilled and sure hand by the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the
Sub-Continent might easily have suffered division into a third major segment in which the smaller princely States would have grouped themselves round the more powerful rulers in Independent blocs with resultant balkanisation of a large part of the land." In *New Patterns of Democracy in India*, Vera Michele Dean writes: "The Indian Federation had to weld together British India and five hundred and sixty-one of the five hundred and sixty-two princely States, with Kashmir the only State remaining in special relationship to India...This seemingly insuperable amalgamation was effected with a minimum strain and stress—except for the States of Hyderabad and Junagadh and of course Kashmir—largely due to statesmanship of Vallabhbhai Patel, a close associate of Gandhi and Nehru and man of outstanding statesmanship, who played a key role in carrying out the administrative transition from Colonialism to Independence with remarkable speed and harmony. Patel who had the qualities of a high-class tammany politician persuaded the princes that it was to their advantage to join the new Republic—and they did after receiving from the Government privy purses to compensate them for loss of personal revenue." Mahatma Gandhi wrote: "The task of dealing with the princes was truly formidable, but I am convinced that Sardar was the only man who could have coped with it."

J.N. Sahni says that within two or three years Patel liquidated the Indian princes as a political power. He extended the boundaries of India by a territory three times larger than Bismarck added to Germany in a decade or Hitler by his adventures during the first phase of the Second World War. Sardar Patel did not use bombs and bullets like Hitler. He did not adopt the coercive methods of Bismarck. While seeking the willing consent of the princes, he accepted the arrangement whereby the Government of India agreed to guarantee the Maharajas, the nobles and the Rajas millions of rupees in tax-free pensions. They were allowed ownership of billions of rupees in jewellery, properties, land shares and securities. The Nizam of Hyderabad got a tax-free pension of Rs. 50 lakhs and also income from his jagirs. The Nawab of Bhopal was given a tax-free privy purse of Rs. 11 lakhs and ownership of his properties. J.N. Sahni admits that because of the hostile forces then at work, the liquidation of the political
power of the princes could not be long delayed but he contends that the future historian will have to answer the question whether the fabulous price paid to the princes was justified and whether that was the only practical and proper way of liquidating them. J.N. Sahni maintains that if Patel and Nehru had been 10 years younger they would have preferred battle with these princes rather than be blackmailed. However, it must be pointed out that taking into consideration the circumstances prevailing at that time, the only practical policy was the one which was followed by Sardar Patel. The Indian rulers were in a position at that time to do a lot of mischief. The lead was already given by Hyderabad and Bhopal. Indore made no secret of its intentions of following Bhopal. There were reports of joint action by the two States to create an independent pocket in the heart of the Indian Union and enter into treaty relations with Pakistan. The Bhopal-Indore axis indicated the ominous possibilities of the fragmentation of India. The forces at the disposal of the Government of India were absolutely inadequate. Hence the policy followed by Sardar Patel was the only policy practicable under the circumstances. As regards the Privy Purses, those have already been abolished by the Government of India after amending the Constitution which guaranteed them.

Sardar Patel has been criticised for his attitude towards the Muslims. However, a critical examination of his views shows that he had no ill-will against them and all that he asked the Muslims was that after the partition of India they should be faithful to India and if they could not be so, they should go to Pakistan. On 3 January 1948, Sardar Patel declared in the Calcutta Maidan: "As regards the controversy of a secular versus Hindu State, there can be no serious talk of a Hindu State. But one fact is indisputable. There are 4½ crores of Muslims in India many of whom helped the creation of Pakistan. How can anyone believe that they have changed overnight? The Muslims say that they are loyal citizens and therefore why should anybody doubt their bonafides? To them I would say: 'Why do you ask us? Search your own conscience.'"

On another occasion, Sardar Patel observed: "I am a true friend of the Muslims though I have been described their greatest enemy. I believe in plain speaking. I do not know how
to mince matters. I want to tell them that mere declarations of loyalty to the Indian Union will not help them at this critical juncture. They must give practical proof of their declarations. I ask them why they do not unequivocally denounce Pakistan for attacking Indian territory with the aid of Frontier tribesmen. Is it not their duty to condemn all acts of aggression against India? I want to ask the Indian Muslims only one question. In the recent All-India Muslim Conference why did you not open your mouth on the Kashmir issue? These things create doubt in the minds of the people. So I want to say a word to them as a friend of Muslims, and it is the duty of a good friend to speak frankly. It is your duty to sail in the same boat and sink or swim together. I want to tell you very frankly that you cannot ride two horses. You select one horse, whichever you like best... Those who want to go to Pakistan can go there and live in peace. Let us live here in peace and work for ourselves. Those who are disloyal will have to go to Pakistan. Those who are still riding two horses will have to quit Hindustan."

Sardar Patel did not consider the R.S.S. volunteers as criminals but only misguided patriots. He wanted to wean them from their ways by sympathy and understanding and use them to strengthen the hands of the Government in restoring order. In his famous speech at Lucknow on 6 January 1948, Sardar Patel said: "I appeal to the R.S.S. to use their wisdom and work in a proper way. I ask them not to be rash or tactless. Do not be aggressive. In the Congress those who are in power feel that by virtue of authority they will be able to crush the R.S.S. By _danda_ (force) you cannot suppress any organisation. Moreover, _danda_ is meant for thieves and _dakus_. Its use will not help much. After all, R.S.S. men are not thieves and dacoits. They love their country. Only their trend of thought is diverted. They are to be won over by the Congressmen with love." So long as disturbances continued in India, the Sardar was not inclined to take strong measures against the R.S.S. volunteers. However, under no circumstances he was prepared to allow them to take the law into their own hands. The enforcement of law and order was the duty of the Government and he would not tolerate any encroachment on it.

Sardar Patel was not an extremist. He believed in a cau-
tious policy. He did not believe in pursuing ideologies and ignoring the realities. In one of his statements, he said: "You want levelling of wealth, but where is the wealth to be levelled? Do you want distribution of poverty? We have not gained freedom for distribution of poverty! We have to create wealth first." In what seemed to be his last message, Sardar Patel said: "What we have is not Swaraj, but only freedom from foreign rule. The people have still to win internal Swaraj, abolish distinctions of caste or creed, banish untouchability, improve the lot of the hungry masses and live as one joint family; in short, to create a new way of life and bring about a change of heart and a change of outlook."

Sardar Patel had very poor health and Gandhiji advised him to take complete rest. Sardar Patel's reply was: "What is the point of taking rest for long hours to keep up the body? What harm is there if one dies a few days earlier? While one is alive, is it not better to keep working all the time?" He continued to work unmindful of sickness and suffering and extracting the last ounce of his energy to fulfill his mission in life. On 15 December 1950, he died in Bombay.

In Parliament, Prime Minister Nehru paid the following tribute to Sardar Patel: "It is a great story, as all of us know, as the whole country knows, and history will record it in many pages, call him the builder and consolidator of the new India and say many things about him. But perhaps to many of us here, he will be remembered as a great captain of our forces in the struggle for freedom, and as one who gave us sound advice in times of trouble as well as in moments of victory, as a friend and colleague on whom one could invariably rely, as a tower of strength which revived wavering hearts when we were in trouble. We shall remember him as a friend, and a colleague and comrade above all, and I, who have sat here on this bench side by side with him, will feel rather forlorn and a certain emptiness will steal upon me when I look to his empty seat." Rajagopalachari said: "Vallabhbhai was born not a day too soon for India. But, alas! he died too soon. India wishes he had not found rest in the mother's lap so hurriedly when he was so much wanted for so much longer." Raj Kumari Amrit Kaur declared that Sardar Patel was India's great warrior-statesman." Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai described Patel as "a
great patriot, a great administrator and a great man. His personality, more than that of any one else, constituted the sheet-anchor of the country’s internal and external security.”

Lord Mountbatten observed: “His spirit will live for ever in India. His work as incharge of Ministry of States in 1947-48 will go down in history, for he handled one of the most difficult problems which ever confronted any statesman with a high degree of understanding and regard for the Indian Princes.”

In his extempore speech on 20 June 1948, Lord Mountbatten had referred to Sardar Patel in these words: “I was warned before I came to India that I should meet my match in a very ‘tough guy’, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel but when we met I came to the conclusion that he could not be quite as tough as the act that he put on. He is so very apparently hard and firm and unyielding, and I think he is like that because he does not want the world to know what a very warm heart beats behind the rugged exterior and I regard him as one of the greatest friends I have made here.”

The Manchester Guardian wrote: “Without Patel, Gandhi-ji’s idea would have had less practical influence and Nehru’s idealism less scope. Patel was not only the organiser for the fight for freedom, but also the architect of the new state when the fight was over. The same man is seldom successful as a rebel and statesman. Sardar Patel was the exception.”

Alan Campbell-Johnson has described Sardar Patel as a man with Roman qualities. To quote him: “Mountbatten had been somewhat apprehensive about his first meeting with Patel who had the reputation of being the strong man in the Congress High Command, but he very quickly detected a twinkle in the Sardar’s eye. His approach to the whole problem was clear and decisive.” Sir Archibald Nye whose knowledge of Indian affairs was intimate and first hand told Alan Campbell-Johnson that “he was very much impressed with Patel who was a real leader in the military sense.”

Patel has been compared with the great Athenian Pericles, about whom Thucydides wrote: “Pericles by his rank, ability and known integrity, was enabled to exercise an independent control over the multitude—in short to lead them instead of being led by them; for as he never sought power by improper means, he was never compelled to flatter them but, on the con-
trary, enjoyed so high an estimation that he could afford to anger them by contradiction."

The death of Sardar Patel was an irreparable loss to India. He had become a symbol of stability, "a pillar of strength", "an iron man of action", and "an illustrious builder of the nation". In the freedom struggle, he had proved himself "a dauntless warrior". His patriotism was unmatched. The inscription on the bust of Patel in the Indian Merchants Chamber at Bombay describes him as an "Apostle of Reality, Statesman, Patriot. His achievements will be recorded in India's history with pride and admiration."

L.N. Sarin has attempted a detailed comparison of Patel and Nehru. According to him, both of them were born and brought up in different circumstances and hence they had two different personal equations. They rose to prominence and from prominence to eminence from two different backgrounds and viewed the problems of life from two different angles. Two different approaches guided the mental process of their thinking. Freedom of the country and reliance on Mahatma Gandhi's leadership were their common meeting ground. For the rest they worked for many common objects with their different outlook on life and its problems.

