HI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

CL No

Ac No

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below An overdue charge of 0 6 nP, will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime

GANDHIJI



EDITED BY

D. G. TENDULKAR
M. CHALAPATHI RAU
MRIDULA SARABHAI
VITHALBHAI K. JHAVERI

[ALL RIGHTS RESERVED]

FIRST PUBLISHED OCTOBER 2, 1944

POPULAR IMPRESSION (UNABRIDGED
NOVEMBER 1944

PRINTED BY B. G. DHAWALE AT THE KARNATAK PRINTING PRESS, CHIRA BAZAR, BOMBAY AND PUBLISHED BY KESHAV BHIKAJI DHAWALE, SHRI SAMARTH SADAN, GIRGAON, BOMBAY 4

BOMBAY

KESHAV BHIKAJI DHAWALE



Mahatma Gandhi with several fellow prisoners — *by Nandalal Bose*

GANDHIJI

His Life and Work

Published on his 75th Birthday

October 2 1944

Einstein on Gandhi

A leader of his people, unsupported by any outward authority; a politician whose success rests not upon craft nor mastery of technical devices, but simply on the convincing power of his personality; a victorious fighter who has always scorned the use of force; a man of wisdom and humility, armed with resolve and inflexible consistency, who has devoted all his strength to the uplifting of his people and the betterment of their lot; a man who has confronted the brutality of Europe with the dignity of the simple human being, and thus at all times risen superior.

Generations to come, it may be, will scarce believe that such a one as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth.

PRINCETON
N. J., U.S.A.
VII-44

. . . to the Gates of Liberty

The figure of Gandhi is incomprehensible to the West. He is derided by some, ignored by many, and admired by those who are wise. Because he has taken literally and acted upon the teachings of great men, even Christians are puzzled by him, and he is reproached. But all great men have been reproached and derided and sometimes laughed at. It is Gandhi's greatness that he has ignored the derision and accepted the laughter and has continued to be himself. Somehow that self still stands intact, and laughter is dying down and derision is becoming futile.

To me Gandhi has been, through his own personality, an expression of what India is. Much of it is what we all are, human, yet searching, changeful, yet constant, and practical and dreaming, shrewd and selfless. But the contrasts and the variety in Gandhi are typical of India, and in all that seems contradictory, there is the unity which is India's deep unity, too, the determination for independence and the indomitable spirit—free, however the flesh is imprisoned.

By finding out all I can about Gandhi, by trying to understand him, I have understood India at least to some degree, even in all its contrasts.

This emergence of a single individual as a sort of epitome of his people always has significance. It means not only that there is a clarification of the people through this single figure. It means, too, that the people are ready for clarification, or they could not have produced this figure. Gandhi has helped

his people to know what they want and he has set their feet firmly on the path of freedom, but before he did this, he was himself a product of their crystallizing desire to be free. He could not have become the vessel for their longings, had not those longings been ready for fusion in his one being. He has expressed for the people of India what they want and are.

This is to say, he is one of the greatest leaders of people that there have been in human history. Such a leader comes only at the confluence of a people's need and desire with the birth of an individual able, by his natural gifts, to feel that need and express that desire. I never doubt for a moment that Gandhi's purposes will be achieved. He has brought his people to the very gates of liberty. If they are not opened, the people of India will open them.



U. S. A.
VII-44

From the Editors

This is not a book of tributes to Bapu; he is in no need of such homage. This volume was planned, when Bapu was under detention, as a birthday greeting to him. It is a token of gratitude on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday.

Here we have made an attempt to reassess his lasting contribution to world thought and progress, and particularly to the advancement of India.

What Bapu means to the West cannot be better expressed than in the messages we have received from Albert Einstein and Pearl S. Buck, two of the finest spirits of our times. What he means to millions of us in India can best be expressed by Jawaharlal Nehru, and we are thankful that it has been possible to reproduce from his autobiography his estimate of Bapu's personality.

To Bapu we owe much for allowing us to tell in his own words the story of Kasturba's life.

The limitations of this book are obvious. Many of Bapu's close associates, who would have enriched this book with the benefit of their intimate experience and knowledge, are behind prison-bars. Even so the present contributions reveal how far-reaching has been Bapu's influence. We thank the contributors for their generous co-operation.

The net profits from the sales of the book in its various language editions—English and Indian—will be presented to Bapu as a modest contribution to the causes dear to him.

October 1944

P S.

The first edition of *Gandhiji* was exhausted soon after it was brought out and we regret it was not possible to bring out a popular impression earlier owing to unavoidable circumstances. The present impression is unabridged and contains all the material of the first edition.

We are grateful to Jawaharlal Nehru for contributing an introduction to this edition. The net profits from the sale of the first English edition amounted to Rs. 24,000, which were presented to Bapu on April 12, 1945. The profits from the present impression will also be handed over to Bapu.

November 1945

Acknowledgements

Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, and its manager, Jivanji Desai, for permission to draw freely on Gandhiji's writings and for Mahadev Desai's articles; John Lane, the Bodley Head, London, and Indira Gandhi for 'The Spirit of India,' compiled from *An Autobiography* by Jawaharlal Nehru; Vora & Co., Publishers Ltd., Bombay 2, for the chapter 'The Gandhian Way' from the book *The Gandhian Way* by J. B. Kripalani.

Mangeshrao Kulkarni, Proprietor, S. S. Purohit, V. A. Golikeri and the staff of the Karnatak Printing Press for their unfailing co-operation in production of the first edition. K. A. Subramanian of the Saxon Press for printing the colour plates.

Pratap Dayaldas, Sind, for the block of Nandalal Bose's 'Dandi March'; Samaldas Gandhi, Jamnadas Gandhi, Radhaben Gandhi for originals of Gandhiji's letters; S. Dasgupta and N. R. Sengupta for their help in the preparation of some illustrations; Adarts Ltd., for block-making; Purushottam Kanji for help in the preparation of khadi charts.

R. R. Diwakar, Suchita Kripalani for co-operation in planning the volume; Valji Govindji Desai for going through the manuscripts; Justice K. C. Sen for translating Nandalal Bose's article 'The True Artist' from the original Bengali; F. R. Moraes, Beryl Moraes, R. K. Prabhu, Indravadan Thakore, Pyarelalji, Shantikumar Morarji, Sumatiben Morarji, Kanu Gandhi, Mangaldas Pakwasa, Devadas Gandhi, D. R. D. Wadia, P. S. Jayasinghe, G. R. Krishnan, Navin Jhaveri, G. G. Majmudar for various forms of help. Anu Bandyopadhyaya for reading the proofs.

We are grateful to Krishnalal Sridharani, New York, who gladly undertook to approach on our behalf Gandhiji's friends in America for their messages.

THE EDITORS

Contents

	Page
A Word for the Reader *by Gandhiji*	v
Introduction *by Jawaharlal Nehru*	vii
On Gandhi *by Albert Einstein*	xi
...to the Gates of Liberty *by Pearl S. Buck*	xii
From the Editors	xv
The Spirit of India *—Jawaharlal Nehru*	1
Kasturba *—M. K. Gandhi*	5
Mahadev *by Verrier Elwin*	14
Gandhi the Humanist *by F. R. Moraes*	19
Gandhi and Tagore *by K. R. Kripalani*	27
East Wind, West Wind *by Marjorie Sykes*	40
Truth in Beauty *by D. G. Tendulkar*	49

CONTENTS

	Page
THE GANDHIAN WAY *by J. B. Kripalani*	56
A BATTLE OF FAITHS *by Mahadev Desai*	68
AHIMSA IN ACTION *by Gangadharrao Deshpande*	76
HIS GREATEST GIFT *by R. R. Diwakar*	79
IS GANDHI A SOCIALIST? *by M. R. Masani*	83
A NEW SYNTHESIS *by M. L. Dantwala*	95
THE INDIAN REVOLUTION *by Humayun Kabir*	99
NON-COOPERATION: ITS BEGINNINGS *by S. A. Brelvi*	105
FRONTIER REVOLUTION *by Khan Sahib*	109
MAN AND MACHINE *by Maurice Frydman*	113
GANDHI AND THE CHURCH *by S. K. George*	121
FRIEND OF ISLAM *by K. A. Abbas*	128
WOMAN THE COMRADE *by Kamaladevi*	132
A CHARTER FOR LABOUR *by Gulzarilal Nanda*	142
PRINCES AND PEOPLE *by H. C. Dasappa*	152

CONTENTS

	Page
MEDICINE FOR THE MASSES *by Sushila Nayyar*	159
BASIC EDUCATION *by K. G. Saiyidain*	164
VILLAGE INDUSTRIES *by V. L. Mehta*	170
A CALL TO STUDENTS *by Ralph R. Kaithahn*	178
WHAT GANDHIJI SHOULD DO! *by Gaganvihari Mehta*	181
TOURS AND MARCHES *by M. Chalapathi Rau*	187
AT SEVAGRAM *by Mahadev Desai*	197
REMINISCENCES *by G. A. Natesan*	208
INTRODUCTION TO 'YOUNG INDIA' *by R. K. Prabhu*	216
MIDNIGHT ARREST *by Vinayak S. Masoji*	219
ONE HOUR *by Bharati Sarabhai*	221
PRINCE OF BEGGARS *by S. N. Agarwal*	224
THE ART OF THRIFT *by Appasaheb Patwardhan*	227
THE TRUE ARTIST *by Nandalal Bose*	230
REBEL AND PROPHET *by Yusuf Meherally*	235

CONTENTS

	Page
TOLSTOY TO GANDHI	241
SATYAGRAHA CAMPAIGNS	244
GANDHIJI IN JAILS	249
GANDHIJI'S FASTS	252
THE TRICOLOUR	254
GANDHIJI'S IDEAS	255
LETTERS FROM BAPU	315
GANDHI CHRONICLE: 1869-1944 *by D. G. Tendulkar*	331
BIBLIOGRAPHY	401

Illustrations

DANDI MARCH — *frontispiece*
by Nandalal Bose

GANDHIJI AT SEVAGRAM — *to face page* 1
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

BA AND BAPU, 1941 — 8
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

KASTURBA — 9
Photos : Kanu Gandhi & N. Jasani

BA READING 'HARIJANBANDHU' — 12
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

LAST MOMENTS OF KASTURBA — 13
Feb. 21-23, 1944. Lone vigil, 'The shadow deepened', Last rites, 'God my Refuge'—(1869-1944)
Photos : Kanu Gandhi

GANDHIJI AND MAHADEV, 1939 — 20
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

HOMAGE TO THE DEAD — 21
at Aga Khan Palace; Samadhis of Mahadev and Kasturba
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

BAPU — 28
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

TAGORE AND GANDHI — 36
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

TAGORE TO GANDHI (LETTER), 1915 — 37
Courtesy : Radhaben Gandhi

KINDRED SPIRITS: — 40
Tolstoy, Ruskin, Emerson, Thoreau

ROLLAND AND GANDHI — 41
Villeneuve, Switzerland, Dec., 1931
Courtesy : Mangaldas Pakwasa

WITH CHIANG KAI-SHEK — 52
Marshal and Madame, Calcutta, Feb. 18, 1942
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

GANDHIJI & RAJENDRA PRASAD, 1940 — 53
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

ILLUSTRATIONS

WITH SHAUKAT ALI *to face page* 56
in Khilafat days; At Oxford (Courtesy : Mangaldas Pakwasa) ; With Ba at Sevagram ; Conferring with Vinoba Bhave ; A small Friend ; With Jamnalal Bajaj (Photos : Kanu Gandhi) ; Stroll with Mahadev and Sitaramayya (Courtesy : Shantikumar Morarji)

GREETINGS 57
from Radhakrishnan (Courtesy : R. K. Prabhu) ; With Malaviyaji (Photo : Kanu Gandhi); Jinnah and Gandhi (Courtesy : Shantikumar Morarji) ; With Kishorelal Mashruwala ; At Sevagram; With Mahadev and Malaviyaji; With his elder brother, Khusalchand Gandhi (Photos : Kanu Gandhi) ; In conference with Maulana Azad and Vallabhbhai Patel (Courtesy : Samaldas Gandhi)

MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD 60
Photo : D. G. Tendulkar

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU 61
Photo : D. G. Tendulkar

JAWAHARLAL WITH BAPU 68
at Sevagram
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

THROUGH CARTOONISTS' EYES 69

A. I. C. C., AUGUST 8, 1942 76
by Babu Herur

THE TWO 'GANDHIS' 108
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

AT TEXILA, FRONTIER, 1939 109
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

AT PRAYER, JUHU, 1944 116
Photo : D. R. D. Wadia

WORK AND WORSHIP: 117
His daily quota; At Sevagram village; Greeting from third class compartment; At a ceremony; His daily work; At a meeting (Photos : Kanu Gandhi) ; Before prayer (Photo : D. R. D. Wadia); Stepping out of bus; At prayer (Photo : D. R. D. Wadia)

FROM SEVAGRAM 120
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

BAPU WRITING 121
using the left hand—to relieve the right
Courtesy : Mangaldas Pakwasa

ILLUSTRATIONS

AT RAJKOT, MARCH 1939 *to face page* 140
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

COMRADES 141
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

AMONG LANCASHIRE WORKERS, 1931 148
Courtesy : Mangaldas Pakwasa

R. T. C. VISIT: 149
Spinning aboard S. S. Rajputana; With Malaviyaji in cabin; Millworkers' welcome—Greenfield Mill, Darwen, Lancashire; At Marseilles
Courtesy : Kusumben H. Desai

AT THE MICROSCOPE 158
examining leprosy germs
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

NURSING A LEPER FRIEND 159
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

MASS SPINNING IN A VILLAGE 162
Courtesy : A. I. S. A.

ON SEVAGRAM GROUNDS 163
(Courtesy : Samaldas Gandhi); With Bhansali; Midday at Sevagram (Photos : Kanu Gandhi); Twenty-five years ago (Courtesy : R. K. Prabhu); Entraining; At Borsad; At Kamala Nehru Hospital Foundation Ceremony, Allahabad, 1939 (Courtesy : Samaldas Gandhi); Harijan Fund collection from train (Photo : Kanu Gandhi)

KHADI WORK 170
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

KHADI PRODUCTION 173
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

KHADI CHART 176
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

SOUTH AFRICAN STRUGGLE: 188
March to the Transvaal; At border of Volksrust; Capetown farewell to Gandhiji, Verulam farewell meeting, 1913-14
Courtesy : 'Indian Opinion' Golden Number

SON OF THE SOIL 189
Photo : Kanu Gandhi

SABARMATI TO DANDI 192
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

A DAY IN HIS LIFE 200
Photos : Kanu Gandhi & D. R. D. Wadia

BAPU'S FEW POSSESSIONS 201
Photos : Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

ILLUSTRATIONS

VALLIAMMA, MAGANLAL GANDHI *to face page* 216
Courtesy : 'Indian Opinion' Golden Number; Radhaben Gandhi

TO MAGANLAL 217
from Tolstoy Farm (Letter)
Courtesy : Radhaben Gandhi

THE MIDNIGHT ARREST 220
by Vinayak S. Masoji

NINTH AUGUST, 1942 240
by Babu Herur

FLAG SALUTATION 245
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

SATYAGRAHA MAP 248
Ashrams, Jails, Satyagraha centres
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

THE TRICOLOUR: ITS EVOLUTION 254
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

CHARKHAS, INDIAN 272
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

CHARKHAS, FOREIGN 273
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

JOURNALS EDITED BY GANDHIJI 294
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

IN PLAYFUL MOOD 312
Courtesy : R. K. Prabhu

VILLAGE CONGRESS SESSION 313
Haripura, February 1938
Photos : Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri & D. G. Tendulkar

ENVELOPE ADDRESS 316
in Gandhiji's handwriting, 1909
Courtesy : Samaldas Gandhi

TO LAXMIDAS GANDHI 317
from Johannesburg, 1906 (Letter)
Courtesy : Samaldas Gandhi

KARAMCHAND UTTAMCHAND GANDHI 324
Courtesy : Samaldas Gandhi

LAXMIDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI 325
Courtesy : Samaldas Gandhi

HARIPURA GATE 398
by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

BAPU'S BLESSINGS; PHOTO-CHRONICLE 400
Courtesy : R. D. Birla

Cover Design, Fly-leaf, Seal, Title Page and Chapter Ends by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri

THE SPIRIT OF INDIA

THIS little man of poor physique had something of steel in him, something rock-like which did not yield to physical powers, however great they might be. And in spite of his unimpressive features, his loin-cloth and bare body, there was a royalty and a kingliness in him which compelled a willing obeisance from others. Consciously and deliberately meek and humble, yet he was full of power and authority, and he knew it, and at times he was imperious enough, issuing commands which had to be obeyed. His calm, deep eyes would hold one and gently probe into the depths; his voice, clear and limpid, would purr its ways into the heart and evoke an emotional response. Whether his audience consisted of one person or a thousand, the charm and magnetism of the man passed on to it, and each one had a feeling of communion with the speaker. This feeling had little to do with the mind, though the appeal to the mind was not wholly ignored. But mind and reason definitely had second place.

