

jananta

Vol. 72 No. 51
January 14, 2018

**Gandhi and Roy:
The Interaction of Ideologies
in India**

Dr. Dennis Dalton

**National Museum Institute—
Shifting a Tughlakian
Misadventure**

Chandra Bhal Tripathi

Gandhi - A Revolutionary ?

A. Raghu Kumar

Editor :
G. G. Parikh

Managing Editor : Guddi

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Mumbai - 400 007.

Email : janataweekly@gmail.com
Website: www.janataweekly.org

Anthem has to be Respected

Kuldip Nayar

When I was in Sialkot City, now a part of Pakistan, I used to visit cinema halls in the cantonment regularly. What I resented then was that I had to stand up for the British national anthem, "God save the king..." The cinema halls did not bolt the doors and left it to an individual how he or she behaved. There was no compulsion, but you were expected to stand up when the British national anthem was played.

The British rulers were sensitive to the people's rights and did not make it compulsory or impose any penal action against the public that did not stand up. Significantly, the practice of playing the British national anthem at the end of Indian films was gradually avoided, lest the viewers dishonour the king and later the queen. Even otherwise, they wanted to avoid the spectacle.

There have been legal interventions on playing the national anthem in theatres in the past. In 2003, the Maharashtra Assembly passed an order mandating the playing of the national anthem before the start of a movie. In the 1960s, the national anthem would be played at the end of the film. But as people

simply filed out after the movie, this practice was stopped.

Existing laws don't penalise or force any person to stand up or sing the national anthem. The Prevention of Insults to National Honour Act, 1971 states: "Whoever intentionally prevents the singing of the Jana Gana Mana or causes disturbances to any assembly engaged in such singing shall be punished with imprisonment for a term, which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both."

The official duration of the anthem is 52 seconds, though what is usually played in cinema halls exceeds that length. A Home Ministry order in 2015 stated, "Whenever the Anthem is sung or played, the audience shall stand to attention. However, when in the course of a newsreel or documentary the anthem is played as a part of the film, it is not expected of the audience to stand as standing is bound to interrupt the exhibition of the film and would create disorder and confusion rather than add to the dignity of the anthem."

And the law until now, specifically says that it has been left "to the good

sense of the people" not to indulge in indiscriminate singing or playing of the national anthem. There are even specific rules as to whom the national anthem should be played for (the President and not the Prime Minister), and when people can indulge in mass singing of the anthem.

While the application of the Supreme Court order and the penalties for its violation are not clear, there are definitely precedents for individually perceived notions of freedom, which the court order says are overindulged, being upheld over nationalistic causes.

As things stand now, there is no judgment by the apex court, or a legal provision, or an administrative direction that makes it mandatory for people to stand during the national anthem. That they do so is essentially an expression of personal respect. But the Supreme Court had ruled that the national anthem should be played before the screening of films in cinema halls, and that all should "stand up in respect." "...people should feel that they live in a nation and show respect to the national anthem and the national flag."

During the October 2017 hearing by the Supreme Court Justice Chandrachud had hinted at modifying the 2016 order, observing "why do people have to wear their patriotism on their sleeve?... People go to a movie theatre for undiluted entertainment. Society needs that entertainment".

But the government has told the court it may consider restoring the position that existed prior to the November 2016 order when it was not mandatory for movie halls to play

the national anthem. "This Hon'ble Court may consider the restoration of status quo ante till then, i.e. restoration of the position as it stood before the order passed by this Hon'ble Court on November 30, 2016 with regard to direction 'd' in the said order to the extent that it mandates the playing of the national anthem in all cinemas before the feature film starts," it said.

Some years ago, a two-judge bench of the apex court had ordered a school in Kerala to take back three children who had been expelled for not singing the national anthem, although they stood during the anthem. The children desisted from singing because of their conviction that their religion did not permit them to join any rituals except in their prayers to Jehovah, their god.

The Supreme Court ruled that there is no legal provision that obliges anyone to sing the national anthem, and it is not disrespectful to the anthem if a person who stands up respectfully when it is being sung does not join in the singing. The court, however, did not deal with the issue of whether it would be disrespectful if a person chose not to stand during the national anthem. The judgment ended with the message: "Our tradition teaches tolerance; our philosophy preaches tolerance; our Constitution practises tolerance; let us not dilute it."

Unfortunately, in the absence of a clear cut decision, several high courts have dealt with such cases differently. For instance, in August 2014, police in Kerala slapped IPC Section 124A (sedition) on seven people, including two women, after they failed to stand when the national Anthem was played in a Thiruvananthapuram theatre. One of

them, M Salman, 25, was arrested for allegedly "sitting and hooting" as the anthem was played. He was also charged under Section 66A of the IT Act for allegedly posting a derogatory comment about the national flag on Facebook.

I personally think that there only should be a clear-cut order that all will have to stand when the anthem is sung or played because some part of the provision seem to make it mandatory to stand whenever the national anthem is played, while the other part creates an exception. But the rules nowhere prescribe a penalty for not adhering to it and, therefore, it has to work in accordance with the Act.

Email :kuldipnayar09@gmail.com

Janata Subscription

Annual Rs. : 260/-

Three Years : 750/-

Demand Draft / Cheque

on

Mumbai Bank
in favour of

JANATA TRUST

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,

Grant Road (W),
Mumbai 400 007.

Janata

is available at

www.lohiatoday.com

Gandhi and Roy: The Interaction of Ideologies in India – II

Dr. Dennis Dalton

Roy begins his critique of Gandhi in this book with the confident assertion that Gandhism has now 'reached a crisis' and its 'impending wane . . . signifies the collapse of the reactionary forces and their total alienation from the political movement'. Roy's confidence was rooted in the classic Marxist belief in the inexorable march forward of western civilisation. Gandhism was seen as a temporary obstacle in the path of history, which would soon be swept aside: not by the Raj, but by the masses themselves, once they became conscious of the progressive movement of history. Whatever Gandhi may tell the masses, 'post-British India cannot and will not become pre-British India.' Therefore, 'here lies the contradiction in the orthodox nationalism as expressed of late in the cult of Gandhism. It endeavours to utilise the mass energy for the perpetuation or revival of that heritage of national culture which has been made untenable by the awakening of mass energy. . . . Therefore, Gandhism is bound to be defeated. The signs of the impending defeat are already perceptible, Gandhism will fall victim to its own contradictions.'

Roy admits that under Gandhi's leadership, through the effective use of hartal and non-co-operation, 'for the first time in its history, the Indian national movement entered into the period of active struggle.' Yet, here as elsewhere, Roy remains confined within his Marxist categories. Gandhi's success in 1920, he says, simply revealed that 'the time for mass-action was ripe. Economic

forces, together with other objective causes had created an atmosphere' which propelled Gandhi into power. Roy seeks to drive home his argument against Lenin by stressing the potential role of the Indian proletariat, portraying it as an awakened and thriving revolutionary force.

