CHAPTER III
COLLEAGUES

Some of the first hand accounts of Gandhi's movements have been given by those associates of his, who met him after the local satyagrahas at Champaran, Ahmedabad, Kheda, he had emerged as a great champion of the poor and deprived. Our study confines itself to the narratives of R.R. Diwakar, Azad and Bose respectively. R.R. Diwakar met Gandhi in May, 1918, Azad in January 1920 soon after his release from jail and Subhas Bose in July 1921.

The points of enquiry in this chapter are the same as those in the previous one.

R.R. Diwakar

R.R. Diwakar is well-known for his numerous writings on Gandhi, his work and thought. Appreciating Diwakar's understanding of Gandhi's values, Sir M.S. Aney writes, "Among the thousands of satyagrahis there are only a few who understood what satyagraha really means. And even among those fortunate who know, those that can lucidly explain the theory and practice of it are very rare. On reading this brochure, I felt, that R.R. Diwakar, the talented author of it was, one of those rare persons."

Diwakar's 'First Encounter' with Gandhi was in May 1918 as a young volunteer, having been assigned the duty to attend on Gandhi. Few words that might have been exchanged between the two, the author records, stuck in his mind. Reacting to the volunteers' leader's call for strike, Gandhi told the author, "volunteers never strike, it is the labourers who work for wages that strike." So impressed was Diwakar by Gandhi that he decided to join him in the freedom struggle. In 1920 during Non-cooperation Movement Diwakar was arrested and found himself with Gandhi in Yervada Jail in 1922. The opportunity to stay near Gandhi for two years away from politics enabled the author to converse with Gandhi on as many vital issues of Satyagraha and other
areas close to Gandhi's heart. Diwakar only stayed as a constant associate of Gandhi, till the latter's death, and led many local Satyagrahas from time to time.

Although the author joined the Gandhian movements, yet we find that in 1942-44, his conception of non-violence was different from that of Gandhi. But he accepted and understood whatever Gandhi suggested from time to time. He was not a self assuming individual because in his Saga of Satyagraha, he does not mention his own participation. Besides being a politician and journalist his contribution to Gandhaian thought is immense.

SAGA OF SATYAGRAHA

Saga of Satyagraha as the title denotes is a narrative glorifying Satyagraha. Dr. Rajedra Prasad described as a "sort of text-book on the subject." The author tells us that in 1960 "it was studied as a text-book for cultural studies of Indian in American". The book was published in 1946 with an Introduction by K.G. Mashruwala. Its revised edition came out in 1969. The American version of the work was prepared by Dr. Clifford Manhardt with the subtitle "The Power of Truth". It was written in 1942 when the author had gone underground, which the author owns as a lapse on the part of a Satyagrahi and a breach of code of Satyagrahi. But as a true soldier, he considered it necessary to go underground from strategic angle, so that he could organize for others, open defiance to keep the movement going at the juncture when all the important Congress leaders, were being arrested,

"there was confusion among people about the programme of action. Many had the impression that sabotage and such other paralyzing activities which involve injury to government property were permissible."

The work focusses on the meaning of Satyagraha, its antecedents, its origin in the mind of Gandhi, its evolution and relation with Truth and Ahimsa. After discussing the basic principles, the author calls it a way of life which can bring about social change.
if followed methodically. It has the potential to deal with national and international problems hence accepting Gandhi's assertion of universality of the application of Satyagraha. Various Satyagrahas organized by Gandhi from the first in South Africa to Champaran and Bardoli, an also Guru Ka Bagh and Flag Satyagraha are narrated in this work by citing illustrations from Europe where Satyagraha (Passive Resistance) worked successfully. Gandhi's name is mentioned only in the context of the meeting with Lord Irwin, otherwise no names are linked with Satyagraha and are simply referred to as collective activity.

Non-Cooperation 1920-22

Diwakar traces the roots of the non-co-operation on movement of 1920-22 in the Punjab atrocities, Khilafat wrongs ad the Hunter Commitee Report ignoring the dissent of Indian members. The government proscribed the Congress injuring Committee Report and showered praise on those who were responsible for cruel killings of innocent unarmed men, women, makes a mention of the special session at Calcutta where Gandhi's programme of non-violent non-cooperation was accepted and the Nagpur session ratified it with a big majority. It was at Nagpur that even C.R.Das and Lajpat Rai who opposed the programme at Calcutta proposed andseconded it respectively. He, briefly mentions the items of the programme without comment.

"Never before was the country so awakened, so active so united and so determined as during the eventful months of 1921-22. Hindus and Muslims seemed to have been welded into a single community. The movement which began with a simple hartal, fasting and prayer spread like wild fire. The masses took up the campaign of prohibition spontaneously. There was some sporadic mob violence but on the whole, the campaign was non-violent."
About the official reaction, Diwakar states that though the government had instructed local officials to take action against only those persons who go beyond limits set by the organizers, or incite people to violence or for disloyalty of the army or police, yet these instructions were seldom followed. Police took to firing at Dharwar and Malegaon. The author maintains that Ahmedabad Congress in December 1921 met in an atmosphere of tension, to adopt Bardoli no-tax campaign as Gandhi had informed the Viceroy, in advance of the next phase of the movement and in turn received a warning against it. But after the Chauri-Chaura incident, Gandhi himself "felt that it would be wrong to proceed with Civil Disobedience in the face of such violence." Diwakar is of the view, "Though the Satyagraha could not achieve its immediate objective, the country had advanced by at least thirty years. He quotes the Governor of Bombay, "the movement was within an inch of success."

Civil Disobedience 1930-31

About the Civil Disobedience Movement 1930-31 too author says that it was a 'direct attempt' by Gandhi to secure Swaraj, after having waited patiently for the Government to respond positively to the aspirations of the Indian people particularly after the acceptance by the Congress of All-Parties Conference proposal for Dominion Status constitution. The author maintains that Gandhi, after having gauged the impatient mood of the people of India and himself having no faith in the vague announcements of the Government, took the "momentous decision" of organizing a Civil Disobedience campaign.

