Sam Dolgoff
Gandhi and Indian Freedom
April 1931

Road to Freedom, April 1931, vol. 7 #8, p. 6
By Sam Dolgoff [and *Road to Freedom* Editor]

usa.anarchistlibraries.net

Gandhi and Indian Freedom

Sam Dolgoff

April 1931

The truce reached between the Viceroy of India and Gandhi, in which the latter agreed not to press the charges against the police for the slaughter of thousands of India's bravest spirits, to call off the boycott against British commodities and to attempt to reach an agreement with the enemies of Indian freedom, is all that might be expected of one whose behavior is actuated by the principle of non-resistance to violence.

Whatever and whenever any attempt was made on the part of the masses to swerve from this ruinous policy, it was Gandhi who stemmed the rising tide of open revolt.

The Mahatma is not a revolutionist. He is a religious leader, and as such is worshipped as a saint by the people of India and held in great esteem by the liberal clergy all over the world. This is the reason for his great popularity in India and elsewhere. Inasmuch as he helps keep alive the spirit of reaction by encouraging religious superstitions he is working hand in hand with those whose security depends upon the subjugation of the masses, that is to say, the ruling class of India.

The Nationalist Movement in India and the policy of its leaders is strongly influenced by the democracies of the West. The failure

of democracy is recognized by an ever increasing number of intelligent people, yet Gandhi persists in praising it as an ideal worthy of slavery and degradation into which they have fallen.

We can have nothing in common with such a movement. It makes no difference to us if the Indian masses are exploited by the British or native masters. We reject the religious mysticism which has been the one great drawback to the cause of freedom in India.

Not non-resistance to violence; not obedience and humility, but an aggressive militant revolutionary spirit aimed at the abolition of the political state and the substitution of full and complete liberty should be the bedrock of a truly revolutionary movement. This spirit Gandhi has not fostered nor encouraged. The mixture of religious mysticism with diplomacy, interspersed with the discredited ideology of the West cannot take the place· of a really militant Anarchist policy.

[Our friend forgets the lessons of Sepoy and Amritsar. The Indians haven't! England has an armed force of more than one hundred and fifty thousand in India and she maintains strategic control over a water supply with which she can flood the valleys where most of the villages are located. The Indian population is unarmed, has no military training and is even prohibited vernacular schools. England's policy in India is to keep the people poor, ignorant and demoralized. The Indians know there is no honor among any of the people of the West and that is why they employ a subtler strategy than the Occidental mind is likely to perceive at first glance. Gandhi has adopted passive resistance, not because he is stupid, but because he is wise. He is a religious ascetic, it is true, and he has never posed as a revolutionist, but he is not the superstitious zealot our comrade seems to think he is for he has broken caste and his religion welcomes atheists as well as believers, something none of our own have yet deigned to do. All semblance of faith in Western nations was shattered after the debacle of Versailles. Gandhi has so far proven himself incorruptible and he has the wholehearted

support of a vast section of the Indian population, including many Moslems.

The Swaraj Party is committed to Independence, and so is Gandhi. He will doubtless pursue the policy of passive resistance till England is driven to violence and then he will step aside, but the struggle will go on. Gandhi is undoubtedly the greatest living political strategist and when he matched wits with Lord Irwin he gained far more than he gave. The breaking of the salt monopoly and the release of fourteen thousand politicals is no small feat. The pressing of the case against officers would have netted what such investigations usually produce – a whitewash; the calling off of the boycott is a paper victory for the Government for the boycott will go on just the same – the natives will see to that. Enough for Gandhi. His goal is a National Government. He interests us only from the human point of view. He happens to be leader today – tomorrow someone else will take his place. As anarchists, we want to see India free, not only from the British yoke but also from the yoke of the Native Princes and the politicians who have not yet come into power. We would wish to see the Indian people fighting for the abolition of all government, but in the meanwhile, we can applaud the splendid struggle they have fought thus far. Neither the Nationalists nor Gandhi ever aspired to an anarchist revolt, much as we might hope they had, nevertheless, they are making India a mighty uncomfortable place for an Englishman to live and if he could see the handwriting on the wall, he would not be long in sailing for home before all Asia rises up in a war of annihilation and stains the sea a crimson hue with the blood of foreign invaders. Ed.]

Road to Freedom, April 1931, vol. 7 #8, p. 6