Roy's mistake cannot be explained wholly in terms of his Marxism. Rather, his Marxism may be explained as part of a desperate search for a new identity. The identity that Roy sought in the critical period of his youth was that of an urbane, cosmopolitan type, entirely at home with western civilisation which was responsible for the subjugation of his own people. The ideology must, in short, serve to liberate him from the sense of inferiority instilled by imperialism, and at the same time arm him in his struggle for the liberation of India. Marxism suited this purpose exactly. His total affirmation of Marxism, therefore, followed immediately after his total rejection of nationalism, and from this there emerged his total and unreasoning denial of Gandhi as a lasting political force in India. In this sense, *India in Transition* offers a clear example of an intellectual determined to reject his tradition. Not only Gandhi, but also extremist leaders like Tilak and Aurobindo, who only five years earlier had commanded Roy's allegiance, are now dismissed with contempt as examples of 'petty-bourgeois humanitarianism'. For the next few years, until his imprisonment in 1931, Roy struggled to affirm himself in his new identity as an international

Marxist revolutionary.

Throughout the 1920s, as Roy rises to the peak of his authority in the Comintern, his view on Gandhi set forth in 1921 is refined and elaborated. A series of excellent articles and pamphlets by Roy and his first wife Evelyn are devoted to Gandhism. In *One year of Non-Co-operation*, for example, the Roys distinguished five 'grave errors' or 'great defects' of Gandhism. The 'most glaring defect' is the absence of an intelligent programme of economic reform. Next, there is Gandhi's 'obstinate and futile' emphasis on social harmony instead of a frank recognition of the real necessity of class conflict. Then, they find a senseless 'intrusion of metaphysics into the realm of politics'. The revolt against the Raj, they emphasise, 'is a question of economics, not metaphysics.' Further, they deplore Gandhi's reactionary view of history, his desire 'to run from the Machine-age back to the Stone Age'. Finally, they criticise the total lack of any revolutionary quality in Gandhi's approach to social change; they see only a 'weak and watery reformism, which shrinks at every turn from the realities of the struggle for freedom.' The entire critique is made with exceptional clarity and forcefulness, and it, together with other writings by the Roys on Gandhi, represents the most incisive communist criticism of him during this period.

For a variety of reasons Roy soon fell out of favour with Moscow, and in December 1929 he was officially expelled from the Communist

International. He reacted by persuading himself that he could seize control of the revolutionary movement in India, and a year later he returned home. He was soon arrested, and he remained a political prisoner until November 1936. These five hard years in jail witnessed a substantial change in Roy's ideology, and this eventually had its effect on his view of Gandhi.

While in prison, Roy, like Gandhi and Nehru, read and wrote voluminously. His three volumes of 'prison diaries' often refer to Gandhi. Indeed, it might be argued that there is no better index to the extent to which Gandhi's presence dominated the Indian scene than the jail reflections of his harshest critic. Roy had inherited from his early nationalist experience and religious outlook a moralist's predilection for seeing the world in categorical terms of right and wrong and he had acquired from his brahmanical spirit a corresponding intellectual tendency to construct the required moral categories. Although Gandhi was never a theorist of this type, he nevertheless shared with Roy a strong taste for moralising and a passionate concern for the ethical well-being of society. Eventually, in his Radical Humanist phase, the morality in Roy will prevail, just as it had always prevailed in Gandhi, and Roy will abandon Marxism because he finds it devoid of ethics. But even as early as the 1930s, a first glimpse of the way in which Roy's moral outlook will eventually erode his Marxism can be seen in his prison diaries. This appears in his reflections on the two concepts of freedom and revolution. Both of these ideas were to become key themes of Radical Humanism, and the basis of their later development is found here, in the diaries.

When Roy wrote about freedom and revolution as an orthodox Marxist in the 1920s, he conceived them as economic categories. Freedom would come with the necessary changes in the economic mode of production, and revolution would be achieved through a violent seizure of power by the Party and the masses. Now, in the 1930s, Roy begins to perceive other dimensions in these two ideas. In regard to freedom, he says that his aim is to 'indicate the way to real spiritual freedom offered by the materialist philosophy'. For the first time in Roy's writings, the supreme goal of 'spiritual freedom' is distinguished from the lesser aims of 'political freedom, economic prosperity and social happiness'. It should be obvious that Roy, a Marxist, is not using the term 'spiritual freedom' here in a metaphysical sense. Yet the term does not derive from Marxism, and it cannot be a mere coincidence that it was often used by both Vivekananda and Aurobindo, who Roy had at one time read closely. The significant change in Roy's concept of revolution is evident in his increasing preference for the term 'Indian Renaissance', and the second volume of the jail diaries emphasises the need for a new philosophical outlook in India.

The above analysis of Roy's prison diaries is not meant to suggest that a reader of these volumes in the 1930s, with no possible knowledge of the way Roy's thought would develop, could have perceived the affinities between Gandhi and Roy which eventually appeared. The fact, however, that these ideas can be found in the diaries in embryonic form indicates that Roy's movement towards a Gandhian way of thinking did not occur overnight. But while it is necessary to appreciate this

degree of continuity in Roy's thought, it is equally important to recognise the sharp contrasts, especially in his view of Gandhi, between the 1930s and the late 1940s. Roy's ruthless attack on Gandhi in the diaries reaches a climax in an essay entitled 'India's Message'. The critique begins with a contemptuous dismissal of Gandhism as a political philosophy. Far from posing a philosophical system, Roy finds in Gandhism only 'a mass of platitudes and hopeless self-contradictions' emerging from 'a conception of morality based upon dogmatic faith.' As such, it is religion, not philosophy, a religion which has become politicised and thus serves as 'the ideological reflex' of India's 'cultural backwardness' and superstition'.

Roy's attack on Gandhi in 1922 was largely content to write Gandhism off as a medieval ideology at the mercy of inexorable economic forces. Now, in the 1930s, Roy concentrates on the moral virtues which Gandhi idealised and refutes them at length. Roy argues that 'admirable virtues' like 'love, goodness, sacrifice, simplicity and absolute non-violence' when preached to the masses by Gandhi only serve to emasculate them. Overthrow of the ruling classes becomes impossible, and the result can only be 'voluntary submission of the masses to the established system of oppression and exploitation.' The worst of Gandhi's tenets is his 'cult of non-violence', the 'central pivot' of his thought, 'holding its quaint dogmas and naïve doctrines together into a comprehensive system of highly reactionary thought.' Far from serving any noble purpose, *ahimsa* in politics only tends to support the forces of violence and exploitation. 'Therefore, those who preach non-violence, [to and for] . . . the

exploited and oppressed masses, are defenders of violence in practice. If Gandhi's non-violence were practised, capitalism would remain entrenched and the juggernaut of vulgar materialism' would emerge triumphant. 'Love, the sentimental counterpart of the cult of non-violence, thus is exposed as mere cant.' Finally, Roy asserts that Gandhi's values are based on 'blind faith' and offer only 'the message of medievalism' which idealises 'the savage living on the tree.' In this way, Gandhi inhibits real progress, which Roy sees in terms of the 'dynamic process' of 'modern civilisation' that 'must go forward.' For Roy, then, the light is in the West: in the forces of rationalism, technology, modern science and 'an economy of abundance.' This latter position was maintained by Roy until the end, and it will always distinguish him sharply from Gandhi.

