

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT 1930- AN ANALYSIS

A Dissertation submitted to the School Of Arts and Languages

for the Award of the Degree in

Master of History



LOVELY
PROFESSIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Transforming Education Transforming India

Submitted by

Kusavolu Chizo

Registration no: 11512135

Under the supervision of

Priyanka Sharma

Assistant Professor

Department of History

UID-20635

Lovely Professional University

Phagwara- 144401

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I Kusavolu Chizo would like to express my sincere and deepest honour and gratitude to my supervisor and my guide “Priyanka Sharma” for her full time and support, expert guidance, a challenge, understanding and encouragement , giving me a faith and hope throughout my research. Without her incredible patience and timely wisdom counsel, my thesis would have been a frustrating and overwhelming pursuit. In addition, I express my gratitude to the department of history for helping me with my course work and giving me an endless support . special thanks goes to my family and friends, though a thousand miles away from me they supported me morally and spiritually and also to my best of best friends who helped me and were beside me throughout my academic career and my research. Though it is hard for me to repay all your hardships, support and a helping hand, may the living God bless all of you abundantly and a success to the future.

Above all to the great Almighty who stood beside me in a good and a bad times, the giver of knowledge and wisdom and for his countless love, care and blessing

CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

I, Kusavolu Chizo, hereby declare that the dissertation titled "A Study of Role of Non-Government Institutions in Women Education of Colonial Punjab" submitted for M.A degree in History which is based on my original work and all ideas and references have been duly acknowledged. It does not contain any work that has been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma from any university.

Kusavolu Chizo

Reg.No.11512135

Date.....

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled “**CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT 1930- AN ANALYSIS**” is confined and original work done by Kusavolu Chizo, student of Lovely Professional University, Punjab, under my supervision and guidance.

This subject of this dissertation is an original contribution towards the discipline of History and has not previously formed the basis for the award of the Degree, Diploma, Association and fellowship or other similar title to any candidate.

The Dissertation represents entirely an independent work of the candidate under my guidance.

Date-

Place-

Signature of Mentor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sl.no.	Title	Page no.
i.	Acknowledgement	I
ii.	Candidate's Declaration	II
iii.	Certificate	III
iv.	Abstract	1
v.	Introduction	1-4
vi.	Objectives	4
vii.	Research Methodology	5
viii.	Scope of Study	5
ix.	Literature Review	5-6
x.	Chapter 1; Causes of Civil Disobedience Movement	7-15
xi.	Chapter 2; Events leading to Civil Disobedience movement	16-28
xii.	Chapter 3; The Participation of Women in Civil Disobedience Movement	29-36
xiii.	Conclusion	36-40
viii.	References	41-43

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT 1930- AN ANALYSIS

Abstract

These research papers provide comprehensive background on “Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930.” The Civil Disobedience movement was an utmost part of the India’s freedom against the certain laws and command of the ruling British government. It is led by Mahatma Gandhi in March , 1930 breaking the salt law along with his 78 followers began from the Sabarmati Ashram to Dandi on the Gujarat Coast. This research paper highlights the role of Gandhi in mobilizing the masse to fight against the injustice nature British rule in India. Further, it throws challenges it faced due to suppressive policies of British towards the Indian citizens, examines it course to understand the strength and weakness, and how successful it was in giving the political lesson to British government. The paper also gives a complete role and analyse of women’s participation in the civil Disobedience Movement Though, Civil Disobedience movement was not successful, but it prepared people of India for great sacrifices and increased the popularity of the congress.

Introduction

Civil Disobedience movement of 1930, also popularly known as Salt March or Dandi March is one of the major event in the history of Indian independence struggle. It was a mass agitation against suppressive British rule in India. Mahatma Gandhi took the initiative step to raise voice against suppressive laws and rules introduced by British which were hindering Indians in every aspect of life. e.g. politically, economically and socio-culturally. British policies were made according to the need and development of The Great Britain, need of Indians and development of Indians were neglected highly. British colonized many countries all over the world with the motive to get economic benefits and boost up the industrial revolution which was going with full swing in England during 19th and 20th century. India was major colony of British and from India they absorbed huge amount of natural resources.

Although British came in India 1600 A.D. as trading company but they started interfering the political spheres also and eventually in 1757 A.D. they got absolute control over India. They continued their expansion policy and gradually brought many princely states under their rule. Thus to ensure their absolute control, they introduced various suppressive policies in favour of their own benefit. Initially Indians were accepting the British policies as no choice and accepted them as govt. But when British started imposing more dominating policies which made life of Indians miserable, specially middle-class and poor class people, they started

raising voice against British govt. The first notable action against British by Indians came in 1857, which is known as Sepoy Mutiny or Revolt of 1857 A.D. This event is the first revolt of Indians against British where huge number of leaders came together and with same motive to over throw British rule from India. But unfortunately revolt of 1857 A.D. was cunningly tackled down by British and suppressed the notable leaders. After this there was absence of revolutionary leaders for long time in India. But in 1885 with the establishment of Indian National Congress, Indians got a new hope. Indian National Congress was the first nationwide organisation which was putting forward the issues of Indians. Various leaders with revolutionary ideology gained popularity under Indian National Congress.

As a result another revolt broke out in 1905, the Swadeshi Movement. Swadeshi Movement can be regarded as starting point of Indian freedom struggle. This movement was more organised and planned compare to Revolt of 1857. The main motive was to boycott British goods and promote Indian goods. Indian National congress leaders realized how British exploiting Indians by taking resources from India at cheap cost and producing goods in England and selling and same goods selling in India at high price. Swadeshi movement saw huge support from all over the India. Various violence activities carried out against British rule in different parts of the country. But the movement was finally tackled down by British government. After the failure of Swadeshi movement, Indian National Congress aggressive policy need to be changed to continue the freedom struggle. The change came when Mahatma Gandhi entered into Indian politics. In 1916, Gandhi came back from South Africa and joined Indian National Congress. The Ideology of non-violence was the key instrument of Gandhi. His ideology got warm welcome from each and every section of society.

Thus Gandhi became prominent leader of India. First action taken by Gandhi was launching Non-Cooperation movement in 1919. The movement was completely based upon the ideology of non-violence. For the first time agitation was carried through the policy of non-violence or peacefully against British India government. This made Non-cooperation movement different from Swadeshi movement and revolt of 1857. Gandhi urged Indians to reject British rule without any kind of violence activity. Because he knew that if Indians starts non-cooperating British then British would be bound to fulfil their demands.

Movement spread all over India within short span of time and huge number of people from each and every background like students, peasants, scholars, local artisans etc came out to support Gandhi. This movement got success to certain extent compare Swadeshi Movement of 1905. But movement was called off after the tragic incident of Chaura Chauri. Afterwards

Gandhi was arrested and held responsible for the movement. But soon after Gandhi was forcefully released and this incident Gandhi was criticized by many leaders for calling off the non-cooperation movement. Leaders like Subhas Chandra Bose, Lala Lajpat Rai etc who were more aggressive in nature wanted Gandhi to continue the movement but Gandhi justified his decision calling off non-cooperation movement by stating he would not tolerate any kind of violence and Chaura Chauri incident was indicating that the movement was turning towards violence. Although Gandhi was rigid with his ideology of non-violence and continued his work to popularizing his ideology. The next big step of Gandhi came in 1930, when he launched another movement called Civil Disobedience Movement. On 31st January 1930, Gandhi gave ultimatum to Irwin to fulfil his demands.

Gandhi made some important demands including decrease of military expenses, reduction of salt tax by 50% and permission to produce salt by local people also. Salt tax was very important issue at that time because tax was very high on salt and even poorest people also had to pay this tax. Thus made salt tax reduction as the theme of the movement. But Lord Irwin was in no mood to accept any kind of demand from Gandhi as he knew Gandhi emerged as the most prominent national leader and if his demands gets accepted then it will increase his popularity among mass people of India. Thus Irwin straight rejected the demands of Gandhi without caring the ultimatum given by Gandhi. Gandhi responded by launching Salt 'March' from 12 March to 6 April starting from Ahmadabad to Dandi. He started the march from Sabarmati Ashram with 71 members of Ashram and within short span of time march got immense popularity and thousands of people joined the march until they reach Dandi. The movement was more influential than the non-cooperation movement at the beginning. In this movement participation of women was very remarkable achievement of Gandhi. Earlier Indian women were bound within the four walls of home but this movement brought them out of house and encouraged them to participate in national movement.

Another important feature of the movement was huge support from poor class people. Poor class people were mostly exploited by British to a very high extent. All the British policies made their life miserable. Gandhi wanted support from all the sections of society but initially he got huge support from poor class people but later more and less middle-class and elite class people also came out in support of Gandhi. Movement saw huge anti-British demonstration throughout the country. In many regions administrative system was paralyzed by people. Many Indian government officials resigned to show their support towards Gandhi. Impact of the movement was more visible in village and rural areas compared to cities and towns.

Government response was very harsh and aggressive towards Satyagrahis. Large number of Satyagrahis were arrested and tried to normalized situation by suppressing the Satyagrahis. Many instances police showed brutality against unarmed Satyagrahis, more than 90,000 Satyagrahis were arrested and kept in Prison without any legal procedures.

These incidents were highly concerned by international press and British India Government were criticised. Although entire movement was carried through non-violence and peacefully, it showed the increasing influence of Gandhi and his ideology of non-violence among people of India and Indian National Congress. Movement influenced government such extend Lord Irwin convinced to negotiate with Gandhi. Many notable leaders of congress were arrested by police and Gandhi constantly demanded immediate release of them. In 1930, all the political parties were invited to attend First Round Table Conference in London to discuss the demands of Indian people. But congress denied to attend the conference hence First Round Table Conference was not successful.

Later all the arrested congress leaders were released from prison and then Gandhi and congress agreed to attend Second Round Table Conference in 1931. Gandhi also put forward the terms of withdrawing all the laws issued by government against Satyagrahis. Both Gandhi and Irwin agreed the terms. The movement was called off in 1931 but again in 1932 Indian National Congress decided to restart the movement. Eventually in 1934 Civil Disobedience Movement was officially called off by Indian National Congress.

OBJECTIVE

- To examine the role of Gandhi in mobilizing the masses in civil disobedience movement.
- To analyze the course of civil disobedience movement.
- To investigate the mass participation in civil disobedience movement as a successful apparatus.
- To explain Gandhi's principle of Satyagraha through civil disobedience movement.
- To understand the changes in British policies as an impact of civil disobedience movement.