Here the programme of the movement besides violating salt laws, included felling of palm trees a source of toddy find full and special mention.

The Government, author holds "had begun to lose temper by the time Dandi March, completed. During the National Week celebrations, firings took place at
Peshawar, Madras and other places." Police made brutal attacks in Ratnagiri, Patna, Shiroda, Calcutta, Sholapur and many other towns and villages. Bengal Ordinance and Press Ordinance were revived, which Gandhi called 'Veiled Martial Law' and that India was a vast prison house.\(^\text{16}\)

As regards progress of the movement, he informs the reader about non-violent raids on salt pans and depots, breach of ordinances, no-tax Campaign, programme in certain parts of India, defiance of Press Laws, boycott of foreign articles and cloth, special boycott of British cloth and British concerns, general non-cooperation with the Government, and boycott of the Legislatures\(^\text{17}\) but finds raids on salt-pans at different places in Gujarat, Bombay and Maharashtra as the most notable fact. The courage of the volunteers or the Satyagrahis according to the author was unprecedented. They showed marvellous endurance and discipline and drew praise from foreign correspondents and observers. Diwakar thinks that it was a new history written with the blood of the Satyagrahis. He praises the bold non-violent action of the masses for the vindication of their right. In support of his own admiration for the courage of the Satyagrahis he mentions Webb Miller's account of Dharsana raid, such exemplary non-violent conduct of the Satyagrahis went unregistered by the police. It was crushed brutally by lathi charge, seriously injuring the Satyagrahis and rendering them unconscious.

He calls the period (1930-31), the ordinance rule with the lathi and baton very much in evidence. He states that the satyagrahis disobeyed all the Ordinances, and suffered penalties cheerfully. But without respecting the non-violent nature of the movement, the police, brought into play all the brutal methods they were capable of.\(^\text{18}\) The bravery and role of women in this movement who were arrested in thousands, lathi charged and harshly treated or even left in jungles at odd hours finds special mention in this work.\(^\text{19}\)
In a nutshell, the author seems to be thoroughly disapproving and resentful of the methods employed by the government to suppress a wholly non-violent movement, particularly when Labour Party was in power in Britain. In this narration a mention is also made of the attempts to bring about an understanding in mid 1930, made by third parties such as Mr. Solocombe, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mr. M.R. Jayakar and Horace Alexander, a Quaker admirer of Gandhi but without any result.\(^{20}\) Gandhi-Irwin Pact 1931 is hailed as a moral victory for the Congress.

The Government of India is held responsible for the resumption of Civil Disobedience in 1931 by not respecting the terms of Gandhi - Irwin pact, Lord wellingdon had a strong aversion to the Pact. Soon breaches of the Pact by the government were reported from many places. When the Congress complained about this, it was ignored. After the failure of the second Round Table Conference, Lord Wellingdon put India under ‘Ordinance Raj’ and arrested Jawaharlal Nehru and Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan before they could meet Gandhi. Gandhi’s request for a meeting with the Viceroy was turned down. So Diwakar points out that Gandhi was left with no option but to resume the fight.

In 1932 a few new items were added to the earlier list of 1930-31, such as boycott of British-banking, shipping, insurance companies, foreign cloth and forest laws. Non-payment of revenue and chowkidari tax was adopted. And all government officials were to be socially boycotted.\(^{22}\)

Public responded by non-violently picketing liquor shops. Though the processions and meetings were banned two Congress sessions were held one in Delhi in April 1932 and the other in Calcutta in April 1933. They were attended by hundreds of delegates from all-over India. All the items of boycott and defiance were carried on enthusiastically. Special commemorative days were celebrated.\(^{22}\)
The government reacted more harshly. On 4th January, 1932, arrested the Congress leaders including Gandhi and Patel, banned the Congress and declared its committee, national schools, Kisan Sabhas, Seva Dals and allied organizations unlawful. The properties of these organizations were attached and later sold. Lathi charge was indiscriminate.

The author attempts a comparison of the various movements, but jumbling of fact and not following a chronological order, make it somewhat less interesting and more heavy read for analysis.

Gandhi’s fast in September 1932, Diwakar feels "diverted the attention of the people". "The Civil Disobedience went on but removal of untouchability received more serious attention of the people" Gandhi suspended the movement for nine weeks but the fight was resumed as the author thinks that the attempts at reconciliation failed.

**Quit India 1942**

As the emphasis on non-violence was greater than before Gandhi’s stand on World War II and his idea of non-embarassment of the British at their critical moment are sympathetically explained. Though the earlier movements had been non-violent yet in 1940-41 Gandhi was more particular about it. He made a careful selection of people who would take part in it. He wanted quality and the first one to be selected was Vinoba who was a true Satyagrahi. Diwakar admits that the movement had waned by the end of 1941. The Government released all Satyagrahis with a hope of gaining Congress co-operation.

Since the book was written during August 1942 and August 1944, the narrative concludes with the description of ‘Quit India Movement’ which the author, rightly refers as ‘current history’. The writer is of the view that Cripps proposals promised
tons of food in the indefinite future to India which hungered for a morsel here and now.

Gan Jhi was disillusioned at the outset of Cripps proposal, Azad and Nehru in the hope of striking a bargain carried on the negotiations with the Government till July 1942.\textsuperscript{25} Diwakar's treatment of the movement is very cryptic, almost telegraphic. The whole event is dealt in a couple of paragraphs without any specifics, except that the C.W.C. after the long-drawn discussions decided that Gandhi's non-violent mass movement was the only way-out, and called upon Gandhi to give the lead. In July 1942, when bitterness and anger filled the Indian atmosphere and anti-British feeling reached its climax, at this psychological moment, the author reflects, Gandhi began the Quit India Movement.\textsuperscript{26}

Against the negligible figures of casualty in Government accounts, the author records that more than 2000 unarmed and innocent people were shot and 6000 injured by the police, 1,500,000 more Jailed, Rs.15 lakhs were collected as fines. About the other destruction, the author says there has not been any account as there were one no records available.

