CHAPTER V
HISTORIANS OF THE TIMES

History is an eternal search for truth or for knowledge about man. In order to know this truth, the historian deals with facts. But facts by themselves are not history. They become history only when the historian uses them and interprets them as a reputed historian E.H. Carr has pointed out.\(^1\) So interpretations are important because they represent the historian's bent of mind - his point of view, which is always inevitable. Historians often do not see any other interpretation which fits with the facts as well as their own does. They are the representatives of their age, their milieu.\(^2\)

Dr. Bhogaraju Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Dr. Tara Chand, Prof. R.C. Majumdar have been chosen for study in this chapter on being representative of their age since they lived through the movement for Independence and their reputation in academic circles rests on their works on the period.

It should be interesting to see now they reacted to various incidents that happened around them. The expressions they use to explain their experiences; if they view Gandhi as a politician or national leader, strongly committed to spiritual and moral values; and factors that contributed in the making of Gandhi a mass leader; how do they relate Gandhi to Congress and vice versa; who in their narratives emerges more important, the cause or the leader; how have they viewed British action - collective or individual; how far their views on a particular issue are similar to or at variance with each other, and if their background, education, region and political ideology have influenced their works; if their narrative indicates propagation of or passing of judgement over a cause.
Dr. Bhogaraju Pattabhi Sitaramayya, though not a historian by training is the official historian of the Indian National Congress. Sitaramayya was Gandhi’s candidate for Congress Presidentship opposed to Subhas Bose in 1938.

The History of the Indian National Congress

Vol.I (1885-1934) was first published in 1935, by the Law Printing House, Madras, under the auspices of the CWC. This Volume was not a concerted effort to write the history of INC, but was the author’s notes for the lessons on the subject to the students of Andhra Jatheeya Kalasala, Masulipatam, which came to the notice of the Secretary of AICC. Later on the President who after consultation with CWC got them published on the fiftieth anniversary of the INC. Published during the golden jubilee celebrations of the organization, mention may be made here that since then it is in 1985 after half the century that Congress published another work on its history. Its second part (1935-1946) was out in 1946, when independence was a certainty. The Congress, he believes, landed "India on the threshold of Independence".

The volumes are dedicated to "Truth and Non-Violence whose embodied spirit both guided the destinies of the Congress and in whose service innumerable sons and daughters of Hindustan have cheerfully made heavy sacrifices for the Emancipation of their Motherland".

Non-Co-operation 1920-22

To Sitaramayya the year of Non-cooperation (1920) opens with a definite cleavage not only in Indian Political parties but in the Congress also. The positions taken up by Gandhi and his opponents at the Amritsar Congress (1919) were transposed in early 1920, due to anxiety over Punjab atrocities and Khilafat question.
Hunter Report, the author writes, "filled the country with disappointment and disgust" and it gave no solace to Indians as the censured officers had already left India.⁵

Appreciating Gandhi's support to the Khilafat issue in March 1920 and issuing Manifesto indicating his plans of non-cooperation, Sitaramayya quotes from 'India 1920' that Gandhi stood like a 'rock of salvation' before the injured national pride of many of his countrymen⁶. In Tilak's death Gandhi lost his towering strength. Gandhi's tour the country helped him understand the psyche of the people, discipline them and regulate their enthusiasm. In gathering first hand information about the views of the Provincial Congress Committees who had been asked to express their opinions frankly, "Better equipped by the tour, Gandhi was able to assert himself at the special session at Calcutta...⁷ in spite of the opposition from stalwarts like B.C.Pal, C.R.Das and Khaparde.

At Nagpur session, December 1920, Gandhi agreed to include the issue of Swaraj at the behest of C.Vijayraghavchariar - the President of the session in the hopes that once "we won on the ticket of Satyagraha that success would follow the nation with self-confidence."⁸

Nagpur session is considered a great personal triumph for Gandhi, only Motilal Nehru was with him at Calcutta session and at Nagpur C.R. Das and Lajpat Rai also joined him.⁹ Yet Sitaramayya points out that at Nagpur session C.R.Das had brought 250 delegates from East Bengal and Assam and spent an amount of Rs.36000/- from his own pocket to undo the decisions of Calcutta.¹⁰ But he does not explain what made C.R.Das reverse his resolve, and is left to the guess of the readers. Since the existing policy was legitimate means, hereafter the Congress aimed at "the attainment of Swaraj by peaceful and legitimate means."¹¹ It "really marked a new era in recent Indian history. The old feelings of impotent rage and in opportune requests, gave
place to a new sense of responsibility and a spirit of self-reliance" and that the moderates cut themselves off from the Congress for ever.12

The response of the masses to the movement, is discussed National Education efforts, "No Vote" campaign are considered to be a remarkable success, as compared to the boycott of law courts and colleges. The CWC met every month at different places to review the situation and issue instructions to guide the course of movement.13 "Swaraj within a year" generated tremendous enthusiasm and spirit of sacrifice. "Gandhi had evolved a new movement, shaped a new creed and planned a new attack. It was a perfect campaign in which the objective and the strategy were all clearly defined".14

The Congress in order to "ensure greater stability of non-violent atmosphere throughout India" decided to carry on non-cooperation (Swadeshi) programme for the time being, specially in view of the impending visit of the Prince of Wales. But due to increasing pressure from below, in November 1921, AICC had permitted civil disobedience. The rioting and bloodshed could not be contained despite the personal intervention of Gandhi and Sarojini Devi during the visit of the Prince of Wales to Bombay. The visit did help in consolidating the volunteer organisation all over India. The Government had expected the movement to fizzle out soon15 but as their expectations were belied, repressive measures were adopted.

To participate in RTC proposal and Gandhi’s delayed acceptance served no purpose as the negotiations had already failed. For violence or disruption he blames the authorities because he thinks that when leaders are arrested, forces of disruption and corruption join against the movement.16

The police repression and insults to their priests provoked the Moplahs to resort to guerrilla warfare although, the author thinks, Moplahs indulged in forcible conversions, looting of Hindus, arson and murder. The controversy over the
suspension of non-cooperation movement has not been adequately explained by Sitaramayya except for citing the usual instance of Chauri Chaura for changing horses in mid-stream by Gandhi.

About the positive achievement of the movement author writes, "Fear had been cast off by the people. A sense of self-respect developed in the nation. The Congressmen realized that service and self-sacrifice were the only means of winning public confidence. The prestige of Government too was materially shaken and people had received good lessons regarding the ideology of Swaraj."17

Civil Disobedience 1930-34

Sitaramayya supported 'Purna Swaraj' and opposed the Dominion Status as suggested by All-Parties Conference in 1928, and found the situation due to the people's resentment ready for starting Civil Disobedience over Meerut conspiracy case, Jatin Das and Phongy Wizaya who died while on hunger strike in jail, repression and ill-treatment of undertrials in Lahore conspiracy case, the widespread labour unrest resulting that in strikes at different places in India.18

Lord Irwin after his return from England had come out with the October Declaration which raised hopes of cooperation. Although the offer was small, yet the author thinks, that it created uproar in the Imperial Parliament. The leaders asked for assurance on Dominion Status for India. But the same day his train met with a bomb accident near Delhi. As a result, the Viceroy refused to make any further promise. "Thus began the determination for a grim struggle in the near future."19

The Lahore session 1929 was held in a charged atmosphere. Gandhi was opposed on two major issues; i) Resignations from Legislatures, and ii) Condemnation of bomb outrage at the Viceroy's train. The differences were so sharp that it led to the
The formation of a splinter group - Congress Democratic Party. The situation was rather critical but still the hope lied in Gandhi.

