Chapter - 8

ATTITUDE OF DIFFERENT POLITICAL PARTIES IN INDIA TOWARDS THE ‘QUIT INDIA’ MOVEMENT AND THE DISTRICT OF NADIA:

It goes without saying that the scheme of the ‘Quit India’ movement was the official contrivance of the Indian National Congress (I N C) only and exclusively. In fact, it was the Indian National Congress that had devised the plan of the movement and organized and launched it all over India. The leaders and workers of the Congress from different parts of India had primarily come forward to start the movement as soon as the ‘Quit India’ Resolution had been adopted by the All India Congress Committee (AICC) at the deep night of the 8th August, 1942. Thus the issue of the ‘Quit India’ movement was mainly the political contrivance of the Indian National Congress.¹

But it is to be historically noted here that the whole affair of the ‘Quit India’ movement was not confined within the periphery of the Congress alone. It was rather widely extended to the domain of the-then different political parties in India, namely Forward Bloc (FB), Congress Socialist Party (CSP), Revolutionary Communist Party of India (RCPI) etc. All these Parties had strongly participated in the movement.² Not only that they had also played a very active role in
accelerating the speed of the movement all the India over. In fact, it was on the basis of the direct participation and active role of all these parties in India that the ‘Quit India’ movement in 1942 had reached its monumental proportion. They had thus built up the very backbone of the all India ‘Quit India’ movement.

But it is also be noted here heuristically that some other political parties in India like the Communist Party of India (CPI), the Hindu Mahasabha (H.M.) and the Muslim League (M.L.) had not participated in the historic ‘Quit India’ movement and had payed no contribution to it. It was the Communist Party of India (CPI) that had not only refused to participate in the movement, but strongly opposed it too because of the plausible international political ground (Which we will discuss in detail later on). Moreover the Muslim League had not also participated in the movement and mostly opposed it as well. But it was the Hindu Mahasabha that had not participated in the movement but not opposed it directly.³

This is more or less the overall scenario of the attitude of different political parties towards the ‘Quit India’ movement. We will now depict the very scenario in greater detail. But as our work is concerned only with the movement in the district of Nadia alone, we will thus confine ourselves in the discussion of the attitude and behavior of all the political parties in India during the movement in the district only.
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS AND THE MOVEMENT:

The role of the Indian National Congress in the ‘Quit India’ movement requires no mention at all. In fact, the movement was the brain-child of the Congress in general and Mahatma Gandhiji, the-then supreme and the most popular leader of the Congress, in particular. We have mentioned earlier that, under the direction of Mahatma Gandhiji, All India Congress Committee (AICC) had adopted the historic ‘Resolution’ of the ‘Quit India’ movement in its emergent Bombay session at the very late night of the 8th August, 1942. Accordingly the movement had started throughout India from the early morning of the next date (the 9th August, 1942) and the leaders and workers of the Congress from all the parts of India had whole-heartedly come forward to organize, launch and accelerate the heroic freedom movement all over India.

It is worth-mentioning here that Subhash Chandra Bose, the popular youth leader of the-then Congress, had earnestly submitted the proposal for launching an active freedom movement in the form of armed struggle against the imperialist British Government in India to the All India Congress Committee (AICC) in 1938. But it had not been possible for the Congress to start such an active freedom movement against the British Government due to the non-approval of Gandhiji, the-then undisputed supreme leader of the Congress, to the proposal of Subhash
Chandra Bose as Gandhiji being the priest of the principle of non-violence and thus opposed to armed struggle against the British Government in India.

But later on when the Second World War broke out in 1939 between the Allied power consisting of Britain, America, France and Soviet Russia and the Axis Power consisting of Japan, German and Italy, Britain had become heavily engaged in the War and frantically busy with its war efforts. Subhash Chandra Bose had very practically considered this war situation as the really mature condition for organizing an active national freedom movement against the British Government in India and thereby for achieving India’s independence instantly. But Gandhiji, being the devoted follower of the principle of non-violence, had not agreed at all with Subhash Chandra Bose’s evaluation of the War-situation and also with his demand for organizing armed freedom struggle immediately against the British Government which was then deeply engaged and extremely embarrassed with its heavy war-efforts. It was at this background of Gandhiji’s refusal to Subhash Chandra Bose’s proposal for the immediate organization of armed freedom movement against the British Government in India that it had become quite impossible for the Congress to launch any active freedom struggle against the Government.

Having seen Gandhiji quite unwilling to organize strong freedom movement immediately encasing the war situation and also found no other alternative in
organizing active freedom struggle against the war-torn British Government to achieve India’s independence, Subhash Chandra Bose had felt mentally impelled to organize this freedom struggle against the British Government in India from outside India especially with the help of those foreign countries which were by nature the enemies of Britain and accordingly he had thus very secretly and quite carefully left India in 1941 with a view to collecting military help from the foreign countries to launch a vigorous freedom struggle against the British Government. So Subhash Chandra Bose was then not in India and therefore no one was there in India to disturb Gandhiji with the strong demand for armed struggle against the Government for achieving India’s independence in as much as he (Gandhiji) was the noble priest of the ideal of non-violence and peace and was thus quite unwilling to attack and endanger the British Government in India.  