Soon after his discharge from prison, Roy decided that the sole route to political success in India lay in co-operation with the Congress. This meant a much more conciliatory attitude towards Gandhi. Subhas Bose, had opposed Gandhi in the Congress with some initial success, but Roy, unlike Bose, had neither mass appeal nor a strong regional base of power in Bengal. Therefore, Roy made a brief but futile attempt to rise in the Congress through co-operation with the Gandhians. His article written during this period entitled *Gandhiji, A Critical Appreciation* reflects this spirit of conciliation. He begins with the claim that 'I appreciate Gandhiji's greatness better than any of his ardent admirers.' Gandhi, he says, is a great 'political awakener' of the masses and the highest tribute that one can pay him 'would be a regard and respect Gandhiji as the

embodiment of the primitive, blind, spontaneous spirit of revolt of the Indian masses.' While Roy does mention, incidentally, that Gandhism may in the future come to stifle the revolution rather than promote it, he concludes that at present 'let us admire, respect and properly appreciate him for the great services that he rendered to the struggle for freedom.' This article does not present a sincere statement of Roy's view of Gandhi at this time. As his personal correspondence shows, Roy regarded Gandhi in this period as his arch-enemy, who should be destroyed as quickly as possible.

In 1946, Philip Spratt, a close associate and strong admirer of Roy, wrote an appreciative foreword for Roy's latest series of speeches, which were published under the significant title of *New Orientation*. Spratt reviewed Roy's position on Gandhi and then concluded :

Roy was highly critical of Gandhism from the very start, in 1920, and has never altered his opinion. . . . Yet it is true, I think, that he has failed to make his criticisms intelligible to the Indian reader. His approach to Gandhism seems that of an outsider, an unsympathetic foreigner. He has never tried to get under the skin of the Mahatma or his admirers and see where that extraordinary power comes from.

This remark constitutes a good indication of the nature of Roy's difficulties with Gandhi during a generation of observation and criticism. Yet, precisely at the moment of Spratt's writing, we can now see in retrospect that significant changes were taking place in Roy's thinking about several key theoretical issues: fundamental questions concerning the nature of power and

authority, revolution and history, politics and leadership. And with this fundamental reassessment of basic issues, which Roy called his *New Orientation*, there eventually followed a drastic change in his view of Gandhi.

Several factors influenced Roy's sweeping intellectual reappraisal in 1946. First, Roy's Radical Democratic Party, established in opposition to the Congress, was resoundingly defeated in the Indian general elections held throughout the country in the spring of 1946. If the historical importance for India of these general elections was to demonstrate that the League controlled the Muslims and the Congress the Hindus, then their importance for Roy was to show that his party, given the nation's polarisation, was nowhere in picture. It meant the end of his political career. A second factor which affected his thinking concerned the direction and behaviour of the world communist movement under Stalin. Abroad, the brutal aspects of Stalin's leadership were becoming more and more clear; at home, Roy had long been under attack from the Communist Party of India and it became evident that neither practical nor theoretical reconciliation with communism was possible. Roy expressed the nature of his dilemma in stark terms when he told his followers that they must beware of 'two psychoses' prevalent in India, those of communism and of nationalism. 'Radicalism,' he declared, 'is not camouflaged Communism. We shall have to get over the major nationalist psychosis as well as the minor Communist psychosis, if we believe that we have something new to contribute to the political thought and practice, not only for our country, but of the world as a whole.'

An ideologist abhors nothing more than a moral vacuum, or what Roy liked to deplore as the 'moral and cultural crisis' of our time. For such a vacuum or 'crisis' suggests basic uncertainty over the rightness and wrongness of fundamental moral values, and it is the element of moral certainty which the ideologist seeks above all else. In this respect, Gandhi was no less an ideologist than Roy; but whereas Gandhi had achieved certainty on such matters during his experience in South Africa, Roy underwent a series of such crises, the last and most serious in 1945–46. The final phase of his life, from 1946 to 1953, represents a period of gradual resolution in which Roy delved deeply into his personal resources, trying to form a coherent pattern of thought to meet the demands before him. A close examination of Roy's prolific writings during this period could tell us much about problems relating to the intellectual between tradition and modernity or the relation of ideology to the quest for personal identity. The main purpose of the concluding section of this essay will merely be to suggest how Roy, while trying to purge himself of the 'nationalist psychosis', nevertheless moved far away from Marxism into a way of thinking which is significantly akin to Gandhi.

In August 1946, while Roy, residing in Dehra Dun, was appraising and reappraising his *New Orientation*, and Gandhi was busy commenting on Nature Cure from Sewagram, there occurred in Calcutta the worst catastrophe that British India had known. The Muslim League's 'Direct Action Day' in Calcutta was accompanied by unprecedented communal riots: the great Calcutta killing lasted until 20 August, and in these four tragic

days, 4,000 Hindus and Muslims were slaughtered. The event marks a horrific watershed in the study of the Partition, and its consequences were to have a profound effect upon Roy's view of Gandhi.

Gandhi's reaction to the Calcutta killings, unlike that of Nehru or Jinnah, was to perceive immediately their disastrous social implications and then to act courageously in an attempt to quell the violence. Just as the Jallianwala Bagh massacre twenty-seven years earlier had shocked Gandhi into realising the injustice of the Raj, so the Calcutta killings forced him to see the abyss of violence within his own society. The Calcutta killings were followed by the violence spreading into Noakhali and Bihar. Gandhi moved fast and effectively. The ensuing fifteen months, culminating in his assassination, contain the finest hours of his entire career. During this period, he scored two brilliant triumphs for his method of satyagraha in his Calcutta and Delhi fasts against communal violence. Less dramatic than these, but equally impressive, were his 'walking tours' in Noakhali and his ingenious use of the prayer meeting to restore trust in a series of strife-torn villages. These final acts moved nearly everyone in British-India, Hindus and Muslims alike, to a higher appreciation of Gandhi's greatness. Roy in this case was no exception.

'What changed Roy's attitude [towards Gandhi]', writes Phillip Spratt, 'was Gandhi's campaign against the communal massacres, which came at the time of his own final disillusionment with communist political methods.' Spratt observes the similarity in Roy's and Gandhi's mutual opposition to Partition and the common spirit of their response to

the communal riots. He remarks that on hearing the news of Gandhi's assassination, 'Roy was deeply moved . . . henceforth a new respect for Gandhi showed in his writing.' There was indeed a striking change in Roy's attitude towards Gandhi following the assassination. In two articles of February and April 1948, entitled *The Message of the Martyr* and *Homage to the Martyr*, Roy sets forth for the first time the extent of his ideological agreement with Gandhi. He now discovers that Gandhi's revivalist nationalism was neither the essential nor the greatest element in Gandhi's teaching. 'Essentially, [Gandhi's message] is a moral, humanist, cosmopolitan appeal. . . . The lesson of the martyrdom of the Mahatma is that the nobler core of his message could not be reconciled with the intolerant cult of nationalism, which he also preached. Unfortunately, this contradiction in his ideas and ideals was not realised by the Mahatma until the last days of his life.' In Gandhi's final phase, what Roy repeatedly calls the 'moral and humanist essence of his message' appeared, and it is precisely this which is 'needed by India never so very urgently as today'. Thus, Indians can do justice to their Mahatma when they learn 'to place the moral and humanist core of his teachings above the carnal cult of nationalism and power-politics.'

