CHAPTER - I

PROLOGUE : REVIEW AND VIEW
Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born on 2 October 1869 at Kathiawad in Gujarat whereas twenty-seven years later Subhas Chandra Bose was born on 23 January 1897 at a small village Kodiala situated in the province of Orissa then a part of Bengal Presidency. They were the two leaders who really mattered in the last phase of India’s freedom struggle. Not until the advent of Gandhi in India in 1915, do we know any leader who had discerned, comprehended and endured the realities of Indian life at the grass-roots level. The Indian middle class leadership being elitist neither had the life style that could mirror the mass-image nor the practical familiarity with an experience of the realism of ‘the below’. However, Gandhi, “through mass movements encouraged Indians to shed their ingrained fear, realise their own strength and thereby acquire self-respect and self-confidence.” Pradip Bose opines: “The conflict between Gandhi and Bose was not just between the so-called “left” and “right” within the Indian National Congress, or between the older and younger generations, it was also a civilizational and cultural conflict. This was manifested in a number of ways in their mutual interaction, but the most important and open clash between them was in the sphere of politics because in their time the political battle against the British rule was a matter of supreme concern.”
The present study attempts to analyse the comparative ideas, ideology and role of both Subhas Chandra Bose and M.K. Gandhi in the context of Indian National Movement. Such an analysis has been made keeping in view the divergent opinions, the scholars hold about the part played by M.K. Gandhi and Subhas Chandra Bose in the Indian national movement. In fact, a great deal of debate has centred on them; their programmes, policies and actions have been probed with different ideological and theoretical spectrums. Before we discuss the major trends, it is necessary to pinpoint the two significant characteristics found common in all the studies, irrespective of their ideological bias. The restricted or procrustean treatment either conceals or ignores or distorts the long term dynamics and the real objectives of the two great leaders. Such a reductionism of the movement represents the tendencies already criticised by M.K. Gandhi who argued with the ‘Reader’ in Hind Swaraj: “We want English rule without the Englishman. You want the tiger’s nature, but not the tiger: that is to say, you would make India English. And when it becomes English, it will be called not Hindustan. This is not the Swaraj that I want.”

Bipan Chandra opines: “Though Congress and in particular Gandhi, practised the strategy of class adjustment, to our knowledge no Indian leader, not even Gandhi theorised it.” No doubt, the studies made on the both leaders are well grounded on historical source material and authentic data, nevertheless, the results deduced or the judgement given in the last analysis of the books on the comparative role of both the leaders in the Indian freedom
struggle, is not convincing and compatible with their real aim. The second common but significant feature is that the complimentary relationship between Mahatma Gandhi, Subhas Bose and the Indian National Congress causes the perceptual confusion to many who do not differentiate their ‘own’ contribution from that of the Congress movement. To treat the three as identical on the ideological ground would mean to view their entire struggle from the other end of the telescope. Besides sharing the above mentioned two characteristics, the studies made on M.K. Gandhi and Subhas Bose have divergent opinions; and our starting point is to look at these opinions critically in order to illuminate our line of departure with the submission that the whole exercise would be like that of an explorer than like that of an authority.

Let us mention briefly about the biographers and their limitation concerning the source material. In 1948, a few months after Gandhi’s assassination, the nationalist leaders assigned Pyarelal, who had been first assistant to Mahadev Desai and then after his death in 1942 became Gandhi’s Chief Secretary, the task of writing a biography of Mahatma Gandhi. The first part of it entitled The Last Phase came out in two volumes in 1956 and 1958. The second part entitled The Early Phase appeared in 1965. Commenting on this biography Ved Mehta says that:

