

The Gandhian Impact on Freedom Movement of India (1915-1922)

Dr. Vandana Jerin¹, Shraddha Vishwakarma²

¹Associate Professor Department of History Isabella Thoburn College lucknow

²Scholar department of history

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the profound influence of Mahatma Gandhi's leadership on India's quest for independence, with a particular emphasis on the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movement. By tracing Gandhi's journey from his arrival in India in 1915 to the pivotal moments of the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movement, this research provides a nuanced understanding of the intersection of leadership, non-violent resistance, and mass mobilization.

Through a critical examination of historical sources, this study sheds light on the complex dynamics of India's freedom struggle, highlighting the role of Hindu-Muslim unity, non-violent resistance, and mass mobilization in shaping the nation's path to independence. The Khilafat Movement, launched in 1919, and the subsequent Non-Cooperation Movement, which gained massive support across India, are examined in detail to understand the movement's dynamics and its impact on Indian society.

By exploring the significance of the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movement, this research offers valuable insights into the evolution of Gandhi's leadership style and its lasting impact on Indian history. The study also examines the eventual suspension of the movement after the Chauri Chaura incident in 1922, providing a comprehensive understanding of the movement's significance in shaping India's freedom struggle.

This research contributes to a deeper understanding of Gandhi's leadership and its impact on India's freedom struggle.

INTRODUCTION

The Khilafat Movement (1919–1924) was a pan-Islamic political campaign launched by Indian Muslims to pressure the British government to preserve the authority of the Ottoman Sultan as Caliph of Islam after World War I. The movement was sparked by fears that the victorious Allied powers would dismember the Ottoman Empire and undermine the Islamic Caliphate, a symbol of unity and authority for Muslims globally.

Leaders like Maulana Mohammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, and Hakim Ajmal Khan spearheaded the movement in India. The movement aimed to mobilize Indian Muslims and unify them with Hindus against British colonial rule. This marked a significant moment of Hindu-Muslim unity, especially as it coincided with Mahatma Gandhi's launch of the Non-Cooperation Movement.

Mahatma Gandhi, returning from South Africa in 1915, emerged as a dominant leader in the Indian National Movement. He saw the Khilafat Movement as an opportunity to unite Hindus and Muslims in the struggle against British rule. Thus, he linked the Khilafat cause with Indian nationalism, bringing widespread participation from various communities. The Non-Cooperation Movement, launched in 1920, was Gandhi's first mass civil disobedience campaign. Its key features included: Boycott of British institutions: schools, colleges, courts, and government offices. Resignation from government jobs and return of British honors, Promotion of Swadeshi: encouraging the use of Indian-made goods and khadi (homespun cloth). Peaceful protests and non-payment of taxes.

The movement quickly gained traction across India, with millions of Indians voluntarily giving up British goods and institutions. The unique aspect of this movement was non-violence (Ahimsa), which Gandhi considered the soul of Satyagraha. The Non-Cooperation Movement spread rapidly among the masses. It saw unprecedented participation from farmers, students, laborers, and women: In rural areas, peasants protested against landlords and high taxes. In urban areas, workers and students participated in strikes and boycotts. Women joined in by spinning khadi and leading local protests.

This marked the first truly nationwide movement that transcended class, caste, and religion. The unity between the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation movements further solidified a collective national identity against British rule. By late 1921, the Khilafat Movement began losing steam due to international developments. The Treaty of Sèvres (1920) had already dismembered the Ottoman Empire. Then, in 1924, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk abolished the Caliphate in Turkey, rendering the movement irrelevant.

The decline was also caused by growing internal divisions and the realization that British promises would not be kept. As the Khilafat issue lost importance, Gandhi's Non-Cooperation Movement continued, but it was increasingly burdened by incidents of violence, which threatened Gandhi's principle of non-violence.

The turning point came on February 4, 1922, in the small town of Chauri Chaura in the Gorakhpur district of Uttar Pradesh. A peaceful protest by local Congress volunteers turned violent: The protestors picketed a liquor shop and clashed with the police. In retaliation to police firing, the angry mob set fire to the Chauri Chaura police station. Twenty-two policemen were killed in the blaze. This violent incident shocked Gandhi. Despite his deep commitment to the cause of Indian independence, he was unwilling to tolerate violence under any circumstances. He feared that if the movement lost its non-violent character, it would become counterproductive.

In response to the Chauri Chaura incident, Gandhi immediately decided to suspend the Non-Cooperation Movement on February 12, 1922. This decision was controversial: While Gandhi believed it was necessary to preserve moral integrity, other leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, and Motilal Nehru felt the decision was premature and demoralizing. Gandhi was arrested shortly after and sentenced to six years in prison for sedition. The momentum of the movement was lost, and the nationalists entered a period of political silence. Although the movement was suspended, both the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movements left a lasting legacy: Mass political awakening among Indian people.

Establishment of Gandhi's leadership as central to the Indian freedom struggle. A strong precedent for mass civil disobedience in future campaigns (e.g., Salt March, Quit India). The end of Hindu-Muslim unity, especially after the failure of the Khilafat cause.

The Chauri Chaura incident served as a critical lesson in the challenges of mass mobilization and maintaining non-violent discipline. It shaped Gandhi's future strategies and deepened his insistence on training and moral readiness before launching mass movement.

A Year of Unrest: 1919

The year of 1919 can be seen as an year which witnessed many incidents, which played crucial role in the freedom struggle of India. This year was memorable for four major incidents which shaped India's relations with Britain. They are:

1. The Rowlatt Bills, which resulted in terror in Punjab, which culminated the Jallianwalabagh Massacre and forceful enforcement of martial law in the Punjab.
2. The emergence of M.K. Gandhi of satyagraha fame in South Africa as the political leader in India.
3. The passings of the Government of India Act on the basis of Montford Report.
4. Revival of Pan-Islamism as a force in Indian politics.
5. Though these incidents are inter-connected to a certain extent, but it would be convenient to deal with them separately.

Rowlatt Bills

Lord Chelmsford followed the repressive policy of Lord Minto and Lord Harding. Lord Chelmsford suggested to appoint a committee to investigate the revolutionary movement in the different parts of India and recommended a legislation to suppress it. The committee was established under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Rowlatt of U.K. This committee consisted of four persons, where two were Indians and two were Britishers. This committee prepared a detailed scheme of revolutionary movement in India on the basis of numbers provided by Government of India. This legislation was recommended to replace Defence of India Act, which would automatically end with the world war 1st. Lord Montague had warned Rowlatt that the plan already hatched by Government of India was a plan of "Government by means of internment and police", but in vain (Majumdar, 2). After making a detailed scheme of revolutionary movement in India, the committee recommended a special legislation which would limit the liberty of people in a drastic manner. The one which actually changed into law was, Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act 1919. According to this act a special court was established consisting of three high court judges which would provide a speedy trial. There was no appeal from the decision of this court, which would meet in camera and take into consideration evidence and not admissible under the Indian Evidence Act. The provincial government was also given powers to search a place and arrest a suspected person without warrant and keep him in confinement, "in such place and such conditions and restrictions as it may specify" (Majumdar, 2). This bill was extremely opposed by the Indians of

all shades of political opinion. They argued that it would be a foolish step to introduce this bill when the revolutionary crimes were already on decline. On the other hand government's opinion was that it is not possible to demolish the root of revolutionary movement at that time. Subsequent events have shown that the revolutionary crimes always increased after the withdrawal of coercive legislation, and it can be hardly gainsaid that there was no peace but there was an undeclared war in India against British rule. The British government in India primarily focused on ensuring the security of their rule. Their actions were not necessarily wrong or foolish, but they failed to understand the deeper implications for Indian nationalism.

This is not surprising, as authoritarian governments often fail to grasp the true nature of such situations until it's too late. For example, Lord Morley once wisely suggested that granting self-government to Ireland could solve its issues, but he didn't apply this idea to India when faced with similar challenges. The British government eventually realized their mistake with Ireland, but only after a century and when the situation had spiraled out of control. Given this, it's not entirely fair to criticize the Indian government for failing to realize the importance of self-governance within just ten years. Meanwhile, widespread protests erupted across India against the unfair laws imposed by the British. These protests were organized through public meetings, and all Indian members who were not part of the official British administration opposed these laws. The Legislative Council strongly opposed the British government's measure, with four members resigning in protest. Such united opposition from Indians hadn't been seen since the Partition of Bengal. However, the British government, much like the Bourbons in France, refused to learn from past mistakes and stubbornly pushed forward. The Bill was passed on March 18, 1919, with only officials voting in favor, and it became law on March 21, 1919. Interestingly, the new law ended up being ineffective, proving both its supporters and critics wrong. Despite this, the situation highlighted a remarkable political leader—Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. Gandhi went on to gain worldwide recognition and played a pivotal role in India's fight for freedom.

Emergence of Gandhi ji as a political leader in India

Mahatma Gandhi was born on October 2, 1869, in a rich family in Porbandar, Gujarat. His family was well-off, and Gandhi had a comfortable childhood. In 1888, he went to England to study law and became a qualified lawyer. However, when he came back to India in 1891 and started working as a lawyer in Rajkot and Bombay, he didn't do well and faced many failures. During this time, an English officer insulted him in Bombay, which hurt him deeply and changed his life's direction. Looking for a fresh start, Gandhi accepted an offer to work as a lawyer for a business owned by some Muslims from Porbandar. This job took him to South Africa, where he arrived in May 1893. While traveling by train to Pretoria, South Africa's capital, Gandhi faced discrimination. He was forced out of a first-class compartment, even though he had a valid ticket, just because he was Indian. He had to spend the whole night in the waiting room at the station. Gandhi later said this incident became one of the biggest moments that shaped his work. At that time, around 200,000 Indians in South Africa faced racism and were treated unfairly. They were called bad names like "semi-barbarous Asiatics" in official records (Majumdar, 5). One time, when the South African government tried to pass a law stopping Indians from voting, Gandhi led a protest against it. Even though the law was eventually passed, Gandhi's leadership gave the Indian community in South Africa hope and a sense of unity.

In 1896, Gandhi returned to India. While there, he wrote and distributed a pamphlet describing the unfair treatment Indians were facing in South Africa. When he went back to South Africa, this pamphlet made the White community there very angry. They saw Gandhi as a troublemaker. When Gandhi arrived in Natal in December 1896, he was attacked by a mob. They threw stones, bricks, and even rotten eggs at him. They beat him until he fainted. His life was saved by a kind woman who happened to be the wife of the police superintendent. Despite all the discrimination and violence he faced, Gandhi remained peaceful and calm. For example, during the Boer War in South Africa, he even formed a group of Indian volunteers to help the British by providing medical care.

Gandhi believed that volunteering to help during the Zulu rebellion in 1906 would show the White South Africans the value and fairness of Indians. He said because "the British empire existed for the welfare of the world", and he had a "genuine sense of loyalty" to it (Majumdar, 6). He hoped it would reduce their hostility toward Indians and other non-White people. However, he was disappointed when tensions between Indians and Whites grew worse instead of improving. Still, Gandhi joined the British army during the rebellion and led a group of 24 Indian stretcher bearers who provided medical aid to soldiers. Gandhi volunteered because he believed the British Empire existed to help the world and he felt loyal to it. But Gandhi's loyalty to the British was soon challenged. A new law in Transvaal required all Indians to register themselves by giving fingerprints, as if they were criminals. Those who didn't obey faced serious punishment. Gandhi strongly opposed this law, trying every peaceful method to stop it, including petitions, meetings, and discussions. When these efforts failed, he decided to fight the law by breaking it. He refused to register, give fingerprints, or accept permits. On September 11, 1906, Gandhi spoke to a crowd of about 3,000 people in Johannesburg, asking them to resist this unfair law, known as the "Black Act." He told them to be ready to go to jail or even die if needed. The crowd took an oath to fight the law at any cost. This was the start of Satyagraha, Gandhi's method of nonviolent resistance. It was different from passive resistance because it avoided violence completely—not just in actions, but also in thoughts and words. The Satyagraha movement grew to oppose other injustices, such as new laws that banned Indians from entering Transvaal and declared Indian marriages invalid. Many women joined the

movement, and Gandhi, along with his wife Kasturba, was sent to prison. In addition, around 6,000 Indian miners in New Castle went on strike in support of Satyagraha. They stayed strong even though they were forced out of their homes.

