



# Inadequacy of Indian Independence Struggle

Prabhakar Deshpande

Date of Submission: 20-10-2022

Date of Acceptance: 03-11-2022

**Abstract:** Indians are proud of their independence struggle. Indians believe that they got independence through their intelligent non-violent struggle. Of course this is written in history text books of India. But Indians never question why it took 200 years for them to get Independence. And why did India firstly lose independence to a small private limited company in first place. After all if China could stay independent and a small nation like Afghanistan could stay independent, then how come India could not stay independent? This paper proves that Indian Independence struggle was inadequate.

## I. Introduction

India was a colony of Britain for almost 200 years. Indian history text books are full of great praise and admiration for so called great leaders of India who got Independence for India. And hence Indians never even question if India could have got independence earlier or not lost in first place.

Indians presume that India lost independence to a very powerful empire. Is this true? Indians assume that they fought valiantly in 1857 mutiny. Is this true? Indians assume that Congress gave a great fight. Is this true? Indians assume that partition was inevitable. Is this true? Indians assume that Subhash Chandra Bose gave a great fight. Is this true? And finally Indians are indebted to Mahatma Gandhi. Was he that great?

This paper takes a heretical, blasphemous and sacrilegious view of Indian Independence struggle and points to its inadequacy. This paper argues that Indians should have got independence earlier and should have not lost it in first place.

## David and Goliath Story

Britain colonising India is not as obvious as it seems. After all in 1700, Britain's GDP was just 3% whereas India's share of world GDP was 25%. So it is rather strange for a small nation to colonize big nation. In fact India was not colonized by Britain, but by a small British company called East India Company.

In fact this is almost like the biblical story of David and Goliath, where the tiny David, defeats

a giant Goliath. Somehow it was not so much courage and capability of Britain, but something declining in India that was responsible.

Actually India was on ascendancy. With the Maratha empire having spread all over India and the Mughal empire on decline, India was not a very likely candidate for being colonised. What changed however was the Battle of Plassey in 1757.

Interestingly the first public Durga Festival was held in 1757. Now public celebration of religion is more of assertion of power. So the years of 1750s were the years of assertion of Hindu religion. And this was also the year of defeat in battle of Plassey. Of course historians will cite the betrayal of Mir Jafar against Siraj Du Allah. Very interestingly the Marathas lost Battle of Panipat immediately afterwards in 1761.

So there seems to be a strong connection between the rise of Hindu Muslim competitive display of religion in India and the fall of India to British interests. Interestingly Anandmath, with VandeMataram a novel by Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay, is set in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, which actually is not so much rebellion of Sanyasis against Britain, but against Muslims.

Thus the battle between Muslims and Hindus is the serious backdrop against which Battle of Plassey was lost and subsequently Battle of Panipat. Hence the 'Divide and Rule' where Muslims and Hindus were set against each other by Britain was the starting point of Britain's colonisation of India.

## 1857 Mutiny: Much Ado about Nothing

The 1857 Mutiny is considered the First War of Independence. But if one sees it, there is nothing to be proud of in the first war of independence. After all the reason provoking first war of independence was a religious issue of gun cartridge being smeared with cow or pig fat and hence offensive to Hindus and Muslims, clearly proves that there was no genuine desire for freedom and independence.

Again almost 900,000 Indians died in 1857 Mutiny whereas only 6000 British died, thus giving



a ratio of 150 Indians dying for every single British dying. This is clearly an unacceptable ratio. It would tend to seem that those Indians who mutinied were killing Indians with British.

The shameful fact about 1857 mutiny was that the reason for mutiny was religious rather than political and that almost 150 Indians died for every British death, which proves that Indians lost the battle of 1857 rather abysmally leaving nothing to be proud of.

#### **Indian National Congress: Too little, too late**

Indian National Congress was supposed to be the biggest national Independence movement. However if one reads history very harshly it is obvious that Indian National Congress was composed of politicians interested in contesting elections and acquiring seats in legislatures at local, provincial and national level.

By no stretch of imagination, can one assume that the sole purpose of Indian National Congress was to get freedom for India from the British. Indeed consider this the resolution for Complete Independence was passed only in 1930, almost 45 years after formation of Indian National Congress. So for first 45 years Congress was hoping for more crumbs thrown at it in form of greater share in government rather than being focused on driving out British violently or non-violently. And again it took another 12 years for Quit India movement to be launched in 1942, almost 12 years after complete independence resolution.

Interestingly India got independence in 1947, 5 years after Quit India movement and the Government of India act was passed in 1935, 5 years after Complete Independence Resolution. Thus it was the Congress party that was feeble in making demands of the British, not so much the British being reluctant to hand over power. One could as a devil's advocate ask the question, if Congress was formed in 1885, why was resolution for complete independence not passed by 1890 and quit India movement held by 1895. Why did it take so long? Did Congress party get independence or just delayed it.

#### **India got independence when all colonies got independence**

There is often popular perception that India got independence because of brave struggle of freedom fighters of India. But when India got independence from Britain almost 54 nations got independence from Britain without the help of Nehru or Gandhi or Tilak or Jinnah etc.

