CHAPTER VII
MEMORISTS

Biography is written about a person, who in the literal sense, is distinguished because his achievements are not within the everyday range of human experience. The concept of distinguished personality is closely associated with the ‘Great Man’ theory. An outstanding individual creates the forces which change the shape of the world and the thoughts of men. A great man cannot stand outside history. Great historical events are bound up with the life of a statesman. Carlyle holds that Universal history - the history of man’s accomplishment is at bottom the history of great men. All present things are practical realization of their thoughts.

Thus the biographies of historically significant personage become a part of history and help in knowing more about lives and events related to eminent figures.

Though, biography a branch of history yet there is general recognition that history and biography are distinct forms of literature. Sir Sidney Lee while maintaining this distinction, holds that history describes the aggregate movement of men and its role in moulding the social and political events; whereas biography draws apart one unit from the mass of the mankind. Historian looks at mankind through field glass, whereas a biographer puts an individual under magnifying glass. E.H. Carr finds it interesting to distinguish between history which treats man as part of a whole and biography which treats man as an individual. He believes that the behaviour of an individual is different from their conscious motives. Therefore it is evident that biography concentrates on an individual, thus does not end abruptly where as history does so and leaves us in uncertainty. For Andre Mourois human beings live in biography only as much others have taken note of their actions.

The biographers selected for this chapter are those contemporaries of Gandhi who were associated with Gandhi in one way or the other. They are not only
In this Chapter an effort has been made to find out how these biographers who have been in the drift of events have looked at various incidents, how do they place their hero in different situations. As biography is written either to commemorate or to defame, we aim to study how does a particular biography record Gandhi's development and growth into what the hero became and to which aspects the author gives more importance. It is also studied how much space does he provide to the milieu and how he has tried to see Gandhi in historical perspective. While studying Gandhi's actions, has the biographer studied the purpose Gandhi had in mind and why was he unique? How does this biographer put Gandhi-Congress relationship? Has the author given adequate space and sympathetic understanding to Gandhi's concepts and ideology? What role does he assign to Gandhi as a leader of the congress and the freedom movement? How does he analyse Gandhi's strategy and tactics? Is he judging actions from moral standpoint or political strategy? Does he study the British Government in collectivity or officials individually? Similarly his treatment of the congress is also studied.

**Louis Fischer**

A recipient of Watumull prize of American Historical Association for his *The Life of Mahatama Gandhi* and National Book Award in History and Biography for the *Life of Lenin*, Louis Fischer happens to be the first biographer of Gandhi after his death. Fischer was an admirer of Gandhi. He tried to understand him after making an acquaintance with Bolshevism and American Democracy. Louis Fischer is the author of world-wide acclaimed biography of Gandhi. Although written by a foreigner,
it happens to be an expression of an admirer who has turned to the ideology of Gandhi after tasting the popular Isms of the day - Communism and Democracy.

Louis Fischer, for this biography, apart from depending upon Gandhi's Autobiography, Satyagraha in South Africa, Harijan, Indian Opinion, Young India, Speeches and Writing of Mahatama Gandhi, Delhi Diary, Jawaharlal Nehru's The Discovery of India, writing and speeches of Jawaharlal Nehru and various works by Gandhi's colleagues and associates, official reports collected a great deal in information about the times and Gandhi himself.

The Life of Mahatma Gandhi


Non-cooperation 1920-22

In response to Gandhi's appeal for non-cooperation many Indians renounced their titles and decorations. Motilal, Jawaharlal, C.R. Das, Vallabhbhai Patel and Thousands of others left the British courts for even thousands of students dropped their studies and went to villages to propagate non-cooperation. Peasants took to non-payment of taxes and boycott of foreign goods and bonfire of foreign clothes became a common feature in the cities.

The Government reacted to the non-cooperation movement with arrests and imprisonments of 20000 by December 1921. During January 1922 ten thousand more were arrested. In order to break the morale of the prisoners they were put to severe tortures and humiliations in jails.
The new Viceroy, Lord Reading invited Gandhi in May 1921 but nothing came out of the meeting. Gandhi made entry in the national politics through Panjab after the Amritsar Massacre. Pan-Islamism which had never been an issue with the Indian Muslims suddenly gained importance with the Indian Muslims at the time of abolition of Caliphate. Gandhi discovered a great opportunity for the two major communities to join hands against a common enemy. Non co-operation was the obvious choice for an action plan of boycott of everything British - schools, courts, jobs and honours. People were already agitated over high prices and governments repressive measures. So they readily accepted Gandhi's call. Gandhi planned to launch mass civil Disobedience in Bardoli and sent an ultimatum to the viceroy to the effect.

"Gandhi, moreover was not contemplating a fight to the finish with the British Empire." He hoped to "wring reluctant repentence from you (The british) and we ask you to think betimes. and see that you do not make the three hundred millions of India your eternal enemies. It was because of this spirit that Gandhi chose to work in the Bardoli test-tube." as it would be "A united unrestrained, self disciplined Bardoli, Peaceful but not co-operating with the British administration."

Some members of CWC disagreed with Gandhi's suspension of movement. Fischer says that as Gandhi had disarmed himself by suspending the Bardoli Civil Disobedience therefore he could be arrested with impunity.

Civil Disobedience 1930-34

In 1928, situation was fast moving, growing agitation in the minds of Indians over Simon-Commission and Police attack on Lala Lajpat Rai, and his death, growing labour unrest and the Congress declaration of Complete Independence as its goal were the major determinants of Gandhi's decision to suggest 'a two years warning' to the British. Circumstances forced Gandhi to declare, "If by December, 31st 1929 India
had not achieved freedom under the Dominion Status "I must declare myself an independence wala." The author finds Lord Irwin's statement regarding RTC in October followed by Leaders' Manifesto and the consequent meeting with the Viceroy on December 23, 1929, in the meantime conservative attack on Lord Irwin's promise of RTC and Dominion Status precipitating the matter. Hence came the Congress resolution of complete independence authorising Gandhi to launch a Civil Disobedience movement.

Not too keen to start any civil disobedience movement Gandhi obeyed the order like a soldier, as the die was cast. The British Government aggravated the issue by altering the exchange rate of rupee and shilling in favour of Lancashire hitting the Indian middle class. The world wide economic depression hit the Indian peasant. Indian working class was also agitated over the persecution of labour organisers. In this situation Gandhi was looking for campaign which would preclude potential violence, thus he decided to fight the salt tax iniquities and subsequently informed the Viceroy of his plan.

Fischer with great lucidity describes the excitement of people and the welcome extended to Dandi marchers in detail. The impact of the march was so great that even Subhas Bose - whom Fischer considers a 'fierce critic' of Gandhi - compared the Salt March to "Napoleon's march to Paris on his return from Elba."

