CHAPTER IV
LEFTIST WRITERS

The Marxian writers emphasise the fundamental economic and social changes which imperialism effected within Indian society. In the beginning the social effects of these changes were limited but the First World War accelerated the capitalist development which brought new classes into the struggle against imperialism and revolutionized Indian politics. The leftists maintain that Indian nationalism was the outcome of interplay of the economic forces at work.

Prominent among the Leftists writers of the Gandhian era are - M.N. Roy, Rajni Palme dutt, Hiren Mukherjee and E.M.S. Namboodripad.

After a brief mention of their own ideological growth, our purpose here is to analyse their view of (i) Gandhi's movements and the ideological basis, (ii) Gandhi and Congress as one entity or two separate forces, (iii) individual in the history of freedom movement in India. It would be of interest to know if they consider the growth of Communism and of workers as a united force a simultaneous process; emergence of their opposition to imperialism as based on marxist ideology or patriotism.

M.N. Roy

M.N. Roy has been called the father of the Indian Communism. He tried to set the Indian National Movement in the universal Marxist framework of development of society. He was the most convincing of all non-Russian Communists in the Leninist and Stalinist era. Roy was able to develop a group of Communists in early twenties in some cities that is why he called the founder of Communism in India.
India in Transition

India in Transition written in 1922 aims at providing an economic basis to the Indian struggle. To quote him, "There must be a socio-political philosophy behind this great movement. This much needed ideological background of our struggle... will be evolved out of the material forces making the birth, growth and success of such a struggle possible. To study our social conditions actual as well as of the past and to watch the evolution of the economic forces is indispensable for those who desire to understand that the people of India are progressing along a course common to the entire human race".1

A few years earlier, he supported the revolutionary activists but after an encounter with some socialists in Mexico in 1917-1919 he was drawn to Marxism. He was influenced by Ms Rosa Luxamberg and Borodin.2 After his break with Comintern his philosophy further developed. From his position of extreme left he veered towards Congress for a brief span in 1937-39 and in late 1940s and early 1950s he developed his concept of New Humanism which is very near Gandhian thought. New humanism rejects Economic Determinism which he thinks is deducted from a wrong interpretation of materialist philosophy. Human will is the motivating force of social evolution, it is indeed the most powerful determining factor of history.3

While 'India in Transition' was written in 1922; M.N. Roy was an ardent communist agitator and organizer, "an attempt has been made to investigate the past, analyse the present and visualize the future, from the point of Historical Materialism.4 The work is a report on "The structure of the national economy and the class relations of contemporary India". In this report, Roy had differed with Lenin over the latter's view that India was still feudal.5 To support his view, he took the help of Abani Mukherjee, to supply him the necessary statistical abstracts. As he himself admits, "being in a hurry to publish the book, I did not check up the correctness of the abstracts
prepared by him". Though Roy knew that Mukherjee was ignorantly enthusiastic and must have juggled with the data to present a magnified picture of the development of capitalism in India, only to show that India was in the throes of a proletarian revolution.

His main thesis is that India was not feudal because in place of the feudal lords, "the representative of British Commercial Capital became the owner of the land". The increasing wealth of the intellectuals and the absence of profitable means of investments made them discontented with the British Government. The national movement was led by the progressive element of society which possessed capital to be invested. Roy attributes the rise of national movement to (i) the bourgeoisie who wanted a share in the exploitation of national resources and (ii) the growing poverty and the increasing number of unemployables and the unemployed due to the extensive and inextensive exploitation by the foreign capital.

Gandhi's non-cooperation movement from 1919-1921. As the national movement had affected the masses it marked the initiation of a triangular fight between the British, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat which intensified class antagonism and the national struggle.

M.N. Roy points out that Gandhi tried to save the spiritual civilization of India through the aggrandizement of the merchants and manufacturers. The reactionary forces in India were also being appealed to and encouraged against the objectively revolutionary tendencies contained in the liberal bourgeois nationalism which he thinks will not be able to hold their own end Gandhism signifies their collapse. M.N. Roy is quite emphatic that the "narcotic effect of the much vaunted spiritual civilization which kept the Indian masses apathetic to any movement for material progress" will not be able to wish away the present awakening which is a reaction to the old system, and would accept western civilization much criticised by Gandhi.
The author is not impressed by what is written in *Hind Swaraj*. He is unambiguously in disapproval of Gandhi's insistence of non-resistance whilst accepting Gandhi's criticism of capitalist society, points out that Gandhi is totally wrong in maintaining that millions will always remain poor.\(^\text{12}\)

The action plan for non-cooperation, Roy felt, would not cause any damage to the Government's interest. He doubted if boycott of law courts would be effective as long as private property rights are existing. Similarly boycott of educational institutes seemed visionary to him, because in the absence of a nation state, the idea of national schools is not a possibility. Charkha seemed to him an economic impossibility as only the peasants would suffer from its temporary success and boycott of foreign goods would augment sale of Indian industrial products. Having little faith in non-violence, he stressed that the non-cooperation has to be violent to cripple the enemy. Roy equally dispapproves the Constructive Programme as very crudely formulated, instead advocates organization of mass strikes.\(^\text{13}\) He dismisses Gandhi's non-violent non-cooperation 'a blind alley of metaphysical politics' and feels that protagonists of Constructive Programme instead of going ahead are sinking into impotency in the name of Constructive Programme.\(^\text{14}\)

Roy also fails to comprehend the term "Swaraj" as used by Gandhi in its various connotations and criticizes Gandhi for not defining 'Swaraj'\(^\text{15}\) an independent nation which will guarantee to Indian masses a higher standard of living and the opportunity for further progress, from exploitation of capitalism.\(^\text{16}\) The need for a systematic, scientific analysis of Indian society for a profound understanding of the socio-economic forces making for the progress of the Indian people is stressed.\(^\text{17}\)

During the Prince's visit the Government successfully created cleavage between the masses and the leadership by arresting the leaders and terrorized Congress organization by whole-sale persecution and prosecution to vindicate its might.\(^\text{18}\)
The Muslim response to non-cooperation was a reaction against oppression and expression of the resentment of socio-economic discrimination against them. The religion had little to do with it. The idea of Pan-Islamism had never appealed to them nor were they involved in it. "It was not the indignation over the violation of the Khilafat, nor the capture of the Holy places by the infidel that agitated the Muslim masses of India." The Congress received support from the upper classes in the form of money. Tilak Swaraj Fund, Roy cites as a case in point. The items of programme aimed at their own position and power. As it could not achieve its motive of throwing the imperialists out without the help of the masses, it admitted them. The masses joined the movement because they were tired of growing poverty caused by imperialists and concentration of wealth in few hands.19

In Oudh and Gorakhpur in U.P. the violent incidents, Roy maintains, were the result of terrible exploitation of peasants by Talukdars, and the Government's anxiety to avert the acute out-burst of an agrarian revolt. Moppah rising was basically an economic issue which acquired a communal form as the landlords happened to be Hindus and the tenants Muslims.