Thus it is not as if India did spectacularly well in getting independence. There were many nations that got independence from Britain, without such so called great leaders. Hence one is compelled to question if the great leaders of India who got independence for India were really all that great.

In fact the British believe that it was weakness of Britain after World War II rather than any real resistance posed by Indian Independence struggle that made it leave India.

#### **Unintelligent Violence rather than Intelligent Violence**

Indians often pride that their Independence struggle was non-violent. But were Indians really non-violent. Here is the statistics. Nearly 150,000 Indians died fighting for Britain in World War I and World War II.

Thus Indians were willing to kill and die for Britain the nation that was enslaving India. How much more unintelligent can it get. So Indians were violent to enslave India and not to free India.

For every one Bhagat Singh who was intelligent and brave to die for freedom of India, almost 10,000 Indians were unintelligent and brave to die for enslaving India by dying for Britain the nation that was enslaving India.

If Indians displayed this much lack of Intelligence is it any wonder that it took 200 years to get Independence.

Why were there so few BhagatSinghs. Would India have got Independence faster if there were at least 1000 Bhagat Singh instead of 10 or so? After all if the British killed 1000 innocent Indians in JalianwalaBagh, shouldn't Indians have killed a 1000 innocent British in retaliation?

#### **Subhash Chandra Bose**

Some people are proud of Subhash Chandra Bose and his Azad Hind Fauz. But Azad Hind Fauz, did not win any wars against British Indian Army and hence was only a pompous and bombastic army full of rhetorics and polemics but little achievements.

Again Azad Hind Fauz was composed of Indians and so was British Indian Army. How does it help if Indians kill Indians? If Indians had killed British then it would have helped. But that clearly was not the case.

Again Azad Hind Fauz size was 40,000 and British India Army size was 2.5 million, which if adjusted for expertise, experience and equipment could be almost 4 million equivalent of Azad Hind Fauz. Isn't it rather unwise to fight an army that is 100 times as large.



Finally Subhash Chandra Bose went seeking help from Hitler and Tojo. Now isn't this running from British rule into either German rule or Japanese rule. How wise a strategy is that?

### Communalism Galore

From the beginning itself the religion issue was very important. Firstly the 1757 battle of Plassey was accompanied by public Durga festival. Then the 1857 mutiny was triggered due to religious reasons of cow and pig fat on cartridges.

Then in 1892, when first public Ganesh festival was held in Mumbai, there were massive Hindu Muslim communal riots which led to beginning of violence between Hindus and Muslims that not only made freedom struggle difficult but also paved way for partition.

Then when there was a Lucknow pact between Congress and Muslim League in 1916, it was derailed by Khilafat movement which was accompanied by Malabar riots in Kerala, that led to so much violence that it compelled ending of non-cooperation movement.

In fact even then Pakistan could have been stopped but during 1940s Congress played the communal card by making Maulana Abul Kalam Azad as Congress president for almost 7 years, even as Muslim League was insistent that Congress admit that it is party of Hindus.

The fact that Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was made president of Congress for 7 years is very suspect action, especially considering that Muslim League passed the Pakistan resolution one day after he was made Congress President.

The fact that partition took place was bad enough. But what made it even worse was that almost 1 million people died during partition, which makes the violence comparable to genocide of Jews in Germany.

It should also be remembered that while many nations got independence from Britain, only India was a nation that was partitioned along communal lines and especially with extremely high levels of violence.

### Gandhi

Honestly it is easy to overrate Gandhi in the independence struggle.

Firstly was he non-violent?

Gandhi had supported the Boer war in 1899 in South Africa. Clearly if Gandhi was supporting British in Boer War, he can't be described as non-violent.

Again Gandhi was recruiting for British Army during World War I in 1915. If Gandhi was clearly

violent in recruiting for Britain during World War I, how can he be described as non-violent.

Gandhi was also knighted as Kaiser-e-Hind. This was the award given for service of British Empire. Thus Gandhi was in service of British Empire. So how can we call him a non-violent person.

Khilafat Movement is the most hidden part of Gandhi's contribution. The Khilafat movement derailed the Lucknow pact and made it reconciliation between Congress and Muslim League impossible.

And fact remains that Gandhi could not prevent partition of India or the violence that accompanied partition of India.

Again Gandhi was with the British until 1920, so for the first 50 years of his life, he was not a freedom fighter. Hence there is something suspect in his contribution to freedom movement, though it can't be denied that he did contribute to freedom movement in a significant manner.

## II. Conclusion

The fact remains that India took 200 years to get independence. Should it not have got independence in says 2 years. Why did India lose independence to Britain when China could keep its freedom and even Afghanistan could keep its freedom? Why were there so few Bhagat Singh? Should we have had at least 1000 Bhagat Singhs? Why did Gandhi insist on non-violence even as he was recruiting for Britain in World War I and World War II? Why did leaders not check communalism and prevent partition and accompanying violence? Why did Congress party take 45 years to pass Complete Independence resolution? Why did it take almost 55 years for Congress to launch Quit India Movement? And what is the great achievement if India got independence when all other nations got independence. The Indian Independence struggle has a lot to answer for in its inadequacy. In finding answers to those questions, lies the solution to making India a super power and ending communal hatred.