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CHAPTER - 8

THE ROLE OF GANDHIJI IN THE INDIAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT
FROM 1919 to 1929

In the last chapter, we have observed that Gandhiji was strongly determined to fight against the injustices and indignities inflicted upon the Indian people by the British Government through unadulterated non-violent methods of Satyagraha. The suspension of the Rowlatt Satyagraha owing to be perverted by violence proves that Gandhiji was so much committed to the theory of non-violence that he became ready to sacrifice even the national interest for the sake of non-violence. In any case, he was not ready to compromise with any type of violence either implicit or explicit, for achieving the Indian national demands. However, he continued to convince the British Government to repeal the Rowlatt Acts and redress the grievances of the Indian people if it wanted to run the administration smoothly. But the British Government did not pay any respectable heed to the demand of Gandhiji providing him justifiable ground for launching the Khilafat and the Non-co-operation Movement to achieve the specific demands.

The Khilafat movement was initially started by the Muslims of India against the British designs aimed at the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire and dismantlement of the Khilafat system through which the Sultan or Emperor of Turkey was enjoying both the temporal as well as the religious powers over the Muslim countries since 16th century.1 Though during the First World War the British Government had pledged to preserve and protect the sanctity of religious institutions of Islam in spite of the fact that Turkey was fighting against the Allies. "... nothing will be done by us or our

Allies in this war which is likely to injure their religious feelings and sentiments. The holy places of Islam shall remain immune from molestation and every care will be taken to respect them. On the ground of such promises the Indian Muslims had helped the British Government during the war. Prof. Vishnoo Bhagwan points out, "To allay the Muslim fears, the Britishers had pledged during Great War that Turkey would not be deprived of its rich lands of Asia Minor and Thrace. Thus whole-hearted co-operation was extended by the Indian Muslims to the Britishers during the war. The end of the war and the subsequent formulation of 'Sevres Treaty' revealed that the Britishers were not going to stand by their promise. It shocked the Indian Muslims. Thus a powerful Khilafat agitation was launched". On the Khilafat question, therefore, all the Indian Muslims were combined against the British. Louis Fischer writes, "The Moslem leaders, notably Mohamed and Shaukat Ali the brothers who were interned by the British during the war, Jinnah, Asaf Ali, and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad had hoped that Indian interest in the Caliph would at least induce England to moderate the peace term imposed on Turkey. But when it became obvious that the Turks would be shorn of their imperial possession and that the Sultan himself would be deposed, concern for the Caliph, mounted on distaste for the British, produced a powerful Caliphate or, as it is always known in India, Khilafat movement". Accordingly, the Muslims of India formed an organisation.

known as the Central Khilafat Committee of India, Bombay whose aims and objects were, "(1) To secure for Turkey a just and honourable peace. (2) To secure the fulfilment of the pledges given by the Right Honourable, Mr. Lloyd George in his speech of the 5th January, 1918 and to preserve the integrity of the Turkish Empire. (3) With a view to securing the above objects to memorialise the British Ministers, H.E. the Viceroy, if necessary, the President of the United States of America".  

However, after the ban on Gandhiji's entry into the Punjab was lifted, Gandhiji quickly proceeded to Punjab to take stock of the situations of the post-Jallianwala Bagh tragedy. In Punjab, the nationalist leaders including Gandhiji boycotted the Hunter Committee and, instead, on behalf of the Indian National Congress appointed a non-official Inquiry Committee to make an investigation into the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. This inquiry committee was consisted of Gandhiji, Motilal Nehru, C.R. Das, Abbas Tyebji and M.R. Jayakar. As Gandhiji delved into the facts and realities related to the atrocities committed by the British Government in Punjab, he was shocked. Gandhiji discloses, "As I proceeded further and further with my inquiry into the atrocities that had been committed on the people, I came across tales of Government's tyranny and the arbitrary despotism of its officers such as I was hardly prepared for, and they filled me with deep pain. What surprised me, and what still continues to fill me with surprise, was the fact that a province that had furnished the largest number of soldiers to the British Government during the war, should have taken all these brutal excesses lying down".  

Nehru, a veteran Congressman and father of Jawaharlal, in the conduct of an independent inquiry into the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. He drafted the report; his colleagues felt he would be without bias".  

However, while Gandhiji was engaged in his work in Punjab, he received a letter of invitation from the Khilafat leaders to come to Delhi to take participation in the Khilafat conference in November, 1919 to discuss the Khilafat question and adopt effective measures for the achievement of the Khilafat demands. As the Hindu-Muslim unity was one of the most important objects of his constructive programme, Gandhiji not only accepted the invitation of the Khilafat leaders but also he became ready to provide whole-hearted unconditional support to the Khilafat agitation. Accordingly, he attended the Delhi Khilafat conference and suggested the Khilafat leaders for the adoption of the method of non-violent non-co-operation against the British Government for the redress of their demands, though at that time Gandhiji could not elaborate the details of the method of non-co-operation. However, he pointed out, "... It is an unalienable right of the people thus to withhold co-operation. We are not bound to retain Government titles and honours, or to continue in Government Service. If Government should betray us in a great cause like the Khilafat, we could not do otherwise than non-co-operate. We are, therefore, entitled to non-co-operate with Government in case of betrayal". The British Government betrayed and the Khilafat Committee at Allahabad in June, 1920 accepted the method of non-violent non-co-operation and asked Gandhiji to lead the Khilafat Movement. "On June 30th, guided by Gandhi, the Khilafat movement sanctioned the policy of

non-co-operation". However, before launching the Non-co-operation Movement against the Khilafat wrongs, Gandhiji communicated his decision to the viceroy. Gandhiji wrote, "I have advised my Mussulman friends to withdraw their support from Your Excellency's Government, and the Hindus to join them, should the Peace Terms not be revised in accordance with solemn pledges of Ministers and the Muslim sentiment". And, "..... Non-co-operation is the only dignified and constitutional form of direct action, for it is the right recognised from times immemorial of the subject to refuse to assist a ruler who misrules". Earlier, Gandhiji had also exhorted the Hindus to support their Muslim brothers on the Khilafat question without any condition and reservation. Louis Fischer writes, "The Moslem Conference in Delhi, in November, 1919, which Gandhi attended, was a Khilafat meeting. Many Hindus were present. This period was the honeymoon of Hindu-Moslem political friendship. The letter of invitation, which reached Gandhi in Lahore, said cow protection as well as the Caliph would be discussed. Gandhi demurred. He told the conference that if, in deference to Hindu regard for the cow as a sacred animal, Mohmmedans wanted to desist from slaughtering it, they should do so irrespective of the Hindu attitude toward the Khilafat question. Similarly, if Hindus believed they ought to support Moslems on behalf of the Caliph they should, but not in the expectation of a bargain on cow protection. The cow, therefore was removed from the agenda". According to Gandhiji two important factors were responsible for his unconditional support to the Khilafat Movement. The first was