Picking of Salt by Gandhi was a signal to the nation. People responded by going to the sea or beach with a pan to make Salt. People in large numbers violated the salt Laws and openly sold it in the cities. Picketing of liquor shops and foreign cloth shops commenced throughout India. Women demonstrated in the streets. Within a month the movement spread to Maharashtra, Gujrat, Bengal, Bihar, Madras, Delhi, Karnataka, Punjab and N.W.F.P. and United Provinces. he also cites violent incidents
of Chittagaon, and N.W.F.P. by Afridi Tribes. In Ahmedabad only 10000 people obtained illegal salt from the congress office on payment and free also. Many legislators resigned from the legislatures Fischer maintains that on the whole people remained non-violent as they had learnt a lesson in 1922. In Gujarat, U.P. and some parts of Bengal, peasants refused to pay rent and the land tax.  

The Government was perplexed and puzzled whether to arrest Gandhi or not. Mass arrests were already undertaken, but later on the government became vindictive and resorted to firing and machine gunning resulting in killing of two persons in Karachi and Peshawar, Censorship was imposed on Nationalist papers, Against the official figures of 6000 arrests given in Lord Irwin’s biography, Fischer maintains the number to be one lakh. As an example of Government’s extreme repression he cites Webb Miller’s account of Dharsana raid.

Regarding the impact or significance of the movement he states that India was in a state of ‘insurrection without arms.’ India was now free, though technically, legally nothing had changed as India was still a British Colony. In support of his argument he quotes from Tagore that the movement made the British people realize that they had lost their moral prestige in Asia, they were known as upholders of Western race supremacy and exploiters of other countries. He agrees with Tagore and attributes this achievement to Gandhi. He says, “Gandhi did two things in 1930, he made the British people aware that they were cruelly subjugating India, and he gave Indians the conviction that they could by lifting their heads and straightening their spines, lift the Yoke from their shoulders.”

Further he says, "The British beat the Indian with batons and rifle butts. The Indians neither cringed nor complained nor retreated. That made England powerless and India invincible."
When efforts to ensure Gandhi's participation at the first RTC were being made by George Solocombe, Fischer attributes it to the Labour ministry in London which considered Gandhi a nuisance both in or out of jail. In January 1931, it was the conciliatory mood of the Labour Government that finally Gandhi - Irwin Pact was signed. He makes a reference to clause two of the pact without being critical of it as only seventeen years after the pact, India got independence. He finds the pact significant as it was signed on terms of equality. Though it did not promise either independence or Dominion status yet it established the equality between representatives of England and that of India.

Fischer mentions that complaints about non-fulfilment of promises and police high handedness were levelled against the Government, soon after the pact was signed. But during his stay in England the situation had taken an ugly turn. On his arrival Gandhi found emergency powers, ordinances in U.P., NWFP, and Bengal, with authorities having the enormous powers with Jawaharlal and T. Sherwani already arrested. Gandhi wanted to negotiate with the government for the redressal of the same but Lord Wellingdon was in no mood to hear him. This compelled him to resume the civil disobedience movement on 3 January 1932. Next day Gandhi was arrested.

The government’s repression, after the resumption of Civil Disobedience in 1932, crossed all previous limits, Congress was its main target. "Congress organizations were closed and almost all leaders imprisoned; In January 14800 persons, were jailed for political reasons; in February 17,800. Winston Churchill declared that the repressive measures were drastic than any since the 1857 Mutiny."

On 20 September, 1932 Gandhi went on his ‘Epic Fast’ on the issue of separate electorates. The author informs the reader that Jawaharlal who was first annoyed at Gandhi's decision to choose a side issue for final sacrifice, later accepted that Gandhi knew well how to pull the strings that move people’s hearts. Socially it created
"religious - emotional upheaval, "No mystic himself Gandhi affected others mystically. They became one with him as one as mother and babe, Reason withdrew... Hindus were reacting to single throbbing wish: The Mahatma must not die. The caste hindus with utmost sincerity started destroying the illegal practice deeply embedded in complicated religious overtones and under currents. 'A taboo haloed by religious custom and ritual lost its potency." Thus the epic fast snapped the long chains of antiquity that had enslaved tens of millions Gandhi’s fast went a long way in promising freedom to untouchables.

Gandhi was released when he again went on a three week fast on may 8, 1933, and in return as a gesture of friendship to the government he suspended the movement. In July he sought an interview with the Viceroy which was denied. Consequently Gandhi started a March to village Ras and was arrested on August 1, 1933. Three days later he was released to be arrested again for one year, had to be released on August 23, 1933 on grounds of health due to the intended fast on 16 August, 1933. He nevertheless considered himself as serving the years sentence and announced that he would not resume civil disobedience before 3rd August, 1934.

World War II

Between 1933 and 1939 Gandhi completely devoted himself to constructive work and allowed nothing to digress him from this.

India resented the proclamation of being at war with the Axis powers as an additional proof of foreign control. Fischer has provided us with a peep into the inner conflict going on in Gandhi’s mind, "Gandhi had a daily quarrel with God; non-violence had failed; God had failed. But at end of each quarrel, the Mahatma decided that neither God nor non-violence is impotent. Impotance is in men. I must try without losing faith in God."18
Gandhi held Hitler responsible for the war and sympathised with England and France. His, "whole heart is with the Poles in the unequal struggle in which they were engaged for the sake of their freedom."

Within the Congress, Gandhi felt himself ill at ease. "Gandhi and congress fought a friendly but hard battle". The Congress which echoed the views of most articulate Indians, considered non-violence as a policy, whereas for Gandhi, it was creed. "Congress adopted non-violence for expected gains. Gandhi wanted no violence irrespective of the fruits." Hence Gandhi pledged that he would not embarrass the British Government. On the other hand Congress was ready to support the war effort if specific conditions were satisfied. When Gandhi found that he was "alone in thinking that what ever support was to be given to the British sould be given unconditionally and nonviolently". He supported the resolution drafted by Jawaharlal Nehru. Fisher comments "when ever congress rejected Gandhi's pacifism and volunteered to aid the British he did not interfere. Whenever Congress agreed with him and wanted to hinder the war effort, he objected."19 The author also mentions that Gandhi's close friend C.Rajagopalachariar converted Vallabh Bhai Patel to his side, thus only Gaffar Khan 'Frontier Gandhi' sided with the Mahatma.

