
ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF INDIAN WAR
OF INDEPENDENCE

Vol. 3

CONTENTS

Preface

1. Lala Lajpat Rai	1
2. Lajpat Rai's Political Views and Works	9
3. Bose and India's Independence Struggle	146
4. Bose's Vision for India	177
5. Political Views of Netaji	231
<i>Bibliography</i>	293
<i>Index</i>	295

nationalist party, the Bharatiya Janata Party. It was the Partition of Bengal in 1905 that aroused their robust nationalism and set them firmly on the path to fighting for freedom. The repressive measures of the British Government against the growing nationalist movement inspired them to infuse greater national pride and self-respect into the populace. The trio wanted a degree of self-government that was considered radical at the time. They were the first Indian leaders to demand complete political independence. Rai presided over the first session of the All India Trade Union Congress in 1920. He also went to Geneva to attend the eighth International Labour Conference in 1926 as a representative of Indian labour. He had an opportunity to watch the labour movement in the USA and England where he was required to prolong his stay for political reasons.

Rai led the Punjab protests against the Amritsar Massacre (1919) and the Non-Cooperation Movement (1919 - 1922). He was repeatedly arrested. Rai however disagreed with Mohandas Gandhi's suspension of the movement due to the Chauri Chaura incident, and formed the *Congress Independence Party*, which was particularly pro-Hindu in voice and policy. He was not only a good orator but also a prolific and versatile writer. His journal *Arya Gazette* concentrated mainly on subjects related to the Arya Samaj. *Bande Mataram* and *People*, contained his inspiring speeches to end oppression by the foreign rulers. He founded the Servants of the People Society, which worked for the freedom movement as well as for social reform in the country. He also wrote an autobiography in English titled *The Story of My Life*.

SIMON COMMISSION PROTESTS

A strong believer in leading by example, he himself led a procession with Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to demonstrate against the Simon Commission, which was to prove fatal for him. He was made the target of a brutal lathi charge in which he was injured badly. A meeting was held the same evening where he spoke with such vigour that his words, "*Every blow aimed at me is a nail in the coffin of British imperialism*", became historic. Though he recovered from the fever and pain within three days his health had received a permanent setback and on November 17, 1928, he succumbed to the fatal injuries.

he became a bete noire of the anglo-saxon bureaucracy at a very young age, his name had come to be associated with political turmoil in the Punjab and even in the neighbouring provinces.

In 1907 British bureaucracy was gripped by the 'mutiny psychosis' or the prospect of a second mutiny exactly 50 years after 1857. Their panic was getting accentuated by daily doses of hysterical stuff in print conjuring up nightmarish scenes of their women and children being done to death in cold blood and their shrieks rending their ears. Vigilant to every emergent call they were determined to nip any such eventuality in the bud.

Coincidentally in same year an agitation by the Punjab peasantry against the proposed canal colony legislation assumed the character of a popular uprising which the Punjab bureaucracy considered exceedingly dangerous and demanding of the most stringent measures. Sir Risely, Secretary to the Government of India, was briefed by E. Maclagan, The chief secretary of the Punjab about the dangerous and seditious activities of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh whose fiery speeches in the Lyallpur canal colony areas had won him wide acclaim and following. But in the report Lajpat Rai was dubbed a revolutionary and brain behind the whole agrarian unrest in the Punjab. As is now evident from the voluminous Minto Morley papers that Minto, the Viceroy was misled by Sir Denzil Ibbetson, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab into believing that Lajpat Rai was the head and centre of the entire movement in the Punjab and his most prominent agent in disseminating sedition was Ajit Singh. As a result Lajpat Rai was arrested from his home in Lahore and deported to Mandalay on May 9, 1907, under the Bengal Regulation III of 1818 without a hearing and without a trial before a lawfully constituted tribunal of justice. Just a few hours before his arrest Lajpat Rai penned briefly the real causes of the Punjab disturbances in a letter he wrote to The Punjabee. He listed the following reasons in a chronological order:

- a. The letters and articles, etc., that appeared in The Civil and Military Gazette.
- b. The prosecution of The Punjabee, but desisting from taking a similar action against The Civil and Military Gazette.
- c. The Colonization Bill.

he drew a petition to His Excellency, the Viceroy and Governor General of India. In this memorial he respectfully but emphatically protested his innocence and utterly denied that he did any such thing 'at the time of his arrest or before or after it as a result of which there was any commotion taking place in any part of the dominions of His Majesty, the King Emperor of India or which could otherwise justify the application of Regulation III of 1818'. He prayed that 'he be informed of the grounds on which action had been taken against him and the petition be forwarded to His Majesty, the King Emperor of India'.

In September 1907 Lajpat Rai learnt from a magazine that one of the charges against him was that of his having attempted to tamper with the Loyalty of the native army. This not only was an unfounded charge but a gross libel. He felt like filing a libel suit against certain newspapers spreading this canard and soon after his release he instituted cases of libel against them. But immediately he proceeded to address the second memorial to the Right honourable, the Secretary of State for India, London. In this memorial, like the previous one, Lajpat Rai protested his innocence and emphatically stated that he had done nothing calculated to cause commotion or attempted to tamper with the loyalty of the British Native Army or for that matter any thing that could make him liable under Regulation III of 1818. He protested how he was kept ignorant of the allegations against him and even denied access to newspapers. That he took no part in Lahore or Rawalpindi riots and did not make any speeches that could be considered seditious. That he had always been acting within the bounds of law and constitution in matter of expression of disapproval of certain measures of the government exercising the public mind. That he never advocated any violent or illegal method of redress. That the suspicion, if entertained against him of having tampered with the native soldiers of his Majesty's Army was entirely unfounded, for the petitioner had no opportunities whatsoever of mixing or communicating with the same.

The memorial finally raised a point of legal and constitutional nature in that the Regulation III was opposed to the letter and spirit of the British constitution and British Laws and hence ultra vires. He continues to pray that 'the provision of the said regulation

himself hereafter for the grievous wrong inflicted by the British bureaucracy on the person of Lala Lajpat Rai. When in parliament Mackarness asked Morley on June 18, if Lajpat Rai had made any protest against his arrest, Morley expressed his ignorance since the representation Lajpat Rai had submitted to the Secretary of State for India had been intercepted on the way. A bit longish though it would be revealing to quote what he has to say about this ugly episode for which he regretted:

“It seems clear from the papers that the Lieutenant-Governor of Burma refused Lajpat’s request to see his solicitor. This is in itself, a hateful thing to do, only worthy of Russia, or, say Austrialia, in her Italian days. But worse still, I was allowed to tell the House of Commons that access to a solicitor would of course be allowed. In this, nobody in your government set me right... More than that, I was permitted to say that he was allowed to receive letters from his family. It now seems that some 50 such letters were stopped, and I was never told. Now, even the officials responsible in India, must surely know that in this country, which after all, is and means to be their master, for a Minister to mislead Parliament in matter of fact, is as heinous an offence as he can commit” (J. Morley to Minto, April 15, 1908, J. Morley Papers, Vol. III).

In sum, Lajpat Rai’s arrest and deportation in 1907 was his first baptism in fire from which he emerged a high-minded statesman cast in a heroic mould. It blazed a trail of such examples of suffering and sacrifice for public causes and this considerably helped accelerate the pace of the Indian nationalist struggle. Even though he had clear differences with those adopting methods of militant struggle for the liberation of their country from foreign yoke, Lajpat Rai remained the symbol of militant nationalism and an inspiration for the youth. Revolutionaries like Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev and Rajguru wore the crown of martyrdom to avenge the assault on Lalaji which had led to his death. Widely acclaimed as the Punjab Kesari, the lion of Punjab, he occupies a prominent position in the galaxy of leaders who sacrificed their all for the freedom of the motherland. Gandhiji gave a touching tribute on Lajpat Rai’s death in *Young India* of 22 November 1928: “Lala Lajpat Rai is dead. Long live Lalaji. Men like Lajpat Rai cannot die so long as the sun shines in the Indian sky.”

two million square miles of very fertile and productive territory. They have been a civilized people for thousands of years, though their civilization is a bit different from that of the West. We advisedly say "a bit different," because in fundamentals that civilization has the same basic origin as that of Greece and Rome, the three peoples having originally sprung from the same stock and their languages, also, being of common descent. For the last 150 years, or (even) more, India has been ruled by Great Britain.

Her people have been denied any determining voice in the management of their own affairs. For over thirty years or more they have carried on an organized agitation for an autonomous form of Government within the British Empire. This movement received almost no response from the responsible statesmen of the Empire until late in the war. In the meantime some of the leaders grew sullen and downhearted, and, under the influence of bitter disappointment and almost of despair, took to revolutionary forms. The bulk of the people, however, have kept their balance and have never faltered in their faith in peaceful methods. When the war broke out the people of India at once realized the world significance of this titanic struggle and in no uncertain voice declared their allegiance to the cause of the Allies. Our masters, however, while gratefully accepting our economic contributions and utilizing the standing Indian army, spurned our offers for further military contributions. In the military development of the Indians they saw a menace to their supremacy in India.

The Russian Revolution first, and then the entry of the United States into the War, brought about a change in the point of view of the British statesmen. For the first time they realized that they could not win the war without the fullest cooperation of the people of India, both in the military and the economic sense and that the fullest cooperation of the United States also required as a condition precedent, quite a radical revision of their war aims. President Wilson's political idealism, his short, pithy and epigrammatic formulas compelled similar declarations by Allied statesmen. The British statesmen, at the helm of affairs, found it necessary to affirm their faith in President Wilson's principles and formulas if they would not let the morale of their own people at home suffer in comparison. In the meantime the situation in India

Regarding the Indian Budget Debates in Parliament, he said:

“Does anybody remember the Indian Budget Debates before the War? Upon that day the House was always empty. India did not matter, and the Debates were left to people on the one side whom their enemies sometimes called “bureaucrats”, and on the other side to people whom their enemies sometimes called “seditionists,” until it almost came to be disreputable to take part in Indian Debates. It required a crisis of this kind to realise how important Indian affairs were. After all, is the House of Commons to be blamed for that? What was the Indian Budget Debate? It was a purely academic discussion which had no effect whatever upon events in India, conducted after the events that were being discussed, had taken place.”

He held that the salary of the Indian Secretary of State should be paid from the British Treasury, and then there would be real debates:

“How can you defend the fact that the Secretaries of State for India alone of all the occupants of the Front Bench, with the possible exception of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, are not responsible to this House for their salaries, and do not come here with their Estimates in order that the House of Commons may express its opinion. . . .

“What I am saying now is in the light of these revelations of this inelasticity of Indian government. However much you could gloss over those indefensible proceedings in the past, the time has now come to alter them.

“The tone of those Debates is unreal, unsubstantial and ineffective. If Estimates for India, like Estimates for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the Colonial Secretary were to be discussed on the floor of the House of Commons, the Debates on India would be as good as the Debates on foreign affairs. After all, what is the difference? Has it even been suggested to the people of Australia that they should pay the salary of the Secretary of State for the Colony? Why should the whole cost of that building in Charles Street, including the building itself, be an item of the Indian taxpayer’s burden rather than of this House of Commons and the people of the country?”

beginning of the new plan which you intend to pursue, that gives you the opportunity of giving greater representative institutions in some form or other to the people of India....

“But I am positive of this, that your great claim to continue the illogical system of Government by which we have governed India in the past is that it was efficient. It has been proved to be not efficient. It has been proved to be not sufficiently elastic to express the will of the Indian people; to make them into a warring Nation as they wanted to be. The history of this War shows that you can rely upon the loyalty of the Indian people to the British Empire” if you ever before doubted it! If you want to use that loyalty, you must take advantage of that love of country which is a religion in India, and you must give them that bigger opportunity of controlling their own destinies, not merely by Councils which cannot act, but by control, by growing control, of the Executive itself. Then in your next War “if we ever have War” in your next crisis, through times of peace, you will have a contented India, an India equipped to help. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of expediency, it is not a question of desirability. Unless you are prepared to remodel, in the light of modern experience, this century-old and cumbrous machine, then, I believe, I verily believe, that you will lose your right to control the destinies of the Indian Empire.”

The quick and resourceful mind of Premier Lloyd George at once grasped the situation. He lost no time in deciding what was needed. Probably over the head of his Tory colleagues, possibly with their consent, he gave the Indian portfolio to Mr. Montagu, and told him quietly to set to business. Mr. Montagu’s first step was the announcement of August 20, 1917. On that date he made in the House of Commons the following memorable statement:

“The policy of His Majesty’s Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible, and that it is of

making impassioned appeals to Indian manhood to share the burdens of Empire by contributing ungrudgingly in men and money for its defence. This attitude is somewhat inconsistent with the statements in paragraph 179 of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, wherein, after referring to the natural evolution of "the desire for self-determination," the distinguished authors of the Report concede that "the demand that now meets us from the educated classes of India is no more than the right and natural outcome of the work of a hundred years."

In spite of this uncalled for reservation in the announcement, it is perfectly true that "the announcement marks the end of one epoch and the beginning of a new one." What makes the announcement "momentous," however, is not the language used, as even more high-sounding phrases have been used before by eminent British statesmen of the position of Warren Hastings, Macaulay, Munroe, Metcalf and others, but the fact that the statement has been made by the Secretary of State for India, as representing the Crown and the Cabinet who, in their turn, are the constitutional representatives of the people of Great Britain and Ireland. The statement is thus both morally and legally binding on the British people, though it will not acquire that character so far as the people of India are concerned, unless it is embodied in a Statute of Parliament. Is it too much to hope that when that stage comes the second sentence of the second paragraph might be omitted or so modified as to remove the inconsistency pointed out above?

We have no doubt, however, that the language of the announcement notwithstanding, the destiny of India remains ultimately in the hands of the Indians themselves. It will be determined, favorably or unfavorably, by the solidity of their public life, by the purity and idealism of the Indian public men to be hereafter entrusted with the task of administration, by the honesty and intensity of their endeavor to uplift the masses, both intellectually and economically, by the extent to which they reduce the religious and communal excuses that are being put forth as reasons for half-hearted advance, and by the amount of political unity they generate in the nation. The well known maxim that those who will must by themselves be free, is as good today as

Government in India are also conscious of that fact, as one of them, the present Lieutenant Governor of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, a member of the Indian bureaucracy, remarked only recently in a speech at Allahabad:

“Nothing will ever be the same,” said Sir Harcourt Butler; “this much is certain, that we shall have to shake up all our old ideals and begin afresh ... we have crossed the watershed and are looking down on new plains. The old oracles are dumb. The old shibboleths are no more heard. Ideals, constitutions, rooted ideas are being shovelled away without argument or comment or memorial. . . . Our administrative machine belongs to another age. It is top-heavy. Its movements are cumbrous, slow, deliberate. It rejoices in delay. It grew up when time was not the object, when no one wanted change, when financial economy was the ruling passion of Governments, imperial and provincial. Now there are the stirrings of young national life, and economic springtime, a calling for dispatch, quick response, bold experiment. Secretariats with enormous offices overhang the administration. An eminent ecclesiastic once told me that Rome had, by centuries of experience, reduced ! delay to a science; he used to think her mistress of postponement and procrastination, but the Government of India beat Rome every time. Only ecclesiastics could dare so to speak of the Government of India. I, for one, will not lay audacious hands on the chariot of the sun.”

Coming, as it does, from a member of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, this statement means much more to the Indian people than even the words of the British Premier. If this statement is not mere camouflage, but represents a genuine change of heart on the part of the British bureaucracy in India, then it is all the more inexplicable to us why the new scheme of the Secretary for India and the Viceroy should breathe so much distrust of the educated classes of India. Any way, we have nothing but praise for the spirit of frankness and fairness which generally characterizes the report. However we might disagree with the conclusions arrived at, it is but right to acknowledge that the analysis of the problem and its constituting elements is quite masterly and the attempt to find a solution which will meet the needs of the situation as

DEMOCRACY IN INDIA

Before we take up the report of the Secretary for India and the Viceroy we intend to clear the ground by briefly meeting the almost universal impression that prevails in educated circles in the West, that democratic institutions are foreign to the genius of the Asiatic peoples and have never been known in India before. The latest statement to this effect was made by Mr. Reginald Coupland of the Round Table Quarterly, in an article he contributed to the New Republic (September 7, 1918) on "Responsible Government in India." We have neither the time nor the desire to go into the question as it relates to other Asiatic countries, though we might state, in general terms, that an impartial study of Asiatic history will disclose that in the centuries preceding the Reformation in Europe, Asia was as democratic or undemocratic as Europe. Since then democracy has developed on modern lines in Europe. While Asia has gradually disintegrated and fallen under foreign domination, Europe has progressed towards democracy. As regards India, however, we intend to refer briefly to what historical evidence is available.

Firstly, we wish to make clear what we understand by "democracy." There is no desire to enter into an academic discussion of the subject nor to burden this book with quotations from eminent thinkers and writers. In our judgment, the best definition of democracy so far has been furnished by Abraham Lincoln, viz., "the government of the people, by the people and for the people," regardless of the process or processes by which that government is constituted. One must, however, be clear minded as to what is meant by "the people." Does the expression include all the people that inhabit the particular territory to which the expression applies, regardless of sex, creed, color and race, or does it not? If it does, we are afraid there is little democracy even in Europe and America today. Until recently half of the population was denied all political power in the State by virtue of sex.

Of the other half a substantial part was denied that right by virtue of economic status or, to be more accurate, by lack of economic status considered necessary for the exercise of political power. Even now the Southern States of the United States, Amendment XV to the American Constitution notwithstanding,

it was the populace of the capital (or only a part of it), aided by such force as might be introduced by the contesting generals or leaders, which held all the actual political power. Representative Government ,

*“ the only effective guarantee of liberty of any sort
“ had therefore not yet been dreamt of.”*

Alison in his History of Europe, Vol. I, says: “The states of Florence, Genoa, VenicSicffti Pisa were not in reality free ; they were communities in which a few I individuals had usurped the rights, and disposed of the fortunes, of the great bulk of their fellow citizens, whom they governed as subjects or indeed as slaves. During the most flourishing period of their history, he citizens of all Italian republics did not amount to 20,000, and these privileged classes held as many million in subjection. The citizens of Venice were 2500 and those of Genoa 4500, those of Pisa, Siena, Lucea and Florence taken together, not above 6000. ” [Italics ours.] Coming to more modern times we find it stated by Morse Stephens in his History of Revolutionary Europe that “the period which preceded the French Revolution and the era of war from the troubles of which Modern Europe was to be born may be characterised as that of the benevolent despots.

The State was everything, the nation nothing.” Speaking of the eighteenth-century conditions in Europe, Stephens remarks that “the great majority of the peasants of Europe were throughout that century absolute serfs”; also that “the mass of the population of Central and Eastern Europe was purely agricultural and in its poverty expected naught but the bare necessities of existence. The cities and consequently the middle classes formed but an insignificant factor in the population.” These quotations reveal the real character of the European democracy in ancient and mediaeval and even in early modern Europe up to the end of the eighteenth century, or, to be more accurate, to the time of the French Revolution. Compare this with the following facts about the political institutions of India, during the ancient and mediaeval times: First we have the testimony of ancient Brahmanic and Buddhistic literature, preserved in their sacred books, about the right of the people to elect their rulers; the duty of the rulers to obey the law and their obligation to consult their ministers as well

democratic institutions." Speaking of one of them called Ambasthas (Sambastai), the Greek author of Ancient India says: "They lived in cities in which the democratic form of Government prevailed." "Curtius," adds Mr. Banerjea, "mentions a powerful Indian tribe, where the form of Government was democratic, and not regal." Similarly Arrian, another Greek writer, is quoted as mentioning several other independent, self-governing tribal communities who lived under democratic forms of government and bravely resisted the advance of Alexander. One of them, when making submission to Alexander, told him that "they were attached more than any others to freedom and autonomy, and that their freedom they had preserved intact from the time Dionysos came to India until Alexander's invasion." There were some others which had an aristocratic form of Government. In one of them mentioned in Ancient India, "the administration was in the hands of three hundred wise men." Another Greek writer, Diodoros, speaks of Patala as "a City of great note with a political constitution drawn on the same lines as the Spartan." It may safely be presumed that the Greek meant what he said. Chanakya, the author of a great treatise on political science, mentions many powerful oligarchies that existed down to the fourth century a.d. In one of the inscriptions, said to be of the sixth century a.d., the Malavas are referred to as living under a republican form of Government.

Even when kingship became an established institution the idea that the King was only a servant of the people survived for a long time. His "remuneration" was fixed at one-sixth of the produce. His subjects had the right to depose him or to turn him out if he failed in his duty. The authorities on these points are collected by Mr. Banerjea on pp. 72 and 73 of his book.

Similarly many authorities are quoted by Mr. Banerjea on pp. 74 and 75 of his learned work showing that, according to Hindu ideals practised in ancient times, the king was not above the law. He was not an autocrat. He "was as much bound by the law as his subjects. Laws were not made by kings. "Legislation was not among the powers entrusted to a king," says Mr. Banerjea. "There is no reference in early Vedic literature to the exercise of legislative authority by the king, though later it is an essential part of his duties," says Prof. Macdonell.

that anything of the sort existed in any of the villages over which he ruled. But being led to make specific inquiries on the subject, he had just discovered, in village after village, a distinctly effective if somewhat shadowy, local organization, in one or other form of panchayat, which was, in fact, now and I then giving decisions on matters of communal concern, adjudicating civil disputes, and even condemning offenders to reparation and fine. Such a Local Government organization is, of course, 'extra-legal,' and has no statutory warrant, and, in the eyes of the British tribunals, possesses no authority whatever. But it has gone on silently existing, possibly for longer than the British Empire itself, and is still effectively functioning, merely by common consent and with the very real sanction of the local public opinion." Mr. Matthai has also made a similar remark in Paragraph 22 of his book (Introductory).

Village councils ordinarily called village panchayats have often been confounded with caste panchayats and that fact has been emphasised to prove that these Indian panchayats were or are anything but democratic. Mr. Sidney Webb and Mr. John Matthai both have controverted that position and upon good evidence. Says Mr. Webb:

"One suggestion that these fragments of indigenous Indian Local Government seem to afford sometimes tend to exaggerate the extent to which the cleavages of caste have prevailed over the community of neighbourhood. How often is one informed, 'with authority,' that the panchayat of which we catch glimpses must be only a caste panchayat! It is plain, on the evidence, that however frequent and potent may be the panchayat of a caste, there have been and still are panchayats of men of different castes, exercising the functions of a Village Council over villagers of different castes. How widely prevalent these may be not even the Government of India can yet inform us. But if people would only look for traces of Village Government, instead of mainly for evidences of caste dominance, we might learn more on the subject."

Later on in the same paragraph Mr. Webb remarks that, even where caste exists it has, in fact, permitted a great deal of common life, and that it is compatible with active village councils.

"The history of village education in India goes back perhaps to the beginnings of the village community. The schoolmaster had a definite place assigned to him in the village economy, in the same manner as the headman, the accountant, the watch-man, and the artisans. He was an officer of the village community, paid either by rent-free lands or by assignments of grain out of the village harvest."

"The outstanding characteristics of the schools of the Hindu village community were: (i) that they were democratic, and (2) that they were more secular than spiritual in their instruction and their general character. . . . Nevertheless, when we speak of the democratic character of these early Hindu schools, it is to be understood that they were democratic only in this sense, that they were open not merely to the priestly caste but to all the four superior castes alike. There was never any question of admitting into the schools those who lay outside the regular caste system whose touch would have meant pollution, nor to the great aboriginal populations of the country."

"This is very similar to the public schools in the Southern States, in the United States, where schools for the white children are closed to coloured children and vice versa."

From what has been stated above it appears that the general impression that democratic institutions are entirely foreign to India is nothing but the survival of a prejudice originally due to ignorance of Indian history. In collecting his evidence Mr. Matthai has principally drawn upon South Indian sources. There can be no doubt that abundant evidence of a similar kind is available as regards North India and is waiting to be collected, collated and sifted by other Matthais. We do not contend that India had the same kind of representative institutions as Modern Europe has. In fact no part of the world had.

They are all recent developments. It is clear that idea was never altogether absent from Indian life either in theory or in practise. Even under the most absolute autocracies, the bulk of the people managed their collective affairs themselves. They organised and maintained schools; arranged and paid for sanitation; built public works; provided for watch and ward; administered justice, and for all these purposes raised revenues and spent them in a

control of the world between themselves may accept the underlying policy of the following statement (of President Wilson) that:

"This war had its roots in the disregard of the rights of small nations and of nationalities which lacked the union and the force to make good their claim to determine their own allegiance and their own forms of political life."

And the proposed League of Nations might see that a continuance of the injustice thus far done to small or backward nations is no longer permitted. Being practical men, however, we cannot build on the assumption that at the end of this war the world is at once to be transformed into a paradise and that full justice will be done to all nations and all peoples alike. We already notice a tendency to restrict the application and the enforcement of these principles to the nations of Europe by the more frequent use of the term "free nations." "Free nations" do not need to be freed. It will be wise, therefore not to be carried off our feet by these declarations and statements. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have pointedly reminded us of the Indian saying, "hanoz Delhi Dur Ast" (i.e. "Delhi is yet far away"). But even if they had not done so we were not so simple as to be swept away by the mere language of the war declarations.

The wording of the announcement of August 20, 1917, itself did not leave us in doubt about the truth of the saying quoted by Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford. We have, therefore, to test our ideals and aspirations by the touchstone of practicability and expediency. Happily for us there is, in theory, at least, a full agreement between the political goal set up by the Indian Nationalists of the Congress school (since endorsed by the Home Rulers) and that set up by the authors of the announcement of August 20th.

This goal is "Self-Government within the Empire on terms of equality with the other parts of it," in the language of the Congress school or, "Responsible Government as an integral part of the British Empire," in the language of the announcement. There is a party of Indian politicians who want complete independence, but at present their number is so limited that we need not take serious consideration of their position in the matter. The vast bulk of the educated classes are agreed:

term "responsible" government instead of "self- government" in the announcement as unfortunate because it carries the technical meaning of a government responsible for its existence to an assembly elected by the people. On the other hand, self-government can comprise many and varied forms of expression of the popular will. Further, he is convinced that the words "responsible government" were used in order to carry with the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister some more conservative members of the small war cabinet. It was camouflaged so that the Executive government hereafter might contain English- men, while at the same time the administration became sufficiently liberal to be responsible to the people. With due respect to the Aga Khan we do not see the logical connection between the two. Responsible government may or may not involve the necessary inclusion of Englishmen in the Cabinet. Although we may not approve of the interpretation of the expression "responsible" government given to it by the authors of the report, in our judgment its use as an ideal to be attained expresses more forcibly the right of the people to choose their government than the use of the general term "self government " would.

THE STAGES

In the chapter on ideals we have shown that there is almost complete agreement between the bulk of Indian educated men and the British authorities as to the immediate goal of Government in India. There is no such agreement, however, as regards the stages by which that goal is to be reached, nor on the steps which should be immediately taken to carry us to the first stage. The four formulas by which Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford profess to be guided in their recommendations are not accepted in their entirety by the spokesmen of the Indian people. These formulas are:

- (1) There should be as far as possible complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independence for them of outside control. (Paragraph 188.)
- (2) The provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards the progressive realization of responsible government should be taken. Some measure of

There are some who claim full autonomy at once. There are others who claim full autonomy except as regards foreign relations, the control of native States, the Army and the Navy. All insist that a beginning of responsible Government must be made in the Central Government also, and point out the absolute necessity of conceding some measure, even if not full, of fiscal autonomy. They can see no reason why "the Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament " and why "its authority must remain indisputable." On these matters Indian opinion joins issue with the distinguished authors of the report. We will revert to the subject in another chapter.

THE CONDITIONS OF THE PROBLEM

Immensity of the Problem and the Gravity of the Task

Before we take up the two sets of facts relied upon by them in support of either position we may express our general agreement with them as regards the gravity of the task and the immensity of the problem. The size of the country and the vastness of its population are the measure of the extent of the problem. The existence of powerful vested interests at present possessed by the ruling race which may be interfered with by extended changes in the system of Government are the measure of its gravity. "The welfare and happiness of hundreds of millions of people," which the authors say are in issue cannot be adequately provided for by any autocratic system of Government however benevolent its purpose, and however magnificent its organisation. An "absolute government" is an anarchism, but when it is foreign it is doubly so. To bring out "the best in the people" for their own "welfare and happiness" as well as for that of mankind in general, it is necessary that the people should be free to develop on their own lines, manage their own affairs, evolve their own life, subject only to such restrictions as the general interests of humanity demand; and subject to such guidance as the better placed and more experienced people of the earth can furnish.

The people of India are willing to be guided in their development towards modern democracy by the people of Great Britain and they would be grateful for their cooperation in this difficult task, but they must be made to realize that the task is their

In looking at the conditions of the problem, there is another fallacy which underlies the oft-exaggerated estimates of the blessings of British rule in India by British statesmen and British publicists. They compare the India of today with the India of 1757 and at once jump to the conclusion that "the moral and material civilisation of the Indian people has made more progress in the last fifty years than during all the preceding centuries of their history." The proper comparison is of the Great Britain, the France, the United States, the Germany, the Italy and the Japan of 1757, with the India of that year and of India's progress within the last century and a half, or even within the last 50 years, with the progress of these countries in the same period. We have no desire to withhold credit for what Great Britain has done in India, but what she has misdone or could have done but failed to do, by virtue of her rule in India being absolute and thus necessarily conditioned by limitations inevitable in a system of absolute rule, should not be forgotten.

The Indian critics of British rule in India have repeatedly pointed out that what they condemned and criticised was the system and not the personnel of the Government, and the distinguished authors of the Report "very frankly recognise that the character of political institutions reacts upon the character of the people" and that the exercise of responsibilities calls forth capacity for it (Paragraph 130), which mainly accounts for the conditions that serve as reasons for withholding responsible government from the Indian people. In discussing "the basis of responsibility" Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford very properly point out that the qualities necessary for it are only developed by exercise and that though "they are greatly affected by education, occupation and social organisation" "they ultimately rest on the traditions and habits of the people." "We cannot go simply to statistics for the measure of these things." Yet, unfortunately, it is exactly these statistics that seem to have influenced them largely in the framing of their half-hearted measures. The two dominating conditions which obsess them are (1) that the immense masses of the people are poor, ignorant and helpless far beyond the standards of Europe; and (2) that there runs through Indian society a series of cleavages "of religion, race and caste" which constantly threaten its solidarity.

but likewise " what is much more important " a secretion of thought, an accumulation of knowledge, and a development of literature and philosophy which are not in the least like the characteristic products of villages as we know them in Europe or America.

And today, although the teeming crowds who throng the narrow lanes of Calcutta or Benares, Bombay or Poona, Madras or Hyderabad, or even the millions who temporarily swarm at Hardwar or Allahabad or Puri may include only a small percentage of the whole population, yet the Indian social order does not seem to be, in the European understanding of the phrase, either on its good or on its bad side, essentially one of the villagers. The distinction may be of importance, because the Local Government developed by peoples of villages, as we know of them in Anglo-Saxon England, in the early days of the South African Republic, and in the Balkan States, is of a very different type from that which takes root and develops, even in the villages, in those nations which have also a City life, centers of religious activity, colleges and universities, and other 'nodal points,' from which emanate, through popular literature, pilgrimages, and the newspaper press, slow but farspreading waves of thought and feeling, and aspirations which it is fatal to ignore."

