CONCLUSION
The Civil Disobedience Movement led by the Indian National Congress was one of the most powerful and widespread mass movements in modern times and it succeeded in enhancing the prestige and strength of the Indian national movement to an unprecedented level even though it did not achieve its immediate objective of complete independence. At Lahore, the Congress had set complete independence as the objective of its struggle. The ultimate termination of the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1934 or the 'pause' in 1931 did not signify the cessation of that struggle or the diminution, in any manner of its objective. The struggle for independence continued even after that and the Civil Disobedience Movement was terminated in April, 1934. It was perhaps the most significant or decisive battle in the long drawn out war that the national movement had waged against imperialism.

The period under study, January 1930 to April 1934, witnessed a remarkable spread of nationalist ideas and the strengthening of the position of the Congress vis-a-vis the colonial government among the mass of the Indian people. Many new groups which had remained untouched by nationalism earlier came under its influence in this period and became strong adherents of the Congress. As a result of this, there was a manifold increase in the number of its members and sympathisers. If we compare this support base of the Congres
with that of the movement in 1920-21, we would find a remarkable progress of the Indian National Movement. Although it is very difficult to determine the actual figure of the Congress supporters in any period, the number of persons arrested during the agitations can be taken as one measure of the support to the movement at different conjunctures. During the Non-Cooperation Movement around 30,000 persons were arrested all over India while during the Civil Disobedience Movement some 60,000 satyagrahis were arrested in less than a year, in 1930-31, and at least 1,20,000 were arrested during the fifteen months from January, 1932 to March, 1933.¹

Moreover, the movement had not only widened its base but considerably deepened its roots. The most remarkable was the expansion of the Congress organization in the rural areas. Most of the members of its Volunteers Corps came from rural areas. For example, in Allahabad district, out of a total of 679 political prisoners mentioned by Swatantrata Sangram Ko Sainik, only 179 were the residents of the city and the rest were from rural areas. Again, a UP Government survey in early 1932 indicates that of the 2004 political prisoners surveyed, 1397 were 'petty tenants or labourers'.² We have seen how the number of villages which had hoisted Congress flags,

increased phenomenally in this period. Further, the success of the Congress in collecting huge amounts of money in rural areas, as gate money charged for its meetings, also reflects its popularity in these areas.

In the urban areas, the groups which figured most prominently in the agitations were students and businessmen. The students, however, were the most active participants of the movement in the urban areas of the province though unlike during Non-Cooperation Movement, we do not get many examples of students leaving their studies for participating in the Movement; their participation, however, continued using a series of new forms. Among the students, those of the National educational institutions and BHU were the most outstanding in their activities in the agitations and in social work.

The businessmen played an important role in sustaining the Movement in the province. Although there are very few instances of their participation in the movement in a manner that involved going to jail, their support to the Congress and the Movement in numerous other ways, viz., swadeshi, hartal, fund raising etc., was of immense importance. Even though the Movement resulted in great financial loss to them, they never complained about this nor did they ask the Congress for any kind of compromise with the Government which would weaken the movement. A remarkable aspect regarding their support was that it was generally spontaneous and not under any compulsion or any hope of receiving short term benefit or 'patronage' from the movement's leaders. There is
also no evidence that they made any 'deals' with the Government behind the back of the Congress.

Other urban classes like lawyers, teachers and government officials also supported the movement, though again, their participation took forms which were different from the ones adopted during the Non-Cooperation Movement. Their support this time was largely confined to activities which did not involve a direct confrontation with the Government. This kind of supporters were the largest in the urban centres. It was their constant support to the boycott programme that resulted in the substantial decline in the sale of foreign cloth and other goods.

The kind of participation and support that this movement received from the various classes of Indian people was the result of long years of political propaganda and constructive work of the Congress among the masses. It was this political and ideological work that had exposed the real face of the colonial Government to the masses who began to realise that the removal of foreign rule was the only answer to their miseries. They also realized that the belief assiduously cultivated by the colonial government that their rule was not only benevolent but also invincible was a myth and that it could be challenged by the people if they tried to do so in an organized manner. To this extent, Congress was largely successful in undermining the imperialist ideological hegemony over the Indian people and creating conditions which overcome their political passivity.
The one area in which the Congress suffered a set-back was the mobilization of Muslims. Throughout the period under study, the Muslim, in general held themselves away from the movement. This was in sharp contrast to their large scale participation in the anti-government agitations in 1920-22. In the Civil Disobedience Movement, the appeals of communal Muslim leaders combined with the active government encouragement of communal dissension proved to be more effective and restrained the larger section of the Muslims from joining hands with nationalist forces led by the Congress. This attitude of Muslims was also the outcome of the political and other developments of the 1920s which had resulted in the spread of mutual fear and hatred among the masses of Hindus and Muslims. The riots of early 1931 at various places in UP and especially at Kanpur further aggravated this trend.