The success of the Independence day celebrations resulted in arrests all over India and under the programme of boycott of legislatures 172 members had resigned by February 1930.20

The author says "what a fund of pent-up feeling, enthusiasm and readiness of sacrifice there lay beneath the seeming torpor and despair of the people".21

Authorized by the CWC to launch Salt Satyagraha, Gandhi started his Dandi March. Sitaramayya maintains, without any plan, quotes Gandhi that, the steps would unfold themselves such as the path on a misty road to a fast moving vehicle. The massive following that Gandhi was able to achieve reminds the author of the march of Sree Rama and the Pandavas to the forest, calls it a 'March of Revolt' or a 'miracle of twentieth century'.22

The Government's repressive ordinance and Gandhi's arrest could not dampen people's enthusiasm, instead there were spontaneous demonstrations all over India, with complete hartals in Bombay, Calcutta and other places.

The police action resulted in much loss of lives, hundreds killed and wounded. He describes various incidents in detail and says that every province bore its share of sufferings with local variations depending upon the environment, personal equation of the officers concerned.23

The revenue losses suffered by the government were no less significant. In Bengal and Orissa imports of British cloth fell by 95 per cent. In Bihar it was the chowkidari tax, United Provinces had no-tax campaign, Central Provinces had Forest Satyagraha. Bihar Government lost 40 lacs rupees as revenue from liquor, Central Provinces liquor sales went down by 60 per cent, Kerala toddy sales by 70 per cent.
After Gandhi-Irwin Pact in March 1931 the period of strife and struggle was over, but peace was not in sight. Before Gandhi could leave for London to attend the second RTC, he realized many times that the pact was crumbling, because the Government were not keeping the spirit of Pact. He went to attend RTC but without any hopes. No sooner did he leave for England than repression began in U.P., Bengal and NWFP. "Thus by the time Gandhi returned to India, a pretty mess was created."24

For three days he acquainted himself with the woes of different provinces. But Gandhi "was not the man to plunge the country into the depths of suffering without exploring like a true satyagrahi every avenue to peace."25 The Government had already prepared itself for the impending challenge and on January 4, 1932 began the offensive, without waiting for any pretext, by arresting Gandhi, Vallabhbhai Patal and others.

Four more repressive ordinances were issued, Sir Samuel Hoare described them as drastic. The insults, humiliations and cruelties perpetrated on Satyagrahis in 1932-34 were harsher than even before. Heavy fines were imposed on conviction.26

Despite all this havoc and terror, people never resorted to any serious acts of violence and that the lesson of non-violence had gone deep. The author regrets that the movement lost its openness of defiance, despite the vigilence by the Government the Congress sessions were held at Delhi and Calcutta, though attended by few people27 and other activities were carried on underground. Whereas Gandhi's fast at the time of Poona Pact affected the progress of the Civil Disobedience, for people's greater concern was to save Bapu's life in any case it helped in removing the strong inhibitions on the part of the caste Hindus to a considerable extent.

In describing the events of 1932-34, the author extensively relies on published statements and official correspondence of Congress because of non-availability of other information, he published this volume in 1936. Since he was a witness to the
events narrated in the book, did not require other source material, nor did any such material exist.

World War II

India on being declared a party to the World War II by the British, the author wonders "what was India to do? What part or lot had she in the war? What moral enthusiasm or material aid could she muster up in a cause which was not hers, under a flag which threw down its own and under leaders who could not consult her leaders?" The Congress was in a dilemma, its leaders divided and confused. He describes in detail the shifting Congress stand on the issue of support in the war effort and the differences between Gandhi and Jawaharlal.

To begin with the Congress expected that the government would come round to their view point, if they would apply pressure on it but their hopes shattered sooner than expected. The Congress had to turn to Gandhi for leading them. Sitaramayya equates Gandhi Congress relationship as father and prodigal son.

Individual Satyagraha

Gandhi started Individual Satyagraha in 1940. The author considers it as an indication of its resolve not to die in ignominy. This was a preparation for a deadly war and Gandhi was not prepared to send every signatory to the pledge to go to jail in one go. This campaign with an objective to establish the right of speech, met with right of free expression of opinion in writing, the publication of three weeklies from November onwards. As it was a limited movement, he says, its success or progress should not be measured in terms of arithmetical or geometrical progression.
Quit India 1942

Cripps’ proposals aimed at securing voluntary participation in the war effort, and had no intention to part with power and considered it a repetition of August offer of 1940 and nick named "still-born child of the cabinet". Having rejected the Cripps Mission, AICC held stormy meetings and under duress decided the future course of action, in July at Wardha. "Congress strove its best not to embarrass Britain, but Britain was continually embarassing the country and the most difficult of those embarassments arose with the threats of enemy invasion."32

The factors behind this resolution, he considers are: (i) since the first World War the British Government did not mean whatever it said, (ii) insults of the war time, (iii) the production of war material would be increased many fold jeopardizing progress and production of consumer goods,33 (iv) at the time of Japanese attacks at Rangoon the tragedy of Indian evacuees from Burma, where whites were given preferential treatment, while two lakhs Indian were left to their fate.

The rationale and the psychology of this resolution was to tell the Indian people that they are free. With little emphasis here and there, this very resolution was endorsed next month by the Congress. It became famous as the August Resolution of 1942. The Congress stance regarding this resolution, he notes, was that India’s subjection has degraded her morally and enfeebled her war efforts and that the future promises of freedom cannot produce the necessary psychological and moral effect on the masses.34

The situation went out of hand for a time after the simultaneous arrests of Congress leaders. People were enraged by government’s swift action which had left them without a leader. In a way, according to the author, the blow suffered by the government’s swift action which had left them without a leader. In a way, according to the author, the blow suffered by the Government was greater than the one suffered
by Congress.³⁵ To crush the uprising all processions and meetings were banned, the
whole police, military and reserve forces were mobilized. The armed forces resorted
to tear gas and lathi charge at rally of volunteers and pulled down national flags. The
printing of any news regarding the movement was banned. Talking about earlier
satyagrahas, Sitaramayya puts a simillii of Indian nation having "passed its examination
in non-cooperation in 1920, Passive Resistance and Civil Disobedience in 1921, and
graduated in Satyagraha in 1930 and 1932, it may attempt at M.A. or honours course
in the self-same Satyagraha in 1940 or 1941" and asks, "should we not hurry up while
yet the founder of this new University of life is alive."³⁶

"Indeed the government had begun their preparations to stem the rising
tide, the moment the first ripples appeared in the waters of political life,
for the passing of the Wardha Resolution dated 14.7.42 was soon followed
by what came to be known as the Puckle Circular dated 17 July 1942,...
happended to fall into hands of Gandhi who gave it a wide circulation in
Bombay with a prefatory note".³⁷