After Churchill's Government refused to 'divest herself of the responsibilities which her long association with India had imposed on her', Congress again came back to Gandhi. Rebuffed and eager to protest against the war and India's helplessness Gandhi proposed fast but was dissuaded by Mahadev Desai. Therefore he adopted a milder symbolic form which could not impede the war effort; and started Individual Satyagraha by selected volunteers to defy the official ban on propaganda against the war. The author mentions that the satyagraha continued for a year. "It generated little public enthusiasm. People were tired of going to jail."
Quit India 1942

As the war was moving closure to India, America and China felt the low war morale of the Indians and thus pressurised Churchill to send Sir Stafford Cripps to India with a proposal, which the Congress, the Muslim League and all other parties rejected. "The Cripps terms of the future post-war settlement violated basic Congress and Gandhian principles. That Azad, Nehru and Rajagopalachariar the Congress spokesmen should nevertheless have negotiated with Cripps shows how eager they were to come to agreement about the present." Gandhi rejected Cripps offer because of his pacifism and, too, out of devotion to the idea of a united India. To Fisher Cripps seems to be a victim of Churchill because it was only when the Labour Party was in power that India got independence.

Fischer spent a week with Gandhi in June 1942. Apart from experiences of the summer of Wardha, him minute details about Gandhi, Ba, Asharmites, Congress leaders and G.D. Birla are refreshing and informative. He takes his reader to have a peep in to Gandhi the individual who wished no ill-will to any one, punctual, affectionate thinking only of future and passionate. The author has mentioned his significant interviews with Gandhi on the topics such as Cripps mission, and the proposed civil disobedience. Gandhi did not accept Cripps proposals and left for Sevagram, but he wanted freedom before India could participate in the war effort. Before launching the movement he wanted to interview the Viceroy which was denied to him. Gandhi expected this movement to be not only antibritish but also antilandlord and that Gandhi expected violence.

With the Japanese at India’s door-steps in the summer of 1942, there was a suffocating airlessness making Indian’s desperate. The retreat from Burma, the apprehensions about England’s lack of strength to protect India from invasion, Indians having no voice and no power to act prompted Gandhi to launch a Satyagraha. The
British Government being infavour of suppression than discussion arrested Gandhi and other Congress leaders on 9th August, 1942 soon after the Quit India resolution was passed.  

The popular violent reactions all over India at the arrest of their leaders is aptly described. Fischer's account is more objective, unbiased and forthright. Reasoned arguments based on personal observations and interviews, his statements were not challenged after publication thus, their authenticity is hardly doubted. Violent attacks on government property communications and British officials were made. A powerful underground movement sprang up. The government was inoperative in many areas. Fischer specifies only Maharashtra where popular governments were setup to be put down only in 1944. He discusses other places generally. The British Government blamed Gandhi for violence. Gandhi charged the Government of India of being at fault.  

Whilst no details of the movement are given the author creates the impression that Gandhi never launched a movement. I.N.C. had merely authorised him to launch it but he had not given the order as he wanted to meet the Viceroy. Fischer points out that as the country was in violent mood and Gandhi was aware of it, he could not lay his hands on immediate issue for starting a movement. Here Fischer seems to be exonerating Gandhi of the responsibility of disturbances.  

Fischer likes to believe that if Gandhi had been out of jail he would have curbed the general violence. The British apart from having the satisfaction that they succeeded in putting Gandhi in the prison, gained nothing instead faced mob fury. The author has devoted a special chapter to Jinnah-Gandhi relationship starting with a typical fashion of a biographer's style. "Jinnah who considered himself Gandhi's opponent number one, lived in a large crescent shaped marble mansion... which revealed the cultural and opulent touch... Jinnah was over six feet tall and weighted..."
ninesstones, a very thin man... well shaped head... silver grey hair brushed the straight back. Face was thin, the nose was long and aquiline... temples were sunken cheeks deep holes, which made his cheek bones stand out, standing like high horizontal ridges, teeth were bad, while not speaking chin was pulled in, tight lipped knit his big brow the result was a forbidding earnestness. He rarely laughed." Almost two pages are devoted to such like personal details of Jinnah's exterior, family background and so on. Personal habits and his religion. He gives similar description of Sir Stafford Cripps, tall, thin, austere, vegetarian son of a labour lord and nephew of Beatrice Webb the famous Fabian socialist writer, Stafford Cripps attended exclusive schools and became and unorthodox Left wing Labour member of parliament. A brilliant lawyer giving away a large portion of his income for welfare. Louis Fischer's characteristics as biographer are of great interest immediately catches the eye of the reader, immensly interesting of the writers studied in these pages Fischer has studied Gandhi and his movement by relating it to the personality around Gandhi or with whom Gandhi interacted. No other author in his work has individually mentioned and discussed such a large number of leaders as in his narrative of Gandhi's biography.

In Gandhi, according to Fischer lies the hope of creating human world order, promising freedom and justice to everyone. As he had seen democratic and totalitarian regimes, he considered it best to turn the search light in ward. In Gandhi's ideology of nonviolence lie the answers to the world problems. The author attempts to understand Gandhi's non-violence, his individualism and humanitarian in the context of his religiosity.

The author's language is simple. Louis Fischer combines in himself the qualities of a good researcher and a journalist which have made his work popular and authentic. Fischer is the most respected biographer of Gandhi and other leaders of the 20th century.
Pyare Lal

In the introduction to the first volume of Mahatma Gandhi - The Last Phase, Dr. Rajendra Prasad states that Pyare Lal does not need any introduction as he is well known for his writings in Harijan, Young India and on Gandhi which have established him as a faithful, authoritative, chronicler and interpreter of Gandhi’s life and philosophy. His close association with Gandhi for nearly three decades made him a well known person with the contemporaries of Gandhi. He came to Gandhi in 1920 after leaving his studies, was made an assistant to Mahadev Desai - Gandhi’s Chief Secretary a position which he occupied till the latter’s death in 1942. Then he became Gandhi’s Chief Secretary.

Pyarelal’s Mahatma Gandhi - a four volume set (i) the Early Phase Volume I and II, (ii) Mahatma Gandhi -The Last Phase volume I and II. The Last Phase I deals the events of the last few years of Gandhi career before death, when all his principles were put to severest and final test. It is a supplement to the story of ‘My Experiments with Truth’ that deals with the formative phase of his life. The last phase was published in 1956 by Navjivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad. The book was intended to follow up the earlier publication, ‘A Pilgrimage for Peace which describes Gandhi’s mission to NWFP to inculcate non-violence among the Pathans as this work is the story of his mission in Noakhali. The Last Phase consists of two volumes. Volume one deals with the period from Gandhi’s release in 1944 to the arrival of Lord Mountbatten as the Viceroy in March 1947, where as volume II tells the story upto the end of Gandhi’s life.

The author gives "a full, detailed and authentic story of the last phase of Gandhi’s life in which his spiritual powers are seen at work at the height of their maturity."

The author is conscious of the difficulties he had to face due to serious gaps in information. Since many of Gandhi’s serious discussions with his colleagues, and
representatives of the British Government were unrecorded and being so close to the times could not have access to the withheld material under the circumstances the author needed a lot of time and patience.