the justness of the Khilafat demand and the other was the Hindu-Muslim unity. In his letter to the Viceroy dated 22nd June, 1920, Gandhiji very candidly declared, "As a staunch Hindu wishing to live on terms of the closest friendship with my Mussulman countrymen, I should be an unworthy son of India if I did not stand by them in their hour of trial. In my humble opinion their cause is just".14

But, in spite of the sincere appeal made by Gandhiji to the Viceroy to revise the Peace Terms made with Turkey through which the Turkey Empire was dismembered and was deprived of Caliphate, the British Government remained unmoved. Hence, Gandhiji was forced to launch the Khilafat Movement by resorting to the method of non-violent non-cooperation on 1st August, 1920 to be preceded by fastings and prayers on July 31st. Bipan Chandra reveals, "The movement was launched formally on 1st August 1920, after the expiry of the notice that Gandhiji had given to the Viceroy in his letter of 22 June, ...Lokmania Tilak passed away in the earlier hour of 1 August and the day of mourning and of launching of movement merged as people all over the country observed hartal and took out processions. Many kept a fast and offered prayers".15 The programme of non-violent non-co-operation outlined by Gandhiji included the surrender of all titles of honours and honorary posts, boycott of schools, colleges, courts, councils and foreign cloth. In the implementation of these programmes Gandhiji took the lead by surrendering the Kaiser-i-Hind medal and other decorations conferred on him by the British Government in India as well as in South Africa. While returning these medals and titles of honours, Gandhiji wrote to the Viceroy on 1st August 1920, "I venture to return


these medals in pursuance of the scheme of non-co-operation, inaugurated today in connection with Khilafat Movement. Valuable as these honours have been to me, I cannot wear them with an easy conscience so long as my Mussulman countrymen have to labour under a wrong done to their religious sentiments.

"Events that have happened during the past month have confirmed me in the opinion that the Imperial Government have acted in the Khilafat matter in an unscrupulous, immoral, and unjust manner and have been moving from wrong to wrong in order to defend their immorality. I can retain neither respect nor affection for such a Government.

"Your Excellency's light-hearted treatment of official crime, your exoneration of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Mr. Montagu's despatch, and above all the shameful ignorance of the Punjab events and callous disregard of the feelings of Indians betrayed by the House of Lords have filled me with the gravest misgivings regarding the future of the Empire, have estranged me completely from the present Government and have disabled me from rendering as I have hitherto - whole heartedly tendered - my loyal co-operation.

"In my humble opinion the ordinary method of agitating by way of petitions, deputations, and the like is no remedy for moving to repentance a Government so hopelessly indifferent to the welfare of its charge as the Government of India has proved to be. In European countries condonation of such grievous wrongs as Khilafat and the Punjab would have resulted in a bloody revolution by the people. They would have resisted, at all costs, national emasculation. Half of India is too weak to offer violent resistance, and the other half is unwilling to do so. I have, therefore ventured to suggest the remedy of non-co-operation, which enables those who wish to dissociate themselves from Government....."16

In this way, we observe that Gandhiji changed from a co-operator to non-co-operator owing to the British Government's pursuit of immoral and undemocratic acts, particularly, committed in the shape of the Khilafat wrongs and the Punjab atrocities. And by supporting the Muslims of India in their Khilafat movement, Gandhiji tried his best to bring a union between the Muslims and Hindus and built up a strong mass following behind him with the help of Muslim leaders like the Ali brothers, Maulana Abdul Bari, Hakim Ajmal Khan, and others. Gandhiji was extremely successful in mobilizing the public opinion of both Hindus and Muslims all over India against the atrocities and injustices committed by the British Government through the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. The united front of Hindus and Muslims forged in the Khilafat movement provided strong fillip to the leadership of Gandhiji in the Indian National Movement. V.T. Patil has rightly observed, "The starting of the Khilafat Movement in 1919 and Gandhi's participation in it was symbolic of his rapid emergence on the all-India scene as one of the most important leaders professing a style of politics and leadership different from that of others. During the Rowlatt Satyagraha Gandhi had opted for hartal and limited Civil Disobedience, but in the Khilafat Movement he went further by organising a mass political protest Movement involving the withdrawal of co-operation with the government. At one stroke Gandhi provided a new dimension to the theory and practice of struggle against entrenched imperialist authority. From limited politics, to limited opposition Gandhi moved to mass protest and mass opposition through the Khilafat Movement.

"Gandhi succeeded in attracting the Muslim intelligentsia and masses to the national cause. At one remove Gandhi had attracted communities and groups who were kept away from institutional politics. The fact of the matter was that after the Khilafat Movement Gandhi was in a unique position to get the joint support of the Hindu and Muslim
masses. This was a good augury for the success of some of the Movements launched by Gandhi in later years."\(^{17}\)

Till now, Gandhiji had not used the platform of the Indian National Congress and carried on his non-violent struggle against the British injustices almost singlehandedly. Though he was close to the Home Rule Leaguers but he had declined to join the Home Rule Leagues. However, on repeated insistence from the Home Rule Leaguers, Gandhiji did accept the presidency of the Home Rule League only in April, 1920, at Bombay and in October he changed the name of the Home Rule League to "Swarajya Sabha" and accordingly he changed its constitution to incorporate into it the methods of non-violence and the goal of Swarajya of people's choice without any British connection. Following this change, Mr. Jinnah who was an active member of the Home Rule League resigned from the organisation.\(^{18}\) Thus, on the one side the popularity of Gandhiji was rising in the Indian National Movement as the sole leader of the masses, while on the other side, the popularity of the Indian National Congress among the masses was declining very fastly. The Congress itself was becoming sceptical of its constitutional means and pro-British stand. Because, the report of the Hunter Committee had not awarded any punishment to Gen. Dyer for the crime of Jallianwala Bagh massacre.\(^{19}\) "The Hunter Report fully demonstrated Dyer's guilt, yet recommended no measures against the Dyerism of British rulers in India".\(^{20}\) Gandhiji who had used his good offices in preparing the Congress to accept the Montford Reforms at the Amritsar session in


\(^{19}\) Bipan Chandra and Others, *India's Struggle for Independence*, op.cit., p. 185.