Roy is fully conscious that the movement served a purpose in awakening the masses. He maintains that Congress has landed into bankruptcy because of its inability to formulate a definite programme in accordance with the dictates of the dynamic forces behind the movement.20 Further he maintains that Gandhism has failed. Gandhi has sung his swan-song, inspite of the author's realization that during those two years (1920-22) people had made considerable progress, they had gained much experience and consciousness.21

The suspension of the movement in 1922 he feels is a betrayal of the masses by the Congress. The leadership was frightened by the mighty appearance of Indian masses on the road of revolution.22 Even the entry to councils is viewed as "well known
middle class whose success coincides with the betrayal of the masses”. The leadership requires the mass support to project the image of united nation. He further says that the approved programme at Bardoli aimed at spiritual upliftment of masses and material upliftment for the upper classes.23

The movement disintegrated, says Roy, not because of repression by the Government but because of divorce of the masses from the Congress leadership.24

M.N. Roy thinks Gandhi is using concepts of truth and non-violence only to protect a particular section of the Indian society. When Gandhi says that truth should be followed Roy deliberately choose to associate with "Refraining from violence to property". He has gone to the extent of reproducing from Gandhi. He further adds. "This strong instinct of preserving property rights above all betrays class affiliations of Gandhi. Inspite of his pious outbursts against the sordid nationalism of modern civilization, this hostility to capitalist society is manifestly not revolutionary. He believes in the sanctity of private property".

Roy and Gandhi differ on the use of non-cooperation as a political weapon. Roy thinks that this weapon has to be used cleverly and mercilessly in the fight, not to purify our souls but to cripple the enemy with the express intention of destroying him altogether25 whereas for Gandhi non-cooperation was aimed at positive change of heart, besides regeneration of Indians. Here lies the major difference in their ideologies. Roy treats Gandhi as a part of the Indian National Congress which is a big organization of the bourgeoisie. Gandhism eclipsed all other socio-political ideologies of the organisation for the time being.26

Determining Gandhi’s role in the mass awakening, Roy did not believe that a single individual could create a country-wide mass movement out of nothing. Non-cooperation was a spontaneous demonstration of mass discontent.
Roy thinks in terms of the workers, the bourgeoisie and the imperialist forces. At no stage in India in Transition any attempt is made to appreciate Gandhi's philosophy or his Constructive Programme. The work under reference serves its purpose as a report on Indian situation from Communist point of view. The figures, and statistical data are utilized for the above mentioned purpose only. The language, he speaks is the language of Marx. "It (the worker) is having nothing to lose but his chains." And it was the narcotic effect of the much vaunted spiritual civilization which kept Indian masses apathetic to any movement for material progress. Or the Indian bourgeoisie, by himself is too weak to make the imperialist government pay heed to its demands. By and large his assessment and prophecies proved wrong in the times to come.

Rajni Palme Dutt

A recipient of an honorary doctorate from the university of Moscow and the Lenin Centenary Medal in 1970, Rajni Palme Dutt was the founder of The British Communist Party. His greatest contribution to Communism was in the development of the Indian Party, the seeds of which he sowed among the Indian students in Britain in the interwar years.

He was a proponent of Marxian thought and ideology. In his loyalty to the Party he never failed. Even when during the war, his comrade Harry Pollit broke away from the party, he steered it alone for two years, and worked in accordance with instructions from Moscow.

India Today

R.P. Dutt's India Today (1940) is the first historical work from the leftist point of view. It would be of interest to study how he viewed the Indian scene at time of all India Movement in 1920. The general pattern of our enquiry into the works of Leftist
writers remains the same. How he considered the events being contemporary history. What does he expect as a natural outcome of the movements, led by Gandhi, moving in relation to the other forces. How his staying away has affected his writing?

India Today, in author's own words is a continuation of R.C. Dutt's Economic History of Victorian India. Crisis of Britain and British Empire written by him in 1960 is, on his admission, continuation of India Today to a certain extent. The latter is considered to be a master piece of the Marxist interpretation of India's history from 1857 upto Independence and after. First published by Victor Gollannewe, London, in 1940 the book was precensored without any intimation to the author. It was banned in India. Owing to work conditions the manuscript never reached America for an American editor, paper shortage prevented reprinting hence it rapidly became a rarity. This book was smuggled into India and reprinted chapter by chapter in a small illegal edition by the then illegal Communist Party of India. Inspite of its limited circulation it had a tremendous influence on Marxist and other left wing circles.

India Today was the first sustained analysis from a Marxist stand point of the Indian reality under British rule and of the resurgent national liberation movement which sought to overthrow it.

In the thirties when this book was originally written, the questions involved in this estimation of the role and policies of Gandhi, were highly polemical. The author thinks that Gandhi was drawn into closer cooperation with the Communists during the communal riots on the eve of independence.

Rajat K. Ray treats it as representing one of the three main points of view of Indian nationalism - as the most authoritative Marxist work on modern India. R.C. Majumdar considers it a notable example of Marxist historiography. To Bipan Chandra the book is a foundational work of the Marxist school for the study of national movement in India.
The author rejects the proposition that the national movement was inspired by the western liberal thought and education. He is critical of patronizing claims of imperialism treating Indian nationalism as its foster child. Dutt states the British considered India only a ‘geographical expression’ because it was not politically united and also that it had many languages. India to them was a multi-national, multi-lingual subcontinent infested with communal strife. The British invoked these diversities to justify the presence of the empire. Similarly he rejects the British contention of the 222 separate languages. In India and rightly points out "the problem of languages in India is in practice a problem of some twelve or thirteen languages." Dutt has pointed out the contradiction in this argument by citing the Simon Commission report that "Hindu-Muslim antagonism is a special features of the territories under direct British rule" and not found in princely states.

Dutt is of the view that the British rule had a negative impact as it destroyed the foundations of the old order of society. And at the same time takes note of its achievement in the laying of material basis for the new order by bringing in modern, technical and administrative changes and thus the British helped in political unification.

Non-cooperation Movement

The national struggle is studied in three phases - 1905-1910, 1919-1922 and 1930-1934. When Gandhi started the Satyagraha, “the response of the masses started and overwhelmed the initiators of the movement.” Gandhi was alarmed at the situation and within a week of the hartal, suspended the movement. Even after this, the Congress alongwith Gandhi were planning for working of the Reforms. The author points out the Gandhi was, in a way, mocked at by the revolutionary tide of 200 strikes involving one and a half million workers. And in such a situation, Dutt maintains, Gandhi and the Congress leadership changed stance “to take the leadership of the
rising mass movement, and for this purpose evolved the plan of non-violent non-cooperation." Regarding the programme of the movement, he says"...the immediate measures were measures of boycott to be adopted by the middle class elements, officials, lawyers and students, with the only role of the masses the constructive task of hand spinning and hand weaving" the active participation of the masses through non-payment of taxes.... was reserved for later.