Research Methodology

This study is descriptive as well as analytical and provides one of the major events of Indian freedom struggle 'Civil Disobedience Movement'. The information shared in this study is mainly based on secondary sources, are thoroughly analysed to produce an authentic and unbiased research. Important books written on Civil Disobedience Movement by influential writers analysed to get authentic information to complete my study. Historical research data and information will also be considered to make the study more authentic.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study aims at speculating the episodic event of civil disobedience movement and examining its course to understand the strength and weaknesses. The Gandhian philosophy of non-violence and mass participation is closely studied to weigh down its success. The legacy of independence of India and past independence India is traced back to the event of civil disobedience movement. Also the roles of women in the movement are thoroughly analysed.

Review of Literature

'India's Struggle for Independence' explains the various national movement led by different leaders in Indian freedom struggle. In this book Bipin Chandra depicted entire Civil Disobedience Movement from the beginning to the end of the movement. The book provides events and causes briefly with valuable information about the Civil Disobedience Movement.

'Resistance of Civil Disobedience Movement (Kindle Edition)' is a complete work done by Henry David Thoreau on Civil Disobedience Movement. Many disclosed information revealed in this book. It provides brief information about the Origin, Causes and events of Civil Disobedience Movement. Theme of this work is completely based on Movement. Attitude of British India Government towards the movement also mentioned in this book which helps to know various uncovered facts of the movement.

'Modern Indian History 1707 to Present Day' describes modern Indian history with all the major events happened during 18th century to 20th century in India. It has given a special reference to Indian Freedom Struggle and National Movement. Role of Indian National Congress and Gandhi in freedom struggle and various events organized by Gandhi. Civil Disobedience Movement marked as important event of Indian Freedom Struggle in this book and impact of the movement described briefly.

‘India’s Freedom Struggle 1857-1947’ strikes on the National Movement led by many leaders in Indian freedom struggle. Participation of all the classes of society in the Civil Disobedience Movement mentioned in this book. Expansion of the movement throughout the country and important places where the movement had much impact described in this book.

CHAPTER-1 SIMON COMMISSION

The years following the end of the Non-Cooperation Movement formed a critical phase in the history of Indian national movement, mainly due to the emergence of various parties and groupies in the Congress, and the growing spirit of Commununallsm. During this period (1924-28), the torch of nationalism was kept alive by the Gandhi's constructive works. The constructive work was a major channel of recruitment of the soldiers of freedom and their political training. These workers had to act as the steel frame of the nationalist movement during the Satyagraha phase. For that. Khadi Bandar workers, students, teachers of the national schools and colleges, and inmates of Gandhian ashrams served as the backbone of the Civil Disobedience movement. During the years 1922-27, the Gandhian constructive workers were quite active in the political affairs of India in their own separate ways. Lord Birkenhead, the Secretary of State for India, in his speech on July 10, 1925, declared the transfer of authority to the Swarajists Party. Accordingly, Gandhiji was asked to call a meeting of the All India Congress Committee which met at Patna on September 22/23, 1925. At this meeting, the transfer of Congress machinery to the hands of Swarajists was completed. It was also decided that the Council programme, which was continued by Swarajists Party under the banner of Congress, be worked by the Congress through Swarajists Party. At the annual session of the Congress at Kanpur under Mrs. Sarojini Naidu in 1925, Congress recorded the Swarajists political programme on the one hand and on the other many Swarajists leaders like M.R. Jayaker, Dr.Hoonje and Kelkar resigned due to split in the Swarajist ranks and liberated themselves, starting their own cult of "responsive cooperation"

Simon commission was appointed in 1927 with the efforts of British conservative government under the leadership of Stanley Baldwin in order to provide a report related to the working of Indian constitution as per the guidelines of government act of 1919. Simon commission contained seven important members under the joint chairmanship of Sir John Simon and Attlee. but its composition met with a large attack of criticism in India because Indians were excluded and not included. Simon commission was banned and boycotted by Indian national congress party and also opposed by other Indian political parties of that time. Simon held under the leadership of Sir Simon had not even a single Indian member was a great shock for Indians. the action began as soon as Simon and rest of the members arrived to Bombay on 3rd February at that day complete shutdown was seen in major cities and town areas, people showed black flags along with the slogan 'GO BACK SIMON'. The anger and hurt of people was seen in the form of demonstration. Police dealt with people harshly even

Lathi charge was held not only this but Jawaharlal Nehru and Govind Ballabh were beaten by the police. In Lahore LalaLaj Pat Rai was hit on the chest and he died after the few days of this incident.

Actually the objective of Simon commission was to delay the strength and power from British to the Indians. By indulging into reformation of the constitution, and they tried to show the Indians that they were loyal in giving people the right of self rule. It was just like ensuring people with political autonomy and while on the other side economic autonomy was lacking and not provided. In an effort to win over them, Lord Irwin announced a vague offer of Dominions State in India. However they did not satisfy the congress leaders. The radicals within the congress became more assertive which was led by Jawaharlal Nehru and Subash Chandra Bose.

All the parties including Muslim league and Indian National Congress untidily participated in this movement. But due to different opinions among Muslims they got split into two groups one was led by Mohammad Shaffi in Lahore and another session was lead by Jinnah in Calcutta. Jinnah surmise opposed the commission.

Limitations of Simon commission:

- No Indian member was appointed in the commission it consisted of only foreign British members.
- The policy and regulating guidelines of universal franchise was not introduced under Simon commission.
- The position of Governor General continued to exist even after a long demand there was no change.
- No term to remove separate electorate but preferably expanded to other communities.
- No financial support was provided by the government as the economic contribution was lacked and denied to Indians under this commission.

The Congress Ultimatum:

During this time, a series of unfavourable developments took place. This led the congress to organize civil disobedience movement. The emergence of the loyalist parties with the moral backing of the Government caused great concern in the Congress circles. In several places,

the people especially students condemned the leaders of the loyalist parties as antinational and opportunists. It resulted in a police lathi charge in the Science College at Trivandrum. When the third session of the Assembly was opened on , a crowd collected in front of the college hooted and geared at the National Congress leaders when they passed by. Provoked at this, S. Krishna Aiyar, leader of the National Congress Party in the Assembly, moved a resolution seeking protection to the members and urging the house to take necessary steps for booking the culprits. The Dewan President of the house assured protection to the members. In this regard a resolution was put to vote and carried. Taking into account of the resolution, in the evening of that day police lathi charged on the students causing serious injuries to more than twenty students. The congress condemned this as a pre-conceived action of the Government to suppress their party. On 18th July, A. Thanupillai moved for discussion an adjournment motion on the incident in the Assembly. But, the Dewan who was the President disallowed the motion for discussion. The State Congress members staged a walk out in protest from the Legislature. On 17th July, the District Magistrate of Trivandrum extended the ban order for two months. It also prohibited prominent Working Committee members from attending public meetings during the ban period. The reason the Magistrate mentioned in the order was that a strong opposition existed against the responsible government. If these Working Committee members were allowed there would be a clash and that might cause breach of peace. The leaders of the Travancore State Congress felt that it was a serious attempt on the part of the government to abolish the civil liberties of the people. The government stated that there was neither a policy of curtailment nor repression of civil liberties and the Government was forced to take such action on the Travancore State Congress.⁸ Disappointed and disgusted with the attitude of the Government, the Working Committee of the State Congress met at Trivandrum on 3rd August and decided to launch Civil Disobedience Movement and also decided to give an ultimatum to the government. It was a matter of self respect to the Congressites to submit to the prohibitory orders now in force throughout the state. If the present prohibitory orders were not withdrawn before 16th August 1938, so as to restore their fundamental rights, “the Working Committee will have to shoulder the responsibility of asserting the right of public meetings against the prohibitory order at selected places throughout the state with the utmost non-violent discipline and to face whatever sufferings may be forced upon them in consequence”. In an endeavour to avoid crisis, A. Thanupillai requested the government to revise their policy and thus to effect a solution to the problems. The Dewan on the other hand, warned the leaders of serious

consequences. The Dewan further warned the Congress, not to disobey the order. The government would not be a silent spectator.

Salt Act:

The English East India Company in India considered salt tax to be a good source of revenue. In 1835 a salt commission was appointed to review the policy of the government in respect of the Salt tax. It recommended that Indian salt should be taxed to enable import of English salt from Liverpool to India and improve earnings. Consequently the salt price increased. The salt tax was enhanced during the viceroyalty of Dufferin in 1888. The Madras Provincial Government passed the Madras Salt Act in 1889. Under section 8 of the Madras Salt Act IV of 1889, no person shall manufacture salt unless duly licensed. By the definition in section 3(f), the “manufacture” of salt includes excavation, collection, removal, preparation, steeping, evaporation, boiling or any one or more of these processes. Under section 3 (k) “Contraband Salt” is defined as salt manufactured without license. Under section 74(c) any person who manufactures contraband Salt shall on conviction be punishable for each offence with 6 months’ imprisonment or Rs.500/- fine or both.

And under section 79 all contraband salt and all vessels, vehicle, materials, implements, utensils, animals, packages and coverings employed in the manufacture, purchase, sale, keeping concealment or conveyance thereof are liable to confiscation. Section 71 provides that at the conclusion of an enquiry or trial, the Court may order the confiscation of anything liable to confiscation. Any person resisting the search for or seizure of contraband salt or other articles to confiscation commits an offence under section 353 IPC and becomes liable to arrest. If the search or seizure is resisted, the leaders of the party should be arrested and charged either under section 353 IPC or under the Salt Act as may be convenient. Basil Blackett, the British Finance Member doubled the salt tax in February 1923. As salt formed an integral component of any food preparation, taxing the same by such an Act and monopolising its trade to the gains of the colonial Government naturally shook the mind of the native patriots. Hence Gandhi had chosen the salt law for his act of defiance of British laws to demonstrate that Civil Disobedience had been started to become a popular movement.

Imposition of Heavy Revenue:

In 1758, a tax of 10% on the produce of the landed estates in Bombay was imposed by the EIC to meet its extravagant expenses, to build fortifications and other works for maintaining its war with the French in India, and for extending its occupation here. In 1765, the EIC

forcibly obtained the "right" to collect land revenue in Bengal. The profits from this enabled them to further increase their armed strength and to monopolise the production and marketing of commodities. The EIC levied a tax on all salt produced in India, obtaining revenue of more than £1 million per year, during the last years of its rule.