“Pyarelal is not a biographer but, rather, a hagiographer, who celebrates the miraculous deeds of his hero ....”
The other important biographies of Gandhi by the Indians are by B.R. Nanda and D.G. Tendulkar. But all the biographers and narrative historians faced one limitation concerning the archival restrictions “as the fifty year rule barring access to government archives closed many of the original sources for a study of Gandhi’s Indian career.” Eventually the rule was relaxed to thirty years in 1966 allowing an access to the so far closed documents pertaining to the records of the government of India and the private papers of the Viceroys of India-Harding, Chelmsford and Reading, and of the Secretary of the State for India, E.S. Montagu. The opening of the documents expanded the scope and orbit of the historians and biographers whose work suffered from the inadequacy of the sources due to the archival restrictions. In this connection, the work of Judith M. Brown deserves notice. Claiming the study neither a “biography”, nor “a detailed survey of Indian politics between 1915 and 1922”, Brown by using the newly available evidence traces “Gandhi’s emergence as a leader step by step from his return from South Africa to his remarkable triumphs at the Calcutta and Nagpur Congresses of 1920, through his transition from a little known philanthropist to a political leader imprisoned for launching an All-India Civil Disobedience Movement against the British.” Not agreeing to the premise of Gandhi’s charismatic appeal in organising, Brown is of the opinion that “for his real work” Gandhi depended on “small groups of influential local men whom he educated to be his subcontractors in rallying support and organizing his campaigns.”
Well padded with historical source material, the studies of Judith M. Brown on Gandhi’s different aspects situate Brown in the category of historians who deal with the political career of Gandhi. In his preface to another work: *Gandhi And Civil Disobedience: The Mahatma in Indian Politics 1928-34*. Brown says that: “the work is intended as a contribution to the understanding Gandhi’s political career, because his significance for his contemporaries and to some extent for later generations lay in his role as a political leader and innovator, and because he also realized that he could only publicize and implement his ideals through political involvement.”\(^\text{11}\)

Now let us discuss the Marxists who are themselves divided into two groups on the issue of assessing the character of the Gandhian ideology and his movement. The first group comprising M.N. Roy, E.M.S. Namoodripad, Rajni Palme Dutt, Sumit Sarkar and others view Gandhi as a bourgeois leader who succeeded in provoking the mass enthusiasm but precluded the possibility of converting and channelizing it into a revolutionary force and movement.\(^\text{12}\) S.G. Sardesai categorically says that: “we communists did entertain a profound antipathy for Mahatma Gandhi’s basic ideological tenets ... because in practical politics they involved innumerable compromises with imperialists, feudal and Indian bourgeois interests, thereby hampering the full developments of the national revolutionary forces in the country.”\(^\text{13}\) The Left argue that the Gandhian model “proved acceptable both to business groups, as well as to relatively better-off or locally dominant sections of the peasantry, all of whom understood to
lose something if political struggle turned into uninhibited and violent social revolution.”

The Left demur that Gandhi dealt only with the principal contradictions rooted in the imperialist socio-economic structure in India and betraying his class character he deliberately brushed aside the question of secondary contradictions, i.e., the relationship of the native feudal class, aristocracy and the rising bourgeoisie with the masses.

The first group- Marxists argue on theoretical grounds that the principal contradictions and secondary contradictions cannot be studied separately as “the British rule rested mainly on the Indian upper classes in the countryside, native princes and large land owners in many parts of the country.”

Thus, the consideration of the principal versus secondary contradictions leads the first group Marxists to characterize Gandhi’s contribution as non-revolutionary in nature, hence, bourgeois in character.

The second group of Bipan Chandra puts forth a different view. Refuting the arguments of the first group, the second group of the Left polemically asserts that “the Congress-led and Gandhi guided anti-imperialist movement” in India “had to be open-ended without definite hegemony or class character.” Bipan Chandra is of the view that the chief terrain for the transformation of the national movement and the Congress in a socialist direction was the ideological including the moral and intellectual. Indian nationalism from the 1880’s onwards was firmly rooted in a correct critique of the character of the modern economic development. This development perspective, however, remained largely confined within bourgeois parameters, or,
independent economic development was visualized within a capitalist framework. Thus we may characterize the movement or the Congress as a popular or people’s movement that was under bourgeois ideological hegemony or rather under the hegemony of bourgeois economic ideology. But Bipan Chandra opines that the concept should be taken in its ‘weak’ and not ‘strong’ sense. Regarding the question of secondary or domestic contradictions it is premised by them that anti-colonial movement could not chalk out the program of the abolition of private property “except in the ideological realm.” Therefore, they argue that the Communists in India had this theoretical understanding but they failed to evolve a strategy in practice to begin the process of socialist hegemony. To counter the objection that Gandhi restricted the mass enthusiasm converting into a revolutionary movement, the second group emphasizes upon the need to understand the Gandhian strategy of mass movement, which may be described as “Struggle-Truce-Struggle (S-T-S).” They hold the left in colonial India responsible for not having a conception of hegemonic struggle, or of what Gramsci described as a way of position, or even more important, of a struggle which combined a war of movement (Satyaraaha phase) with a war of position (non-satyagraha or passive phase)....

