

**A SUMMARY OF MATERIALS IN THE AICC FILES AND  
THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA'S POLITICAL INTELLI-  
GENCE FILES, ON THE INDIVIDUAL SATYAGRAHA  
MOVEMENT BY CONGRESSMEN IN ASSAM IN 1940-41**

**Bhupen Qanungo**

Why should any student of history in 1987 seek to prepare a full and documented Roll of Honour of the Gandhian Congressmen in Assam who, in 1940-41, suffered imprisonment, fine, and other kinds of punishment, in course of a Satyagraha movement? To this question, one may say in reply that, besides satisfying in a reasonable manner one's curiosity about the available information relating the names and numbers of Gandhian Satyagrahis in Assam of this period, such a Roll of Honour would help one to appreciate how pervading was the respect, among the Congressmen in Assam, for moral earnestness in Gandhian terms in politics, in 1940-41, the years immediately preceding 1942, the year of the Quit India Resolution and the Quit India disturbances.

**I**

To our knowledge, only one scholar, Dr. V. Venkata Rao, a Professor Emeritus of the University of Gauhati, has done very considerable work on the Satyagraha of 1940-41 in Assam on the basis of the All-India Congress Committee Papers, Assam Government papers and legislative proceedings, Assam Police departmental files on nationalists, and material found in the National Archives, New Delhi. This part of Dr. Rao's work, we were privileged to consult in 1986, when it was in typed form of his MSS of a book on the Freedom Movement

in Assam. In the MSS pages, Dr. Rao kindly gave us to consult, we found no footnotes, citations of documents and other sources used by him. But from a perusal of his MSS, we were convinced that Dr. Rao had used with his mature judgement assorted dependable information relating to the Satyagraha of 1940-41.

We may mention here, in brief, some of the essential information we found in the pages 88 to 108 of Dr. Rao's MSS of a part of his work "Freedom Movement in Assam". For this would help the reader to appreciate the amount of patient research Dr. Rao had put in writing his account of the Satyagraha of 1940-41 in Assam. We were prompted by Dr. Rao's work to look into some papers of the AICC and the Government of India relating to this subject.

In Dr. Rao's MSS, we read that as many as 23, out of 26 members of the Assam Congress Legislative party of the Brahmaputra Valley, were enrolled as pledged satyagrahis. Of this list, only 20 names were approved by Gandhiji. Gandhiji did not select, in the Satyagraha of 1940-41, persons who were not in good health, or whom Gandhiji did not wish, for some other special reason, to offer satyagraha. Self-appointed satyagrahis had no role in 1940-41, either in the eyes of Gandhiji who was guiding the movement on behalf of the Congress, or of the magistrates and police enforcing the Defence of India Rules of 1939 which made "prejudicial speech" punishable by imprisonment and fines to a severe extent after summary trial. Independence was not the aim or demand of the Satyagraha movement of 1940-41; its objective was very narrow but very elevating: the right to preach in public against participation in war in the abstract, or against the particular war in which India was involved "without India's consent" in 1939.

To return to Dr. Rao's findings. Out of the eight AICC members from Assam, six were selected for offering satyagraha in the first list. The second list approved by Gandhiji contained as many as 775 names who were members of the Assam PCC and the Assam DCCs. With this, Assam's contribution to the All-India list was expected to be 800, in the number of satyagrahis selected. Of this total for Assam, Dr. Rao notes that there were a number of Congress Muslims, Harijans and tribal people of Assam. As many as 22 were women satyagrahis. "One of the interesting items in this list", observed Dr. Rao, "was that of a person with two of his three wives was permitted to offer satyagraha. His third would look after the children and household affairs." Among those who offered satyagraha in the first batch, there were 23 Congress MLAs of the Brahmaputra Valley and six AICC members from Assam. Dr. Rao noted that up to 27 January 1941, in the Assam Valley 166 Congress members had offered satyagraha; of them 105 were convicted. Dr. Rao mentions that four persons: Hemchandra Barua, Sonaram Dutta, Kuladhar Chalia, and Sarveswar Barua, were exempted by Gandhiji from offering satyagraha. Hemchandra Barua was not physically fit for offering satyagraha; he was directed by Gandhiji to take over the Presidentship of the Assam PCC during the absence of Maulavi Tayebulla, who was selected for offering satyagraha. Instances of disciplinary action taken by the PCC during the Satyagraha movement have been noted by Dr. Rao. Jogesh Chandra Gohain was suspended from his office of the President of the Dibrugarh District Congress Committee, for not offering satyagraha after having signed the Satyagraha Pledge. In his account of the Satyagraha Movement in Assam in 1940-41, Dr. Rao mentions the name of about 69 satyagrahis. Many of them suffered from ill-health, after offering satyagraha and completing the sentence of imprisonment; few were in a position to offer satyagraha for a second or third time, required under the rules