To complete this work, Pyarelal has apart from Gandhi’s office records, Young India, Harijan, Statements and interviews to Press, had depended upon personal notes, taken in the capacity of his most trusted secretary after the death of Mahadev Desai. Pyarelal has also depended upon Gandhi’s journal written for the author in his absence and material collected from Manu Gandhi. He wants the Indian reader to know the path and the goal set by Gandhi.

**Quit India**

The author describes the story of Quit India and the second world war. The main purpose of the book is to discuss events from Gandhi release in 1944 to 1946 yet before coming to the subject he discusses preceding events. Despite the fact that India was declared a belligerent country by the British government without her consent. Indians favoured helping the British war-effort in defence of democracy but still they received rebuffs and refusals from the British Government which caused frustration. Indians resented subordination when the invader (The Japanese) had reached India’s borders as result the Quit India Movement was launched.24

To substantiate his argument Pyarelal cites Arthur Moore, editor of the Statesman who believed that "by insisting on the theoretical part of legal constitution making by Indian themselves - and that, to, in war time of all times - His Majesty's Government has inevitably increased India’s suspicion of its ultimate good faith."25

Gandhi did demand that the British should leave India in and orderly manner to Indians. An American press correspondent in the course of an interview with Gandhi mentioned Quit India and thereafter it caught on. Gandhi did not coin it the
actual expression used by Gandhi was "orderly British withdrawl." The conditions due to war were not favourable but Gandhi was determined. To many, it seems shear madness however the Old Guard was persuaded by Gandhi to join the fight against the alien domination.

The British Government were more afraid of loosing India to Indians than to the Japanese, Quit India resolution was a significant turning point in the history of Indias freedom struggle.

"It was not a slogan but a potent cry of the soul' of India struggling for selfrealization. It swept away at a stroke and rendered obsolete the remanants of the old controversy of dominion Status versus Independence. Unconditional withdrawl of the British Power thereafter became the *sine qua non* of the settlement of the Indian question". Pyarelal further adds the communal problem had hither to been used by the British power as an excuse for their refusal to Quit India, It now became the very reason and justification for the Quit India demand.27

The government’s demand for the withdrawl of the movement, Pyarelal maintains could not secure a withdrawl either through threats or repression or cajoling. Though the official repression was going on with a full force yet Gandhi

"was not prepared to abate an iota from the Quit India demand and compromise the faith of those thousands upon thousands who had taken the Do or Die pledge under his inspiration and lead simply because the odds seemed to be going against them heavily."

As everyone considered that the government wanted "to humiliate us", Senior liberal leaders, great legal luminaries, also, were against withdrawl on account of national self-respect. Similarly responded Industrialists like Tata, Birla, Thakurdas. Gandhi set another precedent, says the writer, in the earlier movements he used to nominate successors this time he did not do so and everybody supposed to be his/her own leader in case of Gandhi’s arrest. Hence due to imprisonment, his leadership had
lapsed and it was for every Indian to decide for himself. Gandhi argued that he had not started any mass civil disobedience, nor was he in mood to do so, but he maintained that every individual had a right to resist if the normal activities of the Congress were interfered by the government. Moreover, how could Gandhi withdraw the resolution when it was passed by the whole house of AICC, which alone was competent to do that, Gandhi pleaded,

"A resolution jointly undertaken can be honourably, conscientiously and properly withdrawn only after joint discussion and deliberation."²⁸

Regarding the impact of the movement, Pyare Lal says that though the authorities were able to contain the movement for the time being yet the spirit, which Quit India released, kept marching on. Pyarelal says that it is because of this movement that the British had to Quit India within five years of the movement.

Many congressmen had lost their moorings during the Quit India struggle. As the resolution had put on every individual, the responsibility of implementation of the programme within the four corners of truth and non-violence, but with the imprisonment of leaders, everyone interpreted non-violence differently. Moreover, a broadcast by Mr. Amery enumerating the 'sabotage activities' planned by Congress gave an impetus to violence to the point that K.G. Mashruwala, a non-violent stickler was misled,²⁹ and a letter which Mashruwala addressed to the Chief Secretary, Government of C.P. and Berar putting the responsibility for the misleading statement by Mr. Amery.³⁰ Though the saboteurs avoided personal injury to any one yet they went underground for many activities of organization. As a result of governmental repression, many of those who had gone underground had grave charges of violence pending against them, e.g. even R.R. Diwakar Aruna Asaf Ali had gone underground with the prizes of big sums on their heads. Socialists considered Ahimsa to be outmoded, as its job of awakening masses was over, they did not rule out use of arms.
Others accepted Ahimsa but suggested modifications in its application. They advocated sabotage and underground activities and setting up of parallel government.

The movement succeeded in setting up parallel governments at Midnapur, Satara and Ballia. At these places it carried an educational administration and welfare work. It also levied fines, and taxes. It disarmed British police along with arrests of officials and government servants.

As regards the role of the communists in India\textsuperscript{31} the author says that after Russian’s entry into the war, the ban on Indian Communists was lifted. They utilized all their resources to thwart ‘Quit India’ movement and in consequence their name had fallen in bad odour with the public and congress. Whilst discussing the role of Constructive workers; violent activities were more successful during the movement as compared to non-violent constructive ones. The Khadi and Charkha suffered a lot. He says that year ago, Gandhi had launched a number of constructive activities to generate non-violent strength among the masses i.e. hand-spinning, hand-weaving, removal of untouchability, village industries and Basic Education. But it was only the constructive institutions which suffered the brunt of repression from Government during the movement.

Pyare Lal’s works are well-known for the hard labour put in by him. It is a veritable mine of information which enables us to watch and hear Gandhi day by day and almost hour by hour. Pyare Lal did exhaustive research on the Kathiawar before writing this work. But he has handicaps in writing English, his language is hyperbolic,\textsuperscript{32} e.g. while writing about Gandhi’s release in 1944 he names the Chapter ‘The Dawn of Freedom’ followed by Wordsworth’s lines or the title of Chapter X, Zero-hour. So far as the facts are concerned he does not offer much information on the Quit India Movement. It is in some other context that he mentions Quit India Movement. He gets into the details which may not be significant to a casual reader but for a researcher
on Gandhi, his work is quite useful for understanding milieu and general environment and situation context under which Gandhi, took a decision and started his programme. Since he had been one of the closest persons to Gandhi, the minute details and facts which he had given in his works cannot be undermined at any stage.

D.G. Tendulkar

Best known for his exhaustive eight volume study *Mahatma* D.G. Tendulkar was a freedom fighter and a writer on freedom movement. He rose to be a great scholar, a litterateur, nationalist and a noted biographer. He was a Gandhian to the extent that he remained a bachelor all through his life.