On October 28, 1913, Gandhi led over 2,000 men, 127 women, and 57 children in a march to the Transvaal border as part of a Satyagraha protest against unfair laws. Gandhi was arrested and sentenced to nine months in jail. The strikers, too, were arrested and sent back to New Castle, where they were mistreated. The workers refused to work in the mines, so they were brutally beaten and whipped, yet they endured all the hardships with courage. Strikes and protests by women also took place in other areas to support the New Castle miners. In some places, the government used violence, including firing at protesters, which caused casualties. This united the Indian community in South Africa to stand firmly against the unfair treatment by the Whites. People in India, including the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, watched these events with great concern and supported the Indians in South Africa. The South African government eventually realized they couldn't imprison all 20,000 Indians who participated in the movement, so they reached an agreement with Gandhi. Some of the most offensive and unfair laws against Indians were removed, and the Satyagraha campaign, which began in 1906, ended in 1914 with the passing of the Indian Relief Act (Majumdar, 7).

Arrival of Gandhi in India in 1915

Satyagraha

Satyagraha, a technique of protest introduced by Gandhi, became central to India's freedom struggle after 1919. It is not just a method of peaceful resistance—it's a unique blend of philosophy, ethics, and spirituality. It focuses on completely rejecting violence in actions, words, and even thoughts. This made it different from other resistance movements. Satyagraha, in its final form, was not something Gandhi came up with instantly. It evolved over more than thirty years as Gandhi refined and developed it through his writings, speeches, and actions. Over time, a lot has been written about Satyagraha, often focusing on its mystical, psychological, or religious aspects. However, the focus here is on its main features as a principle guiding political actions of individuals and groups. The goal of Satyagraha is to change the opponent's mind through self-suffering, not violence. It works by touching the conscience of the opponent. The resisters willingly accept suffering and humiliation to show the injustice they face. This makes the opponent question their own beliefs, weakens their confidence, and creates a sense of guilt for causing suffering.

Originally, Gandhi called his movement in South Africa "Passive Resistance" (Majumdar, 8). However, he later replaced this term with "Satyagraha" because he wanted to highlight its deeper meaning and felt embarrassed using an English word. Gandhi explained that Satyagraha is completely different from Passive Resistance. Passive Resistance is often seen as a tactic of the weak and may include the use of violence to achieve a goal. Satyagraha, on the other hand, is the weapon of the strong and completely rejects violence in any form—whether in actions, words, or thoughts.

Gandhi believed Satyagraha required great strength and courage. It wasn't just about protesting; it was about staying peaceful, accepting suffering, and standing up for what is right in a way that inspires change in others. Gandhi compares passive resistance and Satyagraha, emphasizing their key differences. Passive resistance, according to Gandhi, avoids violence not as a moral principle but due to a lack of resources or practical considerations. It may use violence if opportunities or success seem likely. In contrast, Satyagraha is based entirely on non-violence and the principle of love. It rejects all forms of violence, seeking to win over opponents through patience, love, and self-suffering instead of causing harm or destruction. Gandhi believed in the fundamental goodness of human nature and trusted that love and self-sacrifice could inspire individuals to overcome their wrongdoings. This belief forms the foundation of Satyagraha, which aims to transform rather than harm those opposing it. Gandhi emphasized that the high ideals of Satyagraha were not limited to saints or visionaries but could be practiced by ordinary people to achieve political goals. He described himself as a "practical idealist". Thus he said: "I am not a visionary. I claim to be a practical idealist" (Majumdar, 10). He believed that non-violence was a universal principle for humanity, contrasting it with violence, which he saw as the law of brute force. He identified non-cooperation and civil resistance (often equated with civil disobedience) as key forms of Satyagraha. Other methods included hartals (temporary strikes), purificatory fasts, picketing, non-violent marches (like the famous Salt March of 1930), and fasting, whether for a fixed period or indefinitely. These approaches were all rooted in the principles of non-violence and aimed at achieving justice through peaceful means.

Satyagraha in India

Gandhi left South Africa for good and returned to India in January, 1915. In 1915, Indians welcomed him with their whole heart. His successes and struggles made him famous among Indians. Not only the educated people, but even the illiterate and rural people had come to know about Gandhi ji and had a feeling of respect for him. When Gandhi ji went to the Kumbh Mela in Haridwar, a crowd of villagers gathered to see him. Gokhale had already said after touring India that Gandhi ji has all the qualities that are found in heroes and martyrs. Gokhale also stated that Gandhi ji also has a talent of mesmerizing people. He also has a unique ability to make a common man a sacrificer and a fighter (Chandra, 128).

However, he seemed disconnected from India's political movements at the time, such as the Swadeshi movement, and unfamiliar with Arabinda Ghose's ideas on passive resistance and non-cooperation, even though Ghose had been promoting these concepts during Gandhi's South African campaigns. Gandhi credited writers like Tolstoy and Thoreau for influencing his thoughts but did not acknowledge Ghose's work. Despite facing oppressive British policies, Gandhi remained loyal to the British Empire. During the Zulu rebellion in 1906, he volunteered to form an Indian Ambulance Corps to help the Natal Government, which had enacted discriminatory laws against Indians. Gandhi justified this by believing that his action by saying, "I believed that the British empire existed for the welfare of the world" (Majumdar, 11). While India was engaged in a struggle for political independence, Gandhi focused on improving the moral and ethical standards of Indians. In his book *Hind Swaraj* (1908), he outlined his vision of Swaraj, which emphasized self-rule through moral and spiritual development over political independence.

He criticized Western parliamentary democracy, favoring a unique governance model for India. Though Gokhale dismissed *Hind Swaraj* as crude and premature, Gandhi remained steadfast in its principles, even decades later. Gandhi stayed loyal to the British Empire, even when nationalism was spreading across India. On October 1908, he wrote to the Governor of Madras, "I should be uninterested in the fact as to who rules (India), the important consideration being how he ruled" (Majumdar, 12). Most Indians at the time wanted self-government, but Gandhi still believed the British Empire worked for the good of the world. During World War I, he disagreed with Indians who wanted to take advantage of Britain's struggles and instead created an Ambulance Corps to help, even though they faced insults and poor treatment from the British. When Gandhi returned to India in 1915, he felt himself misfit in politics and accepted Gokhale as his mentor. Gokhale admired Gandhi's focus on humanity but didn't agree with his political ideas. Gandhi couldn't join the Servants of India Society because the group's members didn't like his methods, so he set up an Ashram in Ahmedabad on the bank of river Sabarmati (1915) to teach India about Satyagraha.

The first big campaign of the Ashram happened in 1917. Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy, refused to let Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya introduce a law to stop the Indenture system, which forced Indian workers to labor like slaves in British plantations. Gandhi fought to end this system, and it was abolished by July 31, 1917. The government announced that recruitment under the Indenture system would stop as part of war measures, so Gandhi didn't need to use Satyagraha for this issue.

Later, Gandhi took up the cause of peasants in Champaran, Bihar, who were being cruelly exploited by indigo planters. He visited Champaran with local leaders to investigate the situation. Despite being ordered to leave, Gandhi refused and was taken to court on April 18, 1917. The government withdrew the case, allowing Gandhi to continue his inquiry. His findings exposed the severe exploitation of farmers, leading the government to abolish the oppressive system through new laws. This marked Gandhi's first major success with Satyagraha in India.

Next, Gandhi focused on mill workers in Ahmedabad who were demanding higher wages. He advised them to strike peacefully and not return to work until their demands were met or the issue was sent to arbitration. After two weeks, the workers began losing hope. Gandhi then declared he would fast until the strike succeeded or the workers left the mills entirely. His fast motivated both the workers and mill owners, resulting in a settlement after 21 days.

After the Ahmedabad strike, Gandhi started a Satyagraha campaign in Kheda District. According to the Land Revenue Rules, farmers could stop paying taxes if their crop yield was less than 25%. The farmers claimed this was true, but government officials refused to accept their demand or allow arbitration. When negotiations failed, Gandhi advised the farmers to use Satyagraha. They pledged not to pay taxes and to face consequences like losing their belongings or land. Gandhi was joined by leaders like Vallabhbhai Patel. Despite some setbacks, the farmers stayed strong, overcoming their fear of officials and standing firm against threats and intimidation. They even calmly faced the loss of their property and land. Eventually, the government had to agree to terms that satisfied the farmers. This campaign was another success for Gandhi's Satyagraha movement.

Gains from Champaran, Ahmedabad and Kheda

1. Gandhi demonstrated to the people the efficiency of his technique of satyagraha.
2. He acquired respect and commitment of many, especially youth.
3. He found his feet among the masses and came to have a surer understanding of the strength and weakness of the masses.

Agitation against Rowlatt bill

Gandhi respected the British government but could not tolerate unfair actions by its officials, as seen in Kheda and Champaran. When the government planned to pass harsh laws based on the Rowlatt Committee's suggestions, Gandhi warned he would protest. Despite his efforts to convince the Viceroy, one of the bills became law on March 18, 1919. To prepare, Gandhi held a small meeting with leaders like Vallabhbhai Patel and Sarojini Naidu. They created and signed a pledge on 24 February 1919 to start a Satyagraha movement against the unjust laws.

The pledge was as follows:-

“Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. I of 1919 and the Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill No. II of 1919 are unjust, subversive of the principles of liberty and justice and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole and the state itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these bills becoming law and until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a Committee, to be hereafter appointed, may think fit, and we further affirm that in this struggle, we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property” (Majumdar, 15).

Gandhi formed a group called the Satyagraha Sabha, with its headquarters in Bombay, to organize protests against unjust laws. Bulletins were issued, public meetings were held, and many people signed the Satyagraha pledge. Gandhi suggested a nationwide hartal, where people would stop work for a day and observe fasting and prayer as a way of self-purification before starting Satyagraha. Leaders like Rajagopalachari supported the idea, and Gandhi drafted an appeal for the hartal. The hartal was initially planned for March 30, 1919, but was later changed to April 6. However, in Delhi, the hartal began on March 30 due to a delay in the notice of the date change. The hartal was widely successful, but in some places like Delhi, Lahore, and Amritsar, police opened fire on peaceful processions, causing casualties. Gandhi received urgent requests to visit these areas following the violence. The blood of the martyrs has consecrated his glory to the uncrowned king of India.

Rowlatt Satyagraha

After the failure of peaceful protests through constitutional means, Gandhiji started the Satyagraha movement to fight against unfair laws. He formed a group called the Satyagraha Sabha, where many young people joined to show their dissatisfaction with the British government. The protest involved fasting, praying, breaking certain laws peacefully, and a nationwide strike, known as a hartal. April 6, 1919, was chosen as the start date for the movement. Things didn't go as planned. Gandhiji's call for a nationwide hartal on April 6, 1919, was a major test of his leadership. Reports of success came from many places, including Bombay, where the hartal was peaceful and well-organized. Thousands of people, including Hindus and Muslims, joined processions and listened to speeches by Gandhiji and Sarojini Naidu. Gandhiji wisely advised against taking pledges for Swadeshi and Hindu-Muslim unity without proper thought, as only a few people returned the next day to take them. Civil disobedience also began in Bombay with the sale of banned books written by Gandhiji. In Delhi, however, the hartal was held early on March 30 due to confusion, leading to violent clashes. Police and soldiers used force, including firing machine guns, which caused deaths and injuries.

Despite his efforts, violence continued, with soldiers firing into the crowd. Swami Shraddhananda, a respected leader with a strong reputation across India, played an important role in addressing the unrest during the premature hartal in Delhi on March 30, 1919. A notice had been circulated, calling for a peaceful day of mourning and asking people to close businesses, pray for the country, and attend a meeting. However, at Delhi's railway station, tensions rose when a European official interfered, leading to the police arresting two individuals. People demanded their release but were beaten with sticks, and soldiers arrived with a machine gun. Reports indicated that the machine gun was fired indiscriminately, resulting in deaths and injuries, with bodies dragged into the station yard. Swami Shraddhananda quickly addressed a large public meeting of about 50,000 people, urging them to stay calm and return to their homes peacefully. Despite his efforts, violence continued. As he led the crowd toward the Clock Tower, they encountered Gurkha soldiers. When he approached them to ask for peace, a rifle was fired into the crowd, creating panic. Swami Dayanand's statement was as follows:-

‘I addressed a public meeting which was attended by about 50,000 people, and asked the huge audience to follow me and disperse quietly to their homes. When we approached the Clock Tower we found the Gurkhas in the middle of the road, in double file, facing both ways. On seeing us they moved to the right foot-board, but as soon as we came near them a rifle was fired into the crowd. There was a great commotion but I pacified the men and went alone to the Goorkhas and asked them why they were firing on innocent people. They pointed two rifles at me and said “tom ko ched denge” (we will pierce you) (Majumdar, 17, 18).