Nehru was an aristocrat who turned a socialist and from an individualist became a mass leader. Patel was a self-made man and he rose from obscurity to power. He was not particularly attached to any social ideology and believed in the inevitability of gradualness. Nehru was a political poet, while Patel was a political prose writer. Nehru wanted to rebuild, while Patel attempted to improve. Nehru was a prince among men, but Patel remained a man among the Princes. Nehru did not worry about the details of a policy, but Patel knew that a hole could sink a ship. Nehru could not have integrated the states with Patel's efficiency and Patel could not have placed India on the map of the world with Nehru's vision. Nehru could think better, while Patel could act better. Gandhi once said: "Jawaharlal is a thinker and Sardar is a doer." Nehru's politics were the politics of advancement, while those of Patel were the politics of stability. Nehru argued that the very effort in a big cause meant a degree of success, but Patel looked to concrete results and was content to secure moderate gains from the
routine causes. Nehru had a large mind with many-coloured personality. Patel's acute intellect moved in smaller space and did not allow him to soar to a height where he could not sustain the flight. Nehru could inspire people for action, but Patel wanted them to perspire for results. Nehru had a bigger heart and Patel had a more subtle mind. Nehru could forgive, while Patel could forestall. Nehru wanted to end class distinctions, but Patel wanted to narrow the gap between them to the minimum. Nehru doubted if the capitalist lion and the labouring lamb could live in amity and trust each other. The view of Patel was that a capitalist lion without its sharp claws and pointed teeth was no better than a lamb and with a whip in the hands of the trainer could not devour the lamb. Where the development of economy of the country was concerned, they widely differed in their thinking and approach. Patel saw nothing wrong in mass-production by factory methods; Nehru favoured mass-production with State control. Patel did not rely much on the modern planner and his work, but to Nehru planning was the bed-rock of India's future growth and development. Nehru was an intellectual revolutionary and he tried to create a new mass-awakening against the exploiting classes. Patel was a stern realist and he knew that mass-awakening was a double-edged weapon and could result in class war. Nehru argued that "success often comes to those who dare and act; it seldom goes to the timid who are ever afraid of the consequences." Patel was nothing if not cool and calculating. He often said: "Facts take their revenge if you ignore them." He did not play for high stakes. Nehru believed that "if we seek to achieve great things, it can only be through great dangers". Patel's approach was different. He wanted to make people fearless and galvanise them into life. To him, a self-possessed, resourceful and patient man could surmount all his difficulties without inviting great dangers. Nehru looked to inspiration of great achievements of history, Patel to the mistakes of great historical failures. While Nehru believed in the inherent goodness of human nature, Patel was on guard against the hidden devil in every human mind. Nehru took things at their face value, but Patel would not ignore their market price. For Nehru, the Indian princes before freedom were an anachronism, who knew nothing more than "to manage Polo ponies, or recognise
the breeds of dogs”. According to Patel, the Princes were trustees of the people. In free India, they could profitably exercise “their influence by their benevolent advice rather than by any active interference in the sphere of administration.” Gandhiji was spiritually close to Nehru, but mentally he was very near Patel. He made Nehru his political heir and Sardar his faithful follower. He was sure that after him, Nehru would talk his language. He was equally confident that after him, Sardar would not betray his trust. He gave Nehru his affection and Sardar his esteem. Gandhiji knew the value of Nehru and the utility of Sardar. Both were indispensable to him and neither could be replaced. Subhash Bose considered Nehru the spoiled child of Gandhiji, but suspected the evil genius of Sardar. Nehru looked to the better side of a thing and even if he lost the prize, he did not lose himself. Patel looked to both sides and never lost the prize. Love of country, distrust of imperialism, hatred of fascism and trust in the future destiny of India were their major common preferences. When Gandhiji died, India lost its eminence; when Patel died, India lost its “guts”, and when Nehru died, India lost its vision and magnetism. Patel trusted his intellect and Nehru trusted his faith. Patel wanted proof, Nehru wanted assurance. Patel’s triumph was that of an administrator and not that of a man. Nehru’s triumph was that of a man and not that of an administrator. For some time in office, they did not trust each other. Nehru feared that Patel was alienating the Muslims and unconsciously weakening the foundations of freedom. The view of Patel was that by losing the goodwill of the Hindus, Nehru was doing the same. Gandhiji tried to keep them together as they were required to play complimentary roles. On Gandhiji’s death, a new spirit of mutual trust and reliance grew between them. Patel’s humility was his strength, Nehru’s aristocratic dignity was his grace and magnetism. Nehru could see higher, Patel could see farther. Nehru knew that nations take counsel of men of ability and vision, Patel knew that they follow men of character. Nehru assessed Sheikh Abdullah a real patriot, but Patel under-rated him as an ambitious person. Nehru did not like Patel’s swift and effective action in Junaghar and Hyderabad. Patel wanted to amputate all infectious limbs before they poison the whole body. Nehru was great in his own way. Patel’s greatness was
peculiar to him. They were both the most valuable assets of new India and they immortalised their names by serving the country with no regard of self and without any hope of reward and recognition.

Mahadev Desai compared Patel with Tilak in these words: "On close association with Vallabhbhai and after watching his manner of speech, his smile and his laughter, his anger and his impatience, one cannot but be reminded of Tilak Maharaj. Both of them created an impression regarding themselves which was the exact opposite of what they in fact were. Both appeared at first sight to be arrogant, and stand-offish whereas in fact they were humble and gentle. Both gave the impression of being very complex, obstinate and stern, whereas in fact they were simple, straightforward and friendly."
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Maulana Abul Kalam Azad
(1888-1958)

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad who was the President of the Congress from 1940 to 1946 and also its President in 1923 and who acted as Congress President on many more occasions, was undoubtedly one of the greatest scholars of Muslim culture. He was one of the finest interpreters of the Quran. He enjoyed respect from the Muslims all over the world. At the same time, he was very much loved and admired by the people of India except the die-hards among the Muslim Leaguers. His sacrifices in the cause of India's independence were unrivalled. He was a great patriot who lived a life of dedication and worked hard for his country to the last day of his life. About Maulana Azad, Mahatma Gandhi observed thus in May 1940: “I have had the privilege of being associated with Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in national work since 1920. In the knowledge of Islam he is surpassed by no one. He is a profound Arabic scholar. His nationalism is as robust as his faith in Islam. That he is today the supreme head of the Indian National Congress has deep meaning which should not be lost sight of by every student of Indian politics.”

Shaikh Mohammad Khairuddin Sahib, father of Maulana Azad, had migrated to Mecca and Maulana Azad was born on 11 November 1888 in the Darus Salam quarter of the Holy
City. His father was a scholar of eminence and also a mystic with a considerable following in India. He was known throughout the Islamic world on account of his authorship of an Arabic work in ten volumes published in Egypt. To quote Maulana Azad: "My father was a man who believed in the old ways of life. He had no faith in Western education and never thought of giving me an education of the modern type." Abul Kalam's father arranged for the education of his son at home by some of the most eminent scholars of the day. Humayun Kabir is definitely of the view that Abul Kalam was educated at home and not at the Al Azhar University as was previously believed. He went to that university only as a visitor when he had already finished his studies at home. When Abul Kalam was about 10 years of age, his father was invited back to India by his disciples who lived mostly at Calcutta.

Abul Kalam was admitted to the Dars-i-Nizami course at Calcutta for studies in Islamic theology and divinity. The more Abul Kalam worked upon his books, the more enthusiastic he became in his studies. He was looked upon with wonder and esteem both by his fellow students and his teachers. Under the constant guidance of his father, Abul Kalam became, at a very young age, a well-behaved young-man, a great reader, a brilliant teacher and a perfect speaker.

At the age of 16, he went on a tour to visit the Muslim countries such as Egypt, Syria, Palestine and Iraq. At Cairo where he stayed for some time, he imbibed the spirit of the reformatory movement which had been launched by Syed Jamaluddin Afghani and Shayk Muhammad Abduh. The former was the leader of a powerful Pan-Islamic movement whose object was to liberate the West Asian countries from domination by the West, particularly of Britain. It was the influence of these two great scholars which stimulated the mind of Abul Kalam to inaugurate a similar movement in his own country.

Maulana Azad's father died at Calcutta in 1909. It was expected that this son would follow the profession of his father and guide thousands of his followers. However, he disappointed all of them as he was caught by a new call, a call for freedom of his country from foreign yoke based on Hindu-Muslim unity. He took to journalism to prepare the Muslims for the part which
he wanted them to play. He became the editor of Nairang-i-
Alam and afterwards started his own paper called Lisan-us-Sidq
(Tongue of the Truth). His writings were acclaimed through-
out the length and breadth of India and eminent scholars like
Mohammad Iqbal, Maulvi Nazir Ahmad, Maulana Hali and
Khan Bahadur Abdul Qadir were simply enamoured of the
versatility of his talents. In recognition of his ability and
depth of learning, the Anjuman-i-Himayat-i-Islam, the premier
Muslim organisation of Lahore, invited him to deliver the
annual address on "The Rational Basis of Religion". This was
a signal recognition of the prestige of the young editor of
Lisan-us-Sidq. There were many who were eager to see the
speaker. They thought that Abul Kalam had just sent his son
to read the address on his behalf but when the little boy was
introduced as no other but Abul Kalam himself, all were struck
with wonder and amazement. On that evening, his scholarship,
erudition and ability shot him into lime-light. He was there-
after called Maulana or 'Our Leader'.

Abul Kalam who was acclaimed by such writers as Hali,
Shibli and Nawab Muhsin-ul-Mulk as "an old head on young
shoulders", was considered as a prodigy of the age. His
writings were given a prominent place in the famous papers
of India. He edited Al Nadwa in 1905 and Vakil, a famous
paper from Amritsar, in 1907. The view of Abul-Kalam was
that the interests of the Muslims could be served only if they
took part in the national struggle for independence. The libera-
tion of India was necessary for the progress and prosperity of
the entire Muslim world. He challenged the basic principles
of the Aligarh Party. He repudiated the policy of co-operation
with the British and separation from the Hindus as laid down by
Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and urged the Muslims of India to
identify themselves with the national movement and oppose the
forces of British imperialism.

With these objects in view, he started his famous weekly
paper Al-Hilal (the Crescent) on 1 June 1912 from Calcutta.
The publication of this paper literally took Muslim India by
storm. As a mere literary effort, it was something unique in
the history of Urdu language and literature. There was a rare
combination of rhetoric, eloquence, wit, poetry, biting sarcasm
and lofty idealism in this paper. A new style in Urdu prose
grew out of the models supplied in the editorials of this paper. What captured the imagination of the youngmen was not only the poetic grace or literary excellence but the formulation and statement of a new faith. Within 6 months of its publication, the circulation of the paper went up to 11,000 copies and before the end of the first year of its issue, the figure reached 25,000.

The work which Abul Kalam had put before himself was a very difficult one. It was practically impossible to break the hold of the Aligarh Party over the Muslims of India, particularly when it was supported by the British Government with its enormous resources. However, Abul Kalam was confident of the success of his mission. His view was that it was only in moments of depression such as existed at that time in India that mighty energies could be released for heroic deeds and he sounded the trumpet call in these words: “There comes in the history of nations a time when the desire to live becomes a sin, and there is no greater sin than to live on. At such a time, the number of those behind high walls and iron bars increases and the trade of the ironmonger splendidly thrives. Ropes hang on the branches of trees, and wooden planks are aloft for the sons of Adam to walk on to their doom. Such a day comes only to usher in another day, when the seed sown by executions puts forth the fruit of a living and abiding life.”

That was the tempo of Al-Hilal when it was started and Abul Kalam wrote: “My resolve is not to seek a task, but to seek right men to do it. In this world, there never was any lack of tasks. But there has always been a dearth of men to undertake them. The present age is an age of wars. All around us are hosts of enemies, and there is not a single corner where armours do not ring. So, there is no lack of fields for action. Those who possess the spirit of a soldier and the courage of a hero must come out to face life as they find it and face its trials. I assert once again that there is no lack of tasks. What we really lack among us are patriots and fighters.”

The call of Abul Kalam Azad was heard throughout the country. When the Balkan War started in 1912, he took up the cause of the Muslim states abroad which were being gradually threatened by the Christian powers of Europe. The Muslims of India were very much agitated as the Balkan War
was against Turkey. They started collecting funds to help the suffering Turks. Maulana Abul Kalam condemned European imperialism in the strongest possible terms. The First World War started in 1914. While the Muslim League and the Congress followed a policy of loyalty towards the British Government, Maulana Azad continued to condemn the atrocities committed by the Europeans. The Government of India could not tolerate such an attitude on his part.

The Government forfeited the security of *Al-Hilal* and demanded a fresh security of Rs. 10,000/-. Maulana Azad started another paper called *Al-Balah*. The Government took strong action and Maulana Azad was ordered to leave the province of Bengal within a week. The Governments of the Punjab, U.P. and Madras issued notifications prohibiting the entry of Maulana Azad in their respective provinces. On 30 March 1916, Maulana Azad left Calcutta and settled at Ranchi where he was interned up to the beginning of 1920.

It was at Ranchi that Maulana Azad started writing his famous commentary on the Quran which is considered to be his greatest work. This memorable work entitled ‘*Tarjuman-ul-Quran*’ is a translation of the first eight chapters of the Quran. It is perhaps the most valuable contribution ever made to the field of Islamic studies by an Indian scholar. Sayyad Suleman Nadvi, the eminent scholar of Islamic Theology, writes: ‘It is a notable feature of the ‘Tarjuman-ul-Quran’ that its author understands the spirit of his age and has adopted the same method of fighting the evil of Westernism, which Ibn Taimiya and Ibn Qayyim had adopted to dispel the evils which had sprung from the Tartar invasion. Just as they had diagnosed the causes of the downfall of the Muslims of their age in their submission to the Greek philosophy, similarly the author of the ‘Tarjuman-ul-Quran’ traces out the cause of the deterioration of the Muslims of the day in their blind faith in the Greek and European philosophy.’

During his internment at Ranchi, Maulana Azad wrote another book called *Tazkira*. It is a biographical account of his noble ancestors. Maulana Azad has also written a few pages about his own life. While writing this book, Maulana Azad had to depend entirely on his memory to construct a brilliant piece of historical research covering more than 300
Maulana Azad was released in January 1920. At a meeting of the Khilafat Committee held on 28 February 1920 in the Town Hall of Calcutta, Maulana Azad declared that if the British Government did not listen to the demands of the Khilafat even at that stage, the Muslims would be obliged by their religious injunctions to sever all loyalist relations with it. Maulana Azad also met Mahatma Gandhi in Delhi. At that time, it was decided by the Hindu and Muslim leaders to send a deputation to the Viceroy to place before him the sentiments of the people regarding Turkey and the Khilafat question. However, Maulana Azad did not go with the deputation. His view was that the old methods of begging, petitioning, waiting in deputation could not be of much avail. This thing impressed Mahatma Gandhi and from 1920 till 1948, Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Azad remained friends.

