CHAPTER II
ASSOCIATES

Autobiography, the history of oneself, is an individual’s judgement of his ownself. Although it has been generally stated that it is very difficult to come across a true autobiography of an individual, yet whatever one tells is the true reflection of his personality. It also matters as to which aspect of life, the individual considers significant. But Roy Pascal is optimistic that from statesmen, "Truthful autobiographies are possible when their political activity stands in an essential relationship to their personality"\(^1\). Thus it is natural that autobiographies and memoirs of statesmen and politicians provide historical material. The information contained in them reveals the standing of a hero in the eyes of his contemporaries. Such literature is an authentic source of comment besides offering most valuable documentation of historical material, about the times of the hero. Chapters two and three deal with some such select autobiographical accounts left by Gandhi’s associates.

In this chapter, those associates are taken up for study who met Gandhi, when he was keeping a low profile in national politics or had not yet entered the political arena in India. i.e. Lajpat Rai met Gandhi in August 1914, Jawahar Lal Nehru in December, 1916 and Rajendra Prasad in April 1917. At that time he was known as a fighter for rights of Indians in South Africa. Both Nehru and Rajendra Prasad were not impressed by Gandhi. To Nehru Gandhi seemed to be too distant whereas Rajendra prasad too did not come close to Gandhi in December, 1916. It was only in April 1917 that he met Gandhi. Lajpat Rai met Gandhi in August 1914, as he knew him earlier but he did not support Gandhi’s organizing ambulance corps during the world-war I. But the relationship developed independent of first meeting.

The works of these associates in this Chapter based on their first meeting with Gandhi are being dealt with chronologically. The first set of associates vividly
describes in their accounts how they first saw Gandhi but none of them discussed any matters with him.

Lajpat Rai and Gandhi attended the Congress session in December 1901, but we do not have any details of their meeting except that Gandhi was introduced and was asked to address the delegates on the issue of South Africa. Similarly Rajendra Prasad and Jawaharlal found themselves in the company of Gandhi in the Congress session of 1915 and 1916 (December). Gandhi was known as the fighter for the rights of Indians of South Africa but none of them readily went upto him. It seems that they came into contact of Gandhi during or after his local Satyagrahas in India.

In their works they have reflected upon the All-India movements 1920-42 under the leadership of Gandhi. Some questions have been raised in this chapter to each one of these authors individually. Then there is a set of common questions that we raise to all of them collectively, to assess their responses to Gandhi's leadership. How did they react on various issues coming up during their partnership, what role do they assign to Gandhi and his concepts of truth and non-violence? Have they been able to understand the role of Constructive Programme in achieving the goal of Swaraj? Whether their perspective is limited or wider? Whether they share Gandhi's vision of future India or not, and what significance do they attach to Gandhi as a leader and congress as the main organization of the freedom movement? Do they think that a single individual can play a significant role in the making of history? The historiographical significance of their works and of course how region, background and education have influenced their mental make-up also forms the desired important part in the chapter.

**Lala Lajpat Rai**

Lajpat Rai popularly known as Punjab Kesari, and an important leader among the well-known triumvirate, Bal, Lal Pal was a multi-faceted personality. His activities
were not restricted to politics only, he also worked incessantly for the spread of education through D.A.V. institutions which he desired to open in every town and village. Lajpat Rai was a man of independent thought, which developed according to the circumstances and the need of the hour. He was a dedicated worker who worked incessantly despite adverse circumstances. Gandhi said of him that he was not an individual but "an institution. From his youth he made of his country's service a religion. And his partiotism was no narrow creed. He loved his country because he loved the whole world. His nationalism was international".³

This appreciation was reciprocal. Lajpat Rai wrote of Gandhi, "where in the world shall we find another man equal, in spirit of self-sacrifice and righteousness to Mahatma Gandhi. We may or may not follow him. But I challenge the whole world to produce another man like Mahatma Gandhi."⁴

Gandhi and Lajpat Rai met at London in August 1914,⁵ for the first time. Although both knew about each other through newspaper reports. Lajpat Rai's writings make no mention of that meeting. Nearly 14 years later, Gandhi recorded, "his love for the country left a deep impression on me"⁶.

Lajpat Rai was a gifted writer. He started a newspaper 'The Punjabee' from Lahore and 'Young India' a monthly from New York in 1918, and was a regular contributor to the Tribune and 'Kesari'. Noticeable among the nearly twenty books written by him are "Life of Pandit Guru Dutt Vidyarathi; life of Mazzini, Shivaji and Atam Katha - his autobiography. He wrote his autobiography in bits and pieces, starting from 1907 to 1919. Although his autobiographical writing were compiled and edited by V.C.Joshi in 1965, some other unpublished writings left by Lala Lajpat Rai are now available in J.S. Dhanki's 'The Story of My Life by Lala Lajpat Rai: An Unknown Fragment'.
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The beginning of Gandhi - Lajpat Rai interaction seems to begin with Lala's comment in 1919 "The man, however, who is after our own heart, though we do not always agree with him in politics is Gandhi." And Gandhi expressed, it is, "intolerable that man like Lajpat Rai should have to remain outside India at that critical moment." To which Lajpat Rai replied, "I may be unable to sign the full pledge of a Satyagrahi, but if and when I return to India I shall sign the pure Swadeshi vow."

Non-Cooperation 1920

On return home after prolonged absence Lajpat Rai entered active politics and was elected President of The Congress special session September 1920 in Calcutta and decided to join non-cooperation movement. But made no secret of that he did not approve of the boycott of educational institutions nor was he in the favour of launching the whole programme of non-cooperation at a time when the masses in India were not yet fully trained for it, yet despite these he did not oppose Gandhi.

In December 1920 at Nagpur, he found the redrafted non-cooperation Resolution. "Much more comprehensive, much more effective and much more practical than the language of the old Resolution." He questioned the assumption upon which Mahatma Gandhi insisted on his own programme of non-cooperation being accepted as unjustifiable, the political conscious among the Muslims joined the movement only for the sake of Khilafat, and that they did not respond as well enough to the appeals for Tilak Swaraj Fund as they did for the Khilafat and Angora funds. And Gandhi's "over confidence in his judgement and impulsiveness has often landed us, his humble colleagues, in very false positions but now we are simply routed." He also pointed that the Congress' neglect to keep foreign countries informed of what was going on in India has been most criminal and it is time that we should undo that mistake. He plunged headlong into the movement, and on its sudden suspension by Gandhi, he commented from jail,
within the last eighteen months, from September 1920 upto date of Bardoli Resolution, we have been defeated and that too very badly."\textsuperscript{14}

In principle he accepts non-violent non-cooperation as the only road leading to their goal. He feels that even the cooperation of the Muslims made it workable but he does not believe in its universality, "non-violence as an absolute article of faith to be respected and practiced under all circumstances and in all conditions."\textsuperscript{15} Moreover, he held that human nature cannot be changed all of a sudden,\textsuperscript{16} consequently the occurrence of violence at some place could not have been averted by the best efforts of the leaders and masses. Unlike Gandhi he does not despair at Chauri-Chaura tragedy and reasoned out that "whereas the governments do it deliberately, the masses do it under provocation and in passion"\textsuperscript{17} and held that the country was still ready for mass civil disobedience.\textsuperscript{18}

In the preface to Ideals of Non-cooperation, reflecting on the boycott issue he realizes its merits and writes that as a field cannot be sown with a good seed until the ground is cleared of the weeds, it is necessary to do away with harmful institutions and practices before introducing and adopting new ones.