Swami Shraddhananda bravely worked to pacify the people, demonstrating courage and leadership during a time of chaos. This episode not only highlights the difficulties faced during the hartal but also Swami Shraddhananda's commitment to Gandhiji's principles of non-violence, even in the face of danger. Swami Shraddhananda faced threats and danger while standing for non-violence during the unrest in Delhi. British soldiers pointed rifles at him, but he remained calm in his sanyasi robes, urging the crowd not to retaliate and reminding them of their vow to peace. His courage calmed the situation, and eventually, he left peacefully with the people. The wounded from clashes were taken to a police hospital, but British nurses refused to treat them, labeling them as “rebels.” Only after an appeal to higher authorities were the dead handed over to their families, and the wounded properly treated in civil hospitals. On April 6, Delhi observed the hartal with over 10,000 people attending meetings, and the city experienced high levels of excitement. Local leaders invited Gandhiji to visit Delhi and Amritsar to pacify the unrest. However, the British

government feared his influence and issued an order at Palwal Station preventing him from entering Punjab. Gandhiji was escorted back to Bombay under police watch on April 10. When Gandhiji arrived in Bombay, he was released, but the news of his arrest had already caused an uproar among the people, with tensions rising in PWDHUNI. Gandhiji went to the area to calm the crowds, and a massive procession formed to celebrate his release. However, mounted police tried to stop the procession from proceeding toward the Fort area. When the crowd attempted to break through the police cordon, the officers ordered them to disperse. The mounted police charged into the crowd, wielding lances, which grazed Gandhiji's car as they passed. This charge led to injuries and chaos, with people being trampled or badly hurt. Meanwhile, rumors spread in Ahmedabad that not only Gandhiji but also Anasuya Ben had been arrested. Mill workers, angered by this news, went on strike and resorted to violence, including acts of arson. Martial law was imposed in Ahmedabad, and clashes led to the death of a sergeant and other incidents of violence. Gandhiji learned about attempts to sabotage railway tracks near Nadiad and the murder of a government officer in Viramgam.

To restore peace, Gandhiji sought permission from the government and held a public meeting in Ahmedabad on April 13. He declared a three-day fast as penance and urged the people to observe a one-day fast. He also appealed to those who committed acts of violence to admit their guilt and asked the government to forgive their actions. Despite this, neither side responded, but peace was eventually restored. The Hunter Committee's Report highlighted the aftermath of the unrest in Ahmedabad during the Rowlatt Satyagraha. It recorded the deaths of two officials, 28 rioters, and injuries to 123 others, with additional casualties likely. Telegraph wires were cut at multiple locations, and property worth approximately nine and a half lakh rupees was destroyed. Gandhiji openly criticized the violent actions carried out in the name of Satyagraha during his speech in Ahmedabad on April 14, 1919. He condemned acts like burning buildings, stealing weapons, extorting money, cutting telegraph wires, and harming innocent people, emphasizing that such deeds were against the principles of Satyagraha. He admitted to making a "Himalayan miscalculation" by calling for Civil Disobedience without ensuring that participants were fully prepared for its strict non-violent discipline. Realizing the need for better preparation, Gandhiji suspended the Civil Disobedience movement and decided to train a group of dedicated volunteers who understood the principles of Satyagraha. He raised a corps of volunteers in Bombay but faced challenges as interest in peaceful methods dwindled.

Meanwhile, in Punjab, Lieutenant-Governor Sir Michael O'Dwyer's oppressive policies, including forced recruitment and suppression of nationalist voices, fueled resentment among the people. His actions, such as forcing landowners to provide recruits under threat of losing their land rights, created widespread anger. During the Congress session in Bombay in 1918, delegates from Punjab warned of an impending explosion of unrest, which materialized after the hartal of April 6, 1919, as protests and violence spread across the province. The Hunter Committee investigated the unrest in Punjab following the Rowlatt Satyagraha and highlighted incidents in cities like Lahore, Kasur, Gujranwala, and Amritsar.

Amritsar (Jallianwala Bagh)

April 6, 1919, was chosen as the start date for the movement. Things didn't go as planned. Due to confusion, Delhi held the hartal early on March 30, leading to violence in the city. Similar disturbances happened in other places. Punjab was especially affected because people there were already angry about forced recruitment during the war, strict punishments, and widespread disease. In Amritsar, the arrest of two local leaders made things worse, as the public attacked buildings, cut telegraph wires, and hurt Europeans. The government called in the army, and General Dyer took control, banning public gatherings. Gandhiji wanted to travel to Punjab to calm people but was sent back to Bombay by the government. He stayed in Gujarat to help ease tensions, as protests there were also violent. Meanwhile, the situation in Punjab grew worse. On April 13, a large group of unarmed people gathered at Jallianwala Bagh, unaware of the ban on public meetings. General Dyer ordered his soldiers to fire at them, killing hundreds. This tragic event is known as the Jallianwala Bagh massacre.

The Jallianwala Bagh massacre, also known as the Amritsar massacre, occurred on April 13, 1919, during the Baisakhi festival. Thousands of unarmed people had gathered at Jallianwala Bagh, a public garden in Amritsar, to celebrate the festival and discuss political issues, including the arrest of two nationalist leaders and the oppressive Rowlatt Act. General Reginald Dyer, angered by the gathering, arrived with troops and blocked the garden's only exit. Without warning, he ordered his soldiers to fire on the crowd. The shooting lasted for about ten minutes, with 1,650 rounds fired. The enclosed garden left people with no escape route, leading to a devastating loss of life. Official reports claimed 379 deaths (Chandra, 1982), but other estimates suggested the number was much higher, with over 1,200 injured. The massacre shocked the nation and marked a turning point in India's struggle for independence. It exposed the brutality of British rule and led to widespread anger and protests.

Sir Valentine comments: "But for General Dyer's own statement before the Hunter Commission, one might have pleaded that, left to his own unbalanced judgement by the precipitate abdication of the civil authority, he simply 'saw red'. But, on his own showing, he deliberately made up his mind while marching his men to Jallianwala, and would not have flinched from still greater slaughter if the narrowness of the approaches had not compelled him to leave his machine-guns behind. His purpose, he declared, was to strike terror into the whole of the Punjab" (Majumdar, 27).

Lala Girdhari Lal, the Deputy Chairman of the Punjab Chamber of Commerce, provided a firsthand account of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. Observing the tragic events from a house overlooking the site, he witnessed the brutal firing on the unarmed crowd. After the firing ceased, he was among the first to enter the Bagh, where he saw the aftermath of the carnage hundreds of bodies lying lifeless and many wounded struggling for help. His testimony is a crucial piece of evidence that sheds light on the horrors of the massacre and the extent of the violence inflicted upon peaceful protesters. He says : "I saw hundreds of persons killed on the spot. The worst part of the whole thing was that firing was directed towards the gates through which the people were running out. There were small outlets, 4 or 5 in all, and bullets actually rained over the people at all these gates, and many got trampled under the feet of the rushing crowds and thus lost their lives. Blood was pouring in profusion. Even those who lay flat on the ground were shot. No arrangements were made by the authorities to look after the dead or wounded. I think there must have been over 1,000 dead bodies in the garden then." (Majumdar, 28).

The discrepancy in the death toll from the Jallianwala Bagh massacre highlights the challenges in accurately documenting the scale of the tragedy. The Congress Inquiry Committee noted that the British government delayed investigating the number of casualties until August 20, 1919—four months after the massacre. Initial government figures suggested 290 deaths, but later they accepted the Seva Samiti's estimate of 500, which was based on actual tracing and considered the minimum. Lala Girdhari Lal, who witnessed the aftermath, estimated the death toll to be around 1,000, a figure the Committee deemed plausible after careful investigation. General Dyer's unapologetic stance added to the horror of the event. He openly admitted to the massacre's gruesome details and even justified his actions, claiming it was a "merciful act" to fire without warning on an unarmed crowd. His rationale was rooted in his desire to instill fear across Punjab, and he expressed no remorse for the loss of innocent lives. This unapologetic attitude further fueled outrage and cemented the massacre as a symbol of colonial brutality. The British government imposed martial law in Punjab, further oppressing the people. Gandhiji, deeply saddened by the violence, decided to withdraw the movement on 18 April, but it didn't mean that Gandhi lost his faith in his non-violent satyagraha or in the capacity or in the capacity of the Indian people to adopt it as a method of struggle. A year later, he launched another nationwide struggle, on a bigger scale than of the Rowlatt Satyagraha. The wrong inflicted on Punjab was one of the major reasons for launching it.

The Hunter Report

The news of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre was initially suppressed, but leaders like Rabindranath Tagore and Sir Sankaran Nair protested. Tagore gave up his Knighthood, and Nair resigned from the Viceroy's Executive Council. This drew attention to the tragedy, leading to the formation of the Hunter Committee in October 1919 to investigate the incident. However, the Committee's report, published in March 1920, tried to downplay the massacre. General Dyer was only removed from service as a punishment for his guilt, which was described as "an error of judgment." In the Report, it was stated that the conduct of General Dyer was "based upon an honest, but mistaken conception of duty." Mr. Montagu also took the same view. In the House of Lords, speeches were delivered eulogizing General Dyer as a champion of the British Empire. He was presented with a sword of Honour and a purse of £2000. General Dyer had himself admitted that his object in firing was to strike terror in the whole of the Punjab and even outside to avoid such occurrences in future (Aggarwal, 132).

The Indian National Congress formed its own committee, which reported higher casualties and condemned the massacre as a deliberate act of cruelty. Mahatma Gandhi was deeply disillusioned by the government's refusal to punish the guilty or compensate the victims. This marked a turning point for Gandhi, shifting him from cooperation with the British to leading the non-cooperation movement in 1920. The incident further fueled India's struggle for independence.

Montagu's statement of 20 August 1917

The Montagu Declaration of 1917 was meant to show the British Government's intent to include Indians in administration and gradually develop self-governance in India as part of the British Empire. It temporarily eased tensions but left many Indians dissatisfied. Critics argued that the declaration lacked specific timelines and criteria for reform, and it was unfair that the British would decide when India was ready for each step.

When Edwin Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, visited India in November 1917, he met with Viceroy Lord Chelmsford, British officials. A committee was appointed consisting of Sir William Duke, Earl of Donoughmore, Bhupendra Nath Basu, and Charles Robert Montagu (Grove, 390). This led to the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, published in 1918, which became the basis for the Government of India Act 1919. While the act introduced limited Indian participation through dyarchy in provincial administration, it showed the British were willing to take small steps toward self-governance.

The Government of India Act, 1919

Preamble—The Act laid down in its Preamble the principles on which the reforms were to be progressively carried out in India. These principles were more or less the same as embodied in the Declaration of August 20, 1917. An analysis of the Preamble brings out the following points : (1) British India is to remain an integral part of the British Empire.

- (2) Responsible Government in British India is the objective of the declared policy of Parliament.
(3) Responsible Government is capable of progressive realisation only. (4) In order to achieve Responsible Government, it is necessary to provide for two things: the increasing association of the Indians in every branch of administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions. (5) Concurrently with the development of self-governing institutions in the provinces, it is expedient to give to provinces in provincial matters the highest measure of independence of the Government of India, which is compatible with the due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities (Grover, 391).

The significance of the Preamble was that what already declared by Montagu was now given a definite legal shape. The sovereignty of the British Parliament over India was reasserted and the country was told in clear terms of the basis of the future British action.