The Khilafat conference was held at Meerut and the non-co-operation programme was placed before the public at that conference. The eloquence of Maulana Azad held the public spell-bound. He was welcomed with open arms by the Maulvis and Muslim divines. In a special conference of the Ulema at Lahore where a thousand Muslim divines had gathered, Maulana Azad was unanimously elected as the Imam-ul-Hind or the Spiritual Head of India.

In 1921, Maulana Azad began an extensive propaganda tour of the Punjab where in defiance of law and authority, he made powerful speeches at mass meetings. In March 1921, he delivered a speech at the Badshahi Mosque at Lahore after the Juma prayers.

On 10 December 1921, Maulana Azad was arrested from his residence at Calcutta and was prosecuted under S.124-A of the Indian Penal Code for delivering two objectionable speeches in connection with the non-co-operation movement. At the trial, Maulana Azad made a statement in Urdu which is generally known by the name of Qaul-i-Faisal or the "Final Verdict". Gandhiji hailed it as a great statement. The Qaul-i-Faisal is not only a historical document, it is one of the most outstanding monuments in Urdu literature. In that statement, Maulana Azad observed that non-co-operation was the result of utter disappointment from the existing conditions.
He referred to the iniquities of law courts. He called the Government of India a tyrant. He confessed that he had committed the offence with which he was being charged. To quote him: “I believe that liberty is the birth-right of every nation and individual. No man nor any man-made bureaucracy possesses the right of enslaving human-beings. Howsoever attractive we may coin the names for slavery and servitude, still slavery will remain what it is. It is against the will and canons of God. Therefore, I refuse to admit the present Government as a valid authority and consequently think it to be my national, religious and human duty to relieve my country and nation of this servitude.....

“I am a Mussalman, and as such, my religious duty is the same. Islam does not recognize any autocratic suzerainty, nor any bureaucracy which consists of a few paid servants. It is a perfect organisation of liberty and constitutionalism, which originated for the purpose of restoring their lost freedom to humanity... the freedom which had been confiscated by kings, foreign Governments, selfish religious leaders, and powerful elements of the society. They thought that might was right; but Islam proclaimed from its very birth that might was not right, and right alone was proprietorship; and no one else than God was worthy of enslaving or enthralling the human beings. It (Islam) swept off all racial and national gradations of distinction and authority, and showed the world at large that all human beings hold an equal rank, and all possess equal rights. Superiority does not lie in race, nationality or colour; it is only actions that count, and the greatest man is he who does his work best.”

In the same statement, Maulana Azad declared that “the present Government is simply an illicit bureaucracy. It is absolutely nil for the desires and wishes of the teeming millions. It always prefers prestige over justice and truth...... Its courage is indefatigable and its bravery is unlimited in crushing the sense of justice and there is no restraint to its tongue when falsifying the sense of truth.”

Towards the end of his statement, Maulana Azad observed: “Before I end the statement...I would like to say something about the Magistrate as well. Let him award, without any hesitation, the maximum punishment which he is authorized
to give. I will not have any feeling of grudge or complaint against him, because my contest is against the entire administrative machinery and not with a specified part thereof. I, therefore, know that unless the whole machine is changed, its parts cannot change their respective functions.

"I close my account with the words of Italy's martyr for truth—Gardino Brono, who like me, was also made to stand before a law court, and who declared: 'Give me, without any hesitation, the maximum punishment that you can give, and I assure you that whatever emotions you will have in your heart at the moment of writing the punishment orders, not a hundredth part thereof shall work in my heart while hearing the judgment.'

"Mr. Magistrate!

"I shall not take any more time of the court. It is a very interesting and instructive chapter of history which we both are equally busy in preparing. While I get the criminals' dock, to you comes the magisterial seat; but I admit that for this work your seat is as much important as this dock. Come then, let us finish quickly this memorable act which is soon to become a fable. The historian is watching us and waiting anxiously. Allow me to occupy this place repeatedly and you may also go on writing your judgment with equal agility. This work will continue for some time more, and then the gates of another Court will open wide. That will be the court of the Lord where Time will act as the Judge; it will pass the judgment and that will be the final Judgment."

This statement was made by Maulana Azad on 11 January 1922 and the judgment was given by the Chief Presidency Magistrate on 9 February 1922. He was awarded one year rigorous imprisonment. On hearing it, Maulana Azad observed: "Only one year rigorous imprisonment? But this is far too less than what I was expecting?"

When Maulana Azad was released from prison, there was a serious rift in the Congress between the No-Changers and Pro-Changers. He considered it his duty to do his best to reconcile the two opposing parties. He enjoyed the confidence of both sides and was ultimately successful in bringing about a compromise. He presented a formula with which the Working Committee of the Congress agreed and accordingly a resolution
was passed to the effect that all propaganda against entering the councils was to be suspended and those Congressmen who had no objection against entering the legislatures were at liberty to seek election and non-co-operate with the Government from within, while those who did not believe in such a programme were to redouble their efforts to carry out the constructive programme of Gandhi to achieve Swaraj by united efforts.

Maulana Azad also tried to tackle the communal problem facing the country in 1923-4. A Unity Conference met at Delhi for about a week and was attended by about 150 Hindu and Muslim leaders. Maulana Azad was the foremost among those who tried to bring the Hindus and Muslims together. He made it clear that the social order of India was based upon the maintenance of Hindu-Muslim unity and that could not be done by individual animosities. More Unity Conferences were arranged and more discussions took place and resolutions passed but the communal situation in the country did not improve.

On the occasion of the visit of the Simon Commission to India, Maulana Azad played an important part in the propaganda to boycott the Commission. He made a tour of the Punjab in that connection.

In 1929, the Nationalist Muslim Party was formed within the Indian National Congress and Maulana Azad was chosen as its President. The aim of this organisation was to present a united front against the various Muslim organisations such as the Muslim League and to create a spirit of patriotism among the Muslims so that they may take an active part in the political struggle of the country. In 1930, the Muslims responded to the call of Maulana Azad. He was piloting the ship of the Congress when the Civil Disobedience Movement was at its height. He made an extensive tour of the Muslim majority provinces. He organised non-violence in the teeth of brutal violence and urged upon the rich and the poor, men and women, to join the struggle. Maulana Azad became the Acting President of the Congress after the arrest of Gandhiji and Motilal Nehru. He made picketing a crusade. In August 1930, he was arrested under the Picketing Ordinance at Calcutta and sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment. In 1932, he was served with a notice asking him not to take any part
in the Civil Disobedience Movement. He was arrested for defiance of the notice and sent to jail.

In July 1936, a Parliamentary Sub-Committee consisting of Maulana Azad, Sardar Patel and Dr. Rajendra Prasad was formed to guide the Congress ministries in different provinces and also to take necessary action in case of emergency. Bengal, the Punjab and the North-Western Frontier Province were put under the charge of Maulana Azad. During 1937 to October 1939, he worked as a steersman in the Parliamentary Sub-Committee with great alacrity and aptitude. He organised at Delhi an All-India Independent Muslim Conference under the Presidentship of Allah Baksh, ex-Chief Minister of Sind. He denounced the partition scheme repudiating the claim of the Muslim League to represent Muslim India. In the political creed of Maulana Azad, partition of India was a sin. Maulana Azad presided over the Congress Session in 1940 and continued to be its President till 1946. He tried to approach Mr. Jinnah to find out some means of a compromise but Jinnah refused to see him saying: “You are a show-boy of the Congress. Give it up.” On 13 December 1940, Maulana Azad was arrested and sentenced to 18 months’ imprisonment for making a speech against the Government. It was Maulana Azad who conducted negotiations with Cripps in 1942 on behalf of the Congress. He was arrested in August 1942 along with the other members of Congress Working Committee and was set free after an imprisonment of 34 months. He was given full and plenary powers by the Congress Working Committee to deal with all phases of the negotiations with the Government to end the deadlock. However, the Simla Conference failed as Maulana Azad refused to recognise the claim of the Muslim League to represent all the Muslims of India. He carried on negotiations with the Cabinet Mission in 1946. In January 1947, he became the Minister of Education and he continued to occupy that position up to 22 February 1958.

As Minister of Education and Scientific Research, Maulana Azad did a lot. The University Education Commission was appointed in 1948 and it submitted its report in 1949. The Secondary Education Commission was appointed in 1952 and it submitted its report in 1953. A large number of laboratories for scientific research were established during this period.
The Kharagpur Institute of Higher Technology was started on 18 August 1951. The University Grants Commission with considerable financial resources was created. Hundreds of useful reports, brochures and monographs were published. The history of the freedom movement in India was also prepared. Three national Akademies were set up. The Indian Council of Cultural Relations was set up. The Departments of Archaeology, Archives and Anthropology were developed. Cultural activities received a new stimulus and Indian culture a new recognition and respect abroad. Maulana Azad had a phased programme for the development of Hindi. He wanted to develop it in such a manner that there was no opposition from any quarter. There were people who wanted to oust English from the country but Maulana Azad insisted that English should be retained and given an important place in our national life. He was deeply interested in the welfare of the teaching community.

When Maulana Azad died on 22 February 1958, *The Hindu* of Madras wrote: "In the passing away of Maulana Abul-Kalam Azad, India has lost a tried and fearless patriot, Islam a great exponent of true Koranic principles and the world of scholarship a gifted author and savant who knew no barriers of race, country or language. He warned Muslims against offending Hindu sentiment by slaughter of cows long before other Muslim leaders. He gave short shrift to those who were always bent on getting protection for the minorities. He was a trusted friend of Mahatma Gandhi and in response to the latter's call for sacrifice, he underwent various terms of imprisonment, making eleven years in all. The Congress showed its supreme confidence in his integrity and leadership by electing him President for various terms and he conducted talks with Sir Stafford Cripps in 1942 and with the British Cabinet Mission four years later. Both in the party and outside the Cabinet his voice was listened to with respect and his counsel sought on the most difficult issues. It was he who was responsible for the publication, in 1952, of an authoritative history of Eastern Philosophy and, again, for the history of the 1857 struggle for freedom compiled from the National Archives. Maulana Azad must also claim credit for the recognition and fostering of Indian literary and artistic works and for giving encouragement
to our creative artists, who had been neglected by the State for decades. Through all his lifetime, he was an outstanding exemplar of a truly cosmopolitan culture and despite his arduous work in the political and administrative fields, he continued to maintain his serenity of spirit and to seek a friendly and human approach to problems."

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta wrote: "One of the stalwarts of the Congress, Maulana Azad was called a scintillating solitaire in the diadem of that organisation. There cannot be a more apt description of this profound theologian, keen intellectual, eloquent speaker, powerful writer, sober politician and, above all, lovable man. A devout Muslim, there were few, if any, who could come near him in the knowledge of Islamic theology. Yet he was a rationalist to his finger-tips in outlook and attitude. Strictly speaking, he was a non-party man and not only believed in but personified in his life Hindu-Muslim unity on which, he was convinced, the fate of India depended so largely. His political faith and catholic views brought upon him not a little taunt and jeer from the protagonist of the two-nation theory but he was too great and dignified to care for such mean and unworthy attacks. From the day he openly joined the Congress till his very last breath, he remained a true nationalist to the core of his being and worked for the freedom of the nation and its well-being."

The observations of the *Hindustan Times* of New Delhi were: "Maulana Azad's was a career of outstanding service, of great achievement and of dedication to a cause. The flame of his faith in freedom and in nationalism did not flicker at any time. Neither his powerful pen nor his enviable gift of oratory was ever used for any but the highest purposes. His ardent patriotism, his deep scholarship and his robust thinking have been distinct assets in the political evolution of our times and his death has come as a national tragedy."

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan says that Maulana Azad was a great scholar, a self-sacrificing patriot and a statesman. He worked hard for the unity of India. He was a devout Muslim and an ardent patriot. He suffered persecution on account of his views but he never faltered. His was a life of search and attainment. He was an outstanding figure of great courage, fearlessness and integrity. He was a unique figure in our
political life for two generations. He made no difference between a Hindu, a Muslim, a Sikh or a Christian. He believed that all those who were in this country belonged to one country. The national spirit was the driving force of his life. He was an apostle of national unity and communal harmony. He had a civilized mind. Books were his constant and never-failing companions. He wrote an Introduction to History of Philosophy, Eastern and Western.

Dr. Zakir Hussain says that Maulana Azad had a many-sided personality. He was not only fighter for freedom and a great statesman but a great theologian and a great scholar. He was a great literary artist and possessed an excellent taste and rare aesthetic sensibility. He never gave up scholarship and literature for politics. To the last, he was faithful to his first love.