December 1919 as a gesture of co-operation and goodwill had also lost faith in the British sense of justice after the announcement of the Hunter Report. Therefore, he turned to be a non-cooperator as we have seen in his historical letter to the Viceroy of 1st August 1920 in which he declared his non-violent non-co-operation movement against the Khilafat and Punjab wrongs by surrendering his decorations, medals and titles of honour conferred on him by the British Government for his services as a sign of his loyalty to the British Empire. Gandhiji asserted, "co-operation is a duty only so long as Government protects your honour, and non-co-operation is an equal duty when the Government instead of protecting robs you of your honour".

The combined effects of Gandhiji's rising popularity among the Indian masses, and the continued British oppressions and exploitations compelled the Indian National Congress to consider the adoption of the programme of the non-violent non-co-operation of Gandhiji. At this juncture, Gandhiji was also eager to join the Congress. Ultimately, with his strong Hindu-Muslim support both within and outside the Congress, Gandhiji moved his resolution on the non-violent non-co-operation and got it passed at the Calcutta special session of the Congress in September 1920. However, this resolution on the non-co-operation movement included three demands, i.e., the demands for the redress of the Khilafat wrong, the Punjab wrong and the demand for the establishment of Swarajya. The resolution ran as follows, "The Congress is of opinion that there can be no contentment in India without redress of two aforementioned wrongs (Khilafat and Punjab) and the only effectual means to

---

vindicate national honour and to prevent repetition of similar wrongs in future is establishment of Swarajya. This Congress is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent non-co-operation until the said wrongs are righted and Swarajya is established. For the implementation of the non-violent non-co-operation, the Indian people were asked to:

A. surrender titles, honorary offices and nominated seats;
B. refuse to attend official functions, ceremonies and Darbars;
C. withdraw gradually from Government colleges and schools; and to establish national institutions to replace them;
D. boycott British courts and to establish private arbitration courts;
E. refuse to offer as recruits for service in Mesopotamia;
F. withdraw candidates from elections to the reformed councils and abstain from voting; and G. Boycott foreign goods and to adopt Swadeshi.

The resolution of the non-violent non-co-operation containing the above recommendations passed by the Calcutta special session was ratified by the annual session of the Congress at Nagpur in December 1920. The Nagpur session also passed Gandhiji's resolutions for the adoption and implementation of his constructive programme. Thus, the Congress became fully affiliated with the non-violent policies and programmes of Gandhiji giving him full support for launching, propagating and directing his non-violent non-co-operative struggle against the British exploitative system all over India from its platform. Gandhiji also brought a radical change in the constitutional structure of

25. Ibid.
Congress making it dynamic, democratic and functional in true sense of the terms. The base of the Congress support was widened to bring the people in large number from the remotest areas within the fold of the Congress. Louis Fischer writes, "With Tilak gone, Gandhi was undisputed leader of Congress. A special session of Congress, which met at Calcutta between September 4 and 9, 1920, approved the non-co-operation movement. The annual convention at Nagpur, Central India, in December, unanimously confirmed this approval; Gandhi then offered a resolution making the goal of Congress Swarajya, or self-rule, within the British Empire if possible or outside it if necessary. Mr. Jinnah, and others, preferred home-rule within the Empire. They lost. Jinnah lost interest in Congress. Gandhi politics were Congress politics.

"The Nagpur session adopted a new Congress constitution drafted by Gandhi. Congress had been a golden dome without underpinnings. Gandhi converted it into a democratic mass organization with village units, city district units, provincial sections, an All-India Congress Committee (A.I.C.C.) of 350 members which made policy, and a working, or Executive, Committee of fifteen".26

Thus, by getting his non-violent non-co-operation endorsed by the Congress and by changing its constitution, Gandhiji converted the Congress into a non-violent revolutionary organization and, thus, injected a new political spirit into the Indian National Movement. From January 1921, the non-violent non-co-operation movement started to gain its momentum very rapidly. Almost all communities, and sections and classes of the Indian people - Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, peasants, workers, students, teachers, and lawyers began to non-co-operate with the British Government in their respective fields of life bringing the government machinaries

to a Stand-Still. Bipan Chandra discloses, "The adoption of the Non-Cooperation Movement (initiated earlier by Khilafat Conference) by the Congress gave a new energy and, from January 1921, it began to register considerable success all over the country. Gandhiji along with Ali brothers (who were foremost Khilafat leaders), undertook a nation-wide tour during which he addressed hundreds of meetings and met a large number of political workers. In the first month itself thousands of students (90000 according to one estimate) left schools and colleges and join more than 800 national schools and colleges that had sprung up all over the country. The educational boycott was particularly successful in Bengal, where the students in Calcutta triggered off a province wide strike to force the managements of their institutions to disaffiliate themselves from the Government. C.R. Das played a major role in promoting the movement and Subhash Bose became the principal of the National College in Calcutta. The Swadeshi spirit was revived with new vigour, this time as part of a nation-wide struggle. Punjab, too, responded to the educational boycott and was second only to Bengal, Lala Lajpat Rai playing a leading part here despite his initial reservations about this item of the programme. Other areas that were active were Bombay, U.P., Bihar, Orissa and Assam. Madras remained lukewarm.

"The boycott of law courts by lawyers was not as successful as the educational boycott, but it was very dramatic and spectacular. Many leading lawyers of the country, like C.R. Das, Motilal Nehru, M.R. Jayakar, Saifuddin Kitchlew, Vallabhai Patel, C. Rajagopalachari, T. Prakasam and Asaf Ali gave up lucrative practices, and their sacrifice became a source of inspiration for many. In numbers again Bengal led, followed by Andhra Pradesh, U.P., Karnataka and Punjab.

"But, perhaps, the most successful item of the programme was the boycott of foreign cloth. Volunteers would
go from house to house collecting clothes made of foreign cloth, and the entire community would collect to light a bonfire of the goods".  

