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Passion for Swaraj is the most dominant urge for any subject people and this passion becomes still more intense when the people happen to have a culture and heritage that is very ancient yet very rich and virile and full of vitality. Besides, this passion acquires a degree of militancy when the people and particularly the elite is inspired by an urge for snapping the shackle of foreign domination and rejuvenate itself. Such a stage had been reached in the life of Indian people by the last quarter of the 19th century even if such urge was nipped at the bud in the year 1858. Towards the later half of the last decade of nineteenth century, Tilak had said "Swaraj is my birth right and I shall have it!" Dadabhai Naoroji in his Presidential address at the Calcutta Congress harped on it and Gandhi wrote his Hind Swaraj in 1908. Hence if Subhas dreamt in terms of Swaraj it was but in conformity with the then prevailing atmosphere in the country.

(A) INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS—EARLY POLITICAL GOAL

The formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 is an important landmark in the history of India's struggle for freedom. It is rightly said that "the history of the Congress is really the history of India's struggle
for freedom! Nevertheless, it is very interesting that for the first two decades it had but a modest goal of national endeavour. As a matter of fact, the Indian National Congress as originally conceived by its founder Mr. Allan Octavian Hume was not designed to be an instrument of India's struggle for freedom. A retired member of the Indian Civil Service, Mr. A.O. Hume because of his strategic placement in the Ministry of Home could know and realize that potentialities of a revolutionary situation existed in the country. He thought that such a revolutionary situation foreshadowed the probability of an impending revolution and felt called upon to devise some urgent step to forestall such an eventuality. As it is evident from the testimony of his biographer Mr. Wedderburn, "The ill starred measures of reaction combined with Russian methods of police repression brought India under Lord Lytton within measurable distance of a revolutionary outbreak and it was only in time that Mr. Hume and his Indian advisers were inspired to intervene."

That, the primary motivation behind the formation of Congress was to counter-act the possibility of a revolutionary outbreak is further evident from the frank avowal of Mr. Hume himself. As he admitted "A safety

valve for the escape of great and growing forces generated by our own action was urgently needed and no more efficacious safety valve than our Congress movement could possibly be devised. That apart, Lord Dufferin, the Viceroy wanted the Congress to perform the functions of His majesty's opposition in England and had in mind an organisation where Indian politicians should meet early and point out to the Government in what respects the administration was defective and how it should be improved.

It may be maintained that during the first two decades, the Indian National Congress largely developed along the above lines chalked out by its founders and had no lofty political goal, as such, in its scheme of things. It is evident from the resolutions of the first National Congress (which met under its first President W.C.Bannerjee) which provided the broad framework of the Congress the ambition during period noted above. The more important resolutions formulating India's demands were:

(i) Appointment of a royal Commission to enquire into the working of Indian Administration.

(ii) 'The abolition of the Indian Council'.

(iii) The demand "for the admission of elected members" to the Legislative Councils and "for the right of inter-pellation".

(iv) "for the creation of councils in N.W.P. and Oudh and in the Punjab".

(v) "for simultaneous examinations for the I.C.S. and raising of the age of candidates".

3. Ibid., p.77.
5. Ibid., p.18.
Thus, the primary thrust of the Indian National Congress during the period was on constitutional and administrative reforms and it was hardly inspired by any revolutionary goal of national endeavour such as Swaraj or full responsible government. Hence it is said "It is significant that for the first twenty years the demands of the Congress were modest: the Expansion of the Legislatures into representative institutions; the extension of the jury system, the appointment of Indians to the Privy Council; the expansion of technical education, simultaneous Indian Civil Service Examinations in India and in England; the modification of the Arms Act, and the establishment of military Colleges." So, it is evident that reforms within the framework of British imperialism characterised the vision and outlook of this early phase of Indian National Congress. It did not aim at self-government outside the British empire. As it is said "No basic claim for self-government in any form that is no basic national claim was formulated in its resolutions but only the demand for a greater degree of Indian representation with the British system of rule."  


Apart from their moderate and modest goal, the attitude and approach of the architects of the Congress during its early days towards foreign rule were equally characterised by a reasonable and moderate tone. It may be noted that, by and large, the Congress leaders reposed their firm faith in the British sense of justice and fairplay and considered the British rule in India as a divine dispensation which should be continued indefinitely for the larger interest of India and its people. Over and above, they did not or could not look beyond the British Empire for the political evolution of the Indian Nation.

As Gopal Krishna Gokhle, a great patriot of the moderate school said about his ideals incarnated in the Servants of India Society: "It's members frankly accept the British connection as ordained, in the inscrutable dispensation of Providence for India's good, self-government within the empire for their country and a higher life generally for their country men is their goal".

As he further said about the advantages of British connection. ".....The genius of the British people, as revealed in history on the whole made for political freedom, for constitutional liberty. It would be madness, it would be folly on their (Indians') part to throw away in the struggle that lay before them these enormous advantages".

9. Ibid., p.58.
Dadabhai Naoroji talked also in the same vein in connection with British rule. As he said, "In this rule there is every element to produce immeasurable good, both to India and England and no thinking native of India would wish to harm it". However, it should at the same time, be noted that Dadabhai Naoroji's attitude towards British rule underwent a revolutionary change after Curzon's partition of Bengal and at the Calcutta session of the Indian National Congress in 1906, Naoroji not only denounced the British Indian Government" as a barbarous despotism unworthy of British instincts, principles and civilizations" but unhesitatingly supported Swaraj as the goal of national endeavour from inside the Congress platform. But, of course the Swaraj which he demanded was self-government as a part of the British Empire without meaning complete severance of British connection. As he said:

"There is only one remedy to the present dishonourable, hypocritical and destructive system. That remedy is self-government under British paramountcy."

The foregoing survey of the moderate goal of early nationalists may pain the present generation in the context of the latter ideal of complete Independence as the goal of

national endeavour yet one should not forget the limitations of time, situation, and circumstances at that point of national evolution and the fact that as pioneers in the political evolution of India, they laid the foundation-stone on which was built up the latter structure of India's resurgence. "We cannot blame them for the attitude they adopted as pioneers of Indian political reform, any more than we can blame the brick and mortar that is buried six feet deep in the foundation and plinth of a modern edifice. They, it is, that have made possible the superstructure, storey by storey, of colonial self-government, Home Rule within the empire, Swaraj and on the top of all complete Independence. If today our course is plain and our goal is obvious, we owe it all to our forbears who did the spade work and cleared the forest". 12

(B) POLITICAL GOAL OF EXTREMISTS:

While the Congress in general and its leadership in particular had a very modest ambition of petty reforms, a section of the Congress who in course of time would be known as extremists, could not be content with such ambitions. Both as regards their goal and technique, the small minority of extremists differed from the dominant strand

of the Indian National Congress. Sri K. K. Datta has very rightly observed "while the Congress was trying for attainment of self-government through a moderate policy and constitutional means there appeared another section of Indian nationalists among the members of the Congress from the closing years of the nineteenth century, whose aim was complete freedom of India from alien rule, ideas radical and methods revolutionary. The latter considered the mild method of "moderation and loyalty" to be insufficient for liberation of mother land".13

It may be said that this extremist section of Congress could not rely on the moderate faith that British rule in India was in the nature of a divine dispensation that would serve the larger interest of India. Lack of faith in British sense of justice and fairplay characterised their mental attitude and vision and they were not prepared to believe that our British masters would ever grant self-government out of sheer change of heart in consequence of our pleading, persuasion and appeal. That apart, their vision stretched beyond the limit of British empire and they championed the ideal of complete Independence as the goal of national endeavour. To them there would be no salvation for India, no solution for the problems of its poverty and backwardness, and no possibility of

its allround progress and prosperity except through complete British withdrawal from the Indian political scene and acquisition of Swaraj or complete freedom by India. In the context of their goal of Swaraj or complete independence, they considered the moderate technique of petitions, prayer, resolution, persuasion and appeal as thoroughly ineffective and painfully inadequate and in fact scornfully derided the moderate policy as "political mendicancy". The ideal of the Indian nationalists of the Extremist Wing was clearly explained by Tilak. "Repetition of prayerful resolutions year after year at the annual meetings of the Congress, he said "would bring no results, the remedy was not petitioning but boycott". He simply laughed at the moderate faith "in benevolent intentions" of the British rulers to do any thing remarkable in the interest of India and its political advance. As he said: "This alien government has ruined the country........... Benevolence is used to sugar-coat the declaration of self-interest and we were deceived by the apparent benevolent intentions under which self-interest was concealed".

As he further said about the nationalist ideal:
"He who has set his face towards the temple of the Goddess of independence will never approve of independence under British suzerainty".14

In retrospect, it could be said that this trend of extremism symbolised by a revolutionary change in ideals

and outlook crystallised in the Indian political scenario in the closing part of the nineteenth century. "The seed time was the early 1890's. Tilak quarrelled with Sudharaks (the reformers) over the age of consent issue in 1891 and introduced Ganapati festival in 1893. Autobindo published "New lamps for the Old" in the "Indu Prakash" between 1893 and 1894. The challenge to social conference came in 1895. The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha was captured from the moderates in the same year. The Shivaji festival was first held on 15th April 1896. With the foundation of the Deccan Sabha (4th November, 1896) the division between the moderates and Extremists was well laid in Maharashtra. Rabindranath's classic exposition of the inhumanity of bureaucracy and sound analysis of the deteriorating relations between rulers and ruled, published in the Sadhana (1893-94) must be taken as the articulate protest of the new generation against the moderate policy of mendicancy". Lajpat Rai was uninterested in Congress affairs. Between 1893 and 1900 I did not attend any session of the Congress. "He felt but vaguely, that the Congress leaders are more for fame and pomp than for the interests of the country". The Arya Samaj had also no love for "holiday patriots" "uttering plausibly worded platitudes and well disguised common places".  