We have also quoted, in the chapter on " Democracy in India," the statement of Morse Stephens, about the condition of the people of Europe in the eighteenth century.

EDUCATIONAL BACKWARDNESS

"The Educational returns," remark the authors of the Report, "tell us much the same story," viz., the appalling dissimilarity of conditions in Europe and in India. While it is painfully true that the percentage of illiteracy in India is greater than in any of the countries of Europe, we cannot admit that fact is a fatal bar to the beginnings of responsible government in India or to the granting of a democratic constitution to the country. Literacy is, no doubt, a convenient,* but by no means a sure index of the intelligence of the people, even much less' of their character. The political status of a country is determined more by intelligence and character than by literacy. In these the people of India are inferior to none.

materially India has been highly prosperous under British rule. If so, how is it that in the language of the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy "enormous masses of the population have little to spare for more than the necessaries of life"? What about the prosperity of a province, one of the biggest in India (the United Provinces), in which the number of landlords (not tenants and farmers) whose income derived from their proprietary holdings exceeds £20 (\$100 a year, which comes to 30 cents a day for the whole family), is about 126,000 out of a population of 48 millions!

Acceptance of the argument of poverty as sufficient to deprive people of political right is putting a premium on it which is hardly creditable to the political ethics of the twentieth century. It is the poorest and the most ignorant in the community who most egregiously suffer at the hands of autocracy. It is they who require protection from it. The wealthy and the educated know how to plight the bureaucrat and get what they want. It is the poor who pay the penalty of political helplessness, yet, curiously, it is for them and in their interest that the English Government in India proposes to withhold the power of the purse from the proposed Indian Councils and insists on denying the Indian people even the elements of responsible government. While we admit the general justice and accuracy of the observations made under the head of "extent of interest in political questions," "political capacity of the rural population," we fail to see anything in them which justifies the conclusion that the interests of the classes not politically minded will be safer in the hands of the British officer, and on the whole better protected by him than by his educated countrymen who are likely to get the power in case of responsible government being conceded now. In our judgment no greater argument for the immediate grant of a substantial step in the direction of complete responsible government throughout India and in all spheres of government, could be advanced than what is involved in the following observation of the authors of the joint Report: "The rural classes have the greatest stake in the country because they contribute most to its revenues; but they are poorly equipped for politics and do not at present wish to take part in them. Among them are a few great landlords and a larger number

It is true that "the district officer and his lieutenants" are in a position to know the difficulties that beset the riot and his very human needs. But of what good is this knowledge of the district officer and his lieutenants to him if it has neither provided for the education of his children nor made any provision for his employment in occupations other than agriculture; nor saved him from the intricacies of the law; nor protected him from the ubiquitous salt tax; nor raised his wages proportionately to the increase of prices; nor yet put him in a position to assert his human rights and to obtain redress for his human, too human, wrongs. If we examine a little more carefully the merits of what is claimed to have been done for him so far by "an official Government," we will find that the claim is by no means established.

We have no desire to deny that among the foreign officers of the British Government in India there are and have been a great many who were genuinely anxious to help the riot and do all which is claimed to have been done for him in this paragraph, but that they have been unable to do anything worth mentioning will be admitted by every right-minded official.

The reasons for their failure were not of their making. The laws of the land made by the British legislators fresh from Court, the spirit of the administration and the system of land taxation have effectively prevented them from doing many of the things which they might otherwise have liked to do. We are sorry that the eminent statesmen responsible for the report should have been the unconscious instruments of producing an entirely wrong impression by the statements in this paragraph. If the statements are true, India must be a veritable paradise and the lot of the Indian ryot enviable. But we know, and the authors of the Report knew it as well, and they have stated in so many words that it is not so. We can quote any number of authorities to show that the Indian ryot is the most pitiable figure in the whole length and breadth of India, if not in the whole world.

This is not the place to quote the easily accessible opinions of eminently qualified and highly trustworthy British writers and administrators on the subject. The English official Government has no doubt professed to do all it claims to have done for the

- (e) for the provision of pasture lands,
- (f) for the comforts of the third-class railway travelling public,
- (g) for the milder administration of the forest laws,
- (h) for the reform of the Police, etc.

All these years the bureaucracy did nothing for the ryot and now they pose as his special friends, whose continuance in power and in office is necessary for his protection from the politically minded middle classes. 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 insure the ryot and the working man his rightful place in the body politic. We would not mind the aid of the foreign bureaucracy toward that end if we could be sure that the bureaucracy would or could do it. But we have no doubts in the matter that it cannot be done.

The bureaucracy has so far played into the hands of the plutocrat. They have served first their own capitalists and then' the capitalists and landlords of India. Some among them have tried to do a little for the submerged classes, the poor ryot and the ill-paid sweated laborer, but their efforts were of no consequence. They have failed and their failure is writ large on the face of the ryot. We are not sanguine that the politically minded classes when they get power will immediately rehabilitate the ryot and give him his due. We have no hope of that kind. Yet we unhesitatingly support the demand of the politically minded classes for a responsible government in India. In our judgment, that is the only way to raise the masses to a consciousness of their rights and responsibilities. The experience of the West tells us that in that way and in that way alone lies salvation.

Political consciousness must travel from the classes to the masses and the longer the inauguration of popular Government is delayed, the greater the delay in the awakening of the ryot and the working man. Absolutism must first give way and transfer its power to the politically minded classes, then will come the turn

department of traditional social usage severely alone. In such matters as child-marriage, it is possible that through excess of caution proper to the regime under which it works, it may be actually perpetuating and stereotyping customs which the better mind of India might be brought, after the necessary period of struggle, to modify. A government, in which Indians themselves participate, invigorated by a closer touch with a more enlightened popular opinion, may be able with all due caution to effect with the free assent or acquiescence of the Indians themselves, what under the present system has to be rigorously set aside."

Nor are the authors unmindful of the effect of free institutions on the character of the people as they themselves over and over again recognise.

"Free institutions have, as we have said, the faculty of reacting on the adverse conditions in which the start has to be made. The backwardness of education may embarrass the experiment at the outset; but it certainly ought not to stop it, because popular government in India as elsewhere is sure to promote the progressive spread of education and so a widening circle of improvement will be set up."

Among the authors' reasons for what they call a gradual advance they state the following also: (a) "We find it freely and widely admitted that they (i.e. the Indians) are not yet ready." This admission may legitimately be used against the total withdrawal of all control of Indian affairs by the Parliament. Firstly, it is questionable whether any such admission is really "freely and widely" made. Secondly, the admission justifies the retention of the powers of vital, general supervision and general control and also the retention of some Europeans in the higher services, but not the total denial of all responsibility for maintaining law and order and of all power to control the central Executive, (b) That the responsibility of India's defence is the ultimate burden which rests on the Government of India; and this duty is the last; which can be entrusted to inexperienced or unskilful hands.

"So long as India depends for her internal and external security upon the army and navy of the United Kingdom, the measure of self-determination which she enjoys must be inevitably limited. We cannot think that Parliament would consent to the

us full responsible government even on the civil side. The Indians do not desire nor demand the transfer of the control over the Army or the Navy until the Army is principally officered by the Indians and an Indian Navy has been built to supplement the Imperial Navy. From this criticism of the reasons advanced by the authors for a very mild "advance" (called "gradual") it is with pleasure that we turn to the brighter side of the picture showing the favorable features of the situation.

"The old assumption that the interests of the ryot must be confided to official hands is strenuously denied by modern educated Indians. They claim that the European official must by his lack of imagination and comparative lack of skill in tongues be gravely handicapped in interpreting the thoughts and desires of an Asiatic people. . . . Our educational policy in the past aimed at satisfying the few, who sought after English education, without sufficient thought of the consequences which might ensue from not taking care to extend instruction to the many. We have in fact created a limited intelligentsia, who desire advance; and we cannot stay their progress entirely until education has been extended to the masses. It has been made a reproach to the educated classes that they have followed too exclusively after one or two pursuits, the law, journalism or school teaching; and that these are all callings which make men inclined to overrate the importance of words and phrases. But even if there is substance in the count, we must take note also how far the past policy of Government is responsible. We have not succeeded in making education practical.

It is only now, when the war has revealed the importance of industry, that we have deliberately set about encouraging Indians to undertake the creation of wealth by industrial enterprise, and have thereby offered the educated classes any tangible inducement to overcome their traditional inclination to look down on practical forms of energy. We must admit that the educated Indian is a creation peculiarly of our own; and if we take the credit that is due to us for his strong points we must admit a similar liability for his weak ones. Let us note also in justice to him that the progressive Indian appears to realise the narrow basis of his position and is beginning to broaden it.

To sum up, while we are prepared to concede that the conditions of the problem may justify the withholding of absolute autonomy, " political, fiscal, and military, " for some time, there is nothing in them which can in any way be deemed sufficient to deny full political, and, if not complete, at least substantial fiscal autonomy to the Indian people at once.

THE PUBLIC SERVICES IN INDIA

Until now the European servants of the British Government have ruled India quite autocratically. The powers delegated to and the discretion vested in them have been so large that they could do almost anything they liked. They could make or mar the fortunes of millions; they could further their happiness or add to their misery by the simple fiat of their will. The only limitation on their power was their own sense of duty and justice. That some of them did let themselves go is no wonder. The wonder is that the instances of unbridled oppression and tyranny were not more numerous than they have actually been. Speaking of the European services generally, we have nothing but admiration for their general character. The particular branch of the Public Services that has been all along entrusted with the general administration of the country is known as the Indian Civil Service. It is recruited in England and is overwhelmingly European in personnel. On April 1 1913, only forty- six of the 1319 civilians on the cadre were natives of India.

Speaking of the executive organizations that have so far ruled India, the eminent authors of the Report for the reorganization of the Government of India remark that it may "well be likened to a mere system of official posts, actuated till now by impulses of its own, but affected by the popular ideas which impinge on it from three sources " the British Parliament, the legislative councils and the local boards." The sentence would have been correct if in place of "but affected" the authors had said "and affected but little." "The system," they add, "has in the main depended for its effectiveness on the experience, wisdom and energy of the services themselves.

It has, for the most part, been represented by the Indian Civil Service which, though having little to do with the technical

practice in conflict with those of the rest of the body politic. A Brahmin was forbidden to engage in trade or otherwise accumulate wealth. His life was a life of strict self-abnegation. This cannot be said of the Indian Civil Servant. He receives a handsome salary for his services, expects and receives periodic promotion until he reaches a position which, from an economic point of view, is not unenviable. After retirement he is free to engage in trade and otherwise accumulate wealth. But over and above this, what distinguishes an Indian Civil Servant from an old Brahmin bureaucrat is the fact that in India he represents a nation whose economic interest may not always be in harmony with those of the people of India. He is thus supposed to be the guardian of the interests of his countrymen, and is expected to further them as much as he can without altogether endangering the safety of British rule in India. Looked at from this angle, we have no hesitation in saying that the work of the Indian Civil Service, too, has in its way, been monumental.

As a rule, they have proved capable administrators, individually honest, hardworking and alert. They have organized and tabulated India in a way, perhaps, never done before. But after all has been said in their praise, it cannot be denied that they have done India even more harm than the Brahmin oligarchy in its time, did, by the support they lent to economic exploitation of the country by men of their own race and religion. Now, in this latter respect, we want to guard against being misunderstood. The Indian Civil Service has, in the course of about a century, produced a fairly good number of men who have honestly and fearlessly stood for the protection of Indian interests against those of people of their own race and religion. In doing so they have sometimes ruined their own prospects of promotion and advancement. Whenever they failed in their self-imposed task, and more often they failed than not, they failed because the authorities at the top were forced by considerations of domestic and imperial policy to do otherwise. On the whole, the defects of the bureaucratic administration were more the defects of the system than of the individuals composing it. The Indian Civil Servant, like the old Brahmin, is autocratic and dictatorial. He dislikes any display of independence by the people put under his charge. He discourages initiative. He likes to be called and considered the *Mai bap* (mother

As regards (a) we have already quoted the opinion of the eminent authors of the report. The principle laid down in the announcement of August 20, and the scheme proposed are supposed to do away with the element of irresponsibility. It is obvious that with the introduction of the principle of popular control into the Government, the power of individual servants of the executive will not remain what it is now, or has been in the past. Much that is vested in and done by the service will be transferred to public bodies elected by popular vote. This will naturally affect (b) and (c) also. We will here stop to quote again from the Report:

“In the forefront of the announcement of August 20 the policy of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration was definitely placed. It has not been necessary for us, nor indeed would it have been possible, to go into this large question in detail in the time available for our inquiry. We have already seen that Lord Hardinge’s Government was anxious to increase the number of Indians in the public services, and that a Royal Commission was appointed in 1912 to examine and report on the existing limitations in the employment of Indians. . . . The report was signed only a few months after the outbreak of war, and its publication was deferred in the hope that the war would not be prolonged. When written, it might have satisfied moderate Indian opinion, but when published two years later it was criticised as wholly disappointing. Our inquiry has since given us ample opportunity of judging the importance which Indian opinion attaches to this question. While we take account of this attitude, a factor which carries more weight with us is that since the report was signed an entirely new policy toward Indian government has been adopted, which must be very largely dependent for success on the extent to which it is found possible to introduce Indians into every branch of the administration.”

The authors of the Report then proceed to state the limitations of the process, subject to the general remark that at the present moment there are few Indians (we do not admit this) trained in public life, who can replace the Europeans, and thus to alter the personnel of a service must be a long and steady process. They admit that:

33 per cent, of the superior posts should be recruited for in India, and that this percentage should be increased by 11 per cent, annually until the periodic commission is appointed which will re-examine the whole subject. . . . We have dealt only with the Indian Civil Service, but our intention is that there should be in all other services now recruited from England a fixed percentage of recruitment in India, increasing annually.' '

Now we must admit that this is certainly a distinct and marked advance on the existing situation. The Indian Constitutional party, however, wants to have the percentage of recruitment in India fixed at 50 per cent., retaining at the same time the annual increase I suggested. In our opinion, this difference is not material, provided the number of posts to which the rule of percentage is to be applied is substantially reduced. We may state our position briefly.

We are of the opinion that the system of administration in India is much more costly than it should be, considering the sources and the amounts of Indian revenues. Unless the industries of the country are developed we can see no new sources of increased taxation. Consequently, to us, it seems essential that some economy should be effected in the various departments of the administration. The only way to effect that economy is to substantially reduce the number of posts on which it is considered necessary to retain a certain percentage of Europeans. In speaking of the machinery of the Government of India, the authors of the Report say:

"We think we have reason for saying that in some respects the machinery is no longer equal to the needs of the time. The normal work of the departments is heavy. The collective responsibility of the Government is weighty, especially in time of war. There is little time or energy left for those activities of a political nature which the new situation in the country demands. A legislative session of the Government of India imposes a serious strain upon the departments, and especially on the members in charge of them. But apart from the inevitable complexities of the moment, the growing burden of business, which results from the changing political conditions of the country, is leading to an accumulation of questions which cannot be disposed of as quickly as they present themselves. We find

For those rates are regulated in the higher branches of the administration by the cost of officers brought from England. You cannot work with imported labor as cheaply as you can with native labor, and I regard the more extended employment of the natives, not only as an act of justice, but as a financial necessity. If we are to govern the Indian people efficiently and cheaply, we must govern them by means of themselves, and pay for the administration at the market rates for native labor."

Now, whatever may be said about the necessity of maintaining a strong European element in the departments which require initiative, courage, resourcefulness and all the other qualities of "leadership" they are certainly not a sine qua non for efficiency in secretarial work. We can see no reason why, then, the different secretariats of the Government of India cannot be manned mainly, if not exclusively, by Indians. Their salaries need not be the same as those now paid to the Europeans engaged in these departments. May we ask if there is any country on earth where such high salaries are paid to the secretarial heads of departments I as in India? Secretaries to the Government of India in the Army and Public works and Legislative departments receive 42,000 Rs. each (\$14,000, or £2800 a year); Secretaries to the Government of India in the Finance, Foreign, Home, Revenue, Agriculture, Commerce and Industry and Education departments get Rs. 48,000 a year each (\$16,000 or £3,200) ; Educational Commissioners from 30 to 36,000 Rs. (\$10,000 to \$12,000).

COST OF ADMINISTRATION

On the subject of the cost of administration it will be instructive to compare the annual salaries allowed to the highest public servants in India, the United States and Japan.

The President of the United States, who ranks with the great royalties of the world in position, gets a salary of \$75,000, without any other allowance. The Prime Minister of Japan gets 12,000 yen, or \$6000. The Viceroy and the Governor General of India gets 250,000 rupees, or \$83,000, besides a very large amount in the shape of various allowances. The Cabinet Ministers of the United States get a salary of \$12,000 each, the Japanese 8000 yen or \$4000, and the Members of the Viceroy's Council, \$26,700 each.

in the Education Department gets \$12,000; Joint Secretary, \$10,000; Controller and Auditor-General, \$14,000; Accountant-General, from \$9,000 to \$11,000; Commissioner of Salt Revenue, \$10,000; Director of Post and Telegraph, from \$12,000 to \$14,000.

Among the officers directly under the Government of India there are only a few who get salaries below \$7000. Most of the others get from that sum up to \$12,000.

The United States includes forty-eight States and territories. Some of them are as large in area, if not even larger, than the several provinces of India. The Governors of these States are paid from \$2500 to \$12,000 a year. Illinois is the only State paying \$12,000; five States, including New York and California, pay \$10,000; two, Massachusetts and Indiana, pay \$8000; one pays \$7000, and three pay \$6000. All the rest pay \$5000 or less. There is only one territory, the Philippines, which pays a salary of \$20,000 to its Governor-General.

In India the Governors of Madras, Bombay and Bengal each receive \$40,000, besides a large amount for allowances. The Lieutenant-Governors of the Punjab, the United Provinces, Bihar and Burma get \$33,000 each, besides allowances. The Chief Commissioners receive \$11,000 in Bihar, \$18,700 in Assam, \$20,700 in the Central Provinces, and \$12,000 in Delhi. The Political Residents in the native States receive from \$11,000 to \$16,000, besides allowances.

In Japan the governors of provinces are paid from \$1850 to \$2250 per year, besides allowances varying from \$200 to \$300.

The Provincial services in India are paid on a more lavish scale than anywhere else in the world. In Bengal the salaries range from \$1600 for Assistant Magistrate and Collector to \$21,333 to Members of the Council, and this same extravagance is also true of the other provinces.

Coming to the Judiciary, we find that Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States get a salary of \$14,500 each, the Chief Justice getting \$15,000; the Circuit Judges get a salary of \$7000 each; the District Judges, \$6000. In the State of New York the Judges of the Supreme Court, belonging to the General Sessions, get from \$17,500 and those of the Special Sessions from \$9000 to

We have taken these figures from the Indian Year Book, published by the Times of India, Bombay. We know as a fact that the Police- Constables in the Punjab are paid from \$2.67 to \$3.33 per month “ that is, from \$32 to \$40 per year. The reader should mark the difference between the grades of salaries from the highest to the lowest in India as compared with the United States and Japan. While in India the lowest officials are frightfully underpaid, the highest grades are paid on a lavish scale. In the other countries of the world this is not the case.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT

In the United States (we quote the figures of New York) the lowest grade school teachers get a salary of \$720, rising to \$1500 a year. In the upper grades salaries range from \$1820 to \$2260. Principals of elementary schools receive \$3500 and assistants \$2500. In the High Schools salaries range from \$900 to \$3150, in training schools from \$1000 to \$3250. Principals of High Schools and Training Schools receive \$5000 and the same salary is paid to the District Superintendent. The Commissioner of Education in New York gets \$7500.

In Japan the Minister of Education, who is a Cabinet Minister, gets \$4000, and the lowest salaries paid to teachers range from \$8 to \$9 per month. In the United States College Professors make from \$3000 to \$5000 per year, a few only getting higher sums. In Japan salaries range from \$300 to \$2000. Coming to India we find that while the Administrative officials and even the College Professors get fairly high salaries, the teachers in the schools are miserably underpaid. Even the Times of India, an Anglo-Indian newspaper published in Bombay, has recently commented on the colossal difference between the salaries allowed at the top and those allowed at the bottom. Yet recently the Secretary of State has been sanctioning higher leave allowances to the European officers of the Indian Army.

THE INDIAN ARMY AND NAVY

When the Indian troops first arrived in October, 1914, the situation was of so drastic a nature that it was necessary to call upon them at once to re-enforce the fighting front and help to

war Indian army consisted of 80,000 British and 160,000 Indians. Indian public opinion has for decades been protesting against the denial to Indians of officers' commissions in the Indian army, as also against the strength of the British element therein. Every British unit of the Indian army from the Field Marshal to the Tommy is paid for his services by India. India pays for these services not only during the time they form part of the Indian army but also for their training and equipment. It pays all their leave, transfer and pension charges. It even pays for whatever provision is made in England for their medical relief, etc. In the line of the military and naval defence of India, Great Britain has not done as much for India as she has done for the dominions and self-governing colonies. Under the circumstances it is adding insult to injury to insinuate that India has in any way shirked the duty of providing for her defence. We will say nothing of India's services during the war.

In the military defence of India, the contribution of the Punjab has always been the greatest. If the British provinces are considered singly, it will be found that the Punjab has been supplying the largest number of units for the Indian army, not only in the ranks of the fighters, but also in the ranks of auxiliaries.

During this war, too, the Punjab made the largest contribution of both combatants and non-combatants. Yet, if we compare the civil status of the people of the Punjab with that of other provinces, we will find that they have been persistently denied equality of status ;with Bengal, Bombay and Madras. The Punjab peasantry, which supplies the largest number of soldiers to the army, is the most illiterate and ignorant of all the classes of Indian population. Their economic and legal position may better be studied in Mr. Thorborn's

The Punjab in Peace and in War. The Municipal and Local Boards of the province do not possess as much independence as has been conceded in the other provinces. The judicial administration of the province is as antiquated as it could possibly be under British rule. Instead of a High Court we have still a Chief court Captains and Majors and Colonels are still performing judicial functions as magistrates and judges. The trial by jury in the cases of Indians is unknown.

say on this matter in their report. In Paragraph 328 they state the "Indian wishes" and point out that "for some years Indian politicians have been urging the right of Indians in general to bear arms in defence of their country"; and that "we have everywhere met a general demand from the political leaders for extended opportunities for military service," but that the subject being more or less outside the scope of their enquiry and "requirements of the future" being dependent "on the form of peace which is attained," they "leave this question for consideration hereafter with the note that it must be faced and j settled."

In Paragraph 330 they deal with the question of "British Commissions for Indians."

"The announcement of his Majesty's Government that 'the bar which has hitherto prevented the admission of Indians to commissioned rank in His Majesty's Army should be removed' has established the principle that the Indian soldier can earn the King's commission by his military conduct. It is not enough merely to assert a principle. We must act on it. The services of the Indian army in the war and the great increase in its numbers make it necessary that a considerable number of commissions should now be given. The appointments made so far have been few. Other methods of appointment have not yet been decided on, but we are impressed with the necessity of grappling with the problem. We also wish to establish the principle that if an Indian is enlisted as a private in a British unit of His Majesty's Army its commissioned ranks also should be open to him."

The "other methods of appointment" that have been announced since the report was signed are far from satisfactory. It has been said that the responsibility for this niggardly policy in the matter of admitting Indians to the Commissioned ranks of the army rests with the Home Government and that the Indian Government's recommendations were much more liberal. Now, as practical men, we fully realize that for some time to come, at least until British suspicion of India's desire to get out of the Empire is completely removed by the grant of responsible government to India, India's military policy and the Indian army—must be controlled by the British executive. On that point all the parties in India are agreed. But it is absolutely necessary that some

intentions, to be content to rest like other industries on the new foundation of Government in the wishes of the people. No less is it the wish of Indian politicians to respect the expectations which have been implicitly held out; to remember how India has profited by commercial development which only British capital and enterprise achieved; to bethink themselves that though the capital invested in private enterprises was not borrowed under any assurance that the existing form of government would endure, yet the favourable terms on which money was obtained for India's development were undoubtedly affected by the fact of British rule; and to abstain from advocating differential treatment aimed not so much at promoting Indian as at injuring British commerce."

We must say that the last insinuation is perfectly gratuitous. Nor is it correct to say even by implication that the non-official European community has hitherto abstained from taking part in politics. The fact is that Indian politics have hitherto been too greatly dominated by the British merchant both at home and in India. The British merchant doing business in India had to submit to the prior claims of the British manufacturers in Great Britain in matters in which their interests did not coincide, but otherwise their interests received the greatest possible attention from the Government of India. In proportion to their incomes derived from India by the employment of Indian labour on terms more or less guaranteed to them by the Indian Government's special legislation they have made the smallest possible contribution to the Indian Revenues; yet they have been the greatest possible hindrance in the development of Indian liberties.

They have all the time owned a powerful press which has employed all the resources of education and enlightenment, all the powers of manipulating facts and figures in maintaining and strengthening the rule of autocracy in the country. We do not propose to open these wounds. But we cannot help remarking that so far they have exercised quite a disproportionate influence in the decisions of the Government of India. Those of them who are domiciled in the country are our brothers and no Indian has the least desire to do anything that will harm them in any way. Their importance must, in future, be determined not by their race

assume racial superiority and look down upon the people of the country and take advantage of their being subjects of a European power.

No Indian will be so foolish as to injure the commercial development of his country by scaring the foreign trader or the foreign capitalist. All that he wants is freedom to lay down the terms on which that trade will be carried on consistently with the interests of India's millions. What he stands for is equality and reciprocity. As other peoples are free to name the conditions on which the foreign trader may do business in their countries, so must the Indians be. Nothing more and nothing less than this is demanded.

As regards the citizens of the British Empire also, the same right of reciprocity is demanded. We are glad that the representatives of the Dominions have recognized the justice of that claim and expressed their willingness to concede it.

Coming to the Missions, European and American, the advice given is rather gratuitous. The Indians have left nothing undone to show their gratitude to them for the good work done by them in spite of the fact that they, too, in the past, have not hesitated to use the fact of their race and colour for the benefit of their propaganda. The person of a religious man is sacred in the eyes of an Indian, regardless of his particular creed. The Christian missionary has so far enjoyed a unique position of safety and freedom in the country even to a greater extent than the Hindu or the Moslem priest. The latter have often quarrelled amongst themselves, but the former they have always respected and honored. There is absolutely no reason to think that this is likely to change in any way by the grant of political liberty to the Indians.

It is possible, however, that, with the growth of free thought in India, religious teachers of all denominations may not continue to be the recipients of the same honour as has been paid to them in the past by virtue of their religious office. Dogmatic religion, whether be Hinduism, Mohammedanism or Christianity is in state of decay. In that respect India is feeling the reaction of world forces and no amount of politic coercion or repression can stop it. In my humble judgment the average Indian has thus far been

to live in and no bed to sleep on, much less a territory to rule and an army to command.

This was, however, a part of their royalty. In struggles against powerful enemies, sometimes of their own race and religion, but more often foreign aggressors of different blood and creed, they were many a time worsted and driven to extreme straits of poverty and helplessness. In peace or in war, in prosperity or in misery, they never gave up the struggle. Their right to lead their people and to rule their country they never yielded for a moment. It is true that sometimes they submitted to the superior power of the enemy and accepted a position of subordination, though in one case, at least, even this was done only for a short time under the Moguls. In the darker days of Indian history, when the military devastation of foreign invaders left nothing but tears and blood, ruin and ashes, defeat and misery in their track, these houses kept the lamp of hope burning. For full ten centuries they carried on a struggle of life and death, sometimes momentarily succumbing before the overwhelming force of their adversaries, but only to rise again in fresh vigor and life to reclaim their heritage and preserve their own and their country's independence.

The Sessodias of Mewar called the Ranas of Mewar (Udaipur) and the Rahtores of Marwar (including Jodhpur, Bikaner, Rutlam, Kishangarh and Alwar) have written many a glorious page of Mediaeval Indian history and dyed it with their own blood as well as that of their adversaries. Not only their men but their women have made themselves immortal by their bravery, chivalry, purity and self-immolation. The one thing which distinguishes the Indian Rajput from the peoples of other lands is that he has never waged war against the poor, the helpless and the defenceless.

Numberless men gave their lives freely and ungrudgingly not only in protecting the lives of their own women and children but also in doing the same service to the women and children of their enemies. The Rajput never fought an unfair fight. He never took advantage of the helplessness of his enemy and always gave him right of way and the use of his best weapons for a free and fair fight in the open. Anyone desirous of knowing their deeds may read them in that poem in prose, known as the Annals of Rajasthan by Col. Todd, Col. Todd has drawn a most faithful and thrilling

But after all that is favourable to the Native States of India has been said, their existence in their present form remains a political anomaly. As at present (situated, they are an effective hindrance to complete Indian unity. Although "India is in fact as well as by legal definition, one geographical whole," yet these Native States, occupying about one-third of the total area of the country and with a population of about 70 million will, for a long time, prevent its becoming a homogeneous political whole. Thus a circumstance which was hitherto looked upon as a piece of good luck will operate as a misfortune.

"The Native States of India are about 700 in number. They embrace the widest variety of country and jurisdiction. They vary in size from petty States like Rewa, in Rajputana, with an area of 19 square miles, and the Simla Hill States, which are little more than small holdings, to States like Hyderabad, as large as Italy, with a population of thirteen millions."

The general position as regards the rights and obligations of the Native States has been thus summed up by the distinguished authors of the joint Report (Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu):

"The States are guaranteed security from without; the paramount power acts for them in relation to foreign powers and other States, and it intervenes when the internal peace of their territories is seriously threatened. On the other hand the States' relations to foreign powers are those of the paramount power; they share the obligation for the common defence; and they are under a general responsibility for the good government and welfare of their territories. "

As regards the assimilation of the principles of modern life, it is remarked in the same document:

"Many of them have adopted our civil and criminal codes. Some have imitated and even further extended our educational system. . . . They have not all been equally able to assimilate new principles. They are in all stages of development, patriarchal, feudal or more advanced, while in a few states are found the beginnings of representative institutions. The characteristic features of all of them, however, including the most advanced, are the- personal rule of the Prince and his control over legislation and the administration of justice. "

any intention of forcibly altering treaty rights, they propose to classify the States into (a) those that have "full authority over their internal affairs," (b) those "in which Government exercises through its Agents large powers of internal control," (c) those who are really no more "than mere owners of a few acres of land." It is further pointed out that hitherto the general clause which occurs in many of the treaties to the effect that the Chief shall remain absolute Ruler of his country has not in the past precluded and does not even now preclude 'interference with the administration by Government through the agency of its representatives at the Native Courts.' We need hardly say that such interference has not been employed in wanton disregard of treaty obligations. During the earlier days of our intimate relations with the States British agents found themselves compelled, often against their will, to assume responsibility for the welfare of the people, to restore order out of chaos, to prevent inhuman practices, and to guide the hands of a weak or incompetent Ruler as the only alternative to the termination of his rule. So too, at the present day, the Government of India acknowledges as trustee, a responsibility (which the Princes themselves desire to maintain) for the proper administration of States during a minority, and also an obligation for the prevention or correction of flagrant misgovernment."

And also that:

"the position hitherto taken up by Government has been that the conditions under which some of the treaties were executed have undergone material changes, and the literal fulfilment of particular obligations which they impose has become impracticable. Practice has been based on the theory that treaties must be read as a whole, and that they must be interpreted in the light of the relation established between the parties not only at the time when a particular treaty was made, but subsequently."