There are those who argue that Roy's tributes to Gandhi after the assassination were merely sentimental outbursts, entirely inconsistent with the main line of his thought. This argument is mistaken for several reasons. First, when Roy was attacked by some of his readers for calling Gandhi a humanist and cosmopolitan, he admitted that he had written the article while 'deeply

moved' by the crime, 'in an emotional state'. But then he went on to defend his position with vehemence, deploring the 'insensitivity of the logical purists' who attacked him, and refusing categorically to retract even one word of what he had written. Gandhi, he insisted in this later article, 'sincerely wanted politics to be guided by moral considerations', and his 'endeavour to introduce morality into political practice was the positive core of Gandhism.' This made Gandhi, like Roy, a humanist. A second reason why this argument is mistaken has already been seen: glimpses of Roy's movement away from Marx and towards Gandhi can be found as early as in the prison diaries, in the ideological changes of his 'new orientation'. Finally, his far changed attitude takes a permanent form in his later writings; as Philip Spratt remarked, a 'new respect' for Gandhi now infuses his thoughts. This can be clearly seen in an article which Roy wrote on Gandhi a full year after the assassination. In this piece, Roy pays respect to 'the immortality of his [Gandhi's] message' and then sums up the significance of Gandhi's thought in these remarkable words: 'Practice of the precept of purifying politics with truth and non-violence alone will immortalise the memory of the Mahatma. Monuments of mortar and marble will perish, but the light of the sublime message of truth and non-violence will shine forever.' The passage signifies a total departure from Roy's earlier denunciation of Gandhi. Equally important, though, is the relationship which Roy suggests here between the values of truth and non-violence on the one hand, and the goal of purifying politics on the other. For the formation of this conceptual relationship indicates a nexus of ideas in Roy's mind familiar

to Gandhi's way of thinking, especially on the themes of politics and power, and the relation of the means to the ends of action.

'The implication of the doctrine of non-violence,' Roy now believes, 'is the moral dictum that the end does not justify the means. That is the core of the Mahatma's message—which is not compatible with power-politics. The Mahatma wanted to purify politics; that can be done only by raising political practice above the vulgar level of a scramble for power.' This passage represents those ideas which Roy began to develop at a feverish pace in the last five years of his life. In a characteristically Gandhian manner, Roy now wants to purify politics by purging it of both the 'struggle for power' and the party system itself. 'Humanist politics,' he says, must be a moral force; 'it must get out of the struggle for power of the political parties.' Only in these circumstances can political power be transformed into moral authority. Leadership must come not from corrupt party bosses, but rather from 'detached individuals, that is, spiritually free men [who] cannot be corrupted by power . . . it is possible for the individual man to attain spiritual freedom, to be detached and thus to be above corruption. Such men would not hanker after power.' Thus, preoccupation with the corruptibility of political power and the need for establishing a moral basis for leadership was, as Roy acknowledged, at the heart of Gandhi's thought. Moreover, their common preoccupation emerges from a similar set of ideological assumptions about the moral nature of men, and the possibility of creating a perfect social order of spiritually free men. The implications of this way of thinking for politics

are far-reaching: they range from a vision of the ideal political leader as a *karmayogin* type, above the lust for power, occupying a position of pure moral authority, to a theory of social organisation which urges party-less politics, and a highly decentralised system of government. This is a way of thinking which is fraught with paradoxes. There is a strong element of elitism or moral authoritarianism mixed with a marked strain of not only populism but a peculiar variety of Indian anarchism. Yet it is this paradoxical quality which makes the ideology of modern India so fascinating, as well as appealing, in its own way, as the equally paradoxical thought of Calvin, or Rousseau, or Marx.

It should be stressed in conclusion that the perception of a great tradition of ideas in modern India need not detract from the variety of little traditions of thought which co-exist beside it. Nor are the latter necessarily subsumed within the former. There is much in Roy's thought, for example, that is not encompassed by Gandhi. Radical Humanism as set forth by Roy and developed by his associates cannot be fairly presented as merely a variation of Gandhism. For Roy's persistent emphasis on atheistic humanism, rationalism and materialism must distinguish him from Gandhi, and indeed from any other tradition of thought in modern India. The focus of this essay has been on an ideological movement of congruence and not divergence. It is this movement of thought, shared to a notable degree by such apparently divergent figures as Gandhi and Roy, that can be seen as the dominant ideology of modern India.

(Concluded)

Happy Birthday, Simone de Beauvoir

January 9 marks the 110th birth anniversary of Simone de Beauvoir (1908-1986), the acclaimed French feminist theorist. She is most known for her groundbreaking work, “The Second Sex” (1949) along with her book, *Mandarins*, which received France’s highest literary award in 1954.

Her phenomenal work on gender and her formulation, “one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” became the basis for understanding gender as a construct, a core idea for modern-day feminism.

At 21, the French philosopher became the ninth woman, the youngest person ever to obtain the prestigious agrégation in philosophy from the École Normale Supérieure. Some critics have argued that the lack of perspective on race in her work contributed to avoiding discussion about white privilege among second-wave feminists.

De Beauvoir along with her partner, Jean-Paul Sartre, the French philosopher, known for his work on the theory of existentialism, were invited to visit Cuba’s capital Havana to meet the Argentine revolutionary, Che Guevara, and Cuban revolutionary, Fidel Castro after the Cuban revolution.

Sartre who is known to have spent copious amounts of time in conversation with Castro later published a series of journalistic articles entitled “Hurricane over the Sugar” with *France-Soir*, a French publication in 1961.

The articles depicting the Cuban revolutionaries have a poetic quality

to them as they contain beautiful descriptions of the Cuban landscapes. The pieces were translated into many other languages including Spanish for Latin American audiences as “Huracán Sobre El Azúcar.”

In a 1976 interview with John “Tito” Gerassi, a French journalist and scholar, de Beauvoir, elucidated on why a feminist, by default, was a leftist.

“A feminist, whether she calls herself leftist or not, is a leftist by definition. She is struggling for total equality, for the right to be as important, as relevant, as any man. Therefore, embodied in her revolt for sexual equality is the demand for class equality,” de Beauvoir wrote.

“In a society where each person’s experiences are equivalent to any other, you have automatically set up equality, which means economic and political equality and much more. Thus, the sex struggle embodies the class struggle, but the class struggle does not embody the sex struggle.”

Here are a few notable quotations by the renowned wordsmith to help expand your mind, and world.

“I tore myself away from the safe comfort of certainties through my love for truth — and truth rewarded me.”