for satyagrahis in 1940-41. The wealth of detailed information collected by Dr. Rao on this subject was probably found by him in the Assam PCC Papers which we have not been able to consult till now.

## II

We may now proceed to state in brief what additional or complementary information relating to the Satyagraha in Assam in 1940-41, we could find in the files of papers of 1940-41 of the All-India Congress Committee now preserved in the Nehru Memorial Museum Library, New Delhi.

Regarding organizational information, the Assam PCC office failed to comply with the AICC General Secretary's request made after the Ramgarh Congress for a complete statement of the existing condition and structure of the Congress organization under the Assam PCC. Acharya Kripalani, the AICC General Secretary was informed that the Assam PCC had under them 13 District Congress Committees; these were Gauhati, Barpeta, Dhubri, Goalpara, Mangaldoi (P.O. Tangla), Tejpur, North Lakhimpur, Dibrugarh, Jorhat, Sibsagar, Golaghat, Shillong, and Nowgong. The Assam PCC hoped that Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (who had been elected Congress President in February 1940, and inaugurated President of the 53rd Annual Session of the Indian National Congress held at Ramgarh in Bihar in March 1940) would try to redress "a legitimate grievance" of the Congressmen in Assam regarding the composition of the Congress Working Committee. In a letter of no date addressed to the General Secretary of the AICC, Sri Siddarth Sarma, the General Secretary of the Assam PCC, wrote: "During the last three years the Assam PCC has been pressing the claim of Assam to take a member from Assam in the Working Committee of the AICC to present the peculiar and special problems of Assam before the Working Committee of the AICC." Further, the Assam PCC felt that at least one of the members

of the Working Committee of the Assam PCC, "the President Maulavi Tayyebulla or Sree Gopinath Bordoloi ex-premier, Assam, or one of its ex-Presidents" should be allowed to participate in the deliberations of the Working Committee of the AICC on the political and other problems of the country at this period. In reply to this, Acharya Kripalani explained his own position in one sentence, in a letter dated 12 June 1940, regarding Sri Siddarth Sarma's request and Assam's grievance regarding the composition of the Working Committee of the AICC: "The General Secretary, AICC, neither appoints nor invites members of the Congress Working Committee."<sup>2</sup>

Regarding groupism in the Congress organizations in Assam, the Assam PCC reported that there was no noticeable group rivalry among the Congressmen in Assam. There was a bunch of Forward Bloc-men which "nobody takes seriously."<sup>3</sup> It may be mentioned here that, in the Congress Presidential Election of February 1940, Maulana Azad got 45 votes, and the other candidate M.N. Roy, no more than three votes, from Assam.<sup>4</sup>

Some information about the volunteer organizations in Assam appeared in the Interim Report on Volunteer Organization in the Congress Provinces, prepared by R.S. Pandit and submitted to the President, AICC, dated Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, 15 June 1940. This report said that in Assam there was no official volunteer organization under the Congress PCC. Attempts were however, being made since 1932 to organize a proper Congress Volunteer Organization in Assam on the model of the Hindustan Seva Dal. By June 1940, the Assam Congress had about 40 trained and about 160 semi-trained volunteers. About 500 persons had temporarily worked as Congress volunteers for the purposes of conferences.<sup>5</sup>