On these grounds it is proposed to establish a Council of Princes to which questions which affect the States generally or are of concern to the Empire as a whole, or to British India and the States in common, may be referred for advice and opinion. So long as the Princes do not intervene either formally or informally in the internal affairs of British India, we have no objection to the scheme. On the other hand, we do hope some method will be

and the Secretary of State to create any new States in the future. It is monstrous to transfer millions of ' human beings from one kind of political rule to another like so many cattle, as was done in iqii. The present rule of any Indian Maharaja may be as good or as bad as that of a British Governor or Lieutenant Governor, but the latter has in it greater democratic potentialities than the former, for the mere fact, if for no other, that, while the British are more or less amenable to world opinion, the rulers of Native States are not. It is inhuman, and not in accord with modern ideas of right and wrong to reward somebody's loyalty by giving him power of life and death over numerous fellow beings, otherwise than in due course of law. Even the mighty British Government is not the owner of the bodies and souls of its subjects in India. How, then, can it assume the right of abandoning them to the absolute rule of a single individual, however worthy or loyal he may be? We hope this stupid way of rewarding loyal services may be ended by an express provision to that effect in the statute which will be passed relating to the reorganization of the Government of India. In this connection the following observations made in a leading editorial of the *Servant of India*, Poona (February 16, 1919), are worthy of attention:

"A hundred years ago, it was decidedly in the interests of British rule, and probably also in the interests of the people of India generally, that the small, ill-governed, and eternally fighting states of India should come under the suzerainty of a single powerful power. It may be regarded as a historical misfortune that this power happened then to be foreign, though many regard this contact with a virile civilization as the making of India. This suzerainty could then be established duly by entering into treaties with these states and guaranteeing them certain rights and privileges. But these treaties have now assumed in the eyes of the descendants of the original princes an air of inspiration; they have become a kind of perpetuity. They always come in the way of any improvement. When any new policy is proposed to them, they are always prepared to say, 'This is not in the bond.' One may be allowed to speculate as to how many of these Highnesses would have survived to this day to put forward this claim in the absence of the suzerain power.

development is necessary. It is evident that the present machinery of government no longer meets the needs of the time; it works slowly and it produces irritation; there is a widespread demand on the part of educated Indian opinion for its alteration; and the need for advance is recognised by official opinion also."

The new policy sketched by them is, in their judgment, "the logical outcome of the past. Indians must be enabled, in so far as they attain responsibility, to determine for themselves what they want done"... such limitations on powers as we are now proposing are due only to the obvious fact that time is necessary in order to train both representatives and electorates for the work which we desire them to undertake; and that we offer Indians opportunities at, short intervals to prove the progress they are making and to make good their claim, not by the method of agitation but by positive demonstration, to the further stages in self-government which we have just indicated."

That is the only basis on which they maintain they can hope to see in India "the growth of a conscious feeling of organic unity with the Empire as a whole." With these and a few more prefatory remarks about the educational problem and the attitude of the ryot and the enunciation of the general principles on which their proposals are based they proceed to formulate their scheme, starting first with the provinces.

The proposals relating to Provincial Government may be noticed under the following heads:

- (a) *Financial Devolution*: It is proposed that hence- forth there should be a complete separation of the provincial finances from those of the Government of India; that, reserving certain sources of revenue for the Government of India, all others should be made over to the Provincial Governments with the proviso that the first charge on all Provincial revenues will be a contribution towards the maintenance of the Government of India, considered necessary and demanded by the latter. A certain amount of power to impose fresh taxes and to raise loans is also conceded to the provincial Governments subject to the veto of the Government of India.

“Let us now explain how we contemplate in future that the executive Governments of the provinces shall be constituted. As we have seen, three provinces are now governed by a Governor and an Executive Council of three members, of whom one is in practice an Indian and two are usually appointed from the Indian Civil Service, although the law says only that they must be qualified by twelve years’ service under the Crown in India. One province, Bihar and Orissa, is administered by a Lieutenant-Governor with a council of three constituted in the same way. The remaining five provinces, that is to say, the three Lieutenant-Governorships of the United Provinces, the Punjab and Burma and the Chief Commissioner-ships of the Central Provinces and Assam are under the administration of a single official Head. We find throughout India a very general desire for the extension of Council government. . . . Our first proposition, therefore, is that in all these provinces singleheaded administration must cease and be re- placed by collective administration.

“In determining the structure of the Executive we have to bear in mind the duties with which it will be charged. We start with the two postulates; the complete responsibility for the government cannot be given immediately without inviting a breakdown, and that some responsibility must be given at once if our scheme is to have any value. We have defined responsibility as consisting primarily in amenability to constituents, and in the second place in amenability to an assembly. We do not believe that there is any way of satisfying these governing conditions other than by making a division of the functions of the Government, between those which may be made over to popular control and those which for the present must remain in official hands. . . . We may call these the ‘reserved’ and ‘transferred’ subjects respectively. It then follows that for the management of these two categories there must be some form of executive body, with a legislative organ in harmony with it. . . .

“We propose therefore that in each province the executive Government should consist of two parts. One part would comprise the head of the province and an executive council of two members. In all provinces the head of the Government would be known as Governor. . . . One of the two Executive

it is said that “we do not propose that resolutions, whether on reserved or transferred subjects should be binding.”

The classification of the reserved and transferred subjects was also left to a special committee which has since concluded its labours and whose report is awaited with interest.

Legislation on reserved subjects:

“For the purpose of enabling the provincial Government to get through its legislation on reserved subjects, we propose that the head of the Government should have power to certify that a Bill dealing with a reserved subject is a measure ‘essential to the discharge of his responsibility for the peace or tranquility of the province or of any part thereof, or for the discharge of his responsibility for the reserved subjects.’ . . . The Bill will be read and its general principles discussed in the full legislative council. It will at this stage be open to the council by a majority vote to request the Governor to refer to the Government of India, whose decision on the point shall be final, on the question whether the certified Bill deals with a reserved subject. If no such reference is made, or if the Government of India decide that the certificate has been properly given, the Bill will then be automatically referred to a Grand Committee of the council. Its composition should reproduce as nearly as possible the proportion of the various elements in the larger body. . . . the grand committee in every council should be constituted so as to comprise from 40 to 50 per cent, of its strength. It should be chosen for each Bill, partly by election by ballot, and partly by nomination. The Governor should have power to nominate a bare majority exclusive of himself. Of the members so nominated not more than two-thirds should be officials, and the elected element should be elected ad hoc by the elected members of the council on the system of the transferable vote.”

“On reference to the grand committee, the Bill will be debated by that body in the ordinary course, if necessary referred to a select committee, to which body we think that the grand committee should have power to appoint any member of the legislative council whether a member of the grand committee or not. The select committee will, as at present, have power to take evidence. Then, after being debated in the grand committee

from either the provincial Government or the provincial council for the modification of the reserved and transferred lists of the province; and that, after considering the evidence laid before them, they should recommend for the approval of the Secretary of State the transfer of such further subjects to the transferred list as they think desirable. On the other hand, if it should be made plain to them that certain functions have been seriously maladministered, it will be open to them, with the sanction of the Secretary of State, to retransfer subjects from the transferred to the reserved list, or to place restrictions for the future on the minister's powers in respect of certain transferred subjects. . . . But it is also desirable to complete the responsibility of the ministers for the transferred subjects. This should come in one of two ways, either at the initiative of the council if it desires and is prepared to exercise greater control over the ministers, or at the discretion of the Government of India, which may wish to make this change as a condition of the grant of new, or of the maintenance of existing, powers. We propose, therefore, that the Government of India may, when hearing such applications, direct that the ministers' salaries, instead of any longer being treated as a reserved subject, and, therefore, protected in the last resort by the Governor's order from interference should be specifically voted each year by the legislative council; or, failing such direction by the Government of India, it should be open to the councils at that time or subsequently to demand by resolution that such ministers' salaries should be so voted, and the Government of India should thereupon give effect to such request."

Periodic commissions: . . . Ten years after the first meeting of the new councils established under the Statute a commission should be appointed to review the position. Criticism has been expressed in the past of the composition of Royal Commissions, and it is our intention that the commission which we suggest should be regarded as authoritative and should derive its authority from Parliament itself. The names of the commissioners, therefore, should be submitted by the Secretary of State to both Houses of Parliament for approval by resolution. The commissioners' mandate should be to consider whether by the end of the term of the legislature then in existence it would be possible to establish complete responsible government in any province or provinces,

Government of India called the Central Government may be thus summed up:

- (a) *General*: "We have already made our opinion clear that pending the development of responsible government in the provinces the Government of India must remain responsible only to Parliament. In other words, in all matters which it judges to be essential to the discharge of its responsibilities for peace, order, and good government it must, saving only for its accountability to Parliament, retain indisputable power. "
- (b) *The Governor General's Executive Council*: "We would therefore abolish such statutory restrictions as now exist in respect of the appointment of Members of the Governor General's Council, so as to give greater elasticity both in respect to the size of the Government and the distribution of work."

At present there is one Indian member in the Viceroy's Executive Council consisting of six ordinary members and one extraordinary besides the Viceroy. This scheme recommends the appointment of another Indian.

- (c) The Indian Legislative Council.
 - I. Legislative Assembly: " We recommend therefore that the strength of the legislative council, to be known in future as the Legislative Assembly of India, should be raised to a total strength of about 100 members, so as to be far more truly representative of British India. We propose that two-thirds of this total should be returned by election; and that one- third should be nominated by the Governor General, of which third not less than a third again should be non-officials selected with the object of representing minority or special interests. . . . Some special representation, we think, there must be, as for European and Indian commerce, and also for the large landlords. There should be also communal representation for Muhammadans in most provinces and also for Sikhs in the Punjab."
 - II. The Council of State: "We do not propose to institute a complete bi-cameral system, but to create a second

Assembly. It will then go in the ordinary course to the Council of State, and if there amended in any way which the Assembly is not willing to accept, it will be submitted to a joint session of both Houses, by whose decision its ultimate fate will be decided. This will be the ordinary course of legislation. But it might well happen that amendments made by the Council of State were such as to be essential in the view of the Government if the purpose with which the Bill was originally introduced was to be achieved, and in this case the Governor General in Council would certify that the amendments were essential to the interests of peace, order, or good government. The assembly would then not have power to reject or modify these amendments, nor would they be open to revision in a joint session.

“We have to provide for two other possibilities. Cases may occur in which the Legislative Assembly refuses leave to the introduction of a Bill or throws out a Bill which the Government regarded as necessary. For such a contingency we would provide that if leave to introduce a Government Bill is refused, or if the Bill is thrown out at any stage, the Government should have the power, on the certificate of the Governor General in Council that the Bill is essential to the interests of peace, order, or good government, to refer it *de novo* to the Council of State; and if the Bill, after being taken in all its stages through the Council of State, was passed by that body, it would become law without further reference to the Assembly. Further, there may be cases when the consideration of a measure by both chambers would take too long if the emergency which called for the measure is to be met. Such a contingency should rarely arise; but we advise that in cases of emergency, so certified by the Governor General in Council, it should be open to the Government to introduce a Bill in the Council of State, and upon its being passed there merely to report it to the Assembly.”

India Office in London

The principal proposals under this head may be thus summarized;

"We advise that the Secretary of State's salary, like that of all other Ministers of the Crown, should be defrayed from home revenues and voted annually by Parliament. This will enable any live questions of Indian administration to be discussed by the House of Commons in Committee of Supply. ... It might be thought to follow that the whole charges of the India Office establishment should similarly be transferred to the home Exchequer; but this matter is complicated by a series of past transactions, and by the amount of agency work which the India Office does on behalf of the Government of India; and we advise that our proposed committee upon the India Office organization should examine it and taking these factors into consideration, determine which of the various India Office charges should be so transferred, and which can legitimately be retained as a burden on Indian revenues.

"But the transfer of charges which we propose, although it will give reality to the debates on Indian affairs, will not ensure in Parliament a better informed or a more sustained interest in India. We feel that this result can only be accomplished by appointing a Select Committee of Parliament on Indian affairs."

The above in substance is the proposed scheme. In India it has met with varied response. The European community does not approve of it. They think it is too radical. The European Services have struck a note of rebellion threatening to resign in case of its acceptance by Parliament. The Indian politicians are divided into two camps. Their views are best represented by the following tabular statement which we reproduce from the Indian newspapers.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO THE REFORM PROPOSALS PASSED

Ordinary Rights of Citizens

By the Special Congress Resolution IV. The Government of India shall have undivided administrative authority on matters

Saving such equal and equitable Imperial obligations as may be agreed upon as resting on all parts of the Empire, the Government of India, acting under the control of the Legislature, should enjoy the same power of regulating the fiscal policy of India as the Governments of the self-governing dominions enjoy of regulating their fiscal policy.

Reform Proposals

Resolution VI. That this Congress appreciates the earnest attempt on the part of the Right Hon. the Secretary of State and his Excellency the Viceroy to inaugurate a system of responsible government in India, and, while it recognizes that some of the proposals constitute an advance on the present conditions in some directions, it is of opinion that the proposals are as a whole disappointing and unsatisfactory, and suggests the following modifications as absolutely necessary to constitute a substantial step towards responsible government:

‘This Conference cordially welcomes the Reform Proposals of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy of India as constituting a distinct advance on present conditions as regards the Government of India and the Provincial Governments and also a real step towards the progressive realization of “responsible government” in the Provincial Government in due fulfilment of the terms of the announcement of August 20, 1917. As such this Conference accords its hearty support to those proposals, and, while suggesting necessary modifications and improvements therein, expresses its grateful appreciation of the earnest effort of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford to start the country on a career of genuine and lasting progress towards the promised goal.’

‘This Conference regards all attempts at the condemnation or rejection of the Reform Scheme as a whole as ill advised, and in particular protests emphatically against the reactionary attitude assumed towards it by the Indo-British Association and some European public bodies in this country which is certain to produce, if successfully persisted in, an extremely undesirable state of feeling between England and India and imperil the cause of ordered progress in this country. This Conference, therefore, most earnestly urges his Majesty’s Government and Parliament of the United

of all misery, individual or national. A person economically dependent upon another is a virtual slave, despite appearances. He who supplies food and raiment and the necessities of life is the real master. The desire for gain dominates the world and all its activities. Even religion, as ordinarily understood, interpreted and administered, is a game of pounds and shillings, say what one may to the contrary. There are exceptions to this statement, but they are few and far between. The world does not subsist by bread alone, but without bread it cannot exist even for a minute. The generality of the world cares more for bread than for anything else, though there are individuals and groups of individuals who would not stoop to obtain bread by dishonorable means and those also who would die rather than obtain bread by the violation of their soul.

There are numerous ways in which a subject nation feels the humiliation and helplessness of her position, but none is so telling and so effective as the subordination of her economic interests to those of the dominant power. This is especially true in these days of free and easy transportation, of quick journeys, and of scientific warfare. In any struggle between nations, the victory eventually must rest with the one in possession of the largest number of "silver bullets." It is true that silver bullets alone will not do unless there are brains and bodies to use them, but the latter without the former are helpless.

A nation may be the greatest producer of food; yet she may die of hunger from lack of ability to keep her own produce for herself. Food obeys the behest of the silver bullets. The law of self-preservation, therefore, requires only that nations be free to regulate their own household, subject to the condition that thereby they do not violate the rules of humanity or trample upon the rights of any human being.

Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have, in parts of their Report, been extremely candid. The value of their joint production lies in this candidness. In no other part, perhaps, have they been so candid as in the one dealing with "Industries and Tariff." In Paragraph 331 they frankly admit the truth of the following observation of the late Mr. Ranade on the economic effects of British rule in India:

on locally manufactured cotton goods in the alleged interests of Lancashire is very widely accepted as a conclusive proof of such a purpose. On a smaller scale, the maintenance of a Stores Department at the India Office is looked upon as an encouragement to the Government to patronize British at the expense of local manufacturers."

There can thus be no autonomy without fiscal autonomy. In fact, the latter alone is the determining characteristic of an autonomous existence.

The one national trait which distinguishes the British from other nations of the world is their habit of truthfulness and frankness. When we say that we do not thereby mean that all Britishers are equally truthful " to the same extent and degree. But we do mean that on the whole the British nation has a larger percentage of truthful and candid persons in her family than any other nation on the face of the earth. Where their interests clash with those of others, they can be as hard, exacting and cruel as any one else in the world. But repentance overtakes them sooner than it does the others. They have a queer but admirable faculty of introspection which few other people possess to the same extent and in the same numbers. This is what endears them even to those who are never tired of cursing their snobbishness and masterful imperialism. The faculty of occasionally seeing themselves with the eyes of others, makes them the most successful rulers of men. They are as a nation lacking in imagination, but there are individuals amongst them who can see, if they will, their own faults; who can and do speak out their minds honestly and truthfully, even though by so doing they may temporarily earn odium and unpopularity.

The remarks and observations of the eminent authors of the Report relating to the fiscal relations of India and England reflect the honesty of their purpose and the sincerity of their mind as no other part of the Report does. They have entered upon the subject with great diffidence and, though expressing themselves with marked candor and fairness, have I refrained from making any definite recommendations. In this respect it will be only fair to acknowledge the equally candid opinion of Mr. Austin Chamberlain, who, in 1917, made a most significant confession

training, and a comparative weakness of mutual trust; skilled labour is lacking, and although labour is plentiful, education is needed to inculcate a higher standard of living and so to secure a continuous supply; there is a dearth of technical institutions; there is also a want of practical information about the commercial potentialities of India's war products. Though these are serious difficulties, they are not insuperable; but they will be overcome only if the State comes forward boldly as guide and helper. On the other hand, there are good grounds for hope. India has great natural resources, mineral and vegetable. She has furnished supplies of manganese, tungsten, mica, jute, copra, lac, etc., for use in the war. She has abundant coal, even if its geographical distribution is uneven; she has also in her large rivers ample means of creating water-power. There is good reason for believing that she will greatly increase her output of oil. Her forest wealth is immense, and much of it only awaits the introduction of modern means of transportation, a bolder investment of capital, and the employment of extra staff; while the patient and laborious work of conservation that has been steadily proceeding joined with modern scientific methods of improving supplies and increasing output, will yield a rich harvest in the future. We have been assured that Indian capital will be forthcoming once it is realized that it can be invested with security and profit in India; a purpose that will be furthered by the provision of increased facilities for banking and credit. Labor, though abundant, is handicapped by still pursuing uneconomical methods, and its output would be greatly increased by the extended use of machinery. We have no doubt that there is an immense scope for the application of scientific methods. Conditions are ripe for the development of new and for the revival of old industries, and the real enthusiasm for industries which is not confined to the ambitions of a few individuals but rests on the general desire to see Indian capital and labour applied jointly to the good of the country, seem to us the happiest augury."

The views of educated India about fiscal policy have been very faithfully reproduced in Paragraphs 341 and 342, which also we reproduce almost bodily:

compete, Indian opinion cannot bring itself to believe that the refusal is disinterested or dictated by care for the best interests of India. This real and keen desire for fiscal autonomy does not mean that educated opinion in India is unmindful of Imperial obligations. . . “

These admissions should put India's claims for fiscal autonomy beyond the range of doubt and dispute, but so strange are the ways of modern statesmanship that consistency and logic are not the necessary accompaniments thereof. The authors have advanced another very strong argument for the economic development of India, viz., “military value,” which makes the case conclusive. This argument has been supplied by the Great War and is so well known that we need not state it in their words.

If India is to prosper and take her legitimate place in the British Commonwealth, and in the great family of Nations of the World, it is absolutely necessary that she should be given complete fiscal freedom to manage her own affairs, develop her own industries and do her own trading. Considering her size and resources, it wounds her self-respect and makes her feel exceedingly mean and small to go begging for alms and charity every time there is a failure of rains and the cry of famine is raised.

For a nation of 315 millions of human beings living in a country which nature has endowed with all its choicest blessings, rich and fertile soil, plenty of water and sun, an abundant supply of metals and coal, willing labor, artistic skill and a power of manipulating for beauty and elegance unexcelled in the world “to exist in pitiful economic dependence is a condition most deplorable and most pathetic. We want no charity, no concessions, no favors, no preference. What we most earnestly beg and ask for is an opportunity.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

In December, 1917, the Government of India appointed a committee of three Englishmen and two Indians (1) “to investigate and report on the nature and extent of the criminal conspiracies connected with the revolutionary movements in India, (2) to examine and consider the difficulties that have arisen in dealing with such conspiracies and to advise as to the legislation, if any,

of India, or a deliberate misrepresentation of the nature of the Hindu State. The committee says: "Republican or Parliamentary forms of governments as at present understood were neither desired nor known in India until after the establishment of British rule. In the Hindu State the form of government was an absolute monarchy, though the monarch was by the Hindu Shastras hedged round by elaborate rules for securing the welfare of his subjects and was assisted by a body of councillors, the chief of whom were Brahmin members of the priestly class which derived authority from a time when the priests were the sole repositories of knowledge and therefore the natural instruments of administration." The statements made in this paragraph do not represent the whole truth.

The committee ignores the fact that Republican or Parliamentary forms of Government "as at present understood" were neither desired nor known in any part of the world, except perhaps England itself until after the establishment of British rule in India. 1 Then the committee has altogether ignored that, in the Hindu State, the form of government was not an absolute monarchy always and in all parts of India. There is ample historical evidence to prove that India had many Republican States, along with oligarchies and monarchies at one and the same period of her history. The second part of the second sentence is also not correct, because the priestly class derived its authority from a time when the priests were not the sole repositories of knowledge. The several Hindu political treatises belong to a period when the whole populace was highly educated and could take substantial part in the determination of the affairs of their country.

Equally misleading is the last sentence of the introduction where the committee says that it is among the Chitpavan Brahmins of the Poona district that they first find indications of a revolutionary movement. This statement is incorrect, if it means that after the establishment of British rule in India no attempt had been made to overthrow it prior to the Revolutionary movement inaugurated by the Poona Brahmins. The statement ignores three such attempts which are known to history; viz., (a) the great Mutiny of 1857, (b) the Wahabee Rebellion of Bengal, and (c) the Kiiika Rebellion of the Punjab; not to mention other minor attempts

social, political and economic conditions which made such incitements and their success possible.

It is clear even from this summary that the only two provinces where the revolutionary propaganda took root and resulted in more than occasional outrages were Bengal and the Punjab.

In the Bombay Presidency, revolutionary outrages did not exceed three within a period of 20 years (from 1897 to 1917), two murders and one bomb-throwing. Besides, three trials for conspiracies are mentioned all within a year (1909-1910), two in Native States and one in British territory. Altogether 82 men were prosecuted for being involved in these conspiracies. The total result comes to this, that in the course of 20 years about 100 persons were found to be involved in a revolutionary movement in a territory embracing an area of 186,923 square miles and a population of 27 million human beings. This is surely by no means a formidable record justifying extraordinary legislation such as is proposed. 1 The net loss of human life did not exceed three, though unfortunately all three victims were Europeans.

Bihar and Orissa formed part of the province of Bengal during most of the period covered by the revolutionary movement of Bengal, viz., from 1906 to 1917. It was in Bihar which was then a part of Bengal, that in 1908, the first bomb was thrown. The only other revolutionary outrage that took place in Bihar was one in 1913, resulting in the murder of two Indians.

In the United Provinces of Agra and Oude, the only tangible evidence of revolutionary activity recorded by the committee is the Benares Conspiracy that came to light in 1915-1916. The only outrage noted is that of the alleged murder of a fellow revolutionary by a member of the same gang.

To the Central provinces the committee has given a practically clean bill. In Madras the revolutionary outrages consisted of one murder (of a European Magistrate) and one conspiracy involving nine persons. The conspiracies and intrigues detected in Burma are ascribed to people of other provinces and not a single outrage from that province itself is reported. So we find that in the period from 1906 to 1907, Since enacted. In the Punjab, again, the first revolutionary crime took place in December, 1912, and the second

India. They were also, with the Parsees, the first Indians to send their sons to England for education, to qualify for the Bar, or to compete for the higher grades of the Civil and Medical services. When, however, similar classes in other provinces also acquired a working knowledge of English, the field for Bengali enterprise gradually shrank. In their own province bhadrakok still almost monopolize the clerical and subordinate administrative services of Government. They are prominent in medicine, in teaching and at the Bar. But, in spite of these advantages, they have felt the shrinkage of foreign employment; and as the education which they receive is generally literary and ill-adapted to incline the youthful mind to industrial, commercial or agricultural pursuits, they have not succeeded in finding fresh outlets for their energies. Their hold on land, too, has weakened, owing to increasing pressure of population and excessive sub-infeudation.

Altogether their economic prospects have narrowed, and the increasing numbers who draw fixed incomes have felt the pinch of rising prices. On the other hand, the memories and associations of their earlier prosperity, combined with growing contact with Western ideas and standards of comfort, have raised their expectations of the pecuniary remuneration which should reward a laborious and, to their minds, a costly education. Thus as bhadrakok learned in English have become more and more numerous, a growing number have become less and less inclined to accept the conditions of life in which they found themselves on reaching manhood. Bhadrakok have always been prominent among the supporters of Indian political movements; and their leaders have watched with careful attention events in the world outside India. The large majority of the people of Bengal are not bhadrakok but cultivators, and in the eastern districts mainly Muhammadans; but the cultivators of the province are absorbed in their own pursuits, in litigation, and in religious and caste observances. It was not to them but to his own class that Barendra appealed. When he renewed his efforts

The following two extracts which the committee has taken from one of the publications of the revolutionary party called Mukti Kon Pathe (what is the path of salvation) will explain clauses (f) and (g) and (h). "The book further points out that not much muscle was required to shoot Europeans, that arms could be procured by grim determination, and that weapons could be prepared silently in some secret place. Indians could be sent to foreign countries to learn the art of making weapons. The assistance of Indian soldiers must be obtained. They must be made to understand the misery and wretchedness of the country. The heroism of Sivaji must be remembered. As long as revolutionary work remained in its infancy, expenses could be met by subscriptions. But as work advanced, money must be extracted from society by the application of force. If the revolution is being brought about for the welfare of society, then it is perfectly just to collect money from society for that purpose. It is admitted that theft and dacoity are crimes because they violate the principle of good society. But the political dacoit is aiming at the good of society, "so no sin but rather virtue attaches to the destruction of this small good for the sake of some higher good. Therefore if revolutionaries extort money from the miserly or luxurious members of society by the application of force, their conduct is perfectly just."

Mukti Kon Pathe further exhorts its readers to obtain the "help of the native soldiers. . . . Although these soldiers for the sake of their stomach accept service in the Government of the ruling power, still they are nothing but men made of flesh and blood. They, too, know (how) to think; when therefore the revolutionaries explain to them the woes and miseries of the country, they, in proper time, swell the ranks of the revolutionaries with arms and weapons given them by the ruling power. . . . Because it is possible to persuade the soldiers in this way, the modern English Raj of India does not allow the cunning Bengalis to enter into the ranks of the army. . . . Aid in the shape of arms may be secretly obtained by securing the help of the foreign ruling powers."

- (8) That persons involved in revolutionary crime belonged to all castes and occupations and the vast bulk of them were non-Brahmins. They were of all ages, from 10-15 to over 45 > the majority being under 25. The committee has in an appendix (p. 93) given three tables of statistics as to age, caste, occupation or profession of persons convicted in Bengal of revolutionary crimes or killed in commission of such crimes during the years 1907-19 17. This clause is based on these statistics.

We are afraid, however, that these statistics do not afford quite a correct index of the age, caste, occupation and position of all the people in Bengal that were and are sympathetically interested in the revolutionary movement of Bengal.

In investigating reasons for failure of ordinary machinery for the prevention, detection and punishment of crime in Bengal, the committee has assigned six reasons: (a) want of evidence, (b) paucity of police, (c) facilities enjoyed by criminals, (d) difficulty in proof of possession of arms, etc., (e) distrust of evidence, (f) the uselessness, in general, of confession made to the Police. These reasons, however, do not represent the whole truth. Some of the most daring crimes were committed in broad daylight, in much frequented streets of the metropolis and in the presence of numerous people. Moreover, the Government did not depend on ordinary law. Measure after measure was enacted to expedite and facilitate convictions. Extraordinary provisions were made to meet all the difficulties pointed out by the committee and extraordinary sentences were given in the case of conviction. Yet the Government failed either to extirpate the movement or to check it effectively or to bring the majority of offenders to book.

The members of the committee have frankly admitted: "That we do not expect very much from punitive measures. The conviction of offenders will never check such a movement as that which grew up in Bengal unless the leaders can be convicted at the outset." They pin their faith on "preventive" measures recommended by them. It was perhaps not within their scope to say that the most effective preventive measure was the removal of the political and economic causes, that had generated the movement. The committee has studiously avoided discussing that

and more exacting is confronted by a determined though perfectly natural opposition to the raising of fees. . . . Probably the worst feature of the situation is the low wages and the complete absence of prospects which are the fate of teachers in the secondary schools. ... It is easy to blame the parents for blindness to their sons' true good, but the matriculation examination is the thing that seems to matter, so that if his boy passes the annual promotion examinations and is duly presented at that examination at the earliest possible date, the average parent has no criticism to offer.

This is perfectly natural, but the future of Bengal depends to a not inconsiderable extent on the work done in its secondary schools, and more is required of these institutions than an ability to pass a certain proportion of boys through the Calcutta University Matriculation examination. . . . The present condition of secondary schools is undoubtedly prejudicing the development of the presidency and is by no means a negligible feature in the existing state of general disturbance. It is customary to trace the genesis of much sedition and crime to the back streets and lanes of Calcutta and Dacca, where the organizers of anarchic conspiracies seek their agents from among University students. This view is correct as far as it goes, but it is in the high schools, with their underpaid and discontented teachers, their crowded, dark and ill-ventilated classrooms, and their soul-destroying process of unceasing cram, that the seeds of discontent and fanaticism are sown."

Yet for years nothing was done to improve education, to make it practical and creative and productive. In fact nothing has been done up till now.

Let the reader read with this the report of the Indian Industrial Commission recently issued under the authority of the Government of India and he will at once find the true causes which underlie the revolutionary movement in India. These causes are not in any way peculiar to Bengal or to the Punjab,* they are common to the whole of India, but they have found a fruitful soil in these provinces on account of the rather intense natures of the people of these two provinces. The Bengali is an intensely patriotic and emotional being, very sensitive and very resentful; the Punjabee is intensely virile, passionate and plucky, having developed a strong, forceful character by centuries of resistance to all kind of invasions and

Government careers to the sons of the soil, reduce the cost on the military and civil services, let the people determine the fiscal policy of the country and the revolutionary movement will subside. Die it will not, so long as there is foreign domination and foreign exploitation. Even after India has attained Home Rule it will not die. It has come to stay. India is a part of the world and revolution is in the air all the world over. The effort to kill it by repression and suppression is futile, unwise and stupid.

THE PUNJAB

We may now consider the case of the Punjab. Lord Morley's verdict notwithstanding, it is abundantly clear that the troubles of 1907, with which the history of unrest in the Punjab begins, were principally agrarian in their origin. Lord Morley's speech in the House of Commons (in 1907) as to the root of the trouble was based on reports supplied to him by the Government of the Punjab and we know from personal knowledge how unreliable many of these reports are. We may here illustrate this point by a few extracts from these documents.

Lord Morley stated that: "There were twenty-eight meetings known to have been held by the leading agitators in the Punjab between 1st March and 1st May. Of these five only related, even ostensibly, to agricultural grievances; the remaining twenty-three were all purely political."