The author mentions that the slogan 'Quit India'⁴⁰ became the pivotal point
around which the whole movement followed. It became a shibboleth and a war-cry.
As it caught the imagination of Indians of every age group, rural urban, rich, poor,
higher castes, classes and lower castes and classes.³⁸

The Government charges levelled at Congress of inciting unlawful violent
activities aiming at disruption of communication and public utility services, tempering
with the loyalty of Government servants or organising strikes etc. are unfair, for the
Congress working committee had not thought or worked out such a programme. The
author argues that these charges were made when there was not a single free Congress
leader to answer them.³⁹ The author thought Gandhi meant if the British leave India
the communal problem would be automatically solved by the Indias, imply thereby
that Quit India's slogan was given in order to achieve communal unity and not so much
the country's independence.
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The mob fury of people is explained in terms of simply getting desperate in the absence of responsible leaders to guide them. At the same time he also laments that the Government used much larger force than was needed to control the mob. Where lathi charge was sufficient, machine gun and aerial-firing were resorted to.

The Quit India movement aroused mixed response in America. The masses stood for immediate freedom of India, and government believed in the policy of India to be Britain’s affair. In Britain, too, a very small minority having a sense of equity and justice stood for India’s cause.

As the volume was published in December 1946 the author has not assessed the impact of the movement but he is optimistic about the results where he says that may be in the next ten years Indian National Congress would have achieved its purpose.

In the second volume the author is conscious that events that followed August Revolution have not been fully explained because of non-availability of information. Apart from time this work suffers the problems of writing contemporary history. The historian is not a non-participant observer but a fully involved participant, whose life is related to the event. The titles of the chapters in volume I given an impression of the author’s being more as hagiographer than a historian. The author emerges as an ardent admirer of Gandhi who is convinced that the national struggle under Gandhi’s prophetic teachings and plans of leadership is for her emancipation. "Gandhi was neither a statesman nor a journalist, neither a scurvy politician nor a designing propagandist. He is a prophet and philosopher, a moral man in an immoral society. His plan is to meet untruth with truth, to overcome darkness by light, to conquer death through life." To him, philosophy combines in one wholeness of vision, his affection and his activities. His unified concepts consist of religion, politics, economics, culture and morality.
About Gandhi's philosophy of fast, he says that when the man is not free to answer the charges covered in untruth levelled against him, the only way-out, to him, is to observe fast in order to invoke the decree of the higher power in which he has eternal faith and justify himself in the eye of his Maker.43

Judging from parameters of historiography we may call these volumes in the words of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, as, "the story of the growth of the Indian National Congress", rather than a history of the Congress. No doubt the author's knowledge and experience of the men and affairs of the Congress is wide. It can't be justifiably a detached historical writing, taking events and basing his conclusions on cold recorded facts, in the category of contemporary history.

Dr. Tara Chand

Tara Chand the author of Influence of Islam on Indian culture 1922 and History of Freedom Movement in India, four volumes 1972 had been the Chairman of the History of Freedom Movement in India Unit of Government of India. In 1948, he became Education Advisor to the Government of India working in close contact with Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Jawaharlal Nehru.

His addresses to the Indian History Congress reflect his views on philosophy of history "knowledge alone may give us the power to transmit past failures into its future success." History to him is a perennial quest of man and historian recreates facts with the aid of a prior imagination which by interpolation restores the continuity of facts and by its activity raises the dead to life and makes them the object of thought. History is development and not merely a cyclic repetition, like Croce, he believes, "Noting of what has been returns, nothing of what has been can be abolished". And because development is dialectic reality-history's dialectic thought-which explicates, elucidates and justifies, but it does not judge. History is eternal search for truth and considers the pursuit to be of utmost interest in this hunt instead of the kill.45
In Influence of Islam of Indian, Indian culture is explained as synthetic in character eternally seeks unity in the heterogeneous elements which make up its totality.46

History of Freedom Movement in India

History of Freedom Movement in India four volumes was published by the Government of India in 1972. The first two volumes are concerned with the preparation of the ground for the emergence of the concept of nationalism and freedom. In these volumes he maintains that it was the geographical unity of India which provided the necessary condition for the development of the consciousness of the community of the people living within India. He is one of those historians who maintain that in spite of religious diversities and cultural divergencies striking similarities were predominant.

Non-cooperation 1920-22

Gandhi’s non-cooperation is dealt within volume III. The major thrust of the work is spread of nationalist ideas and growth of the urge for self-determination, throught new interpretation of Hindu and Muslim religions and philosophies. The Satyagraha days were the days of communal harmony. When Hindus and Muslims resisted and suffered together, and taking their food and drinks from the same pot were common place scenes those days.47 When the central khilafat committee decided to resort to non-violent non- cooperation a statement to allay Hindu apprehensions was also issued. While discussing the characteristics of the declaration of non-cooperation movement the author calls it "a revolutionary step tantamount to be proclamation of war, with this difference that the war was non-violent. This was a unique kind of war. It inflicted neither pain nor injury upon the opponent, reserving
all suffering for the non-cooperator." To fight such a war demanded greater discipline, bravery and endurance and a burning faith in the right cause.48

As regards Gandhi's support to the Khilafat cause and combining it with Punjab wrongs and Swaraj, the author finds it justifiable on moral and humanitarian grounds but is doubtful whether it was politically and practically a wise step to mix them all. He is of the view that the Congress and the Khilafat committee did not pay attention to the practical aspects of their objective and showed no awareness of the currents of political thought which were flowing very strongly since beginning of world war I.49

The vast spread of movement stimulated numerous sections of the people to ventilate their grievances, and to launch collective action for their removal. As after the war economic burdens were too heavy on both agrarian and Industrial workers and unemployment among the educated and demoralised, disabled soldiers especially in Punjab, all together resulted in Peasant and Labour troubles all over India.50

The country was profoundly stirred and an unprecedented wave of enthusiasm ran through teeming millions. Scenes of fervour, devotion and sacrifice were witnessed everywhere. He writes, "Gandhiji had cleared the way of self recovery through this vital upheaval from within" and "generated the explosive force needed" for it.

According to Tara Chand the campaign moved in crescendoes and the Tilak Fund was over-subscribed as a result of Umar Sobhani's self-sacrificing efforts.51 Boycott of educational institutions created confusion amongst students nor was the boycott of courts very effective. The impact of boycott of foreign cloth and liquor, of course was felt all over India. The Moplah Rising, initially a part of non-cooperation movement for the Khilafat cause, due to the Government suppression turned into guerilla war in which their Hindu neighbors suffered. Tara Chand is quite critical of the repression by Government in which the 2226 rebels were killed, then he also
mentions rail wagon tragedy in which 66 Moplahs died of suffocation. The Government took the non-cooperation movement very lightly and tried to belittle it, but realized their mistake when it gathered strength. The author thinks that Lord Reading adopted the policy of (i) conciliating the supporting leaders, (ii) suppressing of the movement and (iii) exploiting the communal differences. The author appertains to the nature of Khilafat and non-cooperation movement because they had given a deep religious colour to the struggle for independence and tried to accentuate the religious zeal of both the Hindus and the Muslims.