The author rightly refrains from saying anything about the ultimate outcome of the movement as it would be premature. Like all other associates of Gandhi, Diwakar also describes the violence and repression on the part of the Government. He briefly mentions that within a week all important Congress leaders and workers were arrested. The Government ruled by ordinances, took to lathi-charges, firing and even bombings from aeroplanes. In the last couple of paragraphs in its description, the author mentions the destruction caused by the military and police in terms of human lives and material assets.

About the mass awakening, he is certain that it was unprecedented and incomparable with anything in the past history of the country. The rare courage and
dynamism that the Indian masses showed this time, accounts the author, deserves special attention from any student of social history of India. Though he has mentioned few acts of unorganized violence, pre-dominantly the masses conducted themselves non-violently. 27

Quite surprisingly, he calls it an important chapter in the history of non-violent resistance, "if not of pure and unadulterated Satyagraha". It is a fact to be noted that even Gandhi had accepted that the movement had turned violent. The author himself deviated from the path of a true Satyagrahi to go underground even if to organize and awaken the masses for non-violent agitation.

He speaks the language of a Gandhi-admirer, for him it is only Gandhi who matters all others are simple followers. He takes to Hero-worship, 28 defends Gandhi and speaks his language. He calls the Youth wing of Congress "The more impatient spirits". Nevertheless he has tried to be objective because he brings Gandhi in picture only when necessary, otherwise it is satyagraha by the masses or people.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the President of the Indian National Congress during the most crucial six years (1940-46) at the time of World War II was one of the important negotiators for transfer of power by the British. Azad in Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's estimation was, "a man of infinite compassion impersonal relations and inexorable justice in public affairs." To Nehru he was 'a luminous personality'. 29

Azad met Gandhi in January 1920, soon after his (Azad) release from jail, and joined him in his fight for India's independence. He was a close comrade of Gandhi and Nehru, however, he did not flinch an issue even if it meant disagreement with Gandhi as he elaborately discusses such issues in his autobiographical narrative.
Like Gandhi, Maulana Azad was reluctant to write an autobiography, but Humayun Kabir prevailed upon him to record in his autobiography India Wins Freedom, his experiences of the freedom struggle, participation and involvement in the transfer of power during 1937-47, when the fate of India was being decided. Azad wanted to keep India united and opposed ‘divorce before marriage.’ He worked for a United India. Humayan Kabir wrote down Azad’s autobiographical notes as the latter went on narrating, later on he prepared the draft in English and got it approved by Azad. As mentioned Kabir had suggested that another volume be written covering the early phase of his life upto 1937. A synopsis of the same was prepared but the volume could never be written as Azad died, the present volume saw the light of the day after his death. Since it was published posthumously, the title of the book is Jawaharlal Nehru’s contribution.30

Azad had held back thirty pages of personal nature from publication in 1958 with an instruction that those pages were to be made public only after thirty years. They were deposited in National Archives, New Delhi and National Library, Calcutta. The complete volume consisting the held back thirty pages was published in 1989.

Non-cooperation Movement 1920-22

The narration sounds quite candid and conveys disappointment regarding the failure of realising his dream of united India. His interest in Hindu-Muslim unity and United India was life long. Even in 1920’s he was pained at riots and asked Gandhi to consider the problem urgently in order to avoid communal strife. Azad believed that men and women make history. He forgets that other historical forces are at work too. Azad had reverence for Gandhi and worked with him for three decades. Although on many issues he differed with Gandhi yet always accepted the leader’s command.

The Non-cooperation Movement and the Civil Disobedience Movement have been just referred to in the first chapter. Perhaps as necessary background to Quit
India Movement and are not described in detail. The Non-Cooperation Movement, he believes aimed at winning of Swaraj and solving the Khilafat problem. He gave unqualified support to Gandhi and his programme of non-cooperation which he believed was necessary for achieving the aims of the movement. The author feels that Gandhi's plan was not acceptable to many leaders like Lajpat Rai, C.R. Das and Bipin Chandra Pal till the Calcutta session but gave their full support on realizing the changed temper of the country.

Azad is quite critical of Gandhi's attitude to Government's Round Table Conference proposal in December 1921 and blames Gandhi for missing a golden opportunity of a political settlement. He agrees with C.R. Das who said that Gandhi had bungled the whole situation and committed a political blunder.

Similarly he echoes C.R. Das's views on the suspension of the movement after Chauri-Chaura. He writes,

"This caused a severe political reaction in political circles and demoralized the country. The Government took full advantage of the situation and arrested Gandhiji. He was sentenced to six years imprisonment and the movement slowly petered out."

Civil Disobedience Movement 1930-34

Azad thinks that Simon Commission, its appointment and visit to India mounted political excitement in India. And the non-acceptance of Congress demand for Independence by the British Government were the major factors for the Salt Satyagraha. It was after the rejection of the national demand that a mass movement was launched and Salt laws were to be defined. The author also mentions that the efficacy of Salt as an item for defiance was doubted by the Government and Indian leaders. But both were surprised by its success.
The government in order to arrest the movement took to repression, declared Congress unlawful, with order for the arrest of Congress President and Working Committee members. The Gandhi-Irwin Pact somehow does not receive the author's attention and is dismissed in few words. Probably because the book relates mainly to the period much after the signing of the Pact.

After Gandhi's empty handed return from London, Lord Wellingdon resorted to repression with vengeance.