A glance at the Satyagraha Pledge of 1940 and the Circular letters relating to satyagraha preparations issued by the AICC General Secretary to the PCCs in 1940 would convince one that for this satyagraha movement starting in 1940, Mahatma Gandhi did not propose to enlist as pledged Satyagrahis all who were Congress members. Only pledged Satyagrahis could be considered for selection as Active Satyagrahis by Gandhiji on the recommendation of the PCC in which the Congressmen lived or worked. Under the Pledge of 1940, no one who had not completed 18 years of age could be a satyagrahi. Later, in 1941, the age requirement was raised by three years, obviously to exclude even senior students from signing the Pledge. A satyagrahi in 1940-41 had to be a habitual wearer of Khadi and a regular spinner with the 'charkha'. He had to be active in the Gandhian, or the Congress, Constructive Work Programme, engaged in the promotion of communal harmony, the removal of untouchability, spinning, and village industries. He had to declare; in the Pledge form, "I believe fully in the Congress policy of non-violence for the attainment of Purna Swaraj as also the possibility of defending India non-violently in terms of the Bombay Resolution". He was expected to be in good health and a person whose imprisonment was not likely to cause financial distress to his family. Training programmes in Satyagrahi Shibir (Camp) were designed to make the prospective satyagrahis fit to bear the harsh physical and mental suffering usually the lot of prisoners in jail. Gandhiji was strict on the point of physical fitness of the satyagrahis in 1940-41. Provisional lists of satyagrahis were prepared and scrutinised by the PCCs, before the lists were sent to Gandhiji at Wardha for approval. Only Pledged Satyagrahis could be considered for selection; other Congressmen who were passive satyagrahis and Congress sympathisers were requested to do nothing which could interfere with Satyagraha Movement of 1940-41. Only the selected Satyagrahi, individually, or in a small group of few selected Satyagrahis if

so permitted, would defy only those provisions of the Defence of India Rules of 1939 which curbed freedom of speech and made "prejudicial speech" against the Government's war-effort punishable by imprisonment and fine, after a summary trial, by a magistrate. The defiance of the DIR by a selected satyagrahi would be in nothing more than in raising in public slogans against participation by Indians in war, any war, or the particular war then raging in Europe since 1939 and in which India was involved without "India's consent". A satyagrahi could make a non-violent speech or raise anti-war slogans in public, only after notifying in advance in writing, to the local authorities responsible for law and order in the area of his or her programme, the intention, time, and place of offering satyagraha, of defying the DIR, by public assertion of one's moral right to the freedom of non-violent speech, which Gandhiji regarded as the essence of freedom. Approved satyagrahis who would fail to offer satyagraha by the approved date, would be removed by the Provincial Satyagraha Committee from the list of active satyagrahis. Released satyagrahis were expected to re-offer satyagraha again and again, without undue delay in this matter. For exemption from re-offering satyagraha after release from jail, or on not being arrested by the police, an active satyagrahi had to apply through the PCC to Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhiji hedged in the Satyagraha of 1940-41 with so many restrictions that the movement could never get out of control. Gandhiji himself did not choose to offer satyagraha himself in 1940-41, and the Government of India wisely allowed him to remain outside the jail to keep the movement disciplined. It was the most excellently disciplined satyagraha ever conducted by Gandhiji on behalf of the Congress.

Regarding organizational preparation for satyagraha in Assam, we find that, in his Circular dated 4 May 1940, it was noted by the General Secretary,

AICC, that a seven-day programme of work in a Camp for publicity, Khadi propagation, and training of volunteers, had been decided upon by the Assam PCC for members of Working Committee of the PCC. The Working Committee of the Assam PCC had converted itself into the Satyagraha Committee for Assam. Most of the PCC members had signed the Satyagraha Pledge.

