

The Origin of Political Violence in Punjab within the Context of World War I and Jallianwala Massacre

Dr. Gulshan Majeed*¹ Dr. Muhammad Naveed Sial²

1. Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan,
gulshan_99@hotmail.com

2. Lecturer (Political Science), F.G. Degree College, Gujranwala Cantt, Punjab, Pakistan.

Abstract

The British rise to power in India is associated with treachery, violence and intimidation. In the case of Punjab which is unique in a sense that it was politically quiet and a pacifist state and it was the last territory that was seized by East India Company. Before the World War I (WWI), political violence in Punjab was limited and it was seldom in an organized form. The revolutionary activities in Europe at that time, stirred the imaginations of the Indians to commit revolutionary activities. Furthermore, the policies of British government like the mass conscription, suspension of fundamental rights, and excessive taxation during war time led to increase in discontent and fury among the local populace. With the passage of time, it turned the once pacifist state into the hotbed of revolutionary activities. It was the time when Punjab became ticking bomb on which a minority of white rulers were sitting which could explode at any time. These were the factors that drove Punjabis to resort to violence. The study is done by employing historical research method and it attempts to find the origins of organized political violence in colonial Punjab which shaped the future course of one the biggest state of India. Those events ultimately led to butchery of Jallianwala Bagh which later manifested itself in orgy of violence in the state of Punjab and ultimately in the ruthless violence during partition. The Jallianwala Bagh incident left deep imprints on the minds of the young Indians. In reaction to coercion and intimidation that happened during WWI, many of them went onto become revolutionaries with the sole aim to avenge the killings of Jallianwala Bagh and to rid India of colonial masters.

Key Words: Colonial Punjab, Jallianwala Bagh Political Violence, Revolutionary, World War I

Introduction

Most scholars believe that political violence in India had its origins in the mutiny of 1857. On detailed study, it can be inferred that political violence took an ugly turn during and after the World War I (WWI). Colonial government's policies specifically affected the province of Punjab and it spread the political violence. The Punjab has its own unique identity and history as it was the last major territory which the East India Company captured and it remained less than a century under the British Crown. Punjab was also different from other regions of India socially, politically and militarily. The land of five rivers became India's granary during British rule, major recruitment centre post-Mutiny army of British India, with its unique composition of Muslim, Sikh and Hindu population and abhorrence of mainstream nationalist politics, the land of Punjab had its own unique characteristics. British Government used to present it as their model of success for their rule in Indian subcontinent and yet it was also true that there was a superficial calm that existed during the period it was ruled under the crown. British rule was badly exposed during the bloody partition of the province which left much of its population and politics in shreds for years to come and this model of British success proved exact opposite.

By the turn of nineteenth century, Punjab was often attributed to a pacifist state, whose people were loyal to the Raj and there was little or no political agitation. Political violence was localized to Calcutta and northern part of the India. The calm was artificial and temporary but the things were about to change as turmoil and violence was beginning with the start of big war. It was like a waking up of a sleeping giant and Punjab was to experience worst kind of rioting and political violence in the years to come. Both external and internal factors contributed to the perpetration of violence. On external front

Britain's enemies were at work and on its internal front various revolutionaries were giving hard time to the British government. These were the times when the two mainstream parties, Congress and Muslim League had transformed themselves from a discussion platform to an organization that wanted more self-government for Indians. After the split in Congress, radical elements pressed for action rather than talks. It also tried to extract maximum favors by involving in extraconstitutional methods such as agitation, boycott and militancy. To quote Tilak, "Political rights will have to be fought for" (Jayapalan, 2000). Soon after war broke out, India became a hotbed of terrorist and revolutionary activities. That era also marked by rise of anarchism in Europe. Anarchists carried out a large number of assassinations, which greatly affected the minds of Indians. First casualty in the war was the idol of Western superiority, not only in India but throughout the world. The First world war itself started from one such act of violence in which Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria-Este was assassinated. In addition to this, various successful and unsuccessful assassination attempt were made across the Europe which ultimately engulfed the whole of Europe in the scourge of war.

Explanation and Analysis

There were various factors which were responsible for political violence, some of the main factors are described below.