But this soft corner in the attitude of Gandhiji towards the British Government in India had abruptly started to get changed. Two serious incidents had played a direct role in this very revolutionary change in the mental make-up of Gandhiji, namely, (1) during the peak moment of the Second World War the British Government had, without at all consulting with the Indian political leaders in general and the Congress leaders in particular, declared quite unilaterally and rather most arbitrarily India as the associate of Britain in its war-efforts and (2) the Cripps Mission, which was appointed by the British Government in London
under the leadership of Sir Stafford Cripps to make an effective solution of the political problems relating to the demand for India’s independence, had ultimately failed due to the direct refusal of the main demand of the Indians for India’s complete independence by Mr. Cripps.¹⁰

Gandhiji, the-then super boss of the Congress, had then become extremely aggrieved and gradually he had got mentally prepared to launch a serious mass movement against the British Government for achieving India’s independence.¹¹ “Gandhiji’s mind was now moving” as Moulana Abul Kalam Azad wrote in his book *India Wins Freedom*, “from the extreme of complete inactivity to that of organized mass effort … Jawaharlal said that what Gandhiji had in view was in fact an open rebellion even if the rebellion was non-violent…”¹²

It was at this historical background that Gandhiji had practically advised the Congress leaders to organize a strong mass movement on the basis of the principle of non-violence against the British Government for acquiring India’s independence. Accordingly the All India Congress Committee (AICC) had finally adopted the Historic ‘Quit India’ Resolution on the 8th August, 1942 in its emergent session in Bombay and resolved to organize the ‘Quit India’ movement on non-violent method. But immediately after the adoption of the ‘Quit India’ Resolution by the AICC, almost all the Congress leaders at the national level including Gandhiji were arrested before the dawn of the 9th August, 1942, and it
was against their arrest that the proposed ‘Quit India’ movement had instantly started as basically a protest movement and thus a great wave of mass agitation had started all over India.\textsuperscript{13}

The wave of mass agitation had also reached in the district of Nadia.\textsuperscript{14} In Nadia there were two Congress Committees, namely, 1) Suspended Nadia District Congress Committees (Suspended NDCC), follower of Subhash Chandra Bose who was suspended by the AICC as the member of the Congress due to his overt criticism against the decision of the AICC relating to the compulsory and obedient maintenance of the party discipline and the secrecy of the party policy and 2) Ad-hoc Nadia District Congress Committee (Ad-hoc NDCC), loyal to Gandhiji being the supreme leader of the Congress.\textsuperscript{15} As soon as the news of arrest of all the important Congress leaders reached the district of Nadia in the early morning of the 9\textsuperscript{th} August, 1942, through Radio, both the Suspended NDCC and the Ad-hoc NDCC, having forgotten all their ideological differences, had started the ‘Quit India’ movement hand in hand and jointly proceeded to organize and popularize it through the district.

It is interesting to note here that in regard to the organization of the ‘Quit India’ movement in Nadia district the Suspended NDCC whole-heartedly joined hands with the Ad-hoc NDCC in as much as it was greatly happy to see that the AICC had ultimately accepted the long cherished proposal of Subhas Chandra
Bose for launching a strong freedom struggle against the British Government in
India to compel the Government to leave India and thereby to achieve India’s
independence. The members of the Suspended NDCC had thus met in a few
sessions with the members of the Ad-hoc NDCC to organize and launch the
movement successfully all over the district. The leaders and workers of both the
Nadia district Congress Committees had thus taken ‘Common course of action’ to
organize, launch, regulate and guide the movement in the district.  

It is equally interesting to mention here that in regard to the launching and
organizing the movement in the district, the members of both the NDCCs used to
deliberately avoid all kinds of political divisions and psychological dissension
between and among themselves. Even they had carefully shunned their personality
clashes during the movement in order to make it successfully organized and also to
spread and popularize it all over the district. This is why it had been possible for
them to jointly actualize both the overt constitutional means like meetings,
processions, hoisting of national flag over the tops of the Government offices and
official buildings and the covert violent means like the removal of fishplates and
rails of the railway lines, cutting of the wire of telephone and telegraph, damaging
of the signal posts of the railway, burning of railway platforms, trains and post
offices, snatching of the postal money bags and so on in order to organize and
launch the movement and accelerate its speed throughout the district of Nadia. In this way they had jointly and very expertly organized the movement in the district.

It is in this regard that the name of a few leaders and workers of both the NDCCs, who had jointly performed different pro-movement activities with full co-operation among themselves in order to organize and launch the ‘Quit India’ movement all over the district of Nadia, deserves especial mention, namely Smarajit Bandyopadhyay, Jagannath Majumder, Shibaram Gupta, Haripada Chattopadhyay, Sanat Mukhopadhyay (Vadu Babu), Someshwar Chowdhury, Satyesh Bhattarchatyya, Dhirananda Goswami (Madu Bhbu), Shyamapada Bhattacharyya, Ramani Mohan Goswami, Mohini Mohan Saha, Niranjan Modak, Rampada Raha, Mani Bhattarchatyya, Sudhir Chowdhury, Amal Sarkar, Manoranjan Sen, Kiran Chowdhury, Gopendranath Mukhopadhyay (Junior) Sudhiranjan Lahiri, Sukumar Gupta, Salil Kumar Paul, Shiba Kumar Chottopadhyay, Balailal Mukhopadhyay, Nitai Paul and a great many others. They all had wrought hard to organize the ‘Quit India’ movement all over the district of Nadia with full co-operation and friendly fellowship. 18