“Change your life today. Don’t gamble on the future, act now, without delay.”

“One is not born a woman, one becomes one.”

“The main curse of humanity is not ignorance but the refusal to know.”

“One’s life has value so long as one attributes value to the life of others, by means of love, friendship and compassion.”

“Defending the truth is not something one does out of a sense of duty or to allay guilt complexes, but is a reward in itself.”

“I am too intelligent, too demanding, and too resourceful for anyone to be able to take charge of me entirely. No one knows me or loves me completely. I have only myself.”

“That’s what I consider true generosity: You give your all, and yet you always feel as if it costs you nothing.”

Madhu Dandavate

By

B. Vivekanandan

Price: Rs. 20/-

JANATA TRUST

**D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Grant Road (W),
Mumbai 400 007.**

Letter to the Editor

National Museum Institute—Shifting a Tughlakian Misadventure

Sir,

The present Minister of Culture, Dr. Mahesh Sharma, a well-known doctor running a prominent hospital in NOIDA, whose credentials to having a link with the cultural heritage of India are unknown to the public, has bamboozled the bureaucracy and decided to shift the National Museum Institute (a Deemed Central University) from its present location in the world famous National Museum building in New Delhi to his constituency in NOIDA in UP. In some pictures posted on Facebook on 10 January 2018 he is shown inspecting the coming up project of the NMI.

I cannot appreciate the idea of the

National Museum Institute being located in NOIDA while the National Museum is on Janpath, New Delhi. The interrelation between the two institutions can be compared to that between a Medical College and an attached hospital. It is funny that every Minister who matters should try and succeed in pleasing the voters in his constituency by taking such irrational measures as in the instant case. It is like the successive Ministers of Railways from Bihar opening offices of new Railway Zonal Offices or launching new trains in their State. Or for that matter Smt. Mamata Banerji when she was the MR. These worthies should not forget that their loyalty should be to the whole country and whatever they do should be in the

interests of the nation. Petty minds cannot be accepted as national leaders. Will Dr. Mahesh Sharma also toy with the preposterous idea of shifting the National Museum to NOIDA? What happens if the next Minister of Culture belonging to another party decides to shift back the National Museum Institute from NOIDA to New Delhi? After all, we have the precedent of Mohd. Tughlak shifting the capital of India from Delhi to Daulatabad and after facing its disastrous consequences shifting back the capital to Delhi. Does NOIDA with all its record of crime and corruption have a special claim to culture and national heritage?

—Chandra Bhal Tripathi
Email :tripathicb@gmail.com

PMC BANK
PUNJAB & MAHARASHTRA CO-OPERATIVE BANK LIMITED
MULTI-STATE SCHEDULED BANK
ESTD: 1984 We enjoy to serve

PUNJAB & MAHARASHTRA CO-OPERATIVE BANK LIMITED

**Let's embrace the change and move to
PMC Bank Digital Banking**

24x7

Petrol / Diesel **Utility Bills**

Grocery **Shopping**

Booking Tickets **Insurance Premium***

Mobile Banking **Debit Card** **Internet Banking**

**For Offers & Cashback
Visit www.pmcbank.com**

Toll Free No : 1800 223 993
E-mail : helpdesk@pmcbank.com

**Operating from more than 120 locations across Maharashtra,
Delhi, Karnataka, Goa, Gujarat & Madhya Pradesh**

*T & C Apply

Gandhi - A Revolutionary?

A. Raghu Kumar

The very idea that Gandhi was a revolutionary in terms of Marxist description appears, at the outset, to be unthinkable. A preacher and practitioner of non-violence, an eternal seeker of Truth as God, an apostle of peace and an enigmatic opponent of modern civilisation of the Western Model, can he be understood as a revolutionary, on par with and in the great lineage of Marx and Lenin? Any Marxist trained mind would abhor the very thought and may also pooh-poo such propositions as foolish and absurd. Even the Right wing intellectuals may ridicule such hypothesis as the figment of imagination. The sketch of Gandhiji by almost all his friends and foes of his time, and even many later academics has always been that of a sober Gandhi, lovable or detestable as the case may be, but by no means a revolutionary.

Around three decades back, I read Lenin's article - "*Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution*" which took a critical look at Tolstoy in a historical setting, as an admixture of a great artist and a genius "*who has not only drawn incomparable pictures of Russian life but has made first-class contributions to world literature,*" and "*a landlord obsessed with Christ*". "*On the one hand, merciless criticism of capitalist exploitation, exposure of government outrages, the farcical courts and the state administration, and unmasking of the profound contradictions between the growth of wealth and achievements of civilization and*

the growth of poverty, degradation and misery among the working masses. On the other, the crackpot preaching of submission, "resist not evil" with violence. On the one hand, the most sober realism, the tearing away of all and sundry masks; on the other, the preaching of one of the most odious things on earth, namely, religion, the striving to replace officially appointed priests by priests who will serve from moral conviction..." Lenin, with all Tolstoy's credentials and failures, considered Tolstoy to be a mirror of Russian revolution. When I had read this article as a young man, I had wondered why Indian Marxists had failed to make such a critical analysis of Gandhi and his ideas, instead of hurling abuse and ridicule at him. After all, the canvas of Gandhi and his actions were larger in scope, and he was instrumental in pitting himself in a gigantic task of anti-colonial struggle, though with all infirmities and idiosyncrasies, a mass leader par excellence and, a longtime source of guidance for a political outfit consisting of all shades of thinking from extreme left to extreme right.

My search for a different analysis of Mahatma Gandhi, from Marxian point of view, has almost ended with this finding "**Revolutionary Gandhi**", by Pannalal Dasgupta, a revolutionary Marxist of yesteryears, leader of the Revolutionary Communist Party. "**Revolutionary Gandhi**", was originally written in Bengali as "Gandhi Gabeshana". The Bengali manuscript was written by 1954-55, when Pannalal was

undergoing a prison term in the Alipore Central Jail, and was published in 1986. It was translated into English by K.V. Subrahmonyan in the 1990s. Though the English translation was complete by 1999, it could see the light of the day only in 2011, when it was published by Earth Care Books, Kolkata.

"Indian Communists have never tried properly to understand Gandhiji", writes Pannalal. "So, I have tried to acquaint people with the two most important phenomena and ideologies of our times, Gandhism and Leninism. I have explained Gandhism in the light of Marxism and also analysed Marxian thought and action in the Gandhian light",¹ declares the author. The book ends with a warning of Mahatma² "*Note down these words of an old man past the age of three score and ten; in the times to come people will not judge us by any creed we profess or the label we wear or the slogan that we shout but our work, industry, sacrifice, honesty and purity of character. They will want to know what we have actually done for them. But if you don't listen, if taking advantage of the prevailing misery and discontent of the people, you set about to accentuate and exploit it for party ends, it will recoil upon your head and even God will not forgive you for your betrayal of the people*".