The number of meetings held from March 1 to May 1, 1907 was, at the lowest calculation, at least double of 28, or perhaps treble, and most of them related "even ostensibly to agricultural grievances"; the number of purely political meetings could not have exceeded ten or twelve.

On p. 61 the committee writes that "Chatarji's father too had ordered him home on discovering that he was staying with Hardayal in the house of Lajpat Rai." The whole of this statement is absolutely false. I am prepared to swear and to prove that Chatarji did not stay in my house even for a single night. He came there a few times with Hardayal. Hardayal was at that time living in a house he had rented for himself in the native city about one mile from my place which is in the Civil Station on the Lower Mall.

the most virile portions of the population. They have fought the battles of the Empire. In the interests of the Empire they have travelled far and wide. Yet we find that educationally, as well as economically, they have suffered most. They have the largest numbers of illiterates among them. They are the least developed and the least progressive of all the classes in the Punjab. They are heavily in debt. The Government has occasionally recognised it and has tried to satisfy them by preferential treatment in the filling of Government posts, or in the bestowal of titles or in nominating their supposed leaders to Legislative Councils. These ridiculous palliative measures, however, have failed in their objective. The classes disaffected do not get any satisfaction by these palliative measures. They need opportunities of education and economic betterment. These could not be provided without making education general and without a more equitable distribution of land among the agricultural classes and the inauguration of industries other than agriculture. This the Government never cared to do. The Sikhs and the Mussulmans naturally directed their attention to emigration.

The opportunities they found in other parts of the Empire whetted their appetites. They compared the conditions abroad with conditions at home and drew their own conclusions. Having helped in the expansion and development of the Empire they thought they were entitled to benefit therefrom. They demanded fair treatment. Instead they found the doors shut upon them. Even those that had been admitted were made to feel the humiliation of their position. Deliberate, active, concerted measures were taken to drive them away or to make life for them intolerable. Their wives and children were refused admittance and various pretexts were invented to keep them out or to drive them away. (The revolutionary movement in the Punjab amounted to nothing until it was reinforced by the return of the Sikh members of the Ghadr party during the war. The Committee has failed to answer the question: Why did the Sikhs of Vancouver and California readily fall in with the schemes of Hardayal and Barkat Ullah, the alleged founders of the revolutionary party of California? These latter had nothing in common with the Sikhs. In language and religion, by habits and associations, they were poles apart from each other.

which subsequently investigated the whole affair, considered that Gurdit Singh's action had been much influenced by advice and encouragement received from Indian residents in Canada. At any rate, after failing to secure a ship at Calcutta, he chartered a Japanese vessel named the Komagata Maru through a German agent at Hong Kong. He issued tickets and took in passengers at that post, at Shanghai, at Moji and at Yokohama. He certainly knew what the Canadian law was, but perhaps hoped to evade it by means of some appeal to the courts or by exercising political pressure. It is equally certain that many of his passengers had no clear comprehension of their prospects. The Tribunal that subsequently tried the first batch of Lahore conspirators held that probably Gurdit Singh's main object was to cause an inflammatory episode, as one of the witnesses stated that Gurdit Singh told his followers that should they be refused admission, they would return to India to expel the British. On April the 4th, 1914, the Komagata Maru sailed from Hong Kong. On the 23rd of May the Komagata Maru arrived at Vancouver with 351 Sikhs and 21 Punjabi Muhammadans on board.

The local authorities refused to allow landing except in a very few cases, as the immigrants had not complied with the requirements of the law. Protests were made, and, while negotiations were proceeding, a balance of 22,000 dollars still due for the hire of the ship was paid by Vancouver Indians, and the charter was transferred to two prominent malcontents. . . . A body of police was sent to enforce the orders of the Canadian Government that the vessel should leave; but with the assistance of firearms, the police were beaten off, and it was only when a Government vessel was requisitioned with armed force that the Komagata Maru passengers, who had prevented their Captain from weighing anchor or getting up steam, were brought to terms. On the 23rd of July they started on their return journey with an ample stock of provisions allowed them by the Canadian Government. They were by this time in a very bad temper as many had staked all their possessions on this venture, and had started in the full belief that the British Government would assure and guarantee their admission to a land of plenty. This temper had been greatly aggravated by direct revolutionary influences....

Government and interest to the money-lender. There was nothing to bind them to their homes except the love of home land and the domestic ties. These melted away in the presence of dire necessity. In extreme need they left their homes to make more money to be able to pay their debts, to redeem their lands, if possible to purchase more land and to make life bearable and tolerable. When they came in the open world they found insurmountable barriers between them and plenty. They had helped in making the empire; the empire had enough land for all her sons and daughters; men were urgently needed to bring land into cultivation and otherwise to develop the empire; men of other races and colours were not only welcome but were being induced to come and settle by offers of all kinds. They, and they alone, were unwelcome and barred.

Add to this the attitude and the record of the Punjab Government towards political agitation and political agitators, to use their own favorite expressions. The Punjab Government was the first to resuscitate the old Regulation III of 1818 for the purpose of scotching a legitimate agitation against an obnoxious legislative measure. A wise and sagacious Government would have dropped the legislation which it was eventually found necessary to veto to maintain peace. The deportations drove the seeds of unrest deeper. The other contributory causes may be thus summed up:

- (1) The Punjab Government has been the most relentless of all local governments in India in suppressing freedom of speech and press.
- (2) The Punjab Government at one time was very foolishly zealous in persecuting the Arya Samajists and in making a mountain out of a molehill about the letters found in the possession of Parmanand.
- (3) The sentences which the Punjab Courts have passed in cases of seditious libel are marked by such brutality as to make them notably unique in the history of criminal administration in India.
- (4) The strangulation of all open political life by direct and indirect repression led to the adoption of secret methods.
- (5) The sentences passed in the Delhi Conspiracy case were much more severe than those given in Bengal in similar

and punishment of offenders, and Preventive, i.e., measures to check the spread of conspiracy and the commission of crime. We may say at once that we do not expect very much from punitive measures. The conviction of offenders will never check such a movement as that which grew up in Bengal unless all the leaders can be convicted at the outset. Further, the real difficulties have been the scarcity of evidence due to various causes and the want of reliance whether justified or not, on such evidence as there has been. The last difficulty is fundamental and cannot be remedied. No law can direct a court to be convinced when it is not. Punitive Measures (Permanent). Legislation directed better to secure the punishment of seditious crime may take the shape either “

- (a) of changes in the general law of evidence or procedure which if sound would be advisable in regard to all crime, or
- (b) changes in the substantive law of sedition or modifications in the rules of evidence and procedure in such cases designed to deal with the special features of that class of offence.

The recommendation under (a) does not amount to much and we will not mention it. Under (b) they recommend: In the first place we think that a permanent enactment on the lines of Rule 25 A under the Defence of India Act is required. That rule provides for the punishment of persons having prohibited documents (which may have to be defined anew) in their possession or control with (as we read the effect of the words used) intent to publish or circulate them. . . . We also recommend that the principle of section 565 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (which provides for an order requiring notification of residence after release in the case of persons convicted a second time for certain offences) should be extended to all persons convicted of offences under Chapter VI of the Penal Code (offences against the State) whether previously convicted or not. Such persons might be ordered to give security for a period not exceeding two years for good behaviour so far as offences under Chapter VI are concerned, and in default be directed to notify their residence to Government, who should have power to restrict their movements for the period of two years after their release and prohibit them from addressing public

already described under control in the future, to provide for the continuance after the expiry of the Defence of India Act (though in the contingent form explained and under important limitations) of some of the powers which that measure introduced in a temporary form. By those means alone has the conspiracy been paralysed for the present and we are unable to devise any expedient operating according to strict judicial forms which can be relied upon to prevent its reviving to check it if it does revive, or, in the last resort, to suppress it anew. This will involve some infringement of the rules normally safeguarding the liberty of the subject. We have endeavored to make that infringement as small as we think possible consistently with the production of an effective scheme.

Existing Temporary Powers. The powers at present temporarily possessed by the Government are so far as material for the present purpose to be found in rules 3-7 inclusive and 12A under the Defence of India Act, 1915. . We do not refer for the present to the Foreigners Ordinance, 1914, or the Ingress into India Ordinance, 1914. . . . Shortly stated, their effect is to give power to require persons by executive order to remain in any area to be specified or not to enter or remain in any such area, with penalties for breach of such requirements. These orders may be made and served on the person affected, whereupon they become binding upon him, or the person may be arrested without warrant and detained for a period not exceeding in all one month, pending an order of restriction. There is also a power of search under search warrant. It will be observed there is no provision for an examination of the cases of such persons. The decision lies solely with the Local Government. There is also the power of confinement under Regulation III of 1818. Again: "Two Grades of Powers Desirable. " We now proceed to elaborate . . . the scheme we suggest. "We think, as we have already indicated, that the powers to be acquired should be of two grades capable of being called into operation separately, possibly under different forms of notification.

" The first group of powers should be of the following nature: " (i) to demand security with or without sureties; " (ii) to restrict residence or to require notification of change of residence; " (iii) to require abstention from certain acts, such as engaging in

justified in calling on the political leaders, in the work of education that they will under- take, to bear carefully in mind the political inexperience of their hearers; and to look for further progress not to fiery agitation which may have consequences quite beyond their grasp, but to the machinery which we devise for the purpose. In every country there will be persons who love agitation for agitation's sake or to whom it appeals like an intoxicant. It is the duty of the leaders of Indian opinion to remember the effect on people not accustomed to weighing words of fiery and heated speeches. Where ignorance is wide- spread and passions are so easily aroused, nothing is easier than for political leaders to excite a storm; nothing harder for them than to allay it. Breaches of the peace or crimes of violence only put back the political clock. Above all things, when the future of India depends upon co-operation among all races, attacks upon one race or religion or upon another jeopardise the whole experiment. Nor can the condemnation of extremist and revolutionary action be left only to the official classes. We call upon all those who claim to be leaders to condemn with us and to support us in dealing with methods of agitation which drive schoolboys to crime and lead to religious and agrarian disturbance. Now that His Majesty's Government have declared their policy, reasonable men have something which they can oppose successfully to the excitement created by attacks on Government and by abuse of Englishmen, coupled with glowing and inaccurate accounts of India's golden past and appeals to race hatred in the name of religion. Many prominent Indians dislike and fear such methods. A new opportunity is now being offered to combat them; and we expect them to take it. Disorder must be prejudicial to the cause of progress and especially disorder as a political weapon."

We are in general agreement with the sentiments expressed in this extract but we will be wanting in candour if we fail to point out that, though the revolutionary movement in India is mainly political, it is partly economic and partly anarchic also. In the first two aspects it is at present the product of purely local (Indian) conditions. In the last, it is the reaction of world forces. While we are hoping that the change in the policy, now announced, will remove the political basis of it, we are not quite sure that will

“If there are Indians who really desire to see India leave the empire, to get rid of English officers and English commerce, we believe that among their springs of action will be found the bitterness of feeling that has been nurtured out of some manifestation that the Englishman does not think the Indian an equal. Very small seeds casually thrown may result in great harvests of political calamity. We feel that, particularly at the present stage of India’s progress, it is the plain duty of every Englishman and woman, official and non-official, in India to avoid the offence and the blunder of discourtesy: and none the less is it incumbent on the educated Indian to cultivate patience and a more generous view of what may very likely be no more than heedlessness or difference of custom.”

We admire the dignified way in which they have addressed their advice to the educated Indian. But we hope they do not ignore that except in a few scattered instances heretofore the chief fault has lain with the ruling class. The proceedings of the Royal Commission on the Public Services of India are full of that racial swagger which the authors of this report have mildly condemned in the above extract and it is an open secret that that spirit was one of the dearly cherished articles of faith with the bureaucracy. We hope the war has effected a great change in their temper and both parties will be disposed to profit from the advice given to them in the report. As to the duty of the educated leaders in the matter of suppressing the growth of the revolutionary movement in future, we beg to point out that all depends on how much faith the governing classes place in the professions of the popular leaders. Open public speeches and meetings appealing to racial or religious animosities have not played any important part in the development of the revolutionary spirit. It is not likely that the educated leaders will in any way consciously and voluntarily digress from the limits of reasonable criticism of Government policy, nor have they very often done so in the past. What has so far prevented the educated leaders from exercising an effective check on the growth of the revolutionary movement is their inability to associate on terms of friendship with the younger generation. This has been due partly to a false idea of dignity and partly to the fear that any association with hot-headed young men

will be fatal to the success of the appeal which Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have addressed to the public men of India in the extract given above. In our judgment the most effective way to check the growth of the revolutionary movement is by freeing the mind of the leaders of the fear of being misunderstood if they should mix freely with the younger generation and yet fail to prevent some of them from becoming revolutionists. A revolutionary prospers on exclusiveness. Secrecy is his great ally. Cut off a young man from open, healthy influences and he will be attracted by the mystery of secrecy. Thenceforth he is doomed. After that he may be weaned only by kindness and friendliness and not by threats or persecution. Most of the youths attracted by revolutionary propaganda have proved to be quite ignorant of the real conditions of their country. No attempt has been made to instruct them in politics. They have been fed on unsound history and unsound politics. Reactionary Imperialism has harmed them more than exaggerated nationalism. They have had few opportunities of discussion with people who could look upon things in right perspective.

They could not open their minds to their European teachers. In the few cases in which they did they repented. Somehow or other, the free confidential talks they had with their professors found an entry in the police records. It brought a black mark against their names, to stand and mar their careers forever. The Indian teacher and professor is afraid of discussing politics with them. So they go on unrestrained until the glamour of prospective heroism, by a deed of violence, fascinates one of them and he is led into paths of crimes of a most detestable kind. Unscrupulous advisors lead him toward falsehood, hypocrisy, treachery, treason and crime by dubious methods. One of the things they preach is that morality has nothing to do with politics.

They insinuate that the violence of militarism and Imperialism can be effectively met and checked only by violence. Poor misguided souls! They enforce their advice by the diplomatic history of Europe. They forget that once a youth is led into the ways of falsehood and unscrupulousness he may as easily use it against his friends as against his enemies. If he has no scruples about killing an enemy he may have none about killing a friend.

“There is, however, one aspect of the general problem of political advance which is so important as to require notice in some detail. We have observed already that one of the greatest obstacles to India’s political development lies not only in the lack of education among its peoples taken as a whole, but also in the uneven distribution of educational advance. The educational policy of Government has incurred much criticism from different points of view. Government is charged with neglect, because after sixty years of educational effort only 6 per cent, of the population is literate, while under 4 per cent, of the total population is undergoing instruction. It is charged, on the other hand, with having given to those classes which welcomed instruction a system which is divorced from their needs in being purely literary, in admitting methods of unintelligent memorising and of cramming, and in producing, far in excess of the actual demands of Indian conditions, a body of educated young men whose training has prepared them only for Government service or the practice of law. The system of university education on Western lines is represented as cutting off the students from the normal life of the country, and the want of connection between primary education in the vernaculars and higher education in English is regarded as another radical defect.”

The period of sixty years mentioned is evidently counted from 1858, the year in which the rule of the East India Company ceased and the Crown assumed direct responsibility for the Government of India. British rule in India however began in 1757 a.d. and the foundation of public education in India under the British might well be considered to have been laid by Warren Hastings in 1781, in which year the Calcutta Madrassa was established. For a period of almost 50 years the discussion whether the Indians should be instructed in English or not went on until it was settled in 1835 by Lord Macaulay’s famous minute in favour of English and the European system. In 1824 there were 14 public institutions in Bengal imparting education on Western lines. In the same year, i.e., in 1824, Monstuart Elphinstone formulated a similar policy for the Bombay presidency. To the remarks made in the above quotation about the extent and kind of education imparted in India till now, the distinguished authors of the report add: “From the economic point of view India had been handicapped by the want of professional and technical

from the primary stage can be made attractive. But while the improvement of primary and middle schools is the first step to be taken, very much remains to be done in reorganising the secondary teachers and ensuring for the schoolmaster a career that will satisfy an intelligent man. The improvement of ordinary secondary education is obviously a necessary condition for the development of technical instruction and the reform of the university system. It is clear that there is much scope for an efficient and highly trained inspectorate in stimulating the work of the secondary schools and in helping the inspectorate of the primary schools maintained by the local bodies. We believe that the best minds in India, while they feel that the educational service has not in the past been widely enough opened to Indians trained at British universities, value the maintenance of a close connection with educationists from the United Kingdom.

“This survey of educational problems will show how much room there is for advance and improvement, and also how real the difficulties are. The defects of the present system have often been discussed in the legislative councils, but, as was inevitable so long as the councils had no responsibility, without due appreciation of financial difficulties, or serious consideration of the question how far fresh taxation for educational improvement would be acceptable. As we shall show, it is part of the political advance that we contemplate that the direction of Indian education should be increasingly transferred to Indian hands. Only so, we believe, can the stimulus be forthcoming which will enable the necessary money to be found.

The weak points are recognised. A real desire for improvement exists. Educational extension and reform must inevitably play an important part in the political progress of the country. We have already made clear our conviction that political capacity can come only through the exercise of political responsibility; and that mere education without opportunities must result in serious mischief. But there is another important element. Progress must depend on the growth of electorates and the intelligent exercise of their powers; and men will be immensely helped to become competent electors by acquiring such education as will enable them to judge candidates for their votes, and of the business done in the councils. No one would propose to prescribe an educational qualification for the

provide free and wholesome education to every child at public cost, that education should be compulsory up to the age of 18. The policy of the English Education Act of 1918 ought to be applied to India, and if it cannot be done from current funds, loans should be raised for the purpose. It is a matter which brooks of no delay. The whole future of India depends upon it. Nay, the future of humanity as a whole is affected by it. The world cannot be safe for any kind of democracy, nor can the world make progress towards a better order without the active cooperation of three hundred and fifteen million Indians forming one-fifth of the human race. Not only is the world poorer by reason of India's inability to cooperate in the work of progress but its present educational backwardness is a serious handicap to the rest of humanity going forward.

THE PROBLEM

We have so far discussed the Report and such remarks as we have made have been by way of comment. In this chapter we propose to give in brief outline our own view of the problem.

Let us first be clear about the exact nature of the Indian problem. Political institutions are, after all, only a reflection of the national mind and of national conditions. What is the end? The end is freedom to live and to live according to our own conception of what life should be, to pursue our own ideals, to develop our own civilization and to secure that unity of purpose which would distinguish us from the other nations of the world, insuring for us a position of independence and honor, of security from within and non-interference from without. We have no ambition to conquer and rule other peoples; we have no desire to exploit foreign markets; not even to impose our "kultur" and our "civilization" on others. At present we are counted among the backward peoples of the earth mainly because we are a subject people, governed by a foreign power, protected by foreign bayonets and schooled by foreign teachers.

The condition of our masses is intellectually deplorable and economically miserable; our women are still in bondage and do not enjoy that freedom which their Western sisters have won; our domestic masters, the prince and priest, are still in saddle; caste and privilege still hold some sway, yet it is not true that, taken

the poor was not so marked as it is today in the West. Under the British rule and since its introduction, however, things have changed considerably. Without adopting the best features of modern life, we have been forced by circumstances, political and economic, to give up the best of our own. Village communities have been destroyed; joint and corporate bargaining has given place to individual transactions; every bit of land has been separately measured, marked and taxed; common lands have been divided; the price of land and rent has risen abnormally. The money-lender who, before the advent of British rule, held an extremely subordinate position in the village community, has suddenly come to occupy the first place. He owns the best lands and the best houses and holds the bodies and souls of the agriculturalists in mortgage. The villages which were generally homogeneous in population, bound to each other by ties of race, blood and religion, have become heterogeneous, with nondescript people of all races and all religions who have acquired land by purchase. Competition has taken the place of cooperation.

A country where social cooperation and social solidarity reigned at least within castes, within villages and within urban areas has been entirely disrupted and disintegrated by unlimited and uncontrolled competition. India never knew any poor laws; she never needed any; nor orphan asylums, nor old age pensions and widow homes. She had no use for organized charity. Rarely did any man die for want of food or clothing, except in famines. Hospitality was open and was dispensed under a sense of duty and obligation and not by way of charity or kindness. The survival of the fittest had no hold on our minds. We had no factories or workshops. People worked in their own homes or shops either with their own money or with money borrowed from the money-lender. The artisans were the masters of the goods they produced and, unless otherwise agreed with the money-lender, sold them in the open market. The necessities of life, being cheap and easily procurable the artisans cared more for quality than quantity. Their work was a source of pleasure and pride as well as of profit to them. Now everything has, gone, pleasure, pride, as well as profit. Where profit has remained, pleasure and pride are gone. We are on the high road to a "distinctly industrial civilization." In fact, the principal complaint of our political reformers and free trade

the power to implant in full force and in full vigour the expiring European system, but power to keep out its development on vicious lines, with opportunities of gradually and slowly undoing the evil that has already been done. The Government of India as at present constituted is a Government of capitalists and landlords, of both) England and India. Under the proposed scheme the power of the former will be reduced and that of the latter increased. The Indo-British Association does not like it, not because it loves the masses of India for which it hypocritically and insincerely professes solicitude, but because in their judgment it reduces the profits of the British governing classes. We doubt if the scheme really does affect even that. But if it does, it is good so far.

The ugly feature of the scheme is not its potentiality in transferring the power into the hands of the Brahmins (the power of the Brahmin as such, is gone for good), but in the possibility of its giving too much power to the " profiteering " class, be they the land- lords of Bengal and Oudh, or the millionaires of Bombay. The scheme protects the European merchants; it confers special privileges on the small European Community; it provides special representation for the landlords, the Chambers of Commerce, the Mohammedans and the Sikhs. What is left for the general tax-paying public is precious little. The authors of the scheme say that to withhold complete and immediate Home Rule is in the interest of the general masses, the poor inarticulate ryot and the workingman. We wish we could believe in it. We wish it were true. Perhaps they mean it, but our past experience does not justify our accepting it at its face value.

There is, however, one thing we can do. We can ask them for proofs by insisting on and agitating for the immediate legislative relief of the ryot and the middle classes. We should adopt the aims of the British Labour Party as our own, start educating our people on those lines and formulate measures which will secure for them real freedom and not the counterfeit coin which passes for it. It will require years of education and agitation but it has to be done, no matter whether we are ruled by the British or by our own property holders. We are not opposed to Home Rule. Nay, we press for it. In our judgment the objections urged against giving it at once are flimsy and intangible. The chief obstacles are such as have been created or perpetuated by the British themselves.

This internationalism must have for its foundation justice and self-determination for all peoples, regardless of race or religion, creed or color. In the new understanding between nations cooperation must be substituted for competition and mutual trust and helpfulness for distrust and exploitation of the weaker by the stronger. The only alternatives are reaction, with the certainty of even greater war in the near future, and Bolshevism. Now, nobody knows what Bolshevism represents. The Socialists themselves are divided over it. The advanced wing is enthusiastic, the moderates are denouncing it. The Liberals and Radicals are freely recognizing that it has brought into the affairs of men a new spirit which is going to stay and substantially influence the future of the world. The stand-patters denounce it in the strongest possible terms. They calumniate it to their heart's content and move heaven and earth to exterminate it. But we feel that only radical changes in the existing order will stem its tide. The Socialists and Radicals want to make the most of it, while the Imperialist Liberals and Conservatives want to give as little as is compatible with the safety of the existing order in which they are supreme. The struggle will take some time, but that it will end in favor of the new spirit no one doubts.

The only way to meet Bolshevism is to concede rights to the different peoples of the earth, now being bled and exploited. Otherwise the discontented and exploited countries of the world will be the best breeding centres for it. India must come into her own soon, else not even the Himalayas can effectually bar the entry of Bolshevism into India. A contented, self-governing India may be proof against it; a discontented, dissatisfied, oppressed India perhaps the most fertile field. We hope the British statesmen are alive to the situation.

But that is not the only way to look at the international importance of India. By its geographical situation it is the connecting link between the Near East and the Far East and the clearing house for the trade of the world. Racially, it holds the balance between the European Aryan and the yellow races. In any military conflict between the white and the yellow races, the people of India will be a decisive factor. In a conflict of peace they will be a harmonising element. Racially they are the kin of the European. By religion and culture they are nearer the Chinese and

BOSE AND INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE STRUGGLE

When one thinks of the Indian independence movement in the 1930s and early 1940s, two figures most readily come to mind: Mahatma Gandhi, the immensely popular and “saintly” frail pacifist, and his highly respected, Fabian Socialist acolyte, Jawaharlal Nehru. Less familiar to Westerners is Subhash Chandra Bose, a man of comparable stature who admired Gandhi but despaired at his aims and methods, and who became a bitter rival of Nehru. Bose played a very active and prominent role in India’s political life during most of the 1930s. For example, he was twice (1938 and 1939) elected President of the Indian National Congress, the country’s most important political force for freedom from the *Raj*, or British rule.

While his memory is still held in high esteem in India, in the West Bose is much less revered, largely because of his wartime collaboration with the Axis powers. Both before and during the Second World War, Bose worked tirelessly to secure German and Japanese support in freeing his beloved homeland of foreign rule. During the final two years of the war, Bose—with considerable Japanese backing—led the forces of the Indian National Army into battle against the British.

IDEOLOGY OF FUSION

As early as 1930—in his inaugural speech as mayor of Calcutta—the fervent young Bose first expressed his support for a fusion of socialism and fascism: "... I would say we have here

But who has not failed." On another occasion Gandhi eulogized: "Netaji will remain immortal for all time to come for his service to India."

Many of Bose's admirers have been inclined to downplay or even ignore the fascist elements in his ideology, and even to pretend they never existed. For example, the text of Bose's inaugural speech as mayor of Calcutta, cited above, was reprinted in a laudatory 1970 "Netaji Birthday Supplement" of the *Calcutta Municipal Gazette*, but with all references to fascism, including his support for a synthesis of fascism and socialism, carefully deleted.

Several admiring biographers have found it easier to ignore the fascist elements in his ideology than to explain them. Their subjective accounts do not even inform the reader that Bose spoke positively about some features of fascism, or else, in an attempt to remove from their hero any possible taint, they qualify his remarks in ways that he himself did not. 'Fascist'?

During his lifetime, Bose was frequently denounced as a fascist or even a Nazi, particularly in the wake of the radical, revolutionary (as opposed to reformist) views he expressed in radio addresses broadcast to India from National Socialist Germany and, later, from quasi-fascist Japan. For example, *The Statesman*, a highly influential Calcutta periodical, charged in November 1941: "Mr. Bose's views are those of the Nazis, and he makes no secret of it," while the BBC, Britain's worldwide radio voice, frequently accused him of "Fascism" and "Nazism."

Additionally, historians and writers who do not admire Bose readily point up his "fascist" views. A.M. Nair, a historian who has written favourably of Indian revolutionary Rash Behari Bose (who had sought Japan's help during and after the First World War), found nothing to praise about Subhash Chandra Bose. After all, wrote Nair, he was clearly a fascist.

RECOGNIZED LEADERSHIP

Bose, a patriot of almost fanatical zeal, first joined the Indian national movement in 1921, working under C.R. Das, whom he idolized. He was jailed for six months in 1921-1922 because of his political activities. Immediately upon his release, the 25-year-old Bose organized (and presided over) the All-Bengal Young Men's

“Left-Wing revolt there will ultimately emerge a new full-fledged party with a clear ideology, programme and plan of action.” The programme and plan of action of this new party would, wrote Bose, follow this basic outline:

1. The party will stand for the interests of the masses, that is, of the peasants, workers, etc., and not for the vested interests, that is, the landlords, capitalists and moneylending classes.
2. It will stand for the complete political and economic liberation of the Indian people.
3. It will stand for a Federal Government for India as the ultimate goal, but will believe in a strong Central Government with dictatorial powers for some years to come, in order to put India on her feet.
4. It will believe in a sound system of state-planning for the reorganization of the agricultural and industrial life of the country.
5. It will seek to build up a new social structure on the basis of the village communities of the past, that were ruled by the village “Panch” and will strive to break down the existing social barriers like caste.
6. It will seek to establish a new monetary and credit system in the light of the theories and the experiments that have been and are current in the modern world.
7. It will seek to abolish landlordism and introduce a uniform land-tenure system for the whole of India.
8. It will not stand for a democracy in the Mid-Victorian sense of the term, but will believe in government by a strong party bound together by military discipline, as the only means of holding India together and preventing a chaos, when Indians are free and are thrown entirely on their own resources.
9. It will not restrict itself to a campaign inside India but will resort to international propaganda also, in order to strengthen India’s case for liberty, and will attempt to utilize the existing international organizations.

Second, the book was completed a full year before the commencement of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia (Abyssinia), in October 1935. While Bose would, by the time he completed his book, have known about such violent incidents as “The Night of the Long Knives”—the SS killing of dozens of SA men on June 30, 1934—he had no real reason to consider the European fascist regimes unusually violent, murderous or bellicose. “I should like to point out that when I was writing the book,” he later explained,

“Fascism had not started on its imperialistic expedition, and it appeared to me merely an aggressive form of nationalism. . . What I really meant was that we in India wanted our national freedom, and having won it, we wanted to move in the direction of Socialism. This is what I meant when I referred to a “synthesis between Communism and Fascism.” Perhaps the expression I used was not a happy one.”

Third, despite Bose’s claim to represent the political left, and that a party supporting a fusion of fascism and socialism would be ushered in by a “Left-Wing revolt,” the ideology he expounded might more appropriately be regarded as right wing. Bose’s ideology was radical and contained socialist elements—such as the desire to abolish the traditional class structure and create a society of equal opportunity, and the claim to represent the peasants and workers. To that extent it can be considered left wing. It is worth noting that Hitler’s “right wing” political movement—the National Socialist German Workers’ Party—shared many of Bose’s “socialist” goals. Nehru, a committed socialist, challenged Bose’s characterization of himself and his followers as left wing: “It seems to me that many of the so-called Leftists are more Right than the so-called Rightists. Strong language and a capacity to attack the old Congress leadership is not a test of Leftism in politics.”

Lastly, it should be noted that Bose was willing to tone down his more radical political beliefs on those occasions when he considered it advantageous or necessary to do so. For example, in his February 1938 inaugural speech as President of the Indian National Congress, Bose—probably in a sincere attempt to placate the Gandhian faction—made statements that appear to represent almost an about face from the political views he had expounded

for the complete political and economic liberation of the Indian people." Speaking of Bose a few days after his death in August 1945, Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"In the struggle for the cause of India's independence he has given his life and has escaped all those troubles which brave soldiers like him have to face in the end. He was not only brave but had deep love for freedom. He believed, rightly or wrongly, that whatever he did was for the independence of India... Although I personally did not agree with him in many respects, and he left us and formed the Forward Bloc, nobody can doubt his sincerity. He struggled throughout his life for the independence of India, in his own way."

Along with his abiding love for his country, Bose held an equally passionate hatred of the imperial power that ruled it: Great Britain. In a radio address broadcast from Berlin on March 1, 1943, he exclaimed that Britain's demise was near, and predicted that it would be "India's privilege to end that Satanic empire."

The fundamental principle of his foreign policy, Bose declared in a May 1945 speech in Bangkok, is that "Britain's enemy is India's friend." Although these two speeches are from his final years, they express views he had held since before his April 1921 resignation from the Indian Civil Service. It was this principle of making friends with Britain's enemies in the hope that they would assist him in liberating India that brought him in 1941 to Germany and then, in 1943, to Japan.