In 1920 the aim of the Congress was changed from self-government within the Empire to the attainment of Swaraj by peaceful and legitimate means. Non-violence, Dutt holds was an alien element to the struggle and it belonged to the moralising speculations and reformist pacifism of the petty bourgeoisie.35 And that many of Gandhi’s associates accepted it more as common sense rule of expediency than philosophical concept.

His statement on the concept of non-violence is quite revealing - "That seemingly innocent humanitarian or expedient term contained concealed within it not only the refusal of the final struggle, but the thwarting also of the immediate struggle by the attempt to conciliate the interests of the masses with the big bourgeois and landlord interests." This is what led to the collapse of the movement and the failure to win that speedy victory of Swaraj.36

As the movement was in full swing, and hartal to greet the Prince of Wales was complete, at the occurrence of violence at few places, Gandhi felt that something was going wrong. When tens of thousands of fighters were going to prison, Gandhi was alarmed and in disgust cried that Swaraj stank in his nostrils. About the suspension of the movement soon after Chauri Chaura, Dutt is convinced that Gandhi anticipated it and preparing for it soon after Bombay riots. Ahmedabad Congress retreated its steps by dropping no tax campaign.37
"The whole campaign was over. The mountain had indeed borne a mouse. He underlines that the Bardoli decision had thrown the movement into helpless confusion and demoralization. It had thrown light on the forces and contradictions of the Indian National Movement.39

Dutt believes that it was not a question of violence or non-violence but a question of class interest in opposition to mass struggle which was the breaking point of the national struggle in 1922. And the phraseology of non-violence is revealed only as a cover, conscious or unconscious for class interests and the maintenance of class exploitation.40 He is sore about the repression, and asserts that the all the guns and aeroplanes of the government could not control the "seething couldron of rebellion of 300 millions.41

The Swaraj Party which was formed by a section at the Congress leadership, was the party of progressive upper bourgeoisie. Though this party intended to represent a step in advance towards the mass struggle but "was no more than the reflection of the ebb of the revolutionary tide.... From its inception it slid downwards even closer to the supposed enemy".42

At the end of 1927, after Simon Commission was announced, Dutt believes that at this moment, however unwillingly, the Congress leaders were forced to harness the mass forces once more in their support. During these years the industrial workers had become an independent force, and developed as a political factor. There were colossal strikes in 1928, increased membership of Trade Unions, demonstrations against Simon Commission and the militant consciousness of the working classes were the harbingers and the driving force of the new wave of struggle of the Indian people.
Civil Disobedience Movement

The resolution of complete independence accepted unanimously at the Madras Congress in December 1927, which according to Gandhi was hastily conceived and thoughtlessly passed. The author thinks showed the advance of new leftward tendencies. Gandhi's return to active politics in 1928 marks the march of the Right Wing into his fold.

Gandhi, to Dutt is "the most subtle and experienced politician of the older group, with unrivalled mass prestige which world publicity had now enhanced as the greatest Indian figure; the ascetic defender of property in the name of the most religious idealist principles of humility and love of poverty; the invincible metaphysical theological casuist who could justify and reconcile anything and everything in an astounding tangle of explanations and arguments which in a man of common clay might have been called dishonest quibbling, but in the great ones of the earth like MacDonald or Gandhi is recognized as a higher plane of spiritual reasoning."

The author seems to believe that the Indian bourgeoisie hoped that Gandhi would ride the wave and unleash just that much of mass forces as to drive a successful bargain and save India from revolution. He echoes Bose's view that the Calcutta resolution on Nehru Report delayed action for a year when the mass unrest was at highest level. This delay of twelve months was utilized by imperialists to arrest leaders of the working classes and to put into force the public Safe Ordinance by decree of the Viceroy.

The first Independence day was celebrated throughout Indian on January 26, 1930. Gandhi was "to lead and control the campaign but the plan of action was not clear". The author blames Gandhi for the defeat of the left wing resolution moved by Subhas Bose. About the aim of the Civil Disobedience the author conjectures that
it could be either a decisive struggle for complete Independence, or a limited and regulated demonstration to secure better terms and conditions from the British. But Gandhi's purpose was to fight non-violently against organized violence of the grouping parts of violence. Gandhi's strategy was to find the means in the midst of a revolutionary wave to maintain the leadership of the movement and yet place maximum bounds and restraints upon it.46

In the Dandi March the government extended enough liberty to Gandhi - even the Congress believed that the march succeeded in awakening and mobilizing the masses. The Congress leaders knew that Gandhi would be able to divert "the mass movement into the channels which were being prepared for it by him".47 The author mentions that the movement could not be contained, there were powerful mass demonstrations, the Chittagong Armoury Raid, the mutiny of the Garhwal Rifles at Peshawar.

The author is too bewildered at Gandhi's reaction to the Garhwali soldiers' refusal to fire upon the people. To him it was a demonstration of true non-violence and courage to refuse to kill and prefer to be killed or at least punished. The author thinks such like demonstration of courage is real non-violence, which would threaten foundations of British rule. He finds Gandhi's explanation of his disapproval unacceptable. Gandhi's explanation strictly in terms of duty to obey, totally unacceptable. He is equally critical of Gandhi's neglect of the Garhwali men in the terms of Gandhi-Irwin agreement. He equally regret the neglect shown by the official of Congress history. Many insignificant terrorist activities have deserved attention, but the Garhwali episode finds no place in the official history of the Congress.

Gandhi was arrested when it was clear that the movement was exceeding the limits and Gandhi's authority is in danger of waning.48 After his arrest there were mass
demonstrations. Bombay was in the hands of workers, thus both the parties were alarmed and "there was a possibility of settlement against the Indian people".\textsuperscript{49}

As regards official repression, Dutt says that the government rules by ordinances, in a situation similar to Martial law. Nearly 60,000 were arrested.\textsuperscript{50} When jails were overflowing they took to physical repression - lathi-charge, beating up, firing on the unarmed crowds and in extreme cases shooting, hangings, use of tanks, armoured cars and air-bombing. And above all the censorship was imposed to stop the news from infiltrating out.\textsuperscript{51}

Gandhi and his colleagues were released on January 26, 1931. Gandhi came out with an 'open mind', to quote Dutt "a dangerous condition for the leader of a revolutionary movement confronted with a wily and unscrupulous enemy."

Dutt maintains that Congress secured nothing in Gandhi-Irwin Pact except participation in the Round Table Conference. The withdrawal of the movement of freedom of boycott of foreign cloth favoured Indian bourgeois interests. He further comments that aim of complete independence ended up in smoke. So in a way it repeated the Bardoli experience on a large scale. It took with one hand what it gave with the other.

After Gandhi left for London, repression was extended in space and intensity and there was the rule of ordinances. Gandhi, on return from Round Table Conference, in 1932 asked for an interview with the Viceroy which was refused, and Gandhi was arrested.