It may further be said that this trend of Extremism, the seed time of which was early 1890's grew into a mighty tree with the partition of Bengal in 1905. Though Lord Curzon, claimed that the object of partitioning Bengal was administrative convenience and though it was also true that Bengal was too big to be efficiently administered by a single provincial Government, it's effect, nonetheless, was cataclysmic so far as our national evolution was concerned. It was a rude shock to Bengal in particular and India in general. The cause of Bengal became the cause of India. The struggle against the partition of Bengal was converted into a struggle for India's freedom. The entire country was galvanised into unprecedented nationalist activity, a fervent nationalism was stirred up, there was now a leap forward in our goal of national endeavour, and last but not the least were evolved the revolutionary techniques of Swadeshi and Boycott. As it has been very rightly emphasised "An adult Congress could no longer continue the baby talk of self-government or confine itself to baby tantrums of petition and agitation. It claimed its birthright of freedom in a manner befitting to the militant youth of a nation reborn to its old greatness".¹⁶

¹⁶. Ibid., pp.58-59.
The leading lights of this period of partition were Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh, Lala Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal who not merely gave a new dimension to our goal of national endeavour but injected moreover, a new tone and temper to our national movement. "It crossed the age of adolescence and entered into its youthful idealism" Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak often described as the "Father of Indian unrest" or 'the Father of Indian revolution' was the first and foremost of the Nationalists or the Extremists. He was the embodiment of the revolutionary nationalist sentiment of the times and the very personification of uncompromising nationalism whose method of struggle "marked the end of arm-chair politics". With the foresight of a leader, Tilak saw in the partition of Bengal an unique opportunity to create a national struggle for Swaraj. He implored Congressmen to give up the old policy of mendicancy-see through the ineffectiveness of the moderate methods of petitioning and praying and the utter inadequacy of piecemeal reforms in India's administration. What in fact, he wanted people to do, was to aspire for and demand Swaraj or self-government as their goal of political evolution. As Tilak said:

"The time has come to demand Swaraj or self-government. No piecemeal reform will do. The system of present administration is ruinous to the country. It must end or mend". 18

It may be maintained that Tilak laid the greatest stress on Swaraj. "Swaraj is my birth right and I will have it" 19 was his fearless slogan which exercised its magic spell on most of the patriotic Indians of his times. So, Swaraj was a question of birth right for man which inheres in his very being, and which naturally could not be denied to him without disparaging his very manhood. Swaraj to Tilak was not merely a birth right of the individual, it was moreover his "Dharma"—"a moral imperative". It was a moral imperative because without Swaraj, man does not have the privilege to exercise and enjoy his freedom. It may be noted that Tilak brought in the vedantic ideal of the Existence of Brahma which was symbolic of "Absolute freedom" and "being a universal object man too had Brahma bearing behind his being, providing his Guna, his purpose as also his freedom". 20 So, it would appear that Swaraj for Tilak was not merely a political goal, it had equally a spiritual and moral

20. M. N. Jha, Modern Indian Political Thought, Meenakshi Prakashan, Meerut, p. 75.
orientation behind it. That apart, Swaraj for Tilak was the indispensable prerequisite for the all-round progress and prosperity of the nation. As he said;

"If we do not get Swarajya, there will be no industrial progress, if we do not get Swarajya there will be no possibility of having any kind of education useful to the nation either primary or higher. If we do get Swaraj it is not merely to advance female education or to secure industrial reform. All these are parts of Swarajya. Power is wanted first".21

He further held; "there is no question which is not dependent on Swarajya".22 Apart from Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Bipin Chandra Pal and Sri Aurobindo Ghose were equally passionate in their stress on Swaraj.

Lala Lajpat Rai said expressing his passion for Liberty.

"Can the wealth of the whole world" "be put in the scales over against liberty and honour" "A subject people" he continued, "has no soul just as a slave can have none.....A man without a soul is only a herd of dumb driven cattle". He further said "The goddess of liberty is the most sacred Goddess in the world and before

21. Quoted by Dr. Swarnabala Das in her unpublished thesis Political Technique of Aurobindo, Utkal University, pp. 116-117.
22. Ibid., p.117.
you can approach her, you should show by your life, life of self-denial that you are fit to enter her temple.²³

Bipin Chandra Pal with equal emphasis harped on the indispensability of Swaraj. Stressing upon the nationalist standpoint he said "The new spirit accepts no other teacher in the art of self-government except self-government itself. It values freedom for its own sake and desires autonomy, immediate and unconditioned.... regardless of any consideration of fitness and unfitness of the people for it because it does not believe serfdom in any shape or form to be a school for real freedom in any country and under any conditions whatever. It holds that the struggle for freedom itself is the highest tutor of freedom which, if it can once possess the mind of a people, shapes itself the life, the character and the social and civic institutions of the people to its own proper ends."²⁴ Bipin Chandra Pal not merely valued freedom for its own sake, but over and above, regarded it to be a matter of birth right like Tilak. So he said; "Freedom is man's birth right. It is inherent in very making of man."²⁵

Aurobindo Ghose of "revered memory" was another nationalist of the extremist wing who pressed for Swaraj

on solid logical grounds and gave a much wider meaning and connotation to it. At the outset, it may be maintained that Sri Aurobindo shared his passion for Swaraj with the other nationalists but then his dream of Swaraj was not merely in the sense of self-government as a part of the British empire but self-government as completely free from foreign control and domination.

Aurobindo developed his case for Swaraj on a variety of grounds. Firstly, his passion for Swaraj sprang from his exalted nationalism which bears a philosophical, emotional, personal, intimate and filial accent. It may be noted that Sri Aurobindo characterised nationalism as a religion and was irresistibly attracted by the concept of mother India of Bankim's vision whom he portrayed as a demi-God, a gigantic figure astride the mid-nineteenth century, the central figure of the Indian renaissance.26

"India was to him a mother to be revered and a Goddess to be worshipped" and his "Vande Mataram" epitomised this emotional, personalised, filial and divinely inspired love of the motherland. Sri Aurobindo has observed;

"For what is a nation? What is our mother-country? It is not a piece of earth, nor a figure of speech, nor a fiction of the mind. It is a mighty Shakti, composed of the Saktis of all the millions of units that make up the nation, just as Bhawani Mahisha Mardini sprang

into being from the Shakti of all the millions of Gods assembled in one mass of force and welded into unity. The Shakti we call India, Bhawani Bharati, is the living unity of the Shaktis of three hundred million people.* So, if Swaraj for India became Aurobindo's passion, it was because he perceived the divine mother—the mighty Bhavani Bharati embodied in the Indian Nation. But, unfortunately, Aurobindo found that the mother of his vision—that is mother India was in bondage. It was rather too much for his patriotic self to see the mother is such a sad plight. His heart would simply revolt to see the humiliation of slavery cast on mother India, the oppression and suppression of its teeming millions and the distress and suffering writ large on its face. He would, therefore, call upon his countrymen—the sons and daughters of mother India—to suffer and sacrifice, to offer their all—their life and comfort and every thing for mother India and for its freedom. His burning passion for Swaraj is evident from the high dose of emotional and sensual fervour which characterised his words and phrases.

Aurobindo has observed "Love has a place in politics, but it is the love for one's country, for one's countrymen, for the glory, greatness, and happiness of the race, the divine ananda of self-immolation for one's fellows, the ecstasy of relieving their sufferings, the joy of seeing

one's blood flow for the country and freedom, the bliss of union in death with the fathers of the race, the feeling of almost physical delight in the touch of the mother's soil of the winds that blow from Indian seas, of the rivers that stream from Indian hills, in the hearing of Indian speech, music, poetry, in the familiar sights, sounds, habits, dress, manners of our Indian life, this is physical root of that love. The pride in our past, the pain of our present, the passion for the future are its trunk and branches. Self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness, great service, high endurance for the country are its fruit. And the sap which keeps it alive is the realization of the Mother-hood of God in the country, the vision of the mother, the knowledge of the Mother, the perpetual contemplation, adoration and service of the mother.28

Apart from the above grounds, Aurobindo advocated Swaraj as a matter of right of each nation. He considered that Swaraj was absolutely necessary for our national growth and national development. It was under Swaraj that a nation could grow, develop and expand. So he said: "Our ideal is that Swaraj or absolute autonomy free from foreign control. We claim the right of every nation to live its own life by its own energies, according to its own nature

28. Ibid., pp.125-126.
and ideals. We reject the claim of aliens to force upon us a civilization inferior to our own or to keep us out of our inheritance on the untenable ground of a superior fitness.”

Aurobindo further argued that Swaraj is a condition precedent for the all round growth and development of the nation. He did not believe in the moderate dictum that foreign rule was a God-send or that it would ever ensure the all round development of the Indian nation. Moreover, he was never convinced that a policy of reforms minus Swaraj would ever ensure real development of the country. He thought that it could only be possible when there was freedom of mind, freedom of thought and freedom of action which however hardly existed under a foreign rule. So he said:

“Political freedom is the life-breath of a nation; to attempt social reform, educational reform, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race, without aiming first and foremost at political reform, is the very height of ignorance and futility. Such attempts were foredoomed to disappointment and failure. The primary requisite for national progress, national reform, is the free habit of free and healthy national thought

29. Quoted by Dr. Swarnabala Das in her unpublished thesis Political Technique of Aurobindo, Utkal University, pp. 125-126.
and action which is impossible in a state of servitude. The second was the organization of the national will in a strong central authority.\textsuperscript{30}

It may further be said that Aurobindo harped on India's claim to Swaraj yet on another ground which gave a universal and religious orientation to India's struggle for freedom. If India shall be free and shall attain Swaraj, it is not merely to release mother India from the yoke of servitude, not only because Swaraj alone could ensure India's all-round growth, development, progress and prosperity; She must win Swaraj for the sake of humanity at large—for the resurgence of Asia—for the resurgence of the world and could thereby justify its claim to Swaraj "in terms of its potentiality of service to mankind". He felt that India had a mission to fulfil for the sake of the world. It has the onerous responsibility of becoming "the torch-bearer of Dharma in the affairs of humanity" It had to spiritualize the world and discharge its great role as a teacher and a guide. He thought that this sacred mission of India could only be discharged when it is itself free and attains Swaraj. So he considered Swaraj "as the fulfilment of the ancient life of India under modern conditions, the return of the Satyayuga of national greatness, the resumption by her

\textsuperscript{30} Sri Aurobindo, \textit{Bande Mataram; Early Political Writings} Op.Cit., p.86.
of her great role of teacher and guide, self-liberation of the people for the final fulfilment of the Vedantic ideal in politics.\textsuperscript{31}

He has further observed "India must be reborn because her rebirth is demanded by the future of the world…. It is she who must send forth from herself the future religion of the entire world, the eternal religion which is to harmonise all religions, science and philosophies and make mankind one soul.\textsuperscript{32}

That world in general and Asia in particular needed a free India for their own spiritual elevation was brought home by Sri Aurobindo. Therefore, he wrote:

"A divine power is behind the movement; the Zeit Geist, the Time-Spirit, is at work to bring about a mighty movement of which the world at the present juncture has need. That movement is the resurgence of Asia and the resurgence of India is not only a necessary part of the larger movement but its central need. India is the keystone of the arch, the chief inheritress of the common Asiatic destiny. The idea of a free and united India has been born and grown to full stature in the land of the

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, p.902.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, p.66.
Rishis and spiritual force of a great civilization of which the world has need is gathering at its back.\textsuperscript{33}

The Extremist Nationalists not merely harped on Swaraj as their goal but wanted to ensure that it was accepted by the Indian National Congress. The Indian National Congress met at Calcutta on the 26th December, 1906 and from his presidential chair, Sri Dadabhai Naoroji declared "Self-government as in the United Kingdom or the Colonies" as the goal of national endeavour. It was a victory of Tilak and his comrades since it was for the first time that Swaraj as the national goal was announced from the Congress platform. However, it is interesting that Sri Naoroji "did not choose to define Swaraj or explain what he meant. The moderates and the extremists put different interpretations upon it the former taking it to mean as self-government on colonial lines and the latter, full and absolute autonomy.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{(C) POLITICAL GOAL OF MILITANT NATIONALISTS:}

The partition of Bengal as referred to earlier brought into prominence the emergence of extremists who worked from inside the Congress. Their pressure led not only to the formulation of the ideal of Swaraj in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} J.N.Vajpeyi, The Extremist Movement in India, Op.Cit., p.95.
\end{itemize}
Congress but simultaneously to the "adoption of strong and vigorous measures for asserting the national will". Outside the Congress there also emerged another set of radicals called militant nationalists. It may be noted that the aforesaid trend of militant nationalism which emerged outside the Congress "had its most conspicuous manifestation in Bengal" where Aurobindo Ghosh, Barindra Ghosh and Bhupendranath Dutta were associated with it and which also gained momentum in Maharashtra "owing to the patronage of Tilak and the association of the Savarkar brothers". It also spread abroad and "had its two important centres at London in the United Kingdom and at San Francisco in the United States".