Two major objectives of the book are indicated at the end, in "**Epilogue**": "My purpose has been to show Gandhi in a new light to the

Indian leftists and to present the historical Gandhi to the so-called diehard Gandhians”.³“I look upon Gandhi, Marx, Lenin and other men of the age as forming a powerful giant telescope and introscope, if I may use that word to mean an instrument which shows what goes on with in my mind.”

In fact, the work is also a critique of three other works of that time, which the author considers just and necessary to offer, and those three works were Pyarelal’s “Mahatma: Last Phase”, Prof. Hiren Mukherjee’s “Gandhiji” and E.M.S. Namboodripad’s “Mahatma and the Ism”. It also offers critique of the views of Maulana Azad and C.R. Das and also compares the view points of Gandhi and Ravindranath Tagore, and Gandhi and Subhas Chandra Bose. It also deals with various aspects of Gandhism namely, Truth, God, Religion, Ahimsa, Satyagraha, Constructive Programme, Hindu Muslim Unity, Charkha, Cottage industry, Swadeshi, Economics and Ethics, Nai Talim (New Education), Harijans, Adivasis and Workers, Trusteeship etc. In the modern sense of academic writing it may be an omnibus work, but it was the older method of making a comprehensive assessment of philosophy, from various angles, something like a source book for future students to pursue further study in detail on each subject.

For a person to evolve into a revolutionary, he needs to be, first and foremost, a social scientist. Scientific thinking is the basic claim of Marxism. Can Gandhi be described as a scientist or a social scientist? Yes he can, says Pannalal. For a person to be considered as a scientist, he has to be truthful to the

inquiry and shall discard anything which proves the hypothesis false. While returning from England, at the conclusion of the discussions for the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, Gandhiji, talking to some well-known French journalists, made some remarks of profound significance. He said that he had at one time thought **God was Truth**, but had to change his mind, for he knew now, that **Truth was God**. “Truth has to be inquired into again and again constantly, for no truth wears the same face at all times”.⁴“Seldom do we come across an individual with such passion for inquiry”.⁵“Gandhiji would rather be happy to be a beggar holding on to an atom of truth than a king with a mountain of falsehood”. The search for truth is the main aim of science and Pannalal made a serious attempt to establish such a consistent truth seeker as nothing but a scientist in its strictest sense. An inquiry has been made into Gandhi’s method on that premise in the first Chapter of the work “**Gandhi and Truth**”. Gandhi wanted to show us that “a truth, which needed a false prop to stay safe, was not a complete, whole truth. Besides, if truth had to be defended by sheer physical force, deceit, falsehood or secrecy then the act would be no different from our common practice of defending with all our might something which is far from the truth, something which is untrue but is in our self-interest”⁶. Quoting from G.N. Dhawan⁷ where Gandhi said: “Truth rules out prejudice, evasion, secrecy and deception as well as exaggeration, suppression or modification of reality. It requires that we should never be afraid of confessing our mistakes or retracing our steps”. Thus Pannalal Babu bases his whole work on the premise that Gandhiji was foremost a scientist, dispelling the common notion he was only a

mystic, and a person relying on intuition rather than reason.

How does a Marxist understand a spiritual Gandhi? In search of an answer to this most complex question, while assessing Gandhiji as a sufficiently tempered scientist, the author examines the very nature of religion. Religion, he contends, manifests itself in diverse forms in human life. It ranges from the knowledge of good and evil, the question of sacred and the profane, the ideas of justice and injustice, the standards of beauty and ugliness, the inquiry into truth and untruth, right and wrong, to ideas of vice and virtue, spiritual merit and demerit, conduct and behavior, joy and happiness, arts, literature, architecture, and so on. Ideas about all kinds of social behavior have evolved under the shadow of religion. “Out of a variety of spiritual practitioners, it seems that Gandhiji’s was the only known instance of a spiritual aspirant wanting to see God face to face through politics and service to the country”. “The call of the Gita took Sri Aurobindo away from politics and sent him into total seclusion, and the same Gita inspired revolutionaries in India to wage armed struggle. And it is the Gita that Gandhiji called the non-violent yoga of action and adopted it as his path towards the realization of God...”.⁸Gandhiji has drawn much inspiration from the concept of “*Sthitaprajna*” or “abidance in the self”, which can be considered as a more secular religious understanding.

When once Mr. Montagu asked Gandhi, “How have you, a social reformer, found your way into this crowd?”, Gandhi replied: “I could not be leading a religious life unless I identified myself with the whole of

mankind, and I would not do so unless I took part in politics. The whole gamut of man's activities today constitutes an indivisible whole. You cannot divide social, economic, political and purely religious work into water-tight compartments. I do not know any religion apart from human activities, which they would otherwise lack, reducing life into an image of 'sound and fury' signifying nothing"⁹.

"His prayer meetings were more in the nature of political meetings...." and "during those days of communal frenzy, none but Gandhiji took any worthwhile steps to extinguish the flames". "Gandhiji interacted with atheists as well. People of all schools of thought went to him and held dialogue with him"¹⁰. The author recalls one such conversation of Gandhi with Goparaju Ramachandra Rao (Gora), which was later published by Gora as "An Atheist with Gandhi" (Navajivan Press). In one of such conversations Bapu replied to Gora, "We are seekers after truth. We change whenever we find ourselves in the wrong side.... There is no harm as long as you are not fanatical. Whether you are in the right, I am in the right, results will prove. Then I may go your way or you may come in my way; or both of us may go a third way..."¹¹. Thus the author contends that the ideas of Gandhi on religion are truly secular, and contrary to the many popular views on religion, and offer new insights into it.

On non-violence "Gandhiji said that he had an innate and natural attraction for truth from his early years, **Ahimsa or non-violence** was not an innate trait for him". But according to Pannalal, Gandhi himself was unable to formulate a clear definition of non-violence, but

we may try and formulate his ideas by letting the nature of his non-violence emerge from his work and writings¹². As a Marxist, the author considers that "history is as if a chronicle of wars, civil wars, class wars, and similar unnatural events, and it does not care to note the natural, peaceful periods of human life¹³. However, he notes that "we cannot conclude that there is no area of peace and love in the world, in human society and in the lives of families, simply because history is reticent about man's peace and eloquent about his conflicts". Gandhiji's non-violence is not just absence of killing. Gandhi recognized that in the progress of nations, both evolution and revolution have their own role. He said: "Nations have progressed both by evolution and revolution. The one is as necessary as the other." During a fast in 1932 Gandhi is said to have noted "those who have to bring about a radical change in human conditions and surroundings cannot do it except by raising a ferment in society. There are only two methods of doing this – violent and non-violent". Thus, Gandhiji, also anticipated revolutionary changes, but the means of achieving the same for him was only non-violent. His revolutionary fervor was not a bit less intense than that of the votaries of armed revolution, though their paths and means were different¹⁴. "It was manly enough to defend one's property, honour or religion at the point of the sword. It was manlier and nobler to defend them without seeking to injure the wrong-doers. But it was unmanly, unnatural and dishonorable to forsake the post of duty, and in order to save their own skin to leave property, honour and religion to the mercy of wrong-doers", Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of Oct 15, 1925¹⁵. "It is better to be

violent, if there is violence in our breasts, than to put on the cloak of non-violence to cover impotence. There is hope for violent man to become non-violent; there is no such hope for the impotent"¹⁶.