For the fizzling out of RTC proposal, the Government is held responsible as they refused to agree to a general release, of prisoners arrested in connection with the Khilafat Non-cooperation Movement. Many a tragic events similar to Chauri-Chaura were reported from other places. The author supports Gandhi's suspension of the movement in view of heinous violence, like that of Chauri-Chaura and feels that Gandhi feared that such violence might lead to general anarchy and thus providing an excuse to the government for further repression. He seems convinced that sudden stoppage of the movement was bound to create confusion. It caused divisions in both the Congress and the Khilafat camps, and tantamounting to defeat.

In his assessment of the non-cooperation movement the author points out its failure to achieve two major objectives of Caliphate and the attainment of Swaraj. It was successful in so far as it infused new vigour in people, prepared them to fight greater battles in future. The psychological effects of the movement on bureaucracy were not less remarkable. The self-confidence of the British rulers was shaken. They were doubtful of justifying their rule. The old of ICS began resolving not to send their sons into the same service.
Gandhi’s objective was not narrow political, while Swaraj was a necessary instrument for the attainment of the ideal, khilafat was a symbol of inner conviction. And that spiritual was opposite of the irrational implying violence. So he says that Gandhi’s ideal was a far-off vision determined on this path he moved on.56

The author tries to emphasize that before abandoning India, the British who always accentuated the biases of their subjects so as to widen their differences, took the final step of recognising the separatist claim of the Muslim League and of partitioning the country into two states.

Civil Disobedience 1930-34

Before discussing the development of Civil disobedience movement 1930, the circumstances leading to it are well reasoned out. Gandhi, since his release from the prison in 1924 had not thought of resuming Satyagraha in specific terms. But at Lahore Congress "Gandhiji had to bow before the strong opposition and modify the period of waiting from December 31, 1930 to December 31, 1929" and Poorna Swaraj was to be the declared national goal. Not only that, but he also agreed to lead a civil disobedience movement to achieve the goal. The author writes, "The tricolor flag of Independent India was unfurled and a tremendous roar of 'Inquilab Zindabad' (Long live revolution) went up the immense throng and rent the heavens.

At last, the hesitations and uncertainties were over. The goal was clear and though the path might be strewn with pits and snares, the direction was no longer in doubt.57

The description of the Lahore session seems to be that by a participant. In this session Nehru’s solution to the communal problem was economic revolution, whereas Gandhi advocated moral transformation. The declaration of independence removed the incubus of the minds.58
Appreciating political acumen, he writes; “The solution of Gandhiji was a stroke of genius. No commander of a military plan of operations could have done better. The Salt Satyagraha had all the elements of high class strategy. Surprise, universal mobilization of forces, discipline, organization, simplicity of tactics, universal availability of means and instruments of war, challenging and surrounding the forces of the enemy from all sides, drama. A strange war in which the losses and casualties and sufferings were all on one side.”

The author says that to begin with the movement was ridiculed by enemies and doubted by friends but when soon after overwhelming support came from all sides, everyone was amazed at its spectacular success. Every day enthusiasm was bounding higher. The World was amazed and the Country was electrified at the news.

The Government as usual responded with repression. In police firing hundreds were killed. After Gandhi’s arrest on May 4, a new dimension was added to the prevailing excitement. He cites Webb Miller’s account about the government’s reaction and says that such gruesome scenes were repeated for several days. As the movement intensified so did the government’s reaction. It piled upon ordinances. Jails were filled with agitators.

It is estimated that about one lakh persons went to jail, foreign goods worth thirty crore rupees were sealed in Bombay. Import of other goods reduced to 1/3 or 1/4. Sixteen British owned cloth mills closed. Khadi production and sale went up. Sterling securities in India declined. It drew the attention of the world. Even Jinnah who had opposed Gandhi, supported the demand for Dominion Status at the First RTC. Freedom had already possessed the minds of Indian, it only needed transmution into a political reality. In spite of the opposition by Muslim League a sense of national unity was demonstrated by a large segment of Muslims by joining the Civil
Disobedience Movement. Nearly 12,000 Muslims went to Jail. He is of the view that the Civil Disobedience Movement succeeded in elevating the moral stature of the people and destroyed political prestige of the Government.

As the open non-violent agitation became difficult because of the arrest of Congress leaders in large number, terrorism raised its head in Bengal and Peshawar and Tara Chand mentions instances like Chittagong Armoury raid and Garhwal Rifles mutiny. For all he finds economic distress to be a factor which added fuel to the political fire.

Lord Willingdon who succeeded Lord Irwin in 1931 did not approve of earlier policy of restrained repression and reconciliation. The author supports Gandhi on the conditions such as dominion status and minorities problems be settled which the latter had laid for going to RTC. Gandhi's straight forwardness was a disadvantage because his opponents were the politicians who excelled Machiavelli and Talleyrand in the arts of diplomacy and dissimulation. The British wrecked the conference.

He mentions that the Government let loose a reign of terror by imposing a 'regime of lawless laws' upon people and committed harrowing barbarities and ruthless repression in Gujarat, U.P., N.W.F.P. and Bengal and the author refers to the report of the Delegation of India League in 1932.

The author is critical of the Communal Award as it was based on British theory that India was not a nation but a congeries of racial, religious and cultural groups, castes and interests. He supports Gandhi's view that it injected the poison of separate electorates to disrupt Hindu Community and calls Gandhi's fast as 'historic'.

Civil Disobedience was ruthlessly crushed yet in 1935 the Government had been forced to accept the need of conceding Dominion Status with safeguards. Qualities of fearlessness, self-reliance, sacrifices were evoked, providing the virtues which lie
at the foundation of freedom. Faith in British promises was shattered. In society the untouchability was discarded in principle though yet not up-rooted in practice.

**Quit India 1942**

Talking about outbreak of second world war and India's attitude towards it, Tara Chand says that Congress sympathies were in favour of Britain and its allies, but they were much perturbed by the conduct of the British statement. The Congress had forewarned the Government that a declaration of war on behalf of India without its consent would make for troubles. Being forewarned, the "Government forearmed itself and directed the Provinces to strike against any organization which intended to impede war efforts". The government made preparations to wage an all-out war against Congress but at the same time also made efforts to avert the clash. The Congress, the author writes, declared that the Indian people refused to co-operate in the War so long as equality of status and freedom was withheld from them. They asked the Government to define and clarify its war aims and proposals about India's future. The pleadings of the Congress leaders, and the avowals of Pro-British sympathies were however, brushed aside by the Viceroy. Instead, on October 17, he suggested a RTC on terms which were not acceptable to Indians.

In March 1940 the second stage of the War was ushered in with the sword of Democles hanging over the head of the government in Britian and with the threat of partition confronting India. As the British had no definite long term policy, says the writer, they played the divide and rule game without knowing its end. And their fear that the Congress would dominate the central government became their motivating force. Inspite of the Congress offers the government gave rebuffs. The period from October 1940 to December 1941 saw individual Satyagrahaha which, according to the author, was as Gandhi said a moral protest and not a politically motivated challenge to embarrass the government.
The author states that when Cripps came to India with his proposals, the major objections of the Congress were, the right of states or provinces to secede and the defence membership of the Viceroy's executive council. Regarding the breakdown of talks and responsibility being put on the Congress, the author says, "Having delivered his parting shot from a double-barreled gun placed on the shoulders of the Communal bogeymen..." he tried to malign the Congress as an unreasonable body. The British aggravated the suspicions of minorities against Congress.