Regarding the progress of Satyagraha in Assam in the period from 11 December 1940 to about 8 February 1941, one finds little material, and nothing for the following months in 1941, in the AICC Papers of 1940-41. This paucity of information in the AICC General Secretary's office regarding the progress of this satyagraha movement in areas under the Assam PCC was probably because the PCC office was unable to function regularly or properly after the PCC leaders had courted imprisonment by offering satyagraha. There was strict censorship of the press, in the period from October 1940 to about March 1941, in regard to satyagraha news. The AICC office was aware that full and entirely dependable information regarding the movement was hard to obtain, in this period. It was also known that the police intercepted letters exchanged between political leaders and workers.

We are putting below, in a table, the information received by the AICC office in Allahabad from the PCC Office in Gauhati in the period from 11 December 1940 to 31 January 1941.

**PCC, Assam, Period 11 Dec.1940 to 31 Jan.1941**

Total number of persons who offered satyagraha	- 214
--	-------

Number of women who offered satyagraha	- 17
--	------

Total number of convictions	-	121
Number of women convicted	-	7
Number of satyagrahis under trial	-	7
Total number arrested and let off	-	22
Number of satyagrahi prisoners in "A" Division	-	5
Number of prisoners placed in the "B" Division	-	19
Number of prisoners placed in the "C" Division	-	103
Range of sentences of imprisonment:		One day
Simple Imprisonment	to	one year
Rigorous Imprisonment		Rigorous
Range of fines imposed on satyagrahis	-	Rs.25 to Rs.200
Total amount of fines imposed on satyagrahis	-	Rs.2,395

It was noted that in the matter of fines imposed on the satyagrahis in this period, Tejpur District topped the list with Rs. 1,025. Of the five satyagrahi prisoners placed in the "A" Division, two were ex-Ministers and three were MLAs.

Because of the irregularity and paucity of information the AICC office at Swaraj Bhawan, Allahabad, received from the PCCs, the General Secretary, AICC, could not publish, as planned earlier, reports from the PCCs regarding the progress of the Satyagraha, in 1940-41. Yet, as Dr. Rao's account of the Satyagraha summarised by us in an earlier section of this article, shows that, though much information

from Assam did not for some reason or other reach the Swaraj Bhawan, the Assam PCC and the Assam DCCs were not indifferent to the progress of satyagraha at least in its first phase, from December 1940 to January 1941, in their province.

### III

We may now proceed to summarize the information we could find in the Government of India's Home Department, Political Intelligence Files, 1940-41, regarding the Individual Satyagraha Movement in Assam in 1940-41.

Gopinath Bardoloi, ex-premier, accompanied by A.K. Chanda, Deputy Leader of the Congress in the Assam Valley, went to Wardha in the last week of November 1940, presumably to obtain Gandhiji's approval for a list of prospective satyagrahis from Assam. Bardoloi offered Satyagraha on 11 December 1940; he was immediately arrested, tried and sentenced to Simple Imprisonment (SI) for one year. By 18 December 1940, Maulavi Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, ex-Minister, Bishnu Ram Medhi and a few other MLAs were prosecuted for satyagraha, while Babu Karuna Sindhu Roy, an MLA from Surma Valley was reported to be preparing for satyagraha. These developments were reported by the Assam Government in telegrams to the Home Department at New Delhi, where summaries and tables of weekly developments in the Civil Disobedience movement in the provinces were prepared. We are giving below two tables showing the number of persons offering civil disobedience (satyagraha) in the province of Assam in the period from December 1940 to July 1941, which seemed to be the peak period of official interest in the civil disobedience movement by Congressmen in 1940-41. These two tables have been prepared by us from information found in the Weekly telegram from the provinces received by the Home Department at New Delhi.