Dutt puts the responsibility of resumption of civil disobedience in 1932 on the Government. He says that the Congress men had made no preparations, and were expecting some sort of peace which they hoped Gandhi would bring from London. The Government took the Congress by surprise in its offensive as it had made
preparations since the Gandhi-Irwin pact. Thus Congress was put on defensive.\textsuperscript{52} The Congress was declared illegal with all its property confiscated. The Congress leadership was taken by surprise and was thrown on defensive.\textsuperscript{53}

Gandhi's fast and Poona pact are held responsible for diverting mass attention from the national struggle.\textsuperscript{54} In July 1933, the movement was converted into individual Civil Disobedience. The struggle dragged on till May 1934, neither led nor ended. But Dutt acknowledges that this struggle made every device of British armoury ineffective to smash and cow the people of India into submission. It forged and awakened a new and greater national unity, self confidence, pride and determination.\textsuperscript{55}

As regards the rise of working class movement, Dutt says that it was parallel to the militant national wave in 1905-09, with the highest point in 1908 against Tilak's imprisonment for six years.\textsuperscript{56} In 1918 the strike movement began which intensified in 1919-20. The fact that there was no political movement on the basis of socialism, of the conceptions of the working class and the class struggle.\textsuperscript{57}

Gandhi retired from the Congress in 1934, quitted politics to devote himself to Harijan work and constructive activity.

**World War II**

The Congress ministries resigned in October 1939 in protest against India and unilaterally being dragged by the Viceroy into World War II. In 1940 following the Nazi advance in Europe the Congress offered conditional co-operation in war effort at the cost of rejecting Gandhi's line of non-violence which the British did not accept. The author feels that Gandhi's Individual Satyagraha in 1940 was not a fight for freedom but an assertion of the right to free speech.

The worsening war situation and the impending Japanese threat, Britain as well as the Congress made efforts to come out of the deadlock. The Congress under the
leadership of Jawahar Lal Nehru and Maulana Azad sought to find the basis of cooperation in war as an equal ally of the United Nations. But Churchill's pathological opposition to India's freedom prompted him to specifically exclude India from the operation of Atlantic Charter. Nevertheless, Government released certain Congress leaders in December 1941 and the Congress in return declared its readiness to armed resistance to the Axis.

This abandoned mentioned non-violence relieved Gandhi of the responsibility of leading the Congress. The author here does point out at length sympathetic world public opinion on the issue of Indian independence. Particularly citing Roosevelt's explicit declaration that Atlantic charter applied to the "whole world". The role of Austrian, American and Chinese pressure in order to understand the context of Indian National demand has been rather emphasised by the author.

In the hope of reaching positive settlement with the British Government, the Congress went to considerable length of concession by offering to contribute to war effort provided control over finance and defence was transferred to Indians which the Cripps Mission did not concede. The author feels that Cripps' visit to India in April 1942, proved to be a turning point in the crisis of British Indian relations during the war.

The British through press indulged in "partisan propaganda to blacken the Indian National Movement and to prove to the world opinion all the age old argument; supposedly unrepresentative character of the Congress, the hopeless political division of the Indian People and their in capacity for self government."

**Quit India Movement**

A frustrated Indian national Congress turned to Gandhi, as the only remaining weapon to win India's freedom. The author refers to the dialogues and debates
between Nehru, Gandhi and Azad for reaching an agreement. In July 1942, "serious anti-fascist leaders and advocates of cooperation to the United Nations thus passed into the wake of Gandhi for a dangerous proposal for a non-cooperation campaign at the moment of the threatening Japanese attack." The author obviously does not seem to approve of Congress' decision and points out that this was welcomed by the Pro-axis followers of the decision for India according to Dutt is the direct outcome of the frustration caused by the failure of Cripps mission.

Dutt, however, points out that the August resolution of 'Quit India' was not a spontaneous decision. The intense controversy ranging around the decision and the dilemma facing all the sections of Congress leadership has found due mention in the author's account of the times. All action resulting in embarrassment to the British in the time of war has been the declared policy of the Congress and Gandhi. And when the British are really in a disadvantageous position the Congress and Gandhi asked the British to 'Quit India'. The author states the August Resolution "must be judged a disastrous blunder in its effects within India and on world democratic opinion."59 While accepting the fact that there was no serious intention of launching such a struggle as the leadership had made no preparations whatsoever, but the author at the same time does not consider it prudent to accept the Congress plea that it was only a negotiating tactic. It only projects the frivolity and bankruptcy of an approach.

The Communist party of India had forewarned the Congress of the consequences of such a move, and resolved that the National Front would resist Fascism, press a demand for a National Government, assist in the war effort, reject non-cooperation as fatal to the interests of Indian people. He thinks that the Congress leaders who failed to secure anything with non-violence in twenty two years, now expected to secure a transfer of power within few weeks. He supports the resolution by the C.P.I. that non-cooperation was equal to "cutting our own throats".60
The arrest of the leaders left the people without any leadership. He also believes that the Congress never authorised any section for violent steps. The mass protests and national indignation were spontaneous and wide spread. Whilst the Congress never started the movement nevertheless owned it and confusion and frustration caused by absence of leadership was Muslim league's gain.

About the communal problem, it is desirable to quote the author, "prior to British rule there was no trace of the type of Hindu-Muslim conflict associated with the British rule" and "... the communal strife is thus a special product of British rule, and in particular of the latest period of British rule or of the declining imperialist ascendency." He is convinced that final solution of the communal question lies with social and economic advance thus applauds the declaration of fundamental rights adopted by the National Congress in 1931.

Gandhi, according to the author, is chosen and ablest leader of bourgeois nationalism. While labelling him a bourgeois, views any contradiction between his social philosophy and bourgeois outlook superficial. He further emphasizes that Gandhi - during the transition period - bridged the gap between the actual bourgeois direction of the national movement and the awakening masses. He led the movement, even appearing to create it. But as the masses begin to reach clear consciousness of their own interests and the actual class forces and class relations begin to stand out clear, this role would, correspondingly, come to an end. Dutt, in 1940 wrote that Gandhi during the freedom struggle had been "Jonah of Revolution, the general of unmitigated disasters, the mascot of bourgeoisie". But even he realized after he met Gandhi in 1946 that his indictment of Gandhi had been rather harsh.

Dutt considers the Indian Congress an organization which Gandhi could manipulate according to his own tune. At the same time the Congress as an
independent organization would use Gandhi whenever needed. Thus for him both Gandhi and the Congress made use of each other as and when convenient.

