

From Freedom to Fragmentation: Gandhi, Nehru and the Crisis of Partition of India

Swagatam Khan¹

¹Independent Scholar

Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India

Email: swagatam91@gmail.com

Abstract:The Partition of India in 1947 remains one of the most contested events in modern South Asian historiography. While structural explanations emphasize communal mobilization and British administrative withdrawal, the roles of key nationalist leaders remain central to historical debate. This article examines the contrasting roles of *Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi* and *Jawaharlal Nehru* during the final phase of decolonization. It argues that Gandhi embodied a moral resistance to Partition rooted in his commitment to intercommunal harmony, whereas Nehru increasingly adopted a pragmatic acceptance of division amid escalating violence and administrative urgency. By situating both leaders within evolving historiographical interpretations, the article highlights the interplay between ethical politics, state-building imperatives, and the contingencies of late colonial governance.

Keywords:Indian National Congress, Decolonization, Communal Violence, Partition of India etc.

Date of Submission:17.02.2026

Date of Acceptance: 22.02.2026

Introduction

The Partition of British India in August 1947 marked the culmination of decades of nationalist struggle and communal negotiation, resulting in unprecedented violence and displacement. Historians continue to debate whether Partition was inevitable or contingent upon specific political decisions. Within this debate, the roles of Gandhi and Nehru remain deeply contested. Gandhi's moral opposition to communal division contrasted sharply with Nehru's growing acceptance of Partition as a political necessity. Understanding their roles requires situating individual agency within the wider context of collapsing imperial authority, accelerating timelines, and rising communal conflict¹.

Gandhi: Moral Authority and Political Marginalization

From Freedom to Fragmentation: Gandhi, Nehru and the Crisis of Partition of India

By the mid-1940s, Gandhi's political influence within the Indian National Congress had diminished, even as his moral stature remained unparalleled. Gandhi consistently opposed Partition, viewing it as a civilizational tragedy and a betrayal of the nationalist commitment to Hindu-Muslim unity. His response to escalating communal violence was not constitutional negotiation but ethical intervention. During the riots of 1946-47, he undertook extensive peace missions in Noakhali, Calcutta, and Delhi, often placing himself physically within sites of violence to restore communal harmony². Gandhi's refusal to participate in independence celebrations on 15th August 1947 symbolized his disillusionment with the outcome of decolonization. Instead, he remained in Calcutta attempting to quell violence, a decision widely interpreted as evidence of his moral dissent from the logic of territorial division. In this period, in which Gandhi's influence was "*ethical rather than institutional*," highlighting the divergence between his vision and the Congress high command³. Primary sources reinforce this interpretation. Gandhi's prayer meeting speeches from August- September 1947 repeatedly emphasized unity and moral repentance. Gandhi declared that independence without communal harmony was "*a lifeless thing*," underscoring his refusal to equate political sovereignty with moral fulfilment⁴. Yet Gandhi's opposition to Partition also reveals the limits of moral politics in moments of state collapse. As communal violence intensified and political negotiations narrowed, his emphasis on reconciliation appeared increasingly detached from institutional realities. Scholars argue that Gandhi's marginalization reflected not irrelevance but the transformation of the nationalist struggle into a problem of statecraft rather than mass mobilization⁵.

Nehru: Statecraft, Centralization, and the acceptance of Partition

In contrast to Gandhi's ethical universalism³, Nehru approached the crisis through the lens of governance and state-building⁸. By 1946-47, Nehru had emerged as the principal architect of India's postcolonial future, deeply invested in constructing a strong centralized state. His skepticism toward federal arrangements, particularly those that might weaken the authority of the center, played a significant role in shaping Congress responses to constitutional negotiations. The collapse of the Cabinet Mission Plan in 1946 remains a pivotal episode in this context. Scholars argue that Nehru's July 1946 press conference undermined the fragile compromise envisioned by the plan, thereby strengthening the Muslim League's demand for

From Freedom to Fragmentation: Gandhi, Nehru and the Crisis of Partition of India

Pakistan⁶. While this interpretation remains contested, it underscores the extent to which Nehru's commitment to centralized sovereignty influenced the trajectory of negotiations. Primary sources reveal Nehru's own evolving position. In 1946-47, Nehru increasingly framed Partition as a tragic but unavoidable outcome of political deadlock and communal escalation⁷. In a letter to provincial leaders in early 1947, he warned of the dangers of "endless civil strife" should negotiations collapse entirely⁷. By early 1947, escalating violence and administrative breakdown further reshaped Nehru's stance. The announcement by British Prime Minister Clement Attlee in February 1947 that power would be transferred no later than June 1948, followed by the accelerated timetable under Louis Mountbatten, created a climate of urgency that constrained political alternatives¹². Within this compressed timeframe, Nehru and other Congress leaders increasingly viewed Partition as a tragic but necessary solution to prevent civil war and administrative anarchy⁸. Nehru's decision within a broader landscape of uncertainty, emphasizing the administrative chaos and fears of prolonged bloodshed that shaped Congress calculations. From this perspective, Nehru's acceptance of Partition appears less as ideological capitulation and more as pragmatic adaptation to collapsing imperial governance⁹.