In this connection Gandhiji made his stand clear by pointing out, "In burning my foreign clothes I burn my shame... my modesty has prevented me from declaring from the house-top that the message of non-cooperation, non-violence and Swadeshi is a message to the world.... our non-co-operation is neither with the English nor with the West. Our non-co-operation is with the system the English have established, with the material civilisation and its attendant greed and exploitation of the weak. Our non-co-operation is a retirement within ourselves". Thus by discarding and burning foreign clothes, Gandhiji was attempting to transfer the hatred, resentment, animosity and ill-will of the Indians against the British from man to things. As a substitute, Gandhiji emphasised to wear only hand-spun clothes and for this the people were advised to spin and weave. Louis Fischer writes, "As the flames ate their way through the imported goods, Gandhi would tell his audiences that they must not substitute Indian mill products for foreign manufactures; they must learn to spin and weave. Gandhi took to spinning half an hour a day, usually before the midday meal, and required all his associates to do likewise. Before long, few Indians dared to come into his presence wearing anything but home-spun".

However, with the lapse of time, the Khilafat-Congress combined movement of non-violent non-co-operation went on covering new fields and areas. In many parts of India, such as the Avadh in U.P., Guntur in Andhra, Midnapur in Bengal, Malabar in Kerala and in some other parts of Assam

and Rajasthan, the peasants intensified their no-tax movements and their campaign against illegal revenues and arbitrary rent enhancements. In Assam and Bengal there were labourers' strikes on the tea plantations and in the Railways, resulting in frequent clashes with the police which resorted unjustifiable firings on several places. Defiance of forest laws were also committed. Bipan Chandra points out, "the spirit of unrest and defiance of authority engendered by the Non-cooperation movement contributed to the rise of many local movements in different parts of the country, movements which did not often adhere strictly either to the programme of the Non-cooperation Movement or even to the policy of non-violence". But Gandhiji did not miss any opportunity for preaching the true meaning of non-violent non-cooperation. He again and again reminded the people of India to be non-violent even in the face of the severest type of provocation from the Government. In speeches after speeches and in editorials after editorials, Gandhiji explained to the people the real nature and meaning of this movement. He told the people, "Non-co-operation in the sense used by me must be non-violent and therefore neither punitive nor vindictive nor based on malice, ill-will or hatred". Again, "the movement of non-co-operation is nothing but an attempt to isolate the brute force of British from all the trapping under which it is hidden and to show that brute-force by itself cannot for one single moment hold India".

However, the British Government who was initially unable to deal with the non-violent non-co-operators, particularly with the front leaders of the Khilafat

30. Ibid., p. 190.
31. Young India, 25.08.1920.
Non-co-operation Movement, began to suppress the movement first by arresting Mohamed Ali, one of the founding leaders of the Khilafat movement. Because he had declared on 8th July at the All India Khilafat Conference held at Karachi that it was a religious duty of the Muslims to discontinue their services in the British Army. Bipan Chandra writes, "As a result, Mohammed Ali, along with other leaders, was immediately arrested. In protest, the speech was repeated at innumerable meetings all over the country. On 4 October, forty-seven leading Congressmen, including Gandhiji, issued a manifesto repeating whatever Mohammad Ali had said and added that every civilian and member of the armed forces should sever connections with the repressive Government. The next day, the Congress Working Committee passed a similar resolution, and on 16 October, Congress Committees all over the country held meetings at which the same resolution was adopted. The Government was forced to ignore the whole incident, and accept the blow to its prestige".33

However, in spite of Gandhiji's best effort to keep the non-co-operators away from indulging into violence which was according to Gandhiji, a sort of co-operation with the Government, the people of Bombay went on rioting against those who had participated in the welcome function given in favour of the Prince of Wales. The Bombay riot provided a legal, if not moral, justification to the Government for unleashing a reign of terror on the followers as well as on the leaders of the Khilafat-Non-co-operation Movement. The Bombay riot changed the equation of the war of position in favour of the British Government who started to destroy the non-co-operation movement by arresting the non-co-operators and their leaders without any solid justifications of their crime. Gandhiji who was fully aware of the British immorality

and brutality and their method of dealing a people's movement was extremely puzzled over the outbreak of mob violence and, therefore, tried his best to bring the situation under his control by resorting to fasting for three days. Bipan Chandra discloses, "The next dramatic event was the visit of the Prince of Wales which began on 17 November, 1921. The day the Prince landed in Bombay was observed as a day of hartal all over the country. In Bombay, Gandhiji himself addressed a mammoth meeting in the compound of the Elphinstone Mill owned by the nationalist Umar Shobhani, and lighted a huge bonfire of foreign cloth. Unfortunately, however, clashes occurred between those who had gone to attend the welcome function and the crowd returning from Gandhiji's meeting. Riots followed, in which Parsis, Christians, Anglo-Indians became special targets of attack as identifiable loyalists. There was police firing, and the three-day turmoil resulted in fifty-nine dead. Peace returned only after Gandhiji had been on fast for three days. The whole sequence of events left Gandhiji profoundly disturbed and worried about the likelihood of recurrence of violence once mass civil disobedience was sanctioned".34

Though earlier in May 1921, the Viceroy Lord Reading had discussions with Gandhiji to make compromise, but the discussions proved to be failure owing to the refusal of Gandhiji to concede to the demands of Lord Reading "to ask the Ali brothers to withdraw from their speeches those passages that contained suggestions of violence; this was an attempt to drive a wedge between the Khilafat leaders and Gandhiji, but it failed. By December, the Government felt that things were really going to far and announced a change of policy by declaring the volunteers corps illegal and arresting all those who claimed to be its members.