This process of "spell-binding" was not brought about by oratory or the hypnotism of silken phrases. The language was always simple and to the point and seldom was an unnecessary word used. It was the utter sincerity of the man and his personality that gripped; he gave the impression of tremendous inner reserves of power. Perhaps also it was a tradition that had grown up about him which helped in creating a suitable atmosphere. A stranger, ignorant of this tradition and not in harmony with the surroundings, would probably not have been touched by that spell, or, at any rate, not to the same extent. And yet one of the most remarkable things about Gandhiji was, and is, his capacity to win over, or at least to disarm, his opponents.

Gandhiji had little sense of beauty or artistry in man-made objects, though he admired natural beauty. The Taj Mahal was for him an embodiment of forced labour and little more. His sense of smell was feeble. And yet in his own way he had discovered the art of living and had made of his life an artistic whole. Every gesture had meaning and grace, without a false touch. There were no rough edges or sharp corners about him, no trace of vulgarity or commonness, in which, unhappily, our middle classes excel. Having found an inner peace, he radiated it to others and marched through life's tortuous ways with firm and undaunted step...

Gandhiji had pleaded for the adoption of the way of non-violence, of peaceful non-co-operation, with all the eloquence and persuasive power which he so abundantly

possessed. His language had been simple and unadorned, his voice and appearance cool and clear and devoid of all emotion, but behind that outward covering of ice there was the heat of a blazing fire and concentrated passion, and the words he uttered winged their way to the innermost recesses of our minds and hearts, and created a strange ferment there. The way he pointed out was hard and difficult, but it was a brave path, and it seemed to lead to the promised land of freedom...

What a wonderful man was Gandhiji, with his amazing and almost irresistible charm and subtle power over people. His writings and his sayings conveyed little enough impression of the man behind; his personality was far bigger than they would lead one to think. And his services to India, how vast they had been. He had instilled courage and manhood in her people, and discipline and endurance, and the power of joyful sacrifice for a cause, and, with all his humility, pride. Courage is the one sure foundation of character, he had said, without courage there is no morality, no religion, no love. "One cannot follow truth or love so long as one is subject to fear." With all his horror of violence, he had told us that "cowardice is a thing even more hateful than violence." And "discipline is the pledge and guarantee that a man means business. There is no deliverance and no hope without sacrifice, discipline, and self-control. Mere sacrifice without discipline will be unavailing." Words only and pious phrases perhaps, rather platitudinous, but there was power behind the words, and India knew that this little man meant business.

He came to represent India to an amazing degree and to express the very spirit of that ancient and tortured land. Almost he was India, and his very failings were Indian failings. A slight to him was hardly a personal matter, it was an insult to the nation; and Viceroys and others who indulged in these disdainful gestures little realised what a dangerous crop they were sowing. I remember how hurt I was when I first learnt that the Pope had refused an interview to Gandhiji when he was returning from the Round Table Conference in December 1931...

People who do not know Gandhiji personally and have only read his writings are apt to think that he is a priestly type, extremely puritanical, long-faced, Calvinistic, and a kill-joy, something like the "priests in black gowns walking their rounds." But his writings do him an injustice; he is far greater than what he writes and it is not quite fair to quote what he has written and criticise it. He is the very opposite of the Calvinistic priestly type. His smile is delightful, his laughter infectious, and he radiates light-heartedness. There is something childlike about him which is full of charm. When he enters a room he brings a breath of fresh air with him which lightens the atmosphere...

He represents the peasant masses of India; he is the quintessence of the conscious and subconscious will of those millions. It is perhaps something more than representation; for he is the idealised personification of those vast millions. Of course, he is not the average peasant. A man of the keenest intellect, of fine feeling and good taste, wide vision; very human, and yet essentially the ascetic who has suppressed his

passions and emotions, sublimated them and directed them in spiritual channels; a tremendous personality, drawing people to himself like a magnet, and calling out fierce loyalties and attachments—all this so utterly unlike and beyond a peasant. And yet withal he is the great peasant, with a peasant's outlook on affairs, and with a peasant's blindness to some aspects of life. But India is peasant India, and so he knows his India well and reacts to her lightest tremors, and gauges a situation accurately and almost instinctively, and has a knack of acting at the psychological moment.

What a problem and a puzzle he has been not only to the British Government but to his own people and his closest associates! Perhaps in every other country he would be out of place today, but India still seems to understand, or at least appreciate, the prophetic-religious type of man, talking of sin and salvation and non-violence. Indian mythology is full of stories of great ascetics, who, by the rigour of their sacrifices and self-imposed penance, built up a "mountain of merit" which threatened the dominion of some of the lesser gods and upset the established order. These myths have often come to my mind when I have watched the amazing energy and inner power of Gandhiji, coming out of some inexhaustible spiritual reservoir. He was obviously not of the world's ordinary coinage; he was minted of a different and rare variety, and often the unknown stared at us through his eyes.

India, even urban India, even the new industrial India, had the impress of the peasant upon her, and it was natural enough for her to make this son of hers, so like her and yet so unlike, an idol and a beloved leader. He revived ancient and half-forgotten memories, and gave her glimpses of her own soul. Crushed in the dark misery of the present, she had tried to find relief in helpless muttering and in vague dreams of the past and the future, but he came and gave hope to her mind and strength to her much-battered body, and the future became an alluring vision. Two-faced like Janus, she looked both backwards into the past and forward into the future, and tried to combine the two.

Many of us had cut adrift from this peasant outlook, and the old ways of thought and custom and religion had become alien to us. We called ourselves moderns, and thought in terms of "progress" and industrialisation and a higher standard of living and collectivisation. We considered the peasant's view-point reactionary, and some, and a growing number, looked with favour towards socialism and communism. How came we to associate ourselves with Gandhiji politically, and to become, in many instances, his devoted followers? The question is hard to answer, and to one who does not know Gandhiji no answer is likely to satisfy. Personality is an indefinable thing, a strange force that has power over the souls of men, and he possesses this in ample measure, and to all who come to him he often appears in a different aspect. He attracted people, but it was ultimately intellectual conviction that brought them to him and kept them there. They did not agree with his philosophy of life, or even with many of his ideals. Often they did not understand him. But the action that he proposed was something tangible which could be understood and appreciated intel-

lectually. Any action would have been welcome after the long tradition of inaction which our spineless politics had nurtured ; brave and effective action with an ethical halo about it had an irresistible appeal, both to the intellect and the emotions. Step by step he convinced us of the rightness of the action, and we went with him, although we did not accept his philosophy. To divorce action from the thought underlying it was not perhaps a proper procedure and was bound to lead to mental conflict and trouble later. Vaguely we hoped that Gandhiji, being essentially a man of action and very sensitive to changing conditions, would advance along the line that seemed to us to be right. And in any event the road he was following was the right one thus far...

Jawaharlal Nehru



KASTURBA

IT is my painful duty to have to record my marriage at the age of thirteen. I can see no moral argument in support of such a preposterously early marriage. I was married, not betrothed. It appears I was betrothed thrice, though I do not know when. I do not think it meant to me anything more than the prospect of good clothes to wear, drum-beating, marriage processions, and a strange girl to play with.

About the time of my marriage, little pamphlets costing a pice, or a pie (I now forget how much), used to be issued, in which conjugal love, thrift, child marriages, and other such subjects were discussed. Whenever I came across any of these, I used to go through them from cover to cover, and it was a habit with me to forget what I did not like, and to carry out in practice whatever I liked. Life-long faithfulness to the wife, inculcated in these booklets as the duty of the husband, remained permanently imprinted on my heart. Furthermore, the passion for truth was innate in me, and to be false to her was therefore out of the question. And then there was very little chance of my being faithless at that tender age.

But the lesson of faithfulness had also an untoward effect. "If I should be pledged to be faithful to my wife, she also should be pledged to be faithful to me," I said to myself. The thought made me a jealous husband. Her duty was easily converted into my right to exact faithfulness from her, and if it had to be exacted, I should be watchfully tenacious of the right. I had absolutely no reason to suspect my wife's fidelity, but jealousy does not wait for reasons. I must needs be for ever on the look-out regarding her movements, and therefore she could not go anywhere without my permission. This sowed the seeds of a bitter quarrel between us. The restraint was virtually a sort of imprisonment. And Kasturbai was not the girl to brook any such thing. She made it a point to go out whenever and wherever she liked. More restraint on my part resulted in more liberty being taken by her, and in my getting more and more cross. Refusal to speak to one another thus became the order of the day with us, married children. I think it was quite innocent of Kasturbai to have taken those liberties with my restrictions. How could a guileless girl brook any restraint on going to the temple or on going on visits to friends? If I had the right to impose restrictions on her, had not she also a similar right? All this is clear to me today. But at that time I had to make good

my authority as a husband.

Let not the reader think, however, that ours was a life of unrelieved bitterness. For my severities were all based on love. I wanted to make my wife an ideal wife. My ambition was to make her live a pure life, learn what I learnt, and identify her life and thought with mine.

I do not know whether Kasturbai had any such ambition. She was illiterate. By nature she was simple, independent, persevering and, with me at least, reticent. She was not impatient of her ignorance and I do not recollect my studies having ever spurred her to go in for a similar adventure. I fancy, therefore, that my ambition was all one-sided. My passion was entirely centred on one woman, and I wanted it to be reciprocated. But even if there were no reciprocity, it could not be all unrelieved misery because there was active love on one side at least.

I must say I was passionately fond of her. Even at school I used to think of her, and the thought of nightfall and our subsequent meeting was ever haunting me. Separation was unbearable. I used to keep her awake till late in the night with my idle talk. If with this devouring passion there had not been in me a burning attachment to duty, I should either have fallen a prey to disease and premature death, or have sunk into a burdensome existence. But the appointed tasks had to be gone through every morning, and lying to anyone was out of the question. It was the last thing that saved me from many a pitfall.

I have already said that Kasturbai was illiterate. I was very anxious to teach her, but lustful love left no time. For one thing the teaching had to be done against her will, and that too at night. I dared not meet her in the presence of the elders, much less talk to her. Kathiawad had then, and to a certain extent has even today, its own peculiar, useless and barbarous *purdah*. Circumstances were thus unfavourable. I must therefore confess that most of my efforts to instruct Kasturbai in our youth were unsuccessful. And when I awoke from the sleep of lust, I had already launched forth into public life, which did not leave me much spare time. I failed likewise to instruct her through private tutors. As a result Kasturbai could with difficulty write simple letters and understand simple Gujarati. I am sure that, had my love for her been absolutely untainted with lust, she would be a learned woman, for I could then have conquered her dislike for studies. I know that nothing is impossible for pure love.

One thing, however, I must mention now, as it pertains to the same period. One of the reasons of my differences with my wife was undoubtedly the company of a friend. I was both a devoted and a jealous husband, and this friend fanned the flame of my suspicions about my wife. I never could doubt his veracity. And I have never forgiven myself the violence of which I have been guilty in often having pained my wife by acting on his information. Perhaps only a Hindu wife would tolerate these hardships, and that is why I have regarded woman as an incarnation of tolerance. A servant wrongly suspected may throw up his job, a son in the same

case may leave his father's roof, and a friend may put an end to the friendship. The wife, if she suspects her husband, will keep quiet, but if the husband suspects her, she is ruined. Where is she to go? A Hindu wife may not seek divorce in a law court. Law has no remedy for her. And I can never forget or forgive myself for having driven my wife to that desperation.

The canker of suspicion was rooted out only when I understood *ahimsa* in all its bearings. I saw then the glory of *brahmacharya* and realized that the wife is not the husband's bondslave, but his companion and his helpmate, and an equal partner in all his joys and sorrows—as free as the husband to choose her own path. Whenever I think of those dark days of doubts and suspicions, I am filled with loathing of my folly and my lustful cruelty, and I deplore my blind devotion to my friend.

Even my stay in England had not cured me of jealousy. I continued my squeamishness and suspiciousness in respect of every little thing, and hence all my cherished desires remained unfulfilled. I had decided that my wife should learn reading and writing and that I should help her in her studies, but my lust came in the way and she had to suffer for my own shortcoming. Once I went the length of sending her away to her father's house, and consented to receive her back only after I had made her thoroughly miserable. I saw later that all this was pure folly on my part.

The house (in Durban) was built after the western model and the rooms rightly had no outlets for dirty water. Each room had, therefore, chamber-pots. Rather than have these cleaned by a servant or a sweeper my wife and I attended to them. The clerks who made themselves completely at home would naturally clean their own pots, but the Christian clerk was a newcomer, and it was our duty to attend to his bedroom. My wife managed the pots of the others, but to clean those used by one who had been a *panchama* seemed to her to be the limit, and we fell out. She could not bear the pots being cleaned by me, neither did she like doing it herself. Even today I can recall the picture of her chiding me, her eyes red with anger, and pearl drops streaming down her cheeks, as she descended the ladder, pot in hand. But I was a cruelly kind husband. I regarded myself as her teacher, and so harassed her out of my blind love for her.

I was far from being satisfied by her merely carrying the pot; I would have her do it cheerfully. So I said, raising my voice: "I will not stand this nonsense in my house." The words pierced her like an arrow. She shouted back: "Keep your house to yourself and let me go." I forgot myself and the spirit of compassion dried up in me. I caught her by the hand, dragged the helpless woman to the gate, which was just opposite the ladder and proceeded to open it with the intention of pushing her out. Tears were running down her cheeks in torrents, and she cried: "Have you no sense of shame? Must you so far forget yourself? Where am I to go? I have no parents or relatives here to harbour me. Being your wife, you think I must put up with your cuffs and kicks? For Heaven's sake behave yourself, and shut the gate. Let us not be found making scenes like this."

I put on a brave face, but was really ashamed and shut the gate. If my wife could not leave me, neither could I leave her. We have had numerous bickerings but the end has always been peace between us. The wife, with her matchless power of endurance, has always been the victor.

Today I am in a position to narrate the incident with some detachment, as it belongs to a period out of which I have fortunately emerged.

The incident in question occurred in 1898, when I had no conception of *brahmacharya*. It was a time when I thought that the wife was the object of her husband's lust, born to do her husband's behest, rather than a helpmate, a comrade and a partner in the husband's joys and sorrows. It was in the year 1900 that these ideas underwent a radical transformation and in 1906 they took concrete shape...

The Natal Indians bathed me with the nectar of love. Farewell meetings were arranged at every place, and costly gifts were presented to me. One of the gifts was a gold necklace worth fifty guineas, meant for my wife. But even that gift was given because of my public work, and so it could not be separated from the rest.

The evening I was presented with the bulk of these things I had a sleepless night. I walked up and down my room deeply agitated, but could find no solution. It was difficult for me to forego gifts worth hundreds, it was more difficult to keep them.

And even if I could keep them, what about my children? What about my wife? They were being trained to a life of service, and to an understanding that service was its own reward.