They aimed at the freedom of the motherland by resorting to revolutionary and violent methods. Unlike the moderates they stood for complete independence of India from British strangle hold. Besides unlike the moderates and the extremists they clearly reposed their faith on violent and revolutionary methods and techniques such as secret organisations, preparation and use of bombs and intimidation or killing of oppressive officials. For them the end justified the means and for the noble and

37. Ibid., p. 237.
38. Ibid., p. 238.
over riding goal of Swaraj, any and every means was acceptable to them.

The discussion in the foregoing pages would enable an appreciation and provide a source of understanding into the nature and character of Netaji's political goal. It would be evident in course of our discussion that Netaji's political goal bears a deep impress of the ideas and ideals of the Extremist wing of the Indian National Congress. Sri B.G.Tilak and Sri Aurobindo, in particular, was his "political role model".39

(D) POLITICAL GOAL OF SRI SUBHAS CHANDRA BOSE:

Subhas was deeply impressed by the small minority of extremist nationalists in the Indian National Congress which aimed at Swaraj in the sense of complete freedom of India from alien rule. Hence Swaraj became his political goal but Swaraj not in the sense of dominion status or "self-government within the British empire" but Swaraj implying nothing short of complete Independence with severance of British connection.

This passion for Swaraj or complete Independence was almost a natural and inborn impulse in Subhas. Even as far back as 1914 while a student of the Presidency

college still in his early teens Subhas regarded political freedom as "indivisible and meant complete independence of foreign control and tutelage". In fact, he went on continuously harping on the ideal of complete Independence as its consistent and unfailing champion and did not even hesitate to enter into a battle royal with Gandhi until it was adopted as the Congress creed at the historic Lahore Congress of 1929.

If Subhas advocated Swaraj and accepted it as his political goal it was not merely due to patriotic or nationalist considerations but more so in the interest of humanity at large.

That, apart, Subhas's vision of Swaraj moved beyond the realization of political freedom or national independence and stood for a vision of freedom which was almost complete, comprehensive and all round.

(1) **CAUSE OF INDIA'S POLITICAL BONDAGE:**

Subhas Chandra Bose realized that the greatest problem before India was the realization of its political freedom. From his early days he felt distressed for the woeful slavery into which the country had been thrown by the circumstances. He wrote "Alas! what happened to our hoary past? Where are those Aryan heroes who would freely sacrifice their precious lives in the service of
mother India?" This slavery according to him, was made possible due to the "Indian temperament and Indian traditions" which never had any ill-feeling against the foreigner. This liberal temperament, observed Subhas was partly due to "the philosophical outlook of the people as a whole" and that apart due to "the largeness of the country which made it possible to welcome as many people as could come into the country". He further maintained that India's political bondage could also be accounted for in the diplomacy of the foreigners in general and that of the British diplomacy in particular. "Even when the foreigners took part in any political strife, they were always careful to side with a section of the people, so that they would never get the entire people against them. In this respect the diplomacy of the British was by far the best".

Besides diplomacy, Subhas considered "superior military skill" of the Europeans as another cause for the political bondage of India. As he has observed: "Unfortunately for India, though up to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries she kept abreast of the modern world in her knowledge of the science and art of warfare, during

41. Ibid., p. 18.
the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries she was no longer up to date. Her geographical position had kept her isolated from modern Europe. The wars of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe had effected a considerable improvement in the science and art of fighting and this knowledge was at the disposal of the European races, when they went over to the East*. In his Azad Hind journal, he further observed that India's "isolation from the rest of the World" and its "internal disunity" were two additional factors which facilitated British domination and exploitation in India.

(2) **SUBHAS'S PLEA FOR SWARAJ:**

Subhas was a militant fighter for Swaraj whose life was almost a total commitment to the cause of India's freedom. It should however, be brought home that his struggle for Swaraj was not the struggle of an ordinary fighter. In fact, his conviction for India's claim to Swaraj was based on definite considerations arrived at through a process of intellectual conviction. It may be noted at the outset that Subhas did not agree with the British historians who loosely talked of despotism as the system to which "orientals are accustomed". Through a historical study and analysis, he brought home to them

42. Ibid., p.19.
that behind the cloak of despotism, the people enjoyed a large measure of real liberty, which they have been denied under foreign rule." That apart, he rejected another moral justification for British domination and exploitation of India. He violently reacted to the British propaganda that India is a land "where there is no unity", "where the people are eternally fighting among themselves" and "where the strong arm of Britain is necessary to maintain order and ensure progress". He observes, "These presumptuous Britishers conveniently forget that long before their forefathers knew any thing about administration or national unity— in fact, long before the Romans came to Britain to teach culture and civilization to the uncivilized Britons— India had not only an advanced culture and civilization, but a modern empire founded by Chandra Gupta, extending from Cape Comorin in the South to Afghanistan in the North, an empire that was geographically longer than the India of today." Subhas's blunt and sharp reply to the British propaganda shows the tone and temper of a militant nationalist prone to be misunderstood and has to be judged in the light of his motivation to keep the spirit of nationalism afire in the nation's psyche for which he

43. Ibid., p. 8.
had to deliberately counteract all propaganda directed to thwart the spirit of resistance.

Subhas was very much aware of the disastrous effect of imperialism on a nation and he realised very well what British imperialism meant to India. To him it meant "moral degradation, cultural ruin, economic impoverishment, and political enslavement". In view of that he considered Swaraj or political freedom to be the condition precedent for all round progress and prosperity of the nation. In his Presidential address at the Maharastra provincial conference, Poona on May 3, 1928, he said; "Our benign rulers and our self-appointed advisers are in the habit of lecturing day after day on our unfitness for Swaraj. Some say that we must have more education before we can hope to be free, others maintain that social freedom should precede political reform, still others urge that without industrial development India can not be fit for Swaraj. None of these statements is true. Indeed it would be far more true to say that without political freedom i.e. without the power to shape our own destiny - we cannot have either compulsory reform or education, or social reform or industrial advancement..... I have not doubt in my mind that Swaraj and Swaraj alone is the sovereign remedy for all our ills. And the only criterion of our fitness for Swaraj is the will to be free".

45. Ibid., pp. 34-35.
It may be remembered here that in his espousal of Swaraj as the "sovereign remedy of all ills", Subhas took his cue from his predecessors of the extremist school, more particularly, from the ideas of Sri B.G. Tilak and Sri Aurobindo. Sri B.G. Tilak, as has been observed earlier held that "there is no question which is not dependent on Swaraj" Sri Aurobindo also regarded political freedom to be the "life breadth of a nation" and to attempt any other reform without political freedom, according to him, constituted "the very height of ignorance".

Apart from this nationalist orientation of India's claim to Swaraj, Subhas considered India’s claim to Swaraj having an international raison d’être. He argued that India's freedom would be the precursor of a free Asia and free Africa. He observed "No land need be afraid of a free India. Her freedom means emancipation for all the subject countries of the earth. Her freedom means resurrection of Asia and Africa the two continents that fell victims to the white man's burden, the crucified continents of modern history". In the same vein he observed in his Haripura address "ours is a struggle not only against British imperialism but against world imperialism as well, of which the former is the keystone. We are therefore fighting not for the cause of India alone

but of humanity as well. India freed means humanity saved.\footnote{Subhas Chandra Bose, \textit{Selected Speeches of Subhas Chandra Bose}, Op.Cit., p.87.}

Subhas was conscious and proud that Indian nation as a whole had a "remarkable continuity of culture and civilization" which showed the vitality of its people and of their culture and civilization. This Elan vital or vitality was regarded to be another ground of India's claim to Swaraj. He observed, "The only reason why I stand for India's freedom and believe that as a free nation we shall have a glorious future is that we have sufficient vitality left in us to live as free men and to develop as a nation.\footnote{Subhas Chandra Bose, \textit{Fundamental Questions of India Revolution}, N.R.B., Calcutta, 1970, p.68.}

It may further be said that Subhas harped on India's claim to Swaraj yet on another ground which has a universal and philosophical motivation. If India shall be freed and shall attain Swaraj, it is not merely to release mother India from the yoke of servitude, not only because Swaraj as such is the "sovereign remedy of all ills", not merely because it would herald an era of freedom for the "crucified continents" of Asia and Africa, she must win Swaraj for the sake of humanity at large.\"She must save her self today, for it is for her to save the wider world.\" As he observes in his Azad Hind; "In the
new order that will come India will fulfil her destined role of a veritable link assuring the friendship and understanding between East and West. The free India that will emerge out of the ashes of the British empire will resume her mission of contributing to the peace, happiness and progress of humanity."\(^{49}\)

In the same vein, Subhas observed "India has survived through the ages indescribable hardship and suffering and innumerable struggles and conflicts and is very much alive even to this day. That is only because she has a special "Sadhana" or a life-mission of her own to be fulfilled. She must save herself today for it is for her to save the wider world. It is very important that she must be free for her independence is necessary, as she, our motherland India, is destined to make a unique contribution to the culture and civilization of the world. Indeed the whole world has been waiting today in suspense for India to make this contribution, and the world is the poorer without it."\(^{50}\)

Subhas's faith in the messianic role of a free India was reiterated in his Presidential address at the third Indian political conference, London, in 1933, wherein he proposed the establishment of a new party

49. Azad Hind No.3/4 1943,p.5.
called the "Samyavadi Sangh" and envisaged its role as the architect of a new India engaged in the task of post-independence reconstruction. At the end of his address it was observed that the Samyavadi Sangha will stand for "the ultimate fulfilment of India's mission, so that India may be able to deliver to the world the message that has been her heritage through the past age".51

It may be maintained that Subhas faith in India's mission for the larger interest of humanity, runs on similar lines with the ideas of Sri Vivekananda and Aurobindo in that regard. Sir Vivekananda who exercised a powerful influence on the ideas and outlook of Subhas thought and preached that India's reemergence was indispensable for the benefit of the human race. Aurobindo also believed as indicated earlier that India had a mission to fulfil for the sake of the world.

(3) SUBHAS'S VISION OF SWARAJ:

Subhas was not only an outstanding and fearless advocate of India's Swaraj, he had equally an inspiring and ennobling vision of Swaraj. Like Aurobindo Ghosh Swaraj became his political goal and not only Swaraj in the sense of self-government as a part of the British empire but self-government completely free from foreign

control and enjoying both internal and external autonomy. That apart, Subhas's vision of Swaraj moved beyond the realization of political freedom or national independence. In fact, he became the veritable champion of a vision of freedom which was complete, comprehensive and all-round. Hence he wanted freedom, in every sense, in every field.