Main Provisions of the act:-

The Government of India Act introduced some notable changes both in Britain and in India:

1. **Changes in the 'Home' Government:** The Secretary of State for India, who was previously paid from Indian funds, would now be paid from the British treasury, correcting an injustice dating back to 1793. Some responsibilities of the Secretary of State were transferred to the newly created High Commissioner for India, who was appointed and paid by the Indian government. This High Commissioner handled matters like the Stores Department and Indian Students Department. While the Secretary of State's control over provincial matters (Transferred Subjects) in India was reduced, their authority at the central level remained unchanged. These adjustments were partially made in response to the Congress Party's demand in 1916 that India's governance should shift from London to Indian cities like Delhi and Simla. However, the changes only marginally addressed this demand.
2. **Changes in the Indian Government:** While responsible government was not established at the central level, Indians gained more influence. The number of Indian members in the Governor-General's Executive Council increased to three out of eight. These Indian members were given charge of important departments like Law, Education, Labour, Health, and Industries. The Government of India Act introduced a division of responsibilities between the central and provincial governments:
 - **Central List:** These subjects were administered by Governor-General-in-council, Included subjects of national importance or those affecting multiple provinces, like Foreign Affairs, Defence, Political Relations, Communications, Civil and Criminal Law, Posts and Telegraphs, and Public Debt. These were managed by the Governor-General-in-Council.
 - **Provincial List:** Covered matters of local importance, such as Public Health, Education, Local Self-Government, Medical Services, Agriculture, Law and Order, Land Revenue, Water Supply, and Famine Relief. These were managed by the provinces. Any subject not specifically assigned to the provinces automatically remained under the Central List.
3. **Changes on legislative side: Bicameral Legislature:** The old single Imperial Council was replaced by:
 1. **Council of State (Upper House):** Had 60 members, with a mix of nominated and elected individuals, but women were excluded. 26 members were nominated by the Governor general and 34 were to be elected. 26 nominated members will consist 20 officials and 6 non officials, while of the 34 elected members, 20 were to be elected by General Constituencies 10 by the Muslims, 3 by the Europeans and 1 by the Sikh constituencies. The Council of State was renewed partially every year, though a member held his seat for five years. Its President was to be nominated by the Viceroy and its members were called "Honourable". Women were not entitled to become its members. The governor General could address the House, and he could summon, prorogue or dissolve the House (Grover, 392).
 2. **Legislative Assembly (Lower House):** Consisted of 145 members, with 104 elected and 41 nominated.
 4. **Restricted Voting Rights:** Voting was limited to the wealthy and educated. Only around 17,364 people, out of a population of 240 million, could vote. Only those paying an income tax on the minimum income of Rs. 10,000 a year or those paying a minimum land revenue of Rs. 750 a year were entitled to vote.
 5. **Governor-General's Power:** He retained the authority to summon or dissolve the legislature, and the franchise system heavily restricted representation. While these changes aimed at reform, they failed to empower Indians significantly, leaving the Governor-General and the Seats were allocated based on the perceived importance of provinces, not population.

6. Punjab and Bihar & Orissa were both given 12 seats, despite Punjab's population being much smaller. This was due to Punjab's military significance. Bombay and Madras were allocated 16 seats each, though Bombay had only half the population of Madras, reflecting its commercial importance.

Powers of Central Legislature: The central legislature consisted two houses, council of state and Legislative assembly. the members had the right to ask questions. They had the right to ask questions and supplementaries. Short-notice questions could also be asked. The members enjoyed the right of freedom of speech.

- There were, however, certain restrictions imposed on the Legislature. In certain cases, previous sanction of the Governor-General was required for the introduction of a bill such as (a) Amendment or repeal of an existing law or an ordinance of the Governor-General, (6) Foreign relations and the relations with the Indian States, (c) Discipline or maintenance of the military, naval and the air forces, (d) Public debt and public revenue and (e) Religion, religious rites and usages of the people. Further, if the Governor-General felt that and bill or a part of it affects the safety or tranquillity of British India or any part thereof, he could prevent its consideration. If on the advice of the Governor-General the Legislature refused to pass a law, the Governor-General could pass it himself, subject to the sanction of the Crown. He could make and promulgate ordinances in cases of emergency which could last for six months and which had the same force of law as a law passed by the legislature. His assent was essential for the enactment of law passed by the legislature. Thus we see that the vetoing power of the Governor-General was real and was actually exercised (Grover, 393).
- **Budget proposals** required submission in the Legislative Assembly, with certain items subject to votes and others not even open for discussion.
- **Central government** remained largely under the control of the British Crown, as the Governor-General's Executive Council was irremovable by a legislative vote of no-confidence.

Provincial Government (Introduction of Dyarchy)

The most important feature of the Act was the introduction of dyarchy (from the Greek words di meaning two, and archia meaning rule—double government or government by two rulers) in the provinces (Grover, 398).

The Government of India Act, 1919, introduced dyarchy in provincial administration, a system dividing governance into Reserved and Transferred subjects. Reserved subjects, such as Police, Law and Order, and Finance, were administered by the Governor and Executive Councillors, who were not accountable to the legislature. Transferred subjects, like Education, Agriculture, and Local Government, were managed by ministers chosen from elected representatives and were accountable to the Provincial Legislature. This Act also delineated powers between the Central Government (handling Defence, Foreign Affairs, and Currency) and the Provincial Governments (focused on areas like Public Health and Agriculture). The Provincial Legislative Councils were expanded, with approximately 70% of members elected, and the franchise was extended to around 5.5 million voters, though it retained communal electorates, further dividing representation by community. Governors held extensive powers, including vetoing bills, overriding ministers' advice, and dissolving legislatures, ensuring significant control remained with the British authorities. While the Act aimed to increase provincial autonomy, its limited scope and the retention of key powers by British officials drew criticism for not granting true self-rule.

Salient features of the act:- The Government of India Act, 1919, was created because Indian leaders wanted more rights and self-rule, especially after World War I, where the Allies talked about democracy and freedom for all nations. In 1917, Lord Montague promised gradual steps toward self-governing institutions, but only under British control. The plan, written in the Montford Report, had four main points:-

- i. Introduction of complete popular control in local bodies (municipalities, talukas, district boards, etc.);
- ii. Partial introduction of responsible government in the field of provincial administration;
- iii. Non-introduction of responsible government at the Centre but enlargement of the Indian Legislative Council and more representation of Indians in it; and
- iv. Relaxation of the control of the parliament and the Secretary of State to the extent popular government was introduced in the provinces. (Grover, 397)

Appraisal of the act and it's working

The Government of India Act, 1919, introduced the system of dyarchy in the provinces, dividing responsibilities between elected Indian ministers and British officials. However, it faced criticism from the Indian National Congress for being inadequate and failing to guarantee full responsible government. The Congress launched the non-cooperation movement in 1920, aiming for self-rule, and later contested council elections in 1923 to disrupt the system from within. Despite its shortcomings, dyarchy operated in most provinces until 1937, with notable exceptions due to suspension in Bengal and Central Provinces. The system was criticized as complex and ineffective, but it allowed Indian leaders to

gain administrative experience and achieve limited progress in areas like education, local governance, and social reforms, dispelling British claims that Indians were unfit for self-governance. Ultimately, the Act marked a step, albeit flawed, towards constitutional progress in India.

The Rise of Khilafat Movement

The spread of Pan islamism in India:-A contributor to Calcutta Guardian in 1924 traced the Indian khilafat Movement via pan-islamic to the Russo-Turkish War 1876-78. During this time, the Islamic world realized the decline in areas of Islamic independence, which contrasted sharply with Quranic ideals of Islam's dominance. Turkey, being the only Muslim power capable of standing equally with European powers, became a focal point for Pan-Islamic efforts. The Sultan of Turkey was encouraged to take a more active role in uniting Muslim nations and even extending influence into regions like India. While Sultan Abdul Hamid rejected such ambitious plans, he did send propagandists to preach the doctrine of the Khilafat in India. These efforts resonated among Indian Muslims, sowing the seeds for the eventual Khilafat Movement.

The Turkish Italian war:-

the Turkish-Italian War (1911-1912) influenced the rise of pan-Islamism in India. Initially, the pan-Islamic movement in India had a limited following, but events during this period, such as Italy's attack on Turkey and the occupation of Persia by Russia and Britain, acted as catalysts for its growth. These geopolitical actions heightened discontent among Indian Muslims, who began questioning the British Government's role as a protector of Islamic interests.

Mr. Petrie, an officer with the Intelligence Bureau, reported that Indian Muslims were losing trust in British rule. They believed Britain was working with other Christian countries to harm Islam. This concern grew stronger because of political events like the reversal of the 1905 Partition of Bengal, which many Muslims saw as the government breaking its promises. Many believed Britain and other Christian nations were secretly plotting to weaken Islam, especially due to events like the annulment of the 1905 Bengal Partition. This decision was seen by Muslims as breaking promises and dismissing their interests. Indian Muslims had a strong emotional and religious connection to Turkey, which was home to the sacred sites of Islam. Britain's actions toward Turkey were perceived as anti-Islamic, which worsened the mistrust. Leaders like Zafar Ali Khan and Muhammad Ali emerged as influential voices who could lead Muslim political movements, highlighting their dissatisfaction with British rule. Mr. Petrie noted how easy it was for Indian Muslims to combine religious and political issues, creating a risk of widespread anger and unrest.

The formation of the Muslim League brought a sense of unity and political strength among Muslims. However, Mr. Petrie expressed concerns about a potential rise of a Nationalist Muslim Party, led by passionate younger leaders who could be difficult to control. He warned that such a group might either act independently or join forces with Hindu nationalists, creating a powerful challenge to British authority. At the time, Hindus, who were politically and physically weak, strategically supported Muslim causes to form alliances, even showing sympathy for Turkey. Mr. Petrie's report painted a picture of an increasingly volatile situation, where a mix of religious passion, political grievances, and nationalist movements could destabilize British control in India. It emphasized the need for careful handling of Muslim concerns and political demands to avoid further complications. "The belief that the British Government is no longer a safe custodian of Islamic interests is gaining ground in more enlightened quarters, and with the spread of that belief there arises the problem how best Muhammadans can protect those special interests which they believe the present Government has set itself either weakly or treacherously to betray. In what direction the Muhammadan politicians may turn it is hardly yet possible to say, though a union with the Hindu Congress party seems a probable solution" (Bamford, 112).

Turkish trouble with Balkan states:- Turkey faced in the early 1900s, especially its conflicts with the Balkan States after the Italian-Turkish War. These events influenced Indian Muslims, causing unrest. Many identified Europe with the Balkan States and saw Turkey's struggle as symbolic of Islam's challenges. Abul Kalam Azad, a prominent figure, advocated for boycotting European goods through his paper *Al Hilal* and public speeches. Even some Hindu extremists joined these boycott efforts in Calcutta. In March 1913, a Fatwa published in *Aligarh Institute Gazette* encouraged Muslims to oppose those who supported oppressors of Turkey, including Britain. In Lucknow, Maulvi Waliud-din Salim used his paper, *Muslim Gazette*, to argue that Muslims should show loyalty only to Muslim rulers, citing Quranic teachings.

The Muslim League's annual session in March also emphasized unity. Its president proposed creating a United India League that welcomed all communities to promote a shared national identity. The session condemned efforts to divide Hindus and Muslims further, aiming to bridge gaps between the two groups.

The Anjuman-i-Khuddam-I-Kaaba- In April 1914, Mr. Mushir Husain Kidwai from Barabanki, United Provinces, proposed creating a society named Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba. The group's goal was to defend the Kaaba and other sacred Islamic places from non-Muslim

aggression. Members committed to sacrificing their lives and wealth for this cause. Prominent leaders such as the Ali Brothers (Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali), Abul Kalam Azad, and Abdul Bari, all of whom later played key roles in the Khilafat Movement, supported this initiative.

The Indian medical mission to Turkey-

During the Balkan War, Indian Muslims showed their support for Turkey by sending an All- India Medical Mission led by Dr. Ansari. The mission arrived in Constantinople in December 1912 and interacted with important Turkish leaders like Enver Bey and Egyptian nationalist Sheikh Abdul Aziz Shahwesh. While in Cairo, one mission member harshly criticized British rule in India, calling it unbearable. Zafar Ali Khan visited Turkey in early 1913, collaborating with others to establish a Muslim refugee colony in Anatolia. This idea received backing from the Comrade newspaper, which urged Indians to purchase Turkish bonds. Dr. Ansari and Zafar Ali Khan returned to India in mid-1913. Dr. Ansari later spoke to students at Aligarh's M.A.O. College, asserting that Turkey's spirit remained strong and highlighting the mission's success in fostering ties between Turkey and India.

Outbreak of the War

Indian Muslims during the outbreak of World War I in 1914. Initially, Muslim sympathies were with Austria due to its recent conflict with Serbia, which had also clashed with Turkey. When Russia and Germany joined the war, Muslims leaned toward Germany, recalling its past support for Turkey during the Russo-Turkish War. However, when Britain entered the war, many Muslims shifted their support to Britain, and efforts were made to organize a Red Crescent Mission with Muslim volunteers to assist British troops. Even Shaukat Ali, a prominent leader, was reportedly open to sending volunteers from Aligarh.

The nationalist press generally portrayed Indians as loyal to Britain, driven by aspirations for self-government within the British Empire. However, the Muslim press had mixed views. While many Muslim newspapers expressed loyalty to Britain, some, like Comrade, showed sympathy for Germany, criticizing Britain's alliance with Russia and questioning its motives in the war. The Comrade highlighted grievances against British rule but ultimately acknowledged that British governance was necessary for India's growth at that time. The Zamindar of Lahore stood out for its unwavering loyalty to Britain, even contributing funds to the Prince of Wales Relief Fund. Despite differing opinions, the Muslim community's loyalty to Britain was emphasized, though underlying grievances and frustrations remained evident.