I had no costly ornaments in the house, we had been fast simplifying our life. How then could we afford to have gold watches? How could we afford to wear gold chains and diamond rings? Even then I was exhorting people to conquer the infatuation for jewellery. What was I now to do with the jewellery that had come upon me?

I decided that I could not keep these things. I drafted a letter, creating a trust of them in favour of the community and appointing Parsi Rustomjee and others trustees. In the morning I held a consultation with my wife and children and finally got rid of the heavy incubus.

I knew that I should have some difficulty in persuading my wife, and I was sure that I should have none so far as the children were concerned. So I decided to constitute them my attorneys.

The children readily agreed to my proposal. "We do not need these costly presents, we must return them to the community, and should we ever need them, we could easily purchase them," they said.

I was delighted. "Then you will plead with mother, won't you?" I asked them.

"Certainly," said they. "That is our business. She does not need to wear the ornaments. She would want to keep them for us, and if we don't want them, why should she not agree to part with them?"

But it was easier said than done.

"You may not need them," said my wife. "Your children may not need them. Cajoled, they will dance to your tune. I can understand your not permitting me to wear them. But what about my daughters-in-law? They will be sure to need them. And who knows what will happen tomorrow? I would be the last person to part with gifts so lovingly given." And thus the torrent of argument went on, reinforced in the end by tears. But the children were adamant. And I was unmoved.

I mildly put in : "The children have yet to get married. We do not want to see them married young. When they are grown up, they can take care of themselves. And surely we shall not have for our sons brides who are fond of ornaments. And if after all, we need to provide them with ornaments, I am there. You will ask me then."

"Ask you? I know you by this time. You deprived me of my ornaments ; you would not leave me in peace with them. Fancy you offering to get ornaments for the daughters-in-law! You who are trying to make *sadhus* of my boys from today. No, the ornaments will not be returned. And pray, what right have you to my necklace?"

"But," I rejoined, "is the necklace given you for your service or for my service?"

"I agree. But service rendered by you is as good as rendered by me. I have toiled and moiled for you day and night. Is that no service? You forced all and sundry on me, making me weep bitter tears, and I slaved for them."

These were pointed thrusts, and some of them went home. But I was determined to return the ornaments. I somehow succeeded in extorting a consent from her. The gifts received in 1896 and 1901 were all returned. A trust-deed was prepared, and they were deposited with a bank to be used for the service of the community, according to my wishes or those of the trustees...

Thrice in her life my wife narrowly escaped death through serious illness. The cures were due to household remedies. At the time of her first attack Satyagraha (in South Africa) was going on or was about to commence. She had frequent haemorrhage. A medical friend advised a surgical operation, to which she agreed after some hesitation. She was extremely emaciated, and the doctor had to perform the operation without chloroform. It was successful, but she had to suffer much pain. She, however, went through it with wonderful bravery. The doctor and his wife who nursed her were all attention. This was in Durban. The doctor gave me leave to go to Johannesburg, and told me not to have any anxiety about the patient.

In a few days, however, I received a letter to the effect that Kasturbai was worse, too weak to sit up in bed, and had once become unconscious. The doctor knew that he might not, without my consent, give her wines or meat. So he telephoned to me at Johannesburg for permission to give beef tea. I replied saying I could not grant the permission, but that if she was in a condition to express her wish in the matter,

she might be consulted, and she was free to do as she liked. "But," said the doctor, "I refuse to consult the patient's wishes in the matter. You must come yourself. If you do not leave me free to prescribe whatever diet I like, I will not hold myself responsible for your wife's life."

I took the train for Durban the same day, and met the doctor who quietly broke this news to me: "I had already given Mrs. Gandhi beef tea when I telephoned you."

"Now, doctor, I call this a fraud," I said.

"No question of fraud in prescribing medicine or diet for a patient. In fact we doctors consider it a virtue to deceive patients or their relatives, if thereby we can save our patients," said the doctor with determination.

I was deeply pained, but kept cool. The doctor was a good man and a personal friend. He and his wife had laid me under a debt of gratitude, but I was not prepared to put up with his medical morals.

"Doctor, tell me what you propose to do now. I would never allow my wife to be given meat or beef, even if the denial meant her death, unless of course she desired to take it."

"You are welcome to your philosophy. I tell you that, so long as you keep your wife under my treatment, I must have the option to give her anything I wish. If you don't like this I must regretfully ask you to remove her. I can't see her die under my roof."

"Do you mean to say that I must remove her at once?"

"Whenever did I ask you to remove her? I only want to be left entirely free. If you do so, wife and I will do all that is possible for her, and you may go back without the least anxiety on her score. But if you will not understand this simple thing, you will compel me to ask you to remove your wife from my place."

I think one of my sons was with me. He entirely agreed with me, and said his mother should not be given beef tea. I next spoke to Kasturbai herself. She was really too weak to be consulted in this matter. But I thought it my painful duty to do so. I told her what had passed between the doctor and myself. She gave a resolute reply: "I will not take beef tea. It is a rare thing in this world to be born a human being, and I would far rather die in your arms than pollute my body with such abominations."

I pleaded with her. I told her that she was not bound to follow me. I cited to her the instances of Hindu friends and acquaintances who had no scruples about taking meat or wine as medicine. But she was adamant. "No," said she, "pray remove me at once."

I was delighted. Not without some agitation I decided to take her away. I informed the doctor of her resolve. He exclaimed in a rage: "What a callous man you are!"

It was drizzling and the station was some distance. We had to take the train

at Durban station for Phoenix, whence our settlement was reached by a rough road of two and a half miles. I was undoubtedly taking a very great risk, but I trusted in God and proceeded with my task.

Kasturbai needed no cheering up. On the contrary, she comforted me, saying: "Nothing will happen to me. Don't worry."

She was mere skin and bones, having had no nourishment for days. The station platform was very large, and as the rickshaw could not be taken inside, one had to walk some distance before one could reach the train. So I carried her in my arms and put her into the compartment. From Phoenix we carried her in a hammock, and there she slowly picked up strength under hydropathic treatment.

In two or three days of our arrival at Phoenix a *swami* came to our place. He had heard of the resolute way in which we had rejected the doctor's advice, and he had, out of sympathy, come to plead with us. He held forth on the religious harmlessness of meat, citing authorities from Manu. I knew that some of these verses from *Manusmriti* were interpolations. But Kasturbai's faith was unshakable. For her, scriptural texts were a sealed book but the traditional religion of her forefathers was enough. "Swamiji," she said, "whatever you may say I do not want to recover by means of beef tea. Pray don't worry me any more. You may discuss the thing with my husband and children if you like. But my mind is made up.". .

It happened that Kasturbai, who had a brief respite after her operation, had again begun getting haemorrhage, and the malady seemed to be obstinate. So when all remedies failed, I entreated her to give up salt and pulses. But she would not agree. She challenged me, saying that even I could not give up these articles if I was advised to do so. I was pained and equally delighted—delighted in that I got an opportunity to shower my love on her: "You are mistaken. If I was ailing and the doctor advised me to give up these or other articles, I should unhesitatingly do so. But there! Without any medical advice I give up salt and pulses for one year, whether you do so or not."

She was rudely shaken and exclaimed in deep sorrow: "Pray forgive me. Knowing you, I should not have provoked you. I promise to abstain from these things, but for Heaven's sake take back your vow. This is too hard on me."

"It is very good for you to forgo these articles. I have not the slightest doubt that you will be all the better without them. As for me, I cannot retract a vow seriously taken. And it is sure to benefit me, for all restraint, whatever prompts it, is wholesome for men. You will, therefore, leave me alone. It will be a test for me, and moral support for you in carrying out your resolve." So she gave me up. "You are too obstinate. You will listen to none," she said, and sought relief in tears.

She rallied quickly, haemorrhage completely stopped, and I added somewhat to my reputation as a quack.

I took the vow of *brahmacharya* in 1906. I clearly saw that one aspiring to serve humanity with his whole soul could not do without it. It was borne in upon me that I should have more occasions for service of the kind I was rendering, and that I should find myself unequal to my task if I were engaged in the pleasures of family life and in the propagation and rearing of children. In a word, I could not live both after the flesh and the spirit.

I had not shared my thoughts on the subject with Kasturbai until then, but only consulted her at the time of taking the vow. Kasturbai had no objection. But I was hard put to it in making the final resolve. I had not the necessary strength. But I launched forth with faith in the sustaining power of God.

From that day when I began *brahmacharya*, our freedom began. My wife became free from my authority as her lord and master, and I became free from the slavery to my own appetite which she had to satisfy. No other woman had any attraction for me in the same sense that she had. I was too loyal as husband, and too loyal to the vow I had taken before my mother, to be slave to any other woman. But the manner in which my *brahmacharya* came to me irresistibly drew me to Woman as the mother of man. She became too sacred for sexual love. And so every woman at once became sister or daughter to me...

During the days of the first Satyagraha in South Africa, Kasturba said: "I am sorry that you are not telling me about this. What defect is there in me which disqualifies me for jail? I also wish to take the path to which you are inviting the others."

"You know I am the last person to cause you pain. There is no question of my distrust in you. I would be only too glad if you went to jail, but it should not appear at all as if you went at my instance. In matters like this every one should act relying solely upon one's own strength and courage. If I asked you, you might be inclined to go just for the sake of complying with my request. And then if you began to tremble in the law court or were terrified by hardships in jail I could not find fault with you, but how would it stand with me? How could I then harbour you or look the world in the face? It is fears like these which have prevented me from asking you too to court jail."

"You may have nothing to do with me," she said, "if being unable to stand jail I secure my release by an apology. If you can endure hardships and so can my boys, why cannot I? I am bound to join the struggle."...

I had not intended to say anything about my wife having joined in the Rajkot struggle. But some cruel criticism about her intervention prompts an explanation. It had never occurred to me that she should join it. For one thing she was too old for such hardships. But strange as it may appear to critics, they must believe me when I say that though she was illiterate, she was for years absolutely free to do what she liked. When she joined the struggle in South Africa or in India, it was of her own inner prompting. And so it was this time. When she heard of Maniben's

arrest, she could not restrain herself and asked me to let her go. I said she was too weak. She had just then fainted in her bath-room in Delhi, and might have died but for Devadas's presence of mind. She said she did not mind. I then referred to Sardar. He would not hear of it either.

But this time he melted. He had seen my grief over the breach of faith by the Thakore Saheb induced by the Resident. Kasturbai was a daughter of Rajkot. She felt a personal call. She could not sit still whilst the daughters of Rajkot were suffering for the freedom of men and women of the State...

She was blessed with one great quality to a considerable degree, a quality which most Hindu wives possess in some measure. And it is this : willingly or unwillingly, consciously or unconsciously, she considered herself blessed following in my footsteps.

She was a woman always of very strong will which in our early days I used to mistake for obstinacy. But that strong will enabled her to become, quite unwittingly, my teacher in the art and practice of non-violent non-co-operation. Although she had gone through several imprisonments, she did not take kindly to the present incarceration (1942-44) during which all creature comforts were at her disposal. My arrest simultaneously with that of many others, and her own immediately following, gave her a great shock and embittered her. She was wholly unprepared for my arrest. I had assured her that the Government trusted my non-violence, and would not arrest me unless I courted arrest myself. Indeed, the nervous shock was so great that after her arrest she developed violent diarrhoea and, but for the attention that Dr. Sushila Nayyar who was arrested at the same time as the deceased was able to give her, she might have died before joining me in the detention camp, where my presence soothed her and the diarrhoea stopped without any further medicament. Not so the bitterness. It led to fretfulness ending in painfully slow dissolution of the body. Though for her sake I have welcomed her death as bringing freedom from living agony, I feel the loss more than I had thought I should. We were a couple outside the ordinary. Ours was a life of contentment, happiness and progress.

MAHADEV

By Verrier Elwin

WHEN I heard over the radio of the death of Mahadev Desai the jungle round me became more desolate and all that night I lay awake, my mind thronged with a score of memories of a dearly-loved friend. I remembered him on the battle-field among his beloved peasants at Bardoli; I recalled how he had taught me to read Tolstoy at Sabarmati; I remembered going to see him in prison and how the mean and gloomy little office where we had our interview seemed transformed by the vitality and the beauty of this man whom no chains could bind. Then later I remembered him at the time of Gandhiji's arrest after the Round Table Conference and how at a moment when most secretaries would have been fussed and distracted, he remained calm, unhurried and as always supremely efficient.

Mahadev threw in his lot with Gandhi at the time of the Champaran Satyagraha in 1918; among the list of volunteers from the Bombay Presidency the name of Mahadev Haribhai Desai, B.A., LL.B., then appeared for the first time. At Madhuban on January 17, 1918, a school was opened in the house of Seth Ganshyandas, and Mahadev and his wife were among the workers there. But Mahadev was already Gandhi's secretary and in a very short time was dealing with problems even wider and more exacting than those of a village school. From that year onwards Mahadev was Gandhi's constant companion until his death in the Aga Khan Palace in 1942. He was officially the secretary, but he was much more than that. He was in fact Home and Foreign Secretary combined. He managed everything. He made all the arrangements. He was equally at home in the office, the guest-house and the kitchen. He looked after many guests and must have saved ten years of Gandhi's time by diverting from him unwanted visitors. He had a wonderful way with elderly ladies. He knew just how to handle Emily Kinnaird. When he went to England, he so charmed my own dear mother that she, of very orthodox stock, was completely converted to his politics and half-converted to his religion in an afternoon.

Above all, Mahadev was Gandhi's Boswell. Perhaps in view of Dr. Johnson's liking for hot punch (a partiality which his biographer more than shared), it would be more accurate to say that Mahadev was Plato to Gandhi's Socrates. But, unlike Socrates who never had the chance with Plato, Gandhi read and checked everything

that was recorded of him. Mahadev's task was to make Gandhi real to millions. He made him perhaps the best known man in the world, certainly the best loved. The punctual, vivid, intimate stories that appeared week by week in *Young India* and *Harijan* displayed to readers all over the world a personality so lovable that love was inevitably roused in response. I think there can be no doubt that today Gandhi has the personal love and affection of more people than any other man living; in the creation of that affection Mahadev had his important part, for without knowledge there cannot be lasting love. Without Mahadev a thousand jewels more precious than diamonds would have been lost to the world. Gandhi himself has spoken of the tragedy that took Mahadev from the world with his task unfinished. "Life still lay before Mahadev as ordinary standards go. He aimed at living up to 100 years. The amount of material that he had piled up in his voluminous note-books called for years of patient labour to work up. He had hoped to do all that. In his trunk was found a memo of my talks taken down on the day previous to his final end. Probably none beside myself can today make them out, and even I do not know to what use he would have put them. He was a living example of the wise who live and work as if they were born to immortality and ever-lasting youth. But if all our dreams could be realized, life would become a phantasmagoria and there would be utter chaos on earth. God in his mercy, therefore, has ordained that His will alone should prevail on earth. Mahadev, though an idealist and a dreamer, never allowed his feet to be taken off the firm earth. He, therefore, adorned everything that he attempted."

But was the Gandhi that Mahadev showed us week by week the true Gandhi, or was he a Gandhi sentimentalized, romanticized, tidied-up as it were for presentation to the public? I think we had the truth. Mahadev was a journalist, it is true—he had the makings of a very great journalist, just as Boswell had—but like all the greatest journalists, he had not only a nose for news but a flair for truth. I believe the picture of Gandhi that he gave to the world was true in every respect.

What are the chief elements in that portrait? The first thing that strikes one is the stress on Gandhi as a human, loving, witty personality. Mahadev loves to show his hero in contact with people and with people of every different kind. Some of the best things he ever wrote were his accounts of the English excursions.

Then again Mahadev excels in showing us Gandhi the debater. Here is the true Socratic touch. He was never more pleased than when he could show his Bapu confounding an opponent in argument, putting him down, chuckling him out of countenance. I used to suspect that sometimes he deliberately introduced people into Gandhi's presence for the express purpose of sharpening his wit and enabling him to display his truly marvellous powers of debate. For Gandhi is not a monologue-man : when you go to him he does not address you as if you were a public meeting; he *talks*: he is one of the world's great conversationalists.