Mahatma

The voluminous work on Gandhi was published by Government of India in 1960. The author was inspired by Yusf J. Mehrally with whom he was in Nasik Jail in 1941. In these days Tendulkar was writing a felicitation volume for Gandhi’s 75th Birthday. Tendulkar was helped by Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru in the writing of this work. Gandhi by guiding and revising his own speeches and writings lent authenticity to the work. Even on January 22, 1948, Tendulkar discussed the minutest details of the format of this biography with Gandhi. R.R. Diwakar supplied him the material pertaining to the period 1942-45. It took him six years to complete this work. Whilst depending upon Gandhi’s original speeches and writings, ‘Indian Opinion’, ‘Young India’ and ‘Harijan’ verified historical facts by cross-checking with Mahadev Desai and Pyarelal. He has also consulted Gandhi’s letters to his colleagues and close associates, newspapers and other relevant literature. The author visited all places associated with Gandhi but found lack of historical sense amongst the majority of people, because he found to his amazement that many people had destroyed the
letters written to them by Gandhi, he realizes the need for cultivating appreciation of historical works.33

The biographer is conscious of the inaptitude for historical works and considers his work 'a simple narration of events through which we have lived.' Mahatma's eight volumes contain "history of the last fifty years or so with Gandhi ji in the foreground." The purpose is to tell the story faithfully and as far as possible in Gandhi's own works.

This biography, as the author was also aware, is a good source of research material on Gandhi as it contains Gandhi's own writings, speeches, interviews and important congress resolutions along with correspondence between Gandhi and the Government of India. With the publication of ninety volumes of the collected works of Mahatma Gandhi its value has not diminished (i) in so far as its drafts have personally been corrected by Gandhi, (ii) the narrative is related to the people around Gandhi, the situation of his times. The arrangement of the material is in a chronological order, according to the events and is discussed in a logical manner.

As the author wanted to say mostly in Gandhi's own words, he is left with no option but to make very few comments of his own. And wherever, he got a chance to express his own observation, it is expressed according to his own involvement in the event, he does not express much about the events of 1920s as he was, then, just ten year old child, his comments however become clearer and louder when he comes to treat the period of 1930s and 1940s.

In this setting we find that proper space has been provided to the actor Gandhi. As he was a central figure, he is painted with his own colours. The movements he led from the major chunk of these volumes.
Non-cooperation 1920-22

Enumerating the factors responsible for the uprising the 1919, the author says that revolts were the order of the day not only in India but also in all other colonies of the British Empire in India. "All sections of the people were ready for the action." The reasons were: peasant dissatisfaction over rising prices, industrial workers' resentment at appalling conditions, Muslims indignation at the treatment meted out to the Caliph of Turkey and the Rowlatt Bills. The Rowlatt Satyagraha which resulted in Jallianwala Bagh massacre led to the suspension of Satyagraha.34

The non-cooperation movement had been preceded by Khilafat question over which March 19, 1920 was fixed as a day of national mourning - a day of fasting and prayer. Along with this came the congress Inquiry report on Punjab atrocities on March 25. The author thinks that the time was ripe for united action. During the National week from April 6 to 13, Gandhi prepared the people to make sacrifices. Tilak, though liked the programme but was doubtful of capacity of ability for self-denial by people. He promised support to Gandhi's programme of Non-cooperation.

The author mentions that around Gandhi new forces were gathering. As Gandhi felt the storm brewing he did all in his power to discipline the movement by a gradual preparation of the masses for the coming struggle. He started teaching through the columns of Young India, emphasised the Swadeshi programme with main emphasis on Khaddar. He considered spinning wheel a national necessity. With its items of boycott and disobedience the date fixed was August 1, 1920 for which "The nation impatiently waited for the zero hour."35 Gandhi's signal came through his letter to the viceroy surrendering his decorations and titles. Gandhi went ahead with his programme though it was not yet approved by Congress which was to meet for the special session at Calcutta on Sept 4, Gandhi had to face opposition from men like
Gandhi's programme, Tendulkar says made Congress a revolutionary body representing the masses. The programme along with boycotts included social reform and constructive work. People responded to the programme enthusiastically. Hindus and Muslims dined together, Muslims stopped taking beef even on Id. There were mass-meetings all over the country. Within four months national schools, colleges and universities were started at many places. Government schools and colleges were emptied. The distinguished lawyers who gave up their practice included Motilal Nehru, C.R. Das, C.Rajgopalachari, Vallabhai Patel and Rajendra Prasad. Bose resigned from Indian Civil Service. Congress workers and volunteers worked with zeal and devotion. People in remote villages talked of Congress and Swaraj. Tendulkar opines that there was a strange mixture of nationalism, religion and mysticism. But as people's morale grew, that of the government went down.

The government reacted with repressive measures which started in a small way with serving restraint orders on many leaders. Then came a ban on Congress and arrest of leaders. The government used naked force. Khadi became an anathema to them, the wearer was insulted and humiliated by officials. Volunteers were assaulted, Police played dirty practical jokes on people. Khilafat and Congress offices were destroyed along with their records, crops worth thousands of rupees were burnt. Assaults along with removal of jewellery from women was also reported. Indian papers were suppressed and fined to point of their closure.

About Gandhi's influence on people, Tendulkar writes that Gandhi was considered to be an avatar like Rama and Krishna. He had succeeded in conversion of many to his creed. People from all sections of society, prostitutes, coolies, Marwari merchants, railway workers, tribals became his followers. His new programme also generated mass struggles at local levels such as Akali movement in Punjab, Mulsi Peta in Maharashtra and strikes in Eastern Railways. The old feeling of fear, oppression
and frustration disappeared. There were bonfires of foreign cloth, apart from that, adoption of khadi was the main feature. At Ahmedabad session of the Congress, two schools of thought tried to impress Gandhi and Congress-moderate school suggesting for Round Table Conference and the extremists for taking vigorous steps towards a 'plucky fight for independence'. But both were defeated.

At the end of 1921, Tendulkar makes a crisp remark, "Swaraj did not dawn, but the mind in chains was set free." This was the impact of Gandhi's movement.

The suspension of the movement and its aftermath have been treated by Tendulkar in usual fashion of just continuing the story and filling gaps between the Non-cooperation movement and the Civil Disobedience.

The year 1922 was to begin with Bardoli Satyagraha. Gandhi had sent an ultimatum to the Viceroy on February 6, but two days later he received the news of Chauri-Chaura and Congress Working Committee at his request decided to cancel Civil Disobedience programme and continue with constructive work. He also testifies the fact that it caused consternation among the Congress leaders, who were in jail. To this Gandhi's reply was that those who were in jail were civilly dead. He continued the programme of Individual Satyagraha. And as expected Gandhi was arrested on March 10, 1922.