In September 1914, Maulvi Abdul Majid, a preacher from the Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba, highlighted past mistreatment of Muslims by Christians, such as during the Tripoli War and the Crusades. He urged Muslims to unite in defending the Kaaba and contribute funds to the Anjuman. Around the same time, letters from S.M. Tewfik Bey to pan-Islamist leaders in India revealed Turkey's plans to join Germany and Austria in the war. Indian Muslims were encouraged to donate generously to the Ottoman Red Crescent Society. Similar appeals came through circulars signed by Kemal Umar Bey and Adnan Bey. At this time the attitude of Muhammad Ali's paper — the Comrade — became very objectionable. He sneered at any loyal effusion which appeared, and frankly expressed his own admiration of the Germans in a leading article entitled "The Choice of the Turks" in which he set forth the grievances which Turkey had against each of the Allies (Bamford, 118).

Turkey enters the War:- Turkey enters into World War I on November 1, 1914. Turkish leaders were disappointed with the limited support from Indian Muslims, despite earlier efforts to garner sympathy. Leaflets distributed in Mecca later reached India, portraying the Allies as enemies of Islam and accusing the English of anti-Muslim actions. Objectionable content also appeared in publications like the Kabul-based "Siraj-ul-Akhbar," which described India as Dar-ul-Harb (a land of war). In December, news arrived about the Sultan's declaration of jihad, accompanied by fatwas from the Sheikh-ul-Islam published in Turkish newspapers.

Jihad Declaration(1915):- In January 1915, the Sheikh-ul-Islam at Mecca and Jeddah formally declared jihad, which was confirmed by returning pilgrims, some of whom stayed back to fight under the leadership of members from the Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba. These individuals were involved in revolutionary activities, one of whom was later arrested. Abul Kalam Azad made a provocative speech emphasizing the supremacy of religious duty over allegiance to earthly powers, while the Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba cautiously supported the Sultan's proclamation. At the same time, the majority of Indian Muslims remained undecided about Turkey's involvement in the war, as highlighted by a fatwa from prominent Ulemas declaring the conflict as political, not religious. However, this fatwa faced criticism, particularly from Abdul Bari of Lucknow. By February 1915, anti-British propaganda had intensified, with leaflets urging Hindu-Muslim unity against colonial oppression. This campaign influenced segments of students in Lahore, showcasing the early impact of such agitation during the war. Though some extremist agitation occurred, most Indian Muslims were undecided about the religious significance of Turkey's involvement. A fatwa by prominent Ulemas declared the war political rather than religious but faced opposition. Anti- British propaganda in Delhi urged Hindu-Muslim unity against oppression, influencing a section of students in Lahore by February 1915, indicating the initial effects of the agitation.

Internment of Ali Brothers:-In 1915, two leaders named the Ali Brothers were restricted by the British Government to stay within Delhi. They were punished because they were supporting Turkey and spreading anti-British views. Their punishment led to protests and the closure of two publications, Hamdard and Al Hilal.

Turco-German conspiracy:-Some plans were made by Turkey and Germany to create trouble for British rule in India during World War I. They tried to convince Indian Muslims to rise against the British. The notorious Egyptian pan-Islamist, Abdul Aziz Shahwesh, was specially appointed by the Committee of Union and Progress to put into execution these anti-British schemes; and among those on whom the Committee relied for assistance may be mentioned the names of Zafar Ali Khan of Lahore, Muhammad Ali of Delhi and Imam Uddin of Calcutta (Bamford, 121).

Muslim league meeting at Bombay:-In late 1915, the All-India Muslim League wanted to hold a meeting in Bombay during Christmas week. The meeting had been canceled the year before, but leaders like Mr. Jinnah insisted on holding it, even though many Sunni Muslims in Bombay were against it. The Sunnis believed it was pointless to ask the British Government for anything while the war was happening. They wanted to wait until the war ended and then talk to the British about their demands.

On the other side, Mr. Jinnah and his supporters wanted to meet to work with Hindus on plans for self-government. At the meeting, disagreements happened because orthodox Muslims didn't like Mr. Jinnah and Mazhar-ul-Haq for living in a way that seemed European. Because of this, the meeting didn't succeed.

Later, on January 1, 1916, another meeting was held at the Taj Mahal Hotel. This time, fewer Sunnis showed up. At this meeting, the Raja of Mahmudabad was chosen as the president of the Muslim League, replacing the Aga Khan, who had resigned. Wazir Hassan was picked as the Honorary Secretary.

Division in the Punjab Branch of League:-In the Punjab branch of the Muslim League, there were big disagreements. Younger members, who were more radical, were unhappy with the leadership of the Secretary, Mian Muhammad Shafi (later Sir). He had opposed the League's meeting in Bombay, which upset leaders like Wazir Hassan and Mazhar-ul-Haq. These opponents thought Mr. Shafi was blocking progress with the Congress on education about politics. They also pointed out that the League hadn't held elections for four years, even though the constitution said leaders should only serve for three years.

Because of this, a meeting was held in Lahore to form a new provincial League. Meanwhile, Mr. Shafi held a meeting of the older branch of the League, where he was re-elected Secretary, and Sir Behram Khan Mozari was made President. This led to two separate branches of the Muslim League in Punjab. For now, most people seemed to support Mr. Shafi and the older branch.

The Silk letter conspiracy:-The Silk Letter Conspiracy was a secret plan discovered by the British Government in August 1916. The goal of this plot was to end British rule in India by organizing an attack at the North-West Frontier and encouraging a Muslim rebellion across the country. It was initiated by Maulvi Obeidulla, a converted Sikh trained as a religious leader (Maulvi) at Deoband, and supported by Maulana Mahmud Hassan and other influential figures.

Obeidulla spread militant, anti-British ideas among his followers at Deoband. He also started a school in Delhi and circulated books promoting the idea of Jihad (a struggle against the British). Secret meetings were held, and plans were made for a large Muslim uprising to coordinate with attacks. Some conspirators left India for regions like Arabia and Kabul to gather support. In Kabul, Obeidulla met members of a Turco-German mission aiming to weaken British power. While on his way, Muhammad Mian distributed copies of this document, known as the Ghalib-nama both in India and among the frontier tribes. Obeidulla and his fellow-conspirators had devised a scheme for the provisional government of India after the overthrow of British power (Bamford, 123). With Mahendra Pratap as President, Obeidulla as Minister of India, and Barkatulla, a member of the American Ghadr Party, as Prime Minister. This conspiracy involved connections with Germany, Arabia, and Kabul, but the British discovered and stopped the plans. In early 1916, German members of a mission left Afghanistan after failing to achieve their goals, but Indian conspirators stayed behind. They formed a "Provisional Government" and sent letters to Russian leaders, including the Czar, asking Russia to break its alliance with Britain and help overthrow British rule in India. One of these letters, written on a gold plate, was later captured by the British.

The Provisional Government also tried to ally with Turkey. Maulvi Obeidulla sent letters to Maulana Mahmud Hassan, asking him to share their plans with the Ottoman Government. They are neatly and clearly written on yellow silk. Muhammad Mian's letter mentioned the previous arrival of German and Turkish missions, the return of the Germans, the staying on of the Turks, but without work, the runaway students, the circulation of the "Ghalibnama", the "Provisional Government", and the projected formation of an "Army of God". This army was to draw recruits from India and to bring about an alliance among Islamic rulers. Mahmud Hassan was to convey all these particulars to the Ottoman Government. Obeidulla's letter contained a tabular statement of the "Army of God". Its headquarters were to be at Medina, and Mahmud Hassan himself was to be general-in-chief. Secondary headquarters under local generals

were to be established at Constantinople, Teheran and Kabul. The general at Kabul would be Obeidulla himself. The table contains the names of three patrons, 12 field marshals, and many other high military officers. . Of the Lahore students, one was to be a major-general, one a colonel, and six lieutenant-colonels. The army aimed to recruit from India and unite Islamic rulers against British rule.(Bamford,124)

In December 1916, Mahmud Hassan and four companions were captured by the British and became prisoners of war. Ghalib Pasha, who had signed the Ghalibnama (a document calling for jihad), was also captured and admitted his involvement. The Ghalibnama urged Muslims worldwide to fight against Christian governments and support the cause with men, money, and resources. The British saw this conspiracy as a serious threat, involving secret plans, propaganda, and rebellion. However, the loyalty of most Indian Muslims and the strength of the British Government helped counter these efforts.

Abul Kalam Azad interned and Hasrat Mohani interned:-in March 1916, Abul Kalam Azad gave a lecture at his school, Dar-ul-Irshad, where he said that the Quran did not allow Muslims to live under oppression. He argued that India, which had been under Muslim rule before, must be reclaimed by Muslims. Due to his activities, the Government of Bengal removed him from the region (interned him), and similar orders were issued in Punjab and United Provinces. As a result, he moved to Kanchi in April 1916.

Around the same time, Hasrat Mohani, a political activist from Aligarh, was confined (interned) by the United Provinces Government at Lalitpur in the Jhansi District. The authorities found out that he planned to go to Kabul, where he and Abul Kalam Azad had reportedly received communications from Barkatullah, a member of the "Provisional Government of India." Hasrat Mohani later faced two years of imprisonment for not following the internment orders.

The sharif of mecca declares independence:- The Arab Revolt of 1916, led by the Sharif of Mecca, Hussein bin Ali, marked a pivotal moment in the Middle Eastern theatre of World War I. The Sharif declared independence from the Ottoman Empire and seized key cities like Mecca, Jeddah, and Taif. This event, which became public knowledge in India in June 1916, had profound implications for the Turkish Caliphate and the Muslim world.

Initially, the news was met with disbelief and silence in India, as many found it unexpected and overwhelming. Some dismissed it as exaggerated or a Turkish ploy, while others speculated British involvement. Over time, the educated classes began to grasp the far-reaching consequences of the Sharif's actions, with articles in newspapers like the Calcutta Statesman emphasizing its significance.

The reaction among Indian Muslims was mixed. Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow, representing the Anjuman-i-Khuddam-i-Kaaba, expressed deep concern over the safety of Islamic holy sites and condemned the Sharif's actions. The All-India Muslim League also denounced the revolt, fearing it endangered the sanctity of sacred places. Public meetings and resolutions reflected widespread apprehension and condemnation of the Sharif for jeopardizing the safety of the holy sites.

While some saw the revolt as a result of Turkish misgovernance, others viewed it as evidence of British intrigue. The general sentiment, however, was one of depression and fear, with many condemning the Sharif's actions as reckless and dangerous. The Mujahidin, or Hindustani Fanatics, used the incident to stir unrest, claiming it was part of a British plot to undermine Islam.

The Lucknow Pact:- In his book "India in the Years 1917-18" .Professor Eushbrook Williams wrote: —

"In the course of the year 1915, a definite rapprochement had taken place between some of the leaders of advanced Hindu and of advanced Muhammadan opinion. The Muslim League, which had until recently stood mainly for the protection of Muhammadan interests against anticipated Hindu ascendancy, had gradually become dominated by those members of the " young " Muslim party, who upheld the new ideal of self-government for India. As a consequence of this, the Muslim League probably became less representative of conservative Muhammadan opinion in India; for the Muhammadan community, educationally less advanced than the Hindus, seems at present also less attracted by Nationalist ideals, and less patient of political, as distinct from religious leadership, by any party of advance"(Bamford,128).

The Lucknow Pact of 1916 was a landmark agreement between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, symbolizing a rare moment of Hindu-Muslim unity in India's struggle for self-governance. This pact emerged from a rapprochement between progressive leaders of both communities, driven by the shared goal of self-rule. The Muslim League, traditionally focused on protecting Muslim interests, shifted towards supporting broader nationalist ideals under the influence of younger leaders advocating self- government.

The pact, finalized during the Congress session in Lucknow in December 1916, granted enhanced representation to

Muslim minorities in certain provinces, even at the expense of Muslim majorities in Bengal and Punjab. While this agreement was celebrated as a step towards communal harmony, it faced criticism from conservative factions, including the All-India Hindu Sabha, which opposed prioritizing politics over religion.

Under the leadership of figures like Wazir Hassan, the Raja of Mahmudabad, Mazhar-ul-Haq, and Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the Muslim League aligned closely with the Congress. However, this collaboration led to internal dissent, notably the disaffiliation of the Punjab Provincial Branch, which resisted the League's evolving policies.