Violence or Non-Violence?

Bose envisaged that "the complete political and economic liberation of the Indian people" would inevitably require the use of force. Just before resigning from the Indian Civil Service, he discussed with Dilip Kumar Roy, his closest friend, the subject of anti-British terrorism. "I admit it is regrettable," he said, "even ugly if you will, though it also has a terrible beauty of its own. But maybe that beauty does not unveil her face except for her devotees."

Violence was not new to Bose, even at that early stage of his career. In 1916 he had been expelled from Presidency College in Calcutta for his part in the violent assault on Professor Edward

Independence League. The next day, Subhash Bose reviewed for the first time the soldiers of the Indian National Army (INA), which then comprised 13,000 men. In his address to the troops, which is a good example of his speaking style, he cited George Washington and Giuseppe Garibaldi as examples of men who led armies that won independence for their respective countries. Bose went on:

“Soldiers of India’s army of liberation!...

“Every Indian must feel proud that this Army—his own Army—has been organized entirely under Indian leadership and that, when the historic moment arrives, under Indian leadership it will go to battle...

“Comrades! You have voluntarily accepted a mission that is the noblest that the human mind can conceive of. For the fulfilment of such a mission, no sacrifice is too great, not even the sacrifice of one’s life...

“...Today is the proudest day of my life. For an enslaved people, there can be no greater pride, no higher honour, than to be the first soldier in the army of liberation. But this honour carries with it a corresponding responsibility, and I am deeply conscious of it. I assure you that I shall be with you in darkness and in sunshine, in sorrow and in joy, in suffering and in victory. For the present, I can offer you nothing except hunger, thirst, privation, forced marches and death. But if you follow me in life and in death, as I am confident you will, I shall lead you to victory and freedom. It does not matter who among us will live to see India free. It is enough that India shall be free, and that we shall give our all to make her free.

“May God now bless our Army and grant us victory in the coming fight!”

This “Free India Army” (“Azad Hind Fauj”) would not only “emancipate India from the British yoke,” he told the soldiers, but would, under his command, become the standing national army of the liberated nation.

Choreography for Impact

As his staging at the 1930 Calcutta session of the Congress party suggest, Bose understood early on the importance of political

and to show the world that he regarded himself as a political leader of substance and importance.

This naturally raises the question of Bose's leadership style. In the passage from *The Indian Struggle* quoted above at length, he expressed his belief in what he called "the dictatorship of the party" (the party being the governing body of a free India), but he did not specify the precise nature of the party's leadership, or whether it, too, would be dictatorial. Most importantly, he did not state whether he saw himself as the party leader, or comment directly on what role he intended for himself in a free India. Nonetheless, clues about these details can be gleaned from other sections of *The Indian Struggle* and from the speeches and statements Bose made at various times throughout his career.

DETERMINED LEADERSHIP

Bose clearly admired strong, vigorous, military-type leaders, and in *The Indian Struggle* he listed several whom he particularly respected. These included Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and even a former British governor of Bengal, Sir Stanley Jackson. Nowhere in this book is there any criticism of these individuals (three of them dictators) for having too much power, yet another man is chastised for this: Mahatma Gandhi. Bose admired Gandhi for many things, not least his ability to "exploit the mass psychology of the people, just as Lenin did the same thing in Russia, Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany." But he accused Gandhi of accepting too much power and responsibility, of becoming a "Dictator for the whole country" who issued "decrees" to the Congress. According to Bose, Gandhi was a brilliant and gifted man, but, unlike Mussolini, Hitler and the others mentioned, a very ineffectual leader. Gandhi had failed to liberate India because of his frequent indecision and constant willingness to compromise with the Raj (something Bose said he would never do).

It is clear that Bose—who believed from his youth that he was destined for greatness—saw himself as a "strong" leader in the mold of those named above. "I ask those who have any doubts or suspicions in their minds to rely on me," he told the Indian Independence League Conference in Singapore on July 4, 1943. He continued:

AUTHORITARIAN RULE

Second, in contrast to his statement at the 1938 Haripura session of the Congress party (quoted above)—that leaders would be elected from below—Bose proclaimed, on October 21, 1943, the formation of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind (“Free India”). While retaining his post as Supreme Commander of the Indian National Army, he announced that he was naming himself Head of State, Prime Minister, and Minister for War and Foreign Affairs. (The most important of these positions—Head of State—he anticipated retaining in a free India.) These appointments involved no democratic process or voting of any kind. Further, the authority he exercised in these posts was dictatorial and often very harsh. He demanded total obedience and loyalty from the Indians in south Asia, and any who opposed him, his army or government faced imprisonment, torture, or even execution.

Additionally, if wealthy Indians did not contribute sufficient funds to Bose’s efforts, they risked confiscation of their property. Bose’s threats were taken very seriously, and had the desired effect: funds did pour in. His INA troops were obliged to swear an oath of loyalty to both the Provisional Government and to him personally. He ordered the summary execution of all INA deserters, and also prepared (but was never able to implement) law codes for the entire population of India. These laws, which stipulated the death penalty for a range of offences, were to come into force when the INA, together with the Japanese Army, entered India to fight against the British. With regard to his leadership style during this 1943-1945 period, in fairness to Bose it should be pointed out that the entire world was then engulfed in a horrendous war, and political and military leaders everywhere, on all sides, adapted extraordinarily authoritarian and repressive measures. Some of the measures and policies adapted by the wartime government of the United States, for instance, were as oppressive and as severe as any planned or implemented by Bose.

A NEW INDIA

Bose clearly anticipated that the British would be driven out of India in an armed struggle (under his leadership), and that a social and political revolution would begin the moment the Indian people saw British rule under attack in India itself. This

been completed and “a new generation of men and women in India, fully trained and equipped for the battle of life” had emerged.

Bose clearly anticipated that authoritarian rule would not last beyond the period when social reconstruction was completed, and law and order were established—when India was “on its feet,” as he often wrote. As he frequently stated, Bose aimed for nothing less than the formation of “a new India and a happy India on the basis of the eternal principles of liberty, democracy and socialism.” He rejected Communism (at least as it was practiced in the Soviet Union) principally because of its internationalism, and because he believed that the theoretical ideal found in the writings of Marx could not be applied, without modification, to India. Still, he maintained socialist views throughout his adult life, and, on very many occasions, expressed his hope for an egalitarian (especially classless and casteless) industrialized society in which the state would control the basic means of production.

He was opposed to liberalism, believing that greater emphasis should be placed on social goals than on the needs or desires of individuals. Individual wishes, he reasoned, must be subordinated to the needs of the state, especially during the struggle for independence and the period of reconstruction immediately following liberation. Nonetheless, having himself been imprisoned eleven times and sent into exile three times, he was fully committed to upholding the rights of minority intellectual, religious, cultural and racial groups. He hoped for an “all-round freedom for the Indian people—that is, for social, economic and political freedom,” and would, he said “wage a relentless war against bondage of every kind till the people can become really free.”

It could be argued that he was not as committed to the principle of democracy as he was to socialism and freedom (as he defined it). While he extolled democracy on numerous occasions, at other times his words suggest a belief that other parties would have a place, in a free India, only as long as they were “working towards the same end, in whole or in part,” as his governing party. Political pluralism did not appeal to him at all. He seems to have envisioned a free India that was more authoritarian than democratic. His own actions as head of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind illustrate a lack of regard for the democratic process.

He called for mass mobilization not only in support of his army, but also for his dynamic new government, the various branches of which required financing and manpower.

Women's Equality

As can be seen from the passage quoted above, Bose called on both men *and* women for total support. Unlike the German National Socialists and the Italian Fascists, who stressed the masculine in almost all spheres of social and political activity, Bose believed that women were the equals of men, and should therefore be likewise prepared to fight and sacrifice for India's liberation. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s he had campaigned in India to bring women more fully into the life of the nation. After his return to Asia in 1943, he called on women to serve as soldiers in the Indian National Army—at the time a most radical view. "When I express my confidence that you are today prepared to fight and suffer for the sake of your motherland," he told the women's section of the Independence League in July 1943,

"I do not mean only to cajole you with empty words. I know the capabilities of our womanhood well. I can, therefore, say with certainty that there is no task which our women cannot undertake and no sacrifice and suffering which our women cannot undergo... To those who say that it will not be proper for our women to carry guns, my only request is that they look into the pages of our history. What brave deeds the Rani of Jhansi performed during the First War of Independence in 1857... Indians—both common people and members of the British Indian army—who are on the border areas of India, will, on seeing you march with guns on your shoulders, voluntarily come forward to receive the guns from you and carry on the struggle started by you."

A women's regiment was formed in 1943, and came to number about 1,000 women. It was named, appropriately, the "Rani of Jhansi Regiment," after a heroine of the Indian rebellion of 1857-58 against British rule. While those less suited to combat duties were employed as nurses and in other support roles, the majority were trained as soldiers. When the INA attacked British forces from Burma in east India in mid-1944, the women of the Jhansi Regiment fought alongside the men, suffering equally heavy casualties. When the army was forced to withdraw, the women

more specific about such matters. He appears to have had no precise ideas about political economy, save that economics was not important in itself but must be subordinated to national political considerations. Any discussion here of what economic systems he favoured, and when and how he intended to implement them, would thus be merely speculative.

Unique Political Ideology

While Bose's political ideology can reasonably be described as essentially "fascistic," two qualifying points need to be made here. First, his ideology and actions were not the result of any extreme neurotic or pathological psychosocial impulses. He was not a megalomaniac, nor did he display any of the pathological traits often attributed (rightly or wrongly) to fascist leaders, such as hostile aggression, obsessive hatred or delusions. Moreover, while he was an ardent patriot and nationalist, Bose's nationalism was cultural, not racialist. Second, his radical political ideology was shaped by a consuming frustration with the unsuccessful efforts of others to gain independence for India. His "fascist" outlook did not come from a drive for personal power or social elevation. While he was ambitious, and clearly enjoyed the devotion of his followers, his obsession was not adulation or power, but rather freedom for his beloved Motherland—a goal for which he was willing to suffer and sacrifice, even at the cost of his life.

Bose was favourably impressed with the discipline and organizational strength of fascism as early as 1930, when he first expressed support for a synthesis of fascism and socialism. During his stays in Europe during the 1930s, he was deeply moved by the dynamism of the two major "fascist" powers, Italy and Germany. After observing these regimes first-hand, he developed a political ideology of his own that, he was convinced, could bring about the liberation of India and the total reconstruction of Indian society along vaguely authoritarian-socialist lines. Bose's lack of success in his lifelong effort to liberate India from alien rule was certainly not due to any lack of effort. From 1921, when he became the first Indian to resign formally from the Indian Civil Service, until his death in 1945 as leader of an Indian government in exile, Subhash Chandra Bose struggled ceaselessly to achieve freedom and prosperity for his beloved homeland.

reason for Gandhi not to confront Bose directly rather than reverting to political trickery? It is important to be clear about one thing regarding this issue. Many intellectuals, despite having high regards for Bose, cannot consider the Bose-Gandhi feud objectively. It almost amounts to sin for them even to think that Gandhi can do something unethical. They meticulously desist from associating Gandhi with any sort of Machiavellian politics since they consider him as much above petty politics. Furthermore, they present the accounts of many contemporary revolutionaries who could not see any wrong in Gandhi's actions in spite of being Bose's followers. It is now time to show clearly how both schools of arguments do not hold ground.

Firstly, overwhelming evidence has come to light showing Gandhi directly involved in the conspiracy to remove Bose. Gandhi's statements, letters etc. of those days are now available with the publication of his complete works. However, it was not possible for the revolutionaries during the Tripuri session to understand Gandhi's intentions, which he did not share even with his closest associates. Thus, it was virtually impossible for those revolutionaries, who despite being followers of Bose respected Gandhi, to assess Gandhi's true character. Therefore, even as they were pained by the anti-Bose actions of Gandhi, they failed to realize the Machiavellian tactics adopted by him.

Secondly, the question of right or wrong is in once sense irrelevant here since Machiavellian strategies are to some extent required in realpolitik. If Gandhi was determined to get rid of Bose for the sake of his own power and influence then his actions can be regarded as the most unethical. On the other hand, if he was moved by the consideration that removing Bose was necessary for the good of the country then his actions cannot be labelled unethical, since the interest of the country is always larger than the individual. It is not easy to resolve this debate. It can however be resolved easily if Gandhi is seen as a clever politician instead of placing him in the high pedestal as a divine personality, without going into the question of right or wrong. It is abundantly evident that Gandhi was bothered by the rise of Bose and that he took recourse to a confrontation by proxy rather than facing him in a direct way. It was almost a nonviolent guerilla war. From Gandhi's point of view he was right. It is foolish to expect that he would

do so in a straightforward manner? Why did they bring Mahatma Gandhi between us?" On 4 April 1939 Sarat Chandra Bose, Bose's elder brother had written to Nehru along the same lines, "I believe I shall not be unjust if I say that the members of the Working Committee would have shown greater courage and straightforwardness if they had decided to act on their own and not used Mahatmaji as their cover. Their plain duty was to keep Mahatmaji above all controversy as he should be in our political life." Both put on the dock Gandhi's followers like Sardar Patel, Bhulabhai Desai etc.

Sarat Bose expressed his displeasure in a sharp letter written to Gandhi on 21 March 1939. He wrote, "Tripuri was an eye opener to me. The exhibition of truth and nonviolence of your chosen disciples stunk in my nostrils. The election of Subhash was not a defeat for yourself, but of the high command of which Sardar Patel is the shining light." In fact the conservative leadership comprising of Patel, Desai and others kicked up a vilification campaign against Bose at Tripuri after calling his illness a 'political fever.' Bose wrote about this painful experience in his essay "My strange Illness." Patel was the focus of his wrath in his letter of 28 March too. Bose wrote to Nehru, "Was there nothing wrong in Sardar Patel making full use of the name and authority of Mahatma Gandhi for electioneering purposes?" He failed to understand that his true opponent was Gandhi who was actually controlling the unfolding of events from behind the curtain. In that sense Patel and others did not take recourse to any trickery and confronted Bose openly. The allegations that Bose brought against them should have been raised against Gandhi. Why was he fighting a proxy war instead of playing a frontal role?

Gandhi wrote to his secretary Mahadev Desai on 29 January 1939 that he might not attend the Tripuri session if Bose wins the election. On 3 February 1939 he wrote to Nehru that he will serve the country although he will not attend the Congress session. He left for Rajkot on 27 February and the infamous Pant resolution was proposed on 8 March 1939: a classic example of pure Machiavellian politics. Gandhi knew well that the Pant resolution will be proposed in his absence, but then he will be able to deny any responsibility for the proposal. At a time when Bose was repeatedly asking for Gandhi's opinion and seeking his

Gandhi's challenge and constitute a cabinet of his liking. However Bose did not accept the advice. This was one reason of losing the support of the leftists. Revolutionary of the Juagantar group told the writer that Bose's seeking of Gandhi's support, who had meted him such undignified treatment, also led to anger in certain sections of the revolutionary groups. Late Manohar Mukhopadhyay, another revolutionary of the Jugantar group, also told the writer that Bose was hesitant act against Gandhi.

Perhaps there is some truth in such opinion, but if Bose showed any soft attitude in certain situations towards Gandhi it was due to strategic reasons, not due to any weakness. The former Prime Morarji Desai has made a laughable statement in his autobiography that Gandhi accepted Bose as the President in the Haripura Congress only after Bose promised that he will go by Gandhi's directions. Those familiar with Bose's character know well that he was not one to submit to Gandhi in such a way, but might have just restrained his extreme revolutionary identity for the time being. Rajendra Prasad has written in his autobiography that if Bose had expressed his willingness to be re-elected to Gandhi perhaps the Tripuri conflict could have been avoided. How strange! Would Bose beg Gandhi for his democratic rights? He did not compromise on this issue because with all his respect for Gandhi he was not prepared to take his words as the final. And if he had withdrawn himself from the contest in accordance with Gandhi's wishes, he could not have held his head high in future. This would have not only set a bad precedent, but would have stifled democracy in Congress. Of course democracy was ultimately stifled in Congress due to Gandhi and his followers, but Bose was not involved with that. He did not sign the death warrant of democracy in Congress. It can of course be asked that why did Bose allow Pant resolution to be raised knowing that it was unconstitutional and undemocratic? He explained to Gandhi in a letter written on 25 March 1939 that he could have vetoed this proposal but did not do so because his democratic outlook had the priority over the issue of constitutional validity. He also wrote, "I felt it would be unmanly to take shelter behind the constitution at a time when I felt that there was the possibility of an adverse vote."

This is where Bose committed a blunder since it made easy for Gandhi to write on 30 March 1939, "Since you think that Pant's

politics of Congress. He wanted a compromise with Gandhi in the interest of the larger interest of the country. The British Raj always wanted to split India by its divide and rule policy. Bose wanted to rise above personal grievances realizing that the internal conflict will only strengthen the British policy of divide and rule. But Gandhi was immovable from his position and thus all efforts of Bose failed. It must be remembered that despite all this Bose kept the path of cooperation with Gandhi open. He also joined the special session of Congress on Gandhi's invitation at Wardha after being expelled from Congress. Bose-baiters might see an effort of appeasement in this but if Bose truly had any weakness for Gandhi he wouldn't have searched for an alternative to the Gandhian way. Probably he had hoped that he would be able to convince Gandhi to accept the relevance and importance of his plan of action. When he realized that he was only chasing a mirage, he decided to leave the country. Whether the country gained or suffered a loss will be judged by history but the fact remains that Bose was the only leader who showed the courage of proposing an alternative to the Gandhian way. The main source of his conflict with Gandhi can be found in his unique nature.

Paradoxical Ethics

Many people have charged Gandhi for adopting unethical means to get rid of Bose. According to this writer, the whole issue needs to be judged from a different point of view. As Krishna advised the Pandavas to take recourse to action which apparently was Adharma to be able to ensure victory of truth, Gandhi wanted to achieve a larger ethical framework by going through apparently unethical means. This can be called paradox of morality. Concepts of right and wrong etc. are never absolute. These are relative and can vary according to the time, place, persons involved etc. Gandhi's stubborn attitude towards Bose actually proves the flexibility of his mental makeup because it clearly shows that he did not cling on to any particular idea about morality. Many people have opined that the rigid attitude shown initially by Gandhi towards the issue of violence and nonviolence was much relaxed during his later years. According to this author, it was on the issue of morality that Gandhi showed the most flexibility. He surpassed even Machiavelli in political maneuvering. Yet many intellectuals are still skeptical about this. Actually they have

A critic definitely has the right to interpret and analyse events, but it is desirable to be rational rather than be driven by emotions. Thirdly, Shri Das has cited the following quote from Gandhi, "No doubt I like politics too. But it is a different kind. There is no place for scheming in it." There is no doubt about the veracity of the quote, it should be interpreted with an open mind. To say that there was no place of scheming in Gandhi's political activities or in his thoughts is to belittle him. Although he appeared as a saint actually he was a shrewd politician. Otherwise he couldn't have bothered the British Raj to that extent. The saintly prophetic image covered his true identity of a political leader of unlimited intelligence. Nothing is unmixed right or wrong in politics, but depends on the situation. What Gandhi meant by the above quote is that he cannot accept scheming for fulfilling petty ambitions of individuals. That does not mean he was indifferent to use of political maneuvering for achieving political goals. The tendency to paint Gandhi as a superhuman or a saint has stemmed from the traditional concepts of morality. Any assessment of Gandhi will be one-sided, nebulous and irrational if this illusion of traditionalism is not transcended.

The purpose of this essay is not to belittle Gandhi. The reader will notice that nowhere has Gandhi's campaign to oust Bose been termed as immoral or unethical. At the same time it is not possible to know the truth by imposing divinity on Gandhi. It is not possible to stay above conflicts after entering the world of politics. It is also a fact that once inside the political whirlpool, even great men show self-contradicting attributes. It is not desirable to ignore such attributes due to blind devotion. The centre space of politics is focused towards human beings and not divinities. Therefore any search for political values should be focused on human nature and not divine ones. The spiritual politics that Gandhi refers to is primarily morality-based politics but such morality is dynamic and ever changing. It is not bound by any ideological limits. It is the humble submission of this writer that many problems will be solved more easily if neither Gandhi nor Bose is treated as superhuman or divine beings, but as humans of flesh and blood.

civilizations, such as Egypt or Babylon, Phoenicia or even Greece, the ancient culture and civilization of India is not dead. It still lives in the present. And we Indians of today think the same thoughts fundamentally, the same thoughts and have the same feelings, the same ideals of life, as our forefathers who lived 2,000 or 3,000 years ago. In other words, there is a continuity, historical and cultural continuity, extending from ancient times till the present day-which is in some ways a very remarkable thing in history. Now, in order to understand India, this fundamental fact should first be understood, namely, that the India of the past is not dead. India of the past lives in the present, and will live in the future.

Against this background, this ancient background, we see changes in our national life from age to age. During the last 3,000 years, people have come into India from outside with new ideas, some times with new cultures. All these new influences, ideas and cultures have been gradually absorbed into the national life of India, so that in spite of the fact that, fundamentally we have the same culture and civilization as we had several thousand years ago, we have nevertheless changed and moved with the times. Today, in spite of our ancient background, we are able to live in a modern world and adapt ourselves to that world.

Those who have been influenced, whether consciously or unconsciously by British propaganda, have the impression that India was very easily conquered by the British and also that after the British conquest of India our country was for the first time politically unified. Both these notions are entirely wrong and without foundation. In the first place, it is not true that India was easily conquered by the British. It took British 100 years, from 1757 to 1857, to finally subjugate India. Secondly, it is also an entirely wrong notion to think that India was politically unified by the British. The fact is that India was for the first time politically unified nearly 2,500 years ago under the Buddhist Emperor, Ashoka the Great. In reality, India of the time of Ashoka the Great was even larger than the India of today. Ashoka's India included not only modern India, but also Afghanistan and a part of Persia.

After the time of Ashoka, India has gone through many ups and downs in her national life. There have been periods decay, followed by periods of progress and national upheaval. But through

made by India as a result of her own effort and initiative and last but not the least, the distinction which we have attained in the field of sports, all these go to show that in spite of being politically subjugated the vitality of the nation has remained intact.

If under foreign rule and in spite of the obstacles and restrictions that follow from foreign rule, we could give so much proof of our creative faculty, then it stands to reason that when India is free and when the masses of the Indian people are afforded educational facilities, they will be able to give much better proof of their intellectual calibre and creative faculty in different walks of life.

I have just referred to the first test of a nation's vitality, namely, creative faculty. I shall now consider the second test, namely, as to whether the Indian people are able to fight and to die for the sake of freedom. On this point I should like to say, first of all, that, since the last great fight that they had with the British in 1857, the Indian people have not given up the struggle against the enemy, even for one day.

Unfortunately, owing to what I would call the folly of our forefathers, after our final defeat in 1857, the leaders in those days had allowed themselves to be disarmed. Whatever difficulty we have subsequently experienced in winning back our freedom has been due to largely our having been disarmed. But though owing to the mistake of the leaders the people were disarmed, nevertheless they continued to fight for their freedom in other ways.

I shall not take up your time unnecessarily by giving a description of all the methods that have been used in India against the British. I will only say this, that all the methods that have been tried by revolutionists in different parts of the world for the achievement of their own independence have been tried in India.

At the beginning of the century, particularly after the victory of Japan over Russia in 1904 and 1905, the freedom movement in India got a new impetus and since then, during the last 40 years, our revolutionaries have been studying very closely the methods of revolutionaries in other countries and they have tried to adopt as many of their methods as possible. They have tried also to manufacture secretly arms and explosives for the achievement of

note of the three important factors. The first factor is the ancient background, that is, the ancient culture and civilisation of India, of which the Indian people of today are conscious, and of which they feel proud. The second factor is the struggle which has gone on without any break or interruption since we were finally overpowered by the British. And the third factor consists of certain influences which have come into India from outside.

Modern India is composed of its ancient background, the unbroken national struggle against Britain, and the impact of influences from abroad.

I shall now deal, in some detail with the influences which have reacted on India from outside and which have been responsible, to some extent, in making modern India what it is today. Among these outside influences, the first factor is the influence of Western thought which was crystallized in Liberalism, Constitutionalism and Democracy.

In other words, since 1857, modern liberal and democratic thought has been influencing the intellectuals of India to a large extent.

From the beginning of the present century, a new factor came into operation. After the victory of Japan over Russia in 1904-1905, the eyes of the Indian people were opened to a new movement in Asia—the movement for the revival of not merely of Japan-of other Asiatic countries. Since then, Indian thought has been greatly interested in Asiatic revival. During the last 40 years we have been thinking not merely of what was happening inside India, but also of what was happening in other parts of Asia.

Another important factor which had influenced our mind consisted of the struggles that have gone on in different parts of the world. Indian revolutionaries studied the Risorgimento Movement in Italy under the leadership of Mazzini and Garibaldi and the struggle of the Irish people against their British oppressors.

In Russia, before the last World War, there was, as you know, a movement against the Czar called Nihilist movement. That also was studied. And nearer India the new awakening of China under the leadership of Dr. Sun Yat-sen was also studied very closely and with great interest by the Indian revolutionaries.

toward the acceptance of Western ideas. Generally speaking, his attitude is one of antagonism. But in actual practice he has not always acted in accordance with his own ideas, the reason being that the rest of the country do not share that hostility or antagonism which Mahatma Gandhi personally has toward Western ideas and concepts. You all know about Mahatma Gandhi's attitude on the question of violence of physical force. He does not advocate the use of arms, or the shedding of blood of the enemy for gaining one's freedom. This attitude towards violence or physical force is closely related to his general attitude toward foreign influence, particularly Western influence.

Our generation has followed Mahatma Gandhi as the leader of a political struggle, but has not accepted his ideas on all these questions. Therefore, it would be a mistake to take Mahatma Gandhi as the exponent of the thoughts and ideas of the present generation in India.

Gandhi is in some ways a complex personality and I would like to analyze his personality, so that you may understand him better. In Gandhi, there are two aspects—Gandhi as a political leader and Gandhi as a philosopher. We have been following him in his capacity as a political leader, but we have not accepted his philosophy.

Now the question arises as to how we can separate the two aspects. Why, if we do not accept his philosophy, are we following him? Though Gandhi has his own philosophy of life, he is a practical politician and therefore, he does not force his own philosophy on the people. Consequently though we are following him in our political struggle, we are free to follow our own philosophy. If Gandhi had tried to thrust his philosophy on us, we would not have accepted him as a leader. But he has kept his philosophy separate from his political struggle.

I have mentioned as representatives and exponents of the last generation Tagore and Gandhi. Now let us compare their philosophies. There are some points in which they agree, but in some other points they do not. The points on which they agree are firstly, that they would like to see the national struggle being conducted without the use of arms. In other words, on the question of physical force, they have the same views. On the question of

problems. For the present, of course, the biggest problem is how to fight and win this war. But that is a problem of which you are aware from what you have read in the papers or heard over the radio. I will now consider some of the problems of Free India.

The moment India is free, the most important problem will be organizing of our national defence in order to safe guard our freedom in future. For that we shall have to build up modern war industries, so that we may produce the arms that we shall need for self-defence. This will mean a very big programme of industrialization.

After satisfying the needs of our nation in the matter of self-defence, the next problem in the degree of importance will be that of poverty and unemployment. India today is one of the poorest countries in the world, but India was not poor before we came under the British rule. In fact, it was the wealth of India which attracted the European nations to India. One cannot say that in the matter of national wealth or resources India is poor. We are rich in natural resources, but owing to British and foreign exploitation, the country has been impoverished. So our second most important problem will be how to give employment to the millions of unemployed in India and how to relieve the appalling poverty which now exists among the masses of the Indian people.

The third problem in free India will be the problem of education. At present, under British rule, about 90% of the people are illiterate. Our problem will be to give at least an elementary education to the Indian masses as soon as possible, and along with that to give more facilities to the intellectual classes in the matter of higher education.

Connected with the question of education is another problem which is important for India and that is the question of script. In India there are principally two scripts in vogue. One is the script known as Sanskrit (or Nagri) script and the other is Arabic (or Persian) script. Up till today in all national affairs and conferences we have been using both theses scripts. I must ad that in some provinces, there are scripts in vogue which are modifications of Sanskrit script. But fundamentally there are two scripts, and in all national affairs and conferences we have to use both these two scripts.

occurred or why, if Kuomintang Party has interests of Chinese masses at heart, there should be any need to have a separate party like the Communist Party under foreign influence. Having learnt from experience, we do not want to repeat the mistake that China has made. We actually find today that because the nationalist movement in our generation has identified itself with the peasants who form more than 90% of the people, because we have their interests at heart, there is no *raison d'être* for a separate party like the Communist Party. If the nationalists in India did not have the interests of the masses at heart, then you would have seen the same phenomenon as you see in China today.

Now we come to another question-namely, the political system or Government. If we are to have an economic structure of a socialistic character, then it follows that the political system must be such as to be able to carry out that economic programme in the best possible way. You can not have a so-called democratic system, if that system has to put through economic reforms on a socialistic basis. Therefore, we must have a political system-a State-of an authoritarian character. We have had some experience of democratic institutions in India and we have also studied the working of democratic institutions in countries like France, England and the United States of America. And have come to the conclusion that with a democratic system we cannot solve the problems of a Free India. Therefore, modern progressive thought in India is in favour of a State of an authoritarian character, which will work as an organ, or as the servant of the masses, and not clique or of a few rich individuals.

That is our idea with regard to the political institution in Free India. We must have a government that will function as the servant of the people and will have full powers to put through new reforms concerning industry, education, defence, etc., in Free India.

Before I pass into the next problem, I should like to mention another point, namely the attitude of Free India toward religion and caste. This is a question that is frequently asked. India has several religions. Consequently, the Government of Free India must have an absolutely neutral and impartial attitude toward all religions and leave it to the choice of every individual to profess

people the British turn around and say that we are not fit to be free. I should also point out that if you take a modern power like Soviet Russia and see how heterogeneous the composition of the Soviet Union is, you will realise that if, in spite of this heterogeneous character, so many different races professing so many different religions could be unified in one political system and become such a strong Power, there is absolutely no reason why India which has much more homogeneity than the Soviet Union, should not be united as one nation. As a matter of fact, you will find that outside India, where there is no British influence, there are no differences among the Indian people. In the Independence Movement in East Asia and in the Indian National Army there is no question of religion or caste or class. It is just in India where the British have influence and control that you will find these differences.

On the question of National unity, I should like to give you a friendly warning that British propaganda tries to give the world the impression that the Muslims of India do not support the independence movement. This is wrong. Very often you read in the papers about certain organizations like the Muslim League or the Hindu Mahasabha. The British boost these organizations, because they are in their policy pro-British and are against the Indian National Congress, and they try to make out that the Muslim League represents the Muslims of India. But that is British propaganda. The fact is that the Muslim League and its leader, Mr. Jinnah, represent only a minority of the Indian Muslims. The majority of the Indian Muslims are nationalists and they support the independence movement, as much as anyone else. The President of the Indian National Congress is a Muslim, and so are many other members of the congress, many of whom are in prison today.

These facts are not known to the outside world and the outside world gets the impression that Mr. Jinnah represents all the Muslims of India and that they are not supporting the nationalist movement. So I would like to give out this warning about British propaganda.