Maulana Azad was an outspoken champion of rationalism and progressiveness in all spheres of Indian life. He approached the religious, moral, economic and political questions from a detached and dispassionate point of view and worked for securing justice and fairplay for all sections of the Indian people. Maulana Azad was never a professional politician who would wear a new garment to suit the exigencies and requirements of different occasions. He was a man of religion who would not bargain or barter with his religion. He would not give up his convictions. He never wavered in his faith or in the leadership of Gandhiji. Like many others, he did not believe in non-violence as a creed but he remained loyal to the policy that had been adopted by the Congress after due and careful consideration. No mis-representation of his motives, no insults from others could deflect him from the path he had chosen for himself. His was essentially a voice of reason which was one of moderation and sanity. Though he guided the crowd, he was shy of it. He was not of it.

Maulana Azad was a humanist in the truest sense of the term. Even in the midst of a controversy, he followed a policy of toleration. When Subhash Chandra Bose was holding the Anti-Compromise Conferences as a challenge to the Congress and most Congressmen were bitter about it, Maulana Azad did not say even one harsh word against him or the Anti-Compromise Conferences. He made it clear that while he disagreed
with the approach and politics of Subhash Chandra Bose, he could never forget that he was a true and patriotic son of India. Maulana Azad showed the same spirit of toleration in his dealings with the Muslim League and its leaders. They abused him in season and out of season but he was always courteous in his references to them. Although he opposed the policies of the Muslim League, he never attacked any of its leaders. As for the students and other young men misled by the Muslim League, he refused to condemn or punish them. His view was that they were less to blame than the leaders who led them astray. Throughout his life, he never spoke a harsh word about Mr. Jinnah.

However, Maulana Azad had his critics also. Mr. Jinnah ridiculed him as a “Mulla” and a “Show-boy” of the Congress. The British propaganda against him also emphasised the “Show-boy” image. Dr. Ansari said of Maulana Azad: “He is a Mulla first and a Mulla last. He sits in Delhi and dreams of Mecca.” J.N. Sahni says that Maulana Azad might have distinguished himself as a Chancellor of an institution for theological research on Islamic studies like Al-Azhar, but as a Minister of Education, he was definitely a square peg in a round hole. It was impossible for anyone to convince Prime Minister Nehru of the mistake he had committed in appointing Maulana Azad as the Minister of Education and India had to pay a very heavy price for keeping Maulana Azad as Education Minister because in that position, he perpetuated the system of education which did not serve the needs of the nation. (The Lid Off, pp. 364-6).
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Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan (1890....)

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan is affectionately known as Badshah Khan. He is also known as 'Gandhi-e-Sarhad' (Frontier Gandhi), 'Fakhr-e-Afghan', and 'Fakhr-e-Pathan' (Pride of the Pathans). Badshah Khan is a man of faith. He is the idol of the people but his popularity has not gone to his head. He shuns all power and pomp and show. His passion is freedom for the Pathans. He wants them to serve humanity and play an important role in world politics. He detests slavery and his heart weeps at the sight of misery. He would like to remove tyranny and oppression from the earth. He is a crusader. He fought for India's freedom along with Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Maulana Azad, etc. He has been the champion of Hindu-Muslim brotherhood. He has lived a heroic life. He has spent 30 years in imprisonment, divided equally between British and Pakistani jails. He could have lived a life of ease and plenty as he belonged to a good family and possesses a commanding height of 6' and 3". He could have got a commission in the Indian Army during the British days, but he decided to dedicate his life for the good of the Pathans. He is straight in body and mind, sincere and simple, fearless, faithful and true.
Abdul Ghaffar Khan was born in 1890 in the house of Khan Behram Khan in the village of Utmanzai in North-Western Frontier Province. His father was very fond of the British who used to address him Chacha (uncle). Behram Khan used to say: "The British have come to us as angels, sent by God for our good." He was on very good terms with the British bureaucracy in his Province.

The name of Abdul Ghaffar Khan first came to notice in 1919 when he led an agitation, in common with the rest of India, against Rowlatt Act which severely restricted the political activities in India. His work in connection with the education of the Pathans made him the target of the British authorities. Objection was taken to his touring the Districts. The Government was opposed to his running a school at Utmanzai. When the school was hardly six months old, Sir John Maffey, Chief Commissioner of North-Western Frontier Province, summoned Abdul Ghaffar Khan's father and tried to persuade him to ask his son to close down the school. He impressed upon him that the running of the school was anti-British. To quote the Chief Commissioner: "Why should your son take it upon himself to establish this school, when none else is interested in it? Your son is touring village after village and establishing schools. Ask him to stop this work and stay at home like others, otherwise you both will have to face the consequences." Behram Khan called his son and told him what the Chief Commissioner had advised him and then added: "What the others are not doing, you should not do. Sit comfortably at home." Abdul Ghaffar Khan found himself in a very difficult position but his reply was: "The British in their own interest create differences even between father and son. Supposing all the other people ceased to take interest in the Namaz, would you ask me to give it up and forsake my duty?" The father replied, "Certainly not. I would never have you give up your religious duties, no matter what others may do." Abdul Ghaffar Khan then replied, "Well, then, father, this work of imparting national education is like that. If I may give up my Namaz I may give up the school. As Namaz is a duty so also the education and service of the people is a duty." The father replied, "I see you are right. If it is duty, then do it."

As Abdul Ghaffar Khan continued to do his work of
educating the people, he was arrested and sentenced to three years rigorous imprisonment under Section 40 of the Frontier Crimes Regulation on 17 December 1921. The suffering that he went through in jail completed his baptism that had begun in 1919. He suffered the tortures of solitary confinement. Heavy fetters were put on his hands and feet. The fetters on his feet were so tight that he could hardly walk and the feet were bleeding. There was dirt and filth. He had to suffer insults and kicks at the hands of the British officials. However, he was a model prisoner. He was kind in spite of his strength and gentle even with his enemies. He forgave everything to everybody and possessed unlimited patience. He treated his captors with contempt. His jailor was willing to provide release for a consideration but Badshah Khan’s reply was: “Bribing is a social evil; I will have no part in it. You know that I am here because I refused to furnish security. However, if I have to bribe any one, I may as well pay the security.”

By chance, Badshah Khan was transferred to Lahore Central Jail and that brought him into contact with Indian leaders. He came into contact with Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru and was drawn into the Congress and later on became a member of its Working Committee. These contacts had a great effect on him. Returning to his homeland he told his people: “A revolution is like a flood; it can bring blessings but it can also bring devastation; it can bring fertility and prosperity but it can also bring ruin.” He was anxious for active involvement of the Pathan people in a constructive movement which would concentrate on education. This was the origin of the Khudai Khidmatgar Movement (Movement of the servants of God).

Badshah Khan undertook long and arduous tours on foot to carry to the Pakhtoons the message of social and political reforms. As 98% of the Pathans were illiterate, he went from village to village talking to them. He moved from place to place rousing the enthusiasm of the people and organising the Khudai Khidmatgars. He addressed meetings at mid-night, at noon and in the morning, calling upon the people to act. The people came in large numbers from long distances to listen to him and got solace from his sight. Their love for him was unbounded. The people began to regard him as a saint.

For the awakening of the Pakhtoon masses, Abdul Ghaffar
Khan wanted the co-operation of all Pakhtu-speaking people who were spread all over the world. Many of them were working in various parts of India. Many of them were in South-East Asia. There was a Pathan Colony in Australia. There were Pathans in California. To reach the Pakhtoon community throughout the world and particularly the literates in the North-West Frontier Province, Abdul Ghaffar Khan thought of publishing a journal in Pakhtu. In May 1928, he actually started a monthly journal in Pakhtu known as the Pakhtun and himself became its Editor. His articles appeared under the signature of “Abdul Ghaffar”.

In October 1929, Abdul Ghaffar Khan started the movement in the North-West Frontier Province known as the Khudai Khidmatgar movement. He adopted the red colour for his workers, Khudai Khidmatgars, and that is why they came to be known as Red Shirts also. Their aim was freedom and their motto was service. On the march they sang:

We are the army of God,
By death or wealth unmoved.
We march, our leader and we,
Ready to die.
We serve and we love
Our people and our cause,
Freedom is our goal,
Our lives the price we pay.

When the Khudai Khidmatgar movement was started, it was a social movement but it was the attitude of the British Government that turned it into a political movement. Abdul Ghaffar Khan tells us that when the Government terrorised them, they became helpless. “We went to the Muslim League, the Muslim Conference, and we went to the Musalmans of Lahore, Simla and Delhi, requesting them to help us. But they were not ready to help us. Thereafter, when I was in jail, our brethren complained that the Musalmans of India did not help them and inquired whether there was any other body which would be willing to save them from ruin and destruction, and whether its help could be available. You know that for a man drowning in the sea even the support of a straw is very
great. The Congress told us: 'We are with you, we shall help
you.' Then, we said: 'We, too, are with you.' It obliged us
and turned our position into a political one. This was done
by Government.'

The Khudai Khidmatgar movement aimed at teaching the
Pakhtuns industry, economy and self-reliance, by inculcating
in them self-respect and the fear of God which "banishes all
fear".

The Pathans are famous for their fearlessness and bravery.
However, they wasted a lot of their time in suicidal feuds and
mutual vendetta retaliations. Badshah Khan believed that if
they could adopt the philosophy of non-violence in their
mutual relations, they could give a better account of their
bravery. Non-violence would bring salvation for them.

On account of his sacrifices in the cause of the freedom of
the country, Badshah Khan became very popular and his
prestige in India rose very high. An ardent desire was expre-
sed in 1934 that he should preside over the Indian National
Congress but he refused by saying that he was a learner from
Mahatma Gandhi and not an All-India leader. Jawahar Lal
Nehru writes: "The unquestioned leader was Khan Abdul
Ghaffar Khan...More and more he has come to be in the eyes of
the rest of India, the symbol of courage and sacrifice of a gal-
ant and indomitable people, comrade of ours in a common
struggle."

In 1946, the Khudai Khidmatgars won the Provincial
Assembly elections with a large majority. In spite of that,
a referendum was forced on the North-Western Frontier
Province in 1947. The people were asked to choose whether
they would remain in India or join Pakistan. As an option, the
choice was an illusion because being land-locked and cut off
from India by the large area of West Pakistan territory, join-
ing with India was really out of the question. Badshah Khan
protested that the Pathans should be given the option of self-
determination, namely, to form their own separate state if they
opted for it in the referendum. Lord Mountbatten was not
prepared to allow a province to stand by itself and he made
the fact clear to Jawahar Lal Nehru and the Congress leaders.
The Congress leaders accepted the decision of Lord Mountba-
tten without putting up a fight in favour of the stand taken
up by Badshah Khan. Badshah Khan says: "It hurt and grieved me deeply that even the Congress Working Committee did not lift a finger to help us as we had hoped they would." The result was that Badshah Khan and his followers decided to boycott the referendum. To quote Badshah Khan: "The Congress, which was the representative body in India, not only deserted us but delivered us into the hands of our enemies. To meet them now is like killing all my Pathan self-respect, ethics and traditions." It is stated that Badshah Khan complained to Gandhiji that the Indians were leaving the Pathans to the mercy of wolves. The reply of Gandhiji was: "We will fight Pakistan if they maltreat you. It is true that I believe in nonviolence but it will be for the Government of India to help the Pathans to keep their honour and the right of self-determination."

The fears of Badshah Khan were real. Neither he nor the Khudai Khidmatgars have been treated well in Pakistan. As a matter of fact, Badshah Khan has spent more than 15 years in Pakistani jails and he was released only when his health broke down completely. During the couple of years he was free, he fought against oppression and injustice meted out to his Pakhtoon brethren. In 1955, the North-West Frontier Province was amalgamated with Sind, Punjab and Baluchistan to form the single unit of West Pakistan. The name of the Pakhtoons was wiped off from the pages of history. Celebrating the Pakhtoonistan Day in Kabul on 31 August 1965, Badshah Khan declared that the Pakhtoons form one nation. It was because of their struggle and sacrifices that independence was achieved and the British were expelled. To quote him: "Pakistan was created by us. It is created by the blood of the Pathans. We want to be friendly with Pakistan. The Pathans are demanding only the right to build their own homes."