(i) GOAL OF COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE:

The twenties of the present century mark a significant phase in our national awakening. It fathered new forces and trends which influenced the nature and character of our national movement in the years to come. Gandhi's novel method of non-violent non-co-operation generated an unprecedented awakening in the country. There was the emergence of socialistic and communistic ideas that spread among the peasants and workers. Another noticeable feature of the period was the emergence of youth and the growth of a youth movement since 1926. "The Youth movement appeared under different names in different provinces, but the impulse behind it was the same everywhere. There was a feeling of impatience and revolt at the rotten state of affairs - a sense of self-confidence and a consciousness of the responsibility which they had towards the country". 52 Speaking about the impulse behind

the youth movement, Subhas who was a prominent youth leader in the twenties has observed. "The youth movement in its present form is characterised by a restlessness, an impatience of the existing state of things and a strong desire to establish a new social order. A deep sense of responsibility and self-confidence is at the root of this movement. Youths of our country can no longer rest satisfied leaving all their burden on the shoulders of their elders. They feel it with all their heart that the country and its future depend wholly on them and therefore, they feel it to be their duty to take up the burden themselves, and be prepared for the struggles necessary for achieving success."

The dissatisfaction, restlessness and impatience of youth and their desire for a new order of things also found expression in the speeches of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who was another outstanding leader of the youth. While addressing a youth conference in Bombay Nehru said.

"You have met here, I take it because you are not contented with things as they are and seek to change them. Because you do not believe that all is for the best in this best of all possible worlds. Because you feel the weight, on your young shoulders, of the sorrow and misery of this country and this world of ours, and with the energy and fine temper of youth you believe that

you have it in you to remove this load of sorrow or at least to lessen its weight."\textsuperscript{54}

This spirit of restlessness and impatience against the existing state of things led to the organization and growth of numerous youth leagues and conferences. They discussed the political, social and economic degeneration of the nation and as to whether the existing prescriptions provided for the ills of the body politic were proper and effective. Over and above, they sought to invoke the new "a new state, a new society and a new economic order". The Madras Congress of 1927 was a memorable session of the Indian National Congress that "marked the beginning of revolt among the young leadership". They championed the ideal of complete independence in place of the ideal of dominion status of old leaders. "They had a strong feeling of aversion for dominion status and did not desire even the least dependence on the British Government for the defence of India and her economic prosperity. The appointment of the Simon Commission to which no Indian was appointed was the last straw that created a sense of humiliation among the nationalists. Younger leaders lost all faith in the bonafides of the British Government. This led to desperation and then to the

\textsuperscript{54} Jagat S. Bright, \textit{Speeches of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Lahore, 1945}, p.68.
demand for complete independence to teach a lesson to the Government and its loyal supporters and to give a new shape and hope to the fighters in the battle for freedom.\footnote{55}

Subhas who was a prominent leader of the youth was a constant and consistent advocate of this ideal of complete independence as the goal of national endeavour. Even as far back as 1914 while a student of the Presidency College still in his teens, he regarded political freedom as "indivisible" and meant thereby complete independence of foreign control and tutelage.\footnote{56} As against his ideal of complete independence the goal of the Indian National Congress even at its Nagpur session in December, 1920, was "Self-Government within the British empire". It may be mentioned here that this modest goal of the Congress was uninspiring to the Congress leftwing that pinned its faith on complete Independence. In order to accommodate them, the goal of the Congress was declared to be Swaraj which literally implied self-rule. But then this accommodation was fragile since, Swaraj, as such, was not precisely defined but left to the individual interpretation of Congress men. Though Gandhi defined Swaraj to mean

\footnote{55}{Dr. J. N. Vajpeyi, \textit{Op. Cit.}, p. 307.}

\footnote{56}{Subhas Chandra Bose, \textit{An Indian Pilgrim}, Collected Works, Vol. I, N. R. B., Calcutta, 1913, p. 74.}
"self-government within the empire if possible and outside if necessary", it was but a partial concession to the ideal of complete independence, because of the element of expediency implied in the said definition.

Reverting back to Subhas's advocacy for complete independence as the goal of the nation it may be pointed out that he went on harping on it time and again until it was accepted as the creed of Indian National Congress in the historic Lahore Congress of 1929. As a youth leader organizing the All Bengal Youth League with himself as President in December, 1923, he contemplated "complete Independence" as India's goal rather than the beautiful but vague Swaraj which Gandhi had refused to define concretely.57

The same stress on complete Independence is also found in his speeches made after his release from Mandalay. He observed: "The future constitution would be republican" and unreservedly rejected dominion status on the ground that "it would perpetuate British capitalist interests in India".58

As it has been stated earlier, the youthful and leftist elements in the Indian National Congress were inspired by the ideal of complete Independence. Their


clamour for complete Independence gradually gained ground and in fact, "resolutions had been passed from time to time by provincial conferences recommending to the Indian National Congress that the goal of the Indian people should be defined as complete Independence".  

The struggle of the youth and the left elements did not go in vain. On their behalf Nehru and Subhas pressed for complete Independence as the country's goal at the Madras Congress of December, 1927. Jawaharlal Nehru who was fresh from Europe after attending Brussels meeting (1927) of the League against Imperialism and who had made an on-the-spot study of the phenomenal progress of Soviet Union under its socialist system and who, "had no doubt about the objective of political independence" regarding it to be "some thing radically different from the vague and confusing talk of dominion status" was the man of the hour to move the resolution on complete Independence which he did. Nehru's resolution which was passed in the open session of the Congress said "It is my high privilege to place before you the following resolution. This Congress declares the goal of the Indian people to be Complete National Independence."  

It is worthy of mention here that after the Congress was over, Mahatma Gandhi declared the resolution to have been "hastily conceived and thoughtlessly passed". Even if the said resolution was duly passed, the ideal of complete Independence was not the conviction or the committed ideal of the Congress as a whole. This is borne out by the "uncomfortable feelings" that Jawaharlal had for the controversy that arose on the meaning of Independence. As Jawaharlal writes, "The Independence resolution did not represent then as it did a year or two latter, a vital and irrepressible urge on the part of the Congress; it represented a widespread and growing sentiment."

Even then, the Madras Congress is significant for it marked the emergence of a rising left-wing in the Congress. Subhas has himself remarked that the Madras Congress marked "a definite orientation to the left". This is also borne out by the appointment of Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr. Shagib Qureshi and Subhas Bose as General Secretaries for the coming year.

The Madras Congress is significant, and memorable for another resolution, which led to an open ideological clash between the left and the right wing.

---

over the old issue of dominion status VS complete Independence. The concerned resolution directed the Congress executive to draw up a constitution for India in reply to Lord Birkenhead's taunting remark that Indians were incapable of framing their own constitution. Subhas had the rare honour and recognition of becoming a member of an All parties committee appointed for the purpose with Sri Motilal Nehru as its chairman. The most controversial provision of its recommendations was dominion status defined as the goal of the Congress. In fact, Subhas vehemently opposed this "back-sliding" from the Madras Congress resolution which defined Congress goal as complete Independence. So, it had to be stated in the preamble to the Nehru report that "the committee could not be unanimous on the question of the fundamental basis of the constitution, since a minority would not accept dominion status and pressed for complete national independence, as the basis of the constitution".

However, when the Nehru report was presented for adoption at the All parties conference held at Lucknow from August 28 to 30, 1928, Subhas, Jawaharlal and members of the Congress left wing did not think it wise to oppose its adoption though initially they were

65. Ibid., p.166.
disposed to do it. What mattered them most after mature consideration was the larger interest of national unity and the possible unhealthy consequences of their opposition. As Subhas has observed "Such a step would have given great satisfaction and delight to the enemies of the Congress, would have weakened the forces working for national unity, and would have increased the prestige of the Simon Commission instead of destroying it. However, both Subhas and Jawaharlal registered their voice of protest against dominion status and organized Independence Leagues all over the country to carry on active propaganda in favour of complete Independence.

This ideological cleavage foreshadowed the division of opinion that was witnessed at the Calcutta Congress in December, 1928. Gandhi who was not unaware of "the sharp differences of opinion" attempted "to satisfy or at least to conciliate" the youth and leftwing by moving a resolution in the subjects committee. The important portions of his resolution reads: "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.....whilst adhering to the resolution relating
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to complete Independence passed at the Madras Congress, adopts the constitution drawn up by the committee as a great step in political advance;...provided however, that the Congress shall not be bound by the constitution if is not accepted on or before 31st December, 1930 and provided further that in the event of non-acceptance by the British Parliament of the constitution by that date, the Congress will revive non-violent non-co-operation by addressing the country to refuse taxation and every aid to the Government. "........Nothing in the resolution shall interfere with the propaganda for familiarising the people with the goal of Independence in so far as it does not conflict with prosecution of campaign for the adoption of the same report".

It may be noted here that amendments were moved to the said resolution by Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose. "Their aim was to put no time limit, nor even by implication, to accept for India dominion status as contemplated in the constitution drawn up by the All Parties Conference at Delhi".67

In view of the gravity of the situation around the issue of dominion status VS complete Independence Gandhi considered it quite necessary to put his views

before the country. In his speech at the subjects committee meeting on 26th December 1928 he said "I suggest to you that it will be a grievous blunder to pit Independence against dominion status or compare the two and suggest that dominion status carries humiliation with it and that Independence is something that is triumphant......do not run to the hasty conclusion that the distinguished authors of the report had the interest of the country less at their heart than any of us or most of us. Do not run away with the hasty conclusion that they want anything else than complete Independence for the country. The word "independence" is much abused and is an equally misunderstood word." 68

As a further concession to Jawaharlal and Subhas, Gandhi advanced the time-limit from the 31st of December, 1930 to 31st December of 1929. Explaining the reasons of further concession, Gandhi said......Our life is a perpetual struggle against oppressive environments and a perpetual struggle within our ranks. If we want unity, then adjustment and readjustment, a series of compromises honourable to both parties and to variety of opinions, is to be effected." 69

68. Ibid., p.271.
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The compromising resolution of Gandhi stated; "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 in the event of its earlier rejection, the Congress will organize a campaign of non-violent non-cooperation by advising the country to refuse taxation and in such manner as may be decided upon.

Consistently with the above, nothing in this resolution shall interfere with the carrying on, in the name of the Congress of the propaganda for complete Independence.

Ultimately, Gandhi was able to win both Jawaharlal and Subhas to this modified resolution. They had to succumb though reluctantly to the appeal of Gandhi "that party unity was precious and that their scruples could be satisfied by the formula that if dominion status was not offered within one year the country would go its own way". Over and above, Gandhi had the numbers behind him which saw the resolution passed in the subjects committee by 118 votes to 45. It was also promised by Subhas and Jawaharlal "that they would not oppose Gandhiji's resolution

at the open session.\textsuperscript{71} But it is sad and unfortunate that the promise was fated to be broken at the open session. Subhas was under intense pressure from the Bengal delegates in particular and the leftwing in general "who would not think of a compromise" Still he was reluctant to violate his word of honour to Gandhi. He was warned: "Bengal's leader must speak for Bengal. Did he not realise the fervour of independence? If he failed Bengal now he would lose her."\textsuperscript{72} There was another consideration. It was decided by the Independence for India League to move and support an amendment to Gandhi's resolution. Over and above, Subhas after "a sleepless night of self-analysis" decided that "the flag should not be lowered even for these twelve months".