On Gandhi's fast on 9th May 1933, Azad sent an emotion charged telegram, "Although deeply pained not ventured interference. Your decision because know final. Have fullest confidence in your inner strength. Stop Heart devastated but mind convinced. God give you strength pass through unscathed".37

Quit India Movement 1942

The years 1939-1942 were the years of agreements disagreements, between Gandhi and the Congress. As a principle the Congress leaders wanted to help the democracies in the war, but Gandhi opposed it even at the cost of Independence. On this issue Azad and Gandhi differed.38 Nehru, Azad and other few leaders were continuously in disagreement with Gandhi over his ideology, his improper study of the situation, his methodology and inaction. At the outbreak of the war Congress wanted Gandhi to take action but he was indecisive. Later he wanted to offer unconditional moral support to the British whereas Congress wanted to offer conditional help. Azad records Gandhi was pained at the devastation and on "several occasions, he even spoke of suicide."39 Gandhi had no intention to start another mass Satyagraha when the Congress in March 1940 resolved to launch one, reluctantly, Gandhi announced the Individual Satyagraha.40 In 1941 again Azad and Gandhi
differed on Congress participation in the war. Gandhi realizing that Azad was adament moved a resolution reflecting latter's views.

Appreciational Azad writes, "It was a striking testimony to Gandhiji's capacity for finding a solution to the most difficult of problems... He also had a wonderful capacity of understanding and representing fairly a contrary point of view."41 During this period even Gandhi and Nehru differed a lot, Azad contests Nehru's statement that Gandhi did not give a good impression to Chiang-Kai Shek.42 Azad and Gandhi agreed after the failure of Cripps Mission but soon differed when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbour. It was in July 1942, when the Congress offer was rejected by the Viceroy that Gandhi and the Congress came closer and the Quit India Movement was launched.

At the time of Cripps Mission as the Congress President entered into correspondence with him. And the correspondence was published. One wonder as to what was the motivation for retaining those passages withheld in Azad. The passages just repeat the letters, which the author had written to Cripps.43 One does not find the logic behind the detention of those passages. These letters were added in the appendices to India Wins Freedom 1958 edition and were published in the news papers also.

Regarding Cripps Mission Azad notes down that the negotiations broke because the draft declaration laid more 'emphasis on future than on the immediate present' and the proposals were not specific, and the proposals regarding the present were negative.

Azad has recorded that Gandhi did not influence the views of Working Committee. He also mentions Jawaharlal Nehru's stand on the issue when he mentioned in an interview that though the differences caused the rejection of Cripps
offer, India was willing to help the British whose policy was responsible for this situation. 44

The Cripps Mission Azad maintains did an irreparable injury to Indo-British understanding. Moreover it confirmed the view that only a free India could defend herself. Another significant impact of the mission and its failure, which Azad points out is that the attitude of people and even Gandhi, in regard to war had changed markedly. 45 Gandhi, who earlier held that India should stand for non-violence and not deviate from it for any reason, was considering an organized mass revolt.

He tries to impress upon the reader that at many times Gandhi's presumptions proved to be incorrect whereas his own came out to be true. This is a fact, for example when in 1942 Gandhi, even after the Viceroy's refusal to see Mira Behn, kept hoping that he and Congress leaders would not be arrested, whereas Azad had contested this view 46. And also as regards people turning violent to "oppose the violence of the Government in every way possible". 47 Although, according to the author, the process had begun much earlier but it became clear only after the departure of Cripps 48. He also mentions that as Gandhi had changed his stand completely the author tried to impress upon him that the British Government would not tolerate an organised movement of resistance with the enemy at the Indian frontier. Gandhi, at this time also clarified that it was the right time for Congress to raise the demand that the British must leave India. He also suggested that 'unlike previous occasions, this time the people would not court imprisonment voluntarily' but they should resist arrest and submit only if physically forced to do so. 49

All through the war period Azad and Gandhi differed on one issue or the other. In July 1942, Azad and Gandhi differed first on the issue of launching a movement then on its nature, Azad doubted the movement would remain non-violent in the
wake of war and possibility of arrest of leaders, whereas Gandhi expected the movement to be non-violent and also an open rebellion at one and the same time.\textsuperscript{50}

He also differed with Gandhi on the point of Government taking drastic action against satyagrahis, Gandhi believed that the Government would not take such a step whereas Azad believed the other way round.

Azad also tells us that the Government was fully prepared to meet any movement. It had before hand decided to arrest not only working committee members or AICC members but also local leaders.\textsuperscript{51} The local officials were ordered not to permit any demonstrations or even slogans.

Azad also talks about the response of the masses. Communications had been disrupted and factories closed down. People had attacked, burnt, and destroyed Railway and Police stations. In large numbers military lorries had been burnt. With the closure of factories production of war materials was suspended or reduced.

Although he maintains that the movement was not confined to non-violent resistance, yet the violence was the reaction of the violence let loose by the government.\textsuperscript{52}

As Azad was a Bengali Muslim, he was greatly impressed by C.R. Das and shares and supports Das's views on many issues like (i) Gandhi's rejection of Malaviya's offer of RTC with the Government, (ii) later when Gandhi made efforts for the same, the Government did not pay any heed (iii) the suspension of non-cooperation movement, and (iv) the stand of the Swarajists. He says "one of the major objections of the non-changers had been that Gandhi's leadership would be weakened by the Council entry programme. Events proved that they were wrong."\textsuperscript{53}
The significance of the work lies in the light it throws on personal relations between the author and Gandhi. Though they differed with each other but still Azad always followed Gandhi except in war period. Gandhi too had a great praise for him. "Maulana is a great thinker of keen intellect and vast reading."Azad’s views do reflect the lifelong impression that his revolutionary ideas of youthful days made on him. The present work also echoes the same views.