About Badshah Khan, Mahadev Desai wrote: "He is no less a Musalman than any orthodox Musalman. I don't think that he has ever missed a single Namaz and the spirit of brotherhood is in him more in than many so-called orthodox Musalmans. The elder brother having spent many years abroad and claiming as he does, friends of various nationalities and creeds, is somewhat of an eclectic but he has inherited his father's religious spirit no less than the younger brother. Often
-enough he says in jest: 'My brother offers the Namaz on my behalf also.' The greatest thing in the younger brother is, to my mind, his spirituality, or better still the true spirit of Islam, namely, submission or surrender to God. He has measured Gandhi's life all through with this yardstick and his clinging to Gandhiji can be explained on no other ground. It is not Gandhiji's name or fame that have attracted him to Gandhiji, nor his political work, nor his rebellion and revolution. It is his pure and ascetic life and his insistence on self-purification that have had the greatest appeal for him, and his whole life, since 1919 onwards, has been one sustained effort for self-purification. I have the privilege of having a number of Muslim friends, true as steel and ready to sacrifice their all for Hindu-Muslim unity, but I do not yet know one who is greater than or even equal to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan in the transparent purity and the ascetic severity of his life, combined with extreme tenderness and living faith in God." Again, "Abdul Ghaffar Khan is a soldier who has thousands upon thousands of soldiers ready to obey him and to do his bidding. He is impatient of all cant and hypocrisy, and he cannot understand leadership which connotes anything more than the greatest service. He is no new convert to the programme of constructive work."

His life is an inspiring saga—a triumph of spirit which knows nothing of forces, whose conquests are won by the power of invincible gentleness. Dr. L.M. Singhvi says: "Badshah Khan's life and work is a sublime saga of patriotism, self-sacrifice and dedicated service. In sheer simplicity and forthrightness, he stands out as a towering figure among his contemporaries. The depth of devotional sincerity to the causes he has espoused, the courage, fortitude and imperturbable stoicism with which he has borne the vagaries and tribulations of political persecution and the unruffled sense of detachment and deep compassion which are interwoven in the mosaic of his extraordinary life, make him one of the most remarkable men of our times. He teaches by example which ennobles his essential message and heightens his moral authority."

Badshah Khan has spent some years in Kabul and he visited India also in 1969 on the occasion of Gandhiji's centenary celebrations. At present (1975), he is fighting a battle
along with his son Wali Khan against the arbitrary and despotic rule of Z.A. Bhutto.

**SUGGESTED READINGS**


*Zutshi, G.L.* : *Frontier Gandhi: The Fighter, the Politician, the Saint.* New Delhi, 1970.
Dr. Rajendra Prasad was the first President of independent India. He was the President of the Congress three times. His contribution to the cause of India’s independence is second to none. He was rightly called “the gentleman of Indian politics”. Motilal Nehru described him as a “hundred per cent Chela (disciple) of Gandhiji”. Gandhiji once said: “There is at least one man who would not hesitate to take the poison cup from my hands. He is Rajendra Prasad.” Rajendra Prasad identified himself with the hopes and fears, the struggles and aspirations of the Indian people. He identified himself so much with the national struggle that his personal hopes and fears and family weal and woe became secondary to him. He had virtues of simplicity of personal life, of nobility of nature, of helpfulness to all, of sympathy with and understanding of persons in every grade of life, of devotion to the Master, and of fulfilling in his own person the many things he undertook to do in times and circumstances that were very different from what they were later on. Some people were inclined to think that he was the “Yes-man” of Gandhiji and he had surrendered his reasoning faculties to him and reserved no independence of thought for himself, but that was not correct. The very fact that he had identified himself with Gandhiji should not be taken that he could not act independently. As a matter of fact, he took over as President of the Congress in 1947 for the third time as desired
by Sardar Patel and Nehru although Gandhiji was not in favour.

Rajendra Prasad was born on 3 December 1884. He was a very serious student. He secured a first place in the Matriculation examination and went to the Presidency College, Calcutta for higher studies. At the University, he came first in every examination for Bachelor's Degree and won several scholarships. He passed B.A. in 1906 and M.A. in 1908. He broke all the previous records of the University. He was given a State Scholarship to go to England, but he refused the same on grounds of patriotism. He took the post of a Professor in Muzaffarpur College, but the profession did not appeal to him, and hence he took to law. In 1911, he started the practice of law. To begin with, he had many handicaps. He had no connections, no rich clients, no senior lawyers or influential persons to help him and consequently, he had to rely upon his own efforts. His integrity, hard work and sound knowledge of law drew more and more clients to him, and he rapidly rose in profession and earned the good opinion of the Judges and Senior counsel in the Calcutta High Court. Sir Asutosh Mukherji, a Judge of the Calcutta High Court, was also the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University. He was so much impressed by his masterly presentation of law that he offered him the post of Professor of Law in the Calcutta University. It was a great compliment to Rajendra Prasad who had only two years experience of law. In 1915, he got the Degree of Master of Laws in the First Division. In 1916, he shifted his practice to Patna. In Bihar, he ranked among the leading Advocates and had a flourishing and lucrative practice. However, he spent most of his income on others. He gave a lot of help to the poor students. It is said that when he gave up practice in 1920 to follow Mahatma Gandhi and take part in the Non-co-operation movement, he had Rs. 15/- only in his bank. As a lawyer, Rajendra Prasad did not accept every case that came to him. He would not accept a brief which he thought was weak on moral or social grounds. His view was that the legal profession was not incompatible with honesty. To quote Dr. Rajendra Prasad: "I never accepted a case which could not be argued properly, and I preferred to tell such a client that there was nothing to be gained by filing a suit."

From the very beginning, Rajendra Prasad had taken inte-
rest in the politics of the country. In 1911, he had joined the Congress and was elected a member of the All India Congress Committee. In 1917, he co-operated with Mahatma Gandhi in the Champaran Satyagraha, with a view to remove the grievances of the indigo growers. He participated wholeheartedly in the Non-co-operation movement. In 1924, he was elected the President of the Patna Municipality and he worked in that capacity for more than a year. Although he did not approve of the policy of entering into Legislatures by the Congress, yet when the Congress actually fought the elections and its members sat in the Legislatures, he did not approve of the policy of creating deadlocks all the time.

The Nehru Report recommended dominion status as India's goal. That was not acceptable to men like Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose. However, Rajendra Prasad felt that dominion status would serve the purpose as even a dominion within the Commonwealth had complete freedom to manage its own affairs. To quote him: "Complete independence no doubt, brings prestige to the country, but eventually every country had to seek some sort of relationship of affiliation with other countries in the world if it had to be saved from perpetual conflict. The British Commonwealth is an association of free countries and I saw no harm in being a member of it." His sense of realism also prevailed and he said: "Besides, when we were not in a position to compel the British to concede complete independence to India, I could see no reason to adopt that as the Congress goal and that was why I opposed the complete independence resolution at the Madras Congress."

He had a full share in the Civil Disobedience Movement during the 1930's. When a very severe earthquake occurred in Bihar in 1934 and thousands lost their homes and lives, Rajendra Prasad was especially released from prison by the British Government to shoulder the task of organising relief for the people of Bihar. He was called upon to preside over the Congress Session in 1934, the first regular session after an interval of 3½ years. When Subhash Chandra Bose resigned after the Tripuri Session of the Congress in 1939, Rajendra Prasad was requested to take over the Presidentship of the Congress. Although he was most unwilling, he took over the responsibility as he was directed to do so by Mahatma Gandhi. It was a very
unpleasant job on account of the open opposition of Subhash Chandra Bose.

Rajendra Prasad was one of the three who formed the Congress High Command. He was arrested after the Quit India Resolution, and he remained in jail from 1942 to 1945. He was a member of the Interim Government formed by Jawaharlal Nehru in September 1946 and was given the portfolio of Food and Agriculture.

In December 1946, he was elected the President of the Constituent Assembly. On that occasion, glowing tributes were paid to him. Dr. Radharkrishnan declared: "In Dr. Prasad, we have one who embodies the spirit of gentleness, the gospel of India. He has the soul of goodness; he has great patience and courage; he has suffered...Rajendra Prasad is the suffering servant of India, of the Congress, who incarnates the spirit for which the country stands." Gopalaswamy Ayyangar observed that the election of Rajendra Prasad was a supreme mark of the unstinted confidence that the Constituent Assembly and the country as a whole reposed in him. "It is not so much an honour to him; he has really honoured us by accepting the invitation that we have extended to him...His life has been a life of dedication—dedication to the service of the country...What really has established and will maintain the unique hold he has on the affections of his countrymen, irrespective of community, class and creed are his great human qualities. His innate courtesy, for instance, the manner of his approach to problems, which manner almost compellingly disarms in controversy...the soft word that turneth away wrath—these will be inestimable assets in contributing to the success of the task that he has so willingly, perhaps, after some reluctance, taken upon himself."

Sarojini Naidu observed that Rajendra Prasad was descended spiritually from the Great Buddha, the embodiment of compassion, understanding, sacrifice and love. He would make a reliable guardian and father of the Constituent Assembly because "in him there is essential sweetness, that is part of his strength; there is essential wisdom, that is part of his experience; there is essential clarity of vision, creative imagination and creative faith that brings him very near the feet of Lord Buddha himself."

As the President of the Constituent Assembly, his contribution was substantial. He conducted the proceedings in a
manner which won him the admiration of the people. His impartiality inspired confidence among the members of the minorities and those who had differed from the Congress. His most valuable contribution was behind the scenes. There were internal contradictions not only among the various communities represented in the Constituent Assembly, but even within the Congress Party itself. Some were bent upon having a strong Union Government, while others attached great value to the fundamental rights. The conflicting views were held even by the top leaders. A President of the standing of Dr. Rajendra Prasad alone could secure impartial and unfettered discussion. His deep erudition and sound knowledge of jurisprudence were always available to all members who frequently sought his advice and valued the same.

The closing remarks of Dr. Rajendra Prasad as President of the Constituent Assembly were: "Whatever the Constitution may or may not provide, the welfare of the country will depend on the way in which the country is administered. That will depend upon the men who administer it. It is a trite saying that a country can have only the Government it deserves. Our Constitution has provisions in it which appear to some to be objectionable from one point or another. We must admit that the defects are inherent in the situation in the country and the people at large. If the people who are elected are capable and men of character and integrity, they would be able to make the best even of a defective Constitution. If they are lacking in these, the Constitution cannot help the country. After all, a Constitution, like a machine, is a lifeless thing. It acquires life because of the men who control it and operate it, and India needs today nothing more than a set of honest men who will have the interests of the country before them. There is a fissiparous tendency arising out of various elements in our life. We have communal differences, caste differences, language differences, provincial differences and so forth. It requires men of strong character, men of vision, men who will not sacrifice the interests of the country at large for the sake of smaller groups and areas and who will rise over the prejudices which are born of these differences. We can only hope that the country will throw up such men in abundance.

"Mahatma Gandhi laid great stress on the purity of methods
which had to be pursued for attaining our means. Let us not forget that this teaching has eternal value and was not intended only for the period of struggle but has as much authority and value today as it ever had before."

Together with Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad served on the Partition Council under the Chairmanship of Lord Mountbatten. Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan represented the other side. Dr. Prasad’s legal training enabled him to secure a just and fair settlement of the assets and liabilities and the problems affecting central revenues, currency and coinage, economic relations and armed forces.

Acharya Kripalani was the President of the Congress when India became free on 15 August 1947. However, his feeling was that after independence, he was thrown in the background. He was not being consulted by the Government and was not taken into confidence even when important changes in policy were being considered. Under the circumstances, he decided to resign from the Presidentship of the Congress. His resignation was accepted and both Nehru and Patel agreed to request Dr. Rajendra Prasad to accept the Presidentship of the Congress.

Dr. Prasad had so endeared himself with the people that on 24 January 1950, the Constituent Assembly unanimously elected him as the interim President of independent India. His name was proposed by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and seconded by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. On that occasion, Pt. Nehru said: "Not only have we had experience of your able leadership in these three years of great difficulty but many of us have known you for three and thirty years or so as a soldier of India, ever in the forefront of the battle for freedom. So, we welcome you as our leader, as the Head of our Republic of India, and as a comrade who has faced without flinching all the crises and troubles that had confronted this country during the past generation." Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel said: "This is a red-letter day in the history of India and we have no manner of doubt that under your wise judgment, your unruffled and cool temperament and your method of dealing with men and things, the honour and prestige of this country will rise as days go by and under your distinguished leadership the country will attain status which it deserves among the nations of the world." The general comment regarding his election as President was: "A wonderful organiser, a
great man with a very humane heart, a most faithful disciple of Mahatma Gandhi who was always in the forefront in the struggle of India’s independence.”