***

One remarkable feature of the Civil Disobedience Movement was the complete hold of the Congress over the people. This was especially evident at the time of the suspension of the Movement in March, 1931 after the 'Gandhi-Irwin Truce'. Around this time the agitation in the urban areas had sharply declined but the 'no-rent movement' in the rural areas was still going strong. However, the orders of
the Congress Committees regarding the termination of the agitation were obeyed everywhere without any significant protest or demonstrations. Again, later in 1931 when the Congress was engaged in negotiations with the Government on the question of remission of rent and revenue and the peasants were showing signs of restiveness, the Congressmen were successful in holding them back from coming into direct conflict with the Government. Their strategy was to gain as much remission as they could from the Government through peaceful negotiations. Nevertheless, when the talks failed to provide any substantial remission, they gave a call to the peasants to withhold all payments of rent and revenue. Their call was immediately responded to by most of the peasants. In other words, the Congress was able to have its cadre and followers at the grass roots level respond to the strategic design of the movement as a whole and the consequent changing nuances in its programmes. It was thus saved the embarrassment of sections of its followers, taking a narrow short-term view, challenging the overall course taken by the movement.

***

Beginning with the celebrations of 'Independence Day' on 26 January 1930 till April 1934 when the agitations were finally withdrawn, the Civil Disobedience passed through two
phases of vigorous mass agitation. These two phases were intersected by a phase of passive struggle from March to December 1931.

The whole pattern of the Movement from 1930-34 exemplifies a strategy which has been theorised by a contemporary historian as 'struggle-truce-struggle'. In this strategy "a phase of vigorous extra legal mass movement and open confrontation with colonial authority was followed by a phase during which direct confrontation was withdrawn, and political concessions, if any, wrested from the colonial regime were worked and shown to be inadequate". This strategy makes it possible in certain conditions to withdraw open confrontation in favour of 'Truce' when alternate forms of political activity are pursued. The discontinuation of a mass movement at a certain stage may become necessary. Every mass movement, by its very nature, tends to be short lived as unlike the 'cadre' of a movement, the capacity of the masses to sacrifice or face state repression like imprisonment, lathi charges, fines, confiscation of properties, etc., is not unlimited. A time comes in these movements when the intensity starts declining. At this time, the leaders of the movement have to devise certain measures which would not only save the movement from dying a natural death but also enable it to bargain with the opponent on the basis of its strength to extract the maximum gains possible. Also when a stage of

direct confrontation is followed by a passive phase it gives the movement the necessary rest and enables it to consolidate the gains of the movement and gather strength for the next round of struggle.

A similar trend was witnessed during the Civil Disobedience Movement in UP. During the first phase, the agitation which began in January 1930, had started declining in the urban areas from September onwards. In October, the decision of the UPPCC to start a 'no-rent movement' in the rural areas further reduced the agitations in the urban areas. Even the 'no-rent agitations' was not an unqualified success, as shown by Government sources which reported regular payment of rent and revenue. Moreover, the patience of its die hard supporters like businessmen had started to wane towards the latter part of the first phase. The participation of students and other members of the middle class had also gone down by this time. They all appeared tired of regular strikes and agitations and seemed to be in no mood to suffer any more hardships. This fact was realised by the provincial leadership which supported Gandhiji and the central leadership of the Congress in accepting the peace offer of the Government.

In this situation, the argument of some left historians that the 'truce' was the result of the pressure of the capitalist or the bourgeoisie on the Congress seems to be based on preconceived theoretical precepts rather than on
In our study of the province, we do not find even a single instance when an association of businessmen asked the Congress for any kind of compromise with the Government.

Some other historians believe that the signing of the 'provisional settlements' or 'Pact' by the Congress was a betrayal of the cause of the peasants of UP. They say that the Congress which was till then persuading the peasants against paying any rent to the Government suddenly reversed its stance and asked the peasants to pay the rents. However, we have seen earlier that the Pact was considered by the peasants and village level Congress workers as their victory which resulted in almost complete stoppage of the payment of rent. Moreover, the Congress leadership did not give up the cause of the peasants with the signing of the Pact. They demanded the same amount of remission in rent and revenue as they had been proclaiming earlier. To obtain this demand they started negotiations with the government. It was not the giving up of the cause but a change of tactics. Once these tactics failed to fully achieve their objectives, the Congress once again resorted to agitation in December 1931 in favour of the peasants' demands.


5. See Gyanendra Pandey, *op.cit.*
These activities of the Congress during the 'truce' period and its regular work of the boycott of foreign cloth and propagation of Swadeshi and Khadi kept the enthusiasm of the masses intact. This enthusiasm was reflected when the second phase of the movement was launched in January, 1932.

The second round of struggle started in UP a little earlier than the other provinces. The no-rent movement in UP which was started in the first week of December 1931 was ruthlessly suppressed by the Government with the help of the Emergency Powers Ordinance. As a result, most of the important Congress leaders of the province were arrested. Therefore, the second round of the Civil Disobedience Movement began in UP under the leadership of second and third rank Congressmen. Contrary to the experience of the first phase when the arrest of important leaders had affected the intensity of the agitations, the absence of major leaders did not seem to make any major difference during the second phase. This was reflective of perhaps the most important achievement of the Congress, the leading organ of the Indian National Movement - its success overtime in creating a vast body of political activists who were capable of engaging in political activity often using their spontaneous creativity even in situations when they were left leaderless.