It is in this way that the Congress (i.e. both the Suspend NDCC and the Ad-hoc NDCC taken together) had whole-heartedly organized the ‘Quit India’ movement in the district of Nadia and played an active role in spreading and popularizing it all over the district.
FORWARD BLOC AND THE MOVEMENT:

It goes without saying that the Forward Bloc (F.B.), organized by Subhash Chandra Bose, had very spontaneously and quite actively participated in the ‘Quit India’ movement in as much as Subhash Chandra Bose had been demanding since the annual session of the AICC of the Indian National Congress in Calcutta in 1928 to organize such an active mass and strong movement against the imperialist British Government for achieving India’s independence. In fact, Forward Bloc had not only participated in the movement, but also actively organized and popularized the movement along with the Indian National Congress.¹⁹

It is to be remembered in this regard that Subhash Chandra Bose, being a left-minded progressive personality of the Indian National Congress, had been re-elected as the Congress President in the Tripuri Session of the AICC in 1939 having strongly defeated Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramyya being nominated as a contestant against him (Mr.Bose) by Mahatma Gandhiji, the-then super boss of the Congress. But Mr.Bose had to resign ultimately from the post of the President of the Congress due to the factional politics within the Congress and the direct non-co-operation on the part of the Gandhi-led right wing of the Congress. He (Mr. Bose) had then formed a progressive minded group or bloc within the Congress, called Forward Bloc,²⁰ with all those Congress members who were forward in attitude and
progressive in mentality. In fact, the followers of Subhash Chandra Bose within the Congress had normally become the members of the newly organized Forward Bloc.

It is historically true that Subhash Chandra Bose had an overwhelming influence on the-then Bengal Provincial Congress Committee (BPCC). But due to its (BPCC’s) sincerest loyalty to Mr. Bose, the BPCC had fallen in the wrath of the AICC, led and guided by Gandhiji who was not satisfied with the left orientation of Mr. Bose. The AICC had thus ultimately declared the BPCC as suspended as it had already suspended Mr. Bose as the member of the Congress. Quite needless to mention here that the-then Nadia District Congress Committee (NDCC) as a district branch of the BPCC had also automatically become suspended, then known as the Suspended NDCC. And the members of the Suspended NDCC had really become the members of the Forward Bloc, organized by Subhash Chandra Bose in 1939.21

It is highly interesting to mention here that the leaders, workers, members and supporters of the Forward Bloc had, with all of their resources and energies, participated in the ‘Quit India’ movement quite directly. This was also true in the case of the leaders and workers of the Nadia district branch of the Forward Bloc. As the leaders, members and workers of the Forward Bloc were actually the leaders, members and workers of the Suspended NDCC, they had thus employed
all their energies and capabilities in organizing and popularizing the ‘Quit India’ movement in the district and also in making it a success and this is why they had played quite a direct role in launching the movement all over Nadia along with the leaders, workers and members of the Congress (NDCCs) of the district.

In fact, as Subhash Chandra Bose had been raising the proposal for launching a strong and active freedom struggle against the British Government in India for achieving India’s independence for a long time, it was thus quite natural that the followers of Mr. Bose, i.e., the members of the Forward Bloc would whole-heartedly participate in such movement, if organized at all. This is why when the ‘Quit India’ freedom struggle had ultimately been declared and launched by the Congress (AICC), they had joined hands with the Congress leaders and workers to make the struggle or the movement really strong and effective. The followers of Mr. Bose, i.e., the members of the Forward Bloc in the district of Nadia had also done the same.

The leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the Forward Bloc, who were mostly the members of the Suspended NDCC, had played quite an effective role during the ‘Quit India’ movement to make it a success in the district of Nadia. They had sincerely conducted, followed and actualized both the pro-movement means—overt constitutional means and covert violent means—while launching the movement in the district.
Among the leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the Forward Bloc, some important personalities were Shibaram Gupta, Sanat Mukhopadhyay (Vadu Babu), Manoranjan Sen, Kiran Chottopadhyay, Gopendranath Mukhopadhyay (Junior), Ramani Mohan Goswami, Ramapada Raha, Dhirananda Goswami (Madhu Babu) and a few others. Their strong pro-movement activities had created a great pressure upon the local authority of the British Government. This is why the role of the Nadia branch of the Forward Bloc in the ‘Quit India’ movement in the district of Nadia had become of immense significance.²³

**CONGRESS SOCIALIST PARTY AND THE MOVEMENT:**

The Congress Socialist Party (CSP) had played a very effective role in the India-wide ‘Quit India’ movement. Though the movement was originally proposed and primary organized by the Indian National Congress, yet it was the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) that had performed the heroic role in spreading and popularizing the movement throughout India.²⁴