So, to the consternation of Gandhi and others, Subhas moved an amendment to Gandhi's resolution in the open session of Calcutta Congress. The amending resolution was to the effect that the Congress would be content with nothing short of Independence which implied severance of British connection.\textsuperscript{73} It may be noted here that the amendment was supported among others by Jawaharlal Nehru,

\textsuperscript{71} N.G.Jog, In Freedoms Quest, A Biography of Subhas Chandra Bose, Orient Longmans, 1969, p.73.

\textsuperscript{72} Nihir Bose, The Lost Hero, A Biography of Subhas Chandra Bose, Quarter Books, 1982, p.64.

though he "did it half-heartedly". It looks somewhat inconsistent on the part of a signatory of the Nehru report to comeforward and challenge its major recommendation of dominion status and speak for complete Independence. But, Subhas referred to the statement made in the report itself that the principles of the constitution submitted in the report can be applied in all their entirety to a constitution of Independence. The assigned explanation was the tip of the iceberg and the very fact that he moved the amendment showed the fundamental cleavage between the old school and the new school of thought. Referring to "a new consciousness" among the youth of the country who are "no longer prepared to follow blindfold" but consider it their historic responsibility "to make India free", Bose urged upon the old school to accept his amendment with the words: "I and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru are regarded as moderates among the extremists and if the elder leaders are not prepared to compromise even with these moderates, then the breach between the old and new will be irreparable." He further said that he was not prepared for "a come-down" from the earlier resolution of complete national Independence for
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he thought that in doing so, India will lose "at least a part, if not much, of the prestige", acquired after the Madras Congress. A pragmatist out and out, he put one straight question; "In the main resolution you have given twelve months time to the British Government. Can you lay your hands on your breasts and say that there is a reasonable chance of getting dominion status within the period?" One of the very few who in 1928 could have a rare prophetic vision, that another world war was imminent, Subhas thought that in view of that "India is to be on the alert" and should have a mentality 'a new mentality', "that will say that we want complete Independence" He said:

After all what is the fundamental cause of our political degradation? It is a question of mentality and if you want to overcome the slave mentality you do so by encouraging our countrymen to stand for full and complete Independence. I go further and say assuring that we do not follow it up by action, that merely by preaching that gospel honestly and placing the goal of independence before our countrymen, we shall bring up a new generation.

The spirited speech of Subhas created an exciting atmosphere. It symbolised the spirit of youth.
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dynamism, boldness and vigour and showed the latent possibilities for the nation. It was certainly heartening and reassuring to feel and think that nothing short of independence could possibly be the goal of national endeavour and that India's onward march should be interpreted solely in terms of independence. But then it was a bolt from the blue which took the elders by surprise. What touched to the quick and what surprised them most was the violation of a word of honour given to Gandhi.

In reply to the debate Gandhi made a speech to young Bengal which was befitting to the occasion. The relevant part of the speech showed his attitude towards the controversy around the issue of dominion status VS complete Independence. Gandhi felt that the controversy over the issue of Independence and dominion status was meaningless and unnecessary. Considering it so, he said: "I want to make it absolutely clear that if you are wise you will dismiss from your mind the bogey of Independence VS dominion status. There is no opposition between Dominion status and Independence. I do not want a dominion status that will interfere with my fullest growth, with my independence. These words I suggest are misleading." 79

So, Gandhi asked his countrymen to accept the Nehru report which was made by our own countrymen through our accredited leaders. It was, moreover, the direct outcome of a compromise which was discussed by various people who were supposed to represent different parties. Thereafter, he administered a strong rebuke to the rebels who inspite of their promise acted to the contrary in moving the amendment to Nehru report. He said: "You may take the name of independence on your lips just as the Muslims utter the name of Allah or a pious Hindu utters the name of Krishna or Ram, but all that mumbling will be an utterly empty formula if there is no honour behind it. If you are not prepared to stand by your own words, where will independence be? Independence is after all a thing made of sterner stuff. It is not made by wriggling of words".80

At the end of all sound and fury over the bewitching issue, Subhas's amendment was lost by 973 votes to 1350. He felt that "the vote could hardly be called a free one, as the followers of the Mahatma made it a question of confidence and gave out that if the Mahatma was defeated he would retire from the Congress. Many people therefore voted for his resolution not out of
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conviction, but because they did not want to be a party to forcing the Mahatma out of the Congress.*81

Subhas's statement may possibly be true to some extent in view of the unexpected violation of a word of honour which naturally cut Gandhi and his followers to the quick but to accept it as the whole truth would be to close one's eyes to the other side of the picture. In his reply speech of December 31, 1928 as quoted earlier, Mahatma Gandhi pointed out certain reported irregularities. He said: "It cut me to the quick when I heard that delegates tickets passed hands and were sold like bills of exchange and the rates increased as the days went on and a rupee ticket sold for Rs.15. It is discreditable to the Congress and I tell you that you are not going to get independence by these methods."*82 Over and above everything, Gandhiji was considered as the most indispensable single factor for any meaningful struggle against British Imperialism and therefore it would have been no less a factor to determine the ultimate outcome of the voting. Even then 973 votes as against 1350 showed the rising strength of the youth and left-wing which was certainly a force to reckon with.

It will not be out of place to point out Gandhiji's further ideas concerning the controversy.

raging round Dominion status and Independence. As stated in the foregoing pages, Gandhiji did not think that Dominion status had anything humiliating and that "independence is something that is triumphant". It has also been maintained that to Gandhi "there is no opposition between dominion status and Independence". That apart, Gandhi's article in Young India published on 3.1.1929 and his interview to the Daily Telegraph on January 2, 1929 further revealed his ideas on the issue. In the concerned article in Young India captioned "what is IN A NAME"? Gandhi preferred the term Swaraj to Independence and thought that India must find her independence and conceive of its meaning and contents through a look to its own "needs and capacity" rather than be carried away by the "meaning current in the West". Said Gandhiji;

"What is the meaning of this Independence"?

For me its meaning is Swaraj. Independence is a word employed for European consumption. And those whose eyes are turned outward, whether it be towards West or East, North or South are thinking of anything but India's Independence. For finding India's Independence we must look to India and her sons and daughters, her needs and capacity. It is obvious that the contents of her independence must therefore vary with her varying needs and increasing capacity. India's Independence therefore need not have the meaning current in the West. Italian
Independence is different from that of England, Sweden's differs from both "Gandhi continued further that what we need" is undoubtedly freedom from British control in any shape or form. But freedom from such control of any other power is equally our need in terms of independence.\textsuperscript{83}

Gandhi felt that the Nehru report points the way to such freedom and it prescribed the remedy that India can assimilate today. He then referred to the great confusion surrounding the term dominion status being put out of context. He did not consider it as an imported ideal or "an elixir of life" from Westminster. The expression only implied the opinion of the distinguished authors of the report as to what is needed for India's political growth. He further, sought to remove the fear of Subhas that if Government adopted dominion status on or before 31st December, 1929, "the Congress would commit itself definitely to dominion status by adopting the All parties constitution.\textsuperscript{84} He categorically stated "whilst it may fully answer our needs today, may easily fall short of them tomorrow.\textsuperscript{85} To Gandhiji what was reassuring and heartening in the report was that it was a scheme framed by Indians to be worked out by the nation and not one that was "imposed upon or thrown at her by Britain".
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Gandhi's interview to the Daily Telegraph which appeared in print on 3.1.1929 is a significant exposition of what he meant by dominion status. He reiterated that to him "Dominion status meant independence" and that there is no distinction between the two. "We want Home Rule - a Freedom constitution built up by ourselves-something not imposed from without. The Nehru constitution is of our own making. If that is accepted it means that we become partners at will and makers of our own destiny." 86

It must be mentioned here that Subhas distinguished between dominion status and Independence unlike Gandhi. In his Presidential address at the Maharashtra Provincial Conference, Poona on May, 3, 1928 he said "India must fulfil her own destiny and cannot be content with colonial self-government or dominion Home Rule. Why must we remain within the British empire? India is rich in resources, human and material, she has outgrown the infancy which foreigners have been thrusting upon her and can not only take care of herself but can function as an independent unit. India is not Canada or Australia or South Africa. Indians are an oriental people, a coloured race and there is nothing in common between India and Great Britain from which we may be led to think that Dominion Home rule within the British empire is a
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desirable consummation for India. Rather India stands to lose by remaining within the empire. Having been under British domination so long it may be difficult for Indians to get rid of the inferiority complex in their relations with England. It may also be difficult to resist British exploitation so long as we remain an integral part of the British empire".87

It may be observed here that this difference in outlook was due to the suspicion of Subhas about Britain's sense of justice and fairplay as against the Gandhian outlook. He took his cue from his predecessors of the extremist school such as Aurobindo and Tilak who had no faith in the British sense of justice and fairplay. But Gandhiji who visualized the Indian struggle for attainment of Swaraj as a moral battle anchored his faith in British sense of justice and fairplay though of course that faith became eroded in course of time. His uncompromising stand exhibited during the Quit India movement demonstrated complete erosion of his faith in Britain.

Another facet of Gandhi-Subhas difference, is clearly evident in the press interview. Subhas stood for "nothing short of Independence which implied severance of British connection". Unlike the clear, straight-

forward and definite stand of Subhas, Gandhi's outlook was characterised by a sense of sobriety. "Severance on any account is not my goal. Power for severance when desired is"\(^{88}\) so said Gandhi. Not long after the Calcutta Congress, Gandhi declared that if by the 31st of December, 1929, British Parliament did not concede dominion status as enshrined in the Nehru report, he shall wake up to find himself "an Independence walla"\(^{89}\) in the new year.