On the whole, in Mahadev's portrait, the politician is somewhat in abeyance.

That was natural, for Gandhi as a politician is fully represented by his own speeches and statements. It was Mahadev's special privilege to be able to show the world the Mahatma off the stage and below the platform. There were two things, however, that he never tired of stressing. One was Gandhi's love for khadi and the other his insistent war against untouchability.

Above all, Mahadev's spiritual and intellectual gifts enabled him to penetrate to the heart of things. He was able to show us something of what the struggle really meant. He never exploited Gandhi's sufferings; he did not emphasize them; but occasionally he lifted the veil and gave us a glimpse of the stress and urgency, the almost intolerable burden, the unyielding pressure, the passion of a whole nation struggling for unity and freedom, focussed and concentrated in one human spirit.

As a writer Mahadev revealed a very wide and general culture, with a catholic taste in poetry, art and literature. He had a clear, clean, idiomatic English style. He wrote prodigiously, but never with carelessness or inaccuracy. I have probably, like thousands of other men of my time, read every word that Mahadev ever published. Few writers can have commanded so many regular readers. In addition to his weekly articles, a number of his writings were collected in book form. I have four of these books in my library; I believe they represent his complete published works. It would be a very proper token of love for his memory if everything he has written could be collected and republished in a uniform memorial edition.

The first of my books is entitled *Gandhiji in Indian Villages* and was published by Ganesan in 1927. It is an excellent account of the Mahatma's tours in the villages of Kathiawad, Bengal, Malabar and Travancore in 1925. The following year Ganesan published another tour journal called *With Gandhiji in Ceylon*, giving as the name suggests an account of Gandhi's visit to Lanka in 1927. Then we have the admirable piece of reportage, *The Story of Bardoli*, published in Ahmedabad in 1929. This is, as Mahadev himself says, "an authentic and somewhat intimate record, of great value to all those interested in the methods of Satyagraha as a weapon to secure justice and freedom." Although it is an account of a battle as determined and exacting in its non-violent way as any war of arms, the book is written in the true spirit of *ahimsa*. Mahadev himself admits that the writing "may not perhaps reveal a pen dipped in the ink of love—a positive and a most difficult virtue, but there is nothing which has the slightest trace of rancour and malice." This is, I think, the only book which is not directly about Gandhi himself and yet every page throws light on his character and teaching. I myself saw something of the spirit of the people of Gujarat in those days and there has never been a time when the spirit of Gandhi was more truly interpreted and more bravely expressed.

Finally, there is Mahadev's collection of letters from England which were assembled in *The Nation's Voice*. This, as I have said, is probably the best thing that he ever did. It is an exceptionally brilliant piece of work. It revealed to the people of India their Mahatma and representative moving freely among the greatest and the

humblest of the land, moving with dignity and freedom and at every point giving his message in a spirit of love and truth. If there is anything to compare with these passages it is the wonderful account that Mahadev gave of the operation in the Sassoon Hospital at Poona. This will rank in the corpus of Gandhian literature with the description by C. F. Andrews of the breaking of the Delhi fast in 1924. Gandhi has insisted, however, that literature was not Mahadev's chief pre-occupation. He warns *litterateurs* that they should know that "he put the Charkha above literature. He took delight in spinning for hours. It was a daily duty. He would encroach upon his sleeping hours to finish his daily minimum of spinning. Why this insistence? Not I assure them, to please me. He threw in his lot with me after much deliberation. I never knew him do a thing without conviction. He thought with me that the material salvation of India's teeming but famishing millions was bound up with the Charkha. He discovered too that his daily labour with the hand enriched whatever literary work he did. It gave it a reality which it otherwise lacked."

Mahadev wrote, in a sentence already quoted, the revealing words that love was "a positive and a most difficult virtue." Yet, when I think of him, I feel that it was probably this virtue which he achieved more finely than any other. I do not overlook his indefatigable power of work; I do not forget his profound loyalty, his strength of purpose, his fearlessness, the charm that made him a thousand friends. He had all these things, but in the spirit of love he excelled. If, like Sir Thomas Browne, he could sometimes sit entranced and rapt in the evening beauty of the Sabarmati River to lose himself in an O Altitudo !, he was even more himself listening, like Herbert, to some old peasant's tale of woe. Among the beautiful songs that I remember him singing at the evening prayers in the Sabarmati Ashram was one by Tukaram :

That man is true
Who taketh to his bosom the afflicted.

In such a man
Dwelleth, augustly present,
God himself.

The heart of such a man is filled abrim
With pity, gentleness and love.

He taketh the forsaken for his own.

The servants in his home
He treateth as his own dear children.

No need to praise him more :
These words suffice.
In such a man God dwelleth.

But I would not say that God was "augustly present" in Mahadev; rather one saw the Spirit of Man, simple, kindly, affectionate, natural. Never was a man less

pompous. Never was a man less conscious of his own great powers. His heart was filled with pity, gentleness and love ; his mind was dominated by a great and holy cause. There was no room for selfishness and egotism. He was too busy to be mean. In the greatness of the cause and in the love of his great leader and friend, Mahadev Desai found himself and in his self-realisation brought nearer the unity, the freedom and the peace of India.



GANDHI THE HUMANIST

By F. R. Moraes

POSTERITY, in assessing the place of Mahatma Gandhi, will probably rank him higher as a humanist than as a politician. No man in our times has blended more successfully the temporal and the spiritual without injury to either. On the temporal plane Gandhi has accepted the two western criteria of political well-being—Justice and Liberty—but to each he has given an essentially eastern emphasis. Justice, he translates as devotion to the cause of the oppressed and the outcast, and it is significant that his main charge against the British Raj in India is that it has led to the degradation of the poor. Similarly, he seeks to cleanse Hinduism by uplifting the untouchable. To him Liberty connotes duties rather than rights; in the Gandhian vocabulary patriotism is identified with public duty.

This concept of patriotism explains the strong religious tinge in the Mahatma's politics. "For me," he wrote many years ago, "there are no politics devoid of religion." By western standards this statement seems startling but for Gandhi politics cannot be divorced from religion since both share the same ideal of human service. According to the Mahatma, both the political leader and the religious devotee labour for the good of humanity, and their roles are identical. If western politics has shed moral values it is, so he argues, precisely because the west has tended to keep politics and religion apart. The westerner may retort that India herself provides a warning against identifying politics with religion, and few will deny that Gandhi by elevating his fellowmen to his own moral plane tends to take a far too optimistic view of human nature.

Yet between the communalist's idea of impregnating politics with religion and Gandhi's purpose of importing moral values in the country's public life there is obviously a world of difference. Staunch Hindu though he is, his concept of religion as a moral force transcends mere credal belief.

Towards other religions his attitude is more than that of toleration; it is one invariably of positive appreciation. Gandhi is fond of interpreting the life of Christ as a triumphant vindication of the principle of non-violence, and at his wife's cremation Miraben sang the Mahatma's favourite Christian hymn "Lead, Kindly Light." Gandhi has read the Koran and for Islam's idea of puritanical simplicity and its sense of brotherhood he has often expressed the deepest reverence.

"Let me explain," he once said, "what I mean by religion. It is not the Hindu religion which I certainly prize above all other religions, but the religion which transcends Hinduism, which changes one's very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within, and which ever purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless until it has found itself, known its Maker, and appreciated the true correspondence between the Maker and itself." The idea is as old as human thought. Like the ancient *rishis* Gandhi regards religion as self-realisation, as the striving of the human personality to express itself in service, suffering and sacrifice. "You cannot divide social, political and purely religious work into watertight compartments. I do not know any religion apart from human activity," he writes.

Apply this norm to the Mahatma's actions, and you begin to understand his approach to most problems. If the ordinary man were asked to explain his own idea of politics he would probably define it as "the art of government"; economics he associates vaguely with various laws of supply and demand, with the gold standard and with the convolutions of exchange and high finance. Gandhi's views on politics and economics, because they are fundamental, appear to many to be elementary. To him the basic fact of economics is that man must eat. Freedom from want is the first article of his creed, and throughout his public life he has worked passionately to free his countrymen from the degradation of poverty.

There is a passage in the moving speech he made at his first trial in 1922 where Gandhi indicts not only the British Government but the Indian townsman for neglecting the poor peasant. "Little do town-dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking into lifelessness. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures, can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers of India will have to answer, if there is a god above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unequalled in history." The Bengal famine which came two decades later testified to the terrible truth of the indictment.

What distinguishes Gandhi most clearly from the older school of Indian politicians is this quality of never standing apart from the people. An English friend records how the Congress leader was once asked whether his service was done through love of the cause for which he worked or for love of the people whom he served. "He replied unhesitatingly that his motive was love of the people. To serve a cause without serving persons was a dead thing." Gandhi with his loin-cloth and his simple way of life has integrated more than his personality with the masses; he has stamped the mass mind with his moral impress. Not for everyone perhaps the elation of knowing what Thoreau described as "the joy of possessing all and owning nothing." But behind the simple way of life, as Gandhi has demonstrated, is a whole philosophy of life. Behind it, for instance, are the economics of *swadeshi* and khadi.

Deep in the Indian social system is the idea of self-sufficiency which Gandhi has



made the basis of the *swadeshi* movement. As far back as 1916 in a speech at a Missionary Conference in Madras, he described *swadeshi* as "that spirit in us which restricts us to the use and service of our immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the more remote." What else is that but the doctrine of self-sufficiency?

Elsewhere, in an explanation of the ideals of *ashram* life the Mahatma enlarges and elaborates on the same theme. "So when we find that there are many things we cannot get in India we must try to do without them. We may have to do without many things; but, believe me, when you have that frame of mind you will find a great burden taken off your shoulders, even as the Pilgrim did in that inimitable book *Pilgrim's Progress*. There came a time when the mighty burden that the Pilgrim was carrying unconsciously dropped from him, and he felt a freer man than he was when he started on the journey. So will you feel freer men than you are now, if immediately you adopt the *swadeshi* life." In other words, the *swadeshi* life is the simple life. As someone has put it: *swadeshi* provides an excellent example of the Mahatma's method of "reform from within."

Swadeshi spells all things to all men. Gandhi has often said that India could spin her way to *swaraj*. In the early days of the *swadeshi* campaign the Mahatma was fond of affirming that the cloth industry had enabled England to keep India in subjection, and he claimed that by stopping its import and by encouraging home production the country could save some Rs. 50 to 60 crores of the annual drain. "If India could make a successful effort to stop that drain," he once declared, "she could gain *swaraj* by that one act." In the light of present-day difficulties the claim may seem exaggerated, but underlying *swadeshi* is a positive spirit of discipline and self-denial. An India dedicated to these ideals should prove irresistible.

Gandhi holds that *swadeshi* through the *charkha* or spinning wheel by supplementing the peasant's income provides him with an insurance against unemployment and want; thus it is not a full time substitute but an aid to profitable occupation. In that sense it does not conflict with capital by depriving industry of labour. "The entire foundation of the spinning wheel," declared Gandhi in an article written in *Young India* many years ago, "rests on the fact that there are crores of semi-unemployed people in India. And I would admit that if there were none such there would be no room for the spinning wheel."

His antipathy to industrialisation is impelled by the same humanistic urge. Nothing in all of Gandhi's teachings has been more misunderstood or more misinterpreted than his attitude to machinery. To say that he is opposed to all machinery is simply not true. What Gandhi regards as anti-social is the type of machinery which by displacing human labour increases unemployment, and in *Hind Swaraj*, written in 1909, he states this view clearly.

Asked on one occasion whether he was against all machinery, Gandhi replied: "How can I be when I know that even this body is a most delicate piece of machinery? The spinning wheel is a machine; a little toothpick is a machine. What I

Government of India put it, "the intention of negotiating with Japan," he was doing nothing inconsistent with his creed. Alone almost among the intellectual pacifists of his age, who included such great names as Einstein and Bertrand Russell, Gandhi steadfastly kept true to his pacifist principles. A world in the throes of a desperate armed conflict turns its back today on the prophet of pacifism and, frankly, the practicability of non-violence on a mass scale remains to be proved. Yet it is incontrovertible that violence, like power, corrupts and brutalises. Some day the still, small voice of reason may be heeded by a war-weary world.

Non-violence, implying abstention from violence, suggests a negative method, but for Gandhi clearly it means much more than that. It implies not only active refusal to shed another's blood but the will to suffer in order to convert the opponent. Satyagraha is the weapon of the strong, not the weak. Implicit in the idea is the humanist belief that suffering has a direct instrumental value: "... it is not meetings and demonstrations that would give us victory, but quiet suffering." And elsewhere Gandhi says, "Satyagraha is nothing but *tapasya* for Truth."

In the popular mind Satyagraha is often confused with passive resistance. But there is an appreciable difference between the two terms. Unlike the Satyagrahi, the passive resister does not recognise the duty of loving his enemy. As Gandhi puts it, passive resistance can be characterised by hatred and can finally manifest itself in violence. The aim of the Satyagrahi is to bear pain himself, and by so doing overwhelm his opponent. While passive resistance is the weapon of the weak, Satyagraha is demonstrably the instrument of the strong.

What the true Satyagrahi aims at is to shame the wrong-doer into doing right by enduring the maximum suffering without thought of counter-violence. Thereby the opponent is not physically coerced but morally undermined. The idea of fasting as a form of suffering is impelled by the same motive though here again Gandhi extends the application of an old practice from personal to political ends. In the India of John Company's days the spectacle of a creditor fasting on his debtor's doorstep was by no means novel.

When Gandhi undertook his "capacity fast" in February 1943, he employed a method which however much it may have puzzled and irritated the west was understood by his countrymen. He was, to borrow a phrase, "doing *dharana*" on the British Government's doorstep. He was attempting to shame his opponent into doing right. The fact that the fast served no practical purpose did not in Indian eyes divest it of its moral triumph.

Behind the idea of Satyagraha as of *swadeshi* is the same Gandhian doctrine of "reform from within." Non-violence being, as the Mahatma insists, the weapon of the strong, its practice calls for self-discipline. Its use arises not from a sense of impotence but from a feeling of inner strength. Its value lies in the fact that it inflicts physical injury on none but the exponent.

Gandhi's sense of social service has, unlike some of his political experiments,

invariably sought a practical outlet. His passion for nursing the sick, for instance, dates back to his youth and he records how in his boyhood days he nursed his father through many illnesses. Since then he is found serving in hospitals, in ambulance corps and as a private nurse. In his autobiography Gandhi describes how he conducted without assistance the delivery of his last child. In South Africa he often condemned his countrymen for living in insanitary and filthy surroundings. In 1897 we find him conducting a campaign in Durban for sanitary reform among the Indian residents. The Mahatma's interest in sanitation has remained acute and he has never disdained to perform the most menial tasks such as the cleaning out of latrines. There is in his make-up not the slightest trace of any sense of squeamishness.

At a time when much lip-service is paid to democracy, particularly by certain politicians whose performances vary greatly from their professions, Gandhi's ideas on political organization merit more impartial study than his detractors have given them. When the Mahatma discarded his formal clothes the gesture was more than symbolic; with them he shed many conventional ideas. Bred in the broad and humanising school of *Vaishnavism*, Gandhi retains with his heterodoxy an extreme conservatism in many matters, and the puritanical streak is strong in him. It is this mixture of asceticism and good humour, of the radical and the conservative which equates him with his fellow countrymen and endears him to them. Despite his legal training in England he retains today none of the formal trappings of western education.

Gandhi's political and economic knowledge reveals great gaps. With characteristic frankness he has often confessed his ignorance of recent political developments abroad. Yet no man knows the Indian peasants so intimately or understands their problems with such sensitive sympathy. This is partly because like them he often thinks and acts intuitively. What is his inner voice but his sense of intuition? His writings despite his efforts to rationalise his emotions betray frequently an ascendancy of feeling over thought, of instinct over intellect. His rigid attachment to first principles makes him seem somewhat doctrinaire, and unquestionably he is more interested in achieving the ultimate slowly than in seizing on an immediate advantage and exploiting it. This explains his weakness as a purely political negotiator. As his speech at the second session of the Round Table Conference shows, Gandhi is more interested in the purpose than in the mechanism of modern politics.