### From Assam: Information Relating Satyagraha in 1941

Week ending	Number offering Satyagraha	Arrested	Convicted	Pending	Released or Discharged
15 Jan.	-	-	4	-	-
22 Jan.	-	-	23	6	2
29 Jan.	52	36	29	2	5
6 Feb.	75	53	50	1	-
13 Feb.	-	15	10	3	-
19 Feb.	-	66	40	35	2
27 Feb.	78	33	33	-	-
6 March	86	61	47	5	9
13 March	49	18	10	1	18
19 March	41	14	3	4	8
26 March	42	19	16	-	-
3 April	No Information				
10 April	44	17	9	-	6
17 April	22	-	6	-	-
23 April	9	6	4	-	-
30 April	31	-	-	-	-
7 May	No Information				
14 May	No Information				
21 May	5	4	-	-	-
28 May	No Information				
4 June	2	-	-	-	-
11 June	4	-	-	-	-

Week ending	Number offering Satyagraha	Arrested	Convicted	Pending	Released or Discharged
18 June	19	-	-	-	-
25 June	4	-	-	-	-
2 July	23	-	-	-	-
9 July	13	-	-	-	-
16 July	No Information				

The Assam Government, as other provincial Governments, ignored the satyagraha offered by Congressmen who, in the eyes of the local authorities, had little political influence or reputation; often women satyagrahis were ignored, they were not arrested. We gather from the Weekly Reports by Telegrams, that in June and July 1941, about 36 satyagrahis were ignored by the local authorities and not arrested. The Satyagrahis who were ignored by the police were expected to offer satyagraha repeatedly till arrested, or to go into the villages making non-violent speeches and raising anti-war slogans. This kind of itinerant anti-war satyagrahis did not make much news. The number of satyagrahis of whom the local authorities took notice appeared high from January to April 1941, in which period no less than 529 persons, as the above table indicates, offered satyagraha in Assam. We should note here that according to the information available with the AICC, as we have noticed in an earlier section of this article, in the period from 11 December 1940 to 31 January 1941, as many as 214 Congressmen had offered satyagraha in Assam.

Though it is obvious that precise information and accurate figures relating to the Satyagraha Movement of 1940-41 in Assam were not available with the AICC Office or the Government of India, we may help our readers to form some idea about this movement by submitting in the form of another table the information we could obtain from the Government of India, Home Department files, about the total number of Satyagrahis for India, and the total number of Satyagrahis for Assam, according to an incomplete calculation (on approximate figures in some cases) made in the Home Department in 1940-41.

Position in the week ending	Number of Satyagrahis	
	Total for India	Total for Assam
22 January 1941	-	52
29 January	-	75
27 February	-	78
6 March	-	86
13 March	-	49
19 March	-	41
26 March	-	42
10 April	-	44
17 April	2783	22
23 April	2162	9
30 April	2052	31
7 May	1952	-
14 May	1460	-
21 May	1237	5
28 May	1198	-

Position in the week ending	Number of Satyagrahis	
	Total for India	Total for Assam
4 June 1941	860	2
11 June	795	4
18 June	772	19
25 June	626	4
2 July	344	23
9 July	446	13
16 July	288	-

Official comments noted briefly in regard to the information presented above tell us that the figures were mostly approximate figures, that on a number of occasions weekly information was not received from Assam, and that there were no events of official interest in Assam in most weeks, in regard to the Congress satyagraha. On 6 November 1940, it was noted that there was no popular excitement following the arrest of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru earlier that week in the United Provinces. Against the week ending 18 December 1940, it was noted that the satyagraha movement in Assam was practically restricted to one person, the ex-Premier of Assam, who was sentenced to one year. Against the week ending 15 January 1941, it was noted that Assam MLAs were offering satyagraha, since the Christmas holidays. No developments were noted, till the week ending 23 April 1941, against which it was recorded that among Congressmen there was a tendency to solicit release on health grounds. It is not clear whether they were soliciting Gandhiji's permission not to re-offer satyagraha, or