- i. Conscription
- ii. Ghadr Mutiny
- iii. Resource allocation
- iv. Price hikes/ hardships
- v. Suspension of fundamental rights
- vi. Foreign intervention
- vii. Defence of India Act (1915)
- viii. Ottoman factor
- ix. Unnecessary and unwarranted Rowlett Act (1919)

Archer (1920) once described India's relation with its colonial masters as, "The moment Britain gets into trouble elsewhere, India, in her present temper, would burst into a blaze of rebellion." Land of Punjab, which was once a huge province stretched from borders of North West Frontier Province (NWFP) to Delhi in the East with its fertile soil, irrigated by prominent rivers had been the centre of various cultural, social and political organizations. Panini's magnum opus, "Ashtadhyayi" a celebrated Sanskrit grammar of ancient India, describes the Punjab with the word "Vahik" which literally means 'a region free of religious orthodoxy'. The reason for this was that the people in the region had an abhorrence for caste system and they used to distance themselves from proponents of casteism. Punjab's fertile lands have always attracted diverse people from all walks of life because it provided them with shelter and food who either came as invaders or runaways from nearby areas and later on many of them permanently settled there. In addition to this, Punjab always attracted foreign invaders throughout its history. Many of them settled there and became part of the society while the rest of them plundered its bustling cities and returned to their native lands with enormous spoils. During WWI, colonial government started to use the resources of the agricultural rich province towards war effort. The people of Punjab became frustrated after being impoverished despite their province was serving as the granary of India.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the origins of organized violence and revolutionary activity in Punjab under the British rule with special reference to World War I era. WWI formed a new India, which was breaking itself from old traditions. In the view of Percival Spear, “it was a watershed of ideals and attitudes.” Many new movements sprang up in that period which set the course of violent and agitational politics in the years to come. As soon as the war was over, many elements of Punjabi politics had already been changed for good and would have irreversible effect in years to come. Spear termed it as a “mental revolution.” Britain declared war on Germany on August 4, 1914, Lord Hardinge immediately announced that India too was at war. It was quite natural that ripples were felt in the higher echelons of the Indian government at this sudden dramatic declaration. There followed such a scene of enthusiasm as should have warmed the heart of any government. When the legislature met in November [1914], nonofficial members vied with each other in expressions of loyalty and themselves suggested that India should bear a share of cost of the operation in Europe. It could have become last chance for the creative renewal of old regimes. Mainstream Indian political parties, nationalist leaders and that of the princes overwhelmed the British Government by announcing unequivocal support for the war. Also, propaganda and coercion used in order to generate loyalty among the populace. Tribal chiefs, land lords, pirs used their influence and muscle to muster up the force for the army.

There may be several reasons for not making full use of these so called passionate feelings but primary reason was that “the British lacked imagination” (Spear, 1965). During the war time the price of commodities usually soar and Punjab was not an exception, for it became true mean of turning enthusiasm into discontentment. There is another pressing reason was that in 1918 when the war was reaching near its end, a further effort was made. Recruiting was pushed to the point of coercion in Punjab, supplies were poured overseas and prices were allowed to soar.

The discontent started among the rural population of Punjab where conscription for war effort started. The British government used carrot and stick policy in enlisting the men for the army on emergency basis, which many people resented. The major chunk of British Indian Army was extracted from Punjab as the army was consist of roughly 40% of Punjabis. The Punjab’s population was less than 8% of India. There was a surge of 500% in the army from Punjab during 1914-1918. For instance, in the case of Rawalpindi, almost 30% of eligible population got enlisted in the army. The British pride itself in educating the Punjabis because of enlistment of people in the army. The reason for the increased number of Punjabi soldiers in British Army was that they had helped the Raj won many battles. Famous among them were crushing of rebellion in Ganga region (1853-54). In 1860 Ludhiana regiment was instrumental in winning second Opium War in which Britain occupied Hong Kong and Peking and also other overseas campaign like in Abyssinia, Egypt, Afghanistan, Burma and South Africa (Maynard, 1977).

In the initial phase of war, the press gradually began to abandon the policy censuring the government but it proved to be a short-lived affair. The Moderates also wanted to accommodate academic Extremists in every possible way, but there was a kind of reluctance in accepting the fact as well as dangers of revolutionary activities. Dadabhai Naoroji, a Moderate and one of the founding members of Indian National Congress, abhorred the tag of an approver of the British Raj in India. He indicated that the overwhelming majority of Indians cherished the ideals of justice, liberty and honor and had a support for the British cause in the war against Germany (Naoroji, 1915). A far as the other Congress leaders were concerned, they were also on the same page with the government either for sentimental or selfish reasons or both. Even the intellectual class of the Indians considered the enemies of England as their enemies (Lovett, 1968).