The above controversy within the left obliges us to submit that Gandhi’s contribution to and perception of Indian national movement and its confrontation with the imperialists, non-confrontation with the native dominant classes, its withdrawal, suspension or
beginning-all these issues and others like non-violence etc. should not be tested on the question of principal and secondary contradictions or analyzed from the viewpoint of war of position or war of movement. Undoubtedly, the necessary conditions reflecting in the socio-economic encroachment of the imperialists in India prepared a ground for the rise of Gandhian movement but it is extremely important to comprehend the theoretical base of the Gandhian movement and discern its temperament, program, aims and objectives; and equally it is important to understand that how Gandhi imparted programmatic shape to the Indian unitary thought for dissolving the socio-economic contradictions through the satyagraha praxis. His movement was not in any way confined to the removal of principal contradictions, nor was it serving the domestic dominant classes. Gandhi’s greatest achievement was that he converted the Congress from a debating club into a mass organisation of freedom fighters. It might be said that he took politics from the drawing room to the market place where the masses gather. The basic fact underlying his opposition to work within the legislatures was that he expected the ordinary men and women to play their part in the freedom struggle. Gandhi wanted the Congress to be a revolutionary body pledged to the definite ideal of freedom and working for it through the medium of mass agitation though non-violent. After 1919, when the national movement became a mass movement, Gandhi evolved and propagated a different, non-capitalist, basically peasantist - artisanist outlook but
his socio-economic programme and economic thought were not capable of challenging the basic hegemony of bourgeois ideology.\textsuperscript{23}

Next to the Marxists are the non-left scholars/thinkers under our review. Though they are not divided ideologically like the Marxists, they have divergent views about Gandhi’s contribution. Generally they trace out the origins of the movement in the chrismatic leadership model derived from Max Weber.\textsuperscript{24} R.C. Majumdar expresses that “it is the saintliness and personality of Gandhi that made him dominate Indian politics and enabled him to launch the campaign.”\textsuperscript{25} P.H.M. Van Den Dungen in his essay “Gandhi in 1919: Loyalist or Rebel?”, describes that: “perhaps the best measure of Gandhi’s achievement was the failure of biographers and historians to realize what had happened.... What is important is to realize that the Gandhi of the years before 1905 could not and would not have launched a movement like the Rowlatt Satyagraha of 1919. The Gandhi who emerged at the end of 1909 was not only able to do so but was eager to use satyagraha and not least in the struggle for Swaraj. He had dissociated himself from both moderates and extremists. And his loyalty was a subservient concept which had been brought into line with his nationalist sentiments and aspirations.”\textsuperscript{26} But nowhere these writers unfold the socio-cultural context of the chrismatic characteristic of Gandhian contribution to and perception of the Indian national movement. At one level chrismatic means domination. Therefore, a question arises: did Gandhi intend to dominate the masses or did he teach them the lesson in
de-hegemonizing the institutional and leadership domination and in the process imparting the training of self-rule-in-practice? As a matter of fact, Gandhi was bent upon de-institutionalization and dechristianization. As early as in 1924 he said; “I lay claim to nothing exclusively divine in me. I do not claim prophetship” and in 1940 he said: “Let no one say that he is a follower of Gandhi.” In another article: Independence in Harijan Gandhi wrote: “Independence of India should mean independence of the whole of India, including what is called India of the states and the other foreign powers .... Independence must mean that of the people of India, not of those who are today ruling over them ....” Besides being described Gandhi as chrismatic he is also characterized as moralist, political philosopher, political leader, political campaigner, social worker, reformer, exponent of passive resistance and the like. By and large the non-left scholars working on Gandhi are biographers and narrative nationalist historians.