With Plato is associated the concept of the city state. Gandhi's ideal is the Indian village state with each of the 700,000 units "organized according to the will of its citizens, all of them voting." "Then," he explains to Louis Fischer, "there would be seven hundred thousand votes and not four hundred million. Each village, in other words, would have one vote. The villages would elect their district administrations, and the district administrations would elect the provincial administrations, and these in turn would elect a president who would be the national chief executive."

"This is very much like the Soviet system," Fischer remarked.

"I did not know that," Gandhi admitted. "I don't mind."

The outstanding, and in many ways the most significant feature of the Mahatma's work as a social reformer is the background of radical and conservative ideas which inspire it. "I am a reformer through and through," he has declared, "but my zeal never leads me to the rejection of any of the essential things of Hinduism." To him the equality of all men is a fundamental creed, and his opposition to untouchability as a blot not only on the Hindu social system but as a sin against mankind is passionate and uncompromising. Significantly he has always stressed the point that the system has no sanction in the Hindu *shastras*. On the other hand while criticising the rigours and disabilities of caste he is not prepared to uproot the custom. According to him, the divisions of caste "define duties, they confer no privileges. All are born to serve God's creation, a Brahmin with his knowledge, a Kshatriya with his power of protection, a Vaishya with his commercial ability, and a Shudra with bodily labour. This, however, does not mean that a Brahmin, for instance, is absolved from bodily labour or the duty of protecting himself and others. There is nothing again to prevent the Shudra from acquiring all the knowledge he wishes." It is the familiar Gandhian axiom of status imposing duties rather than rights but this idealisation of caste does not altogether accord with common practice. The abandonment of the caste system is surely a way to the abolition of untouchability.

Yet service is undeniably the master passion of his life, and the Mahatma revered today for his selflessness will also be remembered for it. Saints are rarely simple. The western world is often baffled by the Mahatma's mental processes. A practical mystic like Gandhi is not an easy man to understand. This frail being, as his early activities in South Africa testify, does not lack physical courage; of his moral courage he has given abundant proof. And undeniably he will be remembered more for the spirit he represented and sought to transmit to his fellowmen than for any material achievement he may happen to leave behind him.

Many of the world's great figures have entered men's minds only to destroy human fellowship and goodwill. It is Gandhi's great contribution to the civilization of his day that in entering men's minds he seeks not to destroy but to promote in their hearts a love for their fellowmen.

GANDHI AND TAGORE

By K. R. Kripalani

TOLSTOY and Lenin! Tagore and Gandhi! No people save the Russians and the Indians have produced within recent times a pair of contemporaries, at once so illustrative of their people's genius and so remarkable for the height and quality of their achievements.

Whilst Tolstoy and Lenin challenge and repudiate each other's genius and seem to represent a balance of contrary forces in the development of the Russian civilization, Tagore and Gandhi have confirmed and upheld each other and represent a fundamental harmony in the Indian civilization. Perhaps when the Russian experiment in socialism has been fully worked out, a reconciliation between the spirits of Tolstoy and Lenin will be achieved.

Genius of one order cannot be compared or contrasted with genius of an altogether different order. Gandhi's genius lends no comparison to Tagore's. Nevertheless, both were sons of the same Mother India nurtured on the same lore and the same heritage, inspired by the same ideal and dedicated to the same cause. It is this oneness in the spirit of their genius, the parallel in the *sadhana* of their life, running through a multitude of differences that we shall endeavour to trace and discuss.

Though for more than two generations our intelligentsia have been looking westwards for intellectual and moral inspiration, it is to Gandhi and Tagore that our future generations will look back with pride and gratitude. For these two, more than any others, have embodied the noblest thought and practice of India, if not of mankind. In their personalities were blended and integrated in one intense reality the best of their people's heritage, their strivings and their hopes, India's spiritual sensibility reacting to the spirit of the west, responsive to its stimulus but determined to resist its aggression. Therein lies the permanent significance of their lives.

To the superficial eye, these two men seem as different as two men can be from one another, different in every respect—in physical appearance, in mental equipment, in sensibility, in the influence of heredity and family tradition, in their early upbringing and education, in the paths they laid out for themselves, in the experiences that befell them on the way. From a middle-class Vaishya family of a minor state in

Kathiawad to an aristocratic Brahmin family of *zamindars* in Calcutta at that time the political, commercial and intellectual capital of India—is a far cry.

Compared with young Gandhi, young Tagore had all the advantages of birth and upbringing. Bengal was at that time in the full tide of a literary, social and religious renaissance. If ever there was truth in the Bengali's boast that what Bengal thinks today the rest of India thinks tomorrow, it was then rather than at any other time. Among a stalwart band of pioneers, were Rabindranath's grandfather, Dwarkanath, known as the Prince because of his generous and magnificent ways, his father Devendranath, known as the Maharshi because of his great character and spiritual insight, his eldest brother, Dwijendranath, known as the Philosopher, and his elder brother Jyotirindranath, whose career was like that of a comet, trailing a dazzling path for a brief moment. The influence of the Maharshi, whose life remains recorded as an authentic chapter in the annals of the experiments of Indian sages with truth, formed the spiritual background of his son's education. This saved the Indian Goethe from the natural paganism of a poet's creed and made him in spirit a kinsman of Gandhi's.

What of young Gandhi? Though he was born in a well-to-do, respectable family of upright parents, he was not the favourite of fortune that young Tagore was. Shy and reserved, of no extraordinary distinction in appearance or talent to mark him off from others, he gave no promise in his boyhood of the extraordinary, almost superhuman stature he was to attain in his later age. It was as though Nature, jealous of the delicate and precious instrument she was fashioning, wanted to ward off every evil eye and so hid it in a commonplace sheath. Not even the instrument itself was aware of the herculean mission that awaited it in the world outside. No consciousness of genius haunted it, no prophet's frenzy ruffled the placid surface of an uneventful boyhood, no passionate longings forced their way out of the deep caverns of the soul. He was spared all premature strain of that overwhelming consciousness of his destiny which has been the making and the unmaking of many geniuses and prophets, till his mind had ripened and was able to bear the strain lightly, without pride, without aggressiveness. It is true that a deep sense of loyalty to parents, of devotion to duty, of truthfulness, and an unwillingness to think ill of others were evident even in the little schoolboy, but in the setting in which he was born and brought up these qualities were not perhaps very extraordinary, nor did they give any hint of the dynamic mind of one of the world's greatest revolutionaries.

And yet these qualities, though they could not at that time have led anyone to forecast his future destiny, are the qualities which are still the rock bottom of his character, their content and scope widening with the years. Loyalty to parents has become loyalty to Mother India, devotion to duty the unflinching dedication to the service of humanity, truthfulness pursuit of Truth, and unwillingness to think ill of others tolerance and fair-mindedness towards his political opponents. The little boy who was so deeply moved by a picture of Shravana carrying, by means of slings fitted

for his shoulders, his blind parents on a pilgrimage, was to grow up and carry on his shoulders the burden of his blinded countrymen on the pilgrimage of freedom.

As children, Tagore and Gandhi were very shy and avoided the company of their school mates and hurried back home as soon as the school was over, "afraid," as Gandhi says, "lest any one should poke fun at me." "As a rule," he tells us, "I had a distaste for any reading beyond my school books. The daily lessons had to be done because I disliked being taken to task by my teacher as much as I disliked deceiving him." Young Tagore had no such conscience towards his studies, and did not mind feigning an illness to get rid of the conscientious tutor who would turn up even on a rainy day. But he had an inordinate love of reading anything he could come across outside his school texts. Once when he came across a copy of Jayadeva's *Gita Govinda* written in Bengali script he went through the whole of it, reciting sonorously, though he knew no Sanskrit and understood hardly a verse. But the music of the sound enchanted him and he copied out the whole of the book for his use. Similarly he would sit and recite page after page of Kalidasa's *Meghaduta* without understanding a line. "Looking back on childhood days," he tells us, "the thing that recurs most often is the mystery which used to fill both life and world ... It was as if nature held something in her closed hand and was smilingly asking us : What d' you think I have?" Already at the age of fourteen the young boy was writing patriotic poems and reciting them at the Hindu Mela, "which was then the nucleus of the *swadeshi* movement in Bengal." One of them was a biting satire on the pageantry and pomp of the Delhi Durbar held by Lord Lytton, while famine was raging all around.

At about the same age or a little earlier young Gandhi too was experiencing the first stirrings of patriotic zeal and was putting through quietly and in utter secrecy his first experiment with Truth. Under the influence of an unworthy friend and in the sincere belief that meat-eating was essential to the revitalising of his people to enable them to cope with the British menace, he was training himself to relish meat—at what anguish to his sensitive mind he has himself told us.

For the early life and adventures of these two strange children of Mother India, we have no other authentic record save what they have given us in their autobiographies. While Gandhi, with scrupulous truthfulness and characteristic humility, has bared before us the most intimate details of his personal and private life, Tagore has drawn a discreet curtain over them. Gandhi's personality is integrated in one single pursuit of Truth and he keeps the doors of his life open, as a laboratory for experiments which are of enduring value to all humanity. To quote his own words : "As I have all along believed that what is possible for one is possible for all, my experiments have not been conducted in the closet, but in the open."

Gandhi in his humility refuses to attribute any special inborn genius to himself and believes that any one of us can become like him, if only we earnestly strive. And so to hearten us he talks less of his uncommon virtues and more of his common human failings and draws for us the picture of the little boy "pilfering stumps of cigarettes

thrown away by my uncle," stealing "coppers from the servant's pocket money in order to purchase Indian cigarettes," clipping a bit of gold out of his brother's armlet. Only a shameless cynic or a humble votary of truth like Gandhi would have the courage to lay bare his past to the curious gaze of all.

"Both Gurudeva and Gandhiji," wrote Jawaharlal Nehru in August 1941, a few days after the poet's death, "took much from the west and from other countries, specially Gurudeva. Neither was narrowly national. Their message was for the world. And yet both were 100 per cent India's children, and the inheritors, representatives and expositors of her age-long culture. How intensely Indian both have been, in spite of all their wide knowledge and culture. The surprising thing is that both of these men with so much in common and drawing inspiration from the same wells of wisdom and thought and culture should differ from each other so greatly. No two persons could probably differ so much as Gandhi and Tagore."

Yes, they seemed to differ in every respect. They seemed to differ as the deep blue of the mid-day sky differs from the pageant of colours at sunrise, as a simple reed differs from a *vina*, as a piece of home-spun linen differs from rich brocade. But the most surprising thing of all is not how they differed, but that seeming to differ so much how much in common they had, in their basic character, in the nature of their life-long *sadhana*, in the spirit of their dedication, even in the content of the message they have given to their people, however much the language and the accent of the messages may differ. Pilgrims to the same shrine, they came by different paths, one trudging on bare feet, the other flying on eagle-wings.

Both were deeply religious. Each had a different vision, but both were sustained by the same faith in the absolute reality of the spirit and in the capacity of the human spirit to realise its oneness with it. Both strove, each in his way, to attain this ideal. "What I want to achieve—what I have been striving and pining to achieve these thirty years," writes Gandhi in his autobiography, "is self-realisation, to see God face to face, to attain *moksha*. I live and move and have my being in pursuit of this goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing and all my ventures in the political field, are directed to this same end." "I have ever loved thee," sings Tagore, "in a hundred forms and climes, in age after age, in birth after birth." If nothing else remains, "let only that little be left of me whereby I may name thee my all." Both were modest and truthful enough to admit that they had not attained the goal. "I have not yet found Him, but I am seeking after Him," confesses one. "The song that I came to sing remains unsung to this day," wails the other. "Thou wert hidden in my inmost heart, but I failed to see thee." Both sought Him through love, one as Truth revealed in the Good and the other as Beauty revealed by Harmony. "The stream which comes from the infinite and flows towards the finite—that is the Truth, the Good. Its echo which returns to the infinite is Beauty and Joy."

Neither sought His vision in the privacy of a temple, or in the solitude of a cave, or in the piety of a ritual. Nor did they follow the well-defined, traditional Indian

path of psychic *sadhana,* popularly known as *yoga.* Both sought Him in this world of humanity, one through active dedicated service of his fellow creatures, the other through a direct, intuitive realisation of his affinity with every aspect of creation. "Your idol is shattered in the dust to prove that God's dust is greater than your idol," says Tagore.

Gandhi's mind is more logical, his devotion more single-hearted, his passion less varied and more intense, his courage and his willingness and capacity to suffer much greater than Tagore's. He is the warrior and the crusader of India's new humanity, as Tagore was its herald and its bard. Tagore knew his limitations and could confess with humility : "When I try to bow down to Thee, my obeisance cannot reach down to the depth where thy feet rest among the poorest, the lowliest and the lost." He could admonish the priest to seek his God not in the dim twilight of the temple but in the open and dusty road of human ordeal, where the tiller is tilling the ground and the stone-breaker is breaking stones. He saw Him there, he saluted Him there, but could not keep Him company there. Gandhi sees Him there, he sought Him there and keeps Him company there.

There is something of an ascetic, of an eternally self-denying *tapasvi* about Gandhi. He rejoices in renunciation. Tagore was a poet and a lover of life. He loved, tended and cherished the senses as a musician cherishes his instruments.

Deliverance is not for me in renunciation,
I feel the embrace of freedom in a thousand
bonds of delight.
No, I will never shut the doors of my senses,
The delight of sight and hearing and touch will
bear thy delight.

"Enjoy without greed" was the maxim he had garnered from the *Upanishads.* Yet he was far from being an epicurean. His personal life was simple and clean, at times bordering on the austere, as those know who lived with him. But he knew that the Hindu spiritual tradition had overstated the case for self-denial and had made life seem a bleak desert. He wanted to correct the balance and teach his people the art of enjoying life without vulgarising it.

Alas, my cheerless country,
Donning the worn-out garment of decrepitude,
Loaded with the burden of wisdom,
You imagine you have seen through the fraud of creation.

But though voluntary self-torture as a spiritual exercise was repugnant to his nature, he knew and valued the necessity of suffering as a purifying force in life. He could agree with Gandhi that "suffering is the mark of the human tribe. It is an eternal law. No country has ever risen without being purified through the fire of suffering which is the one indispensable condition of our being." But he would have

added that capacity for joy is an equally indispensable condition of our being. Nor indeed would Gandhi deny the fact. They differ only in their emphasis. In November 1940, only a few months before his death, Tagore wrote :

Small is man's body,
How immense his strength of suffering.

. . . . .

To each moment he brings endless value
From his unconquerable will.

. . . . . .

Is there anywhere such quest, nameless, radiant,
Such pilgrimages together, from road to road?
Such pure waters of service, breaking through
igneous rocks,
Such endless store of love?

What a tribute, nameless and radiant, to Gandhi's own quest and pilgrimage !

Gandhi is the apostle *par excellence* of non-violence. It is the breath of his life, as it is the breath that may one day save humanity from its nightmare of hatred and slaughter. But few people know that even before Gandhi had worked out and applied the possibilities of his faith and creed, Tagore had hailed the advent of such an apostle. In his dream *Prayaschitta* (Atonement) published in 1909 and based on his novel *Bau-Thakuranir Hat,* published in 1883, and again in his play *Mukta-Dhara* (The Waterfall), 1922, he had created in Dhananjay Vairagi almost a prototype of Gandhi. Here is a character who, as his name suggests, has renounced all personal possessions and has taken upon himself the leadership of his unarmed people in a no-tax campaign against the cruel exactions of the king. Here is a regular Satyagraha on a mass scale, based on truth, non-violence and fearlessness.