Despite the repressive measures, the revolutionary activity kept on increasing in tangible evidence. Number of conspiracies were unearthed in Lahore, Delhi and in many places of India. The conspirators wanted to undermine the loyalty of Indian troops. In Calcutta, with the help of a clerk of an ordnance factory, a huge quantity of ammunition and Mauser pistols were stolen. In addition to this, the Sikh emigrants who were returning from Canada and USA, were posing a serious danger to the government. They along with some Bengali revolutionaries, were hatching a plot like that of 1915. It was all came to light in the Sedition Committee Report. In the said report, it was also known that

German government was doing serious efforts in stirring the trouble in Indian territory. (*For alleged German intervention in Indian sub-continent, see Sedition Committee Report from page 119-125*). The Government in a desperate attempt, enforced the Defence Act ostensibly to improve the security situation of India. Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Punjab's Lieutenant-Governor was charged to control a most difficult situation. It was fortunate for the government that Punjab government was fully equipped to tackle serious emergencies thanks to its Criminal Investigation Department, which used to exceed its authority and abused its powers to keep the general public loyal to the government. Due to these efforts, revolutionary activities were limited and it did not affect anything beyond occasional murders or thefts (Lovett, 1968).

On April 21, 1913, an organization was formed by the Punjabis of U.S. and Canada with the objective to free India of foreign occupation, the Ghadr. Its key members were Kartar Singh Sarabha, Rashbehari, Har Dayal and Sohan Singh Bhakna. Although the Ghadr was formed in 1913 but it played its most active part at the onset of great war, when its members came back to Punjab to stir the revolt along with the Babbar Akali Movement. A paper was started by the Ghadr party of the same name in Urdu and Punjabi which soon became spokesman of a sizable section of Indian society. In one of its issues, it stated the purpose of the movement which was to wage a war against the British Government. It hoped for a time that would come when India would be free of foreign occupation and when guns would take the place of pens (Bakshi, 2007). It was a declaration of war. Ghadr party's revolutionary programme included following main objectives: to seduce Indian troops; to murder loyal subjects and loot government treasury; to propagate through distribution of seditious literature; to commit dacoities; to procure arms and ammunition; to manufacture bombs, hand-grenades and other weapons; to establish secret societies which were to carry on anti-Raj propaganda; to loot police stations; to destroy railways, telegraph offices and other establishments and, last but not the least, to mobilise the people living in the villages. Many Ghadrites returned home on ships, one of them was Komagata Maru. When the ship landed on Indian seashore, some of the Ghadrites were shot dead and many were arrested and later convicted. Although, many of them made their way and escape the conviction and became instrumental in carrying revolutionary activity during 1914-15. Almost 8000, Ghadrites came back to India to join the rebellion by the end 1916. One of its leaders Bhai Parmanand claimed around five thousand Ghadrites alone, had returned with him. The British intelligence already knew about their plan. Its agents already informed the authorities about the declaration of war (Bakshi, 2007).

The provincial government was acting under the *Ingress into India Ordinance*, which according to Sedition Committee Report, "empowered it [government] to restrict the liberty of any person entering India after the 5th September 1914, if such action were necessary for the protection of the State." In one of the incidents where Sikhs were not allowed to march on Calcutta en masse. The authorities tried to forcibly turn them into train but Sikhs resisted. In the evening, 60 passengers including 17 Muslims got off the train. Many of the Sikhs had American pistols with them. A rioting took place that took the lives of eighteen; while several others were arrested either then or afterwards; and 29 of them, including Gurdit Singh, vanished. Among the arrested, many were released on bail later in January 1915. Thirty-one of them were sent to jail.