The factors leading to 'Quit India Movement' are the Cripps Mission, advance of the Japanese, economic strains e.g. shortage of food, rising prices, influx of refugees from Burma, "political sky being tumultous with flashes of lightning and roars of thunder". In the event of any movement the government was prepared "to pluck the nettle and crush it". Cripps on his return began propaganda to "turn the world opinion against the Congress and maligning Gandhiji". It caused widespread disillusionment and intense indignation in Congress circle.

The panic created by the evacuation of Madras, Calcutta, Vizagapatnam, Government's scorched-earth policy and the miseries of the starving people, says Tara Chand, moved Gandhi very much. His soul searched for the remedy which he found on a Monday - a day of Silence. Although Nehru and Azad differed from him yet his draft resolution asking British to Quit India was accepted in spirit. The CWC passed the resolution on July 14.

Between July 14 and August 7, the government waited for a right moment to strike. He cites Linlithgow's letter which said that the long awaited opportunity to crush the Congress - had presented itself. Government was helped in its efforts by Jinnah, Hindu Mahasabha and Liberal leaders who started a propaganda war against the Congress. Moreover it published a resolution, alleged to have been adopted by the Congress for unlawful, violent activities such as disruption of communications,
strikes, interference in defence measures. Denying the allegations, the author says, that the Congress draft resolution which was to be discussed on 9th August had nothing to do with violent activities but stood for a total non-violent mass struggle aiming at winning independence.\textsuperscript{78} As the meeting could not take place on that date, the formal sanction could not be given to even that resolution.

The Quit India Movement is called a spontaneous revolution because of the sudden arrest of leaders, the masses acted on their own. As the author writes, "what followed cannot be dignified with the name of a movement, for it was an outburst of blind anger unorganized, unprepared and undirected, of a harassed and distracted people".\textsuperscript{79} But he also thinks that the masses, instead of following the Congress instructions, were swayed by a multiplicity of influences - the terrorists, the revolutionists, Forward Bloc and Socialists all opposed to non-violence. The extremists aimed at destruction of instruments and systems of administration e.g. communications, police and property. In the spirit of rebellion against the tyranny of the Government, they made sporadic, unconnected and unorganised attempts, to paralyse local administration, damage public property, and to put barricades or dig up roads etc. The furious mobs attacked officials along with government buildings, offices and stores etc. The utterly callous and ruthless action of government was responsible for rebellion, because harassment and indignities of all kinds maddened the crowds and drove them to violence. His language is that of a nationalist historian who seeks to answer the charges put forth by the imperialists. The expression is that of a participant - who still has a vivid memory of the events happened thirty years ago. His language also seems to be that being a witness and participant to the movements, his description is full of emotions carrying deep regard for Gandhi and his concepts of Truth and Non-violence. He thinks the aim of Government was to terrorize people, teach them a lesson so that they might not think of defiance again, the open rebellion due to severe extensive repression did not last more than a few weeks though some
activists carried on the movement by going underground. Students role in sacrificing a lot for the country finds due mention. Their militant postures and spirit of adventure stopped only after the release of Gandhi.80

As the movement tried to stall the war efforts, the British government in order to impress the Americans, made effort to malign the Congress. Churchill and Amery made speeches which reflected, hostility towards the Congress and Gandhi. The speeches showed a complete lack of objectivity and competence on the part of British to rule India.81 Congress was charged of inciting the violence in a pamphlet entitled "Congress Responsibility for the Disturbances 1942-43" Rebutting the charges Gandhi wrote a rejoinder and asked for evidence and a trial of detenus, "the Government was not prepared for judicial proceedings as it knew its case would not bear such a probe".82

To win over the liberal opinion in India, a few more amenable Indian members to the Viceroy's Executive Council were appointed. It was these members who suggested that Gandhi and other Congress leaders be arrested. The government, the author contends, also tried to appease the Muslim League by installing Muslim League Ministries in the Muslim majority provinces.83

The author maintains that Gandhi's release from jail on May 5, 1944 marked the end of the Gandhian era. Events since 1942 signaled the onset of new era of struggle for Independence. For him Gandhi's influence was short lived as he could lift the people in their moral understanding above their ordinary self, for a very short period because the war had created an atmosphere of violence. He also says that the nation had departed from the exalted moral values and had subordinated means to ends.84

Inspite of a change in attitude of Indians towards non-violent methods, the author thinks that Gandhi's movements had achieved two great results: (i) illusion of the British that their empire was morally justified, beneficent and desired by the
Indian masses was no longer valid, and (ii) that non-violence was the only efficacious method to prevent the war-psychosis-paralyzing reason, promoting the vicious thirst for blood-shed, hatred and anger no more acceptable to Indian belief that these movements causing sufferings only to the agitators causes nausea disgust and tiredness and make them realize the futility of their actions.  

Dr. Tara Chand’s work is quite repetitive because he mentions the Congress session of December 1929 twice, Irwin’s visit to England in June 1929, his Declaration of October 31, 1929 thrice, Congress reasons for the movement twice, declaration of Independence twice, Impact of Civil Disobedience movement twice, Muslim participation in Civil Disobedience twice. His work seems to be reflecting his ideology who thinks that history teaches and that in India Hindus and Muslims lived peacefully.

No bibliography is attached to these volumes, though footnotes provide ample information. At places the facts has not been verified such as while discussing Nagpur session 1920 it is mentioned that 1500 delegates attended the session, where it was 14,582 the largest number for the first time, who attended the Congress session. Although he has been a contemporary and a participant observer but this work is not contemporary as it was written twenty to forty years after the events. Reflective and based on rich source material the work may be called later history by a contemporary historian.

R.C. Majumdar

R.C. Majumdar is an eminent historian of Indian history, ancient as well as modern, whose works have not only solved many riddles but also furthered our knowledge in various fields of study of Indian history. Although he has almost twenty works to his credit apart from works in collaboration with other authors and had
specialization on Ancient Indian History, yet his works on freedom movement are equally well known.

Dr. Majumdar has stated his views on writing history in Heras Memorial lectures. He thinks, the real purpose of history is to report correctly the progress of events, which did not in all cases mark the progress towards liberty.

History of Freedom Movement in India

R.C. Majumdar's History of the Freedom Movement in India is divided into three volumes. In volume I, gives a new interpretation to the Revolt of 1857, where he says it was not the first struggle for India's independence but a sepoy mutiny.

Non-cooperation 1920-22

Regarding the Punjab Wrongs, he finds it difficult to understand the change in Gandhi's attitude regarding the issue because in December 1919 he had supported the cooperation to reforms and refused to link Punjab and Khilafat issues and in a period of six months he became a non-cooperative and adopted Khilafat. Perhaps the author does not wish to see that Gandhi changes his stand only after being disillusioned about the British scene of justice after the Hunter Report's publication on June 8, 1920.