Tagore, as is well-known, had taken an active part in the early days of the *swadeshi* agitation in Bengal. His poems, songs and speeches had roused and inflamed the favour of patriotic passion in Bengal and had hardened the will of the people to resist. But while he could rouse feelings and stimulate thinking, as perhaps no one else could, he could not control and direct the action of his people. That is one great difference between him and Gandhi, who is a born leader of men. Gandhi is human will personified. He is master of his own will and is, therefore, able to control and direct the wills of others. When the popular agitation in Bengal found its natural overflow in violent activities, Tagore shrank from it in disgust and withdrawing from the arena sought consolation in his Muse.

Nevertheless, it is astonishing to recall how closely the programme of national activity he had laid down and expounded to his people as early as 1904 in his lecture on Swadeshi Samaj and in his presidential address at the Bengal Provincial Conference at Pabna, in 1908, resembles the programme of constructive activity framed and organized by Gandhi. Non-co-operation, Hindu-Muslim unity, anti-untouchability,

village reconstruction, revival of handicrafts, rural education with its emphasis in training through hand labour, village self-government and volunteer organizations,—all these were advocated by him in language of passionate sincerity. Though born and brought up in a city, his heart was with rural India. From its landscape his Muse drew its unfailing inspiration and to its neglected, voiceless masses his heart ever returned.

To the dumb, languishing and the stupefied
must we give voice;
These hearts, wilted, withered and broken
must be galvanised with new hope;
Beckoning them we must exhort.
Lift up your heads this very instant
and stand united,
They before whom you quake in fear, quake more
than you in their guilt,
They will take to their heels the moment
you are roused...

It was as though Tagore was the immortal voice and Gandhi the invincible arm of the new India.

Though Gandhi had become the spearhead of Indian nationalism and Tagore was looked upon as the prophet of internationalism, Gandhi's mission of liberation embraces the entire humanity, and Tagore's love of his country was as deep-rooted and as intense as Gandhi's. "I am wedded to India," says Gandhi, "because I believe absolutely that she has a mission for the world. My religion has no geographical limits. I have a living faith in it which will transcend even my love for India herself." Again: "For me, patriotism is the same as humanity. I am patriotic because I am human and humane. My patriotism is not exclusive I will not hurt England or Germany to serve India ... A patriot is so much less a patriot if he is a lukewarm humanitarian." Tagore's patriotism needs no advocate. His songs have been on the lips of Bengal's martyrs being led to the gallows. He wanted the freedom of India not that she may shut herself up in her isolation nor that she should lord it over other nations, but that she may be in a position to offer to the world her best gifts and be able to accept from others the best they have to offer. He resented India's political subjection because to continue existence as "the eternal rag-picker at other people's dustbins" is the greatest shame. "All humanity's greatest is mine. The infinite personality of man can only come from the magnificent harmony of all human races. My prayer is that India may represent the co-operation of all the peoples of the earth. For India unity is truth and division evil."

No two Indians of recent times have raised their country's stature so high, given their countrymen so much to be proud of and have revealed to them the greatness of their heritage and the possibilities of their future so vividly as these two. And yet

neither of them ever flattered their people's vanity or ever encouraged national or racial self-complacence. They have been the most unsparing critics of their people's failings. "If the Indians have become the *pariahs* of the empire," said Gandhi, "it is retributive justice meted out to us by a just God." Says Tagore :

Prisoner, tell me who was it that wrought
this unbreakable chain.
It was I, said the prisoner, who forged
this chain very carefully.
O my hapless country, those whom you have
insulted—
Their humiliation will drag you down to their
own level.

"India contains all that is disgusting and all that is noble. You take your choice," said Jawaharlal Nehru. Both Tagore and Gandhi, like Jawaharlal himself, have made no choice. They accepted their country in its entirety, heightening its nobility and cleansing, purifying and redeeming its disgustingness. Both understood by *swaraj* something far more positive than mere freedom from foreign domination. Both were jealous guardians of moral values. Both were passionate believers in the sanctity and the inviolable rights of the individual's personality, and were, therefore, mistrustful of the ever increasing claims of the state over the individual in a modern industrial society. Both were inveterate and vehement preachers against the dangers of a materialist and mechanical civilization. Tagore hated the spirit of the Machine Civilization which ruthlessly grinds the individual under its wheels in the name of efficiency, though he was an admirer of western science and believed that, properly controlled, the machine could and should be made to serve the needs of man. Gandhi is even more radical in his scepticism of the worth of an industrial civilization to human welfare : "I would not shed a tear if there were no rail roads in India." It is true that of late he is willing to compromise on that issue in the sense that he will not stand in the way of industrial development in India, if the Indians want it. But he has an ascetic's deep-seated fear of multiplying men's wants by making it easy to cater to them.

Though friends of the poor, neither was a socialist, in the accepted sense of the term. Both began by believing that it was possible to persuade the rich to regard themselves as trustees for the poor. Their insistence on moral values as the guiding factor in human conduct and their profound faith in human nature, coupled with mistrust of the impersonal and non-human nature of the state, made it inevitable for them to think so. Though Tagore developed considerable sympathy and admiration for Soviet Russia towards the end of his life, it is doubtful if he ever believed in socialism. Gandhi's theory of trusteeship, on the other hand, is so flexible, and his concern for the interests of the dispossessed so inflexible, that he may find it quite possible

and consistent to advocate, or at any rate to tolerate, the expropriation of the propertied interests without compensation.

Both were anti-fascists to the core and openly and passionately denounced Japanese aggression in China, even when British diplomacy was openly and shamelessly condoning it. It is a remarkable coincidence that both of them expressed their readiness to go to Japan to plead with the people there to desist from the wrong they were doing. Such was their faith in human nature and such their universal sympathy that they never could believe that a people could be intrinsically and wholly wicked, even when their governments were pursuing a wicked end. Wars, according to them, were due not to the specific wickedness of this nation or that but to the general fever of greed and violence generated by the industrial and materialist civilization of the west. The only ultimate way to prevent wars is to abjure violence, restrain greed and respect the supremacy of moral values. "Modern arms," says Gerald Heard, "whoever employs them, can destroy civilization. Modern regimentation—the *sine qua non* of the efficient employment of modern arms—must destroy all humaneness. It does not matter under what flag, under which slogan, you employ such methods. If you drink cyanide wishing to commit suicide or if you drink it believing it to be a cordial, the consequences must be the same. Means control ends." If today European thinkers like Gerald Heard and Aldous Huxley are able to assert that means control ends, it is because Gandhi and Tagore have been preaching and living by that faith for more than a quarter of a century.

Both began by crediting the British with good intentions and believed that if only they could be made to see the wrong they were doing to India, they would desist. Both were destined to be disillusioned, step by step, and came to realise that the British have one set of principles for home consumption and another and quite a different set for export to India and the colonies. India to realise her destiny must break away completely from the tentacles of British imperialism. There is no other way. But even in the bitterest moments of this realisation, they never gave way to hatred and prejudice, nor indulged in self-righteousness, nor lost their wide perspective of humanity. What a contrast between their language and the language of Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill against their enemies! Even the great intellectuals of England and America, men who prided themselves on their universal tolerance, and the great religious leaders who preached commentaries on the Sermon on the Mount could not resist the temptation of indulging in frenzies of pious hatred.

They gather in their prayer halls in a pious garb,
They call their soldiers,
Kill, Kill, they shout;
In their roaring mingles the music of their hymns,
While the Son of Man in His agony prays, O God,
Fling, fling far away this cup filled with
the bitterest of poisons...

On the very eve of India's bitterest struggle for freedom, and even while assuming the leadership of that struggle, Gandhi could say : "We must remove hatred for the British from our hearts. At least in my heart there is no such hatred. As a matter of fact, I am a greater friend of the British now than ever I was. The reason for this is that at this moment they are in distress...It may be that in a moment of anger they might do things which might provoke you. Nevertheless, you should not resort to violence and put non-violence to shame." In the whole history of mankind's struggle for freedom, there is no instance of such majesty of moral discipline.

Only for a brief interval during and after the first non-co-operation movement was there anything like a misunderstanding and opposition between these two apostles of India's regeneration. It is not surprising. When two such gigantic personalities, at once intense, vital and original, rub shoulders, what is surprising is not that they once challenged each other in an open controversy but that throughout their careers their relationship was marked by a spirit of the deepest respect, understanding and friendliness. Even when they differed, they were one in their spirit of mutual reverence.

Their personal contact dates from 1915, when Gandhi first visited Santiniketan where the members of his Phoenix Ashram had already found a temporary home on their return from South Africa. During that first visit, Gandhi, true to his practice, had suggested to the teachers and students that they should dispense with the services of the cooks and other servants and do all the work themselves. When the suggestion was put to the poet, he said to the boys, "The experiment contains the key to *swaraj*." The experiment, however, did not last long, but the Santiniketan Ashram still observes March 10 every year as Gandhi Day, when all the servants, including the sweepers, are given a holiday and all their work is done by the students and teachers.

They met again at the end of 1917 when the poet recited his famous "India's Prayer" at the opening session of the Calcutta Congress and Gandhi attended a stage performance of *The Post Office* at Tagore House.

In 1919 came the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy in the Punjab. When the news, despite the strict military censorship, trickled down to Bengal, Tagore was the first to make a public protest. It is interesting to compare the letter Tagore wrote to the Viceroy on May 30, 1919, giving up his knighthood, with the one written by Gandhi on August 1, 1920, returning to the Viceroy his Kaiser-i-Hind medal. "The time has come," wrote Tagore, "when the badges of honour make our shame glaring in the incongruous context of humiliation, and I for my part wish to stand shorn of all special distinctions by the side of those of my countrymen who, for their so-called insignificance, are liable to suffer degradation not fit for human beings." "I can retain," wrote Gandhi, "neither respect nor affection for a Government which has been moving from wrong to wrong in order to defend its immorality." Both were moral protests couched in words of great dignity and passion. But while Tagore's protests ended with the renunciation of his title, Gandhi's inaugurated the non-co-operation

Dear Mr Gandhi

That you could think of my school as the right and the likely place where your Phoenix boys could take shelter when they are in India has given me real pleasure – and that pleasure has been greatly enhanced when I saw those dear boys in that place. We all feel that their influence will be of great value to our boys and I hope that they in their turn will gain something which will make their stay in Shanti Niketan fruitful. I write this letter to thank you for allowing your boys to become our boys as well and thus form a living link in the <u>sādhanā</u> of both of our lives.

Very sincerely yours
Rabindranath Tagore

movement. It is surprising that Tagore, who was the first to make such a noble and dramatic gesture of non-co-operation, should have failed to appreciate the significance of the mass movement launched by Gandhi. Gandhi met him in Calcutta in September 1921. No record exists of the interview, but it seems the two parted agreeing to differ.

The best statement and exposition of these differences is given us by a foreigner —a foreigner who was great enough to appreciate and interpret these two—Romain Rolland. We cannot do better than quote his words.

"The controversy between Tagore and Gandhi, between two great minds, both moved by mutual admiration and esteem, but as fatally separated in their feelings as a philosopher can be from an apostle, a St. Paul from a Plato, is important. For, on the one side we have the spirit of religious faith and charity seeking to found a new humanity. On the other, we have intelligence, free-born, serene, and broad, seeking to unite aspirations of all humanity in sympathy and understanding.

"On April 10, 1921, Tagore wrote from London, 'We are grateful to Gandhi for giving India a chance to prove that her faith in the divine spirit of man is still living'...

"Yet it was inevitable that the breach between the two men would widen... At the time he (Tagore) was not only a 'poet' but the spiritual ambassador of Asia to Europe, where he had asked people to co-operate in creating a world university at Santiniketan. What an irony of destiny that he should be preaching co-operation between Occident and Orient at one end of the world, when at that very moment non-co-operation was being preached at the other end!...

"Non-co-operation clashed with his way of thinking, for his mentality, his rich intelligence, had been nourished on all the cultures of the world... In other words, just as Goethe in 1813 refused to reject French civilization and culture, Tagore refuses to banish western civilization. While Gandhi's doctrine does not really set up a barrier between the east and the west, Tagore knows it will be interpreted as doing so, once Hindu nationalism is stirred... Tagore saw the danger of mental despotism loom near, and in the *Modern Review* of October 1921, he published a real manifesto, 'An appeal to Truth', which was a cry of revolt against this blind obedience. The protest was particularly strong because it was preceded by a beautiful homage to the Mahatma.

"Tagore's noble words, some of the most beautiful ever addressed to a nation, are a poem of sunlight. And the only criticism one can make of them is that they plane too high...

"In his answer to Tagore Gandhi displays more passion than he has so far shown in the controversy. On October 13, 1921, in *Young India*, his stirring rejoinder appears. Gandhi thanks the 'Great Sentinel' for having warned India as to the pitfalls ahead. He agrees with Tagore that most essential of all is the maintenance of a free spirit... Tagore is the sentinel who warns of the approach of the enemies called Bigotry, Lethargy, Intolerance and Inertia. But Gandhi does not feel that Tagore's misgivings are justified. The Mahatma always appeals to reason."

"To a people famishing and idle the only acceptable form in which God dare appear," wrote Gandhi, "is work and promise of food as wages ... Hunger is the argument that is drawing India to the spinning wheel.

"Give them work that they may eat! Why should I, who have no need to work for food, spin?—may be the question asked. Because I am eating what does not belong to me. I am living on the spoliation of my countrymen. Trace the source of every coin that finds its way into your pocket, and you will realise the truth of what I write. Every one must spin. Let Tagore spin, like the others. Let him burn his foreign clothes, that is the duty today. God will take care of the morrow. As it says in the *Gita*, 'Do Right'."

"Dark and tragic words these!" comments Romain Rolland. "Here we have the misery of the world rising up before the dream of art and crying, 'Dare deny me existence!' Who does not sympathise with Gandhi's passionate emotion and share it? And yet in his reply, so proud and so poignant, there is nevertheless something that justifies Tagore's misgivings: *Sileat Poeta*, imposing silence on the person who is called upon to obey the imperious discipline of the cause. Obey without discussion the law of *swadeshi*, the first command of which is 'Spin!'"

What a sad and unnecessary controversy! Here was the poet challenging the very man for whose advent he had waited and prayed, whose very methods he had anticipated and blessed, in his poems, speeches, dramas and novels. And Gandhi today would be the first to admit* that the Great Sentinel had more than earned his right to his bread and did not need to spin to justify his existence. However, the poet was silenced. Had he not admonished himself? "If you can't march in step with your compatriots in the greatest crisis of their history, beware of saying they are in the wrong, and you in the right! But give up your place in the ranks, and go back to your poet's corner and be prepared to meet with ridicule and public disgrace." Retiring into his poet's corner, he wrote the play *Mukta-Dhara* (The Waterfall), which was the highest tribute he could have paid to Gandhi and his crusade of non-violence. So ended the controversy which only brought into relief the innate greatness of the two and the enduring affinity of their spirits.

Years passed, Gandhi lay in Yeravda Prison, determined to resist with his life the iniquitous Communal Award. The epic fast was to awaken the conscience of his people and of their alien rulers. On September 2, 1932, before the fateful day dawned, he remembers his great fellow-spirit and pens these words to him.

Dear Gurudev,

This is early morning 3 o'clock of Tuesday. I enter the fiery gate at noon. If you can bless the effort, I want it. You have been to me a true friend because you have been a candid friend, often speaking your thoughts

* We do not think Gandhiji would make any such admission. Has he not said that every art would be richer for the artist spinning? Gandhiji would accept the poet's offering for what it is worth but he would accept nothing as a substitute for hand spinning.—*Editors.*

aloud. If your heart approves of the action, I want your blessing. It will sustain me. I hope I have made myself clear. My love.

M. K. Gandhi

But before the letter was despatched, the poet's telegram was handed to him. "It is worth sacrificing precious life for the sake of India's unity and her social integrity... Our sorrowing hearts wil follow your sublime penance with reverence and love."

On September 24, the poet left for Poona and was at Gandhi's bedside in the Yeravda Prison in time to receive the happy news that the British Government had relented and Gandhi had won. Before the fast is broken he sings to Gandhi his beautiful song, a favourite of Gandhi's : "When the heart is dried and parched up, come with your shower of mercy."