The Indian Government in a desperate measure enforced the drastic Defence of India Act, 1915 with the purpose to check revolutionary activities. It was fundamentally a harsh act whose sole aim was to curb revolutionary activity and to counter foreign threats especially from Germany. This law was specially enacted for the situation in Punjab. The crimes were tried before a special tribunal, the accused had no right to appeal. Authorities were also vested the power to imprison the suspects. Government of India passed the Defence of India Act in response to constant requests from government of Punjab on March 18th, 1915. It was passed in such a haste that Imperial Legislative Council Passed it in one setting. The important aspect of the law was about setting up of Special Tribunals for the trial of revolutionary crimes. It allowed neither commitment proceedings to the Tribunals nor the right to appeal. In a letter dated September 30, 1915, the Punjab Government stated its salutary effect. Lord Hardinge himself admitted that it was far more drastic than a similar legislation in Britain known as DORA (Defence of

the Realm Act) in Britain. In the words of O'Dwyer, it gave maximum powers to the Lieutenant-Governor (Murray, 1948).

A number of cases were disposed of by Special Tribunals which were set up under the Defence of India Act. Notable among those were the three different trials for conspiracy in Punjab known as 'the Lahore conspiracy trials'. Plotters were tried in nine batches by the Special Tribunals which were constituted under the Defence of India Act. On September 13, 1915 the judgement of the special Commissions on the Lahore Conspiracy case was awarded. There were 82 accused who were sentenced as follows. Death was awarded to 24, Transportation for life for 27; six were awarded various terms of imprisonment; two were discharged; four acquitted; one was turned approver and 18 absconded. The Government of India commuted 17 of the death sentences to transportation for life. Montagu-Chelmsford Report declared the Defence Act as, "a drastic measure" that vested the Governor-General to legislate to secure public safety and security of the country. The report also acknowledged that Defence of India Act was more drastic than the DORA.

As the war progressed, Indians started becoming disillusioned and, there started another era of friction between Indians and British authorities. It all happened when the Ottoman Empire decided to enter the Great war to join the Central Powers. They were fighting against the Britain, India's sixty million Muslims' colonial masters. That "bastard war" proved a test of loyalties for them. This was to become a tragic affair (Wolpert, 1977).

In the year 1917, two events changed the course of the world history. First was the Russian Revolution. Russia was viewed as the twin great power along with Britain. Revolutionaries interpreted that if despotic government could fall in Russia, why not in India, this idea greatly stirred their imagination as can be seen in the 1920s when Communists and other revolutionaries carried out attacks on government assets. Second was the American intervention in WWI and Wilson's fourteen points which carried in them magical words of "National Freedom" and "self-determination" of people which obviously had their effect on local politics.

As the war lingered on, the people in Punjab suffered the most. Their travelling facilities were curtailed along with import and export of merchandise in the province. Nature also didn't spared them as there were heavy rains in the autumn of 1917, which caused widespread malaria, resulted in heavy death toll (Bakshi, 2007). One author described that situation in these following words, "the people died like flies, the villages were harder hit than the towns, the men than women, and those in the prime of life worst of all. Whole families were wiped out by the dozens; the losses in most districts ran into tens of thousands. Altogether more than a million died in the province, including the Indian States. Of these, more than two lakhs were men of military age." (Leigh, 1922).

The government decided to increase war loan and introduce the new Income-tax Act, which increased the misery of already stricken people. Pressure was applied on Zaildars and Lombardars through Deputy Commissioners to raise money for war effort, which led to severe frictions at many places. In one instance in the town of Leiba (District Muzaffargarh), mobs surrounded the official residence of Naib Tehsildar. The mob assaulted the officer's peon and a policeman. Some persons were arrested and were tried under section 147 of IPC. An appeal was lodged in which the judge gave the remarks that aggrieved people looking for a place to let out their anger and frustration.

In some districts under the special income tax scheme, rate of taxation was increased from 100 to 200 percent. The unrest spread throughout the rural population where the peasantry had numerous grievances against the government's policy. The apathy of the governmental policy and the utter neglect of the basic needs had greatly agitated minds of the public. Frustrated Gandhi confessed on that occasion, that, "despite there is a news of gross injustice and oppression came out of Punjab on daily basis, I can do nothing about it other than just to sit and quash my teeth" (Gandhi, 1929). At that time, mainstream political parties were rallying around the government for support of war efforts including Gandhi (1929) who thought it is an act of "far-sightedness" not to embarrass the government

during the war. In his view, it might be a gesture that showed he was not an opportunist, who was taking advantage of those vulnerable times.