About Gandhi’s approach to fight out untouchability and the British claims on caste differences in India, the author thinks that it was not brought by the British but under inspiration from Gandhi the temples in South India were thrown open to the untouchables whereas the British Government had sent police to prevent the access of the untouchables, on the ground that such access would be offensive to the religious sentiments of the population, which was the sacred duty of the government to protect.67

The author is quite selective in language. His view of history is based on historical materialism. He thinks that we are still undoubtedly only at the beginning of this task of historical review of the rich panorama of world history in the light of the Marxist-Leninist understanding.66 For him history can guide the path forward which is the task of Marxist history.69 he finds support for his arguments in the data of tables given in official reports. To quote E.M.S. Namboodripad India Today is well researched work and the first attempt to interpret history of India from a leftist angle.70

Hiren Mukerjee

Hiren Mukerjee, the recipient of Soviet Land Nehru Award, a communist leader, a parliamentarian has a life long association with academic and politics. A journalist and a lawyer, he is well known for his India’s Struggle for Freedom, Gandhiji - a study of biographies of Jawahar Lal Nehru and Subhas Bose. Hiren Mukerjee comes from a middle class family, both his grandfather and father were journalists, journalism thus runs in his blood.
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Mukerjee believes that history has its contradictions, since there is no absolute objectivity in either science in general or history in particular. And apart from the hard core of facts, it consists the surrounding pulp of interpretation. The author like E.H. Carr maintains the pulpy part of the fruit is more rewarding than the hard core. However, for him, fact is like a sack which will not stand until you have put something in it. The historian should stock his mind by dispassionate diligence with checked and counterchecked items of information but not a robot exercise. He accepts Karl Marx's view that all change arises from prevailing social conditions, helped sometimes by extraneous impact but never without the impetus of indigenous circumstances.

India's Struggle for Independence

India's struggle for Freedom, was originally published in 1940 under the title 'India struggles for Freedom', understandably as the freedom struggle was still going on. In 1962 National Book Agency republished it under the present title after making certain additions and alterations. Another addition with updated forward appeared in 1986 published by Manisha Granthalaya.

Gandhiji - A study was first published in 1958 by National Book Agency, New Delhi and its second revised edition came out in 1960 by People's Publishing House, New Delhi. The work is Marxian critique of Gandhi with due regard for Gandhi as a man but he does not accept his thought and work in which he finds limitations. He has written on Gandhi "with great respect and yet with a conviction of divergences".

His views on Gandhi’s All India Movements, are similar to those expressed in India's Struggle for Freedom. India's Struggle for Freedom wishes to communicate the idea that India never submitted supinely to the alien intruder. As even before the British we had a bourgeoisie, therefore, also the wherewithal for a full-fledged national movement.
The book consists of nineteen chapters. The titles of the chapters are taken from the works of various English writers like Shakespeare, Keats, William Morris and also from Robindra Nath Tagore. The first ten chapters cover Indian history up to 1919. The mutiny in 1957 discussed at length. It was widespread though its main venue was extended from Punjab to Bihar. As the Indian Society consisted of Hindus and Muslims. These strands could neither be combined nor eliminated.

The author is convinced of that it is that the Hindu Muslim problem and a creation of the British rule. It is interesting to quote what he thinks of the imperialist historians view on the issue, "that devil's advocate of an imperialist valentine chiroi, fairly granted. So the extremely backward and unruly Moplahs had taught Hindus a lesson." Moreover before the British there was no such thing as the so called Hindu-Muslim problem.

Non-Cooperation Movement

Against the Rowlatt Act at Gandhi's summons a hartal was observed. Then came the horror of Punjab brutalities which roused the country to a bitter determination, and all the honours bestowed by the British Government were returned by the recipients as contaminated. The tide of mass unrest was intensified by the economic crisis which developed in 1920. There were 200 strikes involving fifteen lakh workers. Most of the muslims resented, the British share of the spoils of Turkey's truncated empire. Gandhi joined in their agitation and suggested non-cooperation which was adopted by the khilafat committee in May 1920. The Congress too adopted it at its special session held in September 1920, at Calcutta. So "Nationalism and Khilafatism were originally related as the avowed twin objects of the entire country."

He calls the year 1920 the year of "a magnificent struggle" which has remained engraved in India's mind and heart. The title of the chapter is 'Hindu-Muslim Ki Jai'.
anti-untouchability and temperance reform was to be undertaken, the author is fully conscious of Gandhi's realization that the move may be politically unwise and unsound but there is no doubt that it is religiously sound.

He accepts the achievements of the movement but he opines that the movement failed due to the growing fear of awakening mass activity and militancy because the Bardoli resolution comprised of seven out of which four clauses were regarding non-payment of taxes.\(^77\)

In the gloomy atmosphere appeared the sinister forces of communalism leading to terrorism.\(^78\) Even the Swaraj party which was the result of this suspension only though aimed at obstruction in the legislatures and Swaraj for the 98 percent was in fact working only for the rich and landlords.

**Civil Disobedience Movement**

During 1926 and 1927 the growth of communism in India and Jawaharlal's visit to Brussels and Soviet Union helped in the advance of Trade Unionism which in return caused anxiety to the authorities. Even after the adoption of independence at Lahore Congress and 26th January being celebrated as the Independence Day, Gandhi still did not define Poorna Swaraj; nor did he explain the action programme, the author is surprised that the masses still joined him enthusiastically.

Gandhi's statement to an American Journalist at the same time his putting forward "Eleven Points" are viewed by the author as Gandhi's flair for the paradoxical actions!! The Dandi March started, Gandhi did not call industrial workers to join but enlisted the peasantry for support in such a manner such as not to trouble the landlords. The credit for the success of the movement is given to the peasants and working class. We find the above statements quite contradictory, when Gandhi did
not summon the industrial workers how did they contribute in the success of the movement.

Mukerjee acknowledges that "India’s debt to Gandhiji is irredeemable... he roused the dormant spirit and restored our selfesteem" and that he made heroes out of clay. While admiring action of Garhwal rifles he expresses his disappointment in Gandhi for not supporting them at the time of negotiating the Gandhi Irwin Pact.  

In, Gandhi-Irwin Pact, the author maintains "Imperialism sought a treaty with Indian nationalism but obviously on its own terms". He thoroughly disapporves K.M. Munshi’s description of it as the greatest event in history for centuries and shares Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Bose’s disappointment and indignation at the terms of the pact. The Karachi resolution on Fundamental Rights is considered as progressive step and a ‘basic democratic charter’ but indecisive as it neither satisfied the Marxists nor the industrialists’ aspirations.

The R.T.C. is a complete miscalculation by Gandhi of his own strength. It being a motley array of Government puppets Gandhi’s claim to represent the whole people of India was neither admitted by the Government nor by the adamant Hindus and Muslims. Except for playing his role as world teacher, Gandhi came back empty handed on the Indian question.

As soon as Gandhi had left for London, repression had begun, and even Gandhi was arrested soon after his arrival in Bombay. The 1932 struggle was more intense and the Government more repressive.

Gandhi after the fast unto death in September 1932, devoted his time to the issue of harijans only while the movement dragged on till May, 1934. Its end was rather distressing Mukerjee’s consolation was that it opened "reservoirs of our people’s patriotism" inspite of bankruptcy of leadership people were more determined to win
the freedom and it was of course a great satisfaction that the Muslims also participated as much as they could.82

During the period 1936 to 1939, the Congress fought elections, formed ministeries Mukerjee maintains allienated Muslim League and failed to fulfil the fond hopes of the working classes.