This excessive tax compelled impoverished millions to reduce the quantity of salt consumed to less than one-half the amount declared by the medical authorities to be absolutely necessary for health, if not for life itself. The British imposed or enhanced taxes on land, trades, occupations and commodities. In South India, the taxes were raised from 12 to 16% of the gross agricultural produce to 50%. The tax was calculated on what the farmer obtained in a good agricultural year. If, for any reason, he had a bad crop he would almost surely make a loss because the amount of tax remained fixed. Such oppressive taxes led to the decay of the excellent traditional agricultural, industrial and trading systems.

The taxation policies of the British served to enrich the rich and impoverish the poor-as most such policies still do today. In 1929, the people of India were taxed more than twice as heavily as the people of England. The percentage of the taxes in India, as related to the gross product, was more than doubled that of any other country.' While most of the taxes extracted by the British went out of the country, much of the revenues extracted by Indian rulers went back to the people, with only about 5% being retained by the ruler in 1750. The actual producers got 70% back. 10% went to religious, cultural and educational projects, 7.50% to economic services and the police, another 7.5% to the army and the political aristocracy.

Calcutta Session of Congress:

In the Calcutta Congress held in December 29, 1928, under the President ship of Motilal Nehru, Gandhi moved the following 'Compromise' resolution regarding the Nehru Report. "This Congress, having considered the constitution recommended by the All-Parties committee Report, welcomes it as a great contribution towards the solution of India's Political and communal problems, and congratulates the committee on the virtual unanimity of its recommendation, whilst adhering to the resolution relating to independence passed at the Madras Congress approves of the constitution drawn up by committee as a great step in Political advance, especially as it represents the largest measures of agreement attained among the important Parties in the Country."Subject to the exigencies of the political situation, this Congress will adopt the constitution if it is accepted in its entirety by the British Parliament on or before December 31,1929, but the event of its non- Congress will

organise a Campaign of non-violent non-cooperation by advising the Country to refuse taxation and in such other manner as may be decided upon" Gandhi's re-entry into politics was signaled by a resolution which asked the Indians to start Civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes as a protest against the revised land assessment . It was also resolved to boycott foreign cloth, use 3 6 khaddar, remove untouchability etc.

Idea of Purna Swaraj:

One year of grace given by Congress to the government to grant India Dominion Status expired at the midnight on 31 December 1929. At that very hour Congress, at its annual session held at Lahore under the president ship of Jawaharlal Nehru, declared its goal to be the achievement of complete independence for India. It was resolved that the proposed Round Table Conference should be boycotted, that Congressmen should walk out of the central and provincial legislatures, and a Civil Disobedience Movement be launched at a proper time in the near future. Irwin looked upon the Lahore Resolution as the beginning of a 'secession movement', though he hoped to get the full support of 'sober citizens'. Gandhiji's problem was to define the means and methods of Civil Disobedience and make its programmes attractive to all elements of Indian society so that they all could take part in the movement. He took the first step on 26 January 1930. On this day people all over the country were to take a pledge announcing India's determination to attain complete independence. According to Subhas Chandra Bose the Declaration was prepared by Gandhiji himself. The Congress working Committee passed it as a resolution on 26 January 1930. The first half of the resolution awakened the spirit of independence among them against the fourfold oppression of the British rule and the second half declared their modus operandi. The excerpts of the resolution is given: "We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life, so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses. We hold it to be a crime against man and God to submit any longer to a rule that has caused this fourfold disaster to our country. We recognize, however, that the most effective way of gaining our freedom is not through violence. We will, therefore, prepare ourselves by withdrawing, so far as we can, all voluntary association from the British government, and will prepare for Civil Disobedience, including non-payment of taxes. We are convinced that if we can but withdraw our voluntary help and stop payment of taxes without doing violence, even, under provocation, the end of this inhuman rule is assured. We, therefore, hereby solemnly resolve

to carry out the Congress instructions issued from time to time for the purpose of establishing Purna Swaraj."

Irwin did not want to interfere with the celebrations of the Independence Day though he was fully prepared for the maintenance of law and order. The Bombay government wished to check demonstrations. Irwin felt that there would be no dramatic departure in the Congress policy. But Gandhiji was satisfied with the popular response to the Independence Day celebrations which Hailey described as a display of stage-fighting and teapot thunder. It was, however, marked by a communal riot in Dacca, non-participation of Muslims in Delhi and the Punjab, and clashes between workers of the Girni Kamgar Union and Congressmen in Bombay. But still Gandhiji was waiting for the psychologically correct moment.

His friend Dr. Ansari warned him that it was one thing to join a procession, it was quite another to face hardship and to withstand repression. The principal part of the Lahore resolution on complete independence related to the starting of a campaign of Civil Disobedience, for which the authority had been vested in the All India Congress Committee, However, it was crystal clear to all concerned that in reality it was the Mahatma who had to decide the future course of action. But Mahatma Gandhi himself depended upon his 'inner voice' for guidance, and his inner voice kept him waiting for more than two months. On 18 January 1930 when Rabindranath Tagore paid a visit to the Sabarmati Ashram and enquired about the nature of the movement, Gandhi replied "I do not yet see any light coming out of the surrounding darkness . " But it would be wrong to think that Gandhi was idol.

His inner voice might take time to speak to him, but he himself had started speaking to his countrymen as soon as had returned to his Ashram from Lahore. He wrote in Young India that; "granted a perfectly non.,-violent atmosphere and a fulfilled constructive programme, would undertake to lead the Mass Civil Disobedience struggle to a successful issue in the space of a few months." Replying to the critics of the movement he said; "The Congress cannot stay its hands after having passed the independence resolution. It was no bluff, no showy nothing. It is then as much up to the critics as to me, to devise way, and means of achieving independence. "On 30 January 1930, Gandhiji set down eleven points and requested Irwin to satisfy the 'very simple but vital needs of India'. The eleven points enumerated by Gandhiji were: (1) total prohibition (2) reduction of the rupee ratio to 1 s 4 d (3) reduction of land revenue by at least fifty per cent and making it subject to legislative control (4) abolition of the salt-tax (5) reduction of the military expenditure by at least fifty percent(6) reduction of the salaries of the highest grade service ,to one half or less so as to

suit the reduced revenue (7) imposition of protective tariff on foreign cloth, (8) passage of the Coastal Tariff Reservation Bill, (9) discharge of all political prisoners save those condemned for murder, withdrawal of all political prosecutions and abrogation of Section 124-A Regulation of 1818 and the like, and permission to all Indian exiles to return, (10) abolition of the C.I.D. or its popular control, (II) issue of licenses of firearms for self defence, subject to 2 popular control. Gandhiji assured that if the British government would accept the eleven points he would not press on with Civil Disobedience. From Irwin's point of view, the eleven points were "unrealistic, high-pitched and fantastic".

Mahadev Desai tells us that only salt, cloth boycott, temperance and land revenue were really important for Gandhiji and he was willing to government on the basis of these four negotiate with The Congress Working Committee met in the Sabarmati Ashram from 14 to 16 February 1930. The members were obviously growing impatient.. In response to the Working Committee resolution earlier, thirty three members of the Central Legislature, seven members of the Bombay Provincial Legislative Council, seven members of Legislative Council from Madras, forty from Bengal, seventeen from U.P., thirty from Bihar and Orissa, fifteen from C.P. and twelve from Assam resigned.

Subash Chandra Bose and eleven Congress leaders had been sentenced to imprisonment for a year. The working Committee wanted Gandhiji to precede with surer steps. Its resolution on the Civil Disobedience Movement clearly showed the Gandhian transformation of the Congress, "In the opinion of the Working Committee, civil Disobedience should be in it initiated and controlled by those who believe in non-violence for the purpose of achieving Purna Swaraj, as an article of faith, and welcomes the proposal of Mahatma Gandhi and authorises him and those working with him who believe in non-violence as an article of faith to start Civil Disobedience. The Working Committee further hopes that in the event of a mass movement taking place, all those who are rendering voluntary cooperation to the government such as lawyers, and those who are receiving so-called benefits from it, such as students, will withdraw their cooperation or renounce benefits as the case may be, and I throw themselves into the final struggle for freedom".

Irwin found it very hard to preserve patience with Gandhiji who wrote in Young India on 6 February 1930 that the British rule was a perfect personification of violence. On 2 March 1930 Gandhiji sent a politely worded ultimatum to Irwin through a young British Quaker, Reginald Reynolds, to the effect that, unless the Viceroy accepted the eleven points, he (Gandhiji) would disobey the salt laws on 11 March 1930. Irwin regretted his inability to

comply. S.Gopal remarks that Irwin's policy gave the authority the cloak of courtesy and restraint.

In civilized warfare Gandhiji was well-matched by Irwin. On 12 March 1930 Gandhiji wrote to Irwin, "On bended knees I asked for bread and received stone instead. I repudiate this law and regard it as my sacred duty to break the mournful mandatory of compulsory peace that is choking the heart of the Nation for want of free vent. "Gandhiji described the decision as the last throw of a gambler, insisting that even the risk of violence was worth it. Civil Disobedience need not be stopped because of a sporadic act of violence. Apart from these circumstances which led to the launching of the Civil Disobedience Movement there were other reasons which indirectly favoured it. This was the time when the world faced a severe economic depression and like other countries India too was affected by it. The prices of every day commodities in the market started swelling and working classes faced a terrible financial crisis. The peasantry in India had always been poor and with this crisis they were not in a position to pay the land revenue and their condition was pitiable. It caused naturally peasant unrest. British government was not in favour of giving even Dominion Status to India and only insisted on calling Round Table Conference to discuss matters. Therefore, in order to achieve complete independence, Congress was bound to start Civil Disobedience movement.

CHAPTER 2: THE EVENT OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT

The British Salt act reserve and forbid Indians from collecting and trading salt, a basic material, and minerals in the Indian diet. Citizens of the country were forced to shop for the very important mineral from the British, the British government executed and object duty on creation or offer of salt, regardless they made it illegal to generating manufacturing or selling of salt without paying heavy taxes, salt was very essential for day to day diet in spite of the fact that India's poor, endured with heavy tax, Indian required salt Defying the act, Gandhi contemplated that it would be a straight forward path for Indian to overstep the British law peacefully. Gandhi declare a campaign salt Satyagraha, a mass civil disobedience movement on March 1930. The term Satyagraha is a Sanskrit word 'Satyr' signifying 'truth' and 'Agraha' indicate 'Demanding'.