In fact, the CSP had taken every step to make the ‘Quit India’ movement reach in every nook and cranny of India, even in the remotest villages also. The pro-movement underground activities, performed by the leaders and workers of the CSP, had created a romantic sense of freedom struggle all over India and thereby raised a pro-movement wave of mass-struggle throughout India. In this way they
had made the British Government in India afraid and irritated completely. In this respect the daring role of Jay Prakash Narain, the-then youth leader of the CSP, had become a history in the whole history of the ‘Quit India’ movement in India.\textsuperscript{25}

The district branch of Nadia of the CSP had also played a very crucial role in the ‘Quit India’ movement in Nadia.\textsuperscript{26} The leaders and workers of the district branch of the CSP had greatly participated in the open constitutional activities in favour of the movement in the district. But their role in committing the pro-movement violent activities in Nadia had become of great prominence. In fact, their pro-movement violent activities in favour of the movement in Nadia were so large in extent and so deep in gravity that they had disturbed the British administrative authority of the district a lot.

In fact, it was the CSP leaders and workers of Nadia who were actively engaged in the pro-movement violent activities in the district like the removal of fishplates and signal posts of the Railways, cutting of the railway lines, telephone and telegraph, severing of the railway lines, damaging of the government offices, setting of fire on the post offices, station-platforms, trains and Government buildings, snatching of mail bags and so on. Similarly they had also organized non-violent constitutional activities like processions, meetings, hoisting of National flag on the Government offices and buildings and so on. It is with their both types of serious pro-movement overt Constitutional and covert violent activities that they
had created a great wave of romantic nationalism in favour of the movement in the
district of Nadia.

In fact, having followed the all-India party line regarding the ‘Quit India’
movement, the Nadia district party leaders and workers of the CSP had played a
unique role in organizing the movement all over the district. The district leaders
and workers of the CSP like Asim Kumar Majumder, Shyam Sundar Halder,
Tinkari Bhattacharyya, Pritirajan Acharyya, Supriti Sanyal and a great many
others had played a great role in this regard.²⁷

REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA AND
THE MOVEMENT:

It is an open secret that the Revolutionary Communist Party of India (RCPI)
had whole- heartedly and quite spontaneously participated in the ‘Quit India’
movement.²⁸ In fact, the RCPI had supported the movement and also worked hard
to make it a revolutionary freedom struggle against the British Government in
India due to its revolutionary attitude and orientation. Really speaking, the RCPI
had tried a lot to convert the ‘Quit India’ movement into a total revolution on the
part of the Indian people for acquiring India’s independence from the imperialist
British Government and thereby to establish a revolutionarily changed and sound
society in the independent India.
It is to be mentioned here heuristically that due to its revolutionary ideology the RCPI had although criticized the ‘bourgeois’ leadership of the Indian National Congress. In fact, it had always opposed the moderate political policy and the principle of political mendicacy of the bourgeois Congress. Due to its own progressive orientation and revolutionary ideology, the RCPI used to criticize vehemently the compromising attitude of the Congress towards the British Government in India and also consider it (the Congress) as one averse to struggle by mentality and compromising by nature regarding the question of organizing mass-struggle to achieve India’s independence. This is why it had not been possible so far for the RCPI to perform political role along with the compromising bourgeois Congress.  

But now in 1942 when the Congress had pronouncedly declared and boldly organized the historic ‘Quit India’ movement all over India as a form of freedom revolution, i.e., active freedom struggle against the British Government in India, then the RCPI had become very much inspired with the very revolutionary kernel of the movement and had thus decided to take valiant part in it. Accordingly the RCPI had very spontaneously participated in the movement with all its resources.

In fact, though the RCPI used to criticize the Gandhian ideology and policy of action severely and opposed the ‘bourgeois’ mentality of the Congress vehemently, still it had whole-heartedly participated in the historic ‘Quit India’
movement, proposed and organized by the Congress and also joined hands quite liberally with the Congress to organize and popularize it as well as to make it a successful revolutionary struggle for freedom of India especially due to the revolutionary probability of the movement.

This all India approach of the RCPI to the ‘Quit India’ movement had been perfectly followed by its district branch of Nadia. The leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the RCPI had very vigorously participated in the movement and worked hard to spread it all over Nadia district as well as to make it a success in Nadia. Though they had strongly performed a great many open constitutional activities in favour of the movement in Nadia, still their role had been historically marked in the whole history of the ‘Quit India’ movement in India for the vigorous revolutionary activities, they had committed during the ‘Quit India’ movement in Nadia, like the political dacoity, snatching of postal money bags for funding the pro-movement activities, cutting of wires of telephone and telegraph, removal of fishplates and signal posts of the railways, damaging of the Government offices, buildings and record rooms etc., setting fire on Post Offices and the offices of the Station Masters of different railway stations and so on.

It is also to be mentioned here in this connection that the pro-movement violent activities of the leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the RCPI while accelerating the speed of the ‘Quit India’ movement all over the district had really
achieved a revolutionary shape. In fact, their pro-movement revolutionary activities, committed throughout the whole of Nadia district, had become so serious in both gravity and extent that the administrative authority of the district had got really alarmed and frightened as well. The authority had thus become too much eager to arrest some of the daringly distinguished RCPI leaders and workers of the district. Even the authority had declared money reward of lump some amount for helping in arresting a few district leaders and workers of the RCPI and it had also declared the money reward of Rs 2000 (Two Thousand Rupees) in anyhow helping the police arrest Kanai Paul of Shantipur, one of the most important revolutionary leaders of Nadia.