On that occasion, the Hindustan Times wrote: “He (President Prasad) considered himself as one among the common people and never allowed any distance to grow between him and them. The higher he rose in the service of the nation, the nearer he seemed to come to his people, with the result the humblest among them could approach him as easily as though he were a co-villager. The honours that came to him unasked sat so lightly on him that it was no wonder that the people decided to bestow on him the highest honour which free India can confer on any citizen. With him as President, the country and the world at large have the guarantee that Republican India will remain ever true to the essentials of Gandhiji’s creed of betterment of the lot of the people at home and furtherance of the cause of peace abroad.” The Indian Express wrote: “It is indeed exceedingly lucky that soon after her political emancipation, India has been able to have as her First Citizen a man of the stature of Rajendra Prasad who embodies in him the wisdom of the sages, the tolerance and considerateness of Gautama Buddha and the self-denial and equanimity of Mahavira.” The tribute paid to him on his election as President by an eminent public man would bear repetition. He said of Rajendra Prasad: “Here is a man who in all the heated controversies of party strife and mortal conflicts of political warfare has not caused or received a single bruise. There is nothing like bitterness in him and political acerbities have left him unscathed. His gentleness and innate nobility, his simplicity and sweetness, his sincerity of conviction and earnestness of purpose, and above all, his selflessness have given him a moral stature that the nation has learnt to adore. His whole philosophy of life is so Gandhian in substance and spirit that he is readily accepted as one who can in his role as the President of the Indian Republic, best maintain the Gandhian tradition, and bring honour to the Motherland in whose service he has grown grey.”

The comment of Times of India was: “To the veteran Dr. Rajendra Prasad the nation as a whole accords a warm and respectful welcome as first President. Apart from his long career of self-sacrifice in the national struggle for independence and
his constructive leadership of the Constituent Assembly in the intensive and arduous labour which has produced the Republican Constitution, Dr. Prasad has the unrivalled distinction of being loved and respected by supporters and opponents alike. He is a man of exceptional gentility and humility whose genius for commanding the confidence of all sections of Congressmen as well as of the general public has done as much to give him the outstanding position he holds in the country as have his learning and unstinting work. For a long time he has suffered in health to an extent sufficient to discourage much younger men; but always has he carried on with national effort as a labour of love. As his pacifism so trenchantly proclaimed at the recent conferences in Santiniketan and Wardha, he today personifies more than any single leading individual in India’s political world the true spirit of Mahatma Gandhi which has become too conspicuous by its absence. There can be no single person in the country who by his career, lack of pretension and yet brilliant qualities, is more suited to personify as the first President of India the deep-seated ideals which have inspired the creation of the Republic.”

Dr. Rajendra Prasad was the President of India from 1950 to 1962. He played a glorious role as the first President of India. He won over everybody by his lofty idealism, sincerity of purpose and integrity of character. The President is given a salary of Rs. 10,000/- per mensem in addition to other allowances. However, Dr. Rajendra Prasad drew Rs. 2,500/- only a month. After retirement, he went to Sadakat Ashram, Patna. However, he died on 13 May 1963.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad was a great thinker and a great writer. He wrote a number of books in English and Hindi. His “History of the Champaran Satyagraha” was published in 1917. “India Divided” was published in 1946. His “Atmakatha” was published in Hindi in 1946 and in English in 1957. In 1954, the Nagari Pracharini Sabha of Banaras awarded him a prize as the best autobiography in Hindi. It is written in a lucid and simple style. It portrays the thoughts of a great patriot endeavouring to find a way of serving the country through many ups and downs. As Rajendra Prasad was in the inner circles of the Congress, he had a unique opportunity of seeing the struggle from behind the scenes. It is a valuable document of the struggle
for freedom. "At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi" was published in 1955. It is a learned exposition of the philosophy and teachings of Mahatma Gandhi.

Rajendra Prasad was a devoted student of Persian and Urdu in addition to his studies in Sanskrit and Hindi. He was one of the most brilliant products of the Calcutta University. He had read deeply in English literature and studied Western civilization and culture through the medium of English. He combined in him the traditions of ancient, medieval and modern India.

Many reasons have been given for his success in life. One was his utter simplicity and sincerity of purpose. A man of great intellectual acumen, he was at the same time a modest and humble man. All his life he looked upon his talents as a gift of God. His constant awareness of the kindness of God made him gentle and unassuming in his dealings with others. His gentleness combined with intellectual powers made him an ideal negotiator. Again and again, he was called upon to iron out differences and bring about reconciliation between the conflicting points of view.

In 1940 at the Ramgarh Session of the Congress, Nehru spoke of Rajendra Prasad in these words: "We often commit mistakes. Our steps falter. Our tongues falter and slip. But here is a man who never makes a mistake, whose steps do not falter, whose tongue does not falter or slip and who had no occasion to withdraw what he once said or wished undone what he once said."

While unveiling a life-size patrait of Rajendra Prasad in the Kerala Assembly chamber on 27 April 1958, Pt. Nehru observed: "Rajen Babu not only occupies the highest office in our country but is something much more. Perhaps more than anyone else he embodies in his life the Indian national movement through which we have passed. The great national movement had many facets and it had with it many types of leaders. Dr. Rajendra Prasad represents the basic Indian tradition and, more especially, of rural India, though he is not an ordinary peasant. He is highly intellectual, a great educationist and an able lawyer...It is a good fortune for us that we should have him still with us, not only because of his wisdom, his quiet dignity but also because of this link that he has with the leadership that
launched many a great struggle in this country, a reminder to us
of those days.”

Writing about Rajendra Prasad Shri C.P. Ramaswami Aiyer
says: “Dr. Rajendra Prasad’s career furnishes a rare example
of self-abnegation and intense patriotism. After a brilliant
academic career and start in the legal profession, the call for
public work and politics came to him and he became and has
continued to be one of the most consistently loyal of Gandhiji’s
followers. During the intensive campaign in the Champaran
area, he gave up his practice and has never resumed it. Apart
from his occasional and distinctive literary contributions, he has
concentrated his energies on public and social work, where his
success has been outstanding and in the course of which he has
established an unparalleled influence over the people of his own
and neighbouring Provinces. That he should have dedicated
his book ‘India Divided’ to Mazhar-ul-Haque is itself a token
of his catholicity of temper and wide sympathies…”

About Rajendra Prasad, Chester Bowles says: “Rajendra
Prasad is a simple-living follower of Gandhi, who spent many
years in British jails fighting non-violently for Indian freedom.
He wore a white Dhoti made of hand-spun yarn. He has a
walrus-like moustache, and his magnificent face always seems to
be holding back a smile at the strange twist of history which
took him from the British Viceroy’s jail into the Viceroy’s own
palace with the Viceroy’s own bodyguard. He is such a warm
and unostentatious person that the great long walls and cham-
bers must have seemed oppressive and unnatural.”

In his biography of Nehru, Michael Brecher says thus about
Rajendra Prasad: “By contrast, Prasad is a kindly, gentle-look-
ing man. He is sturdy and tall, heavy, slow-moving with a
muddy complexion and an impressive, bushy moustache. Simple
in dress and manner, never without his Gandhi cap, he looks
very much like the father-figure he is to many Indians today.
An orthodox Hindu and a devout believer in pure non-violence,
Prasad was among all Gandhi’s political disciples, the most
spiritually akin to the Mahatma. Prasad has been loyal to his
mentor throughout his public life.”

V.P. Menon says: “Among the luminaries who adorn the
political firmament of India today, Dr. Rajendra Prasad is
undoubtedly one of the most conspicuous.”
SUGGESTED READINGS
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Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the greatest of our generation. He was an outstanding statesman whose services to the cause of human freedom can never be forgotten. He was a man of indomitable will and he knew no fear of any kind. He was a man of colossal energy. It was under his presidency that the Congress passed the Independence Resolution on the banks of the river Ravi at Lahore on 31 December 1929. It was under his leadership that the Independence oath was taken for the first time on 26 January 1930. It was he who was invited by Lord Wavell to form the Interim Government. It was he who on 15 August 1947 took over as the first Prime Minister of free India and worked in that post for about 17 years without a break. He tried to put India on a progressive, scientific, dynamic and non-communal basis. He used the existing social and political institutions but put into them a new spirit and a new vitality. By his powerful and vibrant voice, he created, moulded and inspired the whole generation of Indians. He had not only great ideals but also left no stone unturned to achieve them. He was a great national leader who played an illustrious role in the freedom movement of the country. He was a great nation-builder. He was the founder of our secularism, our socialism and our democracy. He established firmly the foundations of Parliamentary democracy in India. He was our greatest parliamentarian and he showed great
respect for Parliament. He set standards for coming generations to follow. He inculcated a sense of true values.

He was the architect of India's foreign policy and he endowed the same with his vision. He was the author of the Congress resolutions on foreign policy. His credit stood very high in the international field. Whenever he visited the United States, the Soviet Union, Communist China or Egypt, millions came out to receive and cheer him as if he was their own leader and not a mere foreigner visiting their country. Dr. Soekarno of Indonesia once said: "So great was popular enthusiasm for your Prime Minister that at times I felt jealous of him myself."

Nehru dominated Indian politics in a manner which had not been done in living memory in any democratic country of the world since Roosevelt and Churchill. He was not a dictator and did not aspire to be one. However, no dictator during the last half a century had enjoyed as much power, swayed so completely the minds and thinking of so many people and received so much willing homage from so many millions of his countrymen as Nehru did. He was a proclaimed socialist. He was even inclined to be a Marxist. However, among his private hosts in the United Kingdom were many Dukes and Earls and in the United States, the Rockefellers, the Fords and Dupants felt proud of him as their guest.

Jawaharlal Nehru, the son of Motilal Nehru, was born on 14 November 1889, and he died on 27 May 1964. He was sent to Harrow for education at the age of 15. From there he went to the Trinity College at Cambridge and from there he got a degree in Natural Sciences in 1910. He was called to the Bar in 1912. He started practice in India but gave it up as he found no interest in it.

He was attracted by the Home Rule Movement started by Tilak and Annie Besant. When Gandhiji started the agitation against the Rowlatt Bill, Jawaharlal Nehru wanted to throw himself into politics but Gandhiji dissuaded him. He wandered about among the peasants of Uttar Pradesh. He went to jail during the Non-Co-operation Movement. He went to the State of Nabha in the Punjab in 1923 to watch the Sikh agitation against the ruler. In the same year, he was appointed the General Secretary of the Congress and he accepted that post
till 1929 when he was elected its President. About Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhiji wrote in 1929: “By his bravery, determination and grit, he has captivated the imagination of the youth of the land... He is rash and impetuous, say some. This quality is an additional qualification at the present moment. And if he has the dash and rashness of a warrior, he has also the prudence of a statesman. He is pure as a crystal, he is truthful beyond suspicion. He is a knight sans peur, sans reproche. The nation is safe in his hands.”

Nehru’s speech as President of the Congress at its Lahore Session in 1929 was a masterly performance. He surprised everybody by breaking off from the printed script and making some sensational pronouncements extempore. He called upon the British Government to come to terms for a peaceful, orderly withdrawal or be prepared to be thrown out. To quote him: “India is to be for Indians. India is to be a free, independent, sovereign socialist State.” He gave notice to England that any debts or commitments made without India’s consent would be repudiated. He concluded by saying: “None of us can say what we can achieve and when we can achieve it. But success often comes to those who dare and act; it seldom goes to the timid who are afraid of the consequences. We play for high stakes and if we seek to achieve great things, it can only be through great dangers.” Jawaharlal Nehru unfurled the newly adopted tri-colour with the Charkha as the flag of Independence at Lahore. The frontier pipers played “Hindustan Hamara”. The sky was rent with cries of “Inqilab Zindabad”, “Gandhi aur Nehru ki Jai”. All sang in chorus “Jhanda Uncha Rahe Hamara”.

During the Civil Disobedience Movement started in 1930, Nehru was put behind the bars. He was very critical of what happened at the Second Round Table Conference held in 1931 which was attended by Mahatma Gandhi as the sole representative of the Congress. He wrote in his Autobiography: “We saw the pitiful and absurdly inadequate attempts to scratch the surface of national and economic problems, the pacts and intrigues and manoeuvres, the joining of hands of some of our own countrymen with the most reactionary elements of the British Conservative Party.... It was all jobbery—big jobs, little jobs, jobs and seats for the Hindus, for the Muslims, for
the Sikhs, for the Anglo-Indians, for the Europeans, but all jobs for the upper classes, the masses had no look-in.... The very conception of freedom had taken the form of large scale jobbery.... No one thought in terms of independence, of real freedom, of transfer of power to a democratic India, of the solution of any of the vital and urgent economic problems facing the Indian people."