D.K. Bedekar has thrown light on three trends in Maharashtrian enlightenment: Ranade, Tilak and Agarkar. He opines that Gandhi was more cautious and compromising (with orthodoxy) than Ranade, because he was rooted in a more orthodox Gujarati, Mod Vaishya (many Muslims who had migrated to South Africa too belonged to this caste) social milieu. Gandhi’s compromises with orthodoxy are loose, more sporadic and more capricious than those of Ranade. While Ranade remains firm on principles and falls victim to orthodox pressures in ‘double life’. Gandhi runs wild into extremes of
radical and revivalist stances (cow-protection, varn-ashram, fasts, etc.). Gandhi is more pragmatic (in Dewey’s sense) than Ranade, but both are essentially experimenting with ‘truth’ through socio-political activity.\textsuperscript{31}

A lack of theoretical understanding of Gandhian phenomenon has led many to criticize Gandhi with the communal stick and such a criticism emanates from the vulgar empiricism. It is necessary to cite precisely the communalistic view on Gandhi. For instance, commenting on the \textit{Khilafat} agitation, Sarvarkar criticizes Gandhi that in spite of “the warnings of the great Tilak, Gandhi committed the Congress to the purely communal, religious and extra territorial khilafat agitation to placate the Muslims and himself went to the length of insisting on the point that the question of \textit{Swaraj} itself should be subordinated to the \textit{Khilafat} issue - nay, he said it was the religious duty of the Hindus to help the \textit{Khalipha}.”\textsuperscript{32} On the other hand, presenting a Muslim view, K. Sarwar Hasan expresses that “the life, manners and speeches of Gandhi were those of a Hindu par excellence ... Gandhi did not attack, or ask for the liquidation of the Hindu system of caste as the supreme barrier between the Hindus and the Muslims.”\textsuperscript{33}

Ambedkar also criticizes Gandhi on the issue of caste system, and is of the view that the social ideal of Gandhism is either caste or \textit{Varna} and both are “fundamentally opposed to democracy.”\textsuperscript{34} Thus the communal interpretations of Gandhi and his movements suggest
that the protagonists of such a narrow analysis have been unable to transcend the perceptual stage of cognition to conceptual stage of cognition of the Gandhian practice.

Recently Gandhi has been analysed from the viewpoint of the hermeneutics, the art of interpretation which aims at demystifying or disclosing the hidden coherence or sense in a text.\textsuperscript{35} The protagonists of this school believe that the political "practices and institutions are embedded in, and constituted by our linguistic practices and hermeneutic or interpretative understanding."\textsuperscript{36} Thus, they identify the emancipatory context in Gandhi’s discourse and practice. The roots of such a nature of discourse and practice are found by them in Gandhi’s critical interpretation of both the Indian tradition and thought, and of modern Western thought. To quote: \textsuperscript{37} What is instructive in the Gandhian mode of emancipatory discourse and practice is that his efforts of understanding and reviewing the Western tradition of political discourse and practice lead him to a deeper and more critical understanding of his own tradition of thought and vice-versa.\textsuperscript{37} No doubt, Gandhi’s knowledge of the English liberal humanism or the humanitarian attitudes of the enlightenment era and his contact with the English liberal humanists of the protestant non-confirmist tradition and his readings of Ruskin, Thoreau, Tolstoy, Carlyle and others influenced him and made him familiar with the tradition of European dissent against the domination of the hegemonic institutions and practices, but the roots of his emancipatory discourse and practices lay more in the Indian unitary
thought than in the comparative study of the Western and Indian traditions. His non-violence resisting practices were emancipatory and were of ‘holistic’ nature because the sole purpose of the satyagraha praxis was not to ‘negate’ an opponent rather to ‘transform’ him. The holistic nature of the emancipatory practices and discourse was entirely different from the liberal nature of the emancipatory practices and discourse. The former aimed at establishing the hegemony of an individual while the latter subordinated individual to the institutions. This is the reason that there was seldom an occasion when the objectives of Gandhi committed to ‘holistic unity’ and that of ‘liberal’ middle class leadership of the Indian National Congress were identical. Again it is holistic and not the liberal context of Gandhi’s discourse and practices that prohibited Gandhi to be one of the elected representatives of the Indian people, and that made him suggest the abolition of the Indian National Congress after independence.