Concluding the examination of Gandhi's perplexing ideas on non-violence, the author contends that "in brief, the application of non-violence and satyagraha in each case had not been easy and smooth, and in his (Gandhiji's) experiments with and exploration of this path, Gandhiji had to keep probing and questioning himself until his final days. He kept asking himself time and again at Naokhali whether at all the non-violence of the brave was possible. His quest was incomplete, for on the last lap of his life's journey, he could not make the country strong through the non-violence of the brave..."¹⁷.

While evaluating the concept of satyagraha and its execution in practical field, the author declares his objective of explaining Gandhi: "Anybody who wants to understand Gandhiji will have to reckon with two facts. First, Gandhiji's historical role, and second his personal and independent ideology. Gandhiji was not merely the embodiment of non-violence; he also symbolized the national struggle against imperialism. He was the representative of India in a special era, and he also had a special responsibility with regard to non-violence. In his historical role he provided leadership to the nation and his endeavour was to guide history along a certain direction..."¹⁸. While Gandhi was more inclined to invoke non-violence and satyagraha as his modes of struggle, he was never willing to be included among the pacifists, even though many pacifists tried to persuade him to lend his name

to their movement. He knew that peace lovers and pacifists could never fulfill people's desire for freedom and emancipation. He, therefore, wanted a war, but one which would be free from violence, horror, cruelty and cowardice of wars. The war of Gandhi was called 'satyagraha'¹⁹. "Non-cooperation is not a passive state but it is an intensely active state – more active than physical resistance. Passive resistance is a misnomer."²⁰

The need for arms is not an eternal truth. What is eternal is the need for class struggle. It is not an unchangeable belief of Marxism-Leninism that class struggle will finally take place only by recourse to arms in all countries and at all times. The recourse to arms would depend on the actual conditions, and Lenin mentioned this too. It has been accepted at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party also that it is possible to usher in socialism in many countries even without the use of arms and without a civil war and that all efforts should be aimed in that direction.²¹ There is no fundamental contradiction between the spirit behind Lenin's views and Gandhiji's non-violent struggle. Pannalal while accepting the dictum of Mao Tse-tung that revolution flows through the barrel of the gun, contends that this gun-toting is not valid for all countries and for all times. Statements like Mao's may make one think that revolution and the gun are interdependent and necessary, that one is the concomitant of the other. Such tall talk, according to him, can lead to an anti-social ideology, giving a boost to the morale of hoodlums. Struggle is certainly necessary, he accepts, but to assert that there can be no struggle without guns should be shunned.²²

Nirmal Bose²³ wrote: "It is just here that the method of satyagraha steps in as a possible and effective substitute for war. It does not propose to do away with conflicts; but it raises the quality of those very conflicts by bringing into operation a spirit of love and a sense of human brotherhood. **Satyagraha is not a substitute for war, it is war itself**, without of course many of its ugly features and guided by a purpose nobler than we associate with destruction. It is an intensely heroic and chivalrous form of war" (emphasis supplied). Thus the author states that the need for arms is not an eternal truth, but what is eternal is the need for class struggle. It is not an unchangeable belief of Marxism – Leninism that class struggles will finally take place only by recourse to arms in all countries and at all times.

Gandhi's non-violence, according to Pannalal Babu, is not merely a political tool or an ad hoc strategy. This non-violence is at the same time, the goal, the path and the provision for the path. It endows the individual's life with wholeness and aims at the molding of a complete human being. In its eyes, man is not merely a means but an end in himself. This non-violence is not a mere political tool; it is the sustainer of man, it is man's life principle, and hence the formation of man's character is its special primary focus. Hence, the non-violent man's democratic politics can prove to be as tremendously different – from the constitutional politics of the opportunistic, fortune-hunting man – as heaven is different from hell.²⁴

Two of the best topics well articulated in this work have been – "Constructive Programme" and "Economics and Ethics". The

leftists' belief that the masses cannot be rallied and organized except through struggles is a mere illusion, claims the author after examining the constructive programme of Gandhi. As a result of this belief that people can be organized only through struggles, says Pannalal, they saw Gandhi's many-sided constructive programme as nothing more than a reformist movement. Gandhiji was even more realistic and pragmatic than the Marxists in the field of action. He showed in no small measure the importance of the economic basis of political action, whereas the leftists and various Marxist parties believed in educating the masses in politics solely through political means. The constructive programme of Gandhiji, he says, has an economic foundation. It was the sum total of the constructive work which finally gave sustenance and strength to the freedom movement. According to Pannalal, "Innumerable workers and promising young men have wasted their ideals, dreams and lives in the so-called revolutionary parties" and he blames for this miserable state of affairs, more specifically in Bengal, the ultra-leftist politics which is devoid of roots, mass contact and constructive action.²⁵ However, the author also notes with all sincerity that "constructive programme could not awaken or enthuse political workers in a big way" and "people could not adequately appreciate the value of Gandhiji's contribution in this respect". In his analysis constructive work is not something dazzling and there is very little excitement in it to attract younger persons.

It is in the same breath, he considers the Charkha, Cottage Industry and Swadeshi. Quoting from N.K. Bose,²⁶ where Gandhiji said: "You cannot build non-violence

on factory civilization, but it can be built on self-contained villages, even Hitler was so mired, he cannot devastate seven hundred thousand non-violent villages. He would himself become non-violent in the process. Rural economy as I have conceived it eschews exploitation altogether and exploitation is the essence of violence. You have therefore to be rural minded before you can be non-violent.” The author examines the idea of charkha and cottage industry and says harmony and progress are possible only through the reconciliation and synthesis of mutually opposite trends. Marx and Engels, according to him, have exposed the face of the machine-culture and industrialization of the 19th century in all its ugliness, and Gandhi has showed the miserable condition of the human habitations, both India and abroad, which resulted from the centralized industrialization of the capitalist kind.²⁷ The specific understanding of Gandhiji in respect of these ideas has been that he too visualized electricity, ship-building, iron works, machine-making, and the like side by side with village handicrafts. The traditional Europe economist considers industrial cities to be dependent upon villages for supplies whereas Gandhiji wanted to reverse the process, i.e., the cities to be supply sources for villages. The author suggests that socialism would be richer in many respects by accepting Gandhiji, and Gandhism too would enrich itself by absorbing socialism. Cooperation would benefit both ideals as conflict can harm both.²⁸

One of the major considerations of the author has been that Gandhiji attempted to reconcile economics and ethics. One of the main charges leveled by economists at Gandhiji is that he did not accept the

independence of economic laws and created confusion by bringing ethics into economics. “Marx pointed out this blind operation of economic laws within capitalism and said that so long as capitalism survived, society could not exercise any direct and conscious control over its economics, whereas in socialism, economics could be regulated consciously and in a planned manner. Even under socialism, the objective laws and forces of economics continue to operate and remain independent but the internal anarchy is resolved and they become free from any conflict with the conscious endeavors of man”.²⁹ Gandhi believed in the importance of objective and scientific forces but even greater for him were also the ideas of wisdom and dharma. In his view, morality and religion were integral parts of everyday life. In a lecture before Muir Central College of Economic Society of Allahabad, he said: “I venture to think that the scriptures of the world are far safer and sounder treatises on the laws of economics than many of the modern text books”.³⁰ At the same time, it is not that there is no ethical content in Marx and Engels economic theories. According to Pannalal, with the end of capitalism and imperialism and, with the advent of socialism and the exploitation-free society, what Gandhi said about morality and conscience will no longer seem merely imaginative, utopian and impractical. Ethics will therefore rapidly permeate economics. Hence, though Gandhi’s ethical and moral demands might sound unrealistic, they do not prove to be so in practice in socialist systems.