On 5 February the newspaper published that Gandhi would start the civil disobedience movement, resisting the salt law; he made regular statements to the worldwide media regarding the march from Sabarmati at his regular prayer meeting constantly on the press coverage. Gandhi believes in standard organized and faithful to Satyagraha and ahimsa. As regard to these, he recruited the marchers from the resident ashram that was taught in Gandhi uncompromised standard of regulation. On 14 feb1930, the congress active committee met at Sabarmati Ashram and gave Gandhi with full authority at a time and place of his alternatives. The fuss was announced and Gandhi declared that he would sooner defy the salt law along with his 78 chosen members.

By second of March Gandhi wrote a letter to the viceroy, Lord Irwin declaring that he would withdraw the march if Irwin compromised his eleven demands. The note to Irwin collect the matter of the mass attention (around half percent cut in military operating cost and social examine annual income, the overall total elimination, discharge of political prisoners in restructuring of the C.I.D, however it pave away in reshuffling the Arms Act and taking over the problems of firearms licenses, lowering of rupee exchange ratio, safeguard of textile and a quota of coastal delivery and transportation for Indians) so also including 2 basically labor themes-50% went down in land profits, and shutting down of salt tax and administration in salt domination.

Nevertheless, the letter was ignored and makes no appealing to Irwin and so the movement was set in motion. Gandhi along with 78 of his followers set out from Sabarmati and marched to the beach front town of Dandi through the heartland of Gujarat strained covered maximum

of India which got a massive public relation and interest from the whole country even on a world level. on 11 march, Gandhi declared and announces that across-the-board against the law and production and selling of salt should proceed after he himself have violated the salt law forbidden by the British government by picking a small portion of salt from the sea water; it also included boycotting of foreign goods and liquor. Civil disobedience movement began at this moment .He urges the people to celebrate the week from 6 to 13 of April as a national week and defy the British law. Gradually the entire nation got to be included in it.Hartal (strike) put life to a halt. There was substantial scale boycott of schools, universities. The foreign product was set to fire and citizens quit paying taxes. Following the arrest of Gandhi and those accompanying him led to a massive protest in the country.

Demonstrations were organized throughout India against Gandhi arrest. Police beating and assault was indiscriminate, a boycott of British goods was highest in Bengal, Orissa, and Bihar .The movement was very tense in Bengal and the northwest, the riot was very intense and police started a reign of terror which did not spare even the honors of women, the peasants witnessed the destruction of their huts and all the possession they had on earth. However, they deny paying taxes. Sarojini Naidu came to the forefront during the movement. In the northwest, the most famous leader was Abdul Gaffar Khan known as “Frontier Gandhi”. Mass civil disobedience escalates rapidly throughout the country, where millions of people started violating the salt law by manufacturing and selling salt illegally. The British responded and made every effort in breaking the spirit of the people including the declaration of the legislative body reunite against the law. However, no actions slow down the interest group. In order to discuss the constitutional reform, the British government organized a series of three round table conference. However, there was disagreement between the British and Indians party leaders will not make their mind up.

First Round Table Conference:

On September 11 1930, the employees in the conference were officially declared. The first round convention was inaugurated by George V on November12, 1930 at the Royal Gallery House of the Lord at London it was headed by Ramsay MacDonald. In this conference three political parties from British along with sixteen resource person. From British India there were 58 party leaders and 16 delegates from the princely states, all together there were 89 resource people from India who attended the conference, but, in which one of the major political party in India the INC along with the high dealing class people were not present at

the meeting, most of the leaders was put to prison because of their contribution in Civil Disobedience Movement, so also the convention was boycotted by the congress, what happen after the meeting was that the party influential active member of the congress and the working group was imprisoned, but later they were set free, when the resource person and the delegates reached India. Tej Bahadur made an appointment with Gandhi and met him, ask Gandhi to meet Lord Irwin and discuss a peaceful settlement in the name of congress.

However in this conference the participants were the British representatives, Indian states representatives, British-India representatives, and Indian states resource staff, secretaries and secretary general and several representative from India were Muslim League: Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Muhammad Shafi, Aga Khan, Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Zafrulla and A.K Fazlul Huq Hindu Mahasabha: B.S. Moonje and M.R. Jayakar Indian Liberal Party: Tej Bahadur Sapru, C.Y.Chintamani and SrinivasaSastri. Sikhs: Sardar Ujjal Singh. The Untouchables: Dr. B.R. Ambedkar. The conference began with six complete fully attended to discuss and put forward their problems, where eight secondary committee was created for the agreement of various centralized constitution, regional establishment, region of Sindh., also for their protection services, minorities etc.

However it was carried on by the news of the sub continents in the central constitution, provisional constitution minorities, Burma, North West boundary line Provinces, charter, security forces and Sindh, that went along with the ultimate end of the conference. This movement was not easy to make it final without the presence of the ruling party in India but however few progresses were prepared. The proposal made by the All India Federation later on shifted in between the meeting by Tej Bahadur Sapru, several organizations that were present in the conference were in favor of this decision made. So also the princely states too were in favor in the federation provided that for their own personal profit and freedom so also the Muslim League were in favor with the alliance, where they had been divergent to a well-built core.

Britishers decided their diplomat's regime must be initiated on regional stage. Several essential points were accountable for administrative, legislative so also for the different people entitled to vote known as Untouchables as ask and demanded by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar. There was a religion differences between the Hindu and the Muslim, differences as in overcastted the conference as the Hindus were giving much pressure for strong central government but the Muslims aim for the smooth and loose federation or complete autonomous provinces, so also the Muslims asked for separate electorates, the Muslims also

started to claim the majority in the case of Punjab and Bengal however the Hindus resisted their majority because so as Muslim the Sikhs also claimed for the dominance over Punjab.

Gandhi-Irwin Pact

At the end of the first round table meeting, British high officials realize that it was important for the unification of the Indian National Congress for their own profit and for making laws and order and also for building up constitution in India for their own interest. This made Lord Irwin to call Gandhi for discussion, and in which Gandhi agreed to end Civil Obedience Movement without any terms and conditions made, which led to an official agreement between Gandhi and Lord Irwin, and was signed on 5th March 1931. After the agreement was signed between Gandhi and Lord Irwin, following are the salient features:

- 1 That the congress should end the Civil Disobedience Movement.
2. The congress should attend the round table conference.
3. The Indian government should take back the ordinances given to curb the congress.
4. The congress should step back in regard with the prosecution connecting to the offences not involving violence.
5. The congress should set free to all the personals going under the sentences of imprisonment for their role played in civil disobedience movement. The agreement signed between Gandhi and Irwin clearly shows how the British officials were eager in bringing the Indian National Congress in convention.

Second Round Table Conference

On account of serious differences within the Indian States Delegation and disagreement on communal matters among the British Indian parties no agreed decision could be reached on most of the vital issues, such issues of composition and authority of central governing body, the nature of the federal executive, its relationship to the federal legislature and the levying of corporation tax in the Second Round Table Conference. In absence of agreement on federal proposals it was decided to appoint various bodies to decide these questions, yet the prospects of an Indian federation appeared to be dim.

To end the deadlock in the Princes' camp on the question of the apportionment of seats among them in the federal legislature, the Federal Structure Committee, in its third report, made it clear that, if the Princes failed to arrive at any agreement amongst them before March 1932, an Expert Committee would be formed to decide the issue. As neither of the groups desired the intervention of such a committee, they decided once again on a compromise. For this objective summit, Princes and Ministers were called in the capital on March 11, 1932.

Delhi Pact: The deliberations brought about reasonable agreement between the two factions; a Committee of Ministers was appointed “for the purpose of reconciliation, as far as possible, in the different schemes for associating the States with the proposals for all-India constitutional reforms”. The Princes met again on March 24, 1932. They incorporated the outcome of their deliberations in three documents which were acceptable to all the Princes. These documents were known as the A.B.C. documents. While document ‘A’ described the safeguards sine qua non for the Princes to join the federation, document ‘B’ listed the “fundamental principles” which the Princes desired to be incorporated in the proposed federal constitution. Document ‘C’ included the principal recommendations of the Committee of Ministers’ regarding the need of and also the method to the joining of the federation by the Princes. Now let us discuss here these documents, of course, briefly.

Document-A:

It comprised seven clauses. It was related to representation of the Princes in the legislature and the guarantee of non-intervention in their internal affairs either by the federal executive or legislature. The Princes also demanded 50% representation in the federal legislature. The representation was to be so constituted as to secure one seat for each State which “is a member of the Chamber of Princes or is qualified to be a member” and “collective representation for those States who are not members of the Chamber”. They further observed that they were against the revision or alteration of treaty rights except with their willing consent. This provision was to be safeguarded by the Crown. They also desired the recognition of their “right to secede from Federation at any future time”.

Document-B

In this document, the Princes enumerated seventeen fundamental principles. They maintained that, to make any federation acceptable to the Princes, the inclusion of the clauses set out in the document in the constitution was essential. To begin with, they maintained that the sovereignty and autonomy of the States should be fully respected and guaranteed. They further stated that there should be no intervention, direct or indirect, with the internal affairs of the States. They also expressed that no direct tax or levy of any kind including income tax and corporation tax should be imposed by the federal government.

Federal sources of revenue and other subjects should be strictly confined to the subjects mutually agreed upon; all residuary powers should remain with the States; the States must have at least 40% 99 representation in the Upper House and 33% in the Lower House;³⁴ the system and method of their representation should be of no concern of the federation; States

would enter the federation by means of treaties made with the Crown; it should be open to them to enter the federation directly or through confederation; the position of the States and British India in federation should be of equal partners; the federal court should derive its authority from the Crown as well as from the Rulers of the federating States. States would enter the federation by means of treaties made with the Crown; it should be open to them to enter the federation directly or through confederation; the position of the States and British India in federation should be of equal partners; the federal court should derive its authority from the Crown as well as from the Rulers of the federating States; in case of issues where the federating units were involved, an appeal should lie with the Privy Council in England; the fundamental rights should find no place in the federal constitution and should not be treated as a federal subject; and lastly, India should remain a vital element in British reign.