About the failure to achieve Swaraj in one year he said, "we have been defeated not because the country did not rise to the occasion but because Mahatmaji pitched his standard too high for the possibility of achievement."\textsuperscript{19} Yet the movement was significant, to quote him.

"It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that whatever may be said of the failure of the non-cooperation movement to achieve Swarajya within one year, its success in fostering and spreading the idea for national freedom, and in creating a collective will to achieve this by our own effort, has been monumental.\textsuperscript{20}
In the article "The Immediate work before us" he considers the Bardoli resolution "an act of wisdom on the Mahatmaji's part to drop at least for a time, civil Disobedience from the Congress programme." He understood Gandhi's concern and asked the nation to, "organize and educate in a constructive spirit and in an atmosphere of sustained work".21

Initially sympathised with the swarajists but formed his own party Independent Congress party in association with Pt. M.M. Malaviya.22 In 'Unhappy India' - Lala Lajpat Rai's reaction to Miss Mayo's 'Mother India', the impact of the movement has been succinctly summed up, "it created an unprecedented bitterness against and mistrust of the British" and feels that "if the Liberals had joined the Non-cooperation movement the Government would surely have collapsed and capitualated."23 Shortly before his death in 1928 he expressed willingness to work under Gandhi's leadership.24

While differing with Gandhi on the use of absolute non-violence, Lajpat Rai shared Gandhi's views on the relevance and content of Constructive Programme, and concern for masses, peasants and labourers. He recognizes Gandhi as an essentially constructive mind and accepts that the destructive operations involved in his programme are purely with a view to future constructive work.21 Lajpat Rai's expression is forceful and effective.

Jawaharlal Nehru

As is well known Jawaharlal Nehru worked in close association with Gandhi for nearly three decades of the turbulent phase of modern Indian history. Jawaharlal, who first saw Gandhi in December 1915 at Calcutta session, and later in December 1916 at Lucknow session writes that Gandhi was, "very distant and very different and unpoltical to many of us youngmen."25
After realising the impact of Gandhi's success in the local satyagrahas of Champaran, Kheda, and Ahmedabad that impressed Nehru as he writes, "soon afterwards his adventures and victory in Champaran, on behalf of the tenants of the planters, filled us with enthusiasm. We saw that he was prepared to apply his methods in India also and they promised success." Nehru's entry in politics coincides with Gandhi's. Although both entered political arena in 1919, but unlike Gandhi, Nehru's importance is confined to U.P. till he came to the forefront of national politics at the Lahore session in 1929 and thereafter remained permanent member of CWC except for short intervals and was elected the President of the Congress for four times in pre-independence India.

Both Gandhi and Nehru were emotionally dependent on each other, though they differed a lot generally on current issues. Nehru made no secret of his disapproval, and expressed their differences of opinion. The emotional bond, however, did not affect the independence of mind in each one of both. Of the ideological differences in 1927 at the Madras Congress, emerged a rift between the two when Nehru and Congress were in a real dilemma, as they had to decide two interrelated questions whether the struggle for India's independence was more important than the war to preserve liberal democratic values against Fascism and Nazism or vice-versa, and number two whether non-violence could meet the challenge of war. Nehru records that party had often debated in the 1930's the validity of non-violence in international affairs and had been led to the conclusion that it was suited to the national struggle within the country but in realm of International affairs. There was no question, "of the doctrine of non-violence coming in the way of armed conflict..."

On the eve of war in August 1939, the Congress carried a resolution drafted by Nehru against Gandhi's resolution advocating total non-violence. Fully aware of the
party’s attitude Gandhi publicly acknowledged, “Nehru’s draft represented more truly than mine the country’s opinion and the working committee’s as whole”.

The extent of Nehru’s emotional dependence on his mentor is reflected in, "I was sitting in my chair... worried about Bapu’s funeral. The colossal problem that it presented baffled me. Suddenly I said to myself ‘let me go and consult Bapu’ If Nehru looked to Gandhi for guidance, Gandhi too would nominate Nehru as his heir in October 1945.

An Autobiography

Of Jawaharlal Nehru’s numerous writings ‘An Autobiography (1936). The Discovery of India (1945) are relevant. An Autobiography was first published in 1936 by Bodley Head London again in 1942 a chapter ‘Five Years Later’ was added then the Indian edition appeared in 1962 by Allied Publishers Bombay.

Besides personal account, the book is a testament of a whole generation striving hard to negotiate the difficult passage, from the dying old world to the new world that was struggling to be born. Having himself merged in the national movement the writer represents in a large measure, the feelings of many others, and fuses personal history with national history.

Non-Cooperation Movement 1920

To Nehru, Gandhi’s entry in politics, was, ”like a powerful current of fresh air that made us stretch ourselves and take deep breaths, like a beam of light piercing darkness and removed the scales from our eyes... He did not descend from the top. He seems to emerge from the millions of India, speaking their language and incessantly drawing attention to them and their appalling conditions.”
In 1920 Nehru felt that his politics was a bourgeoisie one as he had no knowledge of peasants or factory workers. Even the nationalist press was owned by land-lords and industrialists. Though agrarian movement was entirely separate from the Congress movement yet both these powerful and widespread movements had the same root causes.

Nehru considers the communal problem, in fact, to be a fight between the feudal, conservative regime and the nationalist, revolutionary and democratic forces. Religion was just a mask.

Nehru records that the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs were the topics of the day, and non-cooperation was an attempt to bring about a righting of these wrongs. He also states that though issue of Swaraj was not stressed upon, but still it had caught people’s imagination and frequent reference was made to it in various meetings and gatherings.

At the Calcutta session, the author states that Gandhi’s programme of non-cooperation was opposed by leaders like Lala Lajpat Rai, C.R. Das. But in December 1920, after the elections were over, as the point of contention was resolved, many a leaders except Jinnah, joined him.

Regarding the programme of the movement, Nehru does not discuss items of the boycott but he writes that action based on peaceful methods was to be the basis, ‘The call of action was two-fold. There was, of course, the action involved in challenging and resisting foreign rule; there was also the action which led us to fight our own social evils’.

Gandhi’s action of making the Congress a mass organisation and non-cooperation was opposed by the entire old guard of the Congress except Motilal Nehru because of their inability to keep their old bearings and join the unknown
region. With Gandhi came the upsurge of masses of the organization which the older leaders did not accept. Thus many fell away. By December 1920, Motilal had persuaded C.R. Das to join. 39 M.A. Jinnah, dropped out not only for political grounds but because of Congress becoming an organization of Khadi clad masses. Temperamentally he did not like the new Congress. 40 The liberals stayed away.