Soon after the publication of the Reforms Scheme, a report of a different nature was published in India. At the insistence of the Government of Bengal, who was much concerned at the difficulties encountered in coping with revolutionary crime in their province, the Government of India, under the authority of the Secretary of State, had appointed a committee of five which would investigate and report revolutionary crimes.

The Committee collected numerous records through the examination of several witnesses (official and non-official) and by going through various official documents and records of trials in Calcutta and Lahore. By April, the Committee submitted its unanimous report to the Indian Government. The report contained in itself, the full account about the origins and growth of revolutionary activities. The Committee also traced the movement by connecting various dots of conspiracies in different other provinces. The Committee in its report, also gave recommendations for corrective measures to deal with the revolutionary movement. The measures also included the legislations for countering the conspiracies. It was announced that the report would be published by the July 9th. Expectedly, the report was severely criticized by the press (Lovett, 1968).

The head of the committee was Justice Sidney Rowlatt. He presented his committee's findings in the form of a report to the government. In the light of the recommendations, Govt. passed the bill later known as 'Rowlatt Act.' Rowlatt Act was even more drastic legislation than the Defence of India Act. Its sole purpose was to extend "emergency measures" which were described in Defence of India Regulations Act, also a war time legislation for curbing the seditious activities in India. By the passage of those acts, government was empowered to try certain political cases in special tribunals where jury and warrant was not necessary. The basic idea behind the Rowlatt Act was the continuation of repressive emergency provisions of the Defence of India Act into a permanent law.

M.A. Jinnah, President of AIML resigned in protest on the passage of Rowlatt Act from the Legislative Assembly. He warned the government of the reaction against the act. He feared countrywide agitation and discontent if that law came into effect. He also cautioned about the breakage of sacred bond between the people and the government that would unleash those forces that will engulf whole of the country. Wide scale agitation started against that brutal act which caused serious riots in many cities especially in Punjab, where this agitation lead to Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy. It was only beginning of an end. In order to control revolutionaries and activists, Martial Law was imposed in Punjab.

When report came to light, it was revealed that it was absurd and it focused on rather trivial matters as at one place it discusses that the country at large was in no way disturbed by all these political events. The people generally were concerned about the abnormal delay of the rains and in rising prices. So far, the war period had been marked by good harvests; but in 1918 the monsoon broke down disastrously. The high prices first of salt and afterwards of cloth and oil, caused considerable hardship in the months to come; and for the people who least understood the Reforms proposals, there were many thousands who, as the rains persisted in holding off, looked anxiously for Government measures to enable them to buy salt, oil, and cloth at prices within their means.

In 1918, relations between government and leaders of Congress grew bitter because of their seditious speeches and tours in different parts of the country. Earlier in that year B.G. Tilak and B.C. Pal were barred from entering Punjab. The Punjab government feared the outbreak of an organized rebellion by the people because of its acts during the war time. This state of panic became instrumental later when government committed inhuman atrocities on the people of Punjab (Mishra, 1956).

The agitation against the Rowlatt Act spread in the United Provinces through Delhi into the Punjab where, with the turbulent city populations, it culminated in outbreaks of riot, murder, torching and rebellion directed against British authority in general and against everybody with a white skin, however innocent, in particular. The Amritsar affair became an inferno. This is what had started in

Amritsar (Chaudhry, 1986). There had been disturbances in Delhi on 30 March 1919, which added fuel to the fire. In the meantime, the attitude of the extremist became press more violent in the Punjab. In Lahore and Amritsar, posters appeared urging the populace at “Kill and Die” and warning the British officials at Lahore that, there will be a great Ghadr (Revolt) at Lahore but 6th day of April passed away peacefully without any violent outbreak (Chaudhry, 1986).

There were peaceful agitation and demonstration in Punjab. O'Dwyer, the Lt. Governor of Punjab, however, grew violent. Freedom of speech in public was suppressed. He threatened the press and prevented the entry of newspapers like New India, Amrita Bazar Patrika and independent into Punjab. Annie Besant declared O'Dwyer as an oppressor because of his press-gang methods, persecution of all political leaders and forced war loans.