When the general elections were held in February 1937, he made a whirlwind tour of the country and carried everywhere the message of the Congress. The success of the Congress in the elections was very much due to his efforts. When Cripps came to India with his proposals in 1942, Nehru, along with Rajagopalachari, was very keen on a settlement with the Government. He saw a grave menace to India and the rest of the world from Germany and Japan. However, Cripps was not able to agree on behalf of the British Cabinet to strengthen some of the weak points in his offer. A message from Aurobindo Ghose was conveyed to Nehru that the Cripps offer should be accepted in its entirety without any bargaining but the same could not be done on account of the circumstances. After the departure of Cripps, Nehru exercised a sobering influence on Gandhiji and prevented him from taking any hasty step. It was on account of the insistence of Nehru that the Resolution of the All-India Congress Committee adopted at Allahabad in May 1942 was modified. The resolution, as amended, kept the door open for further negotiations, if possible, with the British Government. Nehru met Gandhiji at Wardha and succeeded in persuading him to agree to three major points: (1) No action against Britain to be taken which might even indirectly assist Japan against China, (2) a treaty between the allies and free India permitting the use of India as a base for allied operations against the Japanese, and (3) avoidance of a conflict with the British Government if at all possible.

Nehru was an unhappy man in August 1942. His view was that if the British made a firm promise of independence for India at the end of war, India should give full support to the Allies and should not think of a separate peace at any stage. However, that was not to be. It was Nehru who moved the "Quit India" resolution on 8 August 1942. He
was arrested along with the other members of the Congress Working Committee on 9 August 1942 and he remained in jail till the end of the war in 1945.

In September 1946, he formed the Interim Government. He took an active part in organising the Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi in March 1947. While addressing the Conference in the Purana Quila, Nehru declared: “Standing on this watershed which divides two epochs of human history and endeavour, we can look back on our long past and look forward to the future that is taking shape before our eyes. Asia, after a long period of quiescence, has suddenly become important again in world affairs... A change is coming over the scene now and Asia is again finding herself. We live in a tremendous age of transition and already the next stage takes shape when Asia takes her rightful place with the other continents... We have no designs against anybody; ours is the great design of promoting peace and progress all over the world. For too long we of Asia have been petitioners in the Western courts and chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own feet and to co-operate with all others who are prepared to co-operate with us. We do not intend to be the playthings of others.” Mahatma Gandhi also addressed the gathering.

On 15 August 1947, Nehru became the first Prime Minister of India. Although the partition of India had made him sad, he hailed the dawn of independence on 15 August as India’s “tryst with destiny”. During his speech, he declared: “These dreams are for India; but they are also for the world, for all nations and peoples are too closely knit together today for any one of them to imagine that it can live apart. Peace has been said to be indivisible; so is freedom; so is prosperity now; and so also is disaster in this One World that can no longer be split into isolated fragments.”

As Prime Minister of India, Nehru had to face mighty problems created partly by the British withdrawal from India and partly by the partition of the country. The Indian leaders were prepared to take over the responsibilities of the Government from Britain but they had not provided against the terrible consequences of partition. There were communal riots everywhere accompanied by unprecedented savagery. Nehru
was most unhappy when he saw millions of men, women and children pouring into India for protection and livelihood. Apart from the need to assuage the grief and anger of the Hindus and Sikhs who had been turned out from Pakistan by providing them with shelter and gainful employment, the Government of India had to face the problem of financial and administrative dislocation. There was to be a division not only of the territories and physical assets, but also of the administrative personnel. From Delhi alone, as many as 25,000 Government employees and their families, with 60,000 tons of personal luggage were moved to Karachi. Among the 9,25,000 railway employees, 83,500 were transferred to Pakistan from where 73,000 came to India. These transfers took place when the communication system in the country had practically collapsed. India had to transfer 17½% of the “joint assets” to Pakistan. Those who migrated to India as a result of partition lost all they had. It is estimated by Penderel Moon that the value of the property left behind by the Hindus and Sikhs in West Pakistan was Rs. 500 crores as against Rs. 100 crores lost by the Muslims who went to Pakistan. The work of rehabilitation was a stupendous one but the same was accomplished successfully.

Nehru believed that India could not accomplish much without planning and consequently he set up the Planning Commission and himself became its Chairman. He gave to the Commission dynamism and power. During his tenure of office as Prime Minister, three 5 Year Plans were prepared and executed successfully. Nehru himself became the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Nehru had a deep reverence for parliamentary institutions and he attended Parliament as his first duty. It is true that sometimes he was irritated by the heated behaviour and crude personal attacks of some members, but he never lost respect for parliamentary institutions. He was deeply hurt by the activities of a few demagogues who tried to reduce democracy to mob rule. He never lost hope for the future of democracy in India. He made the Indian Parliament the home of liberty and democratic practices. He was tolerant even of the most intolerant. He never proceeded by mere weight of numbers or majority rule. A suggestion was put forward that the Law
Minister of the Government of India should also become the Attorney-General of India and a lot of work was done in that direction. However, when it was brought to his notice that the proposed change was not in the interests of the country, he dropped the same. When the 18th Constitutional Amendment was proposed, it was taken up for consideration in Parliament and it passed through the first stage. However, when Nehru saw that there was much opposition to it, he dropped that also. This shows that Nehru was responsive to public opinion. His mind was not dogmatic but flexible. He was always ready to respond to the expressions of public opinion.

As a democrat, Nehru believed in the importance of the individual. No individual was to be thrown on the rubbish heap of humanity. He must be regarded as significant and nobody should try to suppress the individual. The cardinal principle of his belief was that the state exists for the individual and not the individual for the state.

Nehru believed that narrow nationalism was a form of political bigotry. War was not inevitable and likewise peace was not impracticable. He followed a policy of non-alignment. He tried to steer clear of power blocs and refused to become a camp-follower. He was anxious to help and mediate, if possible. The Indian troops were sent to the Gaza Strip and the Congo. India sent one of her Generals as the Chairman of the Korean Repatriation Commission. The same General worked in Cyprus.

In his address to the Columbia University in the United States on 17 October 1949, Nehru explained the objectives of India’s foreign policy in these words: “The main objectives of that policy are: the pursuit of peace, not through alignment with any major power or group of powers, but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue; the liberation of subject peoples, the maintenance of freedom, both national and individual; the elimination of racial discrimination; and the elimination of want, disease and ignorance which affect the greater part of the world’s population.”

It is true that Nehru was allergic to imperialism, but he apprehended no attack on the sovereignty of India either from Europe or from America. He told President Eisenhower that India might “logically fear major attack from two countries
only, the USSR and China.” However, his conclusion was “that large scale military operations by those countries against India were impracticable because of the fortunate location of the Himalayan mountain chain.” He further told the American President that “both the Soviet Union and Communist China were too deeply involved in their own domestic problems that they had no time to launch any aggressive adventures abroad. They would “confine their aggressive intentions to nations that posed a threat or supplied a tempting prize to the Communists. India fulfilled neither condition.” Nehru was no military expert. He was an idealist. He ignored the fact that his eminence was no substitute for experience and maturity of judgment in these matters.

Nehru played an important part in the holding of the Bandung Conference in April 1955. He described the Conference as “an historic event” and declared: “We have met because mighty forces are at work in these great continents, moving millions of people, creating in their minds urges and passions and desires for a change in their condition.” Being inspired by the gathering before him, he asserted, “We are determined not to fail. We are determined in this new phase of Asia and Africa to make good...We are determined to bring happiness and prosperity to our people and to discard the age-old shackles that have tied us not only politically but economically—the shackles of colonialism and other shackles of our own making.” Asked by an interviewer later on about the common factor of the Bandung Conference and the practical results emerging from it, Nehru replied: “Well, the common factor was rather against Western domination. Everybody agreed about that. The other common factor was a desire for social progress. Again, everybody agreed about that.” His further observation was: “If we had gone into details about the methods, agreement would have been lacking.” Nehru explained that the only practical outcome of the Bandung Conference was the creation of “a slight alarm” in America and Europe over the “coming together and intrinsically challenging the supremacy which the Western nations had exercised.” India certainly got nothing tangible from the Conference. Indonesia later on turned against India. Chou En-lai, Prime Minister of Communist China, made a deep impression on the
assembled delegates and a beginning was made for friendship between Communist China and Pakistan at the Conference.

The view of Nehru was that by reducing tensions, by enlarging the area of understanding between nations and by building up a bridge of understanding between the Eastern and Western countries, war could be avoided or at least deferred. Nehru played an important part in preventing the outbreak of hostilities between the United States and the Soviet Union over Cuba. He persuaded Khrushchev to withdraw the antiballistic missiles from Cuba and also cancel his visit to Havana.

It is rightly said that Nehru "died on the day the Chinese crossed our frontier." Nehru's policy towards China failed and that was directly responsible for his death. Nehru made a mistake in putting too much faith in friendship with China. He made a mistake in allowing China to occupy Tibet. Even after that, he adopted a very friendly attitude towards China. There were slogans of Chini-Hindi Bhai Bhai (The Chinese and the Indians are brothers). Neither the Prime Minister nor his advisers tried to understand the true nature of Communist China. From the beginning, Nehru refused to recognise the presence of Sino-Indian differences. Speaking in the Lok Sabha on Chinese border claims in December 1953, Nehru said: "At no time has any question been raised by them or anybody about the frontier problems...We will not discuss frontier problems and it is not an issue at all to be discussed." Merely because the Chinese chose not to raise the question in the early days, Nehru assumed that it did not exist. The Sino-Indian agreement on Tibet of April 1954 contained nothing about delimiting the frontier even though the then Secretary General of External Affairs, Girja Shanker Bajpai, urged Nehru to secure recognition by China of the McMahon Line. When 5 years later, Chou En-lai referred to the presence of border disputes, Nehru reacted like a bewildered friend whose trust had been grossly betrayed. Nehru's China policy was based on the utter impossibility of the Chinese ever attacking India. His thinking on military matters was out of date. On the advice of Krishna Menon, his Defence Minister, Nehru insisted that the real enemy of India was Pakistan and not China. As late as May 1962, Krishna Menon was reported as having
observed in a meeting of the Congress Parliamentary Party's Standing Committee on Defence that "Indian public opinion appeared to be much more concerned about border dispute with China than with the more immediate threats from Pakistan." Nehru declared in Lok Sabha in August 1962: "It is quite absurd to talk of China invading India." The Opposition had asked the Government to strengthen the defence of India against China and suggested foreign assistance to repel Chinese aggression. However, the suggestion was rejected on the ground that the same was "not in consonance with India's self-interest". On 11 September 1959, Nehru had declared at a Press Conference: "This vague thinking of searching for allies is a sign of utter weakness of character in an individual and a nation. I hope our country will not suffer that weakness of character." Nehru ruled out an attack by China on India on the ground that that would inevitably lead to a world war. In the light of what actually happened, Nehru's China policy proved to be an utter failure and he paid for the same with his own life.

A critical examination of the foreign policy of Nehru shows that it was not a success. While paying a tribute to Nehru's knowledge, K.P.S. Menon points out that India's foreign policy "necessarily rested on the intuition of one man, who was our Foreign Minister as well as Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru." Badr-ud-din Tyabji tells us that the helpful suggestions made by him by means of notes to improve the efficiency of the Foreign Service were ignored by the Prime Minister. While writing to Nehru, Tyabji admitted that he was aware of the preoccupations of the Prime Minister but he was prompted to submit his proposals out of concern over "the effect that his neglect of such matters would have on his future reputation as India's first Foreign Minister and the architect of her foreign policy." However, nothing was done to improve matters. It is rightly pointed out that the failure of Nehru was due to the fact that he had too many things to do! He was not only the Prime Minister of India but also the Minister for External Affairs. He was the Chairman of the Planning Commission and the Atomic Energy Commission. Sometimes he took over as Defence Minister of India. Sometimes he took over as the President of the Indian National Congress. Obviously, he
could not do full justice to all and no wonder failed.

Nehru was not only a voracious reader but also a prolific writer. His important books are his Autobiography, Glimpses of World History and Discovery of India. His Autobiography is considered to be one of the most remarkable books of our times.

Nehru worked very hard. It is stated that before 8 a.m., he was ready to sign all the letters and notes dictated to his secretaries the previous night. From 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. or later, there were interviews at the External Affairs Ministry to senior officials, diplomats, visitors and ministerial colleagues. During the Parliament session, this work shifted to Parliament House after 11 a.m. Lunch and dinner nearly always meant a discussion with an important diplomat or colleague or a visiting delegation. In the late afternoon, there was probably a meeting of the Congress Executive or a public function of some kind or it might be a Cabinet meeting. Brief intervals between the engagements gave him time to look through important telegrams and papers and dictate replies. He was busy every minute of the day. Even after dinner when last of his guests left, he returned to study. Until mid-night or even later, he was busy reading reports from India’s representatives in different capitals, dictating replies, dealing with urgent state matters, passing orders on petitions from persons in different corners of India or writing personal letters to groups of children, etc. By his bed-side was a bunch of cuttings from periodicals and newspapers marked for his perusal before sleep.