Indian masses reacted to Gandhi’s call by a new aggressive spirit. Self-reliance and fearlessness seemed to be there to an extent that the prestige of British rule in India was visibly melting. ’Repression in a small way strengthened the movement. Nehru calls 1921 a year of great tension, when there was much to irritate, annoy and unnerve the official. Actual happenings were bad enough but the officials imagined still worse. Because of prominence being given to Khilafat issue, a large number of Maulvies and Muslim religious leaders took a prominent part in the struggle 41

The cities wherever the Prince of Wales went gave a deserted look. Even though the government adopted the policy of arrests and convictions, still there was no limit to the volunteers, so the government had to give up the policy of indiscriminate arrests. 42 Gandhi’s insistence on release of Ali brothers, Nehru in terms of his responsibility as leader of both the Congress and the Khilafat movement. 43 Gandhi’s repeated warnings had a sobering effect on the movement and that it invigorated the supporters and stilled the opponents. “For the masses Khilafat means Khilaf or against the Government. This movement created a sense of freedom, the old feeling of oppression and frustration had gone. The masses were ready for jails, as nothing was secret, the spies and secret service men had become pitiable individuals. 44 Gandhi’s unique method gave a sense of moral superiority and self-righteousness.

The participation of Maulanas, Maulvies and the Khilafat issue gave a religious tinge to the movement. Gandhi’s emphasis on spiritual and religious side gave the revivalist character to the movement. He also did not like the use of terms like Ram
Rajya by Gandhi. Although Nehru understands what religion meant to Gandhi yet the presence of Ali brothers, Maulvis and Maulanas and Hindu Swamis helped in the rise of orthodoxy. Nehru considers their public addresses to be most unfortunate which in a way prevented all clear thinking.\[^45\] In 1921 "there was a strange mixture of nationalism, politics and religion and mysticism and fanaticism."\[^46\]

Nehru records the "Government had decided to crush the movement. Handspinning on the Charkha was then spreading among the peasantry at the instance of the Congress. A Charkha therefore became the symbol of sedition and the owner got into trouble, the Charkha itself being often burnt"\[^47\] The Government did not arrest Gandhi till the suspension of the movement, for they were afraid of Army and Police rebellion. Not only Nehru was unable to appreciate Gandhi's reasons for sudden suspension of the movement but was infuriated and baffled. He even doubted the efficacy of non-violence which does not seem universal and infallible method. He wonders if Gandhi would not be contradicting himself.\[^48\] "We were angry when we learnt of the stoppage of our struggle at a time when we seemed to be consolidating our position and advancing on all fronts." Not appreciating Gandhi's reasons for suspending the movement due to some stray incident in a remote village. He doubts the hope of turning three hundred millions people completely non-violent, but even if it so happens, the Government would send 'agents (Italics) provocateurs' and 'stool pigeons' to indulge in violence and induce others to do so."\[^49\] In retrospection ten years later Nehru realized that Chauri Chaura incident was not the actual reason "as the discipline and organisation were disappearing and the movement was going to pieces." Gandhi understandably sensed the mood of the people and suspended it because he realized that masses without training and faith in non-violence, cannot fight non-violently for long. Still Nehru felt this sudden bottling up responsible for the communal riots.
On the outcome of the movement 1920 Nehru comments Gandhi became a "symbolic expression of the confused desire of the people. Under Gandhi's spell no one thought of the philosophical and theoretical aspect of the movement. (ii) As Gandhi was 'delightfully vague' on Swaraj, and did not encourage clear thinking, so everyone interpreted it differently. (iii) Gandhi gave the backbone and character to the Indian people.51 People worked in the struggle as if under intoxication, the old feeling of oppression and frustration was completely gone and they had proud sense of freedom.52 (iv) The first wave of the movement had amazed and frightened the Government53. After Gandhi's release in 1924, Nehru went to meet him at Juhu to know his future programme but the former gave him none. Gandhi blessed the Swarajists' work in the legislatures but for himself, he kept severely aloof.54

Civil Disobedience 1930

The years 1928-29, Nehru records, were the years of agrarian and industrial labour unrest. Gandhi away from politics, was engaged in promotion of constructive work. About the ultimate end of civil disobedience Nehru seems skeptical and wonders if Gandhi would suddenly wind it up as he did in 1922. Nehru thinks if Gandhi would not be contradicting himself by stopping the movement if violence occurred, because if, as Gandhi maintained, non-violence is infallible and universal, it should be applicable in all circumstances and conditions and need not be given up or temporarily suspended in the midst of violence. Its functioning might be varied to suit variety of circumstances if the movement turns violent.55

Soon after the success of Dandi March, he confesses that he felt a 'little abashed and ashamed'56 for his doubts. Salt, ordinances and promulgations by the Viceroy provided opportunity for disobedience. When Gandhi gave a signal to the country around 9th April to begin Civil Disobedience"... it seemed as if a spring had suddenly been released. People were enthusiastic and salt making spread like a prairie fire.
There were processions, hartals to celebrate arrests and to celebrate special observances like Peshawar Day, Garhwali Day etc. Government repression grew, lathicharge and firing were frequently resorted to. The Congress committees, youth leagues were declared illegal. Nehru regrets the flogging of young sensitive boys, who went to jail and showed his resentment through a three day fasting.

Jawaharlal Nehru after his release from prison in October 1930, planned resuming Civil Disobedience in the rural areas and considering possibilities of no tax campaign by the farmers because due to tremendous fall in the price of agricultural produce and the slump it would be difficult for farmers to pay revenue. And he was re-arrested while campaigning in U.P.

Nehru’s description of those days is of great historiographical significance. When the talks suddenly stopped and the break seemed imminent and with it they expected arrests so they passed a resolution regarding further struggle. But again Gandhi was called for by the Viceroy. Nehru tells us that on 4th March Gandhi came back at 2 a.m. after signing the pact Nehru was anxious that the settlement reached at is only a provisional settlement and it did not in any manner tone down the Indian objective of Independence. Though the no tax campaign may have to be withdrawn the peasantry should not be made to pay beyond their capacity. Nehru recalls a vague assurance on the latter being given. But British did not show any consideration and Gandhi Irwin talks, Nehru views, continued only in the context of a Satyagrahi’s continued, Gandhi agreed to do so, although I do not think that he expected much" by the way of result. He is greatly shocked at clause 2 of Gandhi-Irwin Fact with its reference to safeguards. He felt an emptiness as if something precious had gone and expresses poetically the laceration of his heart, "that is the way the world ends, not with a bang but with a whimper."
The more account is mention of his amazement at Kamla's rare courage and organizing capacity shown during the Civil Disobedience Movement. Besides women of his own family, the most striking feature of the movement, Nehru finds, is participation of women in general. The numbers, the unyielding attitude and the courage was unprecedented in the history of the national movement.60

Gandhi's influence was hypnotic and we remembered the words used by Gokhale about him: how he had the power of making heroes out of clay. Peaceful civil disobedience as a technique of action for achieving great national ends seemed to have justified itself, and quiet confidence grew in the country, shared by friend and the opponent alike that we were marching towards victory. A strange excitement filled those who were active in the movement and some of this even crept inside the jail. "Swaraj is coming", said the ordinary convicts.61 At the success of the Civil Disobedience the dying Motilal Nehru feels sure of Swaraj, "Mahatma ji... I shall not be here to see Swaraj. But I know you have won it and will soon have it."