Besides Kanai Paul, many other district leaders and workers of the RCPI had very actively played serious role in organizing, popularizing and spreading the ‘Quit India’ movement through the district of Nadia and worked hard to bring revolutionary success to the movement in the district. The leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the RCPI like Harendranath Bose, Keshab Chandra Mitra, Bimal Kumar Chatterjee, Dulal Bose, Shashi Khan, Gour Paul, Nitai Paul, Phani Khan, Jognanth Mukhopadhyay, Biswanath Mukhopadhyay, Mohan Kali Biswas, Gobinda Chakraborty, Balai Goswami and a few others had contributed a lot to the gradual acceleration of the movement in the district through their pro-movement revolutionary activities. In fact, it is with the active role of these RCPI leaders and
workers of the district that the ‘Quit India’ movement in the district of Nadia had got the form and figure of a revolutionary freedom movement.\textsuperscript{32}

It is however to be mentioned here with great interest that the leaders and workers of the Nadia district branch of the RCPI used to get then efficiently directed and guided by Soumendranath Thhakur, the-then highly distinguished revolutionary leader of Bengal. He was, in fact, the truest friend, philosopher and guide of all the revolutionary leaders, workers and supporters of the-then Bengal in general and those of Nadia in particular. He had thus immense influence upon the leaders and workers of the Bengal provincial branch of the RCPI. It was under his direction and direct advice that they used to perform their political activities all over the province of Bengal. Due to his great command over the Bengal leaders and workers of the RCPI as well as his immense popularity among them the Bengal provincial branch of the RCPI was named ‘Thhakur Group’ according to his title ‘Thhakur’

The leaders and workers of the ‘Thhakur Group’ of Nadia district as being the members of the Nadia district branch of the RCPI had quite actively organized and launched, as per the revolutionary programme and ideology of the party, the ‘Quit India’ movement all over the district with all their resources. Moreover having joined their hands with the Congress leaders and workers of Nadia, they had sought, by their pro-movement revolutionary activities, to make the movement
in the district an active and positive freedom struggle. Herein lies the basic importance of the role of the Nadia district branch of the RCPI in the historic ‘Quit India’ movement in the district indeed.

**COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA AND THE MOVEMENT:**

It is an historical truth that the communist party of India (CPI) had not at all participated in the historic ‘Quit India’ movement in India; it had rather vehemently opposed it. The CPI had felt mentally impelled to do so due to the pressure of the-then international political scenario it had to face heavily. It was, in fact, the flow of the world political events during the period of the Second World War, broken out between the Allied Power of Britain, America, France and Soviet Russia on the one hand and the Axis Power of Japan, Germany and Italy on the other, that had psychologically compelled the CPI to support the war efforts of Britain and to take the side of the British Government in India and thus to oppose the ‘Quit India’ movement in India against the British Government in as much as the CPI used to get then completely guided by the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU) and the Soviet Union, i.e., Soviet Russia was the close ally of Britain as they both (Britain and Russia) being the strong partners of the Allied Power fighting against the Axis Power in the Second World War.
Though the CPI had sincere sympathy and great zeal for the demand of India’s independence and earlier it had repeatedly demanded to launch a strong freedom struggle against the imperialist British Government in India, yet it could not support the ‘Quit India’ freedom movement in 1942 especially due to the psychological pressure of the-then international politics. The CPI had opposed the movement on the ground of its very belief that without at all organizing any strong mass movement against the British Government in India, India should help Britain in its War-efforts in the Second World War, fought by the members of the Allied Power including Britain and Soviet Russia against international Fascism maintained by Italy, Japan and Germany. The CPI used to sincerely believe that Fascism was the most fatal danger to the humanity as a whole in as much as it (Fascism) had proceeded ferociously to destroy peace, prosperity and liberty of the world as a whole and to endanger the future of the whole of humanity.

It was the sincere belief of the CPI that Fascism (of Italy, Germany and Japan) was more fatally dangerous than imperialism (of Britain and America), because imperialism had appeared to be the danger to one or a few countries of the world while fascism, to the world as a whole. The CPI had thus thought that if the fascist Axis Power wins in the Second World War, the whole of the world will be plunged into permanent dictatorship and despotism of the war-monger fascist State or States. So the CPI used to believe eagerly that the Second World war, fought by
the Allied Power against the fascist Axis Power, was a war deliberately designed to protect and preserve the liberty and sound survival of the people of the world as a whole. This is why, the Second World War, according to the CPI, was the ‘People’s War;’ i.e., the war of the people for the protection and promotion of the people of the world as a whole.  

The CPI had, in fact, thought that the fascist Axis Power must have to be defeated in the War and for this purpose generous support and wide help will have to be positively extended to the war-efforts of Britain and its allied states. So India should, according to the CPI, extend all types of support to Britain (in general and the British Government in India in particular) including man power, money power, mental power and so on in its (Britain’s) war against world Fascism and should not organize and launch any mass movement against the British Government in India immediately.