Document-c

Ministers Committee's recommendations firmly pleaded again that the Princes' participation in the federation was "not only desirable, but necessary". Though States' policy, it realized, should be one of joining the federation as a collective unit, it should be "permissible for any State that may so desire, to go individually". It further made clear that the scheme of confederation, as expounded and developed during the discussions of the Committee, was not incompatible with the Sankey proposals and that representation should, as far as possible and except in the case of the States sending their representatives direct, be through an electoral college.

Third Round Table Conference:

In the Conference two members Sir Manubhai Mehta and Sir Liaquat Hyat Khan represented most States. The Chamber of Princes deputed them. They made efforts to secure as many safeguards as they could. However, on the issue of the allocation of seats, differences began to crop up amongst the States. As stated in the Ministers' report submitted on March 6, 1933, to the Chamber of Princes, It read: "Our differences with the States like Hyderabad, Mysore and Baroda were fundamental", and as they were not at all to be satisfied by any kind of compromise, the Secretary of State intelligently decided not to waste time of the Conference on "profitless wrangling amongst ourselves".

Thus, by the close of 1932, no decision could be arrived at with regard to either the size of the federal legislature or the allocation of seats. Federal Finance: It was another question on which the Princes were not at all ready to compromise. As pointed out previously, a

committee on federal finance was formed in 1931 under the President ship of Sir Eustace Percy. It was to examine the question of the federal revenue. Another committee under the chairmanship of Lord Davidson was constituted by the British Government “to explore more fully in detailed about the economic inconvenience that has taken place relating various entity positions. Both these group after examining different aspects of the federal finance and the States as well as the Provinces’ heterogeneity in the economic sphere came to the finale that merely a policy of “give and take” could solve the tough question of federal finance.

For example, according to Davidson’s Report, there were several States which had been enjoying “immunities or privileges” by the treaties as well as had been paying some tribute or other contribution. In this respect, if they desired their tributes to be remitted on the basis that they were of the feudal character or unknown to other federation. It was felt that they should also accept to adjust such remission against the value of any privilege or immunity they had been enjoying so far from ordinary “federal revenues”. Besides, the imposition of some kind of a tax, preferably a corporation tax or surcharge on income tax, was advised by the Peel Committee. It was suggested as a federal source of revenue. It was another setback contrary to the hopes of the Princes on the federal proposals. Thus, the more the scheme crystallized the more they started to realize that the proposed federation might be a liability and not an asset to them. Publication of White Paper: A White Paper incorporating proposals for a constitutional reform in India was issued in March 1933, by the British Government. They were mostly based on the discussions/deliberations of the Round Table Conference and also the recommendations of its various committees including the Federal Structure Committee.

It was popularly known as Sankey Committee. The White Paper suggested a Federation of India. It was to be a “union” between the Governors’ Provinces and the federating States. This Federation could be founded by a proclamation of His Majesty on a request by both Houses of Parliament. This kind of request could, however, be made only when the leader of the country signifying not a smaller amount than half of the total inhabitants state and permitted to a reduced amount, parts of the chairs be given to the country in the superior board room had indicate their longing for their allowance in the confederation. The Ruler was to comply the confederacy with the Instrument by taking over, whereby he would transfer with the top in purpose of confederation, his authority and command regarding with subject that he would be agreeable in recognizing a centralized issues.

In case of every State which would accede, the powers and jurisdiction of the Federation in relation to that State and its subjects were to be strictly coterminous with the powers and jurisdiction transferred to the Crown by the Ruler himself and defined in his Instrument of Accession. The administrative ability of the confederacy was, thus, limited in such supremacy, jurisdiction falling within the federal sphere as the Ruler had transferred to the King. All the authority relating to the country which was implemented by the administrator, other than those which were to fall within the federal sphere, they were to be exercised by the Viceroy as Crown's representative. Federal Legislature: The federal legislature was to be bicameral. In the upper chamber, i.e. Council of States, not more than 100 out of 260 seats were provided to the States; in the federal assembly they were to have not more than 125 seats out of the 375. The distribution of seats among the State-members was to be based, "in the Council of States, on the relative rank and importance of the State as indicated by the dynastic salute and other factors", and in the case of the lower chamber it was to be based, "in the main, on population".

The States' representatives in the central governing body were recruited by the head of the state. The White Paper suggested that the federating States should be needed to contribute corporation tax after 10 years, and should also contribute to the federal revenue a proportionate sum in lieu of surcharges on unpaid revenue. Leaders of the Indian-member of federation was to be needed to see that due effect was given, within his State, to every action that were undertaken by the central government that applied that territory. The head of the state was to empowered. And, if the terms of any State's Instrument of Accession so provided, was to be required "to make agreements with the Ruler of any State for carrying out in that State, through the agency of State authorities, of any federal purpose".

However, in that case the Governor General was to be entitled, by inspection or otherwise, to satisfy himself that an adequate standard of administration was maintained. He was also to be given powers to issue at his discretion general instructions to the government of any State-member of the federation for the objective of ensuring that the federal obligations of the States were being duly fulfilled. The Federal Court, which was to be formed under the new Act, was to exercise both original and appellate jurisdiction. However, these were to be exercised over matters or decisions. These involved the understanding of the instrument of government that arose. It also involved interpretation of every accurate requirement. It was also to have original jurisdiction over several subject concerning to the description, that occur in various contract following the initiation of the instrument of government involving the

association, state or concerning to a Province and a State, unless the agreement otherwise provided.

An appeal in civil suits could also lie in the Federal Court with the leave of the Federal Court or a High Court of a Province or State. White Paper and the Princes: The suggestions made in the White Paper did not evoke the enthusiasm of the Princes. The Confederation group, in its meeting on 20-23 March 1933, expressed its dejection and agony at the White Paper's silence on the issue of confederation. The informal summit of the assembly room, that took place in the same month itself, expressed its regret that the federal scheme, as outlined in the White Paper, was very different from the one which was suggested or proposed in the first RTC; that the White Paper's scheme neither fulfilled all the conditions nor included the safeguards needed by the Princes for the acceptance of the federal proposals.

The resolution, therefore, declared that the proposals were not acceptable to them. However, in the Chamber's formal session, the Princes resolved that, in view of the fact that the Viceroy had invited "reasonable amendment to make it generally acceptable". Of course, the Chamber of Princes was prepared "to make a further attempt towards that end". In April 1933, a Joint Select Committee was constituted by the British Parliament under the chairmanship of Lord Linlithgow. It was to regard the eventual fate of the administration of the state in the light of the White Paper recommendation. For this object, the Chambers Standing Committee deputed Mr. P.K. Sen, Mr. Mir Maqbool and Mr. K.M. Panikkar to give evidence on behalf of the Chamber before the Committee. The delegates took part in the discussions.

A memorandum incorporating the points of view of the Princes was presented. The evidence of Sir Samuel Hoare, bureau of Indian territories, was very significant as it clarified many points; for instance the issue of allocation of seats to the Princes in the federal legislature, contribution from the States to the federal finance, and the question of remission of tributes, enforcements of the acts of the federal legislature in the States, etc.

Report of the Linlithgow Committee: It submitted its report in October 1934. It only endorsed the recommendations of the White Paper on a majority of matters. It laid special emphasis on the voluntary character of the accession of States to the federation. It also made certain significant modifications and additions to the White Paper proposals. be "composed of disparate constituent units, in which the powers and authority of the Central Government will differ as between one constituent unit and another. While the White Paper suggested that

the seats that remained unfilled in the federal legislature on account of no accession of States to the federation should remain vacant.

The Linlithgow Committee Report recommended that the representatives of acceding States should be empowered to elect additional representatives to both Houses up to half the number of States' seats (including those States whose rulers are minors) which remained unfilled. Further, while the White Paper stated that His Majesty's Government was satisfied that some provisions with regard to "individual freedom and privileges of property and the qualification of just for open office, paying little heed to contrasts of standing, statement of faith, religion, and so on., could suitably, and ought to, discover a place in the instrument of government ".

The Joint Select Committee was surely opposed to any declaration of fundamental rights in it. But the Committee wanted it to be reiterated in the Constitution Act that "no British subject, Indian or otherwise, domiciled in India, shall be disabled from holding public office or from practicing any trade, profession or calling by reason only of his religion, descent, caste, colour or place of birth". The Committee also wanted that this provision be "extended, as regards the holding of office under the Federal Government, to subjects of Indian States".

The Joint Select Committee recommended the States to accede to such forty eight items of the Federal Legislative List; that did not include most of the items of federal taxation. The report also accepted in principle some views of the Princes, relating to financial matters, of course, not mentioned in the White Paper, namely, that there should be a "gradual abolition over a period of years...of any contribution paid by a State to the Crown which is in excess of the value of the immunities which it enjoys". It further accepted, in principle, the right of States to collect internal customs revenue. Finally, the report stated that the maritime States should be permitted to "retain only so much of the customs duties which they collect as is properly attributable to dutiable goods consumed in their own State".

Linlithgow Report and the Chamber: Soon after the publication of the report, the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes constituted a three-man committee consisting of Sir Manubhai Mehta, Sir LiaquatHyat Khan and Sir Prabha Shankar Pattani to examine it. Their report was to be in the nature of: (1) a comparative statement on the safeguard demanded by the Chamber of Princes and those provided for in the report; (2) discussion of items which, in their opinion, were either not clear or adequately provided; and (3) their recommendations regarding future action. After analyzing the report clause by clause, the Joint Select Committee recommended that the Viceroy should be asked to clarify some points which were

vague in it. Thus, proper amendments should be introduced in the Government of India Bill, while affirming their previous policy; the Princes must await the actual Bill before any final judgment or decision. The Linlithgow Report was debated threadbare by the Chamber of Princes during its session held on 22 and 23 January 1935. While not only agreeing but also accepting that the report was an improvement in certain measures on the White Paper proposals, particularly in the financial field.

The Princes too realized that further elucidation appeared to be essential on several points as the recommendation regarding them appeared ambiguous and capable of different interpretations. The Princes too made that clear that they could give their final view merely after examining the parliamentary bill relating to constitutional reforms, the proposed Treaty of Accession and the Instrument of Accession.

Government of India Bill: After the creation of the Joint Select commission Report, Government of India statement was presented in the British upper house. The Bill was generally in light of the Joint Select Committee Report's suggestions. It held wilful character of the increase of States to the association of India. Be that as it may, it gave that the States would be considered to have acquiesced to the confederation.