I have already told you about the kind of economic and political system that we would like to have in Free India. Out of

We can solve our problems by making the State the servant of the masses. There is another point which has been overemphasized by Soviet Russia and that is the problem of the working classes. India being predominantly a country of peasants, the problem of the peasants will be more important than the problem of the working classes.

Another point on which we do not fully agree is that, according to Marxism, too much importance is given to the economic factor in human life. We fully appreciate the importance of the economic factor which was formerly ignored, but it is not necessary to overemphasize it.

To repeat once again our political philosophy should be a synthesis between National Socialism and Communism. The conflict between thesis and antithesis has to be resolved in a higher synthesis. This is what the law of the Dialectic demands. If this is not done, then human progress will come to an end. India will, therefore, try to move to the next stage of political and social evolution. I will now pass on the last point in my address, and that is our conception of an international order. On this point I have already spoken several times in Tokyo. I fully support the steps that have been taken through the Joint Declaration to create a new order in East Asia on the basis of freedom, justice and reciprocity. I have been personally greatly interested in international problems, having tried to work in several countries in order to get support for our movement and, in that connection; I also had the opportunity of studying the work of the League of Nations.

The experiment of the League of Nations has failed, and it is desirable and profitable for us to investigate as to why it failed. If I were to answer that I would say that it failed because the sponsor-nations were too selfish and short-sighted. The sponsor-nations were England, France and America. America dropped out of the League, so the Powers that controlled the League were England and France.

Now these two leading Powers, instead of setting an example of unselfishness, tried to use the League of Nations for their selfish interests and for their own benefit. The only basis on which we can set up an international order is freedom, justice and reciprocity.

reason why the experiment should not be a success. I should like to emphasize again the tremendous responsibility which Japan has undertaken by becoming the sponsor-nation in this task. And when I talk of the responsibility of the nation, I want also to stress the responsibility of the youths. The youths of today will be the nation and leaders of tomorrow. An idea that is welcomed and supported by the youths will one day be supported by the whole nation. But an idea which does not find support among the youths will die a natural death. Therefore, their responsibility for making this new order a success devolves, in the last analysis, on the youths of this country. I hope and pray and trust that the youths and the students who are the future representatives of the nation will realise the tremendous moral responsibility which Japan has undertaken in initiating this new order.

There may be people who doubt whether a nation can rise to a high moral level, whether a nation can be farsighted and unselfish and undertake the work of establishing a new order. I have every faith in mankind. If it is possible for one individual to be unselfish, to live one's life at a high moral level, I see no reason why an entire nation cannot also rise to that level. In the history of the world we have seen examples in which a revolution has changed the mentality of a whole nation and made it rise to a high level of morality. Therefore, if anybody has any doubt whether an entire nation can rise to that level, then I do not share that doubt.

I repeat, in conclusion, that the sponsor-nation should realize the tremendous responsibility that it has undertaken. This is a task not only for the leaders and the politicians, but for the whole nation and especially for those who are the hopes of the nation—the youths and the students.

GLIMPSES OF NETAJI

Two questions which I am often asked about Netaji are, one about his personality and another about his life. The first question is, what was so exceptional in his ability which attracted and inspired those who came in touch with him? Whenever I am asked this question, I am reminded of the fable of "The Elephant and the blind men." Like one of those men I could not scan that

out of the room and sat at the type writer. Abid and Swami went to his room in turn and brought me the Proclamation manuscript, sheet after sheet, as Netaji finished it. What amazed me was that he never even once wanted to see any earlier pages that he had written. How he could remember every word that he had written in the preceding pages, how he could remember the sequence of the paragraphs? In the entire script there was not one word corrected or scored out, and the punctuation was complete.

That he wrote out the whole proclamation sheet after sheet without break and at one sitting was some measure of Netaji's clear thinking, remarkable memory and grasp and facile pen! The entire historic proclamation was written with the ease with which a brief letter could be penned."

The proclamation shows Netaji's extraordinary grasp of history.

Alexander Werth, one of the important Liaison Officers at the Free India Centre, in Chapter Four, "Planning for Revolution-1941-1943", in the book, *A Beacon Across Asia*, edited by Sisir K Bose, Alexander Werth and SA Ayer (published by Orient Longman) has observed (page 127):

"Those who observed Bose during these years were all greatly impressed by the fact he succeeded so well in convincing all his co-workers-both Indian and German-about the great importance of the work they were doing and inspiring them with a sense of mission, common objectives and mutual cooperation. Whenever there were differences of opinion or misunderstanding or even quarrels amongst his colleagues, he showed his remarkable capacity of keeping the thread of all activities of his political, military and technical co-workers in his hands so that the over all control of the whole organisation remained with him. He was the driving spirit behind all activities of the Free India Center. He succeeded in doing so much inspite of the fact that the organisation that he built up was something between an official mission and a provisional government and no so fully recognized association of a group of exiles from India."

Earlier, after his arrival in Berlin, Netaji went under the name of Orlando Mazzota for quite some time. He intended to remain

Though apparent from above, still it must be specially agreed that the Indian forces, while operating in any joint sub-command, must not be deployed on any front other than against the British or other troops under the British command subject to any unforeseen military entanglements. While the free India establishment and its forces would support all anti British actions, it would not ipso facto consider itself at war with the other allies of Great Britain. The Nazis were flabbergasted to see the terms. Were these conditions of a powerless one-man state for cooperation with the Reich? The man must be cut to size. The task was assigned to one of Ribbentrop's senior officers who came to meet Bose in the Foreign Office with an SS Colonel accompanying him in the mission. The following account of the conversation which took place has been given by Vyas:

"Your Excellency", Ribbentrop's officer began, "While we realise on many questions, don't you think that after your having come here, there could be no activity of any kind unless the German government voluntarily agrees to it?"

Subhash Chandra Bose replied: "Do you mean that you could put me in prison if I do not agree to work on your terms?"

"Certainly not, Your Excellency", the SS Colonel interposed, "but you would be incapacitated and will have to remain inactive."

Bose: "If I wanted to remain inactive I would have remained in a British prison. But this war provides a unique chance for my country to be free. So I would rather go else where or even to India and fight from there, come what may."

The Foreign Office representative commented sarcastically, "But Your Excellency, even for leaving Germany, you will require our permission, isn't it?"

Apparently the officer bargained for more than he could afford, because the reply that came stunned him. : "Sir, I have heard a lot about your Gestapo. Probably the gentleman here is a representative of that body. But believe me, the British CID in India is no less efficient and ruthless. And if I have failed them and escaped, I shall do the same here. I have not come here to live the life of an exile. Gentleman, I think we shall leave it at that." The meeting came to an end abruptly.

Chandra Bose. There have been 'netas', many of them will come and go but Netaji will remain only one and one only Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose.

BOSE IN TOKYO

About Netaji's early days in Tokyo, Dr. Joyce Lebra in her book, *Jungle Alliance* has this to say: "After several week on a submarine Bose was exhausted and in need of rest. But he had one aim in Tokyo, an obsession. He had to meet Premier Tojo. Yamamoto after a few days arranged meetings with Army Chief of Staff Sugiyama, Foreign Minister Shigemitsu, Navy Minister Yonai, and various section chiefs of the Army, Navy and Foreign Ministers. Bose's opening words to Sugiyama took the Chief of Staff by surprise. "The war will end in victory for Japan!" Bose boomed. Japan was in the midst of adverse circumstances in Guadalcanal and the campaign was obviously not going well for Japan, perhaps Bose's statement was a material resource. Bose continued with out waiting for a response from the bemused Chief of Staff, "Will Japan send soldiers to India or not? We are going to fight our way to India step by step. If we don't push on with determination we won't be able to achieve Independence."

"The immediate reaction of Sugiyama was that Bose had none on the humility or reserve a Japanese would have shown in such an interview. But there was no doubting his sincerity of his aims. He was a known quantity, whatever Operations Bureau of IGHQ thought of his value to Japan. Sugiyama, despite his interest and sympathy derived from two year's experience in India, could only respond to Bose with a briefing about Japan's current military position. Bose, dissatisfied with Sugiyama's general discussion, explained with great fervour his hope of first taking Chittagong, then pushing on into Bengal. Sugiyama assured Bose of his sympathy with Bose's aspirations, and Bose's first interview in Tokyo ended more calmly than it had begun. But Bose was dissatisfied. He had to meet Tojo and get Japanese commitment. Yamamoto, meanwhile acting as a guide for Bose, for ten days escorted him through factories, schools and hospitals, trying to distract his attention from Tojo and keep him occupied. Bose was impressed with what he saw but not deterred from his object.

cooperation was the crucial point. In this Bose had succeeded admirably, and Tojo was ready to make public his official support to Bose and the INA.

On 16 June Bose visited the House of Peers in the 82nd Extraordinary Session of the Diet. Tojo made a historic address on the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere which attracted attention outside Japan. Bose listened intently in the audience to interpreters as Tojo said, "India has been for centuries under cruel rule. We wish to express righteous indignation at their agony and sympathy for their aspirations for complete independence. We firmly resolve that Japan will do everything possible to help Indian independence, I am convinced the day of Indian freedom and prosperity is not far off..." Tojo spoke too of the emancipation of all of East Asia. This was not Tojo's first mention of India in the Diet. Early in 1942 he had spoken of the Pacific war as an opportunity for India to rise against British Rule. But, this time when Tojo promised aid and cooperation for Indian Independence Bose was listening in his audience and felt Tojo was making him a promise which he would follow through."

In the 11th Chapter of this treatise I narrated how cool, fearless and graceful was Netaji under fire. Now I wish to portray in General Shah Nawaz Khan's own words from his book, *My Memories of INA & Its Netaji* (Rajkamal Publications, Delhi-page 179) another picture of Netaji under fire. "He listened to me very calmly, because he knew that all that I said came from the very depths of my heart and was prompted by my extreme anxiety for his safety, he just smiled and said, "Shah Nawaz, it is no use pleading with me, I have made up my mind to go to Popa and I am going there. You don't have to worry about my safety, as I know England has not yet produced the bomb that can kill Subhash Chandra Bose."

This last statement appeared particularly true, as Netaji seemed to lead a charmed life. That afternoon the place he was living in was heavily bombed by Sixty B-25. They caused terrible devastation all around, and it was difficult to imagine how Netaji escaped with out even a scratch. All of us had failed to persuade Netaji not to proceed any further, but once he had made up his mind no one could change it."

and he understood completely. Later I heard that he told his men, "Now that Germany and Italy are out of the war, we must continue it with the Japanese as long as they are still in it; and if they too are knocked out we must fight on by ourselves." Those words spoken during the greatest crisis of his life sum up the essential spirit and character of the man. Time masses and powerful men in their day come and go, and a few of them, a very few, leave behind memories which live on and even grow by themselves with the years. Such men become part of the ultimate story of their people. There is every reason to believe that Subhash Chandra Bose is among those few men, I need not say more."

Netaji's personality appealed so much to us that he would ever remain and live as a superhuman hero in imagination of not only us who has the good luck to work with him but also in the imagination of our people. His spirit of patriotism is bound to manifest itself in the future generations and serve not only India and Asia but also the world. His very name commanded our subconscious mind without knowing and thus brought out the latent good lying deep down in and individual. Imagine a jawan having been awarded death punishment for committing heinous crime, i.e. rape and when given the option to appeal to Netaji against my award, the man cried out, "No sir, shoot me here rather than sending me to Netaji. Now I have no face which I can show him (ab main Netaji ko kya moonh dikhaunga?)

I am reminded of the man who when admonished by his Section Commander for exposing himself to the enemy fire, the raw recruit retorted, "How can I be killed today when Netaji himself has sent me a pair of boots?" It was that confidence in Netaji which made us face a enemy superior to us in all respects.

In his book *Builders of Modern India-Subhash Chandra Bose* (Dr. Girija K Mookerjee (Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India) on page 104 says:

"The question to all of us is then: Will Subhash be remembered by the generations to come? I think he will. At least it was for this recompense that his restless soul traversed oceans and foreign lands in search of an answer to India's freedom. It is too horrible to think that he is no longer amongst us, to his colleagues he will remain ever alive, ever green and immortal.

to wash hands, shedding tears with immediate steps to supply relief. Such spontaneous feelings coming out of his heart made him extraordinarily a rare leader of men in war. His men felt happy, proud and lucky to do and die under his command. It was this relationship which kept up our morale in spite of all our difficulties and deficiencies.

Netaji's knowledge of history of wars fought on different battlefields of the world could easily surpass the knowledge of any seasoned General. He read a lot and did his homework on the subject and he had to deal with. When we had to see anybody he would learn all about the person and his problems before the interview. The result was that the man could go back happy and contented that the Supreme Commander knew him intimately. An interview with Netaji went a long way in creating that confidence without which it is impossible to wage a revolutionary war.

He had a gift of judging the character of a man which served him to put the right man at the right place at the right time in the right job. He picked up some of us from the dust and made heroes out of us.

He never failed to appreciate when appreciation was due. A good word from him made us to strive to do our job well. He had a very kind heart, so kind that he never punished anybody. He always gave a defaulter an advice so that the defaulter could improve himself.

He had remarkable power of observation and could predict any eventuality correctly. Once he wrote a small note to me on the margins of a routine order. It was scribbled in his own hand. He told me that as the mail was getting ready to be dispatched, he wanted to advice me that instead of expecting the enemy at a particular point which I had reported in my previous report, I should also watch at a point. He gave 6 figured map reference. The note was written in Rangoon about 500 kms away from me. When I received it I was surprised at the accuracy of Netaji's judgment. I was already facing the enemy where he had told me to watch. This was measure of Netaji's skill at generalship. Again, I am reminded of my conversation with him when he gave me the command of The Nehru Brigade-4, the Guerrilla Regiment. I

As soon as the first INA trial of the three front line commanders started on 5th November 1945, within a week disturbances broke out in Lahore, then in Lucknow and in Calcutta where hundreds of demonstrators were injured and twenty killed by the police firing. Even after the first INA trial in which the three accused officers were released by the Commander in Chief, the public demand to stop the future INA trials continued. Anti British Raj feelings kept on rising unabated. The climax came with the mutiny of the Royal Indian Navy in Bombay during February 1946. There were further disturbances in Royal Indian Air Force in Karachi and certain units of the Armed forces in Jabalpur. The British Top brass were for a strict action. The British were however lucky that Field Marshal Sir Claude Auchinleck, the Commander in Chief in India could read the writing in the wall. Netaji's stratagem had transformed the British Indian Army into the Indian Army. The days of the British Raj in India were close to their end.

Having shown Netaji's powers of Generalship which turned the defeat of the INA into the defeat of the British Raj, let me record that another great asset in Netaji's being was that he was at once secular. Whatever our religion and the area or the situation of our birth, we had full confidence that we would get absolute justice from him and his Government-the forerunner of our Government today. To show how his mind worked in this direction, his brief but an all-embracing idea of independence is shown in distilled form in the last but one para of the Proclamation of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind :

" The provisional Government is entitled to, and hereby claim the allegiance of every Indian. It guarantees religious liberty, as well as equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens. It declares its firm resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally and transcending all the differences cunningly fostered by an alien government in the past."

JAI HIND

Netaji-The Leader with a Mission

Writing about Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose is a journey down memory lanes, a journey that's both painful and exhilarating:

the Scottish Church College has done much in producing a person of his calibre. Again when he decided to give up the coveted ICS service and dedicate himself to the service of the Motherland, he knew he was taking a major decision of his lifetime. He said, "I must either chuck this rotten service and dedicate myself wholeheartedly to the country's cause, or I must bid adieu to all my ideas and aspirations." To the Under-Secretary of State of India he said, "...I did not think that one could be loyal to the British Raj and yet serve India honestly, heart and soul." The bell rang in his heart, India calling. And the rest is history.

Later in life when Netaji arrived on the Indian scene, the going was tough and those who appeared though couldn't get going. He brought in a different mind set altogether. When the whole nation was singing hosannas of Gandhiji and his doctrine of Ahimsa, Netaji was marching to the beat of a different drum-armed combat. He had a little or no faith in the idea of nonviolence. He felt that the British would understand only the language of the sword and any inaction on the part of the Indians would be inferred as weakness, as a sign of subordination. He had seen what revolution had accomplished in the other parts of the world. He sought to instil this fighting spirit among all Indians. He was dreamy. He was unconventional. The masses sensed the mood. Scepticism turned to admiration, criticism lost out to felicitations. He no longer looked ordinary. He looked different. In Netaji there were courage and mission: he possessed one and pursued the other. That's a powerful combination. His perseverance paid off. It was the beginning of a new dawn.

Character is about staying calm in the face of adverse crisis. Whatever the danger, Netaji was always a picture of calm and control. He missed death by inches several times and yet remained unperturbed. Once when he along with Major Abid Hassan was travelling by submarine from Germany to Japan, they were attacked by Allied submarines several times and at times the danger was great but Netaji remained a picture of calm. He coolly turned to Abid Hassan to whom he was dictating a letter and asked him, "... Hassan Sahib, what is the last word you have taken down...". Such control is indeed rare to find. Physically her was weak but his mental stamina proved to be his major strength.

of self-service. This he learnt from the great Swami Vivekananda. He was greatly influenced by the writings of the Swami who propagated salvation through service to humanity. How selflessly he did service to Mother India is evident in all his actions. Vivekananda's teachings also helped him in his years of imprisonment where he learnt to think and not to brood. He was truly a unique phenomenon. A man who aroused thousands of Indians with his one resounding battle-cry of 'Delhi Chalo'. There was something in his words that went beyond mere words. There was passion. There was sincerity. There was confidence. He was the true Neta, one who was able to command the respect of his men. In his speech of the INA in Singapore of 5th July 1943, he said, "For the present, I can offer you nothing except hunger, thirst, privation, forced marches and death. But if you follow me in life and death...I shall lead you to victory and freedom." To this great man we must give due credit for he made heroes out of ordinary men, students, shopkeepers the common man. He formed the Balak Sena comprising of young boys and inculcated in them the spirit of patriotism, discipline and pride of being Indian. His respect and belief in the womenfolk of our country led to the formation of woman's regiment-The Rani of Jhansi Regiment-and it played an active part in the war. He told them, "...When I express my confidence that you are today prepared to fight and suffer for the sake of your mother land, I do not mean only to cajole you with empty words. I know the capabilities of our womanhood well. I can, therefore, say with certainty that there is no task which our women cannot undertake and no sacrifice and suffering which our women cannot undergo...". Under him the women never lagged behind anybody and along with the men folk they also faced lathi charge by the merciless British Police and faced privations of prison life, torture and humiliations. This army did the services of Florence Nightingale and fought fearlessly like the famous Joan of Arc.

Netaji also formed the Reconstruction Brigade where he hired doctors, lawyers, administrators and engineers and involved them in all activities in the freedom movement. He made arrangements with the Japanese authorities to send students to Japan for further training. I was among the 45 students selected by Netaji himself for the training. Till this day I treasure the moments spent with

national Army of Free India. You have volunteered to shoulder the responsibility of 40 crore of Indians. From today your mind, might and money belongs to the Indian nation." He again said, "...Your names will be written in golden letters in the history of free India. Every soldier who is martyred in this holy war will have a monument in free India. The coming generations will shower flowers on those monuments. You are very fortunate that you have got this valuable opportunity to serve the mother land..." Well this was the way Netaji thought we Indians will remember those martyrs. But no, those brave soldiers who died fighting for the freedom of our motherland are today forgotten. Their sacrifices have been sidelined. It is tragic that even our leader Netaji has not been given his due place in the history. His life has been a chronicle of continuous endeavours and relentless toil.

He was truly an extraordinary man whose only burning desire was to shake off the shackles of colonial rule. This worthy man shed his blood, suffered immensely and died for our freedom, our prosperity and our well being. It is almost as if he said to his future children: here's my gift for you. But look at the condition that India is in today. In his address to an independence day meeting in Berlin on 26th January, 1943 he said, "... And India is a country where the past has not been forgotten, but where our past history and tradition live in our blood and the marrow of our bones. It is because of this national self-consciousness that neither political domination nor economic impoverishments have been able to kill our soul..." Such sterling words from this great man. He was one leader whose style of functioning was worth imitating, whose ideas worth adopting and whose examples worth following. But today we have buried our past. We have not made use of the wisdom of the past.

Netaji's skills as a diplomat left many of his contemporaries astounded. The manner in which he dealt with Hitler—even while requesting for help from Germany he minced no words in telling Hitler that he did not approve of his treatment of Jews—leaves one with no doubt of his courage and abilities as a diplomat. The Japanese Prime Minister Tojo was so enamoured by his engaging personality and sincerity that he granted him all his requests including the formation of the Provisional Government of Free India and handing over Andaman and Nicobar Islands to the

done will be dreadful. But sadly, we aren't even looking in this direction. Our minds are preoccupied with other issues.

How little it takes to make our lives unbearable...the broken top button of the shirt, a traffic jam, a tyre puncture, Indian team performing badly Everything slightly inconvenient makes us look up to the God and complain, crib, curse. We waste time in trivialities like the protest against the Miss World pageant which was appalling to say the least. We seem to ignore larger issues that are facing us in the eye. Issues like bride burning, child marriages, sati, female infanticide which have debauched our society. Issues like corruption are staggering. But what is even more shocking is our total indifference to the situation. For long we have been swallowing our anger with our pride that we have begun to get used to its taste. Injustice is to us, second nature. We thrive on it and let others thrive on it.

Post independent India has been through some really rough weather. Today our hard-earned freedom for which countless men and women laid down their lives is being threatened by various foes. Why have we not been able to learn from the experiences of our past leaders, sages, thinkers and scholars? Our forefathers showed us that courage and sacrifice can triumph against overwhelming odds. Netaji said, "... I would like to remind you that a revolutionary is one who believes in the justice of a cause, and who believes that the cause is bound to prevail in the long run. He who gets depressed over failures is no revolutionary. The motto for a revolutionary is: Hope for the best, but be prepared for the worst...Hope is a quality we share with the spider. He makes us feel positive. Hope makes us forget failures. Hope brings hope. But for a leader, hope takes much more. It takes more than just waiting to make hope arrive on the horizon. He has to pledge his life. Netaji was hopeful. Still believing that his tomorrow can be bright. If the spider wouldn't give up, why should we? The spirit of our past leaders knew no fatigue or death and by their abiding faith in India and their mission, they had shaped the destiny of future India. The optimist that he was, he said, "...And if we fail in that too (attaining independence) then there will indeed be World War III to give us another opportunity to strike for our freedom." Let us draw inspiration from the pages of his

practice their faith in their respective manner. India has not only almost 850 million people but also has a great diversity of culture. For example, let us take a person from Ladak or the Kashmir Valley in the north and compare him with someone in Kanyakumari in the South or, for that matter, with someone in Rajasthan or Gujarat in the West or Nagaland and Manipur in the East. What have they in common? They do not look alike for their climatic conditions are very different. In fact they can not even converse with one another because they speak completely different languages. Yet each is an Indian. Often they quarrel among themselves, but in time of crisis or danger, they become one. There is some thing which holds them together. It is a fine line but the bond is very strong. It is difficult to find words to describe this. I call it Indianness or being an Indian-the pride of belonging to India, the land which has given them birth and where they shall return ultimately after death or where they shall return ultimately after death or where the ashes of their mortal remains will mingle and become one with the waters of the rivers which flow through the country's length and breadth.

In order to keep this vast and varied multitude of people together, the country needs a leader of the caliber of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose. He believed passionately that all Indians, irrespective of the region they come from or language they spoke or religious faith they practiced, were members of the same family. He gave his belief practical shape and convinced all those who came in contact with him that unless this basic fact was accepted without hesitation, there was no future for India. Netaji as Subhash Babu in his early days was a symbol of the restlessness of Indian youth, who dreamed of a great and free India. As Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, he was the colossus who strode across East Asia and organized and led an army of liberation against the British Empire, entrenched in India for almost 200 years. In the two years when he led the Indian independence movement, he lived a dream-a dream that the dedicated and the restless youths of India had dreamt for decades and for daring to make that dream into a reality, several had gone to gallows with a smile on their faces.

I came in contact with this great man and, in the opinion of many of us, the greatest Indian leader of his time, when I was only

and ethnicity, there was some thing of an underlying unity in the midst of diversity in our people. Bound by a common goal. A common subjectivity and action programme as it was, the INA could live down at the operational level, all manner of differences of religion, language, caste and the rest of it. Throughout his political career Bose crusaded for unity in action and unity of faith. He never agreed to a unity of sorts for the sheer purpose of temporizing, rather he did encourage a genuine respect for all the religions and communities in his INA. He made sure that religion was treated purely a personal affair. A common greeting, a common but simple lingua franca and a National Anthem were all devised to work as cementing forces in the conduct of the INA affairs. Not only were the INA soldiers united in their implicit allegiance to their leader and government but also they were deeply animated by a spirit of national integration. Incidentally Bose himself was a religious man in personal life, there was no place for any communal or sectarian consideration in his political ideology.

He never shied away, throughout his political life, form and insistence on complete separation of religion from the nationalist politics of the day. His ideas in regard to communal harmony found an almost complete expression and in perfect implementation in the INA. He saw to it that INA was rendered free from all political influences which the British Raj encouraged to maintain in India as a dependency. His spirit of secularism moved and gripped the INA as a whole, much though every soldier in it had perfect liberty to practice his own religion privately. The lesson was brought home to them by Bose, that the communal divide was just a sample of British propaganda.

Nataji was quite alive to the problem of national unity since the inception of his rather short but eventful political career. His approach to this problem was both incisive and positive. He always endeavoured to persuade the Muslims of India to join the main stream of the struggle for the emancipation of India. The Pakistan idea was never his cup of tea. Indeed through his INA and Azad Hind Government, Netaji showed us at a critical moment of our history how to forge national will in a concrete, resolute action. He fervently tried to give rise to a cultural organization

trial virtually shook the unfree and undivided Indians from their long deep slumber. Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians were evenly represented in the Government and the Army and they all unitedly posed from outside a serious challenge to the separatist forces set work in the homeland. The Indian National Army became a dramatic symbol of national unity as the trials of a Hindu, a Sikh and a Muslim INA officers proved to the hilt. A Muslim accompanied Bose in his perilous submarine journey and another Muslim sent him off for the last time at the airport. Some of his brigades were led by Muslim officers exclusively and some were named after the living Indian nationalists leaders. The INA trials followed up by the RIN revolt represented a turning of the tide as far as the prospects of the secularism were concerned.

Netaji Subhash assembled different scattered forces in East Asia and formed an army with the help of youths of different areas and communities in India. He mobilised the a-political forces in South East Asia in order to fight the last war of liberation for a United India. Indeed he and his INA served to hold up the dropping spirits of all sections of Indian people and example of rare unity and patriotism. He infused into his men a certain non-communal spirit, and inspired them to feel proud of their Indian identity. He inspired his men, in his own inimitable way to identify themselves not as Hindus or Muslims but as the sons and daughters of India. He succeeded in installing in them a kind of cultured sensitivity and a secular passion. He succeeded in rousing a mighty army unified in spirit and committed ideologically to work for a free and united India. He almost fully carried out his ideas on national unity in the formation of the INA which consisted of more than sixty percent of Muslims. He could persuade his associates to shed their religious superstitions about food and the practice of denominational faith. He forge an emotional relationship among the diverse ethnicities that came to serve in his army on their own accord. In fact the INA became a paradigm of national and emotional integration. However, it is not enough to recapitulate the INA saga but it is peremptory to take lessons form it, now more than ever, particularly when we have to tackle the problem of disintegration that threatens us today, when the whole nation is faced with a crisis of leadership of conviction and general sense of direction.

could enhance his majesty. On the contrary his being first amongst us was much needed recognition for us. He placed his confidence in us. Confidence is a great morale booster. It invigorated our spirits. Our chests expanded, with heads held high and feet dug deep into ground with the battle cry-CHALO Delhi on our lips, we followed the fluttering TRICOLOUR. And we sang :

Kadam kadam Bharaey ja

Khushi Ke geet gaye ja

Ye Zindegi hai Qaum ki

Tu Waum par lutaey ja.

Within a few days of his arrival in the East, Netaji gave us Vanguard-the Rani Jhansi Regiment. We felt that the valour of the Goddess Durga had reincarnated in the daughters of Mother India. They manifested the blessings of the Goddess and power of her Shakti. With our allies the Japanese our armies advanced against the armies of Great Britain and their allies who were in occupation of the Indian Subcontinent. Some of the bloodiest battles of the Second World War were fought in the spring of 1944 on the battle fields of Akyab, Arakan, Manipur, Imphal, Nagaland, Kohima and Red Hill. India's Tricolour was planted on the liberated territory of India at Moirang in Manipur.

Victory was a matter of touch and go. Then came rains. Our supply lines were cut off. Tables turned. Having lost one hundred thousand lives, we and our valiant allies the Japanese withdrew to the Irrawaddy line. Initiative passed on to opponent's hands. Delhi started getting out of our reach. The Allies were winning everywhere. We had practically lost the War. When Netaji was asked, "Now what is left for us to fight for?" his prompt reply was, "To pay the price of India's Liberty." We continued our fight on the banks of the Irrawaddy at Nyaungu and Bagan, Mount Popa and Kyauk padaung, Magwe and so on, towards Prome and Pegu on the way to Rangoon. We fought against odds. What to talk about weapons and rations, even water was scarce.

So what? Wasn't it one of the things offered to us by Netaji during his very first address on 5th July.1943. His oft-repeated words, "There is no power on earth which can keep India enslaved any longer. India shall be free and before long." His prophetic

war, and for the liberation of our motherland. The British were determined to teach us a lesson and we were determined with unity and faith to sacrifice our life to pay the price for India's liberty. In a situation like that no enemy could ever favour her archenemies by providing such a grand (nor a better) stage than the historic Red Fort of Delhi. We were further favoured by our own people who united as a man to defend us during the trial.

Tallest of the tall legal luminaries of India got together with Shri Bhulabhai Desai as their chief Counsel to defend the accused officers of the INA. In his historic address Mr. Desai explained, that it was the right of a subject race to wage war for their liberty. Desai's address awakened the whole nation. How apply the British Commander in chief in India, General Sir Claud Auchinleck, who had spent all his life in the Indian Army and known the soldiers' mind well, did assess the situation then prevailing is apparent through his letter to Army Commanders dated 12th February, 1946. The letter is marked STRICTLY PERSONAL AND SECRET: NOT TO BE PASSED THROUGH ANY OFFICE.

It is a long letter in which Sir Auchinleck laboured hard to explain to his Army Commanders the effect of the action taken in respect of the first INA trial on the Indian Army as a whole. I quote just an excerpt from his letter. It is most important that we should study and analyse carefully these effects, as they may influence very greatly our ability, to maintain the solidarity and reliability of the Indian Army in the difficult times which undoubtedly lie ahead of us. It is for this reason that I am writing this letter to you. I have considered the desirability of making a personal public statement in explanation of my action in commuting the sentences of transportation passed by the Court on the first three accused, but I have decided that this would not be in the best of interest of discipline of the maintenance of my influence and authority as Commander-in-Chief. I feel however, that we should do all we can to remove the feelings of doubt, resentment and even disgust which appear to exist in the minds of quite a number of British Officers, who have not the knowledge or the imagination to be able to view the situation as a whole, or to understand present state of feeling in India. As I see it, the communication of the sentences of transportation on Shah Nawaz, Dhillon and Sehgal has had the following effects in India:

self-sacrifice. And, in the pages of that history, the names of Sirajuddaula and Mohanlal of Bengal, Haider Ali, Tippu Sultan and Velu Tampi of South India, Appa Sahib Bhonsle and Peshwa Baji Rao of Maharashtra, the Begums of Oudh, Sardar Shyam Singh Atariwala of Punjab and last, but not the least, Rani Laxmibai of Jhansi, Tantia Tope, Maharaja Kunwar Singh of Dumraon and Nana Sahib-among others-the names of all these warriors are for ever engraved in letters of gold. Unfortunately for us, our forefathers did not at first realize that the British constituted a grave threat to the whole of India, and they did not therefore put up a united front against the enemy.