No wonder, one writer has compared Nehru with Napoleon. Napoleon was a man of the sword and a military genius while Nehru was a humanist par excellence. From this point of view, the comparison is not apt but there were many other things common between the two. Napoleon was an indefatigable worker who laboured 20 hours a day without fatigue. Nehru’s capacity for work was equally great. Napoleon did not expect men to be perfect and he was always willing to pardon their faults. Nehru was equally tolerant towards the failings of his colleagues and comrades. Like Napoleon, Nehru had an explosive mind which seldom remained at rest. About Napoleon, Andre Maurois says: “Napoleon had plans but they were constantly changing. He had too much imagination and consequent lack of proportion. When he drew up long-term plans
for the future, he got carried away. "You can give an impetus to things", he said, "but then they carry you along with them." The author goes on to say that Napoleon's plans were admirable but they were too many. He declares, "The supreme art is not to succeed but to know when to stop." Everyone of these words applies to Prime Minister Nehru. He attempted too many things and as he did not know the art of delegating his authority or decentralising his work, much of what he undertook went wrong. He held the office of Prime Minister for nearly 17 years and there was none to equal him in power or prestige. He could have made his country really great but he failed.

Nehru had his differences with Sardar Patel and Dr. Rajendra Prasad. Sardar Patel died in 1950 and after that Nehru became free to do whatever he pleased. It is well-known that Nehru wanted N. Gopalaswamy Aiyangar to be elected President of the Constituent Assembly but in spite of that Dr. Rajendra Prasad was elected the President. In 1950, Nehru wanted C. Rajagopalachari to be elected as the President of India but instead Dr. Rajendra Prasad was so elected. Nehru was opposed to Dr. Rajendra Prasad's re-election as President in 1957. He made even public speeches insulting that men in high positions should not cling to office. Nehru tried to prevent Dr. Rajendra Prasad from inaugurating the renovated historic shrine of Somnath. When Dr. Rajendra Prasad tried to impress upon Nehru the necessity for caution in India's dealings with China, especially on the Tibetan issue, Nehru got annoyed. He dismissed all suggestions for the liberation of Tibet as "manifest nonsense".

As regards Nehru's relations with Gandhiji, Nehru was an impetuous, angry young man when he first met him but Gandhiji tamed him, brought him into line with his methods and made him suffer long periods of imprisonment. There were differences between Gandhiji and Nehru but both managed to pull together. Gandhiji once said, "We have many intellectual differences but our hearts are one."

Too much of hard work certainly put strain on his health. However, his defeat at the hands of China in 1962 gave him such a shock that he never recovered afterwards. In spite of his best efforts, death came nearer and nearer. A few days
before his death, Nehru copied out the following verse from a poem by Robert Frost on a memo pad on his writing desk:

“The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep
And miles to go before I sleep.”

When the news of his death on 27 May 1964 was broadcast, a Cabinet Minister announced with tears in his eyes to the Lok Sabha: “The Prime Minister is no more. The light is out.” His death was mourned in every family. World leaders mourned his death and paid tributes to him as one of the greatest men of all times. President Johnson said: “For long we had counted on his influence for good; it now seems impossible to believe that he is no longer with us, yet his spirit lives on. The rich heritage he left us, his faith in his people and humanity will serve to sustain you and yours as we strive together to translate his ideals into reality. Perhaps more than any other world leader he has given expression to man’s yearning for peace. There could be no more fitting memorial to him than a world without war.” Sir Robert Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia, observed: “This is a significant date in history. It marks the close of the life of one of the remarkable men of our times.” Sir Anthony Eden described Nehru as the architect of modern India and the doyen of world statesmen. His death was an incalculable loss to the Commonwealth and the world. Home referred to Nehru as “a man of magnanimity, of great breadth of mind and vision.” Mrs. Bandarnaike said: “A light has gone out which for long has illuminated our times.” Tunku Abdul Rehman observed: “Mr. Nehru was one of the most illustrious statesmen of our day and age...His words and deeds have often helped me in my work as Prime Minister. The example he set in the creation of India and in the cause of democracy was an inspiration to all the world and particularly to the people of Asia in their struggle for independence.” Habib-ur-Rehman of Pakistan referred to Nehru as “a champion of liberty and freedom throughout the world.” President de Gaulle of France paid his tribute to Nehru “whose eminent qualities placed at the service of democracy,
of social progress and of peace have profoundly marked the
destiny of India and the world." It is said that when the news
of the death of Nehru was broadcast, Sheikh Abdullah was
touring Pakistan and was receiving welcome everywhere. On
hearing Nehru’s death, he openly wept at Muzaffarabad in the
territory of the Pakistan-held Azad Kashmir, cancelled his tour
and flew to New Delhi to attend Nehru’s funeral.

President Radhakrishnan paid the following tribute:
"Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the greatest figures of our genera-
tion, an outstanding statesman whose services to the cause of
human freedom are unforgettable. As a fighter for freedom he
was illustrious; as a maker of modern India his services were
unparalleled. His life and work have had a profound influence
on our mental make-up, social structure and intellectual
development. As a man, Nehru combined a fine sensitivity
of mind, a rare delicacy of feeling, with large and generous
impulses. To the weak and the frustrated, his heart went out
in profound sympathy. He was an author of distinction. Nehru
held the office of the Prime Minister of our country ever since
the dawn of independence and in the long years of his premier-
ship tried to put our country on a progressive, scientific,
dynamic and non-communal basis. His steadfast loyalty to
certain fundamental principles of liberalism gave direction to
our thought and life. We can understand the endless surprises
of his attitudes and actions; all these fall into their place if we
remember his faith in democracy and freedom. He used the
existing social and political institutions and breathed into them
a new spirit, a new vitality. Nehru was a great believer in
world peace and the concept of one world community. No
one had shown greater faith and allegiance to the Charter of
the United Nations than Mr. Nehru. He realised that in a
thermonuclear age, war would mean the extinction of all
civilised values. That is why he was convinced that the true
role of a statesman in this distracted world lay in the way of
lessening tensions and conflicts and bringing about a climate of
understanding and mutual accommodation with a view to the
settlement of international differences without resort to the
horrors of war."

Dr. Einstein said of Nehru: "He combines Tagore’s love
for beauty and Gandhiji’s spiritualism, with a dynamic
scientific mind of his own."

About Nehru, J.N. Sahni says: "A born exhibitionist, an actor who could simulate the post best suited to a circumstance, the real Nehru now lived in a chrysalis of his mental creation, insulated against the consequences of his actions, feeding his ego on seeming triumphs, blaming others for set-backs and failures—feeling all the time a sense of superiority and insecurity which both increased with the diminishing IQ of the associates around him. There were now times when Nehru spoke to you, and the real Nehru passed you by. There were other times when Nehru over-powered you with an intense emotional impact, like a depth charge from a highpowered dynamo, without even saying a word. He became a man of shocks and surprises, a man of paradoxes and contradictions. He became a man with highly strung nerves, and a will of iron; a volatile, excitable temperament and yet capable of utmost patience; a bundle of indecisions, and a man of intense action; a thinker of extraordinary depth and clarity, but invoking intuition to dictate big decisions; a man of long silences, and at the same time a voluble speaker whose resistance broke down in front of the miko."

Prime Minister Churchill observed thus about Nehru at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference: "There are two predominant emotions in the world today—hate and fear. Nehru appears to have conquered both of them."

Shriman Narayan says in his Memoirs that as Congress President, Pandit Nehru was very systematic and thorough in his work. In spite of his preoccupation with official responsibilities as Prime Minister, he never failed to reply to the queries or attend to the problems at the office of the All India Congress Committee. The files were returned with cogent and comprehensive notes the very next day and he managed to find time for the General Secretaries to meet him at the Parliament House or at his residence whenever necessary. Very often, he came to 7, Jantar Mantar Road, New Delhi to meet Congress workers from different parts of the country. He never missed an opportunity to mix with the general public at various functions, including marriage receptions and celebrations of National Days in different embassies. In the case of death of a member of Parliament or an old Congress worker
in Delhi, he was the first to reach the residence for conveying his personal grief and sympathies. He also found time to visit persons in hospitals when they took suddenly ill. He never appeared agitated and strained. He kept his composure in spite of his numerous engagements day after day, week after week and month after month. He possessed exceptional vitality, physical as well as mental. He could go through a large number of programmes daily, without feeling fatigue or exhaustion.

Nehru had deep faith and affection for the Indian National Congress. He believed that the Congress had to fulfil a great mission which was to promote India's unity and ensure world peace. The Congress alone could achieve those basic objectives and was therefore an organisation with a purpose and destiny. He was conscious of the shortcomings within its organisation but he refused to despair. He often said, "We may sometimes stumble and fall, but we shall rise again with courage and march ahead towards the goal."

Nehru was an ideal draftsman of the Congress. All resolutions adopted at various meetings of the Congress Working Committee, the All India Congress Committee and the open sessions of the Congress were invariably drafted by him. The Congress manifestoes of the First and Second General Elections were also his drafts which were accepted by the Congress with a few minor alterations. His language was simple and to the point. It had also a poetic flavour and beauty of its own. He asked some other members of the Working Committee to draft a statement or resolution but ultimately the Working Committee would request him to produce the final draft.

Although he loved and adored crowds, he never lost an opportunity to give them the necessary training in discipline and orderly behaviour. He knew how to handle the unruly crowds. He always instructed his driver to slow down and even stop the car whenever some persons in the crowd on both sides of the road held garlands in their hands. He would always accept those garlands from the people with great love and afterwards throw them with equal affection at women and children among the crowd. He always reminded Congressmen to maintain intimate contacts with the people from whom the organisation ultimately derived its strength.
Nehru generally liked Congressmen to speak in Hindi or in the regional language because the crowds could not follow speeches in English. However, he never objected to a person speaking in English if he so desired.

He always tried to draw the attention of Congressmen towards modern science and technology and the emergence of atomic power. He believed that it was necessary for India to move on from a traditional society towards a modern and progressive society. He was very much against caste and communal considerations in public life.

Nehru did not subscribe to the Communist ideal of achieving socialism through violence and class war. His view was that India should pursue the socialist approach for the liquidation of hunger, poverty and unemployment. He did not believe in short-cuts and desired economic and social reforms to be followed through the democratic processes of discussion, persuasion, education and legislation. On 15 August 1958, he wrote, “I have the greatest admiration for many of the achievements of the Soviet Union. Among these great achievements is the value attached to the child and the common man. Their systems of education and health are probably the best in the world. But, it is said, and rightly, that there is suppression of individual freedom there... Unfortunately, communism became too closely associated with the necessity for violence, and thus the idea which it placed before the world became a tainted one. Means distorted ends. We see here the powerful influence of wrong means and methods.” He compared the Communist methods with those of Gandhiji in these words: “This is completely opposed to the peaceful approach which Gandhiji taught us. Communists as well as anti-Communists seem to imagine that a principle can only be stoutly defended by language of violence, and by condemning those who do not accept it. For both of them there are no shades, there is only black and white. That is the old approach of the bigoted aspects of some religions. It is not the approach of tolerance, of feeling that perhaps others might have some share of the truth also. Speaking for myself, I find this approach wholly unscientific, unreasonable and uncivilized, whether it is applied in the realm of religion or economic theory or anything else.”

Nehru had great regard and affection for Acharya Vinoba
Bhave. He once said: "Whenever I am in difficulty about a problem, I think of Gandhiji. But since Bapu is no more, my thoughts invariably turn to Vinobaji whom I regard as the best interpreter of Gandhian thought and tradition."

By temperament, Nehru was a democrat. It is true that he had his own likes and dislikes about various persons but in the long run, he yielded to the general opinion within the party or in the general public. After the second General Elections in 1957, he had almost promised to Dr. Radhakrishnan the nomination for Presidency as the Congress candidate. The matter came up for discussion at a meeting of the Central Parliamentary Board. It was postponed to the next meeting, owing to differences of opinion among the senior members of the Board. Maulana Azad and some other leaders were in favour of continuing Dr. Rajendra Prasad as President of India. Sometimes before the next meeting of the Parliamentary Board, even the Chief Ministers of Southern states, including Kamaraj, Nijalingappa and Sanjiva Reddy publicly indicated their preference for Rajendra Prasad. The result was that Nehru did not press the name of Dr. Radhakrishnan. Although he was disappointed, he did not say a word to express his feelings.

Nehru was often child-like in his behaviour. His sincerity was transparent and he could never hide his inner feelings. He maintained good health with regular physical exercises and Asanas every day in the morning. It was on account of his inherent self-control that he was able to maintain sound health and keep his body in good trim.

Planning was almost a passion with him. Even before the independence of India, he had worked as the Chairman of the National Planning Committee set up by Subhash Chandra Bose as Congress President. As the first Chairman of the Planning Commission of free India, he gave this work the highest priority and the Commission was regarded as his favourite instrument for building up a new nation.
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