Gandhi's message of maintaining peace even after his arrest was followed by people. Tendulkar remarks that it showed nation's determination to follow his message of self-control and non-violence, his method became so popular that it was adopted even in Germany by residents of Ruhr district. And that too inspire of Gandhi's arrest, his spirit animated India.

He mentions Malabar rising only in brief and does not comment on that except Gandhi and Mohammed Ali were not permitted to visit the area to pacify the people.
But he mentions Gandhi's Ajmer tour which is not referred to by many of his biographers. Tendulkar believes that in 1922-23, Gandhi’s influence was temporary on the Congress and the masses.

**Civil Disobedience 1930-34**

Regarding Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-34, the author begins with Simon Commission and Nehru Report. The year 1928 was full of political activity while Gandhi was in Sabarmati. Tendulkar writes that "death of Lajpat Rai bred an intense revolutionary mentality in the youth of the country. Added to it was the wave of leftist ideas surging all around."

At the Congress session December 1928, Gandhi had to face the opposition on the issue of Dominion Status from Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Bose who demanded severing connections with the British Empire. But Gandhi gave the time limit of one year to the British Parliament to accept the Constitution as given in the Nehru Report, as an effort at compromise. Industrial workers were also in a revolutionary mood. Gandhi promised to give them Swaraj within one year provided they followed his programme honestly. But they were impatient and the Congress pavillion was invaded by nearly fifty thousand of them.⁴⁵

The year 1929 was full of terrorist activities all over India. Gandhi toured U.P., Andhra. And then came the Independence Resolution which Gandhi sponsored because he had been responsible for postponement of the demand for Complete Independence. Gandhi considered this resolution as the root of future Congress work towards its goal.

The liberals had reacted sharply at the Independence Resolution by passing a resolution at Madras in favour of Dominion Status. The Viceroy though desired cooperation but was ready to do anything to maintain law and order. The Muslim
League decided to abstain from the demonstrations of the Congress. Tendulkar decries that Independence Resolution was also not welcomed by any democrats in Britain. Only in United States Senate a resolution was put forward for recognizing India's independence.

Independence day on 26th January 1930, Tendulkar opines revealed as in flash the earnest and enthusiastic mood of the country. It was after Independence Day that time was ripe for action. Still he sent his offer of 11 points to the Viceroy which if accepted he would not launch Civil Disobedience. But these points were criticised by Indians and the Britishers for different reasons. And Viceroy's negative reply to his request clinched the issue.

For the selection of salt as an issue in February 1930, after his discussions with CWC, Tendular points out that he wanted to attack the nefarious monopoly, by means of a disciplined Satyagraha. He published a code of conduct for the participants through 'Young India'. Training to Satyagrahis was given for a fortnight.

On March 9, 1930, nearly 75000 people met him at the Ashram to take the pledge and Gujarat Vidyapith suspended its activities to join the Satyagraha. Only children below 16 years were not taken. The number he gives is 78 followers led by Gandhi. He describes the way people had watered the roads and bestrewn them with green leaves. Tendular gives details of the Dandi March in vivid manner. Gandhi's breaking the salt law at Dandi was a signal to the nation. Gandhi visited nearby villages preaching Civil Disobedience and cutting down of toddy trees. He asked women to work for picketing and khadi. The movement got worldwide attention. The author attributes this to the efforts of Romain Rolland, who awakened the west.

Describing response from the Indian people Tendulkar opines that India rose like one man. People faced firings and air-raids but processions and picketings continued. He also describes raids on salt depots at Dharsana and Wadala as narrated.
by Webb Miller and George Solocombe. He also tells us that in the face of official repression, the Congress went underground and the people remained non-violent. He describes how during the no-tax campaign in Gujrat 80,000 villagers left British territories and entered the state of Baroda with all their belongings. To suppress the movement, the government resorted to usual practice, arrests and repression. Nearly 90,000 went to jail. Troops, aeroplanes, tanks, guns, ammunition were used against demonstrators. In one month 500 tones of bombs were dropped on NWFP alone. It was here that the 18th Royal Garhwal Rifles refused to fire on non-violent Pathan crowd in Peshawar.

The Government issued ordinances and people defied them. The Press Act of 1910 was revived under an ordinance which resulted in the seizure of 67 nationalist newspapers and 55 printing presses. Ordinances to counteract picketing were also broken.

He admires women's participation as successful picketers. The result of picketing was fall in import and sale of foreign cloth, cigarettes and other British Goods. Import of cotton goods went down to 1/3 or 1/4, cigarettes to 1/6 and 16 British owned mills had to be closed, whereas khadi sales went up by 70 per cent. In all khadi gave employment to 1,52,401 persons in 6494 khadi Sangh villages.

During this period efforts at negotiations were made but the author does not give details about that. He just briefly mentions the signing of Gandhi-Irwin Pact.

He does not comment on the Pact but briefly narrates the significant clauses. He does not mention the reaction of Nehru and others on objectionable clauses but mentions how Gandhi faced people over the issue of revenue and hangings of Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Sukhdev. After signing a second agreement with the new Viceroy Wellingdon, Gandhi left for London to join the second Round Table.
Conference. During his three month stay in Europe the situation in India had rapidly worsened.

Nearly 50 pages are devoted to Gandhi's visit to England as the sole representative of the INC to attend the Second RTC. There is a passing reference to the discussion on minorities issue. The narrative is full of funny anecdotes e.g. celebration of Gandhi's birthday in Kingsley Hall is mentioned even the menu and of course, how the food was served as so on. Tendulkar points out another anecdote, in this connection, the essay that little girl wrote on Gandhi comparing him with St. Francis of Assissi. His message to the American through Columbia Gramophone meeting the great English Comedian Charlie Chaplin visit to Lancashire and the discussion with Mill workers, his meeting with George Bernard Shaw, with Prof. Lindsay at Oxford are also mentioned. Here is Gandhi's opinion of RTC in his own words, "the whole thing is the huge camouflage and harangues that we are treated to and are meant only to mark time. Why not I ask them, make a clean breast and announce your policy and let us make own choice. But it does not seem to be in the English political nature to do so. It must so by tortuous ways."

The truce, Tendulkar says, had been one sided, because repression continued. Gujarat, U.P., Bengal and N.W.F.P. had suffered most. Due to increase in terrorist activities, repression had intensified. Gandhi was left with no option but to resume the struggle which he did. But again the same cycle of arrests, oppression and suppression followed. The struggle was resumed and Gandhi was arrested on January 4. Tendulkar cites Irwin supporting the action of Lord Wellingdon when he arrested Gandhi and promulgated four more ordinance. The Congress was again banned along with its associate organisations.