Subhas Chandra Bose

Subhas Chandra Bose is one such associate of Gandhi who shared the latter’s aim but was ideologically at variance. Subhas was the representative of young socialist revolutionary element in the Indian Nationalism. Subhas was impressed by Gandhi’s spirit of sacrifice and sincerity of purpose, but was never influenced by his ideology of non-violence as, for him, non-violence was not an efficacious means in politics. Both had deep regard for each other. Gandhi wrote about Bose, "Netaji was like a son to me. I came to know him as a lieutenant full of promise under the late Deshbandhu Das." At another occasion he said, "Netaji’s name is one to conjure with. His patriotism is second to none... This bravely shines through all his actions." Bose was drawn towards Gandhi in the beginning but drifted apart. But still the break was never complete. His last message to INA was to work non-violently under the guidance and leadership of Congress was in fact an acceptance of Gandhi’s leadership when the war was over.

There was no instantaneous liking on either side. Gandhi sent Bose to C.R. Das and did not ask him to work with him. Similarly Bose liked and respected C.R. Das more, as he considered him to be his Guru who “was both feared and admired by the Government. They feared his strength but admired his character... He was clear-headed, his political instinct was sound and unerrings; and unlike the Mahatma he was fully conscious of the role he was to play in Indian politics.”
The Indian Struggle (1920-34)

The Indian Struggle (1920-34) was written while Bose was convalescing in Vienna in 1934 having no access to information about the happenings in India or books and newspapers for reference. Thus he largely draws upon memory. And seems to think that the account does not suffer from any limitations as, "has been written by one who has played an intimate part in the struggle which he has narrated..." The purpose of the writer is to 'help interpret the Indian struggle to the foreign observer." The book was banned by the Government of India in 1935, but few copies were unofficially circulated among the revolutionaries. Written from the leftist viewpoint, the work is fairly objective about the role of other parties.

The Indian Struggle is a narrative of the events of national movement from 1920-34. Netaji Research Bureau Calcutta collected Bose's later speeches and writings and published as collected Cross-roads and complete writings were published as collected works of Subhas Chandra Bose Vol. I & II in 1964. The later two chapters 1935-42 were written by Bose during the World War II when he was in Europe. The manuscripts for these later writings were obtained by editors and compilors from his wife after the war.

Non-cooperation 1920-22

During the non-cooperation movement, Bose was in England keeping himself informed about developments in India. He holds war years followed by Rowlatt Bills, Jallianwala Bagh massacre, unsatisfactory Reforms, dissatisfaction of Indian Muslim and Hunter Committee Report, responsible for launching of non-cooperation.

The Government of India's attitude to the Punjab atrocities proved to be the last straw. Thus Punjab and Khalafat wrongs brought about the Gandhi and Khilafat Committee alliance.
The programme of non-cooperation and triple boycott ending in non-payment of taxes was adopted at Calcutta. To it was added Swaraj as the goal of Congress at Nagpur session. Bose writes that INC's declared goal of Swaraj lacked clarity of meaning. What constitutes Swaraj, was any body's guess and interpretation. Other items were revival of hand spinning and weaving, removal of untouchability and collection of Tilak fund of ten million rupees. Bose regrets the closure of British committee of INC which was the only centre of Congress propaganda outside India.62

Commenting on the developments in movement, he notes that well known professionals left their practices, boycotts and prohibition resulted in loss of two-thirds of revenue to the Government, and temperance movement was popular for moral as well as economic purpose, whereas removal of untouchability was carried on moral and humane grounds. Adoption of Khadi resulted in becoming the uniform of Congressmen, and it proved a big challenge to foreign mill-made cloth. Tilak Swaraj fund was over-subscribed. New educational institutions were opened. Bose lauds the role of students and volunteers who made this movement a success, and mentioned that a large number of men gave up their titles and very few resigned their job.63 The participation of Muslims strengthened the movement. A major rail strike in Bengal crippled rail and steamer traffic in Bengal and Assam. No tax campaign in Midnapore district was also a success.64

Bose records that the adoption of Act regarding self-Government for villages though did not give any powers to the villages purported to additional taxation without any benefits to people. When people resisted the act, repressive measures such as forcible seizure of property, harassment, prosecution and intimidation of people by both military and police were adopted.
Bose believes that the existence of Khilafat Committees along side the Congress in the long run proved harmful for communal unity it should have been merged. He considers Moplah rebellion, which was orginally directed against local Hindus and the Government proved harmful to Hindu Muslim Unity.

The proposal for a Round Table Conference before the visit of the Prince of Wales, Bose fully agrees with C.R. Das, was a God send. If a settlement was made before December 31st and all the political prisoners were released, it would appear to the popular imagination as a great triumph for the Congress. The Round Table Conference might or might not be a success, but if it failed and the Government refused to consider the popular demands - the Congress could resume the fight at any time and when it did so, it would command greater prestige and public confidence. Bose rejects that Gandhi was adament on his terms but when he agreed to participate it was too late as the Government was no longer in mood to negotiate.

He finds the suspension of the movement, the announcement of no-tax campaign had excited the country. "Suddenly there came a bolt from the blue which left the people speechless and dumb-founded. That was the incident at Chauri-Chaura.

Gandhi should not have arbitrarily decided to suspend the movement without consulting representatives from different provinces. The reader finds the author in agreement with C.R. Das in disapproving Gandhi's handling of the situation. He laments "To sound the order of retreat just when public enthusiasm was reaching the boiling point was nothing short of a national calamity."

In his indictment of Gandhi for lack of diplomacy and prudence, Bose quotes C.R. Das,

"The Mahatma opens a Campaign in a brilliant fashion. He works it up with unerring skill; he moves from success to success till he reaches the
zenith of his campaign but after that he loses his nerve and begins to falter."71

Bose feels that the sudden suspension of the movement caused revolt within the party and brought about nadir of Gandhi's popularity.