Regarding Gandhi's attending the Round Table Conference Nehru maintains that it was not that Gandhi had hopes but he did not want to miss any opportunity for reaching a conciliation, and Congress's concern was as the author puts 'how much power the British were willing to transfer to India?' and "There was no question of failure or success at this Round Table Conference itself. Little was expected of it... Gandhi ji went as the representative of the Congress, and as a leader whom millions followed. This gave prestige to the conference, and India followed its career with far greater interest; and any failure, whatever the cause, redounded now to the discredit of India. We understood then why the British Government had attached so much importance to Gandhi ji's participation in it.62

The British manipulation in selection of delegates to the conference from reactionary communal elements made it seem that the real problem in reaching the
solution was the communal issues. But Nehru maintained that success or failure was not to come from London but events in India itself. The people had reached a stage from where there was no question of going back.

"Situation was developing swiftly in India. This was noticeable all over the country and especially so in Bengal, the United Provinces and the Frontier Province as the Gandhi Irwin Pact made no difference to them. He regrets that rent realization campaign crushed the poor peasants.

Nehru did not agree with the leaders who believed had Lord Irwin stayed as Viceroy in 1931-32 situation would have been different, as he maintains that instructions from Home Government had to be followed by any Viceroy in realizing rent and revenue from the peasantry.

Nehru stresses the point that whereas the Congress leaders were not in a mood to resume the fight. They asked Gandhi for advice, he gave them green signal but still they waited for him to return and decide. The Government did not wait and struck before Gandhi could land at Bombay.

Nehru views the resumption of the Civil Disobedience not as a doing of Congress leadership but forced on them by the Government of India which was working at instruction from London. He also mentions that Gandhi tried to enter into negotiations with the Viceroy but was informed that interview could take place only under certain conditions which included non-discussion of events in Bengal, U.P. and NWFP and the ordinances. Here Nehru retorts if not these issues then what the negotiations were going to be held for. The die was cast. The Government of India was determined to crush the movement. At this time the Congress had no option but to resume the fight.
Nehru also points out that the initiative of offensive in 1930 was with the Congress but in 1932 the Congress was on defensive.\textsuperscript{66} Moreover Gandhi and Congress Working Committee in 1932, were in favour of avoiding Civil Disobedience. But on January 4, 1932 Gandhi was arrested and four new ordinances giving far-reaching powers to magistrates and police were promulgated.

The Government reacted to the movement with every source at its command. India lived practically under martial law. The Congress was declared illegal, the English and Anglo-Indian press tried to defame the Congress. Women protesters and workers were treated severly with long sentences and bad treatment. India was literally under a Police Raj. In Bengal, U.P., NWFP the measures were severest. NWFP Red shirt movement had thoroughly upset the Government, but it imposed collective fines and punitive police in villages. In Bengal, the Government declared almost all Hindu population to be hostile. They were made to accept humiliating terms and conditions. Whipping was a common feature in Jail.\textsuperscript{67}

Yet in its second phase it was really a mass movement, this time the suppression was far more intense and frequent than ever before.

Gandhi’s decision to undergo ‘fast unto death’ in disapproval of communal Award upset Nehru and the thought of possible consequence made him shudder and he felt annoyed with Gandhi for choosing a side issue for his final sacrifice. He, even, wondered if it was consistant with non-cooperation and civil disobedience or even push the larger issue into background. "If Bapu died. What would India be like then?" But his fears were not only dispelled but replaced with hope when he got the "news of the tremendous upheaval all over the country, a magic wave of enthusiasm running through Hindu society, and untouchability appeared to be doomed. What a magician, I thought, was this little man sitting in Yeravda prison, and how well he knew how to pull the strings that move people’s hearts.\textsuperscript{68}
"Your telegram and brief news that some settlement reached filled me with relief and joy. First news of your decision to fast caused mental agony and confusion, but ultimately optimism triumphed and I regained peace of mind. No sacrifice too great for suppressed downtrodden classes. Freedom must be judged by freedom of lowest but feel danger of other issues obscuring only goal. Am unable to judge from religious view point. Danger your methods being exploited by others but how can I presume to advise a magician."

Although he feels that the intelligentsia followed Gandhi in the forward going movements. His following in rural India was more spontaneous and indiscriminating. Undoubtedly, the success of these movements was Gandhi's achievement, nonetheless Nehru's Marxian leanings are reflected in holding the economic factor as a vital contribution to the mass following that Gandhi was able to have, Nehru points out that it is the agitation of the industrial labourers, the peasantry which developed spontaneously, without any intervention of the cities and the politicians. "It will be correct to say that both these widespread and powerful movements were due to same fundamental causes", namely economic.

As the Epilogue runs, "I have reached the end of the story this egotistical narrative of my adventures... have been brought upto date. This record of changing moods, of exaltations, of depression is our common record. I have been one of a mass, moving with it, swaying it occasionally, being influenced by it; and like other units, and individual apart from the others, living my separate life in the heart of the crowd... I have continually feeling of growing up.. gives a zest to my activities as well as to the readings of books," against, Nehru, himself, has pointed to the limitations of retrospective narrative.

"In writing this narrative I have tried to give my moods and thought at the event to represent as far as I could my feelings on the occasion. It is difficult to recapture a
past mood, and it is not easy to forget subsequent happenings. Later ideas thus might inevitably have colored my account of earlier days. But my objective was... to trace my own mental growth".

It goes without saying that An Autobiography is an incomplete account of Nehru's life and experiences as all autobiographies are, however Nehru picks up the thread again in Discovery of India as far as the experiences of the freedom movement are concerned, in the concluding para of the autobiography he writes, "I have a feeling that a chapter of my life is over and another chapter will begin".

The Discovery of India

The Discovery of India was first published in 1946 and revised in 1947 by Asia Publishing House Bombay. The Discovery of India is Nehru's search of the past, a journey into India's past. Nehru was no historian, of course, but his Discovery of India is by far the most analytical and authentic account of the evolution and development of Indian civilization. His reading of British accounts of political history of India created an urge to know his people and their heritage. "The past suddenly changed into having a pattern, a meaning useful for an understanding of the present"

The ten year gap between an Autobiography and the Discovery of India seems to have toned down his attitude. He who is a severe but respectful critic in an Autobiography, has acquired greater understanding of Gandhi in the Discovery of India.

World War II

In the later portion of the book, whilst Nehru shares the popular feeling of indignation and hurt at Britain's declaration of India as a belligerent country in World War II, differs with Gandhi sharply and radically on the issue of India's war effort and the transfer of power. Though in 1940 Nehru had differed with Gandhi, yet felt
remorse and writes, "that the Congress went too far in eagerness to bring out a settlement with the British Government"\textsuperscript{72}

Nehru states that it was after the rejection of its offer and demands by the British that the Congress once again turned to Gandhi who agreed to launch Individual Satyagraha on a smaller scale to protest against, but not to embarrass the British. As a result the leaders were in jail, from October 1940 to December 1941.

The Cripps proposals encouraged separatism. Individually Cripps, of course, meant well for India, but the proposals were prepared at the behest of British Government and were to be accepted or rejected.