In the meanwhile, Lord Irwin, the Viceroy issued a statement saying that he had been "authorised on behalf of His Majesty's Government to state clearly that in their judgement it is implicit in the declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as there contemplated, is the attainment of dominion status"\(^{90}\). It was a clever statement of the Viceroy without any definite commitment as to when the goal of dominion status was to be achieved. To Jawaharlal, it was "an ingeniously worded announcement" which could mean "much or very little" and that "the latter was the more likely contingency"\(^{91}\). However, Gandhi along with Madan Mohan Malviya, Tej Bahadur Sapru, Motilal Nehru, and others signed what is known as Delhi Manifesto appreciating not only the sincerity underlying the declaration.
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but "tendering their co-operation to His Majesty's Government in their effort to evolve a scheme of Dominion constitution suitable for India's needs".92

Jawaharlal of course believed the statement to be injurious and wholly inadequate.93 It was "wrong and injurious" to give up the demand for independence even in theory and even for a short while and yet he admitted that he allowed himself "to be talked into signing" and that "a soothing letter from Gandhiji and three days of reflection calmed me".94 As a contrast to this Subhas stood firm in his ideological commitment to the goal of complete Independence and took a determined and principled stand in refusing to sign the leader's manifesto. Along with Sri Subhas Dr. S.Kitchlew and Mr. Abdul Bari issued a separate manifesto opposing the acceptance of Dominion status and condemned the idea of participating in a so-called round table conference to frame a scheme of dominion constitution for India. The manifesto said: "In a real round table conference only the belligerent parties should be represented and the Indian representatives should be selected not by the British Government as had been intended but by the Indian people".95

Subhas it may be noted, had warned the Indian people that the Viceroy's declaration was a "trap laid by the British Government". Even "The Times" had declared on the day following the Viceroy's declaration that it "contains no promises and reveals no change of policy". It is worth reflecting in this connection that the speeches and debates in the Parliament on the Indian question were most disappointing. "Mr. Winston Churchill considered the grant of dominion status as a crime and Lord Birekenhead and Lord Reading did not agree with the Viceroy". Over and above, Gandhi and Pandit Matilal Nehru's interview with the Viceroy in December, 1929 proved thoroughly unavailing. A specific assurance on the grant of dominion status to India could not be assured to them by the Viceroy. The significance of Lord Irwin's declaration was further negatived when Sir Samuel Hoare declared in the House of Commons that "the dominion status intended for India was not of Westminster variety". In the face of all these disappointments and frustrations, the Congress had no other go but to act upon the previous years's ultimatum and declare Purna Swaraj or complete Independence as the country's goal.

This historic declaration was made at the Lahore Congress which met under the Presidenship of Jawaharlal Nehru. True to his promise, Gandhi himself moved the resolution advocating complete Independence. It may be realised that the Madras Congress in 1927 "had only passed a resolution on Independence and had not altered the goal as defined in the Congress constitution". This was done at Lahore. The Lahore resolution stated:

"This Congress.......in pursuance of the resolution passed at the Calcutta Congress last year, declares that Swaraj in Congress creed shall mean complete Independence and therefore, further declares the Nehru scheme of Dominion status to have lapsed and hopes that.... All parties in the Congress will devote their exclusive attention to the attainment of complete Independence...... And authorises the All India Congress Committee, whenever, it deems fit, to launch the programme of civil disobedience, including non-payment of taxes whether in selected areas or otherwise and under such safeguards as it may consider necessary".

This resolution accepting complete Independence as the Congress creed was the victorious consummation


of a relentless struggle of the youth and the Congress leftwing. Subhas played undoubtedly a very distinguished role in this struggle along with Jawaharlal. But compared to Jawaharlal, he proved to be more uncompromising as a votary of independence as could be gauged from the foregoing pages. It will not be out of place to point out that he continuously stressed upon this goal of complete independence throughout his political career both in India and abroad. In his London address (1933) on Anti Imperialist Struggle and Samyavada, Subhas observed that without the invigorating ideal of complete Independence "Indians will not be able to rise to the full stature of their manhood". Explaining his opposition to Dominion Home rule as in Canada or Australia and his plea for Full National Sovereignty as it obtained in the United States of America or France, Subhas said further that under Dominion home rule India will not be able to safeguard the interest of Indians who have settled in other parts of the empire as it could do under an independent India outside the British empire. The Samyavadi Sangha which Subhas conceived of as India’s party of the future also stood for complete Independence an "all-round freedom"-Social economic and political as its goal. The same emphasis on complete Independence is also found in the goal of the Forward Bloc.
Its first and foremost aim was complete National Independence and an uncompromising Anti Imperialist struggle for attaining it. The same emphasis is marked in his voice from abroad almost to the point of exhaustion. That showed the degree of importance Subhas attached to the ideal of complete independence.

As regard to Gandhi's commitment to the ideal of complete Independence one does not fail to find equivocations both preceding the Lahore Congress and thereafter. One feels, as if Gandhi was on the throes of an inner struggle in that regard.

A few days before the Lahore Congress while replying to cables from English friends appealing him to reciprocate to the effort of Labour Government to help India, Gandhi wrote: "I am dying for co-operation... I can wait for the Dominion status constitution if I can get the real dominion status in action, if, that is to say, there is real change of heart, a real desire on the part of the British people to see India a free and self-respecting nation and on the part of the officials in India a true spirit of service.... My conception of dominion status implies present ability to sever the British connection if I wish to."
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In a statement to the New York Herald which was published on 9.1.1930 Gandhi said: the independence resolution need frighten nobody since for him, as for all Congressmen "Dominion status could mean only virtual Independence". On 30th January, 1930 Gandhi published an article captioned "Clearing the Issue. "Therein he enunciated Eleven points of reform such as total prohibition, reduction of the ratio to 15.4d, reduction of land revenue, abolition of the salt tax, reduction of military expenditure and salaries of the higher grade civil service, protective tariff on foreign trade, discharge of political prisoners and withdrawal of political prosecutions, abolition of C.I.D. and issue of licences to use firearms for self-defence. He appealed to the Viceroy to satisfy these simple but vital needs of India and assured him that "he will then hear no talk of civil disobedience". Regarding Gandhi's famous Eleven points Subhas writes; "On January 30th he issued a statement in his paper Young India, saying that he would be content with the substance of Independence and he mentioned Eleven points to explain what he meant by that expression. At the same time he virtually gave up the use of the word 'Independence' and substituted in its place the more elastic expression, 'Substance of Independence' and he
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mentioned Eleven points to explain what he meant by that expression. At the same time he virtually gave up the use of the word 'Independence' and substituted in its place the more elastic expression "Substance of Independence" or another expression especially coined by him - namely Purna Swaraj which he could interpret in his own way. 104

In another article captioned "My Inconsistencies" published in Young India on 13.2.1930 Gandhi further said "Independence constitution is not an end in itself....Independence means at least those eleven points if it means any thing at all to the masses...... By mentioning the eleven points I have given a body in part to the elusive word "Independence". 105

For a layman who is not a Mahatma, it is probably difficult to think of these eleven points in terms of Independence. At any time it would have been greatly difficult to think of them as the "substance of Independence" but it seems to be more baffling after the Lahore resolution on complete Independence. What really one fails to understand is that if these eleven point reforms were satisfied Gandhi would not talk of civil disobedience, notwithstanding the Lahore directive that Congress will devote its "exclusive attention to the attainment of complete Independence" and its specific authority given to the All India Congress Committee to

launch upon a programme of civil disobedience. Gandhi wrote a long letter to the Viceroy on 2nd March, 1930 on the eve of launching the Civil Disobedience Movement known as Salt Satyagraha. In between the lines of the letter, one also finds the equivocations of Gandhi as regards the goal of complete Independence. Moreover, the tone and temper of the letter are couched in a manner that hardly corresponds to the Post-Lahore euphoria and enthusiasm witnessed on the first Independence Day celebration on January 26, 1930 and thereafter.

Holding the British rule in India to be a curse and thereafter with a brief survey of events as to how they had no option but to go for complete Independence, Gandhi said "but the resolution of Independence should cause no alarm, if the word Dominion status mentioned in your announcement had been used in its accepted sense. For, has it not been admitted by responsible British statesmen that Dominion status is virtual Independence?" 106

Then Gandhi enumerated the evils of British rule and said thereafter that his civil disobedience movement aimed at combating these evils. He said "But if you cannot see your way to deal with these evils and my letter makes no appeal to your heart, on the 11th of this month, I shall proceed with such workers of the Ashram as I can take to disregard the provisions of the salt laws. I regard this tax to be

---

the most iniquitous of all from the poor man's standpoint.\footnote{107}

At the end of the long letter, Gandhi wrote:

"I have no desire to cause you unnecessary embarrassment or any at all, so far as I can help. If you think that there is any substance in my letter and if you care to discuss matters with me and if to that end you would like me to postpone publication of this letter, I shall gladly refrain on receipt of a telegram to that effect soon after this reaches you."\footnote{108} A look to the letter of Mahatma with its ifs and buts would lead one to think with those who thought that inspite of himself, he had to sponsor the resolution on complete Independence at Lahore. It lends support to Subhas's view that Gandhi's orthodox followers, like himself, had all along been advocates of Dominion Home Rule and they did not like to depart from that attitude. "But the Mahatma felt that in the atmosphere then prevailing in the country, a resolution on independence would be carried inspite of his opposition and therefore, it was much better for him to move."\footnote{109} The following lines of Mahatma's letter are significant in this context.

"The Delhi interview having miscarried, there was no option for Pandit Motilal Nehru and to me but to take

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{107} Ibid., p.7.
\footnote{108} Ibid., p.7.
\end{footnotes}
steps to carry out the solemn resolution of the
Congress arrived at in Calcutta at its session in 1928.

Another thing about the letter. The concluding
portion implies that Gandhi was not bent on a struggle
against the Raj. He would not possibly have gone for it,
if the Viceroy "would have cared to discuss matters with
him." Sri R.C. Majumdar has rightly observed "The letter
can by no means be reconciled with the Congress resolution
either in letter or in spirit. It does not speak the
language of a fighter or of a politician but that of a
saint." 110

(ii) CONCEPT OF FREEDOM:

Subhas Chandra Bose not merely harped on Swaraj
in the sense of complete independence from foreign control
and tutelage but had a splendid vision of Swaraj which
was deeper and more significant. In his scheme of Swaraj
achievement of political freedom was not the peak of his
thought process; he rather visualised and put forward a
concept of freedom which was most extensive and comprehen-
sive and embraced every sphere of freedom. This will be
evident from the following. "By freedom I mean all-round
freedom, i.e., freedom for the individual as well as for
society, freedom for the rich as well as for the poor.

110. R.C. Majumdar, History of Freedom Movement in India,
freedom for men as well as for women, freedom for all individuals and for all classes. This freedom implies not only emancipation from political bondage but also equal distribution of wealth, abolition of caste barriers and social inequities and destruction of communalism and religious intolerance. This is an ideal which may appear utopian to hard-headed men and women, but this ideal alone can appease the hunger of the soul.\textsuperscript{111}

Thus, Bose had a broad and comprehensive vision of freedom and he realized that political freedom alone or freedom from alien servitude as such was not enough for the development of man's personality.

He also felt that freedom as such would be the privilege of a few unless a just and equitable social order becomes the condition precedent. He was for freedom for the individual and for the society, freedom for one and all. Society is an aggregate—the sum total of individuals and in a society of unequals with poverty, suffering, destitution and discrimination, freedom becomes a marginal experience, nay, an unreality, an illusion to the vast multitude of teeming millions. Therefore Subhas emphasises upon the imperative necessity of a just socio-economic order where there will be no social discrimination on the basis of caste, class, religion and sex and which

will also ensure equitable distribution of wealth to bridge the gap between islands of prosperity and the sea of poverty in the India of his vision. The soul hungers for freedom and Bose felt that this hunger could only be satisfied with the realization of his vision.