Gandhi's rise to leadership in 1920 is attributed to his commitment to the bold and vigorous policy of the Satyagraha and asceticism and saintly character, despite the opposition of the liberals, university authorities and the revolutionary party. And of course found strength in Moti Lal Nehru, C.R. Das, Lajpat Rai and Maulana Mohamad Ali who stood by Gandhi. The defection of the moderates from the Congress lowered the intellectual level of the party, but it was compensated by mass support in the hope of 'Swaraj within one year.'

As the movement was slackening, the visit of Prince of Wales gave it new strength and it led to countrywide clash between the supporters of the Government and the Congress. In Calcutta C.R. Das, in order to give stimulus to the movement, Mrs. Das's arrest led to public indignation and even disloyalty in the police. The government had to announce substantial wage hike of the Police men to calm them.72

Bose commemorates the achievements as follows (i) the Congress was converted into a Revolutionary organisation with its new constitution and nationwide basis, (ii) the importance of the tri-color flag increased, (iii) uniformity of ideology and policy, (iv) Khadi became the uniform and Hindi the linguafranca. The shortcomings were: (i) dictatorship of Gandhi (ii) the promise of Swaraj within one year not only unwise but unfortunate. He wonders at the blind faith of even educated classes in Gandhi's Swaraj within one year. The communal riots were a consequence of the sudden suspension of the movements as the built up energies had to find an outlet.
Swaraj Party was anti-Gandhi as it forced him to temporary retirement from politics till 1928. He praises C.R. Das for controlling dissimilar elements in bureaucracy and no-changers. He views every move of Gandhi as that of a man seeking power. He writes that Gandhi had all the time been carrying out his Constructive Programme with a view to consolidate his power. His team of Khadi workers was of invaluable service to him when he desired to recapture the Congress machinery once again.

In 1928, Gandhi was suffering from acute mental depression. Bose regrets that Gandhi did not see any light although there was the need for a movement like the one which was started two years later. People of Bardoli were ready, labour unrest could also be well utilized. The author did not approve Congress's seeking support of other parties for preparing the constitution for which it has been fighting alone. The Nehru Report's demand for Dominion was unacceptable to the author who along with the younger nationalists formed an Independence League within the Congress. But as Gandhi was not ready to accept the Delhi formula, the Left wingers had to yield. Gandhi's allowing year's time to the British to accept Nehru Report is viewed as naivety. Bose views Gandhi's support to the demand for Complete Independence as the "superb tactics of a far- sighted politician to take the wind out of the sails of the Extremists." The Congress demand of resignations of the Legislators in 1929 is a revenge of the Swarajist victory of 1923.

The appointment of all-white Simon commission, he writes, it "evoked a chorus of condemnation from the Congress leaders of all parts of India as also from the public at large. The Congress decided to boycott the commission and at passed the resolutions (i) to prepare a constitution by all-parties and (ii) complete Independeance as the goal of Indian people."
Bose finds the country ready for a campaign in 1929 as apart from the political upheavals, there were, students' movements and labour strikes were going on in all the major cities of India.

"It would have been in fitness of things if a political campaign had been launched in 1929. It would have synchronized with a movement in other spheres as well."

Bose writes Gandhi supported the demand for Complete Independence, because he felt that in the atmosphere then prevailing in the country, a resolution on independence would be carried inspite of his opposition and it was, therefore, much better for him to move it.

**Civil Disobedience 1930-34**

He vividly describes how the audience was thrilled by Lahore Congress at the declaration of independence departed with new hope and with the torch of a new message. 'Bose credits Gandhi with sensitivity in judging atmosphere in the country and taking the direction in his own hands to keep the struggle non-violent.' However, he criticises his 'Eleven Points' a move to pacify those (capitalist) who were alarmed at the declaration of independence.

In his description of the Dandi March he records the sarcastic reaction of Anglo-Indian press and sceptical attitude of the Government and equates the public response and historical significance with Napoleon's march to Paris on his return from Elba. So strong was the public spirit that the government's repressive Ordinances 'stimulated the movement. The Congress monitored the movement through secret radio from Bombay."

"April 1930 was a month bristling with sensational incidents. Everyday seemed to bring forth some new development and no part of the country was free from it...."
Apart from the items mentioned in official congress plan, forest laws were defied in Bombay and C.P. In Gujarat, U.P., Bengal no-rent and no-tax payments were adopted. NWFP showed a most intensive anti-Government but non-violent movement. Bose lauds the role which women played in this movement.87

The author reflects that initially government was sceptical but as the movement gained momentum, it took to ruthless repression resulting in terrorist activities in Bengal. In Gujrat suppression caused exodus of peasantry to the state of Baroda. Indiscriminate and brutal attacks were made on women. Properties were confiscated. Iron-shod batons were used freely on non-violent protesters and prisoners. Firings, at many places, were resorted to, in NWFP, at Peshawar when Garhwal Rifles refused to fire non-violent demonstrators, the soldiers were courtmartialled and imprisoned for long terms. Substantiates his view by citing from Miss Madeline Slade's (Mira Behn) account. Special powers to officials were issued. Press Ordinance resulted in closure of many printing presses and news papers.89 Crops were burnt.90 Bose painfully narrates the incidents of Chittagong Armoury Raid, Salt Depots at Dharasana. Martial Law was imposed in Bombay followed by reign of terror.

In June 1930, efforts at reconciliation by the Government through George Solocombe was a clever move, which Bose thinks failed because the Nehru, Gandhi, Sarojini Naidu and Sardar Patel wanted a definite promise from the Government for three basic conditions, right to secede at will, responsible national Government including control of defence and finance, right to submit to an impartial scrutiny for public debt of India.

Settlement under Gandhi-Irwin Pact was possible because Labour Party was in power, British Government's anxiety to see Gandhi at Round Table Conference and Lord Irwin's own assessment of Gandhi as the best policeman in India, and the defiant attitude of frontier tribes and disturbed situation in other parts of India.92
He also mentions reaction of various sections of people to the pact. He says Jawaharlal Nehru, politically awakened people and youth organizations were dissatisfied. Bose himself was in Alipore jail at that time and despite his dissatisfaction over the Pact, he supported it at Karachi in order to avoid a split in the Party. The Pact as was inopportune, a curse or lack of diplomacy in Bose’s opinion.