His Majesty had connoted his acknowledgment of the affirmation made by the Ruler for himself, his beneficiaries and successor that he acknowledged the Act as material to his State and subjects. It was excessively finished with the aim that government experts would practice in connection to his State and subjects such capacities as may be within them or beneath the work. The Ruler was likewise approved to execute a supplementary announcement with respect to his ability to acknowledge, restrictively or something else, some other matter as a subject in respect of which the central government may make laws in connection to the country and subjects.

Thereof, or his willingness to waive, in whole or part, any condition specified in earlier declaration made by him. The Bill provided for a few safeguards against discriminatory legislation regarding British subjects domiciled in Great Britain. However, no provision was made in respect of fundamental rights of the people of India.

Hydari Committee Report: Immediately after the Bill was introduced in the Parliament, a committee of Minister along with a legal counsel, at the initiative of the Nawab of Bhopal, was constituted under Sir Akbar Hydra's Chairmanship. The Committee held that in certain

significant huge regards the statement withdrew from "the concurred circumstances touched base at amid the gatherings of the State delegates with His Majesty Government". It especially called attention to that the implement of agreement was not in the frame of a "bilateral agreement between the States and the Crown". It did not include "any declaration or covenant on the part of His Majesty preserving inviolate the treaties and agreements concluded with the States".

The Committee further maintained that, under clause 6(1) as at present drafted the Instrument of Accession would operate only so far as "the Act gives it effect". It made clear that "there should be no misapprehension that the acceptance of the Act does not mean or lead to the inference that the legislation is applicable to the States propriety vigour". Consequently the Committee suggested that subclause (a) of clause 6(1) should be so redrafted as to make it vivid that "what are accepted are specific provisions of the Act and that the governing factor in the transaction of accession is that implement of taking over, area under discussion to which alone in requirement of Act are agreed to".

It also suggested that the Instrument of Accession should indicate in a schedule "the matter in respect of which the States agree to federate and the reservations, conditions and limitations (e.g., in the matter of administration) subject to which they accede". Finally, the Committee held that without these satisfactory amendments the suggested scheme could not be accepted by the Rulers. On February 25, 1935, a meeting of the Princes and the State Ministers was held. It was to discuss the Bill in the light of the Hydra Committee's recommendations. The Princes realized that the time had come for them to take a final decision on the question of federation. They refused to accept the Bill because of various factors.

The Nawab of Bhopal opined the Bill in its present form affected the sovereignty of the Princes. Instead of giving them protection it, "opened the door to incessant encroachment on our internal rights". Sir C.P. RamaswamyAiyer, while examining its constitutional provisions, warned them of its "implications". Sir Akbar Hydari reiterated his views which were earlier stated in the Hydari Committee Report.⁹⁰ Ultimately, supporting the views of the Hydari Committee; the Princes expressed "regret to note that the Bill and the Instrument of Accession do not secure those vital interests and fundamental requisites of the States on which they have throughout laid great emphasis". They summed up that, "in their present form, and without satisfactory modifications of, and alteration to, the fundamental points, the Bill and the Instrument of Accession cannot be regarded as acceptable to Indian states"

Modification to the Bill: The Princes subsequently conveyed these views along with their suggestions to the Viceroy. These were taken into consideration by the British Government. Some substantial modifications, especially in respect to clause six that dealt with the nature and terms of accession of the States, were made in the Government of India Bill and in sub-clause (a) of section 5(1) of the Act it was particularly laid down that the federal authorities should, "by ideals of his implement of agreement, however matter dependably to the terms thereof, and for the reasons just of the confederation, practice in connection to his State such capacities as might be within them by or under this Act". After receiving Royal Assent on August 2, 1935, the Bill became an Act. Thus, after many vicissitudes and shifts in position, the British Government was able to provide a federal constitution for the country and British India.

The Proposals of 1935: The Government of India Act, hence, for instant in India's constitutional development, opened the path for the States to be brought into the federal structure. Even after the passing of the Act there were several issues which remained to be solved. There was, for example, the problem of the allocation of seats amongst the Princes. On this, there was a clash of interests between the smaller and the middle-sized States which resulted in the split up of the Princes into Federation and Confederation. This bifurcation subsequently resulted in the weakening of the Chamber of Princes to such an extent that, during 1933-34, most of the 17 and 19 salute States, who were active members in the Chamber, expressed their intention to withdraw from it.

The Chamber could not, thus, make itself realized as much as it had done before on vital issues, nor could it give a clear lead in the matter. On the question of Federation as such, a review of the Princes' attitude at different phases of its evolution indicated that, though initially they accepted it, they were all the time keenly conscious of the possibility of their powers being absorbed by the federal authority. Also the clearer the federal proposals became the more confirmed the Princes' fears got. In respect to federal finance also, the Princes, after the publication of the Federal Finance Reports, realized that the Federation might not assist them financially. In other spheres again, the Princes became increasingly conscious of the overriding powers of the federal authority. This was evident from their suggestions and counter-suggestions for the modification of the constitutional proposals as well as the emphasis on the inclusion of safeguards and sine qua non, ad verbatim in the federal constitution.

Chapter 3: PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN CIVIL DISOBEDIENT MOVEMENT

The Women of India had contributed surprisingly in different peaceful developments began for India's opportunity. Their peaceful developments can be extensively examined in three unusual stages in particular Non-Cooperation Movement (1920 – 1922) and Civil Disobedience Movement (1930 – 1934) and Quit India Movement. Before talking about these mass developments, The Civil Disobedience Movement began in the year 1930 and proceeded till 1934. The vast majority of the general population of our nation, particularly the intelligential, was persuaded that the strategy for influence couldn't work successfully. They felt slanted to utilize the solid dialect of fomentation to constrain the British Government to tune in to their requests. The British Government had effectively dismisses the Nehru Report of 1928 and restraint was going ahead of course. The Congress accordingly was left with no option yet to begin a Civil Disobedience Movement .Gandhi was approved to work out the subtle elements of the program of Civil Disobedience in meeting with the working advisory group, and the All India Congress Committee. It was along these lines that the most recent days of December, 1929 brought forth the Civil Disobedience Movement.

The program of Civil Disobedience Movement incorporated the infringement of Salt Law, blacklist of the instructive establishment by the understudies and workplaces by the Government representatives, picketing of shops managing alcohol, opium and remote merchandise and blaze of outside material and non-instalment of taxes. The Civil Disobedience Movement motivated and brought numerous Indian ladies to take an interest. At first Gandhi was hesitant to include ladies specifically with the primary scene of activity and it was not commendable that the gathering of supporters who went with him to Dandi was an all-made unexpected. Most amazing of all was the state of mind of ladies, numerous Indian women of good family, high savvy, centre and privileged ladies were assembled energetically in their own particular humble ways. They guaranteed really sub continental measurements and saw profoundly moving and extraordinary scenes in each niche and corner of the nation.

It was then that Gandhi at long last concluded that it ought to appear as dis-complying with the salt law which made it unlawful for people to make salt. Government gained syndication over its produce and it additionally exacted an obligation on salt so fabricate and this brought about its being sold to the general population at a high cost. Many individuals disparaged him

for having picked the insubordination of that law for ousting the British Rule in India yet ensuing occasions demonstrated that it turned out to be the best weapon during the time spent picking up flexibility. Salt was an article of normal utilization. Resistance of Salt Law made an intense interest on each man and lady. It is additionally simple to challenge the law with respect to its fabricate, and actually it empowered huge quantities of individuals to take part in the development. On 2 March 1930 Gandhiji composed a letter to the Viceroy advising him that he would infringe upon the Salt law and therefore began the Civil Disobedience Movement.

On the opposite side, the Civil Disobedience Movement wanted to work into three stages. The primary period of the development constituted from Gandhi walk to Dandi on April 1930 until about the mid of May. The second stage kept going from June 1930 till the general turmoil and insubordination of the law in July, which was the most troublesome for the government and their authorities. The third stage was from July to the settlement of 5 March 1931. On March 12, he attempted with seventy nine prisoners of his Sabarmati Ashram for the popular memorable walk to Dandi in the Surat District. He strolled through the towns in transit. A huge number of villagers met him amid his March and this gave him a chance of revealing to them what they ought to do and how they ought to continue with their work. He however requested that they not challenge the Salt Law until he himself broke it at Dandi. It was on April, 6 that he achieved Dandi.

At a young hour in the morning he and his devotees showered in the ocean after petitions and he gravely picked a modest bunch of salt on the ocean drift and typically overstepped the salt law. At the point when the Dandi March was on advance, various individuals joined with him. He went through 300 towns. When Mahatma Gandhi achieved Dandi, he had the entire country, stimulated and expected sitting tight eagerly for the last alert. It was a development that was to stay phenomenal in the historical backdrop of the Indian National Movement for the countrywide by the passage of Mahatma Gandhi; the Civil Disobedience Movement had taken off as an agitation Campaign.

All through India it had obtained quality and prevalence when the Government of India had not expected. What's more, behind the prevalent energy was the forefront of violence. When the development turned out to be exceptionally mainstream, the ordinary citizens to a great extent participated in this. Promptly on 6 April 1930, Mahatma Gandhi was captured, around then he assigned Smt. Sarojini Naidu to leader of the Movement. On 15 May 1930, Sarojini

Naidu drove the strike on the Dharasana Salt works. In spite of the fact that she and her confidants were captured, they were discharged around the same time; empowering Sarojini Naidu to lead another group of 25,000 plunderers on a similar salt chips away at 21 May. This was the event for a standout amongst the most noteworthy exhibits of the soul of peacefulness accumulated by Gandhi Movement, as the volunteers remained completely serene regardless of to serve incitement and horrifying outrages perpetrated on them by the police. . Impression of ladies in the public eye experienced an ocean change amid the Salt Satyagraha Movement. Mahatmas Gandhi made an interest to Indian ladies to turn out from their family segregation and exhorted them to take part in the political development to end the British manage in India. It ought to be noted here that preceding 1930, just a couple of ladies for the most part from the groups of pioneers partook in political development. Be the as it may, amid the Salt Satyagraha ladies progressively selected themselves as volunteers. Around then, a ton of ladies took an interest in this development from better places and regions that drove the Satyagraha in their own provinces.