34. Ibid., p. 189.
"C.R. Das was among the first to be arrested, followed by his wife Basantidebi, whose arrest so insensed the youth of Bengal that thousands came forward to court arrest. In the next two months, over 30,000 people were arrested from all over the country, and soon only Gandhiji out of the top leaders remained out of jail. In mid-December, there was an abortive attempt at negotiations, initiated by Malaviya, but the conditions offered were such that it meant sacrificing the Khilafat leaders, a course that Gandhiji would not accept. In any case, the Home Government had already decided against a settlement and ordered the Viceroy, Lord Reading, to withdraw from negotiations. Repression continued, public meetings and assemblies were banned, newspapers gagged, and midnight raids on Congress and Khilafat offices became common.\textsuperscript{35} Prof. Vishnoo Bhagwan reveals, "The failure of the government to come to terms with the Congress further deteriorated the situation. The machinery of repression was let loose. The orders to "repress without hesitation" were issued to all local authorities. Before the end of 1921, all the top most leaders except Gandhi were imprisoned. About fifty thousand arrests were made on political grounds. Public meetings were banned."\textsuperscript{36}

Thus, the Government was all out to suppress the Khilafat Non-co-operation Movement by resorting to lawless repressive measures in a very undemocratic manner. The Government, by misusing the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Seditious Meetings Act, created a situation worse than martial law in which all fundamental civil liberties including the freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of the press were gagged and paralysed. Gandhiji was highly critical of the Government's unconstitutional and undemocratic methods of dealing with the non-co-operators

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., pp. 190-91.

\textsuperscript{36} Prof. Vishnoo Bhagwan, \textit{Constitutional History of India and National Movement}, op.cit., p. 172.
and civil resisters. Therefore, "At its Ahmedabad session held towards the end of December, the Congress resolved to start "Civil Disobedience Movement" with Mahatma Gandhi as the sole executive authority. On February 1, 1922, Gandhi wrote a letter to the Governor-General intimating him of his intentions to start 'no tax campaign' unless the government gave ample proof of its sincerity and change of heart within seven days, by releasing non-violent non-cooperating prisoners and announcing a policy of absolute non-interference with all non-violent activities". Louis Fischer points out, "Gandhi preferred to try mass civil disobedience in one area and he chose the country of Bardoli, population 87,000, near Bombay, where he could personally supervise the experiment. On February 1, 1922, Gandhi informed Reading of this plan ".

By declaring his plan of launching a non-violent mass civil disobedience of non-payment of land revenue in Bardoli at a time when the Government's terror in the form of repressive measures was at height, Gandhiji was, in fact, trying to arouse and strengthen the feelings of fearlessness, self-sacrifice, self-suffering, self-injury and self-respect among the people of India in order to change the hard and vindictive attitudes of the Government. Gandhiji made it clear to the Government, "no matter how you repress us, we shall one day wring reluctant repentance from you; and we ask you to think betimes, and take care what you are doing, and see that you do not make the three hundred millions of India your eternal enemies". Gandhiji was trying to prove to the

40. Quoted in Ibid., p. 197.
Government that India was neither coward nor violent. Rather India was brave and non-violent having tremendous capacity to suffer non-violently for the cause of winning Swarajya. If the Government would not, "Discharge the fatwa prisoners, discharge political prisoners against whom convictions exist or prosecutions are pending under the ordinary law or under the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Seditious Meetings Act"\(^{41}\), then the people of India under the leadership of Gandhiji would launch a non-violent mass civil disobedience in Bardoli and would suffer the consequences peacefully and patiently. But the Government declined to release the political prisoners and, therefore, Gandhiji was forced to launch the civil disobedience movement in Bardoli. But while Gandhiji was busy in the preparations for launching the civil disobedience movement, a fateful incident occurred at Chauri Chaura which changed the entire course of action of Gandhiji. On February 5, 1922, a procession belonging to the Khilafat Non-co-operation Movement under grave provocation from the police set fire to the police station at Chauri Chaura burning and killing 21 policemen.\(^{42}\) Gandhiji called this violent incident as the crime of Chauri Chaura and looking upon the incident as a "divine warning" promptly retraced his steps. As soon as Gandhiji received the news of mob violence, he became extremely sad and worried and immediately called off the entire movement of the non-co-operation including the Khilafat movement. At the instance of Gandhiji, the Congress Working Committee passed resolutions on February 12 which indefinitely suspended all forms of non-co-operation and civil disobedience movement against the British Government and advised the people to concentrate on the constructive programme of non-violence.\(^{43}\) Bipan Chandra writes, "The

---

\(^{41}\) Quoted by K. Gopalaswamy, *Gandhi and Bombay*, op.cit., p. 175.

\(^{42}\) *Young India*, 16.12.1922.

\(^{43}\) *The CWMG*, vol. 22, pp. 377-82.
Viceroy was unmoved and, left with no choice, Gandhiji announced that mass civil disobedience would begin in Bardoli taluqa of Surat district, and that all other parts of country should cooperate by maintaining total discipline and quiet so that the entire attention of the movement could be concentrated on Bardoli. But Bardoi was destined to wait for another six years before it could launch a no-tax movement. Its fate was decided by the action of members of a Congress and Khilafat procession in Chauri Chaura in Gorakhpur district of U.P. on 5 February 1922. Irritated by the behaviour of some policemen, a section of the crowd attacked them. The police opened fire. At this, the entire procession attacked the police and when the latter hid inside the police station, set fire to the building. Policemen who tried to escape were hacked to pieces and thrown into the fire. In all twenty-two policemen were done to death. On hearing of the incident, Gandhiji decided to withdraw the movement. He also persuaded the Congress Working Committee to ratify his decision and thus, on 12 February 1922, the Non-cooperation Movement came to an end.44

The withdrawal of the non-co-operation movement by Gandhiji at a time when the movement was at its peak, was highly resented and criticised by many important nationalist leaders like Motilal Nehru, C.R. Das, Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhas Bose and others. But Gandhiji strongly and confidently defended his decision. He very boldly and candidly declared, "Let the opponent glory in our humiliation and so-called defeat. It is better to be charged with cowardice than to be guilty of denial of our oath and sin against God. It is a million times better that I should be the laughingstock of the world than that I should act insincerely towards myself.... I know that the drastic reversal of practically
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the whole of the aggregate programme may be politically unsound and unwise but there is no doubt that it is religiously sound. What is morally wrong cannot be politically right".\(^4^5\) As Gandhiji was waging a moral war of position against the immoral and exploitative system of the British, he was trying to defeat the prestige of exploitation and violence with the help of the non-violent weapons. Therefore, he was not ready to allow the people to use violence which ultimately would provide the British a justifiable ground to crush and demoralize the non-violent popular movement very easily. Besides, the use of violence, under any provocation against the British was likely to create popular opinion in favour of the British which Gandhiji did not want. Rather, he wanted the British to use violence against the peaceful and non-violent non-co-operators so that the British would lose the popular national and international support and, thus, would be compelled to do justice to the Indians by conceding their demand of Swarajya without any bloodshed. He wanted to protect both the Britishers as well as the Indians from physical elimination by bloodshed, thereby, leaving behind a history of bitterness and ill-will. Moreover, for Gandhiji politics, religion, truth, non-violence and morality all were convertible terms through which he wanted to attain both external as well as internal Swarajya. His aim of non-violent struggle was two-dimensional - to win freedom from the British yoke and to moralise the people of India and Indian politics in order to establish the Ramrajya or the Divine Rule after the withdrawal of the British from India. And the latter was more dear to him than the former. He did not wish merely to transfer the corrupt and exploitative system of the British to the corrupt and immoral men belonging to India. To make a difference, Gandhiji wanted to make the people of India non-violent.