Of late there has been a spurt in senseless acts of violence. Whatever motives may be, the narrow parochial, lingual, sectarian and regional passions, cannot but have a baneful effect on the unity, integrity and well being of our country. The story of the Azad Hind Fauj, the composition of which cut across barriers of caste, creed, colour and language, can serve as a model for our youth. Subhash Chandra Bose carried on his struggle against British rule in India from Europe and East Asia with the help of the then enemies of the British empire, viz. Germany, Italy and Japan.
For independence, the Indians are indebted as much to Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose as to Mahatma Gandhi. In a loose sense, Mahatma Gandhi prepared the back-ground of the emergence of Indian freedom, but it was Netaji whose efforts contributed a good deal in compelling the British to withdraw from India. He was indeed much loved by his people on account of the substantial role that he played in the struggle for his country’s freedom. There are several books on the life and works of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. He was such a towering personality and so enormous was his contribution to India’s liberation from British tutelage that he deserves to be remembered as much as Gandhiji. Now let us discuss the major works on Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. The book *Life and Times of Subhas Chandra Bose As Told in His own Words* (ed., Comp.) by Madan Gopal is a pure narrative of the life, works and times of Subhas Chandra Bose. It could in some ways be considered as his (auto) biography. The prefix “auto” is used deliberately because the first two sections are based entirely on Netaji’s works and include: *An Indian Pilgrim* and *The Indian Struggle*, supplemented by his other writings or letters, all in the first person singular. The third and final section is also based on the writings and speeches of Netaji in Europe and East Asia. There are many important documents and speeches published by Netaji Research Bureau and edited by Sisir K. Bose. The important among them are: *Correspondence 1922-32* in 3 vols. and *Statements, Speeches, prison notes and Boycott of British Goods 1923-1929* and *The Great Escape*. There are books jointly edited by Sisir K. Bose and Sugata
Bose: like the one which deals with personal letters between Subhas Chandra Bose and Emilie Schenkl; *Letters, Articles, Speeches and Statements 1933-39* in 2 vols, *The Alternative Leadership 1939-41*, and the *Collected works vol. 11 & vol. 12* forth coming. Alexander Werth delivered the ceremonial Netaji Oration in Calcutta in 1969 on the occasion of the 72nd birth anniversary of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. Werth referred, on the one hand to the vacuum in European literature regarding Netaji and on the other, to a distorted image of the leader prevalent in many circles. Unfortunately, such lack of information or a wrong view of his role in the history of our times affected intellectuals and historians as well as lay people. It was clear that Netaji's activities during the second world war and the exigencies of war-time propaganda about him in Britain and all countries allied to Britain were responsible for this state of affairs. This contrasted sharply with Netaji's current status and image in India where he ranks as a national leader with Mahatma Gandhi and where his war-time contribution is widely regarded as the determining factor in India's final liberation from foreign rule. As to the authors, who would seek to present the image of Subhas Chandra Bose in full conformity with his true historical role and personal performance, the name of N.G. Jog is noteworthy. His biography of Netaji: *In Freedom's Quest* published in 1969 and his work: *A Beacon Across Asia* Co-authored with Lothar Frank, Alexander Werth, Tatsuo Hayashida, Fred Saito have been widely acclaimed. These scholars are of the view that no proper understanding of contemporary Indian or Asian History is
possible without an adequate understanding of Subhas Chandra Bose....In order to correctly interpret the more spectacular and the rather controversial activities of his later years, it is necessary to understand his origin, the fundamentals of his faith and idealism and the evolution of his personality through a life of relentless struggle.”

Dilip Kumar Roy was a close associate of Subhas Chandra Bose. He wrote two books: *Netaji- The Man (Reminiscences)* and *The Subhas I Knew*. Dilip Kumar Roy’s Book: *Netaji- The Man*, gives many revealing glimpses of Subhas’s innermost feelings, and of the sufferings and ordeals he had to go through. It also shows the lighter side of his nature and provides many instances of his sense of humour. Subhas often wrote letters to Dilip Kumar Roy. In one of his lyrical letters to Roy dated 31 December 1931 Subhas stated:

“Do you want the fragrance of the full blown rose? If so, you must accept the thorns. Do you want the sweetness of the smiling dawn? If so, you must live through the dark hours of the night. Do you want the joy of liberty and the solace of freedom? If so, you must pay the price. And the price of liberty is suffering and sacrifice.”

Yet another commentary on Netaji’s role in the achievement of Indian freedom is of Michael Edwards, a noted historian. In his work: *The Last Years of British India* he categorically stated that :”Only one outstanding personality took a different and violent path, and, in a sense, India owes more to him than to any other man even though he
seemed to be a failure."* The Springing Tiger: Subhas Chandra Bose by Hugh Toye-formerly of the British Intelligence Service, is probably the most significant British work, which expresses opinion in deviation from the official view. In this "study of a revolutionary"; Toye has made the first attempt from the British side to assess the character and recount the events of Subhas's life.