"All the monied interests also desired to see the armistice followed by a permanent peace."93

He resented Gandhi’s selection as sole representative of the Congress at RTC and held him solely responsible for the failure and says, it was a consequence of Gandhi’s too busy and overtiring schedule, not walking out of the conference after realizing its futility, being alone in a hostile gathering, late arrival, indecision, lack of planning, combination of two roles of a world teacher and political leader and not speaking the language of Stalin and Mussolini.94 He also regrets that Gandhi did not cultivate relations with Mussolini on way back. He sent a telegram to Gandhi showing full trust in him and requesting him not to accept any thing less than birth right and emphasised the need for resumption of fight in case of failure.

Bose attributes the resumption of Civil Disobedience to Gandhi’s failure at Round Table Conference, Government of India’s attitude towards the Pact as ‘just a scrap of paper’ and worsening situation in Bengal, NWFP and U.P. during Gandhi’s absence. He mentions the Hijli camp incident, ‘Red Shirts’ being declared illegal and economic crisis in United Provinces as other reasons. Repressive ordinances were issued in these provinces.95 Despite Gandhi’s efforts to negotiate, he was arrested on January 4, 1932 along with a number of his followers. The Government had ready lists for arrests prepared in advance.

The author records that in January and February more than 30,000 arrests were made. Uncontrollable number of arrests made the govt. change its tactics and use of
force and lathi charge, firing, prohibition of meetings and demonstrations was resorted to, Congress was illegal, its offices and funds seized, land and property of members confiscated and National Literature banned. He quotes Malaviya's report of official repression from January to April 1932, which more than corroborates the data already mentioned by him. Martial law was imposed in Dacca, Chittagong and Midnapore. Fire-arms were liberally used in dispersing demonstrators. Firing was resorted to seventeen times in Bengal, seven times in U.P., thrice each in Bihar and Orissa and once each in NWFP and Madras. In Bombay shootings left 34 killed and 91 wounded.

The restrictions and prohibition could not kill people's enthusiasm and prevent them from picketing of foreign cloth and liquor shops, organizing processions and meetings, picketing British goods, banks, insurance companies, publishing nationalist material manufacturing salt, hoisting the national flag and occupying government confiscated buildings. The Congress sessions were held despite ban in Delhi and Calcutta in 1932 and 1933.

Bose states that repression by the government resulted in terrorist activities, the congress had to carry on its activities secretly. On the whole the movement was non-violent. But in 1930-31 the congress was on offensive side whereas in 1932 it had to remain on defensive.

Gandhi's fast on Communal Award, Bose argues, sidetracked the political movement by creating a stir in the Hindu community and completely dispensed with rational thinking. Internationally it became known that besides India's independence, there was another issue for which Gandhi could stake his life and also India was a land full of internal dissensions. Bose regrets that the country could be saved this agony if Gandhi had reached an agreement with Ambedkar on the same
terms in London itself and with his support he could make this voice heard. He also resents that the depressed classes were pacified at the cost of Hindu seats.  

The author maintains, Gandhi's all National Movements ended in anticlimax. In May 1933 Civil Disobedience was abruptly suspended. According to Bose the movement was not fizzling and thus Gandhi's decision seemed unrealistic and purposeless. He totally disapproved the suspension.  

Collected Works of Subhas Bose Volume II  

When the World War II began in September, 1939, and India was declared a belligerant country, Bose favoured Civil Disobedience movement, to which Gandhi and other Congress leaders, did not agree. Bose had already formed Forward Bloc. Through its forum he began propaganda against war. He also argued that to sit idle at such a time was a shift from congress policy and resolutions issued from 1927 onwards in which it had been consistently maintained that the organization would not support the British in war-effort.  

According to the author due to Forward Bloc initiative for Civil disobedience on Congress, the Congress ministries in the provinces resigned. Of course other contributory factors were the white paper issued by the Viceroy in reply to Congress offer of conditional co-operation in British war-effort, and suspension of constitution of 1935 and restrictions on Civil liberties in many parts of India.  

Confrontation between Congress and Forward Bloc during the war period has been candidly portrayed. Even the launching of Individual Satyagraha is attributed to the campaign for passive resistance by Forward Bloc which stirred the rank and file of the Gandhi wing. He maintains that inspite of orders from the party high command that no Gandhi followers would join the passive resistance, rank and file joined and started the stir in many provinces. It was only when Gandhi's hands were forced that
the Congress withdrew co-operation to government and Individual Satyagraha was launched.107

Bose attributes the restricted nature and number of Satyagrahis to Gandhi's ever-lasting desire for compromise which would be impossible if large scale bitterness is demonstrated against the British Government at a time of its trial.

The author had a strong conviction that India can win her independence only by joining the Axis powers in the war, as the British would never on their own make India free and escaped to Germany. The author accidently finds himself in agreement Gandhi in believing that Cripps mission, failed because it was a promise of dominion status after the war with a threat of partition of the country.108

While dealing with the 'Quit India Resolution' of 8th August 1942, Bose points out that it was opposed by 'negligible minority' of communists and followers of Rajgopala-Chari. He also maintains that Gandhi's speech expressed his determination of fight to finish.109

The Government had already made preparations to meet the challenge. To legalize its repressive and illegal acts the government issued a statement which Bose calls a masterpiece of British hypocrisy. Within few hours of passing of the Resolution all the Congress Leaders were arrested. The British dropped their mask of liberty and democracy to crush the Indian people with naked soulless alien despotism.110 Compelling the nationalists to resort to underground activities which the author calls a 'new chapter in India's struggle for freedom'.