The two popular anti-colonialists Dr. Satya Paul and Dr. Kitchlew, were prohibited to write anything against the Government. Gandhi was also prohibited from entering into the Punjab on 4th April. He was detained and taken to Bombay on 9th April. The news of his detention reached Lahore on 10th April. A thorough strike throughout the Punjab was organized within half an hour. The people protested against the action of the Government. The people were fired upon and were lathi-charged. This was a signal for disturbances all over the province.

In the city of Gujranwala, serious trouble began on the same day [6th April], where 20 wires having been cut and the line was damaged for 2.2 miles and 450 insulators smashed. Similar damage affected Nizamabad, 1.2 miles from Wazirabad Railway Station towards Gujranwala, where 7 posts and 400 insulators were broken. Telegraph instruments were burnt at Gujranwala Railway Station and at the combined Post and Telegraph Office (Chaudhry, 1986). A state of discontent was generated in the whole of the Punjab. Dr. Pal and Dr. Kitchlew were detained and were taken to the Dharamsala Jail on 10th April 1919. When the people came to know this, they congregated at the Hall Gate on 10 April to march and threw stones at the troops stationed there. The First Class Magistrate ordered the troops to fire on the mob which resulted in the killing of several people.

A devious character in the Indian Army, Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer, who was responsible for killing of hundreds of individuals in Jallianwala Bagh, an event which was to become the repetition of the events of 1857. When Dyer was sent to Lahore, the people of Lahore and adjoining areas were in a state of revolt. On April 13, Baisakhi Day was being observed in the city of Amritsar and people of the city were also holding peace rallies throughout the city. Two people with the help of tin cans announced a rally at 4:30 p.m. at the venue of Jallianwala Bagh against the drastic Rowlatt Act and its related incidents of violence. At the same time many people who came from nearby villages, gathered in Jallianwala Bagh on the eve of Baisakhi Mela. Jallianwala Bagh was an open dusty field with a single narrow entrance to it.

Dyer reached the ground with the 50 British and Indian and 40 Gurkha troops all carrying rifles. They had two armored cars which stayed outside the only entrance to the ground. Few minutes later Dyer ordered to fire. 1656 rounds were fired at the crowd of mix gathering of people who were observing a festival and among them were political workers (Hunter Inquiry Report, 1920). According to official data, 379 people were killed but real casualties were much higher.

Tragedy of Jallianwala Bagh was just a beginning of an extended chapter of the appalling brutality. In the follow up to the events of Jallianwala Bagh, protests spread like wildfire mainly in the areas of Wazirabad, Chuharkhana, Sangla, Sheikhpura and Gujranwala. In the town of Gujranwala, protestors were literally bombed from an aircraft. The bombs also fell on Khalsa Boarding House, a residential place for students.

On April 18, M. K. Gandhi decided to call off Satyagraha due to fear of spread of violence. A committee was set up by the Government of India and the Legislative Council in order to probe in to the disturbances and their origins especially in Bombay, Delhi and Punjab. The Committee was to be headed by Lord William Hunter. They thoroughly investigated and took statements from eyewitnesses

within the period of several weeks. "I fired and continued to fire until the crowd dispersed," Dyer said in front of an enquiry committee headed by Lord William Hunter. Dyer's intention was to instill fear in the hearts and minds of the Indians. He further told the Committee, "It was no longer a question of merely dispersing the crowd, but one of producing a sufficient moral effect, from a military point of view, not only on those who were present but more specifically throughout the Punjab. There could be no question of undue severity." Majority of the members of the committee condemned Dyer. The Committee, in its detailed report stated that it was a grave error to fire continuously at the non-retaliatory crowd that gathered at Jallianwala Bagh.

In the aftermath of Rowlatt Act and Jallianwala Bagh tragedy, loss of public property was estimated to be Rs. 25, 55,071 in Punjab alone according to the Hunter Inquiry Report.