Discussing the objectives of Non-Cooperation Movement he is quite critical of joining Khilafat with national independence. He thinks that khilafat Movement had Pan-Islamic and anti-national sentiments, and that any support to it ought to be considered international, as a result he challenges the aptness of the title aFather of the Nation' given to Gandhi. He thinks that history cannot dispense with logic and reasoning and accept, instead, mystic instinct of impulse as the sole criteria of a political leader's conduct. The joining of demand for Swaraj with redress of Punjab and Khilafat wrongs side tracked the main issue of the fight for freedom.
While discussing the support to the Non-cooperation resolution by C.R. Das and others, though he cannot explain the somersault by C.R. Das yet he says that "it seems that the rank and file of Congress politicians had gladly and willingly surrendered their political judgement and conscience to the safekeeping of few individuals." Here he mentions the beginning of the dictatorial regime (Guruvad) in Indian politics.95

He states that Tilak Swaraj Fund, Charkha targets were achieved, membership campaign could register half of the estimated number. Picketing of liquor resulted in decline of liquor consumption and fall in revenue to the Government. The weaving and polarizing of Khaddar made some progress but production being slow, it could not achieve the target. Boycott of foreign cloth, in spite of burnfires, could not make satisfactory progress. As regards Hindu Muslim unity the situation worsened and he refers to Moplah rising, and Multan riots and is critical of its attribution to mischief makers by the Congressmen.96

Boycott of Councils was a complete failure. Since the seats vacated by Congressmen were filled by non- congressment. But "the Congress succeeded in proving to the world that the new Legislative Councils elected under the new constitution had no claim to represent the people of India."97 Boycott of law was more spectacular than effective as it did not make any impression on the British law-courts. Same was the result of boycott of educational institutes. Boycott of titles and honours and of Government jobs, he says, was a hopeless failure with the exception of few notable instances.98

Regarding the boycott of Prince of Wales’ visit in November 1920, he says that it offered an opportunity of monetary excitement. At the arrival of the Prince in Bombay there were riots but in Calcutta hartal was peaceful and successful.99

The Government was initially complacent and believed that it might be rejected by the country as a visionary and a chimerical scheme. It avoided punishing the leaders
so as not to make them martyrs, and also that tempering the Freedom of Press and speech was inconsistent with self-government. Eventually the Congress and Khilafat declared unlawful. As a reaction to the violent activities by the mill hands, city-rabble and unemployed labourers who were paid for their service, Majumdar maintains that the Government adopted drastic measures.100

The official repression he describes in detail and says that the movement brought into "prominent relief the brute force of the British rule in India." He states that at the non-cooperators, firings were resorted too. There was lawless repression, undue imprisonment of undertrials and even lawlessness outside the courts. The non-cooperators were unduly harassed.101

As regards Gandhi's rejection of the RTC in 1921 he doubts quoting C.R. Das, whether the whole thing was put before Gandhi in a lucid form and criticizes Gandhi for his insistence on the release of Ali Brothers and their associates of being ungenerous and tactless and appertains it to undue and over-zealous solicitude for keeping the Muslims well in hand.102

After the Ahmedabad Congress in December 1921, Gandhi announced the Bardoli campaign for which preparations were made both by the Congress and the Government only to be dropped the abrupt suspension of movement by Gandhi after the Chauri Chaura. "No Indian could foresee that the great battle for freedom began with such trumpet and fanfare, would be irretrievably lost even before it was begun" He is critical of Gandhi's followers who attributed the retreat to the Divine will. Perhaps Gandhi suspended after a request by few politicians. Jinnah, Malviya, Natarajan and Jayakar103 and mentions the anguish of Lajpat Rai, Bose, Das and Jawaharlal Nehru over the sudden suspension. Government was initially hesitant to arrest Gandhi lest it should lead to bloody outbreak.104
Majumdar thinks that any movement should not depend upon guidance, exertions and personal whims of one man. This movement had no chance of revival, so says the author as long Gandhi was in prison.\textsuperscript{105}

Professedly non-violent people showed their worst instincts.\textsuperscript{106} Majumdar describes the excesses committed by the people. He thinks that picketing was far from peaceful, intimidation of opponents was commonly resolved. There were agrarian riots in U.P., mob riots at Aligarh, Giridh and Malegaon, Chauri Chaura and Bihar.\textsuperscript{107} He maintains that both the Government and the Congress's charges and countercharges were correct. The Government was based on force, but amongst the Satyagrahis too, very few were inspired by the true spirit of Satyagraha, majority of them adapted it as a politically expedient method.\textsuperscript{108} The non-cooperation invoked the magic of Gandhi's name, miraculous powers.

The people willingly endured the hardships and punishments inflicted by the Government, which inspired them to launch a new campaign at a very later date. The Congress movement had become for the first time a mass movement and that the Indian National Congress became revolutionary organisation. Its aims and objectives were, he maintains, very close to the so-called terrorist party of the early 20th century. The difference was of methods and absence of secrecy. It directed the national energy to a revolutionary programme, non-violent if possible and violent, if need be.\textsuperscript{109}

One of the repercussions of the movement was the outbreak of the Moplah rebellion. Moplahs, had acquired an unenviable reputation for crimes perpetrated under the impulse of religious frenzy. Here Majumdar seems to be a Hindu historian as he says the Muslims as well as Gandhi and his blind followers ignored the terrible outrages upon a large number of Hindus.\textsuperscript{110} Other repercussions were satyagraha for
reforms in religious institutions as the Akali Movement, Tarakeshwara Satyagraha, the Assam Coolie Exodus, Nagpur flag satyagraha and Bardoli-no-tax campaign.

**Civil Disobedience 1930-34**

Tracing the cause of the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-31, Majumdar says the appointment of Simon Commission was the first event leading to it. As a result of Lord Birkenhead's challenge, attempts were made by Indian leaders to draft their own constitution. Death of Lala Lajpat Rai as a consequence of the fatal attack on him by police, death of Jatinder Das in jail, revolutionary activities and youth movements along with widespread labour unrest were other factors. Lastly, the Viceroy's declaration of 31st October 1929 which promised Dominion Status in a distant uncertain future, forced Gandhi declare himself for independence.¹¹¹

The Congress session in December 1929 passed resolution of Independence and revival of civil disobedience movement as a means to achieve it. Revival of Civil Disobedience was Gandhi's handiwork. Majumdar criticises the Congress for surrendering its judgement the safekeeping of Gandhi.

He blames Gandhi for excluding the left wingers like S.Iyengar and Subhas Bose from the CWC because he wanted a committee of one mind - his mind.¹¹²

Gandhi's going for bargaining, suspending and abandoning the fight is unjustifiable Gandhi's explanation given in this regard are clear contradiction of the Lahore resolution.¹¹³

He admits that the march to Dandi was a grand plan as it was an automatic and intensive propaganda which "roused an entire countryside to a realistic sense of the coming struggle for Swaraj, contemplated by the Congress". The official attitude to it was initially of ridicule and scoffing later changed to a nervous apprehension. The success gained in violation of salt laws generally emboldened people in U.P., Gujarat,
Bengal, N.W.F.P., C.P. and Bombay to adopt various techniques to defy government laws such as non-payment of tax and revenue, and defiance of forest laws.