Because of this very sympathetic attitude of the CPI towards Britain in its war efforts in the Second World War as the War being, according to it (i.e., the CPI, the ‘People’s War,’ it had not at all participated in the historic ‘Quit India’ freedom movement, organized against the imperialist British Power. Not only that, it had also opposed the movement with all its resources. Moreover it had also sharply criticized the inborn weak points of the ‘Quit India’ movement. It had rather boldly upheld and propagated the weaknesses of the movement like the
elitist character, bourgeois leadership, lack of proper leadership, absence of well-built organization, absence of definite programme of action, irregular course of action, dispersed and distracted pro-movement activities, unnecessary use of violence, childishness on the part of movement leaders and workers in organizing protest programmes in favour of the movement and so on. It is in this way that the CPI had seriously opposed the Quit India movement.

It is more interesting to mention here in regard to the attitude of the CPI to the ‘Quit India’ movement that during the period of the movement it (i.e. the CPI) had taken the policy of giving sufficient importance to the international political scenario along with the national political situation relating to the freedom movement of India. This is why it had centralized all its attention only to the ‘Anti-Fascist Second World War’ and shown great sympathy to the War considering it to be the ‘People’s War.’ Consequently at this very background of the international politics relating to the ‘Anti-Fascist Second World War’ that the CPI had to strongly oppose the Anti-Imperialist struggle, started all over India through the revolutionary upheaval of the ‘Quit India’ movement against the British Government in India. In fact, it used to consider the international Fascist danger as the more fatal and more terrific than the national Imperialist danger and because of this consideration it (i.e., the CPI) had not only refused to support the ‘Quit India’ freedom movement in India but also opposed it tooth and nail.
It is also to be mentioned here in this connection that because of its non-participation in, and strong opposition to, the ‘Quit India’ movement, the CPI had been, however, sharply criticized. Moreover it had been disgraced and discredited as the Anti-Independence and therefore harmful danger to the freedom movement in India. Consequently the CPI had automatically become seriously isolated from the Indians and quietly segregated from the main stream of the freedom struggle in India.

But it was an historical fact that the newly developed international political events occurred during the course of the Second World War had mentally forced the CPI to adopt the very attitude of opposing the ‘Quit India’ movement. That very background scenario of the international political development, as per the political history of the World, was as following.

The Second World War had broken out as soon as the Nazi Germany had attacked Poland, the nearest neighbour of the Soviet Russia. The Soviet Russia had become excessively aggrieved and it had considered the attack on Poland to be the attack on itself and it had thus instantly protested against the attack made by Germany. Immediately all on a sudden Germany under the arrogant direction of Adolf Hitter, the-then Chancellor of Germany, had made direct attack on the Soviet Russia as the Russia being the motherland of Communism and socialism. This incident of Fascist attack of the Nazi Germany on the Communist Soviet
Russia had very quickly created a great deal of anxiety and excitement in the minds of the members of the Communist Party of India (CPI) and a sense of sympathy for the Soviet Russia had grown in the minds of the Indian Communists as they were politically guided and regulated by the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU).  

In order to resist the attack of the Fascist Germany, the Soviet Russia had made a contract of alliance with Britain. The Theorists of International Relations had considered this contract between the Communist Soviet Russia and the Capitalist Britain as ‘Strange Alliance’ in as much as it was an uncommon alliance between the two countries of the two quite opposite and conflicting ideologies of Communism and Capitalism. This alliance between the Communist Soviet Russia and the Capitalist Britain was made in such a time when Britain had been utterly maintaining its imperialist rule in India and endless exploitation and expropriation over it.

But according to the condition of the ‘Strange Alliance,’ Britain had now energetically come forward to help the Communist Russia in its life and death struggle for survival against the fascist aggression of the Germany. This very incident of the sincere help and assistance of Britain to the Communist Russia in the world-wide struggle for liberty and peace of mankind against Fascism had greatly inspired the CPI to get associated with the-then current tendency of the
international communist movement of supporting and helping the Anti-Fascist Power of the world. And as per the guidelines of the-then international communist movement, the CPI had openly declared the Second World War as ‘People’s War,’ i.e., a War for preserving the liberty of the people of the world as a whole and also decided to whole-heartedly support Britain along with its friendly states of the Allied Power in the very War against Fascism. This is why the CPI had taken quite opposed attitude towards the ‘Quit India’ movement in India, launched against the British Power, and thus rejected it altogether.

Besides, the CPI had also criticized the ‘Quit India’ movement in India in 1942 as ‘Jap-inspired movement.’ According to it, the bourgeois leaders of the Indian National Congress had organized the movement against the British Power under the direction and direct help of the fascist Japan.