The final phase of Netaji's life has been explained by many historians and there is still controversy looming large over the death of Netaji Bose. First of all, the name of G.D. Khosla may be mentioned. He was the head of the Commission appointed to enquire in detail about the death of Subhas. Later he published a book entitled: Last Days of Netaji. In this work he mentioned:

"In these pages I have set down a straight-forward and unembellished account of what was undoubtedly the most unusual, and in some respects, the most interesting experience of my judicial career. No other matter which I was called upon to enquire into and adjudicate upon offered such a variety of human behaviour, made so many demands on my patience and forbearence, and earned me so many invectives."*42

Samar Guha, M.P. called the report of Khosla Commission an act of conspiracy and treachery. He in his book: Netaji Dead or Alive?, showed his full dissatisfaction regarding the issue which involved the fate of the greatest hero of Indian freedom. He was neither satisfied
with the report of the Shah Nawaj Khan Committee nor of the Khosla Commission. In his book, the author has tried to prove on the basis of irrefutable facts and arguments that the report of Netaji’s death in the alleged air crash was wholly fictitious and its story was circulated by Japan in order to provide a camouflage for giving Netaji an opportunity to seek an asylum in the Russian territory. The book has been devoted mostly to prove that Netaji did not die in the alleged air crash. What happened to him after his escape to Russian territory has not been discussed in the book. A Japanese named Tatsuo Hayashida, too, tried to present Subhas as a great Indian patriot. While writing about the death of Subhas, he in the preface of his work has showed that Subhas was one of those: “who happened to be on the scene of the occurrence of the accident in Taipeh, Formosa that resulted in his tragic death, I can hardly keep back my tears when I recall the dreams he nurtured in his mind. His untimely death prevented him from living to see his ambition realized. Secondly, I feel called upon to try to bring into the open the truth of Netaji’s last days, which almost sank into oblivion amid the confusion resulting from the surrender.” He holds that Subhas died in the air crash.

There are other works of the nature of collection of source material by Ravindra Kumar, *Selected speeches and writings* by Jagat S. Bright, and in another introduction by S.A. Ayer. There are few books which deal with the political philosophy of Subhas Chandra Bose. There is a notable contribution from Verinder Grover (ed.). *Political Thinkers of Modern India, vol. 6., Subhas Chandra Bose*. Its one
part; deals with the political philosophy of Subhas Chandra Bose, his role in the Indian National Congress, as the leader of the ‘Forward Bloc’ within the party, his differences with the Gandhian view and as a rebel in the Congress party. I would fail in my duty if I donot mention the name of V.P. Saini and his work: *Conspirators, Abductors and Killers of Netaji*. V.P. Saini: Endeavoured to critically analyse the whole issue of Netaji’s disappearance and prove the involvement of some very powerful and highly placed persons in the conspiracy which kept Bose away from India and deprived the nation of the services of her greatest son. There are other important works, too, which are referred to in the dissertation. There is hardly any work which undertakes entirely comparative study of M.K. Gandhi’s and Subhas Chandra Bose’s ideas and ideology in the context of freedom struggle. This is what has prompted me to choose this theme for my doctoral research.

In the light of the above historiographical survey the present study endeavours to: (i) trace out the theoretical and practical roots of the Gandhian leadership; (ii) to comprehend and focus on the relative autonomous role of an individual vis-a-vis of socio-cultural milieu on him; (iii) to integrate the relationship between Gandhian ideology and Subhas Chandra Bose’s fiery idealism; (iv) to conceive their relationship as dialectical, creative and rejuvenating in the practice of leadership; (v) to separate Gandhi, Subhas Bose and Indian National Congress in different perspectives and to identify their comparative ideas, ideology and role in the Indian national movement.
The study is divided into six chapters. The chapters confirms to a mosaic pattern dictated by the nature of the problem under study. The first three chapters deals with the biographical background and influences at work on these two great leaders. The fourth and fifth chapter contains their ideas comprising two different directions. The sixth chapter is of the final ideological rift between the two leaders. But in all the chapters an attempt to characterise their ideas and ideology is conspicuously present; and thematically one chapter flows into the other. The extreme complexity of the Indian struggle for freedom and its length of time imposes certain limitations on a researcher particularly on him/her who deals with two stalwarts of freedom struggle which embraces almost the whole Indian national movement. Therefore, the present study in the light of its theme is comparatively thinly padded with archival source material, and deals with only those events and issues which sharply throw spotlight on the comparative role of both Subhas Chandra Bose and M.K.Gandhi. The historical narration sometimes is disrupted because the purpose is to compare their ideas, ideology and role and not to narrate events in a chronological order. The collected works, biographies and autobiographies are used as a source material. The last appeal is that M.K.Gandhi and Subhas Chandra Bose must be comprehended on their own terminology and its context. They had their own perspective with which they embarked upon their programme of action. No amount of comparisons or drawing of parallels can adequately explain the nature of their ideology.
We think it would be better to give the summary of each chapter to make a background of what has been submitted in details.