Ultimately, when the Indian people were roused to the reality of the situation, they made a concerted move and under the flag of Bahadur Shah in 1857, they fought their last war as free men. In spite of a series of brilliant victories in the early stages of this war, ill-luck and faulty leadership gradually brought about their final collapse and subjugation. Nevertheless, such heroes as the Rani of Jhansi, Tantia Tope, Kunwar Singh and Nana Sahib live like eternal stars in the nation's memory to inspire us to greater deeds of sacrifice and valour. Forcibly disarmed by the British after 1857 and subjected to terror and brutality, the Indian people lay prostrate for a while-but with the rebirth of the Indian National Congress in 1885, there came a new awakening.

From 1885, until the end of the last World War, the Indian people in their endeavour to recover their lost liberty, tried all possible methods-namely agitation and propaganda, boycott of British goods, terrorism and sabotage-and finally armed revolution. But all these efforts failed for a time. Ultimately in 1920, when the Indian people haunted by a sense of failure, were groping for a new method, Mahatma Gandhi came forward with the new weapon of non-cooperation and civil disobedience. For two decades thereafter, the Indian people went through a phase of intense patriotic activity. The message of freedom was carried to every Indian home. Through personal example, people were taught to suffer, to sacrifice and to die in the cause of freedom. From the centre of the remotest villages, the people were knit together into one political organization. Thus the Indian people not only recovered their political consciousness but became a political entity

to undertake this task-the task of setting up a Provisional Government of Azad Hind (Free India) and of conducting the last fight for freedom, with the help of the Army of Liberation, (that is, the Azad Hind Fauj or the Indian National Army) organized by the League. Having been constituted as the Provisional Government of Azad Hind by the Indian Independence League in East Asia, we enter upon our duties with full sense of responsibility that has devolved on us. We pray that the province may bless our work and struggle for the emancipation of our Motherland. And we hereby pledge our lives for our comrades in arms to the cause of her freedom, of her welfare and her exaltation among the nations of the world.

It will be the task of the Provisional Government to launch and to conduct the struggle that will bring about the expulsion of the British and their allies from the soil of India. It will then be the task of the Provisional Government to bring about the establishment of a permanent National Government of Azad Hind constituted in accordance with the will of the Indian people and enjoying their confidence. After the British and their allies are overthrown and until a permanent National Government of Azad Hind is set up on Indian soil, the Provisional Government will administer the affairs of the country in trust for the Indian people.

The provisional Government is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Indian. It guarantees religious liberty, as well as equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens. It declares its firm resolves to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally and transcending all the differences cunningly fostered by an alien government in the past.

In the name of God, in the name of bygone generations who have welded the Indian people into one nation, and in the dead heroes who have bequeathed to us a tradition of heroism and self-sacrifice-we call upon the Indian people to rally round our banner and strike for India's freedom. We call upon them to launch the final struggle (against the British and all their allies in India and prosecute that struggle) with valour and perseverance in full faith in final victory-until the enemy is expelled from Indian soil and the Indian people are once again a free nation.

so little respect for democracy or democratic reforms in India. Others felt that it was inappropriate to seek concessions when Britain itself was in peril, or else that pressure was better applied within India and in peaceful fashion, and found that their distaste for Nazi Germany and Japan outweighed any possibility that an alliance with them would bring India's independence closer.

Bose, in particular, was accused of 'collaborating' with the Axis, after he fled to Germany in 1941 and offered Hitler an alliance. He criticized the British during World War II, saying that while Britain was allegedly fighting for the freedom of the European nations under Nazi control, it would not grant independence to its own colonies, including India. It may be observed that along with Nehru, Bose had organized and led protest marches against the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, and of China itself in 1938, when he was Congress president. In 1937 he published an article attacking Japanese Imperialism in the Far East, although he betrayed some admiration for other aspects of the Japanese regime. Bose's earlier correspondence (prior to 1939) also reflects his deep disapproval of the racist practices of, and annulment of democratic institutions in Nazi Germany. He also, however, expressed admiration for the authoritarian methods (though not the racial ideologies) which he saw in Italy and Germany during the 1930s, and thought they could be used in building an independent India. Nevertheless, Bose's tenure as Congress Party President (1938-39) did not reflect any particular anti-democratic or authoritarian attributes. Nirad C. Chaudhuri, Anton Pelinka and Leonard Gordon have remarked that Bose's skills were best illustrated at the negotiating table, rather than on the battlefield.

That Bose eventually changed his political stance reflects his deep discontent with the nature of the British rule, and a growing belief that the formation of an Indian free state was too far into the future on the British political roadmap to be acceptable. At the Tripura Congress session of 1939, he made his views quite explicit—he demanded for a programme of immediately giving the British Government a six-months ultimatum to grant the national demand of independence and of launching a mass civil disobedience movement if it failed to do so. He believed that "... the country was internally more ripe for a revolution than ever

have been at the cost of an Allied defeat in the Second World War, a price that some Indians would argue is too high: Gandhi himself, in the immediate aftermath of the war, said that Bose had been “foolish in imagining, that by allying himself with the Japanese and the Germans, who were not only aggressive Powers, but also dangerous Powers, he could get Indian freedom”. The alternative of nonviolent protest within India espoused by Gandhi and the rest of Congress ultimately led to British withdrawal, albeit at the expense of the partition of the country along communal lines. Even before 1939, Congress had secured political concessions from the British in the form of elected Provincial Assemblies, and an agreement that the British taxpayer would foot the bill for Indian re-armament. Although it was rejected by Congress at the time, the 1942 Cripps mission’s offer of full independence after the war could be considered the point at which the British departure became inevitable. Britain’s weakness after the war, and domestic political pressure on the Labour Government also made British withdrawal more likely. Publicly at least, Bose never believed that this would happen unless they were driven out by force: as late as 1944, three years prior to Independence, he announced that “I am honestly convinced that the British Government will never recognise India’s demand for independence”..

Nirad Chaudhuri considered it a backhanded tribute to Bose that the Congress tricolor and the Muslim League green flag flew together for the last time during the mutiny of the Indian navy in Bombay unleashed in 1946 partly at anger within the Navy at the trial of INA officers by the British.

Judith Brown argues that the Mutiny of the Indian Navy was a minor factor in the British decision to leave compared to domestic political pressure, American hostility to any continuation of the *Raj*, and the breakdown of almost all networks of support and collaboration brought about by thirty years of Congress agitation. By 1946 over 50% of the members of the Indian Civil Service were Indians, and even Churchill recognised that the offer of independence made by the Cripps Mission in 1942 could not now be withdrawn. In this interpretation concerns over the loyalty of the military were only one factor amongst many amidst the general breakdown in authority: nor, it could be argued, did all this

cooperation and active participation. In other words, the Gandhi and the Congress would go for years quietly coexisting with British rule, then launch a non-cooperation campaign, gain some concessions from the British, and then go back to another period of relative quiet. For the most part, there were few challenges to this approach outside the Congress. The terrorists carried on in certain areas of the country, especially Bengal, but they were, at the most, a nuisance. By the time of WW II, it had long become evident that elite terrorism was not going to inspire a popular revolution. After Gandhi came along and demonstrated how a popular movement might be generated, the terrorists became even less relevant.

The challenge to the predominance of Gandhi and Gandhian tactics in Indian nationalism came from within the Congress. It came from a man named Subhash Chandra Bose, who, at the height of his political influence, was one of the two or three most powerful leaders in the Congress. Gandhi certainly saw Bose as a rival and a dangerous upstart, and did his best to destroy him politically. I want to focus on Bose today not because I think his battles with Gandhi are particularly fascinating, but because Bose held up an alternative vision, not only of political tactics, but also of political objectives. Whereas Gandhi sought compromises with the British, Bose sought absolute victories. Gandhi was willing to wait a long time for independence, Bose wanted immediate action, if not immediate results. Gandhi was anti-materialistic and hostile to modern technology, Bose saw technology and mass production as essential to survival and dignity. Gandhi wanted a decentralized society and disliked the modern state; Bose wanted a strong central government and saw the modern state as the only solution to India's problems. And finally, Bose did not share Gandhi's dedication to nonviolence.

Bose came from an upper-class Bengali family. His father was a well-known lawyer in Cuttack. He was the ninth child in a big, busy family; but his parents were aloof, and Bose grew up as a loner. He was a voracious reader, and he was especially attracted to the writings of the 19th-century Hindu social reformer, Swami Vivekananda. From Vivekananda he picked up a desire to take India, especially Hindu India, back to an idealized past in which

English women. And like Gandhi, Bose became more conscious of his Indian identity when he was in England. But there were some very significant differences, as well. Gandhi did not become a nationalist while he was in England. That came later. Gandhi's nationalism developed slowly over the decades, and if we had to look for pivotal movements we would have to find them in South Africa and later in Jallianwalla Bagh. Bose arrived in England as a budding nationalist, and as somebody who was very conscious, and very resentful, of the racial basis of British rule in India. In England, he wrote one of his friends: "Nothing makes me happier than to be served by the whites and to watch them clean my shoes. In England, Bose's nationalism became more clearly defined, and more militant, than it had been before.

At the same time, Bose liked England. He enjoyed the openness of English society, the freedom of expression, the debates in Parliament and at the university, the fact that students weren't shadowed by the police. It made him acutely aware of how different life was in colonial India. Also, there was a lot that Bose admired about the British in England. He found them efficient and energetic, he appreciated their sense of a national interest, and what he saw as their can-do attitude. These qualities—efficiency, energy, discipline, a sense of punctuality—are all central to modern industrial society, and they became central to Bose's vision of what India should be like.

He did very well in the ICS exams, and then faced a dilemma that had, by the 1920's, become common for Indian nationalists. Should he join the IAS, and participate in the administration of India, or should he keep his distance from the colonial government? Would participation constitute collaboration? Eventually Bose decided to stay away from the IAS.

Quite apart from his qualms about the Indian Civil Service, there was another major factor that influenced his decision. Bose was one of those people who desperately needed a father-figure in his life. Ever since he had been a child, he had attached himself to his teachers and to various swamis, hoping to find somebody who could be a combination of spiritual advisor, political mentor, and intellectual guide. For Bose, who was already leaning towards a career in nationalist politics, one possible choice might have

Gandhian line-but through pressure exerted by powerful organizations, such as a parallel government, or an independent nation-state. Das was impressed by Bose's ideas, and invited Bose to work with him in Calcutta. So he went, and in 1921 he plunged immediately into hectic political activity and fully utilized his talents as an organizer. Seeing a need to develop alternatives to the colonial educational system, Bose threw himself into creating a nationalist college. He set himself up as the principal, found professors who were willing to lecture, invented courses, developed course schedules, and even planned on taking some courses himself. All this was typical of the man: he wanted to be the leader, he wanted to plan and to organize, and at the same time he wanted to learn.

When he was not working on the nationalist college, Bose was organizing strikes and demonstrations in Calcutta as part of the non-cooperation movement. The British threw him in jail, along with C.R. Das and thousands of other activists, but this was pretty much what the non-cooperation movement aimed to achieve. He was released after six months, and was immediately back at work, doing what he did best: organizing large-scale operations. There had been serious flooding in parts of Bengal. Bose, working with Congress volunteers, set up relief operations that were bigger and more effective than anything the Congress had done along those lines until then. Since the colonial government didn't do much to help the flood victims, Bose's reputation as an effective political leader grew larger.

At around this time, Bose began to have his first open disagreements with Gandhi. Actually, it was Das who had the disagreement with Gandhi, and initially Bose was involved only as Das' right-hand man, Das wanted the Congress to contest elections to local councils under the Montagu-Chelmsford Act of 1919, and to become actively involved in local government. Gandhi felt this would undermine non-cooperation, and refused. But Das had support within the Congress on this issue, particularly from the two Nehrus. They got together and formed the Swaraj Party. This was not really a separate party, but a group that remained within the overall Congress organization. Faced with this tension within the Congress, Gandhi compromised and allowed the Swaraj

over the Indian nuclear programme, he added: "Free India must arm herself for any eventuality as long as the whole world does not accept wholeheartedly the policy of disarmament."

His second point of disagreement with Gandhi was over the pace and the objectives of the nationalist movement. Gandhi tended to give the British a lot of time to respond to Congress demands, and there were long gaps between the periods of active agitation. Bose wanted immediate agitation, and could not understand why Gandhi always waited for the right moment. A true revolutionary, he felt, created the moment, rather than wait for it to arrive.

Also, Gandhi and his allies within the Congress were not, in 1928, ready to come out and demand complete independence. They preferred to define the nationalist goal as dominion status, *i.e.*, as autonomy within the British Empire. Bose found this unacceptable, and he did not hesitate to say so. Nevertheless, he was still working closely with the Congress. During the Congress' convention in Calcutta in 1928, Bose organized the ceremonies. In the process, he allowed his imagination to run wild: he put Congress volunteers in military-style uniforms, named himself General Officer Commanding, and held a military-style honour guard for Nehru senior. Once again, this was his childish delight in uniforms and smart salutes coming to the forefront. Most people didn't know whether to laugh or to cry. Gandhi, most likely, was not amused. In 1929, Bose was elected president of the Bengal branch of the Congress, defeating Gandhi's candidate. Not long after that, he was jailed for protesting the government's treatment of revolutionaries and political prisoners. In 1930 Gandhi finally gave the call for complete independence, and launched a new campaign of civil disobedience.

Bose watched the campaign from prison. While in prison, he was elected mayor of Calcutta. When he was released in the fall of 1930, he immediately went back to being the organizer of massive nationalist demonstrations. After a confrontation with the police in which he was violently assaulted, he was sent back to jail. For the time being, his career as an active politician in India came to an end.

Bose's health failed again in prison, and he went to Europe to recover. He spent most of the 1930's in Europe, shadowed by

Party in the Soviet Union. At this point, he still believed that this party would be the Congress. Bose finally returned to India in January of 1937. He was now much more radical than he had been when he had left. He was quick to reject the Government of India Act of 1935, which had allowed for greater Indian participation in the provincial governments. For Bose, the law was too little too late. He was unhappy that the Congress had agreed to participate in the government under the Act, but this did not keep him away from Congress politics. The years in Europe had not diminished his popularity in India, and he had no trouble getting elected as the president of the Congress. He remained president for only a year, before Gandhi schemed to bring him down.

But for that one year, Bose was king, and he enjoyed himself thoroughly. As in the past, he threw himself into building Congress up as a practical parallel government. In keeping with his faith in modern technology, he set up a committee of prominent scientists to develop a viable industrial policy. He raised funds, and he campaigned tirelessly all over India. He emphasized his socialist ideals, and along with Nehru, became the recognized leader of the Congress left. But Bose and Nehru did not become political allies. There are several reasons. There were the philosophical differences: Nehru was a democrat, Bose was authoritarian. Also Nehru, at heart, was something of an Anglophile, in the sense that he had a soft spot for India's connection with England. Bose had no such sentimental attachment. Then there were differences in temperament that played out in the way they each approached socialism and policy-making. Nehru was a visionary without much interest in the details of implementing his visions. But details mattered to Bose. And finally, there was the Gandhi factor.

In spite of his philosophical differences with Gandhi, Nehru was Gandhi's protege, and everybody knew it. Nehru would disagree with Gandhi on specific issues, but when push came to shove and a decision had to be made, he would give in and let Gandhi have his way. This was partly Out of a genuine respect for Gandhi's leadership, and partly because Nehru understood very well that his own political fortunes were linked to Gandhi's. As long as Nehru was Gandhi's boy, his own future within the Congress organization was insured. This reluctance to go up against

and Bose had no option except to resign, four months into his second term as president. One of the interesting things about this whole episode is that Bose blamed Nehru more than he blamed Gandhi. He never completely cut his ties with Gandhi, and continued to try to rebuild his bridges. But he never forgave Nehru for not helping him during this crisis. On September 3 of 1939, war finally broke out in Europe. And not just in Europe, because the Viceroy Lord Linlithgow declared war on India's behalf, without consulting a single Indian. This was a major embarrassment for the Congress, which was now faced with two choices. It could either get some significant concessions from the colonial government. Or it could resign from the ministries it controlled under the Government of India Act. So the Congress went to the government, and asked for a clear statement of its military objectives.

The government stonewalled, saying that it was too early in the war to talk about military objectives. It also refused to talk about Indian independence, saying that any such discussion would have to wait until after the war. Since there was no clearly defined military objective, it meant that the government would decide when the war was over, and when Indian independence could be discussed. Congress now resigned from its ministries. It's been suggested that the British deliberately maneuvered Congress into resigning, to have a free hand in running the government during the war. Whatever the case may be, the Congress now found itself out of office, and with nothing but moral outrage to show for it. Still Gandhi refused to launch an agitation.

Bose, meanwhile, had been busy organizing his own party, called the Forward Bloc. This was initially within the structure of the Congress. But by 1940 it had become an independent political party, mainly because the Congress had refused to tolerate its allegiance to Bose instead of to Gandhi, and had kicked its officers out of office. Things were happening very fast for Bose, as usual. In July of 1940, he was arrested and sent to prison again for planning to lead a march demanding the removal of a memorial to the victims of the Black Hole of Calcutta. He went on a hunger-strike, and in December he was released. Then began his great adventure. Even before his last arrest, Bose had begun to think

and lose India simultaneously. This was the big picture. To bring all this about, Bose put forward several ideas. Some of these he accomplished; in others areas he was frustrated. Let's look at his political objectives first. Bose wanted facilities for broadcasting radio messages into India. This the Germans readily provided, and he made regular speeches directed at the Indian public. In his broadcasts, Bose urged people to use the war as an opportunity to break free. Germany would win the war, and the British should not be allowed to hang on in India. The first broadcasts created a sensation in India, largely because Bose's disappearance had generated a lot of public interest. But it didn't go much further than that. This was because in spite of Bose's presence in Berlin, to most Indians the war with Germany was still far away, and people couldn't really visualize the German army sweeping through the Caucasus to liberate India. Also, by this time, Gandhi and the Congress had finally launched the Quit India movement, and a violent revolutionary situation already existed in India.

Bose's other major accomplishment in Germany was organizing the Indian Legion. In the course of the fighting in north Africa, the Germans had taken thousands of Indian POWs. Bose went to the POW camps, and asked the Indian soldiers to join him to fight against the British. This idea was not entirely new. An expatriate Indian named Mohammed Iqbal Shedai had already made a start organizing Indian POWs captured by the Italians. For a while, Bose and Shedai ran parallel efforts with the POWs. Then the Indian soldiers in Shedai's camp mutinied, This discredited Shedai, and left Bose as the only Indian organizing an army to fight on the side of the Axis.

Ultimately, the Indian Legion that Bose organized in Germany numbered about 3000 soldiers. It was not easy putting this force together. Initially, when Bose visited the POW camps to talk to the soldiers, he got a hostile reception. The British Indian Army may have been an army without a nationalist ideology, but it would be a mistake to think of it as a purely mercenary force. The colonial army had its own ideology, which was a combination of loyalty to the British throne, loyalty to the commanding officer, loyalty to the regiment, and a tradition of service in which the same family or same village sent many generations of soldiers into

essentially, that Germany would get a free hand in Europe, and England would get to keep most of its empire. He was perfectly willing to use Bose to make trouble for the British, but he had no long-term interest in India's future, one way or another. Bose knew this, of course. He wanted to use the Germans for his own purposes. But eventually, as things turned out, neither was able to do very much for the other side.

But by the middle of 1942, Bose was already looking beyond Germany, to Japan. The string of Japanese victories after Pearl Harbor had achieved two things. One was that Singapore, which was a major British military stronghold, had fallen to the Japanese. This placed tens of thousands of Indian soldiers in Japanese hands. What Bose had tried to do with the Indian Legion in Germany, he could try in Southeast Asia on a much larger scale. The other thing that encouraged Bose was the fact that Japanese forces had come all the way to the Indian border with Burma. In other words, if he could organize an army in Japanese-occupied territory, and attack on India would be a relatively practical idea.

So, in February of 1943, the Germans did Bose one last favour: they helped him get to Japan. He travelled in a German submarine to the coast of Mozambique, where he transferred to a Japanese submarine. This submarine took him to southeast Asia.

The former British colonies of southeast Asia-Burma, Malaya, and Singapore-had large Indian populations, and Bose was welcomed as a conquering hero. In a sense, they had been waiting for him; in spite of all efforts to keep his plans secret, rumours had been circulating that he would come. The Japanese welcomed him also, and were far more enthusiastic about working with him than the Germans had been.

I'll give you an example of the difference in attitude: when Bose was on the German sub, he ate bread that tasted like it had been dipped in diesel. On the Japanese sub, the crew had brought along Indian spices especially for him, and cooked him Indian curries until he protested about the frequent meals. After he reached Asia, Bose travelled widely in the Japanese-help territories: to Burma, Malaya, Singapore, the Philippines, Vietnam, occupied China, and of course Japan. Unlike his uneasy relationship with Hitler, he quickly developed an excellent relationship with Tojo.

This was, in a way, a parallel of what had happened in Europe with Shedai's army. When Bose came to Asia, he quickly assumed command of what was left of Mohan Singh's old INA. At this time, this force had only 13,000 soldiers. But Bose had big plans. He wanted to expand the INA in two phases, first to 50,000 soldiers, and then to a force of 3 million. The men would come from the colonial Indian Army as well as from the southeast Asian Indian community.

The Japanese were shocked at such an ambitious plan, and told Bose that they would be able to arm a much smaller force, of about 30,000. Eventually, the INA reached a peak strength of around 50,000. It was an interesting social experiment in more ways than one. The colonial Indian Army had organized its units around ethnicity and religion, so that the British could play off one group of Indians against another if necessary. In contrast, the INA had fully integrated units. It also had a regiment of female troops: this was the Rani of Jhansi Brigade, named after the queen who had died fighting the British in the Rebellion of 1857.

For Bose, the big numbers were necessary for their political effect. It didn't matter if most of the 3 million weren't equipped with adequate weapons. He saw the INA as a psychological force as well as a military asset. He knew that if people in India became aware that a nationalist army of 3 million was waiting just across the border, ready to invade, it would have a tremendous effect on the way Indians related to the British. It would inspire pride and confidence, it would take away the fear of British power, and it would make it impossible for the British to maintain control.

In fact, Bose's whole strategy for using the INA depended upon this psychological factor. He wanted the force to spearhead a Japanese invasion, expecting that this would totally demoralize and dissolve the colonial Indian army, ,,drawing its soldiers into the INA. He expected also that the general public would respond with overwhelming support.

It turned out that he was half right. The INA lost the war, but won the peace. In the summer of 1944, the Japanese were finally ready to begin their invasion of India. They attacked from Burma in a two-pronged approach, hoping to capture the town of Imphal. This would then become the base for the rest of the invasion. But,

from Burma to Bangkok, followed closely by British tanks and under frequent attack from the air, he marched for days on end, refusing the offer of a car while his men had to walk. Throughout the march, he made sure that INA troops had proper food and medical care. In the chaos of the retreat, Bose was their best protection, and everybody knew it. Without him, the Japanese would have been only too eager to abandon the INA.

Bose returned to Singapore and tried for a while to rebuild the INA. This was the period when he demanded ten percent of the value of peoples assets to pay for military expenses, and made himself unpopular with the wealthier Indians in Malaya. But for Japan, the war was almost over. After the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, there was nothing left for Bose in working with Tokyo.

He now made a political gamble. The Soviets had been an ally of the British during the war, and an enemy of his allies, the Germans and the Japanese. But Bose correctly foresaw that the Soviet alliance with the west would not last. He decided to travel to Manchuria, which had just been overrun by the USSR. He planned to continue his fight against the British, but from Russia this time.

On 16th August, a day after the Japanese surrendered, Bose boarded a Japanese bomber in Saigon, on his way to Darien, in China. On the 18th of August, after a refueling stop in Taipei, the bomber crashed. Bose was still alive, but badly burned. He died in a Japanese military hospital in Taipei, soon afterwards.

The story didn't end there, During the war, the British had carefully suppressed all news about the INA. This news now finally broke in India. Bose immediately became a hero of mythical proportions. People refused to believe he was dead; in fact, people refused to believe it for decades.

Also, Bose's predictions about the psychological value of his army were finally vindicated. The British played into his hands by making a series of miscalculations about how to deal with 25,000 captured INA soldiers. Misreading the public mood, the British decided to stage a series of highly publicized trials of INA officers in New Delhi. Incredibly, they believed that since the INA

the sailors in street battles against British forces. The rebels eventually failed, in part because they didn't have the firepower that the British were able to call in, and in part because the Congress panicked and told them to stop fighting. The mutineers had looked to the Congress and the Muslim League to lead them. By the spring of 1946, however, the Congress and the League were too deeply implicated in the government of the country to see any good in this kind of unrest. Leaders like Nehru and Jinnah knew that independence was now at the most only a couple of years away. As such, they did not want to encourage something as messy, as volatile and as dangerous as an armed rebellion. They had no experience and no stomach for leading this kind of movement, and they quietly supported the British efforts to crush the rebels. But Bose's predictions about what would happen when the INA entered India had, to a considerable degree, come true. He had predicted a public uprising and sympathy from colonial troops, and now he was proved right. This is what I meant when I said that the INA lost the war but won the peace. But if Bose was right, where did he go wrong?

Well, as I've argued, that Bose misread the nature of the colonial army. On the battlefield, when everything was at stake, the colonial army retained its loyalties. It was only after the war that sections of it mutinied.

It can also be argued that Bose misread the political situation in India in the 1940's. Being away in Germany and southeast Asia had isolated him from the political realities of wartime India, and he had missed some crucial changes in the way the wind was blowing. By 1942, the British were willing to discuss independence for India when the war ended. By 1945, there was no doubt that negotiations would soon begin. Yet Bose continued to fight a military battle, instead of rejoining the political process.

Was this unnecessary, and a mistake? Not if you were in Bose's shoes. He had taken up arms against the British, and his relations with the Congress had collapsed. He had reason to believe that if he returned to India while it was controlled by the British or the Congress, he would be treated as a war criminal.

Also, although India was clearly on its way to independence by the mid-40's, this was not the kind of independence that Bose

Japanese had perpetrated against people in the countries they had occupied. Unlike Gandhi and Nehru, Bose believed that the end justified the means. He wanted freedom for India, and to some extent, he didn't care who he had to approach for assistance. But this explanation, I think, is too kind to Bose. At some basic level, Bose had an ideological affinity for fascism, and he was a little too comfortable with using the state to crush dissent and ideological diversity. Indians who refused to believe that Bose was dead, and who continued to believe for decades that he was alive somewhere in the Soviet Union, hoped he would just surface again some day like a messiah, and solve all of India's problems. Yet these people misunderstand Bose, and what he stood for. Had the INA and Bose succeeded on the battlefield, a free India would have been a totalitarian society.

Bose was passionate in his patriotism, and genuinely well-intentioned. He was genuine in his desire to help the disadvantaged segments of Indian society. But good intentions are not enough. Some of the greatest tyrants of the 20th century had good intentions: Lenin, Mao, Pol Pot. (You'll notice that these are all tyrants of the left. Tyrants of the right like Hitler, Franco, or the Shah of Iran, don't get credit for good intentions.) Bose didn't seem to realize that the methods you choose do matter in the final analysis. Totalitarian institutions inevitably corrupt even the best-intentioned people. Even if it hadn't corrupted Bose himself, even if he had remained a so-called benevolent dictator, there would have been no guarantees that his successor would have been benevolent. Ultimately, dying at the end of the war was the best thing Bose could have done for India.

British 'Attempted to Kill Bose'

The British told their agents to assassinate India's independence war leader Subhash Chandra Bose in 1941, an Irish historian has claimed. Eunan O'Halpin, who has written several books on British intelligence, says the order came after Bose sought support of the Axis powers in World War II. British agents were told to intercept and kill Bose before he reached Germany via the Middle East, Mr O'Halpin says. Bose is believed to have died in a plane crash in Taiwan in 1945.

That's a measure of how seriously they took him," says Calcutta historian, Lipi Ghosh. In retrospect, she says, the British had correctly assessed the potential of Bose.

Sugata Bose, Gardiner professor of history at Harvard University and a grand-nephew of Bose, said: "Since he ultimately managed to swing the loyalty of the Indian soldiers to the national cause from the King Emperor, they had all the reasons to contemplate the worst." After 20 years in the Indian National Congress, Bose was elected its president but quit in disgust at Gandhi's plans for nonviolent struggle. After reaching Germany he travelled to East Asia in a 90-day submarine journey to set up the Indian National Army from soldiers who had surrendered to Japan. Bose's army fought with the Japanese in the Imphal-Kohima campaign in 1944-1945.

The Strategy

"The time has come when I can openly tell the whole world, including our enemies, as to how it is proposed to bring about national liberation. Indians outside India, particularly Indians in East Asia, are going to organise a fighting force which will be powerful enough to attack the British Army in India. When we do so, a revolution will break out, not only among the civil population at home, but also among the Indian Army which is now standing under the British flag. When the British government is thus attacked from both sides—from inside India and from outside—it will collapse, and the Indian people will then regain their liberty. According to my plan, it is not even necessary to bother about the attitude of the Axis powers towards India. If Indians outside and inside India will do their duty, it is possible for the Indian people to throw the British out of India and liberate 388 millions of their countrymen."—*Speech by Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose at a mass rally, Singapore, 9 July 1943*

The Alternative Hero of the India's Struggle for Freedom....

It is 23 January 1981, and crowds all over India are celebrating the birthday of Subhash Bose. Politicians who have never known him, and many who fought him when he was alive, garland his statues, invoke his name and urge their audiences to follow his example. More than thirty years after his death Bose has become

to their own propaganda, Bose was regarded not as a puppet of the Japanese but as a great hero. He had dealt with the Japanese as an equal and had succeeded in creating India's first national army. Then there was his undoubted prestige and status in India, particularly in Bengal, where he 'ranks little, if anything, below Gandhi as an all-India figure'.

After listing the various measures that could be taken to deal with Bose, the report went on to discuss their drawbacks. Public pressure would not allow him to be hanged in India; the Burma government was unlikely to want to try him there; trials in Singapore or elsewhere would create just as many problems. A quick military execution was a solution, but that could hardly be defended, and the military might read it as a subterfuge to avoid the independence issue which would figure in a civil trial. Imprisoning him would only lead to agitation for his release. The report concluded:

"In many ways the easiest course would be to leave him where he is and not ask for his release. He might, of course, in certain circumstances be welcomed by the Russians. This course would raise fewest immediate political difficulties but the security authorities consider that in certain circumstances his presence in Russia would be so dangerous as to rule it out altogether."

After several investigations, the British had concluded by March 1946 that Bose might still be alive; but there was not much else they could do about it. The 25,000 I.N.A. prisoners being repatriated to India presented very different problems. Senior British Army commanders were convinced that the I.N.A. were traitors, and that, if the integrity and the discipline of the British Indian Army were to be maintained, they should be severely punished. Some would have preferred kangaroo courts and quick executions.