The author enumerates a number of examples to prove his point. About the awakening and participation of women, he says “their examples redoubled the energy and activities of men and spurred them on to greater efforts and sacrifices for the country.”114

The Government, the author says, struck hard in a ruthless manner. In evidence he gives the summary of the brutal measure complied by the CWC on January 21, 1931. He also discusses the repressive laws such as Press Ordinance, gagging the Press and ban on the Congress. Nearly 75,000 Satyagrahis were arrested. He describes the terrorism by the government under the ordinances which he calls the lawless laws. The author thinks the strong attitude taken by the Indian National Congress and the recent demonstration of its hold over the country prompted the government to ensure Congress' participation in RTC. Sharing Subhas Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru’s view the author considers Gandhi-Irwin Pact as an abandonment by the Congress of its demand for Purna Swaraj. Gandhi had failed miserably at the RTC grand ovation given to him on his arrival in India was undeserved and uncalled for. He calls it a ludicrous exhibition of the pathetic lack of a sense of political realities on the part of the Indians in general and Gandhi in particular.115

Majumdar thinks that the Government of India in a way forced civil disobedience movement on Gandhi in 1932, just to humiliate Congress. Government had made elaborate preparations to fight the next movement. They had already promulgated three Ordinances and four more were kept ready. No sooner did Gandhi announce his decision than the Government let loose the reign of terror and repression. Complete rout and demoralisation crept in, inspite of the ban the Congress
session in Delhi could be held only for ten minutes by about 500 delegates. It showed how deeply the Congress was rooted in India.\textsuperscript{116}

Gandhi’s fast in September 1932 is criticised on the ground that by raising a side issue Gandhi side-tracked the whole campaign. He calls it unwisdom of action and quotes Nehru’s observations on the event. The Poona Pact seems to him a mischievous means of pampering a particular section. The Depressed classes benefitted both ways - double the number of seats in communal award and benefits of modified separate electorate.\textsuperscript{117}

The movement slowly and silently faded away and passed into oblivion the great civil disobedience movement came to an ignoble end, inspite of all the brave and noble words uttered by Gandhi on the eve of his famous march to Dandi.

**World War II**

The Congress felt insulted on being declared a belligerant without consulting the popular ministries and refused to help British war efforts. But because of the inner sympathies of Gandhi and Nehru with Britain, so argues Majumdar, they did not come out with a forceful line of action at once where developed a sharp difference of opinion about war between Gandhi and Congress. Whereas Congress was doing every thing possible to arrive at a compromise with Britain. Gandhi was totally against India’s participation in war. But when the weakened policy of the Congress failed to pressurise the British to concede any demand, it had to reconcile with the leadership of Gandhi. They felt now the need of starting the civil disobedience campaign and they knew that it could be carried on only under the leadership of Gandhi. Subhas Bose who stood boldly in defiance of the Congress Policy and carried on counter propaganda through Forward Bloc to take direct action against government taking advantage of war situation. The civil disobedience campaign launched by the Forward
Bloc continued with increasing vigour and was joined by the rank and file of the Congress.\textsuperscript{118}

**Quit India 1942**

The failure of Cripps Mission is looked into from different points of view: (i) It is assigned to the reactionary attitude of Churchill who stayed the hands of Cripps at a moment when success was within sight.\textsuperscript{119} (ii) The British Official view attributed Cripps’ failure to the pacifism of Gandhi. (iii) Whereas the Indian intelligentsia doubted the sincerity of the British Cabinet and held that Cripps Mission was designed only to placate the American opinion.\textsuperscript{120}

After the failure of the Cripps 'Mission, Majumdar writes, one finds a change in Gandhi's attitude, started talking of an orderly and timely withdrawl by the British for the safety and interest of both British and India. The author says that Subhas Bose and had been trying to make the Congress adopt such a policy since the very inception of the war but failed.\textsuperscript{121} Gandhi once again gained supremacy in the Congress, and was ready for even anarchy "no sober statesman would perhaps endorse these idealistic views of Gandhi who, as usual, ignored the realities of the situation and was ready to play with nation’s fate as a child plays with his dolls". Gandhi was thinking of a movement even though the country had not developed the non-violent strength necessary to throw off the foreign yoke.\textsuperscript{122} The Quit India resolution on July 14, 1942 which was finally endorsed by AICC at Bombay on August 7 to 9, 1942. Nevertheless, he says that some Congress leaders were still desiring compromise with the British.\textsuperscript{123}

Gandhi and his congressmen did not anticipate the consequences of starting such a movement. they "believed that the Government would sit idle while the AICC had proclaimed an open rebellion". Even though Gandhi meant it to be non-violent, he argues, every responsible man should have known that the revolt once begun would not, or rather could not, retain its non-violent character, particularly when Gandhi
has said it to be a fight to finish. So contrary to Congress expectations the Government
struck hard in order to nip it in the bud, and this decision was unanimously taken by
the newly expanded Executive Council which consisted of 11 Indian members.\textsuperscript{124}

The author thinks that with the arrest of Gandhi and other Congress leaders,
Non-violent as a force in India's struggle for freedom came to an end for ever. The
lesson of non-violence was forgotten because it never entered the hearts of people.
But the author contradicts himself in another statement in which he says that the arrest
of leaders was followed by peaceful hartals and demonstrations and that it was the
repression by the Government that "led to violence on the part of the people and the
Government had to face a revolt which was unarmed but most violent in character"\textsuperscript{125}

This is no doubt about the movement being of an All-India character and it was
a revolutionary upsurge of the people manifested in destructive activities. In the
Urban areas the movement was overpowered by the military force and in rural areas
it could not spread due to instant punitive actions. Though the Congress made a
desperate bid to fight the government by issuing new programme of no-tax, no sale of
food, crops, boycott of paper money, destruction of communication system, yet, the
author maintains this appeal also fell flat on people and that the Congress had misfired
its last shot. Majumdar attributes this failure to lack of leadership and necessary
equipment. But he reasserts that the campaign of 1942 is an instance of hopeless
incompetence and utter mismanagement on the part of Congress leaders.\textsuperscript{126} It is a big
toll to start a fight without making proper preparation and planning. Along with such
activities attempts at establishing Swaraj or self-rule were made in certain areas with
some success.