It has to be borne in mind that this ideal of a comprehensive and all round vision of freedom was emphasized upon by Subhas time and again in his speeches and writings throughout his political career. One of the significant aspects worthy of mention in this regard, is his due stress on equality for the realization of freedom and his reference to "socialistic principles." Quite aware of the organic relationship between freedom and equality, Subhas said "Mine is the ideal of a complete and unequivocal freedom for the country,..., The real significance of independence must be clear to everyone. Many of us have not yet fully understood independence in its organic concept......A new social structure we shall have to raise on the sound basis of an all-embracing Samyavada, i.e. Socio-political equality. Caste system must be completely abolished, and women should be free to enjoy equal rights and responsibilities with men in every sphere of life. Economic inequality must not be tolerated any longer, and every individual, irrespective of caste, creed or sex, should be given equal opportunities
for education and advancement. We must steadily exert ourselves in organising the state on a solid foundation by making it completely independent and socialistic in principles."\(^{112}\)

Subhas believed that with the achievement of political independence our struggle for Swaraj does not end. What was equally important was "the ushering in of a new order based on justice and truth, a regime in which every Indian will get his birth right". By way of clarification of this birth right he said: "Our aim is this: that in a free India, every Indian whatever his religion or language must have the same right. Every one who calls himself an Indian and who lives in India must have equal facilities of food, clothing and education. We seek to realise a India with an administration which will provide this. All obstacles which lie on the path of realizing this aim will have to be removed. It is only natural that if we want to give due measure to one and all we cannot allow a few rich people to have more than their due measure."\(^{113}\)

Subhas thought that, for the realization of the new social order in free India, only those who have paid the price of freedom and have won it by their struggle, sweat and sacrifice, should be at the helm of affairs.


directing the destiny of the nation. What concerned him most was that administration in the hands of those who have not paid the price of freedom may turn out to be selfish and reactionary. Rejecting the view of those who think that Congress party should wither away after freedom is won, he said "The party that wins freedom for India should be also the party that will put into effect the entire programme of post-war reconstruction. Only those who have won power can handle it properly. If other people are pitchforked into seats of power which they were not responsible for capturing, they will lack that strength, confidence and idealism which is indispensable for revolutionary reconstruction." However, it is sometimes said that Gandhi was not only unwilling to make any plan beyond independence, he seemed to lack the determination to wield power at all.

(iii) SACRIFICIAL SWARAJ:

Another facet of Subhas's concept of Swaraj was his continuous stress on struggle, suffering and sacrifice. What he stressed upon was that the price of freedom must be paid by a people struggling for Swaraj. Freedom he felt, when obtained as a gift from victorious powers may not be lasting. As he said "If we get freedom without sacrifice and suffering it will be of no avail."

because we will not be able to preserve the freedom which is gained so easily. We shall therefore get our freedom only through our suffering." Subhas's letter to Dilip Kumar Roy two days before his arrest on 2nd January, 1932 and his famous political Testament dated 26.11.1940 addressed to His Excellency the Governor of Bengal are the two important pieces of his writing which breathe the spirit of his sacrificial Swaraj. In the aforesaid letter he wrote:

"Do you want the fragrance of the full-blown rose? If so, you must accept the thorns.....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."

Subhas's political Testament was the best of his writings that clearly reveals the sacrificial Swaraj that animated his being. As he wrote:

"It is through suffering and sacrifice that a cause can flourish and prosper and in every age and clime, the eternal law prevails "the blood of the martyr is the seed of the church".

"In this mortal world every thing perishes and will perish—but ideas, ideals and dreams do not.

One individual may die for an idea but that idea will, after his death incarnate itself in a thousand lives.

"This is the technique of the soul. The individual must die, so that the nation may live. Today I must die so that India may live and may win freedom and glory."\(^{118}\)

Such words of Subhas might be dubbed as the sentimental outburst of a whole-hearted nationalist but then these were no empty words but words "sanctified by practice." However, Subhas was not the exclusive advocate of a sacrificial Swaraj. Gandhi with a host of others equally believed that our national freedom or Swaraj could only be obtained by intense suffering, struggle, and sacrifice and that it would almost be impossible to entertain the view that freedom would ever come as a gift.

(iv) RELIGION AND POLITICS:

Another dimension of Subhas's concept of Swaraj which is worthy of discussion concerned his attitude towards the mixing up religion and ethics in a political struggle for Swaraj. It may be mentioned here that he was disinclined to such intermingling from the standpoint of India's long term interest. To the rational mind of Subhas incursion of religion and ethical issues into our struggle for Swaraj defied understanding. In his book "The Indian Struggle" he

almost condemned Indian's susceptibility to 'avatars, priests and gurus' He did not mince words to say that with the halo of saintliness reminiscent of Christ and Buddha "the Mahatma fully exploited the mass psychology of the people" banking on many of the weak traits in the character of his countrymen which accounted for India's downfall to a large extent. He further wrote; "After all what has brought about India's downfall in the material and political sphere? It is her inordinate belief in fate and in the supernatural—her indifference to modern scientific development her backwardness in the science of modern warfare, the peaceful contentment engendered by her latter-day philosophy and adherence to Ahimsa(Non-violence) carried to the most absurd length."

Subhas has related three important facts that betray his disinclination to the intermingling of ethical questions with our struggle for Swaraj. Firstly, he stated as to how during the heyday of the non-cooperation movement a large number congress men "began to talk more of spiritual freedom than of political Swaraj" treating the author of non-cooperation not merely as a political leader but also as a religious preceptor "Secondly, he related as to how in 1922, India warders in the prisons Department refused to believe that the Mahatma could ever be cast in prison by the British Government and further, that "since Gandhiji was a Mahatma he could assume the shape of a bird and escape"

from prison any moment he liked. "Thirdly, he has written as to how "the Mahatma and his followers would not countenance the boycott of British goods because that would engender hatred towards the British "What further baffled him was the condemnation at the Gaya Congress(1922) of the Swarajist policy on the ground that councils were places of Maya"¹²⁰ as was said by even so intellectual a personality like Mrs. Sarojini Naidu "our celebrated poetess".

Subhas thought that such susceptibility to mysticism and supernaturalism on the part of a people was an unhealthy sign and our political salvation lies in the growth of "a sane rationalism and in the modernisation of the material aspect of life"¹²¹ It may also be mentioned in this regard that though Subhas was a man with a religious frame of mind and was "a mystic par excellence", he was for delinking religion and mysticism from politics. Although he never deeply probed into the question of relationship between politics and religion, there can be no doubts about his aforesaid conviction. One of the important items of the Forward Bloc stated: "While every Indian should have full freedom of religious worship, religion and mysticism should not dominate politics and

¹²⁰. Ibid., p.127.
¹²¹. Ibid., p.127.
political affairs. Political affairs should be guided by political, economic and scientific considerations only.  

Sri A.C. Chatterji in his book "India's struggle for freedom" has pointed out an interesting incident that occurred at Singapore that further shows Subhas's attitude towards the relationship between politics and religion. While at Singapore in his Quest for freedom, he did not like the idea of going to the Chettiar temple to ask for funds for the independence movement. He told them "that the temple was a place of worship and everyman was free to worship as he liked but that religion should not be mixed up with matters of state." Though he consented to visit the temple, on the persistent request of the organisers it was only on fulfilment of his condition by the latter that he could take with him to the temple, officers and men irrespective of caste, creed, and religion.

It is interesting to note the striking similarity of outlook of Sri Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas in this regard. Jawaharlal Nehru resented Gandhi's stress on the religious and spiritual side of the movement. It was very difficult for his modern and rational mind to understand as to what religion had to do with politics. With the


anguish of a troubled heart at the growth of this religious element in our politics, Jawaharlal writes; "Gandhiji, indeed, was continually laying stress on the religious and spiritual side of the movement...it did mean a definitely religious outlook on life and the whole movement took on a revivalist character so far as the masses were concerned....I did not like it at all.... Even some of Gandhiji's phrases sometimes jarred on me - thus his frequent reference to Ram Raj as a Golden age which was to return".124

In this respect, Gandhiji's attitude was different both from Subhas and Jawaharlal. He not only stressed on the religious and spiritual side of the Civil Disobedience Movement, he said "politics bereft of religion was a death trap" His credo was "spiritualization of politics" through the introduction of religion into it. It was his belief that "there was no politics without religion-not the religion of the superstitious and the blind, religion that hates and fights, but the universal religion of toleration politics without morality according to her is a thing to be avoided".125

Subhas's stand on the question of introducing of religion into politics and his clearcut and straightforward view that religion and mysticism should not

125. Young India, 27th November, 1924.
dominate politics and that political affairs should be
guided by political, economic and scientific consider-
ation was prospectively relevant. Introduction of religion
into politics instead of being a boon as Gandhiji, with
his fine ideal thought it to become, became unfortunately
a bane to our long term interest. The Muslim league took
advantage of it and set in motion forces which finally
led to the vivisection of India. True, it was not the
sole factor for our partition but certainly one of the
most powerful villains of the piece for our national
tragedy. However, if Gandhiji's introduction of religion
into politics had it's unfortunate consequence, the fault
lay not with Gandhi, but in the fact that we proved to
be unequal to the immanent spirit underlying Gandhiji's
ideal. The spiritualization of politics was certainly
a "fine idea" and no one could reasonably object to the
propriety of incorporating moral values into politics
even today. However, looking around the Punjab tangle
and the unfortunate consequence of religion in politics
which has almost proved to be a Frankenstein monster
sapping the very foundation of our national integrity,
one would certainly feel that intrusion of religion into
politics is a dangerous proposition in our world of
imperfect men. So it would be politically wise to adhere
to the ideal of Subhas and Jawaharlal and the safer and
saner course would be keep religion apart as a private matter of belief and conviction without inviting it to the domain of politics.

(v) ECONOMIC DIMENSION OF NETAJI'S SWARAJ:

A free India was the consuming passion of Subhas Chandra Bose. But over and above, he dreamt of an India that should be modern, progressive, happy and great. During his Cambridge days, he could not fail to realize that India was centuries behind the advanced nations of the West in the sphere of material progress and prosperity. If it was to catch up with the advanced nations and progress rapidly, it could not close its eyes to the why and how of progress registered in advanced nations. So he thought, of India taking up "modern methods, both in the economic and in political spheres". This flair for progress—progress all round and rapid—led him to expound views which ran counter to the ideas and outlook of the Mahatma.