Conclusion

Repressive measures of Lt Governor Michael O'Dwyer pushed the everyday life of Punjab into the blazes of rebellion. He wanted to completely demoralize the people by his "Supreme effort." He applied harsh and illegal methods to silence the people but on the contrary, he invited violence from them so that he might justify the use of force to crush them through the agency of civil bureaucracy. That policy worked for a brief time but in the long run it brought most shocking developments that he could ever imagined and that anarchical situation went out of control and it became virtually impossible for government to have firm grip on the situation and the peace left Punjab for good. The era of WWI marked the beginning of organized violence in Punjab and the violence that erupted in subsequent history of the province had its roots into that particular period. These events inspired many young revolutionaries with the likes of Bhagat Singh and his comrades who added a unique chapter in the history of revolutionary movement in Colonial India. In the aftermath of these events, Gandhi also led a mass agitational movement of non-cooperation, non-violence which initially remained peaceful but after quite some time, it took a violent form and resulted in a killing of hundreds of people. Third decade of 20th century also saw worst form of communal rioting, which took the lives of many notable figures and thousands of innocent people. Regarding Ghadr, which was the first armed struggle in Punjab, proved to be a disaster not for itself but also for the government. It exposed the government for its hyperbole and over-reaction. It left a toxic legacy which haunted colonial state for years to come, especially its use of lethal propaganda. which was regarded dangerous for the maintenance of colonial rule.

Ghadr remained significant for the Raj and historians alike. The essence was in its uniqueness and its inter-connectedness throughout the Empire. Even after its collapse, it continued to live on in the hearts and minds of later generations of Indians, who would vie for revolution in a colonial state.

References

- Archer, W. (1917). *India and Future* (1st ed.). London: Hutchinson & co.
- Bakshi, S., & Pathak, R. (2007). *Punjab through the ages*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.
- Choudhary, D. (1986). *Violence in the Freedom Movement of Punjab, 1907-1942*. Delhi: B.R. Pub. Corp.
- Collett, N. (2007). *The Butcher of Amritsar*. London: Hambledon Continuum.
- Dadabhai Naoroji, (12 August 1914) Message, in Natesan, The Indian Review War Book, (Madras, 1915).
- Defence of India Act 1915 (1915).
- First Lahore Conspiracy Case (Special tribunal 1915).
- Gadar Party - SikhiWiki, free Sikh encyclopedia. Retrieved from https://www.sikhiviki.org/index.php/Gadar_Party
- Gandhi, M. (2014). *My experiments with the truth*. Lanham: Start Publishing LLC.
- Ghadr | Sikh political organization. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Ghadr>
- Hardinge, L. (1948). *My Indian Years 1910-1916: The Reminiscences of Lord Hardinge of Penshurst*. London: John Murray.
- History of the Ghadar Movement - by Jaspal Singh. (2019). Retrieved from <http://www.panjab.org.uk/english/histGPty.html>
- Hunter Inquiry Report*, 1919-1920, (Calcutta, 1920).
- Jayapalan, N. (2000). *Indian Political Thinkers: Modern Indian Political Thought*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Dist.
- Jinnah, M. (2019). *M.A. Jinnah's debate in the Legislative Assembly, 7 February, 1919..* Speech, Legislative Assembly.
- Leigh, M. (1997). *The Punjab and the War*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications.
- Lovett, V. (1968). *A history of the Indian Nationalist Movement*. London: John Murray.
- Maynard, J. (1922). *The Sikh Problem in the Punjab 1920-1923*. London.
- Mishra, D. (1956). *The History of the Freedom Movement in Madhya Pradesh*. Nagpur: Government Printing.
- Mittal, S. (1977). *Freedom Movement in Punjab*. Delhi: Concept Publ. Co.
- Montague Papers*, M.A. Jinnah to Chelmsford, 28 March 1919.
- Nehru, J. (1936). *An Autobiography*. London: The Bodley Head.
- Report: India. Sedition committee, 1918. (1918). Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/seditionreport00indirich>

- Rowlatt Acts | 1919, India. (1919). Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Rowlatt-Acts>
- Santanam. (1920). *Report of the Commissioner appointed by the Punjab sub-committee of Indian National Congress*. Lahore.
- Soofi, M. (2019). Punjab Notes | Punjab: some of its ancient names. Retrieved from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1154588>
- Spear, P. (1965). *India: A Modern History*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States: University of Michigan Press.
- Superintendent of Government Printing India. (1918). *Sedition Committee Report*. Calcutta.
- Superintendent Government Printing, India. (1920). *Disorders Inquiry Committee Report, 1919-20*.
- Swami, P. (1997). Jallianwala Bagh revisited. *Frontline*, (22). Retrieved from <https://frontline.thehindu.com/static/html/f1422/14220500.htm>
- Wolpert, S. (1977). *A New history of India*. New York: Oxford University Press.