They met again in March 1936 in Delhi and in March 1938 in Calcutta, on which occasions Gandhi came to the poet's aid and got him funds to help Visva-Bharati tide over its difficulties. Their last meeting—the most touching and beautiful of all their meetings—took place in Santiniketan in February 1940, when "this great soul in a beggar's garb," to quote the poet's description of him, came to see him. A few months later when Tagore lay in Calcutta, hovering between life and death, Gandhi sent his personal secretary, Mahadev Desai, to see him. As Mahadev Desai handed to him Gandhi's letter, the poet's hands shook with emotion and tears trickled down his cheeks. He who never wept in sorrow wept in joy. The friendship of these two to the end, despite the many differences that seemed to divide them, will be remembered by their countrymen as an undying testimony to their greatness. Had one of them been a little less great, they would have fallen out. It was so easy to misunderstand each other, with their sensibilities and their ways of living so sharply in contrast, their fields of activity so widely separated, and each surrounded by admirers, not as tolerant and understanding as the masters. That they did not do so is a measure of their stature.

Tagore is no more. He lives only in his words and in them he will live as long as men cherish love for the beautiful. Whether his ideas are accepted or rejected, his feelings will continue to find response as long as men's hearts are alive ; and as long as words have power to move men's hearts, his immortal words will continue to stir, delight and elevate the hearts of his readers. Gandhi is happily still with us. Millions love him and thousands follow him. Millions will continue to worship him. If he succeeds in his mission, he will have achieved what no man ever achieved before. If he fails, he will have failed to use Tagore's words—"as the Buddha failed and as Christ failed to wean men from their iniquities, but he will always be remembered as one who made his life a lesson for all ages to come."

EAST WIND, WEST WIND

By Marjorie Sykes

IT is usual in appraisals of the character and work of the world's great men to discuss the "influences" which their predecessors have exercised upon them, and to try to determine from that study the nature and extent of their own original contribution. Which of us could measure with any approach to accuracy the degree and direction in which our own lives have been guided by any one *guru*, poet or thinker? And if we cannot fully answer such questions even for those whom we know intimately how shall we presume to analyse the mystery of another man's personality? We can, however, make a study of some of the ways in which one human life, in its confessed purposes and action, resembles certain other human lives of power and beauty with which we are familiar. What are the affinities between the thought and practice of Mahatma Gandhi and those of Jesus of Nazareth, and of the great thinkers of the Christian tradition who have drawn their inspiration from Him?

Gandhi first came into contact with Christianity though only in a superficial, external fashion, and partly by hearsay, as a schoolboy in Rajkot. His reaction was hostile. His mind, sensitive from childhood to spiritual sincerity, and trained in a deeply religious home atmosphere, revolted against the foreign external observances and abuse of Hinduism which in his sight characterised the Christian religion. Later on, the same instinct for spiritual reality which caused him to reject the Rajkot preaching, took him deeper and deeper into a study of the essence of Christianity. Over and over again it was a recognition of the living faith of Christian friends which led him to seek the truth by which they lived. The first such friend was an English Christian who persuaded him to read the Bible during his student days in London in 1889.

It is hardly surprising that in attempting to read the Old Testament straight through, with no knowledge of its background or composition, the young student should have been bewildered and even repelled. But the New Testament was a different matter. He records the deep impression made upon him by the life of Jesus, especially by the Sermon on the Mount. "It went straight to my heart. I compared it with the *Gita*. The verses, 'But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil'; 'but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And



Romain Rolland

M K Gandhi

if any man take away thy coat let him have thy cloak too' delighted me beyond measure and put me in mind of Shamal Bhatt's 'For a bowl of water give a goodly meal' etc." It is significant in view of the later development of his thought that part of the appeal of the Sermon was in its resemblance to a Gujarati stanza known and loved from childhood.

The same spiritual sensitiveness brought Gandhi an early recognition of "the futility of mere religious knowledge." "A knowledge of religion, as distinguished from experience, seems but chaff in moments of trial." In Paris in 1890 he was quick to feel the grandeur, the peacefulness, and the genuine devotion which filled the great churches. Back in India in the following year the burning devotion of the poet-merchant Raychandbhai cast a spell upon him. On his first visit to South Africa in 1893 it was again with a group of earnest Christians that he entered into the closest intimacy. When working in Pretoria on behalf of Messrs. Dada Abdulla and Co., he came into contact with Mr. A. W. Baker, the young Mr. Coates, and other devoted Christians who lent him books, discussed them with him, and tried to persuade him to become a Christian. Gandhi answered that he could only take such a step if after a full study of the religion in which he had been brought up (which he had not yet been able to make) he were convinced that it was unable to satisfy his religious needs so well as Christianity. "I assured him that nothing could prevent me from embracing Christianity should I feel the call." He did not feel the call, but none the less he always considered this period of close religious fellowship to have been of very great importance in his life. "Though I took a path my Christian friends had not intended for me, I have remained for ever indebted to them for the religious quest that they awakened in me."

The quest so begun continued and widened in its scope. In the same year Gandhi records another landmark in his contacts with Christian thought: "Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is within You* overwhelmed me. Before the independent thinking, profound morality and truthfulness of this book, all the books given by Mr. Coates seemed to pale into insignificance." A little later, while at Durban, he read more of Tolstoy. "*The Gospel in Brief, What to do?* and other books made a deep impression upon me."

Meantime, in Africa and back in India, by correspondence, reading, and personal friendship, Gandhi's knowledge of the Hindu scriptures, especially of the *Gita*, was being continually expanded and enriched. It is not till 1903, in South Africa once more, that he records the next epoch-making contact with a Christian writer: "Mr. Polak came to see me off at the station (Johannesburg) and left with me a book to read during the journey which he said I should be sure to like. It was Ruskin's *Unto this Last*... I could not get any sleep that night. I determined to change my life in accordance with the ideals of the book."

Gandhi's concern is always with two elements in the religion of Jesus—the one, His insistence on the essential inwardness of religious experience; the other, the pro-

found and revolutionary effect on all social morality of a conception of righteousness that is "rooted and grounded in love." As one would expect from one so convinced of the primacy of the inner experience, mechanical or legalistic theories of inspiration or atonement have no interest for him. Even in early days in South Africa he had put his own inward ideal of redemption before the "Plymouth Brother" whose mind moved on the external plane. "I do not seek redemption from the consequences of my sin. I seek to be redeemed from sin itself, or rather from the very thought of sin." Our breaches of God's Law are met, not by a vindictive but by "a purifying, compelling punishment," which it does not become us to avoid, but humbly to accept. We may see in this high thought of God the fruit of that unforgettable experience of his childhood when he confessed a wrong-doing to his father, and realised that his father's love had cleansed his heart and washed his sin away. His conception of the Divine Sonship of Christ is likewise that He was morally and spiritually, rather than in any way supernaturally, "begotten of the Father."

The student who had found the treasure of the Bible in the Sermon on the Mount continued to find it there. "*The message of Jesus as I understand it,*" he said to the Colombo Y. M. C. A. in 1927, "is contained in his Sermon on the Mount, unadulterated and taken as a whole." Such a mind has natural affinities with the ethical, humanitarian, "Christian Socialist" thinkers of the nineteenth century, with Emerson and Thoreau in America, with Kingsley, Carlyle and Ruskin in England, and with Tolstoy in Russia. These thinkers were witnessing, each from his own angle, in his own country and circumstances, the decay of a corrupt civilization built on money—and machine-slavery, and supported by a "political economy" which assumed self-interest to be the only effective motive-power in human society. Each from his own angle recalled men to the simple essentials of life, the wresting from field and forest of daily bread and shelter. Each proclaimed that there could be no true health or salvation for man so long as he cuts himself off from his roots in this world of Nature.

Emerson, fertile and fertilising thinker as he was, took little active part in the experiments inspired by his writings. His younger friend, Thoreau, lived alone for two years (1845-47) in a house built with his own hands by the Walden pool, supporting himself by work in the fields. Both then and throughout his short life he set himself to show how few and simple are the things needful for a truly civilized life. "Civilization," he writes, "is a real advance in the condition of man," but "at what a sacrifice this advantage is at present obtained." He believed that "we may possibly so live as to secure all the advantage without suffering any of the disadvantage." In one of his letters he asks: "To what end do I live a simple life at all?" and answers that his aim is not simplicity for its own sake, but "rather that I may make use of the ground I have cleared to live more worthily and profitably." This clearing away of material possessions to make room for the spiritual is an ideal familiar to India, and it is no surprise to find that Thoreau was acquainted with

Hindu and Buddhist thought. But his debt to the Sermon on the Mount and his recognition of the revolutionary character of its teaching is explicit: "I know of no book that has so few readers (as the New Testament). There is none so truly strange and heretical and unpopular." He goes on to quote some of Jesus' sayings, such as "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you," "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth," "Go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor," and comments: "Let but one of these sentences be rightly read from any pulpit in the land, and there would not be one stone of that meeting-house left upon another."

Thoreau, like St. Francis, looked upon the animals as his "townsmen and fellow-creatures," possessing "the character and importance of another order of men." The thought of the world of living creatures as a family in which Man is only one of many brothers is a true deduction from Christ's religion of love and compassion, but one that is, alas, not as common as it should be. In fact, the absence of such a loving regard for the animal creation from ordinary Christian teaching as he found it, was one of the reasons which led Gandhi to feel that the Hindu religion was superior to the Christian.

When Gandhi spoke to the Chhatra Sammelan conference at Ahmedabad in January 1930 on "The Meaning of Power", he used these words: "We are born to serve our fellowmen, and we cannot properly do so unless we are wide awake." The sentence reads almost like a condensation of this lovely passage from Thoreau's *Walden*: "Morning is when I am awake and there is a dawn in me. Moral reform is the effort to throw off sleep... The millions are awake enough for physical labour, but only one in a million is awake enough for effective intellectual exertion, and only one in a hundred millions to a poetic or divine life. To be awake is to be alive. I have never yet met a man who was quite awake. How could I look him in the face?"

When Ruskin's *Unto this Last* was published in 1860 it caused a furore in conventional English society. It is a witty, suggestive and dashing attack by a Christian believer on materialistic assumptions in social and commercial life. What do we mean by "rich," he asks. Are not riches power over men obtained by keeping them poor? "The persons who become rich are generally speaking industrious, resolute, proud, covetous, prompt, methodical, sensible, unimaginative, insensitive and ignorant ...The persons who remain poor are the entirely foolish, the entirely wise, the idle, the reckless, the humble, the thoughtful...the clumsy knave, the open thief, and the entirely merciful, just and godly person."

Ruskin, moreover, suggests that the great intellectual professions are held in honour (with the exception of the merchant's) because it is obscurely recognized to be the duty of each one of them to serve society and not self-interest, if needful with their lives. "The soldier must die rather than leave his post in battle, the physician rather than leave his post in plague, the pastor rather than teach falsehood, the

lawyer rather than countenance injustice. The merchant—what is his due occasion of death?... For the merchant's *function* is to provide for the nation, and the public must learn that the market may have its martyrdoms as well as the pulpit, and trade its heroisms as well as war."

Then comes the magnificent peroration: "There is no wealth but Life—Life, including all its powers of love, of joy, and of admiration. That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings."

In his autobiography Gandhi summarises what for him was the message of *Unto this Last*:

1. That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
2. That the lawyer's work has the same value as a barber's inasmuch as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.
3. That a life of labour, that is, the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman, is the life worth living.

The first of these I know. The second I had dimly realised. The third had never occurred to me.

It is not difficult to trace that development of Gandhi's thought which prepared his mind for the tremendous impact of Ruskin's social Christian teaching. In very early days in South Africa he had protested against the acceptance of standards of commercial morality which were lower than the highest, and the consequent banishment of religion from the market-place: "Business, they say, is a very practical affair, and truth is a matter of religion; and they argue that practical affairs are one thing while religion is quite another." Very soon after comes the truly Ruskinian reflection on his own profession: "The true function of a lawyer is to unite parties riven asunder." A few months later, after the reading of *What then must we do?* (which interestingly enough did not then, for all its power, constitute for him the clarion call to action which Ruskin's book did ten years later) he describes with humorous relish his own first steps towards simplicity and self-reliance in the matter of washing his own collars and cutting his own hair. He renounces the material security of an insurance policy as inconsistent with trust in God, and is gripped by the teaching of *aparigraha* (non-possession) in the *Bhagavad Gita*.

Into a mind so prepared by years of thought and experiment, and deeply coloured by his own and Tolstoy's interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, *Unto this Last* came like a match into a powder magazine. The determination "to change my life in accordance with the ideals of the book" was not only made but acted upon with truly explosive energy. The immediate result was the transfer of the *Indian Opinion* press from Durban to Phoenix, and the establishment of the farm-settlement there. Simplification of life proceeded rapidly, and Ruskin's teaching was reinforced by Tolstoy's call to "get off the backs of the poor," by learning to support oneself with manual labour, and by ceasing to enslave men with money payments. Tolstoy Farm

was a natural development from Phoenix; at a later time the "gospel of the *charkha*" owed a great deal of its inspiration to the same source.

The peculiar significance of Tolstoy in Gandhi's thought-life does not, however, lie so much in his reinforcement of Ruskin's doctrine of manual labour as in his powerful advocacy of non-resistance as the true Christian ethic of the Sermon on the Mount, which is the theme of *The Kingdom of God is within you.* The book, published in 1891, contains a most forceful condemnation not only of war, but of all forms of violence, and declares that Governments which employ force "are fundamentally immoral, and exist for the advantage of the rich and powerful to the detriment of the poor and needy." Tolstoy asserts further that it is, therefore, our duty to boycott all such Governments, refuse them services of any kind, and in fact (though he does not use the word) to treat them to complete non-co-operation.

On the positive side, Tolstoy found the essence of Christianity, the Way of Life taught by Jesus, in five "commandments of peace" which he considered to be the gist of the Sermon on the Mount :

1. Live in peace with all men, honouring all of whatever rank, and with anger towards none.
2. Let every man have one wife and every woman one husband, and let there be no divorce and no unchastity.
3. "Swear not at all", renouncing all oaths.
4. Bear all wrong done to you without resistance and without either design or desire to punish.
5. Love all men alike without distinction of nationality; do good to all alike.

It is unnecessary to enlarge on the significance of such teaching, coming as it did to Gandhi in the prime of his youth and at a time when his vigorous intellect was beginning to grapple on a comparatively small scale, with the problem that has ever since formed the background of his public activities—by what authority and under what conditions a Government may justly govern.

Simplicity and labour, renunciation and non-resistance—for these Christian thinkers, and no less for Gandhi, these are the fruits of Love as Jesus taught it, the marks of a society in which the Sermon on the Mount should be taken seriously as the norm of good life. This Love is no weak sentimentalism, but an active goodwill towards all the children of the Father in Heaven, the "enemy" no less than "the poor, the lowliest and the lost" of our own society.

We must now turn to that even deeper element in Christian experience in which the love of the brethren which we have been considering is rooted—the inward experience of the Love of God.

From the first Gandhi saw clearly that the essence of religion is not in the knowledge of the scriptures, nor the intellectual assent to creeds, nor the scrupulous observance of ceremonial law, but in the inner surrender of self to the Truth which

is God, and in trust in His grace for the doing of His Will. Jesus taught that "all the Law and Prophets" was contained in the first and great commandment, "Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy strength", and in the second, "Thou shall love thy neighbour as thyself."