The book is candid expression of the author's dislikes makes no secret of his admiration for C.R. Das for being a practical politician or criticism of Nehru for shifting loyalties leaving the socialist group and joining the Gandhi wing. His assessment of Gandhi too seems to be a mixture of admiration and disapproval. At
times he considers Gandhi ‘an idealist and visionary’ and at other an astute politician’; ‘Obstinate as a fanatic’ or ‘liable to surrender like a child’. He concludes that Gandhi lacked instinct for political bargaining. His address to Gandhi depends on his relations with him at a given moment e.g. from Mr. Gandhi to ‘Mahatma Gandhi’ and the ‘Mahatma’ to ‘Gandhi’. Appreciating the change which Gandhi brought in the organisation to awaken the remotest villages politically, he acknowledges Gandhi’s contribution in transforming the nation into non-violent army. He rejects Gandhi’s logic of non-violence and policy of putting all his cards on the table. Bose’s assumption that Gandhi’s success at Calcutta session would not have been possible had Tilak been alive seems to hold no ground as the latter was alive during the Rowlatt Satyagraha.

A leftist himself is quite critical of M.N. Roy as he calls him one of such agents who were prepared to sell themselves to Britain. An admirer of Gandhi the man, the author differs with him ideologically, and over methodology. An advocate of opportunism, a believer in Kautillian dictum ‘enemy of enemy’ is a friend, Bose stands for radical action, and he is impatient with Gandhi’s reluctance to launch the campaign. When the time is ripe and also unhappy that Gandhi always left room for compromise. He believes in an ‘eye for an eye’ and is opposed to absolute non-violence as a creed and ideology.

The simplicity of expression reflects the author’s clarity of mind. The Sunday Times aptly described him competent though partial historian.

All these associates belong to different provinces and different socio-economic backgrounds. R.R. Diwakar who belonged to erstwhile Mysore State, (Karnataka), hailed from a lower middle class family in which the father was a petty employee in the railways. Maulana Azad born in a family of orthodox religious preachers in Bengal where learning of English was a taboo. Subhas Bose belonged to an aristocratic family
of Bengal. Both Diwakar and Bose's parents provided them with the best possible education. Subhas's parents wanted him to be an ICS Officer as the family had produced the well-known lawyers and civil servants. Maulana's parents desired him to follow the same path which they had followed. But one can discern from a look at the personal lives of these individuals that they took independent decisions. Diwakar did postgraduation in English and the law but did not take up any job, Azad left the family orbit and took to learning of English study of philosophy and history. Subhas Bose left studies and went to the Himalayas in search of God. But later qualified for ICS while still under training in England he resigned to come home and join the freedom struggle.

Each of these associates had an independent outlook. Though Diwakar had an impressionable nature as he was influenced by many persons, yet he took independent decisions. Subhas Bose from the very beginning had been striving to attain the spiritual goals and later he took to Leftist ideology, for national struggle he sacrificed his glamorous career, and refused to comply with his family's expectations. Similarly Azad's family wanted him to follow the family tradition of becoming an interpreter of scriptures and Azad learnt English against family tradition and gathered knowledge on the other end of the land. Though he interpreted religious works yet he did not confine himself to that field. He joined Hindu revolutionaries of Bengal unlike other Muslim youths of his time. Even his pen name Azad means independent.

The first amongst these to meet Gandhi was Diwakar. In his very first meeting in 1918, Diwakar realised that what Gandhi said had substance and followed Gandhi unflinchingly thereafter. Azad met Gandhi in January 1920 when the latter was quite preoccupied with the Khilafat and non-cooperation issues. Bose met Gandhi in July 1921 when Gandhi was in the thick of non-cooperation movement and sent him to C.R. Das, whom Bose accepted as his leader, guide and philosopher.
Diwakar’s book is a treatise on Satyagraha. My Encounter with Gandhi is reminiscences and Saga of Satyagraha is a conceptual work on them. Subhas Bose’s ‘The Indian Struggle’ is part II of his autobiography carried over to Cross-Roads advisedly chosen for study as it covers all the major events of freedom struggle.

Azad’s India wins freedom is also a recollection of events occured during 1937-47.

Diwakar remained in Gandhi’s close contact for nearly 30 years and imbibed Gandhian values in his own life but seems to understand the real philosophy of Satyagraha towards the end somewhere in the 1940’s. Azad was one such follower of Gandhi who differed with him over specific issues and made no secret of it yet followed his command like a soldier. The differences were not over the question of freedom of the country or Hindu-Muslim unity but on tactical issue such as attitude towards war. Azad is both a critic and admirer of Gandhi. Subhas Bose found Gandhi’s ideas vague in the very first meeting, was a constant critic of his ideology as well as methodology. He is critical of Gandhi for being mild towards the British. He disapproved suspension of non-cooperation he was restless and wanted to see India free soon which he thought was possible through military action. He also made no secret of his disregard for non-violence as an effective policy in international affairs. But once India was free he would prefer its development along Gandhian ideals. All of these associates appreciated Gandhi’s action-oriented programme primarily due to their revolutionary outlook.

All these associates are opposed to communalism and are for Hindu-Muslim unity. Maulana was pained at growing communalism. Subhas Bose believed that participation of Muslims gave a fillip to the movement. R.R. Diwakar is for complete communal harmony.
Diwakar believes that Gandhi had awakened the masses during the period 1920-42. He had given them a new weapon and a new way to fight the British. Subhash Bose too acknowledged that Gandhi transformed the nation by teaching people to fight a formidable enemy through non-violence. Though Bose and Azad do not conform to concept of non-violence yet they recognize it as one of important factors in India's struggle.

These authors came into contact with Gandhi after he had become the leader of the national movement. They have almost without fail criticised suspension of the movements by Gandhi. Subhas Bose and Azad seem to be in favour of on-going movements and advocate continuous struggle against strategy of struggle peace and struggle.¹¹³
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