The first chapter is introductory in nature. It broadly reviews important works available on M.K.Gandhi and Subhas Chandra Bose which have a direct bearing on the theme of the dissertation and examines the need for further research in the area. In a way, it forms a prologue to the study and provides a kind of hypothesis and approaches to be followed in the completion of the work.

The second chapter throws light on the formative years of M.K.Gandhi, that is, from 1869 to 1915. It studies his childhood experiences; including the part played by his parents and other family members, friend, and community as also by the liberal West and persons like Thoreau and Tolstoy and even by Christianity in shaping the personality, vision and ideas of M.K.Gandhi, and the methods he was to follow later. His struggle against indentured labour, racial and colour based discrimination is also examined as it throws a significant light on the methods and strategies he was to follow in guiding the course of the Indian national movement. The asram way of life, observation of fast, silence and of sexual restraint presented the Indian masses a paradigm of the Mahatma who ritualized the mass action for he knew the knack of restoring a sense of unity which the Indian masses had lost because of their displacement from the traditional grounds. The untutored mass behaviour is given a coherent and
systematic shape. Gandhi’s interaction with the Indian National Congress has also been discussed.

The third chapter discusses the influences of: parents, family, community, of Bengal Renaissance, and of the Revolutionary movement of the time on Subhas Chandra Bose. It shows to a great extent how his education and his rebellious nature against the established system and his inclination towards liberalism and socialism shows the signs of a future leader. The leadership qualities whether they were inborn or attributed to his environment are also dealt in detail.

The fourth chapter is devoted to the evaluation of Gandhian leadership. The chapter also analyses Gandhi’s concepts of Swaraj, Swadeshi, Ram Rajya, Non-violence and Trusteeship. Swaraj did not mean the expulsion of the imperialists to be replaced by the native dominant classes. Swadeshi did not at all mean petty bourgeois economic programme. And non-violence did not only mean the anti-thesis of physical violence rather it meant also the removal of structural violence. The concept of trusteeship was not only a policy of the uplift of the poor or creating economic equilibrium rather it meant socialism based on the idea of removal of economic contradictions through an action emanating from Satyagraha consciousness. When and under what circumstances M.K. Gandhi and Subhas Chandra Bose emerged on the Indian political scene and their
reactions and responses to this phase of Indian national movement is also discussed.

The fifth chapter evaluates the method of work of Subhas Chandra Bose and what were the differences between M.K.Gandhi and Subhas Chandra Bose singly or as a member of a socialist group. It discusses, how, despite differences on different issues, party policies and programmes, both worked under the banner of Indian National Congress.

The sixth chapter attempts to examine how the differences started sharpening after 1938 and how far these differences were rooted in the political developments centering around the Presidentship of the Indian National Congress or were the result of their wide variations in ideology and approach to gain freedom. The striking difference erupted on the issue of the means of attainment of freedom. It pinpoints how Subhas was desperate to attain freedom, left India, joined hands with the Axis Powers and ultimately formed the Indian National Army. The working of INA is also dealt with. A focus is drawn on Gandhi’s reactions to these revolutionary measures of Subhas Chandra Bose and his own attention centering around negotiations like Cripps Proposals and ultimately Quit India Movement.

The last chapter forms the Conclusion. An attempt is made to assess the efficacy of both the political approaches vis-a-vis Gandhi’s
and Subhas, overall contribution and role in the freedom struggle; their successes and failures despite reservations.
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