Gandhi thinks of this God Whose Being demands this whole-hearted service as the sole final Reality and Certainty of the universe. "I worship God as Truth only ... all else but God which is Truth is an uncertainty." He far transcends the finite conceptions of our limited minds, He combines in Himself all Truth, Knowledge and Bliss. Yet Gandhi does not believe that the Supreme Reality is, therefore, unknowable; on the contrary the knowledge of God is the real goal, the search for God the real occupation, of human life. "The finite human being", he writes, "will never know in its fullness Truth and Love which is infinite, but we do know enough for our guidance." Again, in the preface to his autobiography he says: "I have not yet found Him but I am seeking after Him," and describes how progress in this search for the Absolute Truth can only come as we are faithful to all the "relative truth" which is given to us. Now this adoration of a mystery and majesty beyond our understanding is also an essential element in all worthy Christian thought of God; without that element, Christ's teaching of God's Fatherhood is shorn of its wonder and dignity, and the danger of anthropomorphism becomes real. The Christian disciple likewise thinks of this Reality as revealing Himself to men "in a measure enough for our guidance." And therefore a truly Christian religious consciousness does not belittle the part of the mind and reason in the knowledge of God. Jesus called us to love Him "with all our mind," and to use our own intelligence to judge of truth. So Tolstoy in his *Reason and Religion* (1894) claims that only through the exercise of our reason can we nourish our minds on truth, and in a supplementary letter declares that "one of the chief and most holy duties of man" is the "clearing up by each man of all religious truth accessible to him."

Both in the religious thought of Gandhi and in that of the Christian tradition we see the paradox (a paradox of experience) that this infinite and transcendent Reality is yet "closer to us than breathing, nearer than hands or feet." "He is in us and yet above and beyond us," writes Gandhi. "God is not in Kaaba or Kashi—He is within every one of us." "We can feel Him if we will but withdraw ourselves from the senses. The divine music is incessantly going on within ourselves." This God, he says, speaks and can be heard by the listening spirit in the secret places of our hearts. "The secret of silence is to be able to listen to the still small voice which is always speaking within us." And yet lest his hearers should conclude from such expressions that prayer is a mere exercise in auto-suggestion: "I would allow it to be said that I pray to an outside power. I am part of that Infinite, but yet such an infinitesimal part that I feel outside it." Such an experience of the Indwelling God is the monopoly of no one religion, it is the joy of His saints of every land and nation. Christians speak of it as the real presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps Gandhi's nearest spiritual kin among Christian churches (as distinct from individual

Christians) are the Society of Friends or Quakers, who in their corporate worship of God rely on the immediate guidance of that inner divine spirit to the exclusion of all pre-arranged forms of prayer. On more than one occasion during his last visit to England Gandhi shared in the Quaker worship, with its aspiration for the perfect outward and inward stillness which they like him have found to be a condition of spiritual vision.

Another affinity between Gandhi's outlook and the Christian tradition is in the close and vital relationship which both insist on between moral purity and active obedience, and the vision of God. "Blessed are the pure in heart," said Jesus, "for they shall see God." "I shall never know God," says Gandhi, "if I do not wrestle with and against evil even at the cost of life itself ... The purer I try to become the nearer I feel to be to God." Or again, "No man or woman with an impure heart can appear before the Great White Throne." With regard to obedience Jesus issues his stern warning: "Not everyone that calleth me 'Lord, Lord' shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven (the presence of God) but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Gandhi quotes these words, makes their teaching his own, and teaches his followers that "religion is the service of the helpless," that it is service that makes the heart prayerful, and that "God Himself seeks for His seat the heart of him who serves his fellow-men."

Yet, fundamental to both Jesus and Gandhi as this moral purity and obedience are, both recognise that their demands can be so misinterpreted as to make outward conformity to an ethical law, and the performance of acceptable external "service," *on which a man may pride himself the essential part of one's "religion". There is* sounded unmistakably, both in the teachings of Christ and in the writings of Gandhi, the call to such utterly self-forgetful devotion that no room is left for pride and self-complacency. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "He that would save his life shall lose it, but he that loses his life for my sake and the gospel's shall keep it unto life eternal." When we turn to Gandhi's writings we find the same emphasis on self-abnegation. "Service without humility is selfishness and egotism." "God demands nothing less than complete self-surrender as the price of the only freedom that is worth having. And when a man thus loses himself, he immediately finds himself in the service of all that lives." "You are not going to know the meaning of God or prayer unless you reduce yourself to a cipher."

Another emphasis in Gandhi's religious thought which resembles closely the Christian point of view is his attitude to the material world, the life of the body and asceticism. It is characteristic of his profoundly positive and hopeful religion that he should so often speak of God as "Maker" ("Maker of Heaven and earth," as the ancient Christian creed has it) and thereby declare his acceptance of the material world and of our human body as fundamentally good because made by Him. He speaks indeed in Christian phrase of the body as the temple of God. The *brah-*

machari, he says, uses food "to keep the temple of God in good repair." His discipline of asceticism is not inconsistent with this appreciation of the holiness of material things. Again and again he repudiates as useless the observance of a mere external self-denial. "A mind consciously unclean cannot be cleansed by fasting." The true fast is a natural material symbol or sacrament of the soul's yearning that God should be all in all.

It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that in the foregoing study of the affinities between Christian religious thought and Gandhi's, it is the best and most representative Christian insight that is drawn upon, the insight of Christian saints and sages, aberrations and misplaced emphases being discounted. Between Gandhi and this main stream of Christian experience the differences, with one exception, are rather differences of emphasis than fundamental divergences. As an example of difference of emphasis we may cite the place given in worship and ethic to the consciousness of sin, though even here certain Christian traditions, for example the Quaker, stand much closer to Gandhi's experience than do others. A difference that perhaps goes deeper is that Christians find in the words "Our Father" as interpreted by Christ, that is in the conception of the highest and holiest personality, the least inadequate category which our finite human thought can use in conceiving of a Reality that transcends our imaginations. Moreover they find in Jesus Himself, in His life of perfect love, the revelation of the meaning of that Fatherhood in History, the image and glory of the invisible God. Gandhi's approach is more impersonal: "I do not regard God as a person ... Truth for me is God." Nor does he feel that Jesus' revelation of Him is unique in quality. Yet he declares: "He is a personal God to those who need His personal presence. He is embodied to those who need His touch. He is all things to all men." Whether this divergence is in truth as fundamental as to many minds it appears, is a point on which opinions will differ.

One may fitly quote in conclusion one of Gandhi's most beautiful confessions of faith; "I have made the frankest admission of my many sins. But I do not carry their burden on my shoulders. If I am journeying Godward, as I feel I am, it is safe with me. I feel the warmth and sunshine of His presence. My austerities, fastings and prayers are I know of no value if I rely upon them for reforming me. But they have an inestimable value if they represent, as I hope they do, the yearnings of a soul striving to lay his weary head in the lap of his Maker."

TRUTH IN BEAUTY

By D. G. Tendulkar

Truth and Beauty I crave for,
live for, and would die for.

M. K. GANDHI

GANDHIJI has no consideration for art and culture, declare even his admirers! It is true that he has seldom written directly on the subject. But he has a kind of original philosophy expressed in his doings and utterances which has influenced his life and ours too.

"In his own way he had discovered the art of living and made of his life an artistic whole. Every gesture has meaning and grace without a false touch," aptly observes Jawaharlal Nehru. "Having found an inner peace he radiated it to others."

No wonder many of us cannot recognize the grandeur of Gandhiji's life. For decades, *sahib* has been our guide and philosopher. Like parrots we spoke his language and donned his clothes. Everything we looked at through *sahib's* spectacles. Ajanta and Ellora were mere ruins to us. We melted our wonderful bronzes to stuff our homes with foreign works of questionable art. We sneered at our literature, philosophy, art and culture.

The British planned our education to make us a mere appendage to their Empire. "It was assumed that when once the literate class had been educated in English, western learning, of which English was the medium, would gradually 'filter down' to the masses. Eventually everyone would be westernized, and—as a result—everyone would become Christian," comments Rushbrook Williams on Macaulay's gift to India. Like a good magician Gandhiji has broken the spell.

"The existing system of education," Gandhiji has pointed out, "is defective, apart from its association with an utterly unjust Government ... it is based upon foreign culture to the almost entire exclusion of indigenous culture." "National education," he continues, "wants to rescue the Indian vernaculars from unmerited oblivion and make them fountains of national regeneration and Indian culture. It holds that a systematic study of Asiatic cultures is no less essential than the study of western sciences for a complete education for life. The vast sources of Sanskrit and Arabic,

Persian and Pali, and Magadhi have to be rescued in order to discover wherein lies the source of strength for the nation. It does not propose merely to feed on, or repeat the ancient cultures. It rather hopes to build a new culture based on traditions of the past, enriched with the experience of later times. It stands for the synthesis of different cultures that have come to stay in India, that have influenced Indian life, and that in their turn have themselves been influenced by the spirit of the soil. The synthesis will naturally be of the *swadeshi* type where each culture is assured its legitimate place, and not of American pattern, where one dominant culture absorbs the rest, and where the aim is not towards an artificial and forced unity."

Gandhiji is not interested in the question whether his attitude is "intellectual" according to the current fashion or not. His opinions are found as a rule, judged by the standards of the merely educated, to be at once startlingly revolutionary and startlingly reactionary.

The long pilgrimage of culture begins with the formulation of one's own philosophy. In Gandhiji's case he has expressed his philosophy in such a form and to such purpose that it has definitely influenced the life of the nation.

Gandhiji does not give sermons on culture but he lives it. "An academic grasp without practice behind it is like an embalmed corpse, perhaps lively to look at but nothing to inspire or ennoble" is his principle.

His attitude to culture can best be stated in his own words: "Whoever really understands and loves India must cling to the culture of his country as a child clings to its mother's breast."

"But Indian culture," Gandhiji points out, "is neither Hindu, Islamic nor any other, wholly. It is a fusion of all and essentially eastern ... And everyone who calls himself or herself an Indian is bound to treasure that culture, be its trustees, and resist any attack upon it ... I want the cultures of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any. I refuse to live in other peoples' houses as an interloper, a beggar or a slave."

"Nothing can be further from my thought," he continues, "than that we should become exclusive or erect barriers. It is my firm opinion that no culture has treasures so rich as ours has. We have not known it. We have been made even to depreciate its value. We have almost ceased to live it ... My religion forbids me to belittle or disregard other cultures, as it insists upon imbibing and living my own."

"European civilization," Gandhiji admits, "is no doubt suited for the Europeans," but warns us, "it will mean ruin for India, if we endeavour to copy it." This is not to say we may not adopt and assimilate whatever may be good and capable of assimilation by us as it does not also mean that even the Europeans will not have to part with whatever evil might have crept into it. "The incessant search for material comforts and their multiplication is such an evil," Gandhiji says, "that the Europeans

themselves will have to remodel their outlook, if they are not to perish under the weight of comforts to which they are becoming slaves."

An intellectual in his stubborn attitude clutches to his bosom not so much ideas as words. Gandhiji's mind and thought mingle with the living man, not the abstract one, steep in the springs of real life, of the complete, conscious life of the community. Therefore, his sensitive mind is able to appreciate and impart sensibility to the artistic world concealed in the humdrum of everyday life. "Truth is the first thing to be sought for and Beauty and Goodness will then be added unto you", is his guiding principle.

"God gave me sense of Art," Gandhiji said at Faizpur. His pilgrimage in the realm of culture makes an interesting study and reveals his artistic make-up.

He was immensely influenced by Ruskin, Tolstoy, Thoreau and Emerson—the lovers of beauty in simplicity and truth. Of Ruskin, Gandhiji has said : "My belief is that I discovered some of my deepest convictions reflected in *Unto this Last* and that is why the book captured me. Poets do not influence all alike." Gandhiji is stirred so deeply by the writings of these literary giants because he has much in common with them. His own writings are steeped in great beauty and culture and to understand them is an education in culture itself. Culture, for Gandhiji, is not a thing to talk about but to live for and appreciate.

On his visit to Lakshman Jhula in the Himalayas Gandhiji remarked : "Suspension bridge now, formerly a fine rope-bridge." He was pained to see the jarring environment. "Across the bridge, a number of shabby looking sheds of galvanised iron sheets." Gandhiji's own hut at Sevagram is an example of his taste. It is a picture of beauty in simplicity. The village sessions of the Congress is Gandhiji's idea. It was not purely a mass contact proposition. Therefore, he chose Nandalal Bose to plan these village sessions. They discussed plans together which resulted in Nandalal imbibing the ideas of a practical idealist.

"The construction of the Congress was incredibly simple : Assam bamboo, Assam mud, Assam straw, Assam khadi and Assam labour were responsible for the very simple but artistic huts erected on the Brahmaputra bank ... All the arrangements were in keeping with this artistic simplicity," exclaimed Gandhiji earlier at Gauhati Congress. The Faizpur village session was the first experiment of its kind. The town people could not appreciate it. *The Times of India* commented : "Everything is crude in the extreme ... A bamboo city." Soon some sense of beauty dawned even on the Anglo-Indian mind. The very construction a year later at Haripura was praised by the same paper.

"In India," said Aurobindo, "we have been cut off by a mercenary and soulless education from all our ancient roots of culture and tradition ; it is corrected only by the stress of imagination, emotion and spiritual delicacy, submerged but not yet destroyed, in the temperament of the people." Gandhiji has appealed to this sense of imagination, emotion and spiritual delicacy of our people in reviving

our forgotten handicrafts. "He becomes lyrical," Romain Rolland has remarked, "when he describes the 'music of the spinning wheel', the oldest music in India, which delighted Kabir, the poet-weaver."

Like a poet Gandhiji spoke of "art and beauty in the spotlessly white khaddar and its *soft unevenness*." "If our tastes were not debased we would prefer khaddar to *sticky calico*," he told us. He made us conscious of what he calls spiritual art in khadi. "There is an art that kills and an art that gives life. The fine fabric that we have imported from the west or the Far East has literally killed millions of our brothers and sisters, and delivered thousands of our dear sisters to a life of shame. True art must be evidence of the happiness, contentment and purity of its authors. And if you will have such art revived in our midst, the use of khadi is obligatory on the best of you."

When Saklatwala asked Gandhiji what khaddar stands for, he said : "It stands for simplicity, not shoddiness. It sits well on the shoulders of the poor and it can be made, as it was made in the days of yore, to adorn the bodies of the richest and the most artistic men. It is reviving ancient art and crafts." Khadi he has made not only the livery of freedom but the livery of India's forgotten art.

Gandhiji calls the spinning wheel "the sun round which all the other handicrafts revolve." With clear insight he observes : "India need not despair of seeing a revival of the fine, rich and coloured garments of old which were once the envy and despair of the world. A semi-starved nation can have neither religion nor art nor organization. A spinning wheel alone can stop this reckless waste. Owing to this waste we are living in a state of suspended animation. It can be revived only if every home is again turned into a spinning mill and every village into a weaving mill. With it will at once revive the ancient rustic art and the rustic song."

To popularise handicrafts and raise the artistic taste of the people he launched on khaddar and cottage-industry exhibitions. At Congress sessions, he entrusted this work to Nandalal Bose. At Haripura Nandalal tried to show the evolution of art from ancient times to the present day. Gandhiji has made it a point to study these exhibitions and has exhorted others to follow his example. To popularise handicrafts he has advised A. I. S. A. khadi stores to "aim primarily at quality, never at mere show ... should be original, should introduce village arts in towns and have confidence that they will win the day." If our khadi stores still stuff their windows with ugly articles it only shows that we are philistines.

Handicrafts to Gandhiji connote the highest expression of art. "After all," he said, "all true art can be expressed not through inanimate power-driven machinery, but only through the delicate living touch of the hands of men and women." When Lord Lothian asked him to explain the aim of village industries, Gandhiji said it was to show the people "how to turn waste into wealth."

If Gandhiji is aware of beauty and culture why has he taken to the loin cloth, one might ask. Phrase-monger Churchill called him in ridicule the half-naked Fakir.

Many so-called cultured people took up the tune and made fun of Gandhiji's dress. *Kleider machen die Menschen*—clothes make people—is their firm belief.

To critics of the loin-cloth Gandhiji replies: "Here then is no question of loin-cloth civilization. The adoption of the loin-cloth was for me a necessity. But in so far as the loin-cloth also spells simplicity let it represent Indian civilization." Years ago Gandhiji discarded his *topi* and vest and adopted loin-cloth and *chaddar* to identify himself with the poor. Under "The Poor Man's Way" in *Young India* of September 29, 1921, he appealed to people to discard foreign cloth and replace it by khaddar. In the same