Fall of Baghdad:- The fall of Baghdad in March 1917, during World War I, deeply impacted the Muslim community in India. While the event was not necessarily tied to sympathy for Turkey, it evoked profound religious grief over the loss of one of Islam's significant cities to non-Muslim forces. This sentiment was particularly strong among the less educated classes.

Shortly afterwards it was learnt that a jehad leaflet was being distributed by the Amir of the Hindustani fanatics. It was addressed to the “ Muslim Warriors who are under the yoke of the British, French and Russians ” and it attempted to prove that Muhammadans who had fought for the Allies were infidels, while those who fought for the Central Powers were “ doing jehad in the way of God ” (Bamford, 129). The leaflet distributed by the Hindustani Fanatics in 1917 was a provocative call to action for Muslim soldiers under Allied powers. It labeled them as infidels and glorified those fighting for the Central Powers as engaging in a holy war (jehad). The leaflet urged mutiny, assassination of oppressors, and independence under Ottoman leadership. It was purportedly signed by eight members of the Muslim Ulema Association, representing different countries, and believed to have originated in Berlin. Around the same time, reports emerged that the Hindustani Fanatics were receiving financial support from Wahabis in Bengal, further intensifying unrest. This combination of religious rhetoric and monetary backing highlighted the complex interplay of global propaganda and local dynamics during World War I.

The Newspaper Incident:- The Indian Daily News incident in 1918 sparked significant unrest among Indian Muslims. A phrase in the newspaper, perceived as an insult to the Prophet, led to indignation meetings across the country. Violent speeches were made, and threats of declaring jehad were issued unless the editor was punished. The Indian Daily News published an apology stating that it had reproduced the article from a contemporary (The Catholic Herald) and that it had absolutely no intention of offending the religious susceptibilities of Muhammadans (Bamford, 131). Despite the newspaper's apology, tensions escalated, prompting the Bengal Government to prohibit meetings. Extremist editors fueled local agitation, leading to their expulsion under the Defence of India Act. Religious sentiment ran high, with exaggerated accounts in Muslim papers further intensifying the situation.

The Calcutta Riots and Delhi Session of Muslim League:- In September 1918, the Calcutta Riots erupted when a crowd of 500 Muslims clashed with police near Government House after being denied permission for a meeting. The violence spread across the city, lasting two days and requiring firearms to restore order. Hindu-Muslim relations were strained, with attacks on Marwaris highlighting communal tensions. By the end of World War I in November 1918, Muslim focus shifted to external matters, particularly the fate of the Ottoman Empire and the Khilafate.

The Calcutta Riots of September 1918 were a significant and violent episode in India's history. The unrest began when a deputation of Muslims was denied permission to hold a meeting by the Governor of Bengal. This led to a crowd of around 500 Muslims marching towards Government House, where they clashed with police. The riots spread across Calcutta, lasting two days and requiring the use of firearms to restore order. Communal tensions were evident, with attacks on Marwaris highlighting strained Hindu-Muslim relations. By the end of World War I in November 1918, Muslim focus shifted to external matters, particularly the fate of the Ottoman Empire and the Khilafate.

In December 1918, the All-India Muslim League held its 11th annual session in Delhi. Dr. Ansari, Chairman of the Reception Committee, delivered a speech condemning Sharif Husain's revolt against the Ottoman Caliphate, citing religious teachings and political morality. He emphasized the role of the Turkish Sultan as the protector of Islamic holy places and advocated for the principle of self-determination for Muslim states. However, the League's stance on maintaining Turkish rule over Arabs and Armenians faced criticism for contradicting the self-determination principle. The session also addressed internal grievances, reflecting the Muslim community's frustrations under British rule.

The 1918 session of the Muslim League in Delhi revealed important shifts in its priorities and leadership, reflecting the rising influence of pan-Islamic ideas. At this meeting, members expressed strong support for the Sultan of Turkey, emphasizing his role as the Caliph, or leader of Islam, and advocating for his control over the holy places in Arabia, Palestine, and Mesopotamia. This showed a deep commitment to protecting Islamic traditions and keeping non-Muslim powers away from sacred lands.

One resolution called on British leaders at the Peace Conference to ensure that Islamic law was respected and that Turkey retained authority over Muslim territories. Another resolution focused on sending representatives to England to argue for Muslim interests, with Hasrat Mohani chosen to prepare for this mission. Mohani's inclusion was significant

because of his bold activism and history of defying British rule, reflecting the League's growing support for more assertive approaches. However, this pan-Islamic enthusiasm created tensions within the League. Moderate leaders like the Raja of Mahmudabad and Wazir Hassan stepped down, signaling a shift in control to more radical voices. This change reflected the frustrations of the Muslim community with British policies, as well as their desire to support Muslim unity and independence across the world. Dr. Ansari's speech at the session highlighted these sentiments. He criticized Sharif Husain's revolt against the Turkish Caliphate, calling it a betrayal of Islamic principles. He stressed the importance of unity among Muslims and the preservation of Turkey's leadership role in the Islamic world. He also called for self-determination for Muslim-majority regions, advocating for their freedom from foreign domination. The Muslim League's alignment with Congress demands at the session revealed its evolving stance toward broader political movements in India. However, its emphasis on Islamic solidarity and pan-Islamic goals marked a distinct focus, showing how deeply intertwined religious and political issues had become during this period.

This session was a turning point for the League, highlighting its transition from moderate politics to a stronger, global Islamic identity. It reflected the shifting dynamics of Indian politics and the Muslim world's concerns during the post-war era.

The Khilafat Agitation:—The Congress was investigating the Dyershahi of Punjab. Meanwhile, I received a public invitation, it had a names of late Hakim Saheb and brother Asaf ali. It is also said that Shradhanand ji would be also present in the meeting. I think he was the vice –chairman (Gandhi, 515).

The Khilafat Movement began in 1920 as a unified effort by Indian Muslims to protest British policies regarding Turkey after World War I, particularly concerning the Ottoman Caliphate. The movement gained significant momentum under Gandhi's active support, as he believed the Muslim demand for justice to be fair and urgent. His involvement was driven by a deep desire to foster Hindu-Muslim unity, which he saw as essential for India's broader struggle for independence. Gandhi collaborated closely with the Ali Brothers, key leaders in the movement, advocating for the rights of Muslims while intertwining the Khilafat cause with India's Home Rule efforts. He viewed both as interlinked, asserting that justice for the Ottoman Caliphate was as critical as self-governance for India.

In November 1919, Gandhi's election as President of the All-India Khilafat Conference marked a significant step. The conference, held in Delhi, called on Indian Muslims to boycott British victory celebrations, signaling their dissatisfaction. They also threatened non-cooperation if the British failed to address the issue of Turkey's sovereignty to the satisfaction of Indian Muslims. This sentiment was reinforced by the Muslim League in its Calcutta meeting. The release of the Ali Brothers, who had been key figures in championing the Khilafat cause, further fueled the agitation. By December 1919, during the Indian National Congress session in Amritsar, the Khilafat question had been integrated into Congress' agenda, showing solidarity and strength between the two communities.

An All-India Khilafat Conference held immediately after the Congress session in Amritsar decided to send a deputation to the Viceroy. The delegation, which included prominent Hindu leaders such as Motilal Nehru, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Swami Shradhananda, alongside Gandhi, emphasized Hindu-Muslim unity in its address. The deputation underscored the shared commitment of both communities to justice for the Ottoman Caliphate, highlighting their solidarity as a force to challenge British authority. This Address pointed out that the Hindus and Muslims "now happily reunited and standing shoulder to shoulder will be equally aggrieved if the just demands of the Muslims were not accepted" (Majumdar, 56, 57).

This alliance between Hindus and Muslims, fostered by Gandhi's leadership, gave the Khilafat Movement a unique dimension within India's freedom struggle, intertwining religious and political interests in the quest for justice and self-rule. Through this collaboration, Gandhi sought to prove that unity between India's diverse communities was not just possible but powerful in pursuing independence.

The Viceroy expressed sympathy and added that both he and the Secretary of State were equally convinced that "Muslim feeling in India must be taken into the most serious account in coming to a final decision". He frankly told the deputation: "The contention which you urge in your address that Turkey should preserve in full integrity the sovereignty and dominions which she possessed before the War is one which I fear we cannot reasonably hope will be recognised by the Allied Powers in Conference. She cannot expect any more than any other power which drew the sword in the cause of Germany wholly to escape the consequences of her action" (Majumdar, 57). The Khilafat League, disappointed with British responses, organized deputations to England and other regions like Syria, Yemen, and Palestine to address Turkish sovereignty. While the Indian deputation was received by Mr. Fisher on behalf of the Secretary of State on 2nd March, 1920 and met Lloyd George in March 1920, the outcome was fruitless. The British decision, announced on May 15, 1920, allowed Turkey to retain Constantinople but dismantled much of the empire, intensifying discontent in India.

In response, March 19, 1920, was declared a day of mourning with fasting and hartals. Meanwhile, Gandhi issued a manifesto on March 10, introducing his philosophy of non-violent non-cooperation. He argued that rejecting violence

was both morally necessary and strategically effective, framing non-cooperation as a duty in cases of humiliation or injustice. This manifesto marked a critical moment in the Indian independence movement. The Khilafat Movement's focus on Turkey drew criticism, especially as it seemed to prioritize an external issue over British injustices in India, including Punjab atrocities. Furthermore, Turkey itself abolished the Caliphate within five years, suggesting that the urgency of the Khilafat cause might have been overstated. Gandhi's emphasis on the movement, given his secular vision, remains a complex and debated aspect of his leadership.

The movement, while significant, reflects the intersection of pan-Islamic aspirations and India's struggle for justice under colonial rule. But whatever might have been the impelling motive of Gandhi he chose this as the occasion for hurling the most effective weapon in his armoury against the British. He therefore sketched in his Manifesto a rough outline of the course of the Non-co-operation movement, in the following words : "We may therefore begin at the top as well as the bottom.

Those who are holding offices of honour or emoluments ought to give them up. Those who belong to the menial services under Government should do likewise. Non-co-operation does not apply to service under private individuals. I cannot approve of the threat of ostracism against those who do not adopt the remedy of Non-co-operation. It is a voluntary withdrawal alone that is a test of popular feeling and dissatisfaction. Advice to the soldiers to refuse to serve is premature. It is the last, not the first step. We should be entitled to take that step when the Viceroy, the Secretary of State and the Premier leave us.

Moreover, every step withdrawing co-operation has to be taken with the greatest deliberation. We must proceed slowly so as to ensure retention of self-control under the fiercest heat"(Majumdar,59). Gandhi ji was ready to fight with britishers with his new weapon but his attitude towards the khilafat question was criticised even by his friends. he tried to bring Hindus and Muslims together to fight British rule. His intentions were good, but some people thought it caused problems. They believed that Indian Muslims caring more about Turkey and other Muslim countries outside India made it hard to see India as one united nation. Gandhi understood that the Khilafat issue was very important to Muslims in India. He thought this was a rare chance to unite Indians against the British, an opportunity that might not come again for a long time.

But critics felt that focusing on the Khilafat movement created risks for Indian unity and didn't fully help the idea of one strong Indian identity. While his efforts had a noble purpose, they also highlighted the challenges of balancing religious and national interests. his excerpt explores differing perspectives on the Khilafat Movement and its significance for Indian Muslims. Historian I.H. Qureshi acknowledges that the Sultan of Turkey's position as a religious leader held little practical importance outside the Ottoman Empire. However, he notes that Indian Muslims, having lost their own liberty, felt a strong emotional connection to the Caliph as a symbol of spiritual authority, even if it was mostly symbolic. Prayers for the Turkish Sultan had already become part of Friday sermons in Indian mosques before World War I.

Muhammad Ali, a prominent leader of the Khilafat Movement, earlier dismissed the idea that Indian Muslims should be influenced by events in the Muslim world outside India or collaborate with Hindus to pressure the British. In an article titled "The Communal Patriot," he criticized such notions as misguided and ineffective, arguing that Hindu-Muslim unity required deeper changes in communal attitudes and shared interests. His views at the time questioned the relevance of foreign Muslim affairs to Indian issues and doubted whether symbolic agreements could solve the ongoing divisions between the two communities.

Ironically, Muhammad Ali later reversed his stance during the Khilafat Movement, forming a pact with Hindu leaders to unite against British rule. Critics argue that the reverence for the Caliph was deliberately used by Muslim leaders to rally support for Pan- Islamism and create political strength within India. The movement also sent delegations to Muslim nations outside India, emphasizing its global aspirations while aiming to strengthen the political position of Indian Muslims domestically. This dual focus highlights the complex interplay of religious identity and political strategy during the Khilafat era.