The ladies of South India additionally partook in the development. The general population of the considerable number of districts, for example, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, the Coastal belt of Andhra Pradesh and Kerala, which constituted the Madras Presidency completely, reacted to the call of Gandhi. They all joined the development in the first week of April 1930. On 13 march 1930 enormous meeting was held at Thiruchirapalli. The development accumulated force and the reaction to it from various regions was exceptionally considerable. On 3 April 1930 it was chosen that Vedaranyam was the focal place for the Salt Satyagraha. Quickly the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee moved its central station from Madras to Thiruchirapalli and put the exercises of this board of trustees under direct control of its secretary, T.S. Rajan of Thiruchirappalli.

On 5 April, the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee met at Thiruchirappalli and chose C. Rajagopalachari as its President. C. Rajagopalachari and K. Santhanam were allotted the obligation to dispatch the local Salt Satyagraha battle by Tamil Nadu Congress Committee gathered at Vellore in North Arcot District and affirmed Vedaranyam as the place for the Satyagraha. Considering this, steady planning was begun in Tamil Nadu to dispatch the development. In the Tamil Districts, the salt law has not yet started yet broken, the volunteers around hundred in number headed by Rajagopalachari started its tremendously publicized walk to Vedaranyam close cape calimere where it is proposed to rub salt from connecting bog. This gathering incorporates of few enlisted people from different regions, viz, Madura,

Thiruchirappalli and Tirunelveli. Out of fourteen regions, development prospered in a stunning way in Madras, Madurai, Coimbatore, Dindugal and Tirunelveli. Rajagopalachari and many individuals partook in the development, and every one of them was captured. He was sentenced to experience basic detainment for six months and solicited to pay a fine from Rs.200 and in failure to experience straightforward detainment for an additional instant of three months.

Amid this time Rukmini Lakshmi pathi, Vice President of Tamil Nadu Provincial Congress Rajagopalachari and hundreds of people took part in the movement, and all of them were arrested. As a matter of fact in Madras she was the first lady to be arrested in connection with Salt Satyagraha. In Madras Durgabai Ammal, led the leadership of lady Satyagrahis. Several ladies under the inspiring leadership of Durgabai Ammal and Smt. Prakasam volunteered to join the Satyagraha development and they likewise gave their gems to the Satyagraha support.

A portion of the remarkable ladies pioneers were also captured, around hundred volunteers joined by Durgabai Ammal and Varaga Ammal achieved the Seashore to deliver booty salt. As of now hundred police encompassed "the females and having so ringed them harped on them ruthlessly". They were beaten and persuasively dragged. The female volunteers maintained wounds. Thus Durgabai Ammal scrutinized the police barbarity. She later on gave reputation in the press about the barbarities of police. In the midst of the Salt Satyagraha, endless ladies partook in the opportunity battle. Particularly, Delhi, Bengal and Bihar Women's soles were very admirable and it demonstrated from the Jail records that the Lahore female correctional facility was loaded with salt Satyagrahis.

The ladies in the first place assumed an unmistakable part in arranging youngsters into the Vaanara Senai (Monkey Army). From the previous pages it is seen that the ladies of Tamil Nadu did not fall behind and they played a major part in freedom movement by sorting out young inhabitants into what was called as the Vaanar Sena (Monkey Army). The dynamic vitality of these youths was occupied into efficient and trained action, rather than taking part them the uproar. The association sowed the seeds of patriotism in the brains of young men and young women.

A measurable report demonstrates that the aggregate number of individuals captured and sentenced in prison from Madras were 3,490 of which the ladies Satyagraha were 291. The

ladies who were captured in the development were gravely treated; they were given correctional facility sentence from four months to two years. They were abused in the Coimbatore, Vellore and Cuddalore Jail. Ladies had no extraordinary thought; they were additionally paid the punishment for their deficiencies. On the off chance that they neglected to pay the punishment, they were detained for four months. The Salt – Satyagraha (1930) was trailed by outside fabric blacklist development. The development accumulated energy soon.

A huge number of women even from the universal and highborn families fled out of their homes to picket the alcohol shops. Every one of them were captured and detained. Blacklist of remote materials was additionally captured on a broad scale. At Dharasana, 2,500 Satyagrahis assaulted a salt stop. The police as regular turned to coldblooded constraint. Many individuals were gravely injured, some of them kicked the bucket additionally subsequently of lathi-passes up the police. The blacklist of outside material demonstrated effective past all figuring's. In 1930, the import of remote fabric was decreased to one-fourth of the figures of the earlier year. Sixteen English-possessed material factories at Bombay must be shut.

It demonstrated a surprisingly positive development to Indian plants. The workers additionally did no expense crusade with awesome seal. The British Government knew it well that Congress was the head political gathering of India and its co-operation was basic for taking care of the established issue of the nation. The administration understood the need of landing at a settlement with the Congress. In compatibility of this arrangement and keeping in mind the end goal to make friendly environment for transactions, the Government lifted the prohibition on the Congress and discharged every one of the pioneers including Mahatma Gandhi genuinely on 17 February 1931. It was trailed by extended correspondence amongst Gandhiji and Lord Irwin.

In spite of the fact that the intervention of Sapura and Jayakar, a settlement was finished up amongst Gandhi and Irwin on 5 March 1931. According to this agreement, the Government consented to pull back all statutes and arguments pending against the political labourers, to discharge all political detainees aside from the individuals who were liable of viciousness, to allow the people living inside a specific separation from the ocean shore to gather or make salt without being exhausted, to allow serene picketing of shops offering mixers, outside merchandise and opium to re-establish the property seized regarding the Civil Disobedience

Movement and to give back and unfaltering property relinquished in lieu of land income. Mahatma additionally for the Congress consented to suspend the Civil Disobedience Movement; not to press for enquiry into police abundances; to find a way to connect Congress with the Round Table Conference, and to pull back all blacklist plans. Gandhiji came back from the Round Table Conference with empty hand. However, he was not loaded with any failure. The meeting shut on 1 December 1931. Kamaladevi Chattapadhyaya joined by her secretary Sofia Somji in the interest of the Women's Seva Dal, yet met with little achievement. Talking at Salem on 2 December she encouraged her gathering of audience to be organized for further recommencement of Civil Disobedience. Gandhiji landed on the soil of Bombay on 28 December 1931.

The political scene in India was in no way less sensitive and disturbed than the disappointment of London talks. Without Gandhiji, the emissary turned to constraint as an issue of arrangement. He accepted not in settlement with but rather concealment of the Congress. He damaged the Gandhi – Irwin settlement. The Conservative Party which was in office in England likewise supported a stern state of mind towards Indians and especially the Congress. When the Government demonstrated no preparation to change its mentality, the Congress working council chose to restart the development. Be that as it may, on 2 January 1932 Gandhiji got a wire from the Private Secretary to the Viceroy, which turned down the demand of Gandhiji to meet the emissary and debilitated to make extreme move against the pioneers and devotees of the Civil Disobedience Movement. Gandhiji composed back to the Government his aim and firm assurance to continue the Civil Disobedience Movement tolerating full obligation regarding the results. Subsequently, the fight lines were redrawn.

The Gandhi – Irwin agreement turned out to be dead. However this time, not at all like Lord Irwin, Lord Willington rushed to capture Gandhiji on 4 January 1932 in pre-emptive strike against the Indian National Movement and turned to the different draconian statutes proclaiming all Congress Organizations as unlawful and curbing all common freedoms. Be that as it may, this pre-emptive strike of the British Government met with the severest kind of Civil Disobedience Movement all over India. The ladies picketed the outside materials, as well as took part forcefully in the picketing of the alcohol shops. The alcohol blacklist brought the administration incomes from extract obligations pounding down, it additionally soon accepted another famous shape. The achievement of the alcohol and medications blacklist was clearly associated with the famous convention of viewing forbearance as virtual, for example, an image of respectability. The profundity of this custom was appeared

by the way that the lower ranks attempting to climb in the standing chain of command perpetually attempted to build up their upper position status by surrendering alcohol and eating of meat. The alcohol blacklist brought the administration incomes from extract obligations pounding down, it likewise soon accepted another mainstream shape, when youthful moms and dowagers and unmarried young ladies, turned into a natural sight as they remained from morning to night outside the alcohol shops and opium sanctums and shops offering remote material, unobtrusively however solidly convincing the clients and retailers to change their ways.

The blacklist customized was scathingly gone ahead with the assistance of ladies. The picketing of alcohol shops had been done to an expansive degree by women and meant that the degree to which the patriot development had changed the request of things in the society. Close to influence was utilized, however in the picketing of alcohol shops ladies volunteers confronted affronts from forthcoming clients and in addition beaten by the police. Detachment and Purdahs were relinquished and ladies moved into the open for picketing of alcohol shops. Ladies volunteers confronted affronts from imminent life. The Congress Government allured women to each type of national administration. They did a large portion of the picketing work. They went to jail. They were frequently picked as the tyrants of the nearby advisory groups. The entire country was re-established to strikes, hartals and picketing turned into the consistently undertakings and incapacitating everyday work of the government. For Indian ladies, the Civil Disobedience Movement gave the most freeing background to take an interest in various limits in the same, and the period constitute their first significant passage into people in general circles of political exercises.

The dynamic investment of ladies in this blending period shapes a particular point of interest and speaks to a way softening development up Indian ladies in close relationship with the Congress Movement. It is significant that at this point ladies themselves were quick to assume dynamic parts and some of them requested and verily "pressurized" Gandhi to partner ladies as a necessary individual from the Satyagraha Army. Many ladies rose as Congress "Tyrants" of various regions and territories liberating. They displayed remarkable organizational capacity and leadership ability in furthering the nationalist programmed. Women were motivated to patriotic sentiment and wished to see the end of foreign rule from their motherland. On 14 July, 1933, Mahatma cancelled mass Satyagraha yet enabled the general population to court capture separately. The energy of the general population was at that point winding down and savagery was on the expansion. On savvy contemplations

Gandhiji pulled back the Movement totally on 7 April 1934 and welcomed the general population to work for the expulsion of untouchability and for the execution of alternate things of the valuable program. All in all, it can be securely affirmed that ladies' activism amid the Civil Disobedience action varied among different provinces, yet Gandhi's call had clearly evoked momentous response from women in every region of the country. In spite of the fact that the power of activity fluctuated among various territories, yet Gandhi's call had unmistakably evoked pivotal reaction from ladies in each area of the nation. They turned out from their conventional isolation and overstepped the Salt Law, walked in parades, took an interest outside remote fabric and alcohol shops. Hither to ladies' cooperation was littler in number however now they approached in thousands and partook with expanding support and sought capture.