\(^4^5\) Young India, 16.02.1922.
truthful, religious, moral and brave in true sense of the terms in order to create an atmosphere of good-will and mutual trust which are essential for the development of true civilization.

Hence, Gandhiji condemned the violence at Chauri Chaura and called off the non-co-operation movement taking the entire responsibility in his name and in the name of the Congress Working Committee. And he undertook a five-days fast saying, "I must undergo personal cleansing. I must become a fitter instrument, able to register the slightest variation in the moral atmosphere around me". Bipan Chandra explains Gandhiji's motives when he writes, "By taking the onus of withdrawal on himself and on the Working Committee, Gandhiji was protecting the movement from likely repression, and the people from demoralization. True, the withdrawal itself led to considerable demoralization, especially of the active political workers, but it is likely that the repression and crushing of the movement (as happened in 1932) would have led to even greater demoralization..... It is necessary to remember that, after all, the Non-Cooperation Movement was the first attempt at an all-India mass struggle against the British, and a serious reverse at this elementary stage could have led to a prolonged period of demoralization and passivity". Therefore, Gandhiji withdrew and withdrew in a respectable and dignified fashion and, thereby, provided a breathing space "to consolidate, recuperate and gather strength for the next round of struggle, and that, therefore, withdrawal or shift to a phase of non-confrontation is an inherent part of a strategy of political action that is based on the masses. Withdrawal is not tantamount to betrayal; it is an inevitable part of the strategy itself". Again Bipan
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Chandra writes, "Of course, whether or not the withdrawal was made at the correct time can always be a matter of open debate. But perhaps Gandhiji had enough reasons to believe that the moment he chose was the right one. The movement had already gone on for over a year, the government was in no mood for negotiations, and Chauri Chaura presented an opportunity to retreat with honour, before the internal weaknesses of the movement became apparent enough to force a surrender or make the retreat look like a rout". 49

However, in spite of Gandhiji's condemnation of the mob violence committed to by the non-cc-operators at Chauri Chaura and in spite of Gandhiji's suspension of the defiance of government laws, the British Government did not show any sign of softness. Rather, the Government continued to repress the non-co-operators and at last ordered the arrest of Gandhiji on 1st March 1922. On 10th March 1922 Gandhiji was arrested on the charges of Seditious and after the 'Great Trial' on 18th March 1922 Gandhiji was sentenced to six year's simple imprisonment. 50 And with the arrest of Gandhiji the Non-co-operation-Khilafat Movement came to a virtual end.

Though the British Government had been successful in suppressing the Non-cooperation Movement, and though the movement had failed in winning its three demands, viz. the redresses of the Khilafat wrongs, the Punjab wrongs and the achievement of Swarajya, even then the movement had been successful on many grounds. In the first place the non-violent non-cooperation movement was able to mobilize almost all sections of the Indian people. The movement penetrated into the remotest areas of India bringing both literate and illiterate people within its fold. The movement had also been successful in bringing the Muslims of India into the main stream of the Indian National Movement. "There
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is hardly any doubt that it was Muslim participation that gave the movement its truly mass in many areas; at some places two-thirds of those arrested were Muslims". In this way, Gandhiji's non-violent non-co-operation movement infused a new life into the Indian National Movement as well as into the Indian National Congress giving them the colour and character of a real national and mass movement. Under the leadership of Gandhiji, the people of India became united and fearless, ready to die but not to co-operate with the exploitative and oppressive systems of the British Government. The Indian people became brave and bold and thus the false conception of the invincibility of the British rule was shattered and demolished and it was done not by the use of violent methods but purely by non-violent non-cooperative methods. Moreover, the movement also popularized the Constructive Programme, viz. Hindu-Muslim or communal unity; removal of untouchability; prohibition; khadi; village sanitation; uplift of women; working for economic equality; village industries; basic education etc. The Constructive Programme, in turn, popularised and strengthened the spirit of Swadeshi and anti-Western-culture feelings among the Indian masses. The Programme also helped the people in keeping their pro-Swarajya zeal and zest intact during the inactive phase of the movement. The contribution of Gandhiji to the Indian National Movement during the Non-cooperation Khilafat Movement has been summed up very well by Coupland in these words, "He (Gandhi) had done what Tilak had failed to do. He had converted the national movement into a revolutionary movement... He had taught it to pursue the goal of India's freedom...... not by constitutional pressure on the government still less by discussion and agreement but by force none-the-less force because it was meant to be non-violent. And he had not only made the national movement

revolutionary, he had also made it popular...... Gandhi's personality had deeply stirred the countryside".  

However, with the arrest of Gandhiji, the Indian National Movement once again went into passivity. And the Congress was once again divided into two groups - Pro-changers and No-changers giving a blow to Gandhiji's programmes of Non-cooperation and Constructive Work. The pro-changers, headed by veteran nationalist leaders like C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru, after being defeated on the question of council-entry at the Gaya session in December 1922 left the Congress and formed their own political party in the name of the Congress Khilafat Swaraj Party or Swaraj Party in January 1923. The pro-changers were in favour of fighting the ensuing general elections to the Councils in order to enter the councils and obstruct the government functions from within and prove the Montford Reforms ineffective, thereby, compel the Government to accept the demand of Swarajya. The no-changers opposed such moves as these moves were against the boycott programme of Gandhiji. Therefore, the no-changers headed by ardent followers of Gandhiji like Vallabhbhai Patel, Rajendra Prasad, C. Rajagopalachari and others adhered to Gandhiji's policy of peaceful boycott of Councils and concentrated on the Constructive Programme of Gandhiji. Thus, the Congress and the National Movement were divided into two camps. However, after being released from jail in February 1924 due to failing health, Gandhiji tried his best to convince the pro-changers the futility of the policy of the Council-entry. Gandhiji believed that the policy and programme of the Council entry were detrimental to the policy and programme of non-violent non-co-operation.  