\textbf{Quit India Movement 1942}

Countering the British charge that Gandhi's uncompromising attitude was solely responsible for rejecting Cripps Proposals Nehru records that failure of the mission caused frustration. To add to this chances of invasion were increasing and the influx of refugees from Eastern Frontier caused panic. In Bengal the destruction of boats led to further inconvenience to starving people, with their major source of communication disrupted which was a factor for the Bengal famine. In Madras the high officials left partial destruction of harbour facilities in the face of an attack from Japan.\textsuperscript{73}

To add to this, Nehru mentions that, the Government "definitely aiming at the suppression of our normal political and public activity and there was an all round tightening of pressure". At this attitude both personal and national pride rose in revolt against such treatment.\textsuperscript{74}

It was in these circumstances that the Congress once again turned to Gandhi for his leadership. Gandhi’s articles had given a new direction to people’s thoughts and given shape to vague ideas. He was against inaction at such a moment.
Nationalism in India in these days had an edge over internationalism, which even Nehru reflects that internationalism at that time seemed like the old policy of the imperialist powers, thus it was "aggressive nationalism which in the name of empire or commonwealth or mandatory, sought to impose its will on others."

Nehru records that discussions with Gandhi on national and international matters although made Gandhi think on wider perspective yet "his fundamental attitude remained, his objection to a passive submission to British autocratic and repressive policy in India, his intense desire to do something to challenge this. Nehru writes that Gandhi did not even hint at the nature of action of Quit India movement except once, that too privately, that in the event of failure of all negotiations, he would appeal for some kind of non-cooperation and a one day protest hartal, or cessation of all work in the country, symbolic of a nation’s protest August 7 and 8, 1942 by AICC at Bombay passed the Quit India resolution which argued for India’s freedom and end of British rule for the welfare of India and United Nations both. The resolution also suggested the formation of a provisional government representing all important sections of Indian people.75

All those in prison had been cut off from the event, news trickled down about the happening after the happening. Mass arrests and censorship were the typical Government measures for suppressing the movement.

Official estimates put the number of the killed and wounded by police or military firings at 1028 and 3200 respectively, popular estimates put the number of death at 25,000 which Nehru feels exaggerated, and yet against the official figures he puts 10,000 being nearly accurate.

Greatest sufferers here were the simple-hearted, poverty stricken villagers who had in the hope for better times aroused themselves into action, proving their loyalty.
to the cause of Indian freedom. Nehru cites the case of Tamluk district of Bengal where the cyclone the college campus and houses were burnt by the government.

He decries the collection of 78,50,000 rupees as collective fines from villages which surpassed all inhuman actions of the British Government and nothing that took place in 1942, or after, had such an intensity of suffering as this forcible realization.

The public retaliated in large numbers by attacking the symbols of British authority and power such as the police stations, post offices, railway stations and there were demonstrations, inspite of prohibitory orders, and labour strikes through out the country. Its intensity, duration might have varied from region to region.

The repressive measures of the British, Nehru thinks, were understandable, "It was natural... England suffering the anxiety of war for resentment to be felt against Indians especially those who were adding to their troubles in time of crisis. It seems Nehru was keenly observing the world reaction to the Indian problem.

Nehru records the reactions abroad, in America, "opinion, in so far as it was interested in the far away problem of India, was divided, for people there were not equally convinced of the virtues of the British ruling class and looked even with some disapproval on other peoples empires. They were also anxious to gain India's goodwill and utilize here resources fully in the war against Japan."

In sofar as thought about it in Russia Nehru writes,"it was impossible to say, they were far too busy with their stupendous war effort,... they had carefully avoided all references to India but Stalin had declared in November 1942, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Revolution, that their general policy was Abolition of racial exclusiveness equality of nations, and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights..."
China, Nehru finds, in complete sympathy, with the Indians, which he thinks, has historical roots based on the realization unless India was free, China's freedom might be endangered. He maintains that the same applied throughout Asia, Egypt and the Middle East, Indian freedom had become a symbol of a larger freedom for other subject and dependent countries.

While summing up, his observations on the Quit India Movement Nehru seems to rationalize the attitude and positions of both the rulers and the ruled.

"The sudden, unorganized demonstrations and outbreaks on the part of the people, culminating in violent conflicts and destruction and continued against overwhelming and powerful armed forces, were a measure of the intensity of their feelings. Those feelings had been there even before the arrest of their leaders, but the arrests, and the frequent firings that followed them, roused the people to anger and to the only course that an enraged mob can follow. For a time there seems to have been a sense of uncertainty as to what should be done. There was no direction, no programme, there was no well known person to lead them or to tell them what to do, and yet they were too excited and angry to remain quiescent. As often happens in these circumstance, local leaders sprang up and were followed for the moment. But even the guidance they gave was little; it was essentially a spontaneous mass upheaval. Inspite of the passions aroused there was very little, if any, racial feeling, and on the whole, there was a deliberate attempt on the part of the people to avoid causing injury to their opponents. There was a great deal of destruction of communications and governmental property but even in the midst of this destruction care was taken to avoid loss of life and "Foreign rule over a civilized community suffers from many disadvantages and many ills follow in its train. One of these disadvantages is that it has to rely on the less desirable elements in the population. The idealists, the prouds, the sensitive, the self-respecting, those who care sufficiently for freedom and are not
prepared to degrade themselves by an enforced submission to an alien authority, keep aloof or come into conflict with it.... An Alien government, which must necessarily be authoritarian suffers from all these disadvantages and adds to them, for it has always to function in an atmosphere of hostility and suppression, fear becomes the dominant motive of both the government and the people.\textsuperscript{78}

Which both Nehru and Gandhi during the course of the movement succeeded in alleviating from the minds of the Indian masses.

In the Discovery of India, Nehru emerges as a great reconstructionalist, proud of India's greatness is also conscious of its inadequacies, ready to abandon what he calls, 'The dead wood of past' and retain what is vital and life giving in that past. Whereas an Autobiography is a study to trace his own mental development in a self questioning manner, the Discovery of India is story of the nation. From historiographical point of view both these works provide authentic accounts of the movements based on personal participation, experience and observation.

\textbf{Rajendra Prasad}

Rajendra Prasad \textquoteleft was one of those few men who had the closest contact with Gandhi. His association with Gandhi starting from the Champaran Satyagraha April 1917 lasted for more than thirty years. He first saw Gandhi in December 1915 at Calcutta Congress session and later in December 1916 at Lucknow Congress and April 1917 Calcutta session, but without exchanging a word with him. It is in Champaran in 1917, that he met Gandhi and thereafter followed him all through the freedom movement. For Gandhi he was "at least one man who would not hesitate to take the cup of poison from my hands". He is known not only for his devotion but his identification with Gandhi was complete. Infact in the author, Gandhi saw a great deal of himself. He, once said, "Babu Rajendra Prasad shares most of my ideals and whose sacrifice for the nation judged whether in quality or in quantity is not to be excelled.\textsuperscript{80}
In April 1917 Raj Kumar Shukla had taken Gandhi to Rajendra Prasad's house for Shukla did not know any one else in Patna. The author regrets, "Unfortunately, I was away'.