World War II

After the declaration of war, India was a belligerent country. The viceroy gave a 'negative and niggardly reply' to the congress demand for dominion status. The working class held a massive rally and one day strike in protest against the war, and threw a challenge to imperialism. As the industrialists became friends of the Congress earned profits, the people went to jail under Gandhi's anti-war individual satyagraha. The Muslim League adopted its resolution on Pakistan, the Congress countered it by opposition to Pakistan. The gap between both Muslims and Hindus widened.

The vacillation and inaction of the Congress, he attributes to differing outlooks and social elements with in it. While Gandhi's village reconstruction is commended at the same time his aversion to industrialism seems like medievalism to the author. He laments over the vasclatating attitude of Gandhi during the early phase of the war. In his opinion Gandhi should have given a call to Indian people to rise against the British. But neither Gandhi nor the Congress thought it proper to do that. In such affairs only the Communists tried to give a programme to the people though it was outlawed till July 1942. When the Congress asked for National Government it was proclaimed as pro-fascist.

Cripps proposals disillusioned India, and on August 7-8, 1942, the Congress adopted its famous 'Quit India' Resolution. The whole congress leadership was arrested. Mukerjee has full sympathies with the Congress and maintains that the
government goaded the people to un-organised and spontaneous outbursts. The leaderless people gave a heroic answer to the 'leonine violence' by the government. Here Mukherjee writes that as dubious elements had entered the Congress and formed an A.I.C.C. Directorate, issued circulars instructing sabotage etc. defying the congress resolution in letter and spirit. 83

The government charged Gandhi of inciting violence. The latter went on 21 days fast in February, 1943 against the violence by the Government and the people. Mukerjee comments that this time "Indian patriots had conducted unitedly the movement for Gandhi’s release." 85 But the British Government was adamant. In 1945 India knew her own strength and weaknesses, moreover India had been able to get its problem recognised by the world leaders.

Hiren Mukerjee is not critical of Quit India Resolution unlike others in the this set of writers under study. He holds the government responsible for provoking the masses. Like any other nationalist he is sore about repression during the struggle. Unlike his Marxist comrades, he gives due importance to Gandhi as an individual and tries to understand his strategy actions and concepts rather than judge him from preconceived Marxist notions. Not quite charmed by his non violence but does not charge Gandhi of siding with the bourgeoise and thinks that Gandhi and the congress worked independent of each other - the individual and the institution for a common cause.

Mukerjee, indulges in the study of class struggle and national struggle but keeps them apart, while determining economic factors for discontent gives due place to other forces. An emotional nationalist, the author maintains objectivity in research to a great extant while dealing with the issue such as communal harmony economic determinism. In his discussion of Quit India Movement he rises above party affiliations.
Hiran Mukherjee has depended upon a wide range of sources and has not confined himself to the Marxian sources alone. His language is satirically metaphoric. His expression is of a marxist but that of highly sophisticated marxist mind. The titles of the chapters are chosen from works of literature. Inspite of the fact that all his life he has been a Marxist, we find two things in him that are unlike many other old Marxists. Firstly he is under the impact of fatalist Hindu ideology when he talks of ‘evil stars haunting the fate of India’. Or it seems a freak of fate secondly, his major aim has been to search for unity among Indians and the participation and role of the workers and the peasants. He inspite of being a communist leader is no where disrespectful to Gandhi, though he disagrees with him like any other young nationalists of the day, he does not blame Gandhi for playing in the hands of capitalists. While discussing communalism, he finds its roots in class struggle, yet he agrees with Gandhi and Azad that whatever the Muslims had demanded in 1928, should have been given to them, because the gulf was at that time not too wide to be bridged.

He is unable to understand Gandhi’s idea of complete non-violence as he calls it incomprehensible. Nonetheless, for him Gandhi’s leadership is incomparable and even irreplaceable.

It is an interesting work that captures the attention of the readers. It is both a narrative, through which author has successfully expressed his own thought.

E.M.S. Namboodripad

E.M.S. Namboodripad, founder of the communist party in Kerala, General Secretary of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), is a winner of Sahitya Akademi Award for his autobiography in Malyalam. Acquainted with the term Bolshevism from the age of thirteen he reminisces his transformation into a communist with some pride, “from the Rigveda to the works of Karl Marx, from Brahmshree (an
appellation used for Namboodri Brahmins) to a comrade and from a Jenmi land-lord to the Chief Minister who played a key role in the enactment of agrarian legislation.

The Mahatma and the Ism

The Mahatma and the Ism was first published as a series of twelve review articles of D.G. Tendulkar's Mahatma in New Age in 1954 and was concluded in 1956. To which two more chapters 'Meaning of Gandhism' and 'Gandhism after Gandhi' were added and after slight reformulation to make it a connected story Mahatma and the Ism was finally published in book form in 1958.

This book confines itself to a review of Mahatma's life and traces the the evolution and final deterioration of Gandhism as a philosophy and a programme of political action. Namboodripad has also written 'A History of Indian Freedom Struggle' published in Malyalam and translated in English in 1986, a companion volume, though it includes the philosophy and political programme of Gandhi and not the evolution on the whole and deals with bourgeois philosophy. This work was published first both the works discuss the role of bourgeoisie before 1947. A history of Indian Freedom Struggle written from a consistent class point of view is a comprehensive work. This book presents an analysis of the early struggles in South India upto 1857 and discusses the forces, the classes, factors at work. According to the author capitalism came as an inevitable consequence of the British rule. So there rose a bourgeoisie class which remained in the forefront of the freedom struggle during 1885 to 1947. In their strategy of freedom struggle they adopted the tactics of mass action for anegotiation with the British.

The Mahatma and the Ism, and "A History of India's Freedom Struggle" discuss the same factors with the only difference of the size of the canvas. The introduction to the book reveals the author's ideological attachment and predilections, "my assessment of the Mahatama and his teaching is, ofcourse based on the world outlook
of Marxism, Leninism... let me, however, add that Gandhism is not something which I studied... with the view to criticise it.*89

Beginning study from Gandhi's Satyagraha in South Africa, the author writes that Gandhi was able to arouse the poor indentured labour which did marvellous acts of heroism. But inspite of the heroic act of the working people, it was "Gandhi who decided the course".90

The tactics adopted by the bourgeoisie leadership including Gandhi, Namboodripad believes, suited to the requirements of a particular class* which was fast growing i.e. modern bourgeoisie. The Indian leadership was a product of the Western civilization yet it came into clash with the British. Gradually as a result of events outside India and failure of political tactics, there emerged the extremist group within the congress and revolutionary movements wrongly called the terrorist movement, in Bengal, UP and Punjab. But Gandhi’s technique was quite different from both extremists and the moderates. Gandhi associated himself with the masses of the people, their lives, problems, sentiments and aspirations. Gandhi considered politics selfless with everything belonging to the people.