But the higher echelons of the Raj were not entirely convinced that this was the right policy; in any case, it was not possible to execute 25,000 men secretly. A few were executed, but for the great majority a more selective policy was implemented. They were classified into 'whites'-those who had joined the I.N.A. with the intention of re-joining the British; 'greys'-those who had been misled by Bose and the Japanese; and 'blacks'-those who had

editorship-was full of stories and legends of the I.N.A. and Bose. 'Jai Hind' had replaced all other greetings between Indians, and Bose's photographs-invariably in I.N.A. uniform-now graced a million pan shops.

The defence was led by Bhulabhai Desai, who in the past had been a bitter critic of Bose. By the time of his death, a few months after the trial, he was as great a champion of Netaji as any. The trial became, as Nehru said, a dramatic version of that old contest, England versus India: the legal niceties vanished and even the personalities of defendants were obscured. For Indians it was not only illegal but a slur on Indian nationalism; the victors were disposing of the vanquished in the very place where the latter had planned to hold their victory parade.

Besides, the three accused Shah Nawaz was a Muslim, Sahgal a Hindu and Dhillon a Sikh-represented all the major communities of India. Auchinleck may have hoped that would stress the communal nature of Indian politics-always Britain's strongest point; but for Indians it demonstrated that the I.N.A. was indeed a national army that Bose had indeed succeeded in getting Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs to unite for a common cause.

BRITISH COMMUTE SENTENCE TO AVOID MUTINY IN THE BRITISH INDIAN ARMY

The defence based its argument on the host of precedents, old and new, which supported the right of subject countries to fight for their freedom. But, for all Desai's eloquence, as far as the court-martial was concerned he was arguing a lost cause-one they were incapable of appreciating, let alone accepting.

The predictable verdict was that all three of officers were guilty of waging war against the King. Dhillon and Salgal were acquitted of the charge of murder and abetment of murder; Shah Nawaz was found guilty of abetting murder. All three were sentenced to transportation for life, cashiering and forfeiture of arrears of pay and allowances.

However, the British military authorities had become painfully aware of the consequences of the trial. Even before it had opened, I. N. A. days had been organised in various parts of the country. The day the proceedings got under way the police had to open

declared that the I.N.A.'s 'patriotic motive would be taken at its face value and its members would be treated as though prisoners of war'. A week before the trial ended the Viceroy empowered Auchinleck to commute sentences of death or transportation for life, and when, as required, Auchinleck came to confirm the sentences of the three men, he only agreed to the verdict of cashiering and forfeiture of pay: the transportation decision was quashed and, taking into account 'the prevailing circumstances', the men were set free.

I.N.A. Accused Released & Welcomed as Heroes

Shah Nawaz, Sahgal and Dhillon were welcomed like the heroes of a conquering army and their tales were carried back to the remotest villages of India to be told, retold and eventually mythologised. For a time the I.N.A. seemed to have become India—even for Gandhi. Now, in his weekly Harijan column, he invariably referred to Bose as 'Netaji', and conceded that 'the hypnotism of the INA has cast its spell upon us. Netaji's name is one to conjure with. His patriotism is second to none (I use the present tense intentionally). His bravery shines through all his actions.'

He, too, believed Netaji was alive. The British, however, continued with the selective trials, and on 4 February 1946 Captain Abdul Rashid was sentenced to seven years, imprisonment for certain acts of brutality. Rashid was a Muslim, and now the Muslim League came into the picture. For four days between 11 and 14 February the streets of Calcutta Bombay and Delhi witnessed unique political demonstrations in which Hindus and Muslims forgot their differences and came together to fight the I.N.A.'s battles. Four days of strict martial law were required to bring Calcutta back to normal; by then nearly fifty were dead and over five hundred injured.

In January, too, some 5,200 Royal Indian Air Force personnel had gone on strike to protest over their conditions and as an expression of sympathy for the I.N.A. cause. And on 18 February a revolt began on HMS Talwar, a training ship of the Indian navy moored off Bombay. By nightfall on the 20th virtually the whole of the Royal Indian Navy was in open rebellion: seventy eight ships in the various ports of India—Bombay, Karachi, Madras,

leaders were plainly frightened by the prospect of leading a revolution; Nehru came to Bombay and deplored the revolt. And as the ratings wondered what might have happened if there had been a leader prepared to lead them-Bose perhaps-the British retook their ships. But if the Indian politicians had no use for revolutionary situations, the Labour government had been quick to understand the implications.

On 4 December 1945 Herbert Morrison announced in the House of Commons that a ten-member parliamentary delegation would visit India to study the situation. The five-week visit took place in January and February 1946 and by the end of it nearly all the visiting MPs were convinced that India was in a dangerous state. The February disturbances convinced Attlee that the imperial tide had at last ebbed. India could be held by force of arms for a few years more, but the cost for a Britain devastated by war would be too high.

The British government announced in February 1946 that a Cabinet mission of three ministers would visit India. That mission, in fact, failed in its purpose, the situation required another intervention by Attlee; it was his speech in the House of Commons on 20 February 1947-when he pledged the British government to transfer power to Indian hands, if necessary as two separate nations, 'not later than June 1948'-that finally led to the emergence of the two nations of India and Pakistan on 15 August 1947.

That such a situation existed in 1945 owed a great deal to Subhash Bose. He did not precisely visualise the extent of the post war turmoil; his wildest dreams could not have matched the fervour the I.N.A. trials produced. But he had told his men in Burma to fraternise with the Indians in the British Indian Army, and till the end he was confident that if Indians kept up their resolve, Britain-in an increasingly hostile postwar world-would have to concede independence. True, his army did not parade as victors in the Red Fort; but their trial as vanquished had proved that his belief in a revolutionary consciousness that was grounded in a deeper understanding of the Indian people than his enemies credited him with, or even his most fervent friends believed in.

The vision had been genuine: he just did not have the means, while alive, to translate it into a reality. Even Dilip, so sceptical

the rewards of office. And by placing such faith in the negotiating chamber the Congress had played into the hands of Jinnah, the master lawyer and negotiator. As Bose had foreseen, the Congress had thrown away the trump card of its power-mass struggle-for the dubious delights of the round table.

But could Indians have lived with Bose? An extreme man, he produced extreme reactions: total adulation or permanent rejection. Certainly the India of Bose would have been very different from the India of Nehru. Bose had often said that India needed at least twenty years of iron dictatorial rule, and he would most certainly have rejected the type of parliamentary democracy that has developed. This opens up the whole question of whether it is better for people to have food or to have freedom to change their political rulers every five years. The argument can never be resolved-though, given the recent adulation of the West for China, some of the oldest democracies in the world seem to think food is more important.

Surely Bose's rule would have degenerated into autocracy, like that of Mrs. Gandhi between 1975 and 1977? Though the analogy is not quite accurate (Mrs. Gandhi's rule degenerated long before the events of June 1975), for conclusive evidence Bose's critics point to his behaviour in Germany and with the Japanese during the war. In a climate that brooked no dissent and where the leader was always right, he too came to believe that he could do no wrong.

Part of the possible reason for this change of personality-if there was a change-may lie in the fact that at that stage, particularly in southeast Asia, he found himself a king without any worthwhile courtiers. The people who surrounded him there were political innocents, thrust into the wider world by events beyond their control: they could only applaud, never interject. Bose was, as the official Japanese history puts it, 'a bright morning star amidst them'. There is also evidence to suggest that Subhash Bose was not quite the dictator a simple reading of his speeches makes him out to be.

No doubt there was an authoritarian streak in him, but his actions often belied his dictatorial postures in 1939, as Congress president, he behaved-against Gandhi's wishes-less like an autocrat

how they would have to abandon their beloved sarees in order to do so. In south Asia he did get many immigrant women to join the I.N.A.-demonstrating that Indian feminism could be happily blended with the exigency of war.

The ideological development that Bose sought has never materialised. Like all national-liberation movements, the independent Congress was a coalition: of business seeking to oust British capital, of rural kulaks confident that native rulers would do more for them than alien ones, of various interest groups and of socialists aware that the Congress was the only party capable of furthering their ideas. Gandhi did suggest that the Congress should disband after independence, but this was clearly impossible: self-interest, if nothing else, ruled it out. Today almost all the major political groups in India-communists, socialists, free-enterprise capitalists, Gandhian socialists-trace their ancestry to the Congress: only the right-wing Hindu Jan Sangh can claim a different parentage. The absence of ideological development has meant the politics of banter, with interest groups perpetually feuding amongst themselves, extraordinary alliances-as between Marxists and religious obscurantists-and, above all, comical political defections. Once, in a northern state, a single individual's change of support from Congress to opposition parties led to the fall of two state governments in a single day.

The most valid criticism of Bose is related to the nature of the nationalist movement itself. For Bose's faults-and there were many-were inevitable in a nationalist fighting a colonial-imperial power that both fanned nationalism, and denied it legitimate expression. The Raj, as Marx penetratingly observed, did unwittingly bring modern ideas into India-but the nationalist reaction it produced in India was distorted by the British presence. Pre-British India was seen as a land of milk and honey in which there had been no problems, no caste system and no evils, only Indian harmony and peace. And it is a measure of the failure of Indian nationalism that what in most countries would be dismissed as delicious nonsense is still taken seriously. Today P.N. Oak, ADC to Major-General Bhonsle of the I.N.A., can claim respectable reviews in Indian papers by writing books asserting that 5,000 years ago India had an empire which included Britain. If the world has not

While other leaders of the Indian National Congress fell short of realizing this fact and thus betrayed a lack of pragmatic approach to the turn of world events that provided India with a golden opportunity to strike at the British by a force of arms, Bose rose to the needs of the hour and was quick to seize that opportunity.

While Bose's compatriots in India remained totally wedded to an ideological creed (nonviolence), which at that time could only serve the British and postpone the advent of independence, and while their ideological interpretations of the new revolutionary regimes in Europe—again largely influenced by British propaganda—prevented them from even harboring any thought of seeking their alliance and cooperation in the struggle against a common enemy, Subhash Chandra Bose alone had the courage to take the great plunge, thus risking his own life and reputation, solely in the interest and cause of his country. In January 1941, while under both house arrest, and strict British surveillance, he escaped.

After an arduous trek through the rugged terrains of several countries, with an Italian passport under the assumed name of Orlando Mazzota—in which he was aided by underground revolutionaries and foreign diplomatic agents—Bose appeared in Berlin, via Moscow, on 28 March 1941. Bose was welcome in Germany, although the news of his arrival there was kept a secret for some time for political reasons. The German Foreign Office, which was assigned the primary responsibility of dealing with Bose and taking care of him, had been well informed of the background and political status of the Indian leader through its pre-war Consulate-General at Calcutta and also by its representative in Kabul. Bose himself, naturally some what impatient for getting into action soon after his arrival in Berlin, submitted a memorandum to the German government on 9 April 1941 which outlined a plan for cooperation between the Axis powers and India.

Among other things, it called for the setting up of a "Free India Government" in Europe, preferably in Berlin; establishment of a Free India broadcasting station calling upon the Indian people to assert their independence and rise up in revolt against the British authorities; underground work in Afghanistan (Kabul) involving independent tribal territories lying between Afghanistan

First, Jai Hind or Victory to India, would be the official form of salutation; secondly, Nobel laureate poet Rabindranath Tagore's famous patriotic song Jana Gana Mona was to be the national anthem for the free India Bose was fighting for; thirdly, in a multilingual state like India, the most widely-spoken language, Hindustani, was to be the national language; and fourthly, Subhash Chandra Bose would hereafter be known and addressed as Netaji, the Indian equivalent of the "leader" or the "Führer." In November 1941, Azad Hind Radio (or the Free India Radio) opened its programme with an announcing speech by Netaji himself, which, in fact, was a disclosure of his identity that had been kept officially secret for so long. The radio programmes were broadcast in several Indian languages on a regular basis. During this long period of "hibernation," the period between Netaji's arrival in Berlin and the beginning of operations of the two organizations, it can be reasonably assumed that the idea of forming an Indian legion that could be developed into an Indian Army of Liberation in the West, crossed Bose's mind.

He might even have discussed this matter with his colleagues—the Indian compatriots in Germany who had joined him—as to how best to implement the idea. However, as mentioned earlier, his first memorandum submitted to the German Government did not include any such plan. According to N.G. Ganpuley, who was his associate in Berlin, Netaji himself, when he left India, could not have, by any stretch of imagination, thought of forming a national army unit outside the country, and therefore he had no definite plans chalked out for its realization. Even while in Berlin, he could not think of it during the first few months of his stay there. When and how, therefore, did he come to conceive such a plan? Mr. Ganpuley relates an interesting episode in this regard. To quote again from his book:

It was all due to a brain wave of Netaji which started working by a simple incident. He read one day about some half a dozen Indian prisoners-of-war who were brought to Berlin by the Radio Department to listen to the BBC and other stations which sent out their programmes in Hindustani. He saw them there going about, not as free Indians, but as prisoners-of-war. They were brought to the Radio Office every day to listen to and translate the Hindustani programmes, and were sent back to

Netaji sought and got agreement from the Germans that the Wehrmacht would train the Indians in the strictest military discipline, and they were to be trained in all branches of infantry in using weapons and motorized units the same way a German formation is trained; the Indian legionaries were not to be mixed up with any of the German formations; that they were not to be sent to any front other than in India for fighting against the British, but would be allowed to fight in self defense at any other place if surprised by any enemy formation; that in all other respects the Legion members would enjoy the same facilities and amenities regarding pay, clothing, food, leave, etc., as a German unit.

By December 1941 all arrangements were complete and the next important task was to persuade men to come forward and form the nucleus. It appeared that the POWs needed to be convinced that there were civilian Indian youth as well, studying, well placed in life and responsible to their families at home, who were ready to give up everything to join the Legion. Ten of the forty young Indians then residing in Berlin, came forward. They were quickly joined by five POWs who were already in Berlin in connection with the German radio propaganda, and the first group of fifteen people was thus formed. On 25 December 1941 a meeting of Indian residents in Berlin was called in the office of the Free India Center, to give a send-off to the first fifteen who were to leave the following day for Frankenburg, the first training camp and headquarters for the Legion. The brief ceremony was simple and solemn. Netaji blessed the Legion, the first of its kind in the history of the struggle for Indian independence. He christened it Azad Hind Fauj (Indian National Army). The Indian Army of Liberation in the West thus had a humble and modest birth.

The strength of the Legion grew steadily, as the task of recruitment continued unabated. Once trained to a certain level and discipline, the members of the first batch were assigned the additional responsibility of visiting the Annaberg camp and aiding in the recruitment process. While the Legion was sent to Frankenburg in Saxony, another group was taken to Meseritz in Brandenburg to be trained in tactical warfare. Abid Hasan and N.G. Swamy, the two original recruiters whom Netaji had sent to the Annaberg camp in 1941, had become de-facto

way up to the culminating point of 3500 men. But let us step back to early 1942, almost a year after Netaji's arrival in Berlin. After the inauguration of the Free India Center, Free India Radio, and the sending of the first fifteen legionaries to the Frankenburg training camp, Netaji's activities in Germany began in full swing. His presence in Germany was not yet officially admitted—he was still being referred to as Signor Orlando Mazzota or His Excellency Mazzota—but he began to be known to more and more people in Berlin. Josef Goebbels wrote in his diary on 1 March:

We have succeeded in prevailing upon the Indian nationalist leader, Bose, to issue an imposing declaration of war against England. It will be published most prominently in the German press and commented upon. In that way we shall now begin our official fight on behalf of India, even though we don't as yet admit it openly.

On 14 March, he remarked of Bose, "He is an excellent worker." The fall of Singapore was a signal for Netaji to broadcast his first official speech over the Free India Radio, repeating his vow to fight British imperialism until the end. This he followed with a declaration of war against England, although at that stage such a pronouncement could only be symbolic. Netaji had not yet obtained an Axis declaration in support of the freedom of India that he pressed for in the supplement of his first memorandum to the German government. That government was of the opinion that the time was not ripe yet for such a declaration and unless a pronouncement of this nature could be supported by military action, it would not be of much value.

Meanwhile, Japan proposed a tripartite declaration on India. Encouraged by this, Bose met Mussolini in Rome on 5 May, and persuaded him to obtain such a declaration in favour of Indian independence. Mussolini telegraphed the Germans, proposing proceeding at once with the declaration. To back his new proposal Mussolini told the Germans that he had urged Bose to set up a "counter-government" and to appear more conspicuously. The German reaction, which still remained guarded, is recorded by Dr. Goebbels in his diary on 11 May:

We don't like this idea very much, since we do not think the time has yet come for such a political manoeuvre. It does appear

began broadcasting from Rome with the aid of a few Indian prisoners. It is understood that he had conferred with Netaji a few times, but obviously had no intention of co-operating with him. From radio broadcasting, he advanced into forming an Indian military unit, although it was in clear violation of the Italo-German agreement. The unit was named the Centro Militare India, but existed only from April to November 1942.

During its brief period of existence, however, Shedai succeeded in diverting several hundred volunteers to Italian camps, who would normally have gone to Germany. In November the unit was three hundred and fifty strong, having been trained by Italian officers. On 9 November, after the Allied landing in North Africa, it was learnt that the men were being sent to fight in Libya, contrary to Shedai's promises. When they refused to go and mutinied, Shedai refused to intervene. Consequently, the Centro Militare India was disbanded. It was never revived, and thus a barrier that stood in Netaji's way toward recruitment was removed. In August 1942, the Legion was moved to Koenigsbrueck, a large military training center in Saxony. This had been a regular training ground for the German infantry and motorized units for decades. Here the first contingents paraded before Netaji's eyes in October, and the growth was rapid. However, the rapid expansion of the Legion also posed the problem of finances.

Hitherto, payment to soldiers was being made from the monthly grants to the Free India Center and its office. As the number of Legionaries grew, that source became insufficient. For this problem there could be but one solution: direct payment to the Legion by the Germans. This would mean hereafter that the Legionaries would receive promotions and precedence as soldiers of national socialist Germany, and would become, in fact, a regiment of the German army, while retaining its separate name and distinction. This was agreed upon between Netaji and the German government, necessitating the taking of a formal oath of loyalty to Adolph Hitler on the part of the Legionaries. Describing the ceremony, Hugh Toye writes:

Five hundred Legionaries were assembled. Their German commander, Lieutenant-Colonel Krappe, addressed them, and the oath was administered by German officers to six men at a

to be abandoned. The tide of war was turning swiftly, calling for devising new strategies on the part of Netaji.

While the German army's second thrust into Russia encountered an unexpected counter-offensive at Stalingrad and thus was forced to turn back, in another part of the world the forces of another Axis partner were forging ahead, nearer and nearer to India. Japan was achieving spectacular successes in the Far East and was ready to welcome Netaji as the leader of millions of Indians who lived in the countries of East and Southeast Asia. To Netaji, the Japanese attitude was extremely encouraging. Tolo, the Prime Minister, had issued statements in the Diet about Indian freedom early in 1942, and by March there was a Japanese proposal for a tripartite declaration on India. A small band of Indian National Army legionnaires had already been in existence in the Southeast under Japanese patronage, although a few of its leaders, including Mohan Singh, had fallen out with the Japanese. Netaji would have no difficulty in reorganizing and expanding this organization.

He would get the active support of millions of overseas Indians, and the many thousands of British Indian prisoners-of-war would provide him a greater opportunity for recruitment, and for thus organizing a formidable army of liberation that could immediately be deployed in forward positions as the Imperial Japanese Army kept on advancing through the steaming jungles of the Malayan peninsula and Burma. During his meeting with Hitler on 29 May, the Führer had also suggested that in view of the prevalent world situation, Netaji should shift the center of his activities from Germany to the Far East. Netaji could look back at his two years work in Germany with a sense of pride and accomplishment. Broadcasting, publications and propaganda were all extended. Azad Hind Radio had extended programmes in several languages, and reports indicated that they were being listened to with interest in target areas; Azad Hind, a bilingual journal, was being published regularly.

There were other papers for the Legion besides; the Free India Center had attained an acknowledged status in Germany. It was treated as a foreign mission, entitling its members to a higher scale of rations, and exemption from some of the Aliens' regulations. Netaji himself was given a good villa, a car and special rations

destroyed ... A meeting with Subhash Bose was a special event for the German training staff.-We spent many evenings with him, discussing the future of India. He lives in the minds of the training staff members as an idealistic and fighting personality, never sparing himself in the service of his people and his country ... The most rewarding fact was the real comradeship which grew between Indians and Germans, which proved true in dangerous hours, and exists still today in numerous cases. The Indian Legion was a precious instrument in strengthening and consolidating Indo-German friendship.

A report of Hitler's visit to the Indian Legion headquarters in Dresden was given by Shantaram Vishnu Samanta (one of the Legionaries) during a press interview in India, after his release from an internment camp. According to his statement, Hitler addressed the soldiers of the Legion after Netaji had left for East Asia. He spoke in German and his speech was translated into Hindustani by an interpreter. He said:

You are fortunate having been born in a country of glorious cultural traditions and a colossal manpower. I am impressed by the burning passion with which you and your Netaji seek to liberate your country from foreign domination. Your Netaji's status is even greater than mine. While I am the leader of eighty million Germans, he is the leader of 400 million Indians. In all respects he is a greater leader and a greater general than myself. I salute him, and Germany salutes him. It is the duty of all Indians to accept him as their führer and obey him implicitly. I have no doubt that if you do this, his guidance will lead India very soon to freedom.

A statement by another soldier of the Indian Legion, who remains anonymous, has a somewhat different version. It stated that both Netaji and Hitler took a joint salute of the Indian Legion and a German infantry. In addition to comments cited earlier, Hitler was reported to have made these remarks as well:

German civilians, soldiers and free Indians! I take this opportunity to welcome your acting Führer, Herr Subhash Chandra Bose. He has come here to guide all those free Indians who love their country and are determined to free it from foreign yoke. It is too much for me to dare to give you any instructions

for India's liberation. However, the rebellion was soon quelled after a team of NCOs visited the officials of the Free India Center in Berlin and obtained clarification regarding the rebel Legionaries' grievances. The team went back to the camp and assured the men that they were not being sent to fight a war but were there purely for practical training purposes according to Netaji's wishes; that the promotions were not being passed up, they would follow in due course; and that Netaji had not abandoned them, and they would be informed about his whereabouts and plans as soon as possible. In pursuance of military discipline, the ringleaders of this act of insubordination were sent to prison camps for a specified period. The Legion was stationed in the coastal areas of Holland for five months. Afterwards, there was a decision to move it to the coastal area of Bordeaux in France from the mouth of the Girond, opposite the fortification of Foyan to the Bay of Arcachon. The Legion was taking charge here. The stay in France was utilized to give the Legionaries a thorough training in the weaponry required for the defense of the Atlantic Wall. In the spring of 1944, the first batch of twelve Indians were promoted to officers. Field Marshal Rommel, who took charge of the Atlantic Wall, once visited the area where the Indian contingent was located. Ganpuly writes: ... after having seen the work carried out by the Indians,, he exclaimed: "I am pleasantly surprised to find that in spite of very little training in coastal defense, the work done here is fairly satisfactory." While departing, he said to the Indian soldiers: "I am glad to see you have done good work; I wish you and your leader all the good luck!"

In the spring of 1944, one company of the Legion was sent to North Italy at the request of some officers who were seeking an opportunity to confront the British forces. After the Normandy invasion by the Allied forces in June 1944, the military situation in Europe began to deteriorate. It eventually became so critical that the German High Command decided to order the Indian Legion to return to Germany. So after about ten months of stay in the coastal region of Lacanau in France, the Indian Legion started its road back. It is to be understood at this point that with the landing of the Allied troops in France and their gradual advance through the French countryside, the French Maquis (underground) guerrillas had become very active, and along with the German

into the military camp at the garrison town of Heuberg. In the spring of 1945 the Allied forces crossed the Rhine. The Russians entered the East German provinces murdering and plundering cities, townships and villages. Heavy bomber formations began destroying German cities. Transport systems became completely disorganized and paralyzed. The end was near, and there was no point in remaining in the barracks. The Legion, therefore, left its winter quarters at Heuberg in March 1945, and headed for the Alpine passes. By that time all communications with the Free India Center in Berlin had been cut off. The Legion commanders took decisions independently.

The Legion had already reached the Alpine regions east of Bodensee. However, with the surrender of the German forces on 7 May, all hopes also ended for the Free India Army. While attempting to cross over to Switzerland, the legionaries were overwhelmed by American and French units and were made prisoners. Those who fell into the hands of the French had to suffer very cruel treatment. Several were shot, while others died in prison camps in miserable conditions. The rest were eventually handed over to the British. Although thus swept into the maelstrom of the Axis disintegration in Europe, Netaji's army of liberation in the west had carved for itself a niche in history; for, indeed, it was a nucleus which would eventually precipitate a much larger fighting force elsewhere.

Inspired by its leader, that force would march into India to set in motion a process that would eventually deliver the country from an alien bondage. One, therefore, must not regard the saga of the Indian National Army in Europe as an isolated event that ended tragically. While its dream of crossing the Caucasus along with its allies, the German Armed Forces, and entering India from the Northwest, did not materialize in reality, its extension and successor, India's army of liberation in the east, did enter the country from the opposite direction, thus fulfilling the cherished dream of Netaji and his soldiers. Not only that, as we shall see subsequently, but that army made the mightiest contribution toward finally ending an imperialist rule in India. During his interview with Netaji, Hitler had suggested to him that since it would take at least another one or two years before Germany

in principle it had no objection to Bose's visit to Japan. The third problem was to provide Bose with a safe means of transport to Japan. Communication between Germany and Japan was impossible during those days. Passage by boat was ruled out; and it was decided to use a plane belonging to the Lufthansa Company to airlift Bose from Germany to Japan via the Soviet Union. Tojo (Japanese Prime Minister) objected to this on the grounds that this would amount to a breach of trust with the Soviet Union. An attempt was made by both Yamamoto and Bose to get an Italian plane, but this also did not work. Finally the choice fell on a submarine. Germany agreed to carry Bose up to a certain unknown point in the east and asked that a Japanese submarine be pressed into service thence forward. After a series of exchanges with his government, Oshima finally obtained Tokyo's approval of the plan and communicated it to Bose. Alexander Werth writes:

An interesting anecdote related to this historic journey may perhaps be mentioned here. Shortly before Bose's departure the Japanese Naval Command raised objections because of an internal Japanese regulation not permitting civilians to travel on a warship in wartime. When Adam von Trott (of the German Foreign Office) received this message by cable from the German Ambassador in Tokyo, he sent the following reply: "Subhash Chandra Bose is by no means a private person, but Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Liberation Army." Thus the bureaucratic interference was overcome.

On 8 February 1943, accompanied by Keppler, Nambiar and Werth, Netaji arrived at the port of Kiel where a German submarine under the command of Werner Musenberg was waiting for him. His would-be sole companion on this perilous voyage, Abid Hasan had travelled separately to Kiel in a special compartment without knowing his destination. Only after commencement of the journey was he to be informed of the itinerary. Netaji was leaving behind his chosen 3,500 soldiers of the Indian Legion, the 950th regiment of the German Army, specially trained and equipped for the task of liberating an India held in bondage by the British. We have already followed the history and fate of the Legion. Now let us turn to the East.

- Gandhi, P. Jegadish : *Dr. Abdul Kalam's Futuristic India*, Deep and Deep, New Delhi, 2006.
- Ghose, S.K.: *Politics of Violence: Dawn of a Dangerous Era*, Springfield, Nataraj, 1992.
- Habberton, William: *Anglo-Russian Relations Concerning Afghanistan 1837-1907*, Urbana, University of Illinois, 1937.
- Hasrat, Bikrama Jit: *Anglo-Sikh Relations, 1799-1849; A Reappraisal of the Rise and Fall of the Sikhs*, Hoshiazpur, Local Stockists vv Research Institute Book Agency, 1968.
- Hurewitz, Jacob C.: *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East: A Documentary Record 1535-1914*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1956.
- Huttenback. Robert A.: *British Relations with Sind 1799-1843; An Anatomy of Imperialism*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California, 1962.
- Kelly, John B.: *Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Nair, A. M.: *An Indian Freedom Fighter in Japan*, Bombay, Orient Longman, 1983.
- Nair, Janaki: *Women and Law in Colonial India*, New Delhi, Kali, 1996.
- Noorani, A.G. : *Indian Political Trials : 1775-1947*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Norris, James A.: *The First Afghan War 1838-1842*, Cambridge, University Press, 1967.
- Ray, B.N. : *Gandhigiri : Satyagraha After Hundred Years*, New Delhi, Kaveri Books, 2008.
- Rosen, P.: *Societies and Military Power: India and its Armies*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Singhal, D. P.: *India and Afghanistan: 1876-1907. A Study in Diplomatic Relations*, St. Lucia, University of Queensland, 1963.
- Sivaram, M.: *The Road to Delhi*, Rutland, Vt., C.E. Tuttle Co., 1967.

168, 169, 170, 171, 172,
173, 174, 175, 176, 181,
183, 184, 185, 215, 221,
228, 231, 234, 235, 236,
237, 238, 239, 240, 241,
242, 244, 245, 246, 248,
255, 258, 262, 266, 270,
272, 273, 279.
Gokhale, 1, 5, 131.

H

Hindu Maha Sabha, 1.

I

Ideology, 146, 148, 149, 150,
152, 165, 166, 215, 220,
243, 248, 257.
Indian Army, 10, 47, 62, 64, 65,
66, 208, 214, 218, 231,
232, 235, 254, 255, 257,
258, 259, 266, 268, 270,
274, 282, 283, 284, 289,
292.
Indian Independence Movement,
1, 146, 201, 218, 231.
Indian National Army, 146, 147,
156, 160, 164, 181, 190,
213, 222, 223, 225, 230,
233, 235, 251, 260, 261,
273, 275, 278, 284, 290.
Indian National Congress, 1, 43,
146, 149, 152, 159, 167,
190, 228, 260, 274, 279,
283.
Indian Regiment, 289.

J

Justice, 4, 5, 7, 9, 27, 28, 29,
30, 35, 40, 45, 48, 50,
58, 60, 61, 70, 74, 93,
103, 144, 147, 192, 208,
216.

L

Lala Lajpat Rai, 1, 3, 8.
Leaders, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 17,
22, 35, 66, 77, 108, 109,
112, 118, 124, 128, 130,
131, 132, 133, 147, 153,
158, 160, 161, 166, 171,
180, 185, 193, 194, 207,
213, 215, 216, 217, 222,
229, 233, 236, 255, 256,
267, 268, 269, 271, 274,
284.
Leadership, 55, 58, 71, 147,
148, 149, 152, 155, 156,
158, 159, 160, 161, 167,
170, 171, 182, 209, 222,
228, 241, 244, 273.
Legislation, 4, 24, 68, 74, 81,
84, 89, 90, 91, 93, 95,
102, 106, 117, 122, 123,
124, 125, 271.

N

National Integration, 217, 219,
220, 221.

P

Provisional Government, 157,
160, 162, 163, 195, 196,
208, 214, 227, 229, 230.
Punjab Kesari, 1, 8.

R

Revolutionary Movement, 102,
104, 105, 106, 109, 112,
114, 115, 116, 118, 121,
127, 128, 129, 130, 132.
Revolutionary Party, 110, 118,
127.

S

Struggles, 72, 182, 183, 269.