finding the pro-changers stiff on their policy, Gandhiji, in order to keep intact the unity in the Congress and the national movement, "gave his tacit consent to 'Council Entry' though a compromise was reached between the two wings, according to which a Congressman could choose between 'Council Work' or 'Constructive Work'. Thus the Swarajists' party was to constitute a political arm of the Congress and participate in the parliamentary activities. Gandhiji remained completely aloof". 54

From 1924 to 1929 Gandhiji kept himself busy in mobilizing the masses by popularising the various items of his Constructive Programme. V.T. Patil writes, "During these years the Hindu-Muslim concord was dissipated in Communal violence between the Hindus and Muslims. Militant Hinduism and Muslim extremism launched conflicting campaigns of Shuddhdi and Tablic Movements. In the Province of Bengal revolutionary terrorism became the order of the day. In addition to these cleavages in Indian Society, the controversy between the pro-changers and the no-changers in the Congress generated inner party rivalry among Congressmen jockeying for power and position of authority. Gandhi was deeply pained by the state of affairs in the Congress in particular and the depressed socio-economic political life of India..............

"Gandhi wanted to test and feel the pulse of the nation, so he launched his Constructive Programme..... With his particular programme Gandhi wanted to create a mass awareness among the people of the problems before the country. He moved into the interior areas of the country on a mass contact programme expounding his views to the masses about the socio-economic problems of India. The mass contact

programme of Gandhi was a success specially in removing some of the artificial barriers between different castes and communities in the Indian society. Gandhi's emphasis on the Constructive Programme was part of his tactics to use the in-between periods of Movements to mobilise the masses for subsequent participation in another mass political movement".55 Bipan Chandra records the impact of Gandhiji's emphasis on his Constructive Programme in these words, "In fact, Gandhian Constructive work was multi-faceted in its content. It brought some much needed relief to the poor, it promoted the process of the nation-in-the-making; and it made the urban-based and upper caste cadres familiar with the conditions of villages and lower castes. It provided Congress political workers or cadres continuous and effective work in the passive phases of the national movement, helped build their bonds with those sections of the masses who were hitherto untouched by politics, and developed their organizing capacity and self-reliance. It filled the rural masses with a new hope and increased Congress influence among them".56

However, the political situations in the Indian National Movement restarted to take turn in favour of Gandhiji's revival of non-violent civil disobedience movement with the announcement and coming of the Simon Commission. Bipan Chandra observes, "It was, however, from the latter part of 1927 that the curve of the mass anti-imperialist upsurge began to take a marked upward turn. As with the Rowlatt Bills in 1919, it was the British Government that provided a catalyst and a rallying ground by an announcement on 8 November 1927 of an all-White Commission to

recommend whether India was ready for further constitutional progress and on which lines".57

But the Indian national response to the Simon Commission was unfavourable because the commission had not included any Indian. Therefore, a boycott protest was launched by almost all the sections of the Indian people against the Simon Commission. Even the Muslim League and the Hindu Maha Sabha raised the banner of opposition against the Simon Commission. Prof. Vishnoo Bhagwan discloses, "Since the Commission was composed of seven whitemen with Sir John Simon as its chairman, and not a single Indian was included, the Indian decided to boycott it. The complete omission of the Indians from the personnel of the commission was taken for an insult and humiliation of the Indians. Pt. Moti Lal Nehru condemned it as 'a mere eye wash'. Not only Congress, even the Muslim League, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Liberal Federation condemned its composition. Except the reactionary wing of the Muslim league led by Sir Mohammad Shafi, nobody in the country welcomed the commission on its arrival in Bombay, on 3rd February, 1928, the commission was greeted with a countrywide hartal. Slogans of 'Simon go back' rent the horizon".58 The police further antagonised the people by resorting to repress and suppress the anti-Simon protests. Consequently, the anti-British resentment and indignation began to strengthen all over India. Bipan Chandra reveals, "In Lucknow, Jawaharlal and Govind Ballabh Pant were beaten up by the police. But in the worst incident happened in Lahore where Lala Lajpat Rai, the hero of the Extremist days and the most revered leader of Punjab, was hit on the chest by lathis on 30 October and succumbed to the injuries on 17 November 1928. It was his death that Bhagat Singh and his
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comrades were seeking to avenge when they killed the white police official, Saunders, in December 1928.

"The Simon boycott movement provided the first taste of political action to a new generation of youth...... Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Bose emerged as the leaders of this new wave of youth and students and they travelled from one province to another addressing and presiding over innumerable youth conferences".59

Thus, the all-White Simon Commission created a new wave of indignation and resentment among the Indian leaders and the people alike who launched a concerted and united protest against it. However, Gandhiji did not associate himself actively with the Simon boycott movement. Because he considered that his direct involvement would bring the entire masses into the movement and "might possibly embarrass the promoters".60 However, Gandhiji actively wrote against the Simon Commission and send the messages of success to the protesters praying that "the boycott will pass peacefully and show the nation's strength of purpose".61 Gandhiji also suggested the protesters to boycott the Statutory Commission.62

Along with the Simon Commission, the Bardoli Satyagraha which had been postponed six years ago was in full swing. It had been launched by Vallabhbhai Patel under the active guidance of Gandhiji against a twenty-two per cent increase in taxes decreed by the British Government. The Bardoli Satyagraha proved to be very successful in mobilizing
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the masses to unite once again non-violently against the injustices and repressions of the Government. In spite of Government's wholesale arrests, seizure and auctioning of livestock and land and intimidation and repression, the entire peasantry class of Bardoli braved, the hardships non-violently and peacefully. In result, the Government succumbed to the sufferings and genuine demands of the Bardoli Satyagrahis. Louis Fischer writes, "On August 6th the government capitulated. It promised to release all prisoners, return all confiscated land, return the confiscated animals or their equivalent, and, the essence, to cancel the rise in taxes. Patel promised that the peasants would pay their taxes at the old rates. Both sides kept the agreement". The success of the Bardoli Satyagraha proved the efficacy of Gandhiji's methods of non-violent non-co-operation and civil disobedience. Therefore, those nationalist leaders and followers who had become sceptical of the non-violent methods of Gandhiji on the occasion of the Chauri Chaura incident started to be attracted towards the leadership of Gandhiji after the successful end of the Bardoli Satyagraha. The truthfulness of this statement can safely be proved by the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930 launched by the Congress under the sole leadership of Gandhiji.