Non-cooperation 1920-22

Gandhi’s first mass Satyagraha was a programme of resistance to the Rowlatt Bills in March 1919. He had his grievances against the British but when the Khilafat issue developed as Namboodripad puts it, Gandhi "at once shrewdly added this to his list of grievances." The items of the non-cooperation programme showed the essential class political character of the programme, the character of grievances did not include demands of the labour. And that this programme made it clear that non-violent non-cooperation did not aim at rooting out the empire but to pressurize British Government to come to terms with the Congress. Gandhi was a non-violent man and wanted his movements to be like-wise. However, Namboodripad thinks the real
reason for keeping the movement was the natural fear of bourgeoisie that once the working class is roused the movement will go beyond the limits set by it. Gandhi alarmed at the violent incidents in Rowlatt Satyagraha recognises his mistake and calls it Himalayan miscalculation in 1919. Similarly he suspended movement after the Chauri Chaura incident in 1922, when he realized that "the movement would go completely beyond his control". The author is of the view that both Chauri Chaura and Malabar were peasant uprisings where the peasants were up in arms against the landlords and the state.91

The Congress was split on the issue of council entry to two groups: Pro-changers and No-changers the author calls the 'first breach'. Pro-changers wanted to achieve something by working from within the government while looking for new tactics they decided to use the Legislative Councils and started calling themselves Swarajists. The unquestioned leader of the No-changers, Gandhi's technique on the other hand was to popularize the constructive programme and he undertook a tour of India. This method of mobilizing the masses failed to "prevent them from taking an anti-imperialist political action".156 Fully conscious of the miseries and grievances of the people from all sectors the author believes that Gandhi did not rouse people "against the political or economic system under which they were living but against certain social evils and for certain spiritual values".92 However always diffident to rally the masses against the existing social system. Even his Khadi programme was a programme or organising labour-capital coordination and the purification of British connection. Every item of constructive programme which kept everyone busy, gave the exhilarating idea that everyone was serving the great cause of the spiritual, economic and political regeneration of the country. Moreover, Gandhi's acceptance of both the Swarajists and the constructive workers made him hold the reigns of both the Swarajists and constructive wings of the Congress and thus unite the leadership and ranks of the Congress under him.93
The suspension of the non-cooperation movement, caused frustration and political confusion resulting in the growth of two new forces i.e. communalism and radical anti-imperialism. Instead of communal unity there was an acute communal tension. Radical anti-imperialists were scattered all over India without any organised body. The nationalists worked among the working class and knew their aspirations.

At time of Nehru Report (1928), they rallied under the banner of Complete Independence and wanted it to be the goal of India's struggle. Inspite of the opposition by Motilal Nehru and Gandhi, the movement gained greater strength. After realizing the situation, Gandhi tried a compromise between the two schools. He made Jawaharlal the President of the 1929 Congress session of Lahore and both the groups narrowed down the differences.

Appreciating the working and spirit of the Independence pledge the author writes it was a "stirring call to the patriotic youth of the country to go forward till the last vestiges of foreign rule were eliminated."94

The masses looked upon Gandhi's decision to break the salt laws as the beginning of a big mass movement for Complete Independence of India. Undaunted by the arrests, lathi-charges and firing, people enthusiastically responded the call. Gandhi and the other ranks of leadership tried to divert their enthusiasm and militancy to channels which were safe for the bourgeoisie by (i) demanding eleven points in lieu of independence (ii) restricting the scope of direct action to a limited number of satyagrahis (iii) not including the demands of working classes. Even British adopted a dual policy of the repression of the people and negotiations with the leaders. The Gandhian policy of having a non-violent movement is interpreted by the author as a step to temper the anti-imperialist consciousness of people. After the resumption of the movement in 1932, Gandhian stand at communal award is also taken as "disengaging itself from the mass civil disobedience movement."95
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The author is indeed intrigued as to why Gandhi had to concentrate his energies on a 'minor social issue' of untouchability in place of political mass movement. He is not at all convinced that Gandhi was more interested in social reform than political struggle. He considers him to be an astute political leader of a particular class - the bourgeoisie, in whose class interests he always acted. Though in an interview Namboodripad explained that Gandhi did not serve the bourgeoisie consciously but he being representative of it had the natural bourgeoisie instinct. The author also interprets Gandhi’s withdrawal of the movement in 1934 as the right-wing decision and his retirement from the Congress as an alternative of accepting the dominant position of the Leftists. The purpose of Gandhi’s retirement from the Congress was to carry on Harijan welfare and other constructive work and to let all other groups in the Congress work without any moral pressure from him, and thus to keep both rightists and the leftists in his own hands. He was thus able to put a united front during the 1937 elections. After the Congress accepted office, it had to fight a two-pronged battle: (i) against the British, and (ii) against the leftists by launching a concerted attack on the working class through police, penal and criminal codes, interfering in the struggle by state people, solving some of the problems of the nation, making the Congress President from the left wing for three years, fighting the federal part of the Constitution and demanding an elected Constituent Assembly.

**World War-II**

Of Gandhi’s non-cooperating attitude at the time of World War II the author is quite unforgiving, who was already in the Congress Socialist party and very soon the whole of Congress Socialist Party group joined C.P.I. in 1940. He naturally had his leanings according to the Soviet attitude and points out that Gandhi and Congress feeling of ‘greater horror’ was only a reflection of the changed position of the bourgeoisie. Gandhi’s unconditional offer of moral support and Congress Working
Committee conditional support led to conflict situation between C.W.C. and Gandhi. Soon dismayed by the Viceroy's August offer in 1940, The Congress turned to Gandhi to lead the movement, which the latter advisedly confined to the Individual Satyagraha.

In December 1941, Gandhi dasked the Congress to absolve him of the responsibility. The Congress readily agreed to this as it wanted to negotiate with the Cripps Mission. The author is of the view that the only issue between Gandhi and C.W.C. was how to negotiate and put pressure on the British. So whenever Gandhi withdrew from Congress, it was a part of strategy of the bourgeoise. In 1940 Individual Satyagraha was not a fight for the independence but a fight for 'the right of speech'. For the first time in his life, he did not denounce the masses of people for having resorted to violence and the stand that 'mob violence' was the natural reaction to 'leonine violence' resorted to by government. In 1942 the fight was a clear struggle against the British. That fact however shows that in the time of Quit India Movement Gandhi had no plans of uncompromisingly militant mass action. In 1942, Gandhi wanted it to be be 'short and swift'. He even did not denounce the masses for having resorted to violence. For this he cites Gandhi's meeting with Louis Fischer where he had visualized a mass uprising but would end in a few days (emphasis added) and were to work only against the British and not the landlords. Gandhi's fast in 1944 was the beginning of a campaign for the release of congress leaders in mid-1945.

Gandhi is an idealist according to the author, who fought for certain ideals - moral, political and social - that were a part of his life. His idealism roused the slumbering masses, this semi-religious language made him an incarnation of God for the masses. Though many of his ideals and policies were reactionary yet he drew the rural masses into national democratic movement. After having brought the masses into the main stream he wanted them to act under the leadership of his own class, the
bourgeoisie. Though Gandhi was a representative, friend, philosopher and guide of the bourgeoisie yet he was not always with them. Many times his was a minority or lone voice.