Though the CPI had deep sympathy for the demand of the achievement of India’s independence and the immediate formation of India’s National Government, as raised by the Congress, yet it had not been possible for it (the CPI) to support and help the heroic attempt of acquiring India’s freedom through the ‘Quit India’ movement, organized by the Congress due to the intricacy of the international political developments during the Second World War. It had rather opposed, notwithstanding unwillingness, the movement.
In fact, in order to save socialism of the Soviet Russia, which was terribly attacked by the Fascist Power of the Germany in the Second World War, the CPI had whole-heartedly supported the war-efforts of the Socialist Russia along with its allies of the Allied Power including Britain against the Fascist Axis Power of Germany, Japan and Italy. This is why despite its great desire and continuous demand for acquiring India’s independence through active and direct freedom movement i.e., through mass-revolution against the imperialist British Government in India, the CPI, now at the outbreak of the Second World War in which the Socialist Russia had been attacked and endangered, had firmly decided not to organize any mass-struggle or even support and join any such freedom struggle against Britain, as Britain being the closest ally of the Socialist Russia; and the CPI had accordingly opposed the historic ‘Quit India’ movement in 1942 against the British Government in India. The CPI had of course done it due to the overwhelming dominance of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU)over it (the CPI), as the CPSU was the-then international political guide of the adolescent CPI.\(^42\)

This very attitude of opposition of the CPI towards the ‘Quit India’ movement in India had made a great impact on its district branch of Nadia. Quite obviously the leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the CPI had neither supported the movement nor participated in it. They had rather, having followed
the all India party line of the CPI, propagated continuously the Second World War as the ‘People’s War’ and supported the war-efforts of the British Government in India in the very War.

Not only that, the leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the CPI had also directly opposed the movement in Nadia and even supported the repressive policy of the local administrative authority of the British Government to suppress and repress the movement in the district. It is due to this anti-movement attitude and activities of the members of the Nadia branch of the CPI that they had completely lost the regards and respect of the people of Nadia and become quite isolated from them as well.\textsuperscript{43}

It is however to be mentioned here that though the leaders and workers of the Nadia branch of the CPI had been mentally impelled to oppose the ‘Quit India’ movement in the district of Nadia as per the all India guideline of the CPI, yet a few members of the district branch of the CPI were actually sympathetic to the movement in Nadia. They had also great enthusiasm in the their mind for the movement and used to keep personal contact with the leaders, workers and supporters of the Congress, Forward Bloc, RCPI and CSP, who were emotionally engaged in the ‘Quit India’ movement all over Nadia. A few of them had, out of their personal positive attitude and willingness, also attended a few processions and meetings, organized in favour of the movement in Nadia. Not only that they
had also secretly helped, in a few cases, the Congress leaders and workers of Nadia widely organize the movement in the district of Nadia and assisted then a lot to organize meetings and processions and even to commit pro-movement covert violent activities throughout the district of Nadia.

The role of some of the district leaders, workers and supporters of the Nadia branch of the CPI, namely, Gour Chandra Kundu, Achinta Majumder, Bimal Kumar Chatterjee, Shyamal Chatterjee, Rabindranath Mukherjee and a few others requires especial mention because of their pro-movement sentiment and activities during the movement in Nadia despite the direct opposition of their party—the CPI—to the movement.

**HINDU MAHASABHA AND THE MOVEMENT:**

The Hindu Mahasabha had also not participated, like the Communist Party of India (CPI), in the ‘Quit India’ movement in 1942. It could not support, at all, the movement, devised and organized by the Indian National Congress, in as much as it had no confidence over the activities of the Congress and no faith in its leadership.  

According to the Hindu Mahasabha the Congress, having neglected the interests of the Hindu people, had become very much eager to satisfy the interests of the Muslim people in the name of the politics of secularism. It used to directly
criticise Mahatma Gandhiji, the most powerful and popular leader of the Congress, for his appeasement policy to the Muslims in India. This is why when the All India Congress Committee (AICC) declared the ‘Quit India’ movement to be organized completely under the leadership of Gandhiji, the Hindu Mahasabha had instantly decided not to support the movement and participate in it. Besides, the clear difference between the ideologies, approaches and programmes of action of the Congress and Hindu Mahasabha had prevented it (Hindu Mahasabha) psychologically from participating in the country-wide ‘Quit India’ movement.46

However, it is to be mentioned here especially that though the Hindu Mahashaba had not participated in the movement, still it had not, of course, proceeded to oppose it tooth and nail. In fact, due to its inborn attitude of opposition to the Congress, it had not supported, and participated in, the Congress contrivance of the ‘Quit India’ movement in 1942.

This very negative political attitude and approach of the Hindu Mahashaba at the all India level to the ‘Quit India’ movement was completely applicable to the Nadia branch of the party. This is why the district leaders and workers of the Hindu Mahashaba, having followed the party guide-lines, had not participated in the movement in the district of Nadia.47
Besides, the party organization of the Hindu Mahashaba in the district of Nadia was then not at all strong enough. Though there were a few leaders, workers and supporters of the Hindu Mahashaba in the district, still they were more or less unconcerned about and unattached to, rather quite indifferent to, the movement in the district.\textsuperscript{48} This is why the attitude of the Nadia district branch of the Hindu Mahasabha to the ‘Quit India’ movement was not positive and participatory at all.