they were soliciting the local authorities to obtain release from jail. One can however assume, considering the quality of the selected satyagrahis, that they were soliciting release from the Satyagraha Pledge requiring them to offer satyagraha again and again. In this satyagraha movement, as in the previous Congress movements the satyagrahis were often in poor physical condition after undergoing even simple imprisonment for a few months. Many of them were put in the 'C' class with few amenities to distinguish political prisoners from the common prisoners. Few satyagrahis anywhere in the country had the physical hardihood and spiritual strength of Archarya Vinoba Bhave to offer satyagraha more than once, in the campaign of 1940-41. It was Vinoba Bhave, at that time a little-known constructive worker, whom Gandhiji had selected for inaugurating the Individual Civil Disobedience movement of 1940-41; Vinobaji offered satyagraha at Paunar, under Gandhiji's personal instruction on 17 October 1940. The second person, Jawaharlal Nehru, on Gandhiji's list of selected satyagrahis had no opportunity to offer satyagraha before being arrested on 31 October 1940. In his speech before the court in Gorakhpur Jail on 3 November 1940, Jawaharlal made clear the symbolic character of the Satyagraha of 1940-41: "If I was chosen or before me Shri Vinoba Bhave was chosen for this purpose, it was not to give expression to our individual views. We were symbols who spoke the mind of India in the name of India, or at any rate of a vast number of the people of India. As individuals we may have counted for little, but as such symbols and representatives of the Indian people, we counted for a great deal." From this nationalist attitude, the few hundred Congressmen from Assam, who, in 1940-41, offered satyagraha on behalf of the Congress and Congress sympathisers in Assam were representatives of the national aspirations among the people of Assam.

As in other provinces the Satyagraha, the Civil Disobedience Movement, of 1940-41, was singularly

free from incidents of violence in speech and action by active nationalists in Assam.<sup>11</sup> This was largely because the movement was purposefully confined to selected Congressmen and Gandhiji remained outside the jail to discipline the movement with his great moral influence over the masses. The students and the Leftist Congressmen of "the Violence party" among the Congressmen in Assam and elsewhere had been excluded by Gandhiji strictly, in 1940-41, in this model Gandhian satyagraha. The opportunity for Assam students and Leftist nationalists for exhibiting their passion for Independence in acts of violence against the British Government did not come, in a big way for a while, till on 9 August 1942, after the Quit India Resolution by the AICC at Bombay, Gandhiji and members of the Congress Working Committee, also some members of the AICC found at Bombay, were arrested by the Bombay police, and the AICC and the Congress Working Committee and other Congress Committees practically throughout the British India were declared unlawful. In historical retrospect, in contrast with 1942, the years 1940 and 1941 in the history of the Congress shone with demonstrations of truly 'civil' disobedience of the Gandhian kind by Indian nationalists in the Congress fold. The number of Congress members of the Right Wing and the Left Wing of the Congress in 1940-41 was really no adequate indication of the Congress "influence" in the country, but the figures collected by the Intelligence Bureau of the Home Department of the Government of India in this period indicate that there was a decline in Congress membership in the total for all India after the Congress ministries in the provinces resigned in protest against India's involvement in the Second World War without "India's consent" in the autumn of 1939.

### Indian National Congress

Total for all	Number of Members		
	1938-39	1939-40	1940-41
India	45,11,858	29,73,452	14,81,616
Assam	37,321	56,633	56,000

The number of Congress members increased considerably in 1939-40, and the fall in 1940-41 in the number of members was not large. The strength of the Congress Left in terms of listed members compared to that of the Congress Right, among the Assam Congress leaders assembled at the annual session of the Congress held at Ramgarh in Bihar in March 1940, was not significant,<sup>12</sup> according to the Intelligence Bureau analysis in 1940.

#### Congressmen assembled at the Ramgarh Session, March 1940 (From Assam)

AICC Members	Right Wing	CSP	Forward Bloc	Kisan Sabha	Royists	GPI	Other Leftists
8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Session Delegates:							
60	53	-	-	-	-	-	7

In Assam, the Congress organization was entirely dominated by the Right Wing.