Although we have Rajendra Prasad's Autobiography also but he has discussed his experiences during the freedom struggle in At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi in a more detailed manner, thus this work has been taken up for study. Initially written in Hindi, 'At the feet of Mahatma Gandhi' was translated into English by Prof. M.A., Gidwani of Jai Hind college, Bombay in 1958 is reminiscences of the days Gandhi's leadership of the freedom movement and his association with Gandhi. 'At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi' before even starting when and how this long association began informs its reader about the author's faith in and devotion for the Mahatma, "Mahatma Gandhi is a modern replica of the sacred Ganga... the Ganga gives spiritual solace... material prosperity... so will Mahatma Gandhi's message of love and truth...." Similarly expresses the hope of the author that apostles will arise in this country and distant intent land who, "imbuing the teachings of the masters spread to the corners far and wide his life giving message...." Infact, before the work concludes with the assertion that the message of Gandhi will deliver the world from misery, exploitation and unfortune. The world is in sore need of... the message of Gandhi. The author quotes at length how faith in Gandhi's message rescued him when he found himself... "on the horns of dilemma... the guilty of falsehood" or "Charged with having managed to avoid imprisonment... I have often heard Gandhi saying that one should always stick to the truth even if it was felt that harm should temporarily come from it ultimately only good could flow from it.81 In the very beginning Gandhi is seen as a modern replica in human form of the sacred Ganga82 prosperity generating and catching the glimpse of moral and spiritual heights. The work seems to have been written as a moral duty to his people, to sprinkle what little of the sacred water I had gathered in my minim glass."83 Interaction between Gandhi and the author as the running theme.
The exact date of an event is rarely given, while narrating some very important personal experience, the year of the happening is mentioned in some cases, so are the names of the leaders, not mentioned with some exceptions of course. It seems no diary has been used in writing of the book. The account still is more or less in chronological order.

**Non-cooperation 1920-22**

The joining of hands by the Congress and the Khilafat committee on the issues of Panjab and Khilafat, Khilafat seemed to promise as "if that unity would never breakup". He sees reason in Gandhi's not including the issue of Swaraj in the demands for redressal of Panjab and Khilafat wrongs. Gandhi did not want to make it difficult for the British Government to accept the Congress demands.

The author also mentions that at Nagpur Congress efforts were made by the Liberals and those without any party affiliations and some Congressmen to reverse the Calcutta decisions. The quarrel for the boycott of elections and councils was over as the elections had already taken place.

On the issue of boycott of educational institutes, Rajendra Prasad was doubtful of the efficacy of the replacement by national institutions; later he saw its usefulness for breaking the fetters of Western Education. He was also skeptical about funds to open new national Universities but mentions that when Gandhi asked him to take up and promised funds, he was only too pleased to obey him.

Public response to the propagation of Khadi was enthusiastic; many national institutions were opened; courts were successfully, boycotted by lawyers and litigants. Propaganda against use of liquor etc. was also carried on by the people, message of Swaraj, Khaddar and non-cooperation was carried from village to village. Tilak Swaraj Fund was over-subscribed with in three months. The Congress membership
The programme was also fairly successful but the gospel of Charkha could not be popularised as very few workers know the art of spinning.\textit{86}

There was the Hindu-Muslim Cooperation in the non-cooperation movement, "there was a kind of friendly rivalry between the two in implementing its programme". The Congress Committees and Khilafat Committees worked hand in hand.

There were fewer cow-slaughters on Bakr Id Hindus and Muslims were closer than ever before. The author, however, maintains that the unity forged during the movement started breaking up. The signs of which started appearing during the Mopla rebellion. He says although misunderstanding was removed temporarily "But the seeds of dissention planted in Malabar during the Moplah rebellion germinated and grew in the course of time" according to Rajendra Prasad.

The author regrets the outbreak of riots and excesses against Parsees in Bombay during the visit of Prince of Wales. The Government and Gandhi's critics got an opportunity to claim that riots were the natural outcome of non-cooperation.

"They, therefore, became all the more vehement in their criticism and condemnation of the entire programme. Among them Mrs. Annie Beasant was very prominent, she had opposed the non-cooperation programme from the very beginning, who later wrote a trenchant article in her weekly,\textit{87} to which Deshbandhu Das urged Gandhi to send a crushing retort in Young India. Mahatmaji simply smiled he never said or wrote anything against his opponent." The Government fearing demonstrations against the Prince, made large scale arrests but failed to prevent them. It declared volunteer organizations unlawful but still there were more enrolment everywhere, volunteer corps were established. The Government adopted and resorted to large scale arrests and still more repressive policy. The RTC proposal, the author thinks, that, Gandhi rejected as the terms offered by the Government were
inadequate and that he did not have faith in the promises of RTC by the Government. In accordance with the Bardoli resolution launching civil disobedience in the second phase had to be postponed, because the people at Chauri-Chaura "in their excitement lost control of themselves and had attacked the police station and created disturbances in the area". The author mentions that the working committee unanimously accepted Gandhi's decision to postpone the launching of civil disobedience from Bardoli as the second phase of the Satyagraha movement. Gandhi had realized that people have not yet fully understood the meaning of non-violence, therefore, the moment was not ripe for launching the Civil Disobedience. Rajendra Prasad expresses his concern that this would disappoint the people, but in the due course appreciated Gandhi's view, "the Chauri Chaura had proved beyond doubt that the masses apart, even the Congress workers had not properly understood the essential message of Satyagraha. It was evident that the Congress workers were responsible to set fire to the police station."

Besides the popular protest, the author records that Deshbandhu did not approve of Gandhi's refusal to heed his advice to come to terms with Lord Reading at the postponement of the proposed Bardoli Civil Disobedience Movement, not only felt offended but upset that Gandhi was neither coming to terms nor putting up the fight. Almost all other leaders Motilal, Lajpat Rai, even Allibrothers expressed dissent over Gandhi's decision who nevertheless stuck to his grounds. At the AICC Gandhi had to chair the session because of Dr. Moonje's indisposition who was also critical of Gandhi's decision. Inspite of all apprehensions that with Gandhi in chair the members may not be allowed to speak their mind, every one desirous got the opportunity to freely criticise Gandhi till 10' O'clock in the night, which the author feared would weaken Gandhi's position and to cap it Gandhi allowed voting on the issue, "further adding to my discomfiture", but Gandhi's resolution was ultimately adopted. From the meeting it became apparent that there were two conflicting schools in the congress and the Government might take advantage of it. The Government did
arrest Gandhi on grounds of sedition for writing two articles in Young India and kept him in Sabarmati Jail. This was the first occasion after the non-cooperation started that Gandhi was accused and tried.

When Gandhi in Jail the problem before us was... what next?" The AICC thus at the move of Vithal Bhai Patel appointed a committee to assess the situation for launching another Satyagraha movement. Similarly the Khilafat Committee also appointed a Civil Disobedience enquiry committee for the purpose. Due to the conflicting opinions in the Congress Committee no definite plans could be made. The group which accepted non-cooperation and opposed Council Entry was no changers, the others were prochangers. Thereafter the book is a narration how Gandhi's small hints helped the author conduct him self in a Congress divided and confused.