The Pan-Islamic sentiment behind the Khilafat movement was also indicated by the mass migration of Muslims from India to Afghanistan. This planned movement, known as Hijrat, started in Sindh and gradually spread to N.W.F.P. It was estimated that in the month of August, 1920, nearly 18,000 people were on their way to Afghanistan. Unfortunately, the Afghan Government was inspired more by national than by Pan-Islamic sentiment, and forbade the admission of the Indian Muhajirins to Afghanistan. Thus the Hijrat had to be given up after a great deal of loss and sufferings, including a clash between the emigrants and the military at Kacha Garhi(Majumdar,62,63). The Khilafat movement was a collaboration between Hindu and Muslim leaders aimed at opposing British rule in India, but there were deeper motives at play. Muslim leaders like the Ali Brothers prioritized their religious commitments, advocating for global Islamic interests over Indian nationalism. They even suggested joining forces with an Afghan invasion to fight for their beliefs, showing where their loyalties lay.

Gandhi, however, strongly supported the movement, believing it was a step toward Hindu-Muslim unity and a chance to build a united Indian identity. But the attitude of Gandhi in this respect was much worse, as he lent the whole weight of his magnetic personality towards making a common , cause with the Khilafat movement and carrying the Hindu leaders with him. His statements in justification of his conduct¹ are often of a mystic character. Thus he wrote in the Young India on 20 October, 1921 :

“ I claim that with us both the Khilafat is the central fact, with Maulana Muhammad Ali because it is his religion, with me because, in laying down my life for the Khilafat, I ensure the safety of the cow, that is my religion, from the Mussalman knife”(Majumdar,64). Mahatma Gandhi’s support for the Khilafat movement is criticized for prioritizing pan- Islamic interests over Indian nationalism. Some leaders, like C.R. Das, believed this approach invited external threats rather than fostering unity. Gandhi's reliance on instinct rather than reason influenced Hindu leaders to follow him despite reservations. His stance on opposing British rule, even indirectly supporting an Afghan invasion, is seen as compromising India’s stability. Critics like Sir Sankaran Nair and Dr. B.R. Ambedkar openly denounced these decisions. This period remains controversial, with questions about the long-term impact of Gandhi’s choices.

The Non-Cooperation Movement

Inauguration of the movement by Khilafatists-

On March 10, 1920, Gandhi proposed Non-co-operation (NCO) as the path forward for the Khilafatists if their demands were not met. A committee, including Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Ajmal Khan, Azad, and Shaukat Ali, was formed on March 15, 1920, to review this scheme. The Khilafat Conference in Madras, on April 17, 1920, adopted Gandhi's NCO plan, which outlined four stages: renouncing honorary titles, resigning from government jobs, leaving police and military roles, and refusing to pay taxes. On 12th May 1920, the All-India Khilafat Committee convened an urgent meeting in Bombay to discuss the Non-co-operation (NCO) movement. Gandhi attended and strongly advocated for NCO as the only viable path forward for Muslims.

He emphasized their leadership in the movement, assured Hindu support, and demonstrated his personal commitment by expressing readiness to sacrifice himself and his family for the cause. His efforts persuaded Shaukat Ali and his supporters to commit to a non-violent trial of NCO. Following the meeting, a Sub-Committee, including Gandhi, Azad, Muhammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Chotani, and Ahmad Siddiq Khatre, was formed to organize and implement the movement.

On May 15, 1920, the Government of India released peace terms for Turkey, which deeply upset Indian Muslims. Gandhi urged them to stay calm, avoid despair, and advocated Non-co-operation as the only effective and peaceful remedy to address the injustice. “There is no sacred character about the peaceterms,” said he, “they are capable of being revisedI am convinced that the non-co-operation is the only effective remedy both for avoiding violence and healing the wound inflicted on Muhammadans of India”(Majumdar,68).

On May 15, 1920, the peace terms proposed for Turkey deeply disappointed Indian Muslims, evoking widespread dismay. In response, the Central Khilafat Committee convened a massive public meeting in Bombay on May 28, where Non-co-operation (NCO) was adopted as the definitive course of action. Prominent Muslim leaders renounced their titles and withdrew all cooperation with the British government.

The same day witnessed the release of the Hunter Committee Report and the government's decisions, which left an equally profound and painful impact on the nation. Both Hindus and Muslims were galvanized into action, intensifying the spirit of resistance. On May 30, 1920, the All-India Congress Committee (AICC) met in Banaras, passing several key resolutions that further propelled the NCO movement forward-

1. The AICC criticized the general policy and attitude of the Secretary of State for India regarding Punjab affairs.
2. The AICC criticized Hunter Commission report,the report was condemned for being incomplete ,one sided and unsatisfactory.
3. A petition was brought in front of parliament. The petition urged Parliament to take immediate legal action against prominent officials, including Sir Michael O’Dwyer, General Dyer, Colonel Johnson, Colonel O'Brien, and Bosworth Smith, holding them accountable for the atrocities committed in Punjab during April-May 1919, such as those in Amritsar, Gujranwala, and Kasur. Additionally, the petition called for the dismissal and prosecution of Rai Saheb Sri Ram Sud and Malik Khan for their roles in these events.
4. That the Rowlatt Act be repealed.
5. That the Viceroy be recalled.
6. The AICC strongly opposed the peace terms offered to Turkey, viewing them as a violation of His Majesty's Government's pledges, disregarding the principle of self determination, and insensitive to Indian Muslim sentiments. They urged for the terms to be revised to foster peace and contentment in India.

Adoption of the Non-Cooperation Movement by Congress-

The Calcutta Special Session of the Indian National Congress in 1920 marked a pivotal turning point in India's freedom struggle. It was held in a moment of national grief, with the death of Bal Gangadhar Tilak—a key leader of the Indian independence movement—casting a shadow over the gathering. Lala Lajpat Rai, another stalwart leader, presided over the session, having recently returned from his forced exile in the United States.

The atmosphere of the session was charged with tension and anticipation. The backdrop of the meeting included two major grievances against British rule: the Jallianwala Bagh massacre of April 1919, which exposed the brutality of colonial repression, and the Khilafat movement, which was driven by the indignation of Indian Muslims over the British betrayal of promises related to the protection of the Ottoman Caliphate.

Mahatma Gandhi's resolution was groundbreaking, as it proposed the systematic withdrawal of Indian participation in British-controlled institutions and processes. The strategy of non-violent non-cooperation was a radical and innovative approach to resistance, aiming to assert India's collective discontent and demand Swarajya (self-rule). The key components of the resolution included:

1. **Addressing Religious Grievances:** Gandhi emphasized solidarity with Indian Muslims on the Khilafat issue, advocating assistance for their efforts to protect their religious identity and rights.
2. **Condemning Punjab Atrocities:** The resolution expressed outrage at the British handling of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre and criticized the government's failure to hold responsible officials, like Sir Michael O'Dwyer, accountable for their actions.
3. **Boycott of British Institutions:** Gandhi called for the surrender of titles, resignation from government positions, and withdrawal from British-controlled schools, colleges, courts, and councils.
4. **Promotion of Alternatives:** It encouraged the establishment of national schools, arbitration courts, and self-reliant structures to replace British-controlled systems.
5. **Economic Resistance:** The resolution included the boycott of foreign goods to weaken the economic hold of colonial powers over India.

The adoption of the non-cooperation resolution was the beginning of a mass movement that united Indians across religious, regional, and social divides. While the resolution aimed to minimize risks and sacrifices initially, its ultimate goal was to awaken national consciousness and challenge the British Empire's authority in India. This marked the formal launch of Gandhi's strategy of nonviolent resistance, which would become the cornerstone of India's independence movement. This session was not merely about expressing grievances—it was a moment of asserting agency and reclaiming dignity. It reflected the evolution of the Congress from a platform of elite political discourse to a vehicle for mass mobilization and grassroots action.

The Nagpur session (December, 1920)-: The Nagpur session of the Indian National Congress, presided over by Vijayaraghavachariar, was a critical event in the freedom struggle, held in December 1920. It was convened to ratify the Non-Cooperation resolution passed in the Calcutta Special Session earlier that year. This session represented a significant phase in India's political landscape, marked by both unprecedented enthusiasm and internal dissent.

Approximately 14,000 attendees gathered at Nagpur, demonstrating the heightened interest in the Congress's activities and its transformative agenda under Gandhi's leadership. Expectations were high for a fierce ideological battle between Gandhi and those opposed to his strategy of non-cooperation, particularly figures like C.R. Das, Annie Besant, and Jinnah. However, to the surprise of many, no major confrontation occurred, and the resolution was ratified with near unanimity, albeit with dissenting voices.

The resolution's ratification was made possible by Gandhi's tactical approach and a sudden change in stance by C.R. Das, who had initially intended to challenge the resolution. Subhas Chandra Bose later remarked on Gandhi's ability to reach an understanding with Das, especially since the boycott of legislatures—a contentious issue—was no longer a pressing concern due to elections already being held. This unexpected alignment showcased Gandhi's growing influence and the emergence of a centralized leadership style within the Congress, sometimes described as "guru vad" or a dictatorial approach.

The session also highlighted significant opposition to Gandhi's methods, particularly from figures like Jinnah, who foresaw divisive consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement. Jinnah expressed strong disapproval, warning that Gandhi's approach could lead to social and political fragmentation, affecting relationships between communities, families, and individuals. His criticism marked the beginning of his estrangement from Congress, setting the stage for his later role in advocating for a separate Muslim identity.

Another notable dissent came from G.S. Khaparde, a close associate of Bal Gangadhar Tilak. In his memorandum, Khaparde criticized the Non-Cooperation resolution for its focus on moral and spiritual aspects rather than practical

political strategies. He cautioned that such an approach might cultivate endurance but would lack the necessary energy and resourcefulness for a political struggle.

The Nagpur Congress symbolized a pivotal moment in Indian politics, where Gandhi's leadership style and philosophy began to dominate the national narrative. While the session showcased unity on the surface, it also exposed the underlying tensions and differing visions within the Congress regarding the path to independence. During the Nagpur Congress session of December 1920, three members of the British Labour Party—Colonel Wedgwood, Mr. Ben Spoor, and Mr. Holford Knight—attended and participated in discussions (Majumdar, 99). Colonel Wedgwood warned against the Non-Cooperation Movement (N.C.O.), suggesting it would alienate India's allies in England and lacked a constructive program. However, Indian leaders firmly rejected this view, emphasizing self-reliance and likening their struggle to a biblical journey through the wilderness toward freedom. C.R. Das, initially opposed to the N.C.O., surprisingly moved the resolution himself, with Lala Lajpat Rai seconding it. The resolution reaffirmed the principles passed in the Calcutta session, advocating for nonviolence, renunciation of titles, refusal to pay taxes, and boycotts of British institutions. Additionally, a separate resolution urged Indians to abstain from participating in events honoring the Duke of Connaught.

This session underscored the growing unity among Indian leaders under Gandhi's leadership, despite dissenting voices like Jinnah and others who foresaw potential divisions caused by the movement. It also highlighted the Congress's commitment to a comprehensive and nonviolent struggle for independence. The Nagpur session of the Congress in December 1920 was indeed a landmark event, bringing about significant changes in the organization's structure and goals:

The Nagpur Congress session of December 1920 was a pivotal event in India's freedom struggle. It brought significant changes to the Congress's structure and objectives. Under Gandhi's leadership, the goal of the Congress was redefined from "self-government within the British Empire" to "Swaraj" (self-rule). Gandhi deliberately kept the term "Swaraj" vague, allowing members to interpret it based on their own understanding. He explained it as "self-government within the empire if possible, and outside if necessary."

The Congress underwent a major organizational transformation. A hierarchical structure was introduced, starting from the village level and extending to the All-India Congress Committee (AICC), consisting of around 350 members. This committee, in turn, elected a 15-member Working Committee to serve as the executive body. Additionally, provinces were reorganized on a linguistic basis, such as dividing Madras into Andhra and Tamil Nadu.

Another significant change was the modification of Congress's methods. The phrase "constitutional means" was replaced with "all peaceful and legitimate means," reflecting a compromise between moderates, who preferred constitutional approaches, and radicals, who demanded broader measures. Gandhi's influence helped unify these differing factions. The Subjects Committee was also streamlined, limiting its members to the AICC and organizing meetings before the Congress's open sessions for efficient decision-making.