Gandhi and Nehru: Divergent Visions of Freedom

The divergence between Gandhi and Nehru during Partition reflects deeper philosophical differences within the nationalist movement. Gandhi envisioned independence as a moral transformation rooted in communal coexistence and decentralized social harmony¹³. Nehru, by contrast, conceived freedom in institutional terms, prioritizing sovereignty, industrial modernity, and political consolidation¹⁴. These differences manifested sharply in their responses to communal violence. Gandhi sought to arrest violence through personal sacrifice and ethical persuasion, employing fasts and peace marches as instruments of reconciliation. Nehru, operating within the emerging framework of state power, focused on restoring order through administrative mechanisms and political agreements. Evidence from the Constituent Assembly debates reinforces this contrast. Gandhi's absence from formal constitutional structures contrasted with Nehru's central role in shaping the Objectives Resolution, which articulated sovereignty in institutional rather than moral terms¹⁰. Importantly, this divergence

From Freedom to Fragmentation: Gandhi, Nehru and the Crisis of Partition of India

should not be overstated as a simple binary between idealism and realism. Both leaders were responding to rapidly shifting circumstances. Gandhi's continued resistance reflected his lifelong commitment to nonviolence and unity¹³, while Nehru's pragmatism reflected the burdens of impending governance¹⁴.

Historiographical Debates

Congress Responsibility Thesis

Scholarly work attributes significant responsibility to Congress leadership, particularly Nehru, arguing that the failure to accommodate federal compromise contributed to the inevitability of Partition. In this reading, Gandhi's opposition appears morally compelling but politically marginal⁶.

Structural Inevitability Thesis

Historians emphasize long-term structural factors, including communal mobilization, wartime transformations, and colonial administrative fragility. From this perspective, individual decisions mattered but were constrained by broader forces¹¹.

Contingency and Chaos Thesis

More recent scholarship foregrounds contingency and the chaotic dynamics of 1946-47. This approach highlights administrative breakdown, localized violence, and the accelerating British exit as key drivers, situating both Gandhi and Nehru within a rapidly collapsing political order⁹. Together, these historiographical strands complicate simplistic narratives that either canonize or blame individual leaders.

This article shows, the roles of both Gandhi and Nehru during the Partition of India underscore the profound tensions between moral vision and political necessity at moments of historical rupture. Gandhi remained the moral conscience of an undivided India, steadfast in his opposition to Partition and committed to intercommunal reconciliation even as his political influence waned. Nehru, in contrast, navigated the transition from nationalist leader to head of an emergent viscous state, accepting Partition within a framework of

From Freedom to Fragmentation: Gandhi, Nehru and the Crisis of Partition of India

administrative urgency and geopolitical realism. Rather than viewing their roles as mutually exclusive, it is more analytically fruitful to understand them as complementary responses to an unprecedented crisis. Gandhi articulated the ethical limits of political compromise, while Nehru confronted the practical imperatives of governance. Partition, thus, cannot be reduced to the decisions of individuals alone; it was the product of converging pressures, including imperial withdrawal, communal violence, and competing visions of sovereignty.

Conclusion

Partition ultimately revealed the uneasy coexistence of moral conviction and political necessity at the end of empire. Gandhi embodied the ethical resistance to division, while Nehru confronted the harsh demands of state-building in a collapsing colonial order. Their divergent responses were not contradictions but reflections of a crisis that defied singular solutions. The tragedy of 1947 thus lies in the gap between moral imagination and political possibility.

Notes and References

1. Ian Talbot and Gurharpal Singh, *The Partition of India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 1–15; Yasmin Khan, *The Great Partition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 1–10.
2. Ramachandra Guha, *Gandhi: The Years That Changed the World, 1914–1948* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2018), pp. 702–760.
3. Ramachandra Guha, *Gandhi: The Years That Changed the World, 1914–1948* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2018), pp. 745–780.
4. M. K. Gandhi, prayer meeting speech, September 1947, in *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 89 (New Delhi: Publications Division, 1983), pp. 233–235.
5. Alex von Tunzelmann, *Indian Summer* (London: Simon & Schuster, 2007), pp. 220–240.
6. Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 210–225.
7. Jawaharlal Nehru, letters, 1946–47, in *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Second Series, vol. 1 (New Delhi: Nehru Memorial Fund, 1984), pp. 350–365.
8. Yasmin Khan, *The Great Partition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 80–120.
9. Yasmin Khan, *The Great Partition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 160–200.
10. Constituent Assembly Debates, vol. 1, 13 December 1946 (*Objectives Resolution speech by Nehru*) (<https://www.constitutionofindia.net/debates/13-dec-1946/>).
11. Ian Talbot and Gurharpal Singh, *The Partition of India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 50–80.
12. Clement Attlee, Statement in the House of Commons, 20 February 1947, (*Parliamentary Debates, Hansard*), ([https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/1947-06-03/debates/ad3b5290-8865-4fe2-9bcc-2ad34056c8fb/India\(TransferOfPower\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/1947-06-03/debates/ad3b5290-8865-4fe2-9bcc-2ad34056c8fb/India(TransferOfPower))).
13. M. K. Gandhi, *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol. 48 (New Delhi: Publications

From Freedom to Fragmentation: Gandhi, Nehru and the Crisis of Partition of India

Division), pp. 397–398

14. Bipan Chandra et al., *India's Struggle for Independence (New Delhi: Penguin, 1989)*, pp. 500-505.