As yet, there was no indication of large scale students' involvement in Assam politics. The Intelligence Bureau circulars to the Provincial Governments in 1940-41, indicate that, though from early 1940, "a truculent spirit" was growing among volunteers of all classes in the country generally in Assam neither the Congress nor the anti-Congress bodies had any significant body of volunteers in these years. In January 1940, the Surma Valley Training Corps of students and other youth was reported to be in existence. An I.B. Memorandum dated 13 August 1940, said that, as in Bengal, Bombay and Bihar, there were students' volunteer bodies in Assam, which were small, poorly financed, and of little importance. In the following year, another I.B. Memorandum, dated 22 November 1941, said that the Congress Volunteer Corps in Assam, as in Ajmer Merwara, were marked by stagnation and inactivity.<sup>13</sup> The emergence of the youth in a big role in the nationalist movement in Assam, as in other provinces of India, was not marked before Gandhiji and the Congress leaders following him transformed the Indian political scene, from the Congress point of view, by calling upon the students and all workers, in the fields, factories, and elsewhere, to participate in the Quit India Movement of 1942.

#### Notes & References

1. In the Nehru Memorial Museum & Library, see in the AICC Papers, G/15, 1940, pp. 51-52.
2. AICC, G-1 (Pt.1), 1940-41.
3. AICC, G-28 (Pt. 2)/1940, pp. 41-45.
4. See in Nripendra Nath Misra, The Indian Annual Register, (Calcutta), 1940, Vol. I, p. 220, AICC Genl. Secy's Circular dt. 16 Feb. 1940, to the PCCs announcing the election of

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad as the President of the Congress.

5. AICC, G-28, Pt. I/1940, pp. 1-29.
6. See Circular No.4, dt. 29 March 1940, by Genl. Secy. AICC, in IAR, 1940, I, pp. 238-40, for the form of the Satyagraha Pledge of 1940. For various Circulars by the AICC Genl. Secy., on Congress organizational preparations for civil disobedience, see in IAR, 1940, I, pp. 238-50.

For the distinction between the "passive satyagrahis" and the selected "active satyagrahis", see Kripalani to Rajkumar Chakraborty, dt. 4 May 1940; in AICC, G-4/1940, pp.77-79.

The Communists, Forward Blocists, and Royists, the non-Gandhians generally believing in calculated violence when opportunity offered were advised to "allow Satyagraha a chance".

7. In IAR, 1940, Vol. I, pp. 247-250. Satyagraha preparations in provinces, Position by the first week of May 1940; Enclosure in Congress Genl. Secy's Circular No. 7, dt. Allahabad, 4 May 1940.
8. See in AICC, G-36/1941, p. 65, from Genl. Secy. Assam PCC, Gauhati, dt. 11-2/41. A Statement of arrests in different provinces in connection with the Individual Satyagraha, compiled by the office of the General Secretary, AICC, showing the position in March 1941, on the basis of obviously incomplete information, put 176 as the total number of Satyagrahi prisoners in Assam, and Rs. 3,145, as the total amount of fines imposed on Satyagrahis in Assam.
9. See, in the National Archives, New Delhi, Home Dept. Poll.(I) 3/7/40, pp. 18,47,58,77.
10. For information used by us, in preparing the tables relating Civil Disobedience in 1940-41, see the following files in Nat. Archives; Home Dept. Political (I), 3/21/40: C.D. Movement, Weekly Telegrams from Provinces; Home Dept. Poll.(I) 36/6/40: Weekly Telegrams from Provinces, Statement of the number of persons held under the Indian Penal Code or the Defence of India Rules; Home Dept. Poll.(I), 3/2/41 & K.W., C.D. Movement, Weekly Telegrams from Provinces.

11. There was none from Assam, in the few instances of violence in speech by satyagrahis, in the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1940-41, collected by the Home Department of the Government of India. See in the Home Department Poll. (I), 3/17/40.
12. For information used by us, in the tables regarding the relative strength of the Congress Right and the Congress Left, see the following: Home Dept. (Poll.), 4/4/40, the I.B. Memo., No. 38/Cong/40 of 15-4-40; Home Dept. (Poll.), 4/6/41, pp. 1 - 4.
13. See in Home Department (Poll.), 4/1/40, pp. 1-2, 6-13, 16-17, 26-29.