**MUSLIM LEAGUE AND THE MOVEMENT:**

The Muslim League had also maintained a negative attitude towards the ‘Quit India’ movement. It had not participated in the movement.\textsuperscript{49} Though the movement was organized as the heroic battle on the part of the Indians against the imperialist British Government in India for acquiring India’s independence, yet the Muslim League had not at all mentally felt the urge for supporting and organizing the very freedom movement and even for participating in it. Not only that the League had not also helped even indirectly the pro-movement leaders, workers and supports of the Indian National Congress and other participating political parties of the-then India organize and expedite the historic ‘Quit India’ movemrnt.\textsuperscript{50}

In fact, it was due to the separatist political orientation of the Muslim League and its growing demand for separate independent State for the Indian Muslims by dividing India into India and Pakistan that it (the League) had taken
the non-participatory attitude to the ‘Quit India’ movement and had not at all participated in it.

It is also to be mentioned here that the Muslim League had not only participated in the ‘Quit India’ freedom movement, but strongly opposed it too. Because the League used to consider the movement as opposed to the political interest of it (the League) and not consistent with its increasing demand for Pakistan as the homeland for the Indian Muslims dividing the geographical area of India.

Moveover the Muslim League used to believe quite insistently that the ‘Quit India’ movement, planned and organized by the Congress, was primarily a Hindu programme for establishing independent Hindusthan India in as much as it (the League) was of the firm opinion that the Congress, which had devised and launched the movement, was basically a Hindu organization and its (Congress’) executive body, i.e., the All India Congress Committee (AICC) was composed primarily of the Hindu personalities. 51

Besides, at the time of the ‘Quit India’ movement the Muslim League as the sole organization of the Muslim people in India had become a rival political party of the Congress due to the antipathy and opposition of the Indian Muslims to the Hindus because of the ups and down of the events of the socio-cultural and
politico-economic scenario of the-then India. This is why it had not at all been possible for the Muslim League to join the ‘Quit India’ movement, organized by the Hindu-led Congress. In fact, the anti-Hindu psychology of the League had made it remain quite aloof from the movement. The League had thus maintained although the negative attitude of opposition to the movement.

This negative attitude of the Muslim League to the ‘Quit India’ movement had cast a direct impact over the leaders, workers and supporters of the Nadia district branch of the League. This is why they, having followed the negative party line regarding the movement, had neither supported it nor participated in it. Not only that the Nadia district branch of the Muslim League had strongly restrained the Muslim people in the district from participating in the movement that was sufficiently harmful to the development of the movement in the district indeed.

It is, however, to be mentioned here in this regard that a few Muslim persons from the different parts of the district of Nadia had of course joined hands with their pro-movement Hindu brethren in the district and followed the policy and programmes of the movement jointly with the leaders and workers of the district branches of the Congress and other participating political parties in India. In fact, a few Muslim people of Nadia district, having often violated the negative party approach of the Muslim League towards the ‘Quit India’ movement, had participated in the movement in its both methods of operation, namely,—the open
constitutional method and the covert violent method—and helped a lot in the successful spread of the movement all over Nadia. The pro-movement activities of Kazi Md. Mahasin Reja, Kalimuddin Sheikh, Fazlur Rahman, Manirul Sheikh, Anwar Sheik, Fazil Ali Molla, Karim Khan and a few other Muslim persons in the historic ‘Quit India’ movement in Nadia deserve especial attention.

This is more or less the actual scenario of the attitude of the different political parties in India, in general, and in Nadia, in particular, to the historic ‘Quit India’ movement in 1942.

**AN ESTIMATE : A MIXED REACTION :**

From the above discussion, a compact picture of the attitude of the different political parties towards the ‘Quit India’ movement becomes clear. It has been quite clear that it was the Indian National Congress that had devised the plan of the ‘Quit India’ movement and also actualized the plan by organizing and launching it throughout India. Accordingly the leaders and workers of the Nadia district branch (both the Suspended NDCC and the Ad-hoc NDCC branches) of the Congress had whole-heartedly organized the movement all over Nadia and actively participated in it.

Similarly according to the positive party approach of the Forward Bloc (F.B), the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) and the Revolutionary Communist Party
of India (RCPI) to the historic ‘Quit India’ movement, the Nadia district branches of all these parties had very spontaneously and quite valiantly participated in it and sought to precipitate the speed of its quick spread and rapid expansion all over the district.

But the Communist Party of India (CPI), the Muslim League (ML) and the Hindu Mahashaba (HM) had not associated themselves with the ‘Quit India’ movement. In fact, the sincere sympathy of the CPI for the Communist Soviet Russia, which was unduly attacked by the fascist Germany in the Second World War, and the later developments of the political scenario of the World during the War had turned it (the CPI) into quite hostile to the movement.

Similarly the Hindu Mahashaba had not supported this Congress-led movement due to its evaluation of the Congress as one unnecessarily appeasing the Muslims in India. Moveover, the Muslim League had also not supported this movement, as the League considered the movement as mainly the Congress contrivance and thought the Congress as basically the Hindu organization.

Needless to say at all that the Nadia district branches of the CPI, the Hindu Mahashaba and the Muslim League had followed the all-India negative guidelines of their parties regarding the ‘Quit India’ movement and had not thus participated in it.
This is why a mixed reaction of participation and non-participation, rather opposition of the-then political parties in India to the historic ‘Quit India’ movement in 1942 had become quite evident in the district of Nadia like all other parts of India.56 And this is the overall picture of action and reaction of all the Indian political parties to the movement indeed.
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