While delivering his address to the Third session of the All India Youth Congress Calcutta on December, 25, 1928 Subhas said:

"The actual effect of the propaganda carried on by the Sabarmati School of thought is to create a feeling and an impression that modernism is bad, that
large-scale production is an evil, that wants should not be increased, that the standard of living should not be raised, that we must endeavour to the best of our ability to go back to the days of the bullock-cart, and that the soul is so important that physical culture and military training can well be ignored......In India we want to day a philosophy of activism. We must be inspired by robust optimism. We have to live in the present and to adopt ourselves to modern conditions.....we can no longer live in an isolated corner of the world. When India is free, she will have to fight her modern enemies with modern methods, both in the economic and in the political sphere. The days of the bullock-cart are gone and gone for ever. The free world must prepare itself for any eventuality as long as the whole world does not accept wholeheartedly the policy of disarmament".126

This open and fearless denunciation of Gandhian philosophy showed the divergence of outlook in their conception of Swaraj. It may be noted that Mahatma Gandhi emphasized on the ideal of "plain living and high thinking". A life of poverty, suffering, renunciation and ascetism appealed to his spiritual sensibility. His view of civilization and progress consisted not in the "multiplication of wants" or in the achievement of a

higher standard of living" but in the deliberate and voluntary reduction of wants, which promotes real happiness and contentment, and increases the capacity of service". To Subhas, however, an ascetic life of renunciation and abstinence with limited desires could never be advocated as an acceptable national ideal. Such an outlook was untenable to his mind which dreamt of rapid material progress and prosperity for India which ipso facto implied a higher standard of living for its people.

In this respect Jawaharlal Nehru's idea and outlook was almost identical with that of Subhas who together stood for a modern and realistic approach as regards the conception of a national ideal and ideology. In his autobiography Jawaharlal writes; "Personally I dislike poverty and suffering. I do not think they are at all desirable, and they ought to be abolished. Nor do I appreciate ascetic life as a social ideal though it may suit individuals".127 Though not unaware of the evils of modern civilization, Jawaharlal like Subhas could not think of going back to the days of bullock-cart, a return to a life of primitive simplicity and blessedness. He wrote "We can not stop the river of change or cut ourselves

adrift from it, and psychologically we who have eaten of the apple of Eden can not forget that taste and go back to primitiveness.128

If Subhas could not see eye to eye with Gandhi and went to the extent of openly disapproving his ideals and outlook concerning economic policy it was not the superficial and immediate outburst of a rebel. It was the product of an analytical mind, a mind that was not unconcerned with the ideal but which did not forget the real and the pragmatic. When his opinion was solicited on spinning wheel which was a "symbol of non-violence, a symbol of the hearth and the earth, of being rooted in earth and devoted to nature as well as to the village and to village life, to the fields and the forests and meadows of the village" and to a real rural little democracy, the potter's wheel, the stress upon the individuals and the theories of primitive living, Subhas said "with my heart I can only agree with you, Mrs. Kurti but with my head not at all. I wished that I had lived a thousand years ago, then I could fully agree with you. And so would Nehru perhaps. Who would not want to live in paradise? The times are gone however. We must relieve the dreadful poverty, the ignorance and misery of the masses by modern methods of production and the reforms of socialism. For
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the wealth of India lies in the hands of the few".  

Stressing upon the age-long exploitation of the peasantry and his commitment for their liberation and with his avowed goal of the progress and prosperity of the village and the city, Subhas said further; "We have to create a higher standard of living within all castes and classes all over India. Going back into the past, as Gandhiji proposes, is inconceivable. There is absolutely no choice for the present under present conditions... Self-sufficient nations, provinces and villages is not possible. We are starving. Literally millions are dying from hunger. We are crushed and smothered by feudalism, imperialism and capitalism and their common methods of exploitation. We have to do away with them and start on an entirely new basis".  

It may be noted that the Swaraj of Subhas's conception was to champion the interests of the downtrodden and starving millions whose cause was dear to him. He stood for the "Swaraj of the masses" the ideal for which Sri C. R. Das stood and fought. Though Subhas was straightforward and frank in expounding his ideas and ideals, he did not altogether reject Gandhi's ideal of rural democracy for what it was worth. As he said
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"Much later perhaps in a hundred years or so, when the marriage of industry and science has increased production and improved conditions to a degree now inconceivable - in a hundred years. I say, when a high standard of living has been established for all, then we may create a society based on the maximum spiritual and psychic development of the individual.\(^{131}\) In the modern age of science and technology with its accent on material progress and prosperity as the elan vital, Gandhi's limited and ascetic outlook of life seemed back dated and inadequate to Subhas. He was pragmatic and realistic in his ideas and outlook that conformed to the contemporary trend and spirit.

In 1938, Subhas was elected President of the Indian National Congress for its fifty-first session to be held at Haripura. In his Presidential address of February 19, 1938, he expounded his ideas of post-independence reconstruction. His stress on comprehensive economic planning, industrialisation, family limitation and socialism further marked his divergence of outlook from the Mahatma. He said: "I have no doubt in my mind that our chief National problems relating to the eradication of poverty, illiteracy and disease and to scientific production and distribution, can be effectively tackled only along socialistic lines. The very first thing which

\(^{131}\) Ibid., p.35.
our future national government will have to do would be to set up a commission for drawing up a comprehensive plan of reconstruction.\textsuperscript{132}

Stressing upon the need of family limitation in a free India Subhas further said "with regard to the long-period programme for a free India, the first problem to tackle is that of our increasing population.\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots if the population goes up by leaps and bounds as it has done in the recent past our plans are likely to fail through.\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots It is not necessary at this stage to prescribe the methods that should be adopted to prevent a further increase in population but I would urge that public attention be drawn to this question."\textsuperscript{133} Regarding eradication of poverty, Subhas was forthright in the courage of his convictions. Said he: "That will require radical reform of our land system, including the abolition of land lordism. Agricultural indebtedness will have to be liquidated and provision made for cheap credit for the rural population.\ldots\ldots\ldots Agriculture will have to be put on a scientific basis with a view to increasing the yield from the land."\textsuperscript{134}

Realizing that agricultural improvement was not enough for India's economic progress he said:

\textsuperscript{132} Selected Speeches of Subhas Chandra Bose, \textit{Op.Cit.,p.75.}
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"A comprehensive scheme of industrial development under State ownership and state control will be indispensable....However much we may dislike modern industrialism and condemn the evils which follow in its train, we can not go back to the pre-industrial era even if we desire to do so. It is well, therefore, that we should reconcile ourselves to industrialization and devise means to minimize its evils and at the same time explore the possibilities of reviving cottage industries where there is a possibility of their surviving the inevitable completion of factories.........Last but not the least, the state on the advice of a planning commission will have to adopt a comprehensive scheme for gradually socializing our entire agricultural and industrial system in the spheres of both production and distribution".\(^{135}\)

Still another aspect of his economic Swaraj concerning national reconstruction was his stress on the "aid of science and scientists". By August 1938 Subhas believed that Swaraj was no longer a dream or an ideal to be attained in distant future. On the contrary he felt quite optimistic that we were "within the sight of power". His mind was now working for independent national reconstruction. That could only be possible "with the aid of science and our scientists".\(^{136}\) In his Presidential address

\(^{135}\) Ibid.,pp.76-77.
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at the third general meeting of the Indian science News Association he said "Though I do not rule out cottage industries and though I hold that every attempt should be made to preserve and also revive cottage industries wherever possible, I maintain that economic planning for India should mean largely planning for the industrialization of India". Though all Congressmen did not share his flair for industrialisation, Subhas put forward his own arguments to go for it. It was necessary, he said, for solving our problem of unemployment, for improving the standard of living of the people and also for competing with the foreign industries. Over and above, socialism to which the rising generation is attracted as the basis of National reconstruction, "Presupposes Industrialization".

It may be pointed out that Gandhi's attitude towards industrialization was in contrast to that of Subhas whereas there is a striking similarity of Subhas's views with that of Jawaharlal Nehru. In 1908, in the Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule, Gandhi severely condemned the modern civilization. "India's salvation consists" he wrote in the Hind Swaraj "in unlearning what she has learnt during the last fifty years". He would have nothing to do with the railways, telegraphs, hospitals, lawyers, law courts and machines. Machinery which was "the chief symbol"

of modern industrial civilization of the West, represented for Mahatma Gandhi "a great sin". He was terribly conscious of the vices of industrialization. Misery inherent in large scale production repelled him. In a country like India with immense manpower, the machines instead of becoming a boon, threw "thousands without work to open streets to die of starvation". Over and above, industrial civilization with its money-making propensities and its attendant vices "sapped our very moral being". So, inspite of all the claimed advantages of industrialization, Gandhi wanted every body to realize "that machinery is bad" and sought for its gradual elimination. However, it would be wrong to say that Gandhi was against all machinery. Replying to a question whether he was against all machinery he said "How can I be when I know that even this body is a most delicate piece of machinery? The spinning wheel is a machine, a little tooth prick is a machine. What I object to is the craze for machinery, not machinery as such. The Craze is for what they call labour-saving machinery. Men go on "saving labour" till thousands are without work and thrown on the open streets to die of starvation. I want to save time and labour, not for a fraction of mankind but for all. I want the concentration of wealth not in the hands of a few, but in the hands of all. Today
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machinery merely helps a few to ride on the backs of millions. The impetus behind it all is not the philanthropy to save labour but greed. It is against this constitution of things that I am fighting with all my might.... The supreme consideration is man. The machine should not tend to atrophy the limbs of man".  

Jawaharlal Nehru was quite aware of the "inherent dangers and vices of industrialization" but nevertheless he appears to be one with Subhas in considering that there is no escape from it in "the present epoch" which is the industrial epoch in modern history". In his letter to Krishna Kripalini from Allahabad dated 29th September, 1939 he wrote: "It is true, I think, that there are certain inherent dangers in big industry and big machine. There is a tendency to concentrate power and I am not quite sure that this can be wholly eliminated. But I cannot conceive of the world or of any progressive country doing away with the big machine. Even if this was possible, this would result in lowering production tremendously and in thus reducing standards of life greatly".  

To sum up, Netaji's political goal bears a deep impress of the ideas and ideals of the Extremist
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Wing of the Indian National Congress. Sri B.G. Tilak and Sri Aurobindo in particular was his "political role model". As it were, he accepted Swaraj as his political goal and also Swaraj not in the sense of dominion status or self-government within the British empire but Swaraj implying nothing short of complete Independence with severance of British connection.

Subhas plea for Swaraj was based on definite considerations arrived at through a process of intellectual conviction. In his view, if India shall be free and shall attain Swaraj, it is not merely to release India from the Yoke of servitude, not only because Swaraj as such is the "sovereign remedy of all ills, not merely because it would herald an era of freedom for the "crucified continents of Asia and Africa", She must win Swaraj for the sake of humanity at large "she must save herself today for it is for her to save the wider world". As a matter of fact, Subhas had great faith in a messianic role of mother India, that it was destined to enrich the world by some unique contribution to the culture and civilization of the world.

Subhas's vision of Swaraj moved beyond the realization of political freedom or national independence. He was the veritable champion of a vision of freedom which was almost complete, comprehensive and all round.
That, apart, in his vision of Swaraj, Subhas dreamt of a modern, progressive, happy and great India taking to the path of socialism, as its model of development. He stressed upon comprehensive economic planning, industrialization, family limitation and socialism.

Last but not the least Subhas's vision of Swaraj precluded the mixing up of religion and politics. As a matter of fact, Subhas was disclined to such intermingling from the standpoint of India's larger and long term interest. In his view religion and mysticism should not dominate politics and "political affairs should be guided by political, economic and scientific considerations." Subhas believed that India's political salvation lies in the growth of a spirit of "sane rationalism and in the modernisation of the material aspect of life."