Another important topic of serious concern for Gandhi has always been “Hind-Muslim Unity”. In fact Gandhi’s concepts of religion and

inter-religious faith have been highly advanced by his time and age; and even today we may need to appreciate this area with fresh evidence of increasing religious conflicts. By providing leadership to the Khilafat Movement, the Indian firmament had been filled with the cry of “Hindu-Muslim bhai bhai”. India, oppressed and torn into pieces on religious lines for long, at last found in Gandhiji, a new method of uniting society. However, this kind of unity did not last long. The moment Gandhiji called off the non-co-operation movement in the wake of the Chauri Chaura episode in 1922, the whole country suffered a shock. With the rise of Kamal Pasha in Turkey, the Khilafat Movement lost its meaning and significance. In the meanwhile, the Muslims of India began to drift away from the national struggle. The distinction between nationalist Muslims on the one hand and those belonging to the pro-government Muslim League on the other was becoming sharper. The views of Sir Syed Ahmed began to exercise a strong influence over the Muslims, and the educated Muslim elite was slowly drifting away from casting its lot with Gandhi, into a policy of cooperation with the British. On the whole, the Muslims at no time thereafter accepted Gandhiji as their own. In concluding the debate over Hindu-Muslim Unity, and Gandhiji’s contribution to it, the author says that although there was a conservative element in Gandhiji, yet we have seen that he could move with the times and that, in many cases, he proved himself to be more radical than the revolutionaries and that he had the capacity to assess the historical value of every action and accordingly to adopt or reject it.

Nai Talim (new education) of Gandhian pedagogy, much neglected

by many Gandhian scholars, has occupied a significant stage in the discussion of Pannalal Babu. The first and the foremost observation of the author has been that Gandhiji liberated manual labour from its dismal associations; more specifically in his scheme of proper education. “Trace the source of every coin that finds its way into your pocket, and you will realize the truth of what I write,” Gandhi said.³¹ Gandhiji named his new method of education through manual labour “*Nai Talim*”. Judging by results the contribution of the ‘groves of academia’ (the system introduced by the British) to our enlightenment is highly disappointing, not in one but in most aspects of life. The knowledge that they impart in various fields of education has been very shallow and has had no enduring impact on the lives of people. Learning has lost its intimate contract with real life and work. “If the farmer’s son is sent to school, he not only unlearns cultivation, but also starts looking down upon agriculture and neglects his parents”.³² The reason for this state of affairs is that education lacks an economic basis and a social significance. Gandhiji showed us, according to the writer, that education should be provided through some kind of physical work and behind such a system of education lies a far-reaching philosophical rationale. Gandhiji said: “Our education has got to be revolutionized. The brain must be educated through the hand...”³³ (Harijan Feb 18, 1939). While quoting extensively from Marx, Engels, Sydney and Beatrice Webb, Emerson, etc. the author contends that: We can find in human history fragments and hints which bear out the truth of this kind of thinking. It was Gandhiji, however, who gave in

concrete shape, experimented with it in his life and endeavoured to introduce it into the whole country.

Another great contribution of this work has been providing answers to certain contentious issues between Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore and, Gandhi and Subhash Bose. Both these areas can be said to be highly illuminating though brief. All Indians whose world-view was influenced by western culture and education – socialists, communists and many other groups of people voiced a uniform objection to Gandhi that he was a revivalist. They also objected to his models of constructive programme, satyagraha, non-cooperation, and swadeshi etc., as contrary to the universal goals of civilization and cooperation. Gandhi faced these attacks from almost all ‘progressives’. Tagore³⁴ considered ‘charkha’ movement would only make ‘coolies’ out of the people and it was but a proof of Gandhiji’s aversion to science. “People would go on plodding at the charkha, and not progress in human knowledge. Science has emancipated innumerable sudras from their sudra status”. Gandhiji³⁵ replied emphatically to the charge of Tagore: “... to a people famishing and idle, the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food as wages. God created man to work for his food and said that those who ate without work were thieves....”.

(To be concluded)

¹P. ix, Forward to the Bengali First Edition, Revolutionary Gandhi, Pannalal Dasgupta, Earth Care Books, Kolkata, 2011, Translated by K. V.

Subrahmonyan

² P 477 quoted from Pyarelal’s Last Phase, Vol.II p.255

³P. 443, *ibid*

⁴P.4, *ibid*

⁵P.5 *ibid*

⁶P.6 *ibid*

⁷P.12., from G.N.Dhawan, the Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, p.55

⁸p.15 *ibid*

⁹p.17-18, quoted from Pyarelal’s Last Phase

¹⁰p.26-27 *ibid*

¹¹p.33 *ibid*

¹²pp.38-39 *ibid*

¹³P.40 *ibid*

¹⁴p.44 *ibid*

¹⁵p.57 *ibid*

¹⁶p.57 *ibid*, from Harijan, 21st Oct, 1939

¹⁷p.78 *ibid*

¹⁸p.80 *ibid*

¹⁹pp.92-93 *ibid*

²⁰p.96 from Young India, 25th Aug 1920

²¹p.97 *ibid*

²²p.98 *ibid*

²³p.93 from Nirmal Bose, Studies in Gandhism, p-120

²⁴p.112 *ibid*

²⁵p.155 *ibid*

²⁶p. 197 *ibid*, from N.K.Bose who quoted from Harijan, 4th Nov, 1939

²⁷p.201 *ibid*

²⁸p.221 *ibid*

²⁹pp.223-224 *ibid*

³⁰p.227 *ibid*

³¹p.255 *ibid*

³²p.257 *ibid*

³³Harijan 18th Feb, 1939

³⁴p.271, *ibid* from Rabindranath Tagore’s Rachanavali, Vihwabharati Edition vol.24, pp.405-06

³⁵p.275 *ibid* from Great Sentinel, Young India, 13th Oct, 1921 quoted in Mahatma Gandhi by Romain Rolland, P.111



GANNON DUNKERLEY & CO., LTD.

An infrastructure company established since 1924

REGD. OFFICE :

*New Excelsior Building, (3rd Floor),
A.K. Nayak Marg, Fort, Mumbai 400001.
Tel. : 022 2205 1231 Fax : 022-2205 1232*

Office : Ahmedabad, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Mumbai & New Delhi