Gandhi did not formulate any definite plan of action before his arrest on August
9, except asking people to 'do or die', strictly within the limits of non-violence. He also
deplored underground and secret activities. The author contends Government's
statements asserting that the Congress had planned violent movement the speeches by Congress leaders may have invoked and sanctioned, indirectly, the revolutionary instinct of the masses.127

The author, however, is magnanimous enough to discuss few points about the bright side of the movement. It was really a soldiers’ battle, he says "The General bungled, but all glory to the soldiers who gave a good account of themselves, who laid down their lives as martyrs to the cause of their country’s freedom". He says that the story of 1942 is full of individual instances of heroism, courage, patriotism and self-sacrifice on the part of the people. He says that the Congress leaders who neither did nor died cannot be absolved of the responsibility of hardships to the masses in this fight.128

Majumdar is generally classified as a nationalist historian. He follows Ranke and Niebuhr and thinks that every Indian historian must be reminded every time of the following words by Niebuhr. "In laying down the pen we must be able to say in the sight of God, ‘I have not knowingly, nor without earnest investigation written anything which is not true".129 He considers the eternal quest for truth as the goal of history. While following Ranke he says that only truth should form the steel frame of history, and a historian should merely show what actually occurred.130

In an effort to narrate the events, Majumdar like Momsen and Maitland is a master of details. He describes every event in detail. His planning of the descriptions is systematic and chronological. The sources, he uses, include various reports, journals and other literature. In support of his argument he uses reports in toto or detailed excerpts e.g. Reports from History of Indian National Congress by Pattabhi B. Sitaramayya, for terrorism by the Government in 1930-34 or India League Delegation report 1932.131 When criticizing Gandhi he depends on statements by C.R. Das, Bose, Nehru and Azad.
Though he is critical of official repression yet he takes it logically, as one could not expect less reaction from a colonial Government facing mass movement. He is an expressive historian of Bengali Hindu viewpoint not devoid of sentiments, prejudices and preconceptions, and all kinds of human emotions which are likely to distort his vision and judgement. Rightly admitted in the preface, "Passions and prejudices die hard and personal opinions, once formed, are not likely to be altered soon". A sympathiser of revolutionaries makes a distinction between them and terrorists. He tries to project images of C.R. Das and Subhas Bose larger than life. Generally, he is in agreement with what Das, Bose and Azad say. On the issue of depressed classes and Poona Pact he represents the Bengali Hindu as he says, "Dr. Ambedkar, the most prominent leader of the Depressed classes, was induced to join it, and he fully exploited the situation" and "the Depressed classes benefitted both ways". He says that it was the Hindus whose seats in Central and Provincial Legislature were reduced whereas Harijan seats were doubled along with modified separate Electorates. Similarly he appreciates the role played by the revolutionaries, because during his youthful days, the revolutionary movement in India was dominant in Bengal organized by Middle Class, high caste Hindu youths. This fact is also corroborated by M.A.K. Azad in India Wins Freedom.

On the Hindu-Muslim problem, Majumdar lacks empathy with the nationalist view and the ideology of Gandhi. He considers Khilafat movement to be Pan-Islamic and antinational. He thinks that there were fundamental differences between Hindus and Muslims based on history, culture and tradition and is critical of Gandhi for accepting a purely imaginary fraternity as a fact. At another place he says the Hindu leaders fell into the trap, and blames Gandhi for the Hindu support to khilafat movement. He also considers Gandhi and Nehru as Hindu leaders Commenting upon League manifesto of 1936, he says that though to many people a part of the manifesto appeared a bold bid for second Lucknow Pact, yet it did not prove so.
Similarly some times Jinnah was hailed as ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity because of his fine words or mouth, people forgot that with the Muslims "the sting was in the tail."\textsuperscript{139}

Though he appreciates Gandhi for his humanitarianism or saintliness yet criticises him for being mystic, simple, child like, dictator in the Congress or political Guru. He calls Gandhi a split personality. He is very critical of his followers who having been blinded by the mystic halo of Gandhi, surrendered their own judgement to him, or looked upon Gandhi as a superman or divine being.\textsuperscript{140}

Majumdar seems to support Subhas's view point, but passes judgement when it is related to Gandhi or his activities or his ideology.

Analysis

The historians belong to three different provinces. Dr. Sitaramayya belonged to Kistna district in Madras Presidency, Dr. Tara Chand hailed from Sialkot in Punjab\textsuperscript{141} and Dr. R.C. Majumdar comes from Bengal.\textsuperscript{142} Sitaramayya studied in Medicine and Tara Chand and Majumdar were well-versed with the subject professionally.

Sitaramayya was a Niyogi Brahmin, agriculturally not a dominating caste\textsuperscript{143} It was purely on his merit and brilliance that sitaramayya graduated in medicine\textsuperscript{144} Tara Chand after doing M.A. in History obtained his Ph.D. from Oxford, R.C. Majumdar studied in Calcutta University one of the best in the country. Both Dr. Tara Chand and Prof. R.C. Majumdar have been associated with the study and growth of the subject for almost all their lives. Starting their careers almost simultaneously, their interest and contribution continued till their deaths. Sitaramayya is exceptional his life long association with the organization inspired him to record its activity. Beginning his political activities in 1905-06 independence of India even later he was a member of constituent assembly and was appointed the Governor of Madhya Pradesh (1952-57).
he died in 1959. He was staunch congressite, a Gandhi follower in Sitaaramayya. Tara Chand is a congressite with leftist bent of mind close to Nehru for whom Gandhi had due respect. Majumdar is reepresentative of the prevalent Hindu viewpoint of Bengal.

Sitaramayya emerges as an advocate of Congress and Gandhi’s ideology, critical of Government repression and identified the Congress party with national movement. Tara Chand in describing the national movement highlighting the composite nature of Indian civilization emphasises that communal disharmony was a creation of the British, than any other historian has expressed divergent opinion on this issue.

Each historian in this set has a different perception of Gandhi and his activities. For Sitaramayya, Gandhi was a prophet who had come for the emancipation of his country. He firmly believed in Gandhi’s ideology and oneness of life and seems to propagate in his works, Tara Chand admires Gandhi for his efforts at Hindu-Muslim unity and his concepts of Truth and Non-violence Majumdar is critical of Gandhi on those very issues and blames Gandhi for offering Hindu support to a Muslim cause, a leader lacking in political instinct, who would dispense with logic and reasoning and depend on inner voice or mystic instinct. He also charged Gandhi of popularising dictatorship (Guruvad) in the Congress.

Their accounts of the movements amply indicate its spread encompassing all classes and castes, The Muslim league participation, which they think, weakened.

Sitaramayya’s work is the biography of Indian National Congress Tara Chand and Majumdar is focus is on the movements. The masses are treated as followers or participants but why did the masses follow the Congress leadership or why did they slacken in their support are not looked into deeply.
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Significantly none of these historians questions the legitimacy of the demand for India’s independence and the struggle for it the growth of Muslim League, Tara Chand appreciated for avoiding movement being exclusively a Hindu activity. The details of the police repression show how deep the hatred of the British empire was among the Indian people. It shows that they rose enmasse. The sufferings of the masses during the repression show that Gandhi’s ideology had left deep impression on the minds of the people.

All of them agree that during the World War II when violence was rampant, people were swayed by it. And that Gandhi found it difficult to make them accept his view point. Sitaramayya calls Quit India Movement to be a Gandhian movement. Tara Chand calls it a spontaneous revolution, and Majumdar seems to be self-contradicting. On one hand he says that it was not a Gandhian movement as he did not formulate a definite plan and at another place he says it was a reaction against Gandhi’s arrest.

The contemporary historians of Gandhi discussed in this chapter were in their thirties or forties when Gandhi’s national movement was gaining ground and lived well after his time to enrich their analysis through reflection and restrospection.
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