Tendulkar talks about severe repression. The government took to beating picketers. Punitive police and collective fines were imposed on villages.
The Communal Award was outrightly rejected by Gandhi for further fragmenting the Indian society, "I sense the injection of poison that is calculated to destroy... I have, therefore, been compelled though reluctantly to adhere to the decision...". And the decision was to 'Fast Unto Death' against the Award, which shook the whole of the country. Efforts to save Gandhi's life and also to satisfy him that atleast the Hindus will not consider the Harijans as outcastes began on war footing. Not only temples were thrown open to them but as a part of the Untouchability Abolition Week, interdining, intermarriages also took place.

This, however, did not resolve the basic issue of making India a self governing nation.

Gandhi's campaign eclipsed everything. Even the official policy of suppression and assessement went unnoticed. Though the government wanted to suppress it within six weeks, yet it failed. It was in May 1933 the Gandhi was released, when he suspended the movement for four weeks but later announced it for six weeks. But the author tells us that his "decision was not palatable to many Congress leaders."

Quit India 1942

Tendulkar discusses factors leading to the Quit India Movement in volume five and six. He maintains that the day England declared war on Germany, "the Viceroy without previously consulting the Indian leaders of the legislatures, proclaimed the India was at war". This was followed by a number of Ordinances. When invited by the Viceroy, almost all parties supported the decision and promised support to the war, only Gandhi disagreed but still he promised moral support to the British. The Congress ministries resigned, because the British Government was not prepared to make policy declaration regarding self government for India.
Then came the Viceroy's 'August' Statement promising post-war constitution making body for India subject to British obligations and minority opinions. The Congress which had openly disagreed with Gandhi over the issue of war earlier, turned to him again, as it felt badly let down. Gandhi was invited and authorised to launch any movement under his leadership. And Gandhi, says Tendulkar, decided to fight for the freedom of speech and pen which he considered the foundation stone of Swaraj. But he ruled out a mass civil disobedience movement.55

The author gives details about the type of Satyagrahis and places where they were allowed to court arrests. The stages and manner in which the whole affair was conducted. The movement was however so slow and tardy that it could not move the government. Gradually, as the situation on the war front deteriorated other factors cropped in like Japanese invasion, Cripps mission and its failure, the Congress was faced with great challenges of the day. But the question was how to face them so again Gandhi was approached who found a solution in Quit India campaign.

The congress working committee passed the resolution asking the British to Quit India in July 14, 1942 at Wardha. To this effect Tendulkar notes the reaction of various political parties. The Muslim League and Hindu Maha Sabha asked their followers not to support Congress policy. The liberal leaders asked Gandhi to withdraw the movement, whereas the communists maintained that the policy of Congress does not lead to freedom, but divided the progressive forces in Britain and India.56

The immediate cause, as stated by the President of the Congress was the failure of Cripps mission. The congress demand for the British withdrawal was the transfer of political power to Indian hands. The author also writes that Gandhi's last instructions were to maintain non-violence and to 'do or die' in the effort for independence. Gandhi and other CWC leaders were arrested the same morning. Whereas the public
response was violent, as "serious disturbance had broken out all over India when the news of arrest became known".57

Gandhi was bereaved and his grief was unexplainable Desai’s death Mahadev stunned the country for it was concluded that arrested leaders were being cruelly treated.58 For such rumours he holds press censorship responsible. He mentions the unlawful congress radio broadcasts to be responisble for Industrial strike labour struck work in Ahmedabad and Jamshedpur.

Mobs in spontaneous demonstrations against repression attacked the symbols of British rule and power - the police stations, the post offices, railway stations, telegraph and telephone lines. According to official figures people attacked 250 railway stations, 500 post-offices, 150 police stations within one week. In these incidents, over 30 police officials and a few other officials and soldiers were killed.59 Many of the Congress workers went underground.

The author mentions the government60 reaction at several places. The civilian casualties in the event of firing at unarmed leaders and mobs, according to official estimates at 906 with many more injured. The Govt. resorted to firing on 538 occasions and with machine gunning and air- bombing equal number of occasions were reported for whipping, whereas rupees 90 lakhs were collected as fines from the villagers.61 In the year 1942, 60,000 were arrested with 26,000 convicted and 18,000 detained under Defence of India rules.62 The government imposed censorship and seized Indian processes and news papers. Harijan and Navjivan were also seized. As the government held Gandhi responsible for violence he went on fast in protest. The Government turned down the request of the liberal leaders for the release of Gandhi. Tendulkar maintains that the government brought every obstacle in the way of Gandhi’s endeavour to dissolve the deadlock and tried their utmost to misrepresent the Congress.
Despite appeals by world leaders Gandhi was not released in 1943 which the government had to do on 6th May 1944, on health grounds, while other leaders were released only after the end of the war.

Tendulkar in his work has presented Gandhi’s views only and that too in his own words. Thus this study, while being a storehouse of Gandhi’s writings, lacks analysis and explanation of Gandhi’s beliefs, acts and moves.

Analysis

In this chapter, the set of biographers of Gandhi are those contemporaries who have been very close to their hero or had a nearly complete understanding of the man to be studied. These biographers had an intimate relationship with Gandhi e.g. Louis Fischer had a good rapport with him, as he had experienced the evils of both western democracy and Soviet communism, the pangs of poverty and the strains of wealth, he had turned to Gandhi, as the last hope. He sincerely believed Gandhi to be the saviour of humanity. From 1942 to 1955, he visited India seven times, and met Gandhi. Having understood his ideology and methodology Fischer decided to write a biography of Gandhi. Pyare Lal was a Khatri, born in West Punjab now Pakistan. His father was an extra Assistant commissioner, in Pyarelal’s own words "my father was a petty official in Punjab". Pyarelal has taken to the study of English as a postgraduate student but found himself swayed by Gandhi’s movement in 1920. He abandoned his studies and reached Ahmedabad and was accepted as assistant to Mahadev Desai, Secretary to Gandhi. From that date till Gandhi’s death, Pyare Lal was always working under Gandhi. Similarly D.G. Tendulkar, who was born in Ratnagiri, Maharashtra, travelled wide to various Universities of the world, Bombay, Cambridge, Mariburg and Gottigen Universities, in the course of his student life. Tendulkar took to Gandhi, when he was just a ten year old boy in 1920. Association of both Tendulkar and Pyarelal has been life long with Gandhi.
Gandhi's writings influenced Tendulkar where as Pyarelal was attracted by Gandhi's call for action, Fischer was attracted to Gandhi after having experienced and met the leaders of the world, Fischer was an ardent admirer of his hero, Tandulkar though an ardent admirer yet he is critic of Gandhi, whereas Pyarelal falls into the category of staunch supporters.