The author, however is not willing to concede that Gandhi represented the masses, and want ed tto bring about a revolution. Instead, Gandhi all the time worked for reformation through nonviolence which is contrary to the former's conviction. For, Namboodripad maintains that the only one way to remove inequalities between the rich and the poor, is violent mass upsurge. The author seems to be unmindful of the fact that a leader of bourgeoisie however good an idealist he might be, would never be able to think of building an egalitarian society. He would never fight for giving justice to the poor. As this work is a review of Tendulkar's eight volume Biography of Gandhi, the interpretation is entirely his own. It is more of a treatise on Gandhi and his philosophy than a book review. The impression one gains is that the author is a staunch leftist, whose thinking process is impressed by his own participation in the events. His language is simple. The breaks can be accepted as Marxian interpretation of Gandhism and the national movement.

Analysis

The authors under study in this chapter are the well-known Marxists of Indian origin. Three out of the four belong to Bengal. Only one of these authors hails from Kerala. Both these states are the seats of Communism in India, today.

All these authors are from upper castes - well-to-do Brahmin families, suffering from financial or social constraints. It was a human will which made them react or to turn to communism. Apart from M.N.Roy none of these authors had a revolutionary beginning. Roy belonged to the group which hoped to overthrow the British empire by sporadic revolutionary activities, but later adopted a different outlook. They tried
to disseminate ideas into the minds of the people. They were arm-chair propagators of Marxism.

Each of these writers received good education. M.N. Roy and E.M.S. Namboodripad were taught Sanskrit, Namboodripad in a more orthodox manner. Hiren Mukerjee and R.P. Dutt belonging from educated families received the best education then available. Their bend towards Marxism was voluntary and thus humane. With the exception and Rajni Palme Dutt who was born and brought up in England, all others were associated with the Congress at one stage or the other of their political career. If Namboodripad's career began with Congress, M.N. Roy came mid-way and Hiren Mukherjee had it almost simultaneously as in 1936 he joined the then illegal Communist Party of India and in 1938-39 he was the member of executive of Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, as he believes that the Congress in those days was a common platform for expressing the view points of all schools of thought. In a way it was a movement not a party in the narrow sense. Its membership was wide and varied.

Gandhi for them is a conscious or unconscious standard-bearer of the bourgeoisie. Roy considers Gandhi's concepts of Truth and Non-violence as a strong instrument of preserving property rights. He is critical of Gandhi's view of spiritual upliftment of man, as he says that it was spiritual uplift for the poor and material uplift for the rich indirectly saying 'religion is the opium of man'. Dutt is critical of Gandhi as he thinks that Gandhi suspended the movements whenever he feared that the masses were going beyond the limits put by him. Namboodripad believes Gandhi was an idealist striving to achieve the ideals. Both Dutt and Roy maintain that Gandhi carried along the already awakening masses with and launched the movements. On the other hand Hiren Mukerjee while not accepting the policy of complete non-violence does not charge Gandhi of playing in the hands of the capitalists.
Roy, Dutt and Namboodripad seem to have applied the zero-sum-game to the Gandhian ideology and his efforts to put it in practice. These writers pursue their work on 'one man's benefit is the other man's loss idea. Thus labelling Gandhi the 'standard bearer' of the bourgeoisie, of course, Hiren Mukherjee in this regard maintains a different viewpoint and finds Gandhi working for the unity of the country. Almost none is able to comprehend Gandhi's basic concepts. They havenot even discussed Gandhi's ideals of Swaraj and Sarvodaya. The basic difference is that of ideology and methodology and the basic difference in perception.

For them every action which is a profit for one is loss for the other, whereas to Gandhi it is not the benefit of one person or few individuals but it is a benefit of all. All his plans aim at complete transformation of society not only in material terms but in spiritual terms also. They generally forget that he too believes in equality, but it is not to be forcibly imposed, to make it long lasting and to build a harmonious society, he believed in change of heart, be it rulers or the capitalist and landlords.

Inspite of the ideological and methodological differences, these writers share Gandhi's view on the validity of freedom struggle and communal harmony. They undoubtedly hold economic factors alone responsible for communal disharmony and Gandhi points out various other psychological and political factors also. However consider communalism to be an evil in society which ought to be removed. While discussing the freedom of the country, Gandhi gives due importance to social, political and moral aspects along with economic aspect or the damage which the British empire had caused to India. For Gandhi the freedom is needed for a wider perspective whereas to the leftists it is needed for the material advancement of the country.

The difference of methodology is evident. In the belief system of these writers violent upsurge is inevitable, according to them, for the rights of the poor. Gandhi advocates detachment and trusteeship. He believes that anything achieved by violence
would be short-lived, whereas his ideal society growing gradually would be more permanent and lasting and effort for this goal is to be made by each individual and not one particular class. There is no place for exploitation in Gandhian concept of non-violence as it is real and wider love that is the basis of non-violence, so love rules out any oppression or exploitation. He aims at a peaceful society on the earth which grows along with individual and not independent of him.

For the leftists the happiness of the individuals depends on their financial status whereas to Gandhi’s individuals happiness comes from within, it is a state of mind, which one achieves by controlling one’s desires, by thinking of their own duties and rights of others. It seems leftist sare unable to appreciate this aspect.

At the time of Quit India Movement Congress and the Left had sharp differences of opinion. The Communists have been generally held responsible for supporting imperialism during the crucial moments of fight for freedom. The writers under reference are not negative critics of Gandhi. Roy does not discuss the Quit India Movement as the work was published in 1927. Mukherjee makes no particular comment and suggests that the government goaded the people for violence. Both Dutt and Namboodripad are critical but on different aspects. Dutt does not criticise the action of the Congress, as he believes that the situation changed very fast and the Congress had to take the decision but he holds the view that the decision in doing so Congress fell into the imperialist trap. For him if the Congress had not adopted the resolution the leadership would not have been arrested. Nor is Namboodripad critical however finds Gandhi’s attitude changed as unlike in the past he did not decry violence in 1942 and criticises Gandhi for launching the movement against the British alone and not against the landlords. Gandhi is a bourgeoisie to him. The Leftists who were in India are critical of Quit India as any Indian Nationalists would be yet they have not risen above their party ideology.
Almost all these writers criticise Gandhi for utilising workers for the benefit of the bourgeoisie. They somehow do not realize the fact that the working class movements subsided on the suspension of the movements by Gandhi. They also, perhaps, do not wish to admit that no working class movement raised its head when Gandhi was not leading any Satyagraha, and that even during the intervals the workers’ movement was at a low ebb. Thus the responsibility which they attribute to Gandhi lacks the causal relationship.

They relate the rise of working class to the rise of communism and growth of communism in India. Even today while the workers are organized to fight for their rights all over the country whereas the Communist Party is in majority only in their home states Bengal and Kerala.
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