As per the Government reports an aggregate of 3,648 ladies were captured amid the Second stage alone, i.e. from January 1932 to April 1933. In reality, it would be no distortion to declare that the Civil Disobedience period saw an extraordinary support of ladies everywhere throughout the sub landmass. Unavoidably the Indian National Congress unambiguously recognized the prominent and critical commitment, which women made to patriot bring about amid the Civil Disobedience Era. The expanding cooperation of ladies parades and open gatherings slowly constrained the administration to plan some kind of approaches to manage the ladies Satyagrahis. The section of ladies in vast scale into the Civil Disobedience Movement gave edification to numerous other ladies who started to take an interest the further national Movement, for example, the Individual Satyagraha and Quit Indian Movement.

Conclusion

The struggle for Independence of India starting from 1857 touched a point of reference in 1930. As far back as the arrangement of Indian National Congress in 1885, Indian patriotism had gained a stage, a voice and a shape. Prior to the development of Gandhi on the National political scene of India it had gone through two stages - the Moderate and the Extremist stage. With Gandhi, another period starts and India appears to have become develop. Neither the established strategies for the Liberal Moderates nor the clique of bomb of the Extremists and progressives had a mass interest. The prior was kept to the elite of society .the upper and upper white class and the later to adolescents.

India with its outstretched limits from north to south and from east to west required an initiative, a man who could make utilization of the labour of India, who could enrol the support of the masses for the battle for flexibility. Gandhiji had obtained enormous distinction in South Africa where he battled the Indian foreigners and quelled the administration to reclaim the embarrassing Act. Gokhale who was a built up government official and a superb judge of men found in Gandhi a sprouting authority quality and lifted him up. He welcomed Gandhiji to India, acquainted him with the political world and at the appointed time he developed as the voice of India, the super leader of the Congress. Gandhi was a charming man; he won Indian men, ladies, youthful and old with the energy of his monstrous love, confidence and comprehension. He measured them and found that the faction of bomb, brutality and fear based oppression can't be fruitful in the place where there is Buddha, that Indian blood does not comprehend the dialect of carnage and vicious insurgencies. India was mental fit for peacefulness and along these lines he grabbed another weapon Satyagraha and chose and proclaimed to battle with this weapon alone. Satyagraha, the drive of adoration and the Civil-insubordination were his spirit weapons in 1930 when he propelled an across the country development a mass development known as The Civil Disobedience Movement.

The weapon in the hands of Gandhiji to battle the British out was simply the "Common Disobedience" presumably Gandhiji a most himself effective weapon at any point heard communicated in Young India, of that Civil Disobedience resembles a blade which is to be utilized just sparingly, if at all Disobedience without class, train, segregation, peacefulness, is surely an annihilation. Noncompliance consolidated with affection is the living water of life. Common Disobedience is a wonderful variation to imply development. It is not harshness which spells a passing and demolition. Gandhi had pulled back the Non Cooperation development when it was at its low retreat. Swarajists chose to take an interest in sacred exercises. He saw that he couldn't control the activities of the Swarajya Party inside the Councils. So he went direct to the masses and began an energetic battle for enhancing their condition. The helpful customized was intended for this. Gandhi now truly endeavoured to prepare the Dalits and Women. He demanded Khadi work, expulsion of untouchability, disallowance work and so forth.

Thus Because of the boost of Mahatmaji's work in the towns and towns of India, a few people joined the Congress and they turned into the individuals from Municipalities and Unions In this way the Congress shaped the lion's share in a large portion of these

neighbourhood bodies. It was on the issue of the Salt tax that Gandhi sorted out his next vital development - the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930s. The issue of salt did not estrange the Congress Moderates. It had a far reaching mainstream concern which helped in preparing a mass after. It had no divisive potential. It empowered investment by various segments of the general public. Huge scale in contribution of women was a notable feature of this movement. The development truly exhibited the mass after of the Congress. The two-pronged customized of Boycott and Civil Disobedience had two-overlap objective. The Boycott was coordinated against the obliviousness and childishness of the British open and the Civil Disobedience was coordinated against the self-importance and political ineptitude of the Bureaucracy. The advance of Indian patriotism had three distinct stages.

In the principal stage, the political situation was drastically ruled by the belief system of the conservatives took after by an unmistakable of the radical fanatic philosophies. In the third stage the most huge Goyal, P. K., *Battle of India's Freedom Movement* (Delhi: Vista International Publishing House, 2005) occurrence was the ascent of Gandhi. Under his authority, the national development of the nation came to fruition. Civil Disobedience reached an end with the Gandhi-Irwin agreement of 1931. The movement which later continued walked on for a long time and reached an end in 1934. Gandhi now turned his regard for Constructive Programmed. Gandhi worked at two levels. He worked with the Congress and furthermore through his Constructive Programmed. His methodology depended on a particular procedure. Gandhi had demonstrated an astounding level of versatility.

He took up prompt issues in question to compose the masses around it and through the particular issues he doubted the presence of the frontier expert. His non participation and common defiance developments scrutinized the authority of the British power in India. His strategy was to gradually disintegrate British dominion. So he didn't make "nonsensical" requests. But amid the Quit India development finish freedom was not made the prompt request. Gandhi propelled a development just when he felt that the general population was energetic to take part in it. He generally left space for correspondence with the adversary before propelling a development. He made bargains or changed his field from dynamic legislative issues to useful customized when he felt that the development had lost its energy or when individuals started to move once more from the unsettling front. Gandhi had no aim to pull back from the legislative issues forever. His withdrawals from the political bleeding edge were just brief.

Amid these intervals he fortified his position by social exercise. Gandhi utilized custom to make an option political modified. He utilized the Hindu-Jain convention of "Ahimsa" (peacefulness) and "Satya" (truth) in developing his political software engineers. Despite the fact that he relied on upon Jain, Buddhist and Hindu custom for building up his strategies to activating the masses he reinterpreted it on the light of the conditions in which he connected it. He radicalized religion, incorporated it with present day Also yearnings this was to a great extent valid in sorting out the Harijans and Women. To engage the interests and feelings of the masses he secured for himself the status of a religious-political pioneer.

He recognized himself with the masses. He made a durable political group out of the dormant masses. It was his mass interest that made Gandhi fruitful. It was not a direct result of his magnetism but rather as a result of the utility and practicability of a peaceful procedure that gave Gandhi such an impact in the legislative issues of that time. Gandhian endeavours to activate the different areas against the radical power ended up plainly effective and these individuals promptly took an interest in the development at his call. In spite of the fact that he was not the principal, it was Gandhi who acquired the workers expansive numbers to the national development. His procedure was intended to always broaden the mass base of the development. This was by activating diverse segments like Women, Muslims, Dalits and others. With the end goal of sorting out a mass development Gandhi attempted to put much accentuation on the class mollification. For him the fundamental and essential battle that must be pursued was the counter radical battle. His endeavour was to sort out the masses to scrutinize the authority of the provincial power. His modified were intended to manufacture an expansive joined front against the pilgrim control.

Gandhian strategies were similarly against strife and inside clashes. Gandhi conceded class unrest for accomplishing autonomy. Through his strategies he attempted to make the nation fit for flexibility however not for communism. An imperative part of Gandhian system was the significance given to non-violence. He changed the standards of peaceful resistance into a fruitful instrument for accomplishing freedom. Once only an individual teach, he raised into a social procedure for group or national liberation. The promoters of peacefulness considered power not in the customary way.

As per them the power was vested in the masses. Peacefulness works at the wellspring of energy instead of at the results of energy. Gandhi peaceful battles were conceivably brutal. What Gandhian techniques planned was not complete peacefulness. Complete non violence

was not possible in a mass movement. Gandhi never put peacefulness as a statement of faith before the country. The Indian figured out how the peaceful and inactive resistance could be showed to wage political clashes. The strategy and strategies embraced by Gandhi in the development demonstrate his political thoughts of "Ahimsa" and 'Satyagraha'. Through Gandhi administration in the common rebellion development, he bolsters in his political position as well as assumed a pivotal part in binding together the nations and conveying the political field to all the regular man. In this way, we can say that the common defiance development under the administration of Mahatma Gandhi was a noteworthy stride in the development of freedom.

REFERENCES:

- Basu Aparna. (1976). *Role of Women in Indian Struggle for Freedom*, Vikas Publications, New Delhi.
- Chandra. Bipin. (1988). *India's Freedom Struggle For Independence 1857 to 1947*, New Delhi, India, Penguin Books India Pvt. Ltd.
- Chandra Bipin. (1989). *India's Struggle for Independence*, Penguin Publication, New Delhi.
- Heels. Peter. (1991). *Indian's Freedom Struggle 1857 to 1947*, London, U.K, Oxford Publishing.
- Kaur Manmohan. (1985). *Women in India's Freedom struggle*, New Delhi.
- Mahajan. V.D.(2016). *Modern Indian History 1707 to Present Day*, New Delhi, India, S. Chand and Company.
- Mohan Rajan. (1999). *Women in Indian National Congress*, p.269 New Delhi, 1999.
- R.C. Majumda.(1985). *Struggle for Freedom*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Madras.
- Thakur Bharti. (2006). *Women in Gandhi's Mass Movements*, p.72. 6 New Delhi.
- Thoreau. David. Henry. (1993). *Resistance of Civil Disobedience*, Public Domain Books.

RESEARCH PAPERS:

- Bipan Chandra, "Jawaharlal and the Capitalist Class, (1936)." E. P.W., X, special No. (1975).
- Gandhi, M.K. Non-violence Resistance (Satyagraha) (1961) p.37.
- Gandhi, M.K. "The Theory and Practice of Satyagraha" Indian Opinion(1914).
- Government of Madras, the Civil Disobedience Movement 1930-1931, Madras, 1932,
- Gross, David M. (2014). 99 Tactics of Successful Tax Resistance Campaigns.
- Herbert A. Miller, Gandhiji's Campaigned Begins, the Nation 23rd April (1930).
- "The Indian Independence Movement". Retrieved 2014.05.29.
- "The Congress and the Freedom Movement". Indian National Congress. Indian Round Table Conference Proceeding, Government of India (1931).

NEWSPAPER:

- Gandhiji, Gopalkrishna. “The Great Dandi March-eight years after,” The Hindu, 5th April (2010).
- Times of India, 3rd March (1931).