These reforms were instrumental in broadening Congress's appeal, fostering inclusivity, and laying a stronger foundation for the independence movement.

The Nagpur Programme:- the Non-Cooperation Movement was a transformative chapter in India's struggle for independence, marked by ideological shifts, bold strategies, and public demonstrations. Gandhi initially opposed the boycott of foreign goods, perceiving it as a form of violence, but soon realized its potential as a nonviolent tool for economic and political resistance. Under his leadership, the All-India Congress Committee (AICC) organized efforts to promote Khaddar—hand-spun and hand-woven cloth—as a symbol of self-reliance and national identity (Majumdar, 103). The movement's success relied on mass participation, encouraging the public to reject foreign cloth and embrace indigenous production.

Picketing liquor shops further illustrated the movement's commitment to moral and social reform, briefly reducing alcohol consumption and government revenue. However, these gains were not sustainable, highlighting the challenges of maintaining nonviolent discipline and public momentum. The burning of foreign cloth emerged as a dramatic act of defiance, despite strong criticism from leaders like Patel, who argued that it wasted valuable resources during a time of widespread poverty. Gandhi defended the practice, emphasizing the symbolic rejection of colonial exploitation and foreign dominance.

This period also revealed tensions within the movement—between ideological purity and pragmatic concerns, unity and dissent. Figures like Rabindranath Tagore criticized the destruction of foreign cloth, calling for a more balanced approach to resistance. While the boycott of foreign cloth achieved some progress, it fell short of expectations, reflecting the limitations of mass mobilization and the complexities of grassroots efforts.

In essence, the Non-Cooperation Movement was more than a political campaign; it was a cultural awakening that

sought to redefine India's identity and assert its autonomy. The movement's debates and demonstrations underscored the importance of unity, strategy, and resilience in the face of challenges.

The Non-Cooperation Movement marked a pivotal moment in India's struggle for independence, spearheaded by a bold strategy of defiance and self-reliance. Its boycott of legislative councils, though symbolically powerful, faced limitations. Congress candidates withdrew from elections, creating a vacuum filled by non-Congress members. Despite their influence, Congress struggled to discourage voters completely, and the councils functioned with limited public representation. However, this effort underscored a message to the world that these councils lacked true legitimacy in reflecting India's aspirations.

The boycott of law courts was equally significant but similarly fell short in impact. Leaders like Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das made notable sacrifices by leaving their flourishing legal careers, inspiring others to follow suit. While these actions were symbolic of a larger resistance to British authority, the declining number of boycotting lawyers and the limited reach of arbitration boards and village panchayats hindered the effort's effectiveness in disrupting colonial judicial systems.

The movement to boycott schools and colleges initially evoked enthusiasm, with student strikes and institution closures in key cities like Calcutta and Lahore. Yet, this momentum quickly waned, and the movement failed to gain a nationwide foothold. Many students returned to their previous institutions, while others sought education in newly established national schools. Only a small minority adhered to their commitment to abandon colonial education, limiting the broader impact of the initiative.

Despite these challenges, the Non-Cooperation Movement yielded transformative consequences. Leaders like Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das, along with committed students, became full-time activists dedicated to India's freedom. For the first time, a select group of individuals made the nation's liberation their life's work, catalyzing a sense of purpose that permeated society. This marked a shift from passive aspirations to active, organized resistance, creating a foundation for future independence efforts.

Although the movement's immediate objectives faced setbacks, its long-term influence reshaped the freedom struggle. It ignited a spirit of self-sacrifice, unity, and determination that resonated across the country. The Non-Cooperation Movement transcended its limitations to become a cultural and political awakening, embodying the ideals of self-reliance and national pride. This legacy continued to inspire generations of freedom fighters, ensuring its place as a defining chapter in India's journey toward independence. The boycott of government titles and offices during the Indian freedom movement saw limited success. Few people renounced their honors, but over time, these titles lost their prestige and came to be seen as symbols of oppression. While most government officials did not resign, some notable figures, like Subhas Chandra Bose and P. C. Ghosh, gave up their posts. The movement did achieve greater success in boycotting visits from British royals, such as the Duke of Connaught and the Prince of Wales.

Policy of Government:-The British government's approach to the Non-cooperation movement evolved gradually, balancing suppression with strategic persuasion. Initially, officials overlooked many activities but aggressively cracked down on protests like picketing and burning of foreign goods, often resorting to lathi charges and mass arrests. As the movement gained momentum, the government established a structured policy. They prosecuted individuals attempting to influence the loyalty of the military and police, fearing that even peaceful resistance could escalate into rebellion. To discredit the movement, authorities subsidized newspapers and distributed materials warning of its dangers, though this propaganda largely failed to sway public opinion. Simultaneously, they emphasized the reforms introduced by the Government of India Act, 1919, portraying them as significant steps towards self-rule to discourage participation in Gandhi's campaign. The government hesitated to impose sweeping crackdowns, fearing that imprisoned leaders would be seen as martyrs and that excessive suppression could fuel resentment. They also believed that Non-cooperation was an impractical strategy that would fade away on its own. However, their efforts largely misfired—repressive measures deepened public dissatisfaction rather than quelling resistance, while propaganda failed to convince Indians that British reforms were sufficient. As a result, the movement continued to gain traction, further challenging colonial rule (Majumdar, 113).

The Militant attitude of N.C.O.:- The increasing militancy within the Non-cooperation movement signaled a turning point in the struggle against British colonial rule. Though the government initially hesitated to suppress the movement outright, official reports acknowledged its rising strength, marked by intense public gatherings, fiery speeches, and growing hostility toward British rule. The movement's volunteer forces became more assertive, leading to widespread intimidation and clashes with law enforcement. The concept of establishing a parallel administration that could replace British governance in India gained traction among activists.

At the Congress Working Committee's meetings in 1921, the leadership debated the idea of escalating civil disobedience to a mass scale. Initially cautious, they restricted civil disobedience to individuals prevented from engaging in Swadeshi propaganda. However, following the arrest of the Ali Brothers—key figures in the movement—

the Congress took a bold step, authorizing provinces to begin widespread civil disobedience, including tax refusal. This decision marked a shift from non-cooperation to active resistance. Strict conditions were set for participation: individuals had to embrace Khadi, forsake foreign goods, uphold Hindu-Muslim unity, and maintain absolute non-violence. Any district seeking to participate in mass disobedience was required to be entirely self-sufficient in its use of indigenous materials.

Although mass civil disobedience did not materialize immediately, the resolution passed in Delhi signaled the formal transition to this strategy, which later became the core of the independence movement. The involvement of Bengal's old revolutionary factions further strengthened the campaign. Many of these revolutionaries, who had been imprisoned during World War I and released under the 1919 amnesty, initially opposed Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence, believing it would weaken the Indian people's resolve. However, C.R. Das intervened, arranging a secret conference in September 1921 between Gandhi and these ex-revolutionaries. During this meeting, Gandhi and Das persuaded them that non-violent resistance would empower rather than demoralize the masses. As a result, many revolutionaries pledged their support, ensuring that their faction would not obstruct Congress's struggle for Swaraj.

This conference was a critical moment, bridging ideological divisions within the independence movement. Bose's account highlights how Bengal's revolutionary leaders, once skeptical of Gandhi's methods, ultimately aligned with the broader goal of non-violent resistance. While militant elements persisted, the Non-cooperation movement had set the foundation for a unified strategy that combined civil disobedience with mass mobilization, laying the groundwork for India's eventual independence.

Abolition of Prince of Wales:- During the Non-cooperation Movement, the visit of the Prince of Wales to India in November 1921 became a focal point of resistance. The Indian National Congress had already decided on July 28, 1921, to boycott his visit as part of their broader campaign against British rule. The movement, led by Mahatma Gandhi, aimed to oppose colonial oppression through Non-Violent means, including boycotting British institutions, goods, and events.

When he arrived, he was Prince of Wales met with empty streets and closed shops, as Indians refused to participate in the official celebrations. The boycott was particularly intense in Bombay, where protests escalated into strikes and political gatherings, sometimes leading to mob violence and brutality. The unrest in Bombay deeply troubled Gandhi, prompting him to postpone plans for the Civil Disobedience Movement.

The two English dailies in Calcutta, the Statesman and the Englishman, also wrote in the same strain. They remarked that the Congress volunteers had taken possession of the city of Calcutta and the Government had abdicated; and demanded immediate and drastic action against the Volunteers (Majumdar, 131).

Repressive measures of Government:- The arrival of the Prince of Wales in India during the Non-Cooperation Movement led to significant unrest and a shift in British policy. The Congress and Khilafat volunteer organizations were declared unlawful, and public assemblies were banned in major cities like Calcutta. Lord Ronaldshay, the Governor of Bengal, threatened harsher measures if these actions failed to suppress dissent. The hartal (strike) organized during the Prince's visit on November 17, 1921, marked a turning point, as widespread protests and defiance of authority created a "dangerous spirit of lawlessness," according to the Viceroy's telegraph.

The government responded with repressive measures, including the Seditious Meetings Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act, targeting volunteer associations that were increasingly drawing support from laborers and the unemployed. Arrests of prominent leaders like Motilal Nehru and Lajpat Rai fueled public enthusiasm, with thousands volunteering for arrest. Prisons overflowed, and imprisonment became a badge of honor rather than a deterrent.

In Calcutta, negotiations between Lord Ronaldshay and C.R. Das failed to lift the boycott of the Prince's visit. Das's arrest, along with other leaders, intensified the movement, leading to mass protests and further arrests. The government's repressive policies extended beyond Bengal, sparking a wave of defiance across India. Within a month, 25,000 people were imprisoned, showcasing the resilience and determination of the Indian people in their fight for independence.

Chauri Chaura incident and suspension of the movement:-

The Chauri Chaura incident took place on February 4, 1922, in Gorakhpur district, Uttar Pradesh, during the Non-Cooperation Movement led by Mahatma Gandhi. A group of protesters gathered to boycott a liquor shop, which turned into a clash with the police. The police fired at the crowd, killing three protesters. In retaliation, the mob attacked and set fire to the police station, killing 22 policemen who were trapped inside. Gandhi stopped the Non-Cooperation Movement, emphasizing the importance of non-violence and self-reflection. The British authorities aggressively prosecuted the accused, initially sentencing 172 to death, but only 19 were eventually hanged (Sarkar, 225). There were no nationalist protests against the harsh British response, except for those made by M.N. Roy's Communist journal, Vanguard, and the Communist International's Executive Committee. The incident led to a period of self-reflection

within the Indian National Congress and a shift in strategy, with leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose advocating for more radical approaches and gaining prominence. The incident reinforced the importance of non-violence as a guiding principle for the independence movement and led to the rise of revolutionary movements advocating armed resistance.

Aftermath of Non-cooperation-:

Gandhi's Non-Cooperation Movement began in 1920, but he stopped it after the Chauri Chaura incident in 1922. He fasted for 5 days to show regret. His wife Kasturba supported him and later encouraged people to continue working for India's freedom after Gandhi's arrest. She showed great courage and determination. On 10 of March Gandhi was arrested and lodged in Sabarmati jail. Kasturba and other inmates were permitted by authorities to accompany him to the jail. He was awarded six year imprisonment on 18th of March. On 20 midnight he was taken from Sabarmati jail to Yervada Central Prison and for two days his whereabouts were not known to Ashram inmates including Kasturba, In such a critical moment of life Kasturba displayed a rare kind of firmness, determination and bravery. Instead of being subdued she made a statement giving a clarion call to the people of India to engage in different kinds of Constructive works instead of being caught in the slough of despair(kasturba,91).

REFERENCES

- [1]. Agarwal, R.C. (2022). Constitutional Development And National Movement of India. S. Chand Publication.
- [2]. Bamford, P. C. (1965). Histories of the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movements in India. Government of India Press.
- [3]. Chandra, B. (1989). India's Struggle for Independence. Penguin Books Publications.
- [4]. Gandhi, Mohan Das Karamchand. Satya ke prayog athava Atmakatha. Navjeevan Prakashan mandir.
- [5]. Grover, B. L. & Mehta, A. (2001). A New Look at Modern Indian History (32nd ed.). S. Chand Publication.
- [6]. K. Joseph, Silby. Kasturba Gandhi: An Embodiment of Empowerment, Gandhi smarak nidhi publication.
- [7]. Majumdar, R. C. History of the Freedom Movement in India (Vol. 3). Firma KLM.
- [8]. Sarkar, S. (1959). Modern India: 1885-1947. Macmillan Publication.