However, in order to justify the exclusion of Indians from the Simon Commission, the Conservative Secretary of State, Lord Birkenhead had thrown a challenge to the Indian nationalist leaders that they could not produce an agreed constitution by themselves. Hence, the Indian nationalist leaders, accepting this challenge, had appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Motilal Nehru to draft a

64. The Bombay Chronicle, 29.05.1928.
constitution for India. The report of this committee came to be known as the Nehru Report which among other constitutional measures, defined Dominion status as the form of government for future India. Bipan Chandra writes, "This report defined Dominion status as the form of government desired by India. It also rejected the principle of Separate Communal electorates on which previous constitutional reforms had been based. Seats would be reserved for Muslims at the Centre and provinces in which they were in a minority, but not in those where they had a numerical majority. The Report also recommended universal adult Suffrage, equal rights for women, freedom to form unions, and dissociation of the state from religion in any form. A Section of the Muslim League had in any case dissociated itself from these deliberations, but by the end of the year it became clear that even the section led by Jinnah would not give up the demand for reservation of seats for Muslims especially in Muslim majority provinces. The dilemma in which Motilal Nehru and other Secular leaders found themselves was not one that was easy to resolve: if they conceded more to Muslim communal opinion, then Hindu communalists would withdraw support and if they satisfied the latter, then Muslim leaders would be estranged. In the event, no further concessions were forthcoming and Jinnah withdrew his support to the report and went ahead to propose his famous 'Fourteen Points' which were basically a reiteration of his objections to the Nehru Report". 66

However, though the demand of Dominion Status was supported by Gandhiji and other old nationalist leaders, but it was strongly opposed by the young lot of the nationalist leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Base who were clamouring for 'Complete Independence'. The matter was, however, resolved by Gandhiji at the Calcutta session of the
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Congress in December 1928. At this session, Gandhiji pleaded for the adoption of the Dominion Status as the goal of the Congress giving the British Government one year time to concede this demand. Gandhiji suggested that if the Government failed to concede the demand of the Dominion Status in one year then the Indian National Congress would adopt the Complete Independence as the national goal and the non-violent civil disobedience as the method for achieving it. Consequently, "A resolution embodying this proposal won over the majority of the delegates, and further amendments seeking immediate adoption of complete independence were defeated".67

In fact, by hammering out a compromise formula Gandhiji seemed to try his best to give a chance to the British to do justice without any painful struggle and confrontation leaving behind the feelings and memories of bitterness. By demanding the Dominion Status in place of Complete Independence and by giving a period of one year for its grant, Gandhiji was making a sincere effort to cooperate with the British. But the British Government, intoxicated by the power of imperialism, failed to respond to the friendly, conciliatory and co-operative gesture and attitude of Gandhiji. Under the pressure of the Home Government, the then Viceroy, Lord Irwin refused to concede the demand of the Dominion Status. However, just before the expiry date of one year time, Gandhiji met Lord Irwin and sought to convene a Round Table Conference for drafting a constitution granting full and immediate Dominion Status to India in order to avoid confrontation. But Lord Irwin declined even to give any such assurance. Bipan Chandra writes, "on 23 December Irwin himself told Gandhiji and the others that he was in no position to give the assurance they demanded. The stage of negotiations was over and the stage of confrontation was
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about to begin". In consequence, the Indian National Congress at the Lahore Session in December 1929 adopted the famous Resolution of Purna Swarajya or Complete Independence under the presidency of Jawaharlal Nehru. The Lahore Congress also adopted the non-violent methods of Non-Cooperation and Civil Disobedience for achieving the goal of Complete Independence under the sole authority, guidance and leadership of Gandhiji. Prof. Vishnoo Bhagwan writes, "The Lahore session of Congress held in December, 1929, under the presidency of J.L. Nehru - the doyen of the Indian youth gave an ample proof of militant mood of Indian nationalism. Gandhiji felt the pulse of the nation. He realized that the only alternative to a violent revolution which was bound to occur was to launch Civil Disobedience Movement. He therefore moved a resolution at the Lahore Session declaring "Complete Independence" for India as the substitute for Dominion Status in conformity with the resolution passed at Calcutta a year ago".

Thus, once again the people of India reposed confidence in Gandhiji's non-violent methods of Satyagraha to be applied on the national level, this time for attaining complete freedom from the yoke of British Colonialism. The entire nation became ready to 'Bardolise' the whole of India. It seems to be very clear that the one year grace time given by Gandhiji to the British for granting the Dominion Status to India and the ultimate failure on the part of the British to do the same provided a strong moral justification to the Indian demand of Complete Independence and received full support from the Indian people in favour of the non-violent methods of Satyagraha. In this way, Gandhiji became

68. Ibid., p. 266.
69. Ibid., pp. 268-69.
70. Prof. Vishnoo Bhagwan, Constitutional History of India and National Movement, op.cit., p. 186.
absolutely successful in forging a united moral front against the British by mobilizing the people of India in favour of his moral war of position against the immoral and exploitative rule of the British. The immoral and exploitative foundations of colonialism and imperialism were challenged for the first time in a very clear and rhetoric manner. The Indian National Congress became united once again and the Indian National Movement received full momentum. The people of India became streamlined, directional, morally confident and elevated. The launching of the non-violent civil disobedience movement was only a matter of time. V.T. Patil sums up, "The year 1929 was a momentous one since the mood of the people in the country was one of expectancy of civil disobedience. This was the time when the nation looked towards Gandhi to give a new direction and thrust in the changed context....... In such an atmosphere Gandhi wholeheartedly supported the call for purna Swaraj or complete independence at the Indian National Congress session at Lahore in 1929. The die was cast and Civil Disobedience under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi was only a matter of time".\textsuperscript{71} Again Patil points out, "Gandhi, the Congress and the masses of India were committed to launching the Civil Disobedience Movement once the Britishers refused to concede purna Swaraj in 1930. In many respects the year 1930 marked a turning point in Gandhi's life and in the annals of the freedom struggle in India".\textsuperscript{72}
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