Fischer took to writing of Gandhi's biogoraphy as he had a flair for writing on leaders of the world e.g. Lenin, Stalin, Hitler and Gandhi. He wrote about Gandhi because he found him extraordinary, he was a man who lived a life of truth, kindness, self-effacement, humility, service and non-violence throughout a long, difficult struggle against mighty adversaries, without malice. Pyarelal took to writing about Gandhi's life because his autobiography covered only the formative phase of Gandhi's life, whereas the author wanted to write about the last few years of Gandhi's life when his principles were put to severest test. Tendulkar was inspired to write about Gandhi's life at the inspiration from Yusuf J. Mehrally and R.R. Diwakar, because as a follower and an impartial admirer he was attracted by Gandhi's all-embracing ideology of life, his courage and conviction. He had come to Gandhi through his writings as he was an enthusiastic reader of "Yound India" even as a child of ten years.

Fischer believes that Gandhi had the elements of being extra-ordinary, he became great because he had it in his genes to oppose the authority if it happened to do a wrong, but he had to make the decision, after a lot of thinking. Pyarelal looks at Gandhi as a nation builder, a man who could provide solutions to the problems not only of India but world. He gained followerlship, because of his principles of truth, non-violence and satyagraha. Tendulkar too finds Gandhi to be a great man, who would cover each aspect of human life - Gandhi had revolutionized individuals and the whole of the nation. The author is aware of Gandhi's charisma on his countrymen.
In this set of biographers Gandhi's greatness is well acknowledged by every author Louis Fischer finds the roots of this greatness initially in his genes and later those faculties were developed by Gandhi. Pyarelal too accepts Gandhi as a fountain head, who can guide the world out of present day crisis, in the Early Phase he accepts that Gandhi was an independent mind from the very beginning. But he trained himself to be the master of his 'own self', because of his mastery of self, he was able to draw millions towards him.

For Louis Fischer, Gandhi stands out among the people and leaders of the world, but while making a study of Gandhi, his close friends do matter but the light is focused on Gandhi only. He is the only saviour of humanity. Pyarelal, too views Gandhi as an answer to all the problems of India and through India to the world. Tendulkar too takes up Gandhi as all comprehensive, all embracing idealist, who put into practice what he thought. But all of these biographers somehow, being too near Gandhi, though have milieu in their minds but the works do not present the environment. In Tendulkar's work we find a sort of 'The Gandhi Dialogue', and milieu exists only as much as it does for Gandhi and the author is aware of it through his writings or speeches. Pyarelal does discuss the environment because he discusses the challenges to Gandhi's ideology but as he discusses only 'Quit India Movement' as a backdrop of some other incident, so the focus is some where else. Fischer's attention is focussed on Gandhi only. Only very immediate surrounding to Gandhi are important for him.

Each of these biographers acknowledge amount of influence Gandhi had on his associates and people of his country. Fischer accepts that Gandhi and middle classes joined the congress simultaneously, therefore it is inferred that Gandhi had great influence on the people of India, and the success of Gandhian movements and participation of masses in constructive work are big proofs of his influence. In Pyarelal one finds a glimpse of sadness, when during Gandhi's last years, all his principles were
put to test. He tries to bring out the ideals put forward by Gandhi and the way the
same could be implemented, in an independent India. Each of these authors
mentions the influence of Gandhi on his people as projected through the success of
his campaigns.

Fischer, Pyarelal and Tendulkar portray Gandhi according to their own lights.
Fischer looks at Gandhi in an international purview, Pyarelal studies Gandhi in an
Indian setting faced with a complexity of problematic situations. As he is too involved
in Gandhi campaigns he narrates such anecdotes which we do not find anywhere, thus
authenticity of such information is doubtful till we verify it from some other source.
Tendulkar has made an extra effort to be objective to the extent that his work looks
like a compilation of Gandhi information. He falls into the category of chroniclers so
a picture of the author is not visible in the work. He has tried be a non-participant
observer, therefore he does not offer any interpretation of Gandhi who is portrayed
in his own colours, yet it seems that Tendulkar was far more devoted to Gandhi, than
his other colleagues, he does not believe in narrating anecdotes, which might leave
his own impression on the mind of the reader, and does not consider himself to be
equal to Gandhi in any manner so as to give his views on him, whereas his other
colleagues while narrating day to day incidents seem to be proud of their close
association with Gandhi, Tendulkar is humble a follower of Gandhi. All of them are
objective in handling their plastic material, but in their effort to mould a portray of
Gandhi, the pictures by each of them reflect differences of the outlooks of their
creators.

Their works were published within ten years of Gandhi’s death, these works are
variable mines of personal anecdotes which they shared with Gandhi. As far as they
supply us the information or the spirit of those moments, these works are of immense
value to us. Louis Fischer, who came to India thrice to see Gandhi first in June, 1942
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at Wardha, when he wrote "A Week with Gandhi" and later in 1946, when he saw Gandhi in Poona and Bombay, how they could get information from other associates of Gandhi, thus lets have a clear picture of the man. Similarly Pyarelal's work is full of such details to the extent that he is sometimes called a 'hagiographer' because it is very difficult to verify the details of those personal anecdotes. Tandulkar's is a work of total surrender, in the name of objectivity. His work has provided us with valuable information regarding Gandhi's correspondence and writings. All of these works are now considered to be source books. Although each of these authors regrets the lack of information or data to be verified yet these works themselves are the source now. The sources consulted by them are still the primary sources. Later writings are secondary sources. Pyarelal was at an advantageous position because he was at the Navajivan trust which held and still holds all Gandhi papers, Tendulkar had not only the written material but also oral information as provided by the subject of his study. Fischer's information sources are more varied, apart from Gandhi's own writing correspondence to and from him, he has consulted British office library papers too. He had taken an advantage of his journalistic career, having been experienced in Biography writing, he has been able to avoid monotonous presentation of his ideas, a handicap which we find in Tendulkar, and in Pyarelal we find him garrulous at times, no wonder he spent 18 years while writing on thirty one years of his subject's life. Through their works, the memorists have succeeded in their objective.

Each of them generally agrees on Gandhi's basic concepts and they do accept Gandhi's ability to provide solutions to all the problems. They agree on the significance of non-violence, satyagraha and constructive work. Fischer does not discuss Quit India Movement because he thinks that Gandhi never launched it, where as Pyarelal calls it a 'potent cry of the soul of Indian struggle for self-realization.' Gandhi-Congress relationship for each of them is of the leader and the led, whereas the British Government and British Officials are used frequently. These works inspite
of the effort to remain objective reflect the minds of the authors. These works also reflect, how Gandhi is viewed, in how wide a perspective. For example Louis Fischer views Gandhi in relation to his own varied experiences of life, poverty wealth, Bolshevism democracy, totalitarianism. Pyarelal views Gandhi as a leader of Indian subjugated masses. Tendulkar has picked up his subject to speak for himself but has not ignored any aspect of his thought and busy life. These works, as already mentioned, do show us how great Gandhi was to his biographers.
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