"Controversy on the question of contesting" the election to the legislature took most of the Congress time and hindred constructive work. On release from jail Gandhi announced that the Swaraj party may go ahead with its council entry programme and he devoted himself to the propagation of the Constructive Programme. Primarily, because he saw that the "Hindu-Muslim unity which had been built up by the labours and sacrifices of so many... was crumbling down" causing anxiety to one and all as he had just recovered from illness. But the Mahatma was firm in his conviction and announced that the object was self-purification. Thereafter having left political work, for nearly five years Gandhi was mostly preoccupied with constructive programme. Discussing the events leading to his next major movement, the author feels that Gandhi did his best to resolve the differences within the Congress on the issue of Dominion Status, and could persuade the members of idea to that the Dominion Status would be accepted if it was conferred by the British Government within one year, but if that demand was not met by 31st December 1929, the Congress would amend the objective principle which till then, was the attainment of Swaraj."89
Rajendra Prasad finds roots of the movement of 1930-31 in the failure of Swarajists to prevent the adoption of the repressive measures from time to time and later Lord Birkenhead's statement, and to the growing closeness between Congress and the Swarajist which was further quickened by appointment of Simon-Commission. But the author, somehow, seems to be mixing up the sequence of the appointment of Nehru Committee for drafting a Constitution at Madras and the appointment of Simon Commission. Nehru Committee came up after the announcement of Simon Commission but the author puts both the events simultaneously.

In 1929, the preparations for the impending Civil Disobedience were made by way of constructive work. Khadi was popularised, Gandhi toured the country, and foreign cloth was boycotted and bonfires of foreign cloth were made. People were enthusiastic about the movement due to the visit of Simon Commission and its successful boycott. Lord Irwin went to England to discuss matters and on his return made a statement about Dominion status to India.

Mention may be made that initially the author was apprehensive about masses' response to Mahatma's call in Bihar because noniyas, a particular caste used to manufacture salt out of earth in this region. He suggested to Gandhi that in Bihar Chowkidari tax could be a possible issue for starting the civil disobedience but realizes that salt tax as the issue for starting a disobedience movement was indeed a stroke of Gandhi's political acumen, touching every one. This move (i) will deprive the government of crores of rupees which may be collected as annual revenue (ii) rich and poor will follow the Mahatma and demonstrate even to the poorest that the civil disobedience movement had been started with view to helping them (iii) will be possible for all to participate as India is surrounded by Sea on three sides.
Gandhi, the one to first practice and then to preach was the first to break the law and then ask others to follow. The author while finding it not possible to give here the Satyagraha movement refers to some significant incidents which are not really in chronological order, but great personal experiences of the enthusiasm, courage and discipline displayed by the masses despite Government repression. The narration more or less confines to the details of the movement in Bihar.

The author and Gandhi had long discussions at the possible pact with the government. He mentions that Gandhi Irwin pact was based on and a direct out come of the mutual faith in each other, much to the dislike of Lord Irwin's subordinates and successor. Gandhi considered it a congress victory only to the point "we had won it and not beyond". Initially Jawaharlal Nehru also expressed his disappointment but later did not object to it. But there were others who condemned and opposed it, primarily because of the public resentment over the execution of Bhagat Singh and his associates. Rajendra Prasad mentions that in Bhagat Singh's case Gandhi pleaded with Lord Irwin to remit the sentence of death to one of transportation for life. The Viceroy did not yield, Gandhi was of the view that if the death sentence on Sardar Bhagat Singh was commuted there will be favourable atmosphere in the country. But the secretly conducted execution of Bhagat Singh naturally resulted in a creating a wave of anger and resentment among the people, especially in Punjab. The author puts forth importance of the pact to be a factor for its non-implementation. Because it was the first negotiation held with people's representative organisation. Its other significance was that it provided for the manufacture of salt by the people and paved the way for congress participation in RTC.

Within a week of his return to India, Mahatma was arrested so were many other leaders and repression was intensified on one pretext or the other. So much so that a Congressman could not hire a public vehicle.
Ashrams, Congress offices and other places were declared unlawful bodies. The Congress did not issue any programme. The Government intensified repression. Along with other prohibitions, press was also strangled. The Government orders served as programme for the movement as the people defied those very laws.

The author admires the action of the masses without any guidance or direction from leaders but the 1930 movement had "so trained" that civil disobedience was resumed and carried for months.

The moment Lord Irwin left efforts to render it ineffective began. The RTC was so engineered to establish that the Indians were divided and as such could not put up a united demand whereas the British Government was ready to do so much. The author finds this factor responsible for Gandhi's failure to achieve anything despite his strenuous efforts. Regarding the announcement of the Communal Award, the author makes a subtle distinction between a arbitrary decision and a person in authority. An arbitrary, decision can not be reopened whereas no body is bound to accept the decision of a person in authority. Gandhi's protest was, therefore, morally correct as he had never agreed to MacDonald’s arbitration hence it was not arbitrator’s decision but that of Prime Minister of Britain, a powerful person in authority.

Gandhi's 'fast unto death' against the clause on separate electorates for depressed classes and reservation of seats greatly upset the Indian leadership, particularly in the face of Ambedkar's insistence upon separate electorates. Ultimately on certain conditions Ambedkar came around to an agreement Poona pact after it was made clear to hi... that separate electorates would result in perpetuation of untouchability. However he succeeded in getting more seats for the Depressed Classes than even given in the Communal Award. The Hindus, however, were now, under the pact, honourbound to the eradication of untouchability.
In his Autobiography Rejendra Prasad reflects at the events of 1932 that though the Congress did not issue any programme, its leaders were arrested unawares, yet the enthusiasm of people could not be curbed. The movement which Lord Willingdon boasted to suppress within two weeks lasted for two years till it was suspended by its leader. Independence Day meeting was held inspite of ban, and firing by police, even the Congress session was held in Delhi.

Regarding suspension of the movement in 1933 the author believes that it had lost its vigour, and Gandhi felt that it was not worthwhile carrying it on. So he formally suspended the movement.

These movements made a great impact on the country. In 1920-21 "Bihar was in the grip of excitement". People were prepared to sacrifice their everything for their country's freedom. When Satyagraha was suspended, in order to retain the enthusiasm of people, stress upon constructive work was laid. Even the Swarajists returned to the Constructive work after four years in the councils. In 1930 with Gandhi's march "a tremendous wave of enthusiasm swept over the country" and "still there was not a single case in the whole province (Bihar), of people becoming violent or rioteous", that too inspite of police excesses. In 1932 the masses were well trained in Satyagraha and without any guidance or direction they were able to find ways and means of carrying on Satyagraha.

A great believer in and a follower of Gandhi's non-violence, he narrates, how in 1930-31 non-violent Satyagrahis changed the attitude of police officials and that there was a "great deal of sympathy" for us among policemen.

The Government of India Act 1935, author maintains, was accepted by the Congress and the Muslim League with reservations. The Muslim League felt that since the Act provided for a federation, Muslims being in a minority could not hope to be in majority the Central Legislature and hence had insisted on greater provincial
autonomy, and Congress, insisting that power should be transferred to India, found that it is the British government who retained power through this act. After the elections in 1937, Muslim League having won very few seats, did not occupy any special position in the ministries formed there after. The Congress took office, the league intensified propaganda against the Hindus and made the principle programme of its plan.102

There was a fundamental difference between Gandhi and the Congress. Gandhi sympathisingly offered to render unconditionally all moral help. The Congress on the other hand was for conditional contribution in the British war effort. Gandhi was a victim of misunderstanding this time again. Gandhi was clear in his mind, the votary of ahimsa sympathises with one who has justice on his side - and there was, of course, no question of India associating with the war. It was completely moral help to save democracies of the world.

The Congress will render all help if the British government accepted India’s demand. Unequivocally declared its acceptance of India’s objective of independence (iii) the British must give control over difference and finance for the interim relief. The British however through Sir Stafford Cripps promised Dominion Status after the war was over which was not acceptable to the Congress. Gandhi’s insistence on Congress was not the cause for failure of Cripps mission. The real cause of the failure was England’s unwillingness to transfer real power to India.103

The difference of opinion between Gandhi and the Congress on the issue of war also brought to surface the that congress had accepted non-violence more as a measure of expediency and exingency and adopted non-violence as an opportunist would do." The author feels that this created division within the Congress, there were some who were uncompromisingly committed to Gandhi’s principle of non-violence, on the other those who in their anxiety for Swaraj were prepared to be a party to
violence. After the government rejected the Congress demands, the Congress again turned to Gandhi in his Individual Satyagraha 1940. As far as the Congress was concerned non-violence Gandhi’s Creed and the very breath of life remained only a policy.

Rajendra Prasad considers this Satyagraha a declaration of non-cooperation with the Government but restricted to selected few in which care was taken to prove, Gandhi’s and his followers’ commitment to the pursuit of non-violence, "to prevent the outbreak of violence", to avoid harrassment to the British Government. The Congress was not ready to take upon itself the responsibility of helping the war effort without the transfer of power in a real sense, it was therefore, not possible for it to come to a settlement with the government early in 1942, last minute efforts were, however, made through the Cripps Mission to bring about a settlement" without results. The principal reason for the failure of Cripps Mission was, of course, Mr. Jinnah’s intransigence. The Congress was, therefore, left with no alternative but to demand that the British government should quit India.

**Quit India 1942**

In the Quit India movement Gandhi’s slogan ‘Do or Die’ had tremendous impact on the people. Understandably the author’s description is confined to Bihar. The author does point out that all elements in Indian nationalism wholeheartedly responded to Gandhi’s call for nation wide Satyagraha - the last one in his life. But regrets that the movement became uncontrolled and created anarchic conditions in the country which were neither intended by the CWC nor Gandhi at the time of passing Quit India resolution.

The leaders being in jail, masses took the slogan literally, and resorted to activities Gandhi would never approve of. The young element started distributing leaflets containing an action plan which, however, was never approved by Gandhi. He
refutes the allegation made by Mr. Amery, the Secretary of State for India that a programme of sabotage was approved by the Congress; Gandhi would not approve of activities such as cutting of communication like rail tracks or telegraph lines as such an act reflects the attitude and motive of the doer and the violence in it.

The author mentions that in spite of rainy season and repression, the movement could not be suppressed. The author believes that this movement made the British realize that it was difficult for her to keep India under subjection. Even Churchill sent Lord Wavell, soon after the war was over, as the Viceroy to come to terms with the Congress\textsuperscript{104} and the negotiations for the transfer of power began.

For the author Gandhi could never be wrong who had a firm determination and unwavering mind and would not "sit quiet if his protest was brushed aside\textsuperscript{105} As a principle Gandhi never exaggerated and would "weigh every word he said and attach to it its full meaning and significance\textsuperscript{106} When in 1931 at the RTC he opposed separate electorates for the Depressed classes and threatened to stake his life against it, no one attached any importance to it but Gandhi had used the term "eliberately and had made up his mind to act on it\textsuperscript{107}"

To the author not only was Gandhi a strong, disciplined man but has also projected him as having divine and super-human powers. He was the Ganges, which had come down from the heavens to prosper his scorched land. Indians were "fortunate to see him and come in contact" with this incarnation in flesh\textsuperscript{108}

The author is devoted to Gandhi to the extent of never questioning him even when in doubt e.g. in 1922 when Gandhi suspended the Non-cooperation movement\textsuperscript{109} and when the Congress planned to open national educational institutes and the author did not have funds\textsuperscript{110} The author was rarely in correspondence with Gandhi never entered into an argument with the Mahatma and would be content with Gandhi's answer. The book projects Rajendra Prasad as devoted to social service and
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not given to politics and one third of the work relates to constructive work especially Khaddar untouchability whilst, Hindu-Muslim Unity, and cow protection also receive his attention. He worked more vigorously for the promotion of Khadi and Education.

He is quite critical of the Congress stand on Hindu Muslim question. He thinks that had the Congress accepted Muslim demands, which were not dangerous, in 1928, the history of India would have been different.

In the work under reference, the author gives, minute details of the response to Gandhi's call for Satyagraha in Bihar. Of course some anecdotes from other places such as Ahmedabad session, misuse of Satyagraha by a cow-protection protagonist. Or Dr. Moonje's resolution or anecdote about girl picketeer who did not know whereabouts of her in-laws' house.

The author refers to Gandhi very reverently, Mahatmaji, Gandhiji or revered Mahatmaji.

Analysis

The authors under reference coming from different backgrounds share certain common feature. All are educated, qualified to practice law, born in Hindu families who had liberal religious outlooks, lived through the Gandhian movements, met Gandhi before 1919. During Gandhi's Satyagrahas in Champaran, Kheda and Ahmedabad in 1917-18 and his success in attaining justice for the people in these issues, brought these authors closer. Thus began a lasting relationship that grew on gradually. Then Gandhi had not really become politically active. All whole heartedly supported Gandhi's ideas on Hindu-Muslim unity.

The duration of their association with Gandhi naturally varied. Lala Lajpat Rai, unfortunately did not live to see the second mass-movement much less the independence of India. The others shared the common experiences. All the All-India
movements Gandhi launched and even after Gandhi's death, worked to realize India of Gandhi's dreams not by virtue of their position but as deeply influenced by their leader. They had different views regarding on-violence. Lajpat Rai and Nehru did not share Gandhi's conviction that non-violence can be universally applicable, whereas Rajendra Prasad had complete faith.

All of them accepted Gandhi's programme of upliftment of Harijans on humanitarian grounds. All three consider Gandhi's programme for independence as constructive and creative Lajpat Rai and Nehru describe it as a double edged or two-fold to denote the constructive and destructive aspects of Gandhi's programme. They maintain that while working for realization of swaraj, Gandhi undertook destruction and eradication of social evils. The word destructive does not, of course, denote negativity it seems the authors have used the term to explain the processes of change where reconstruction inevitably, involves destruction of the undesirable.

Whilst All the three authors recognized impact of Gandhi's movements on the masses, but their perception of Gandhi the man, differs. To Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhi was able to have unprecedented influence on the people by becoming one of them and Rajendra Prasad sees Gandhi as super-human having descended on earth for deliverance of millions from misery and ignorance.

By personal example, released the people from the fear of self-suffering or government repression. Both Rajendra Prasad and Nehru had found a pall of fear being removed. All of these works are autobiographical in nature. These autobiographical accounts are not free from the individual views of the author and reflect their own predilections. In their own way, they have expressed their disapproval and dissatisfaction of Gandhi's action of decision on many occasions. The objectivity in their seeing and accepting Gandhi's point of view at a later stage after the event. The expression used in these writings differs primarily because of their equation with
Gandhi Lajpat Rai, enjoying the advantage of being senior to Gandhi, is more dispassionate in his reactions. Nehru, being younger, relatively more reverent yet impatient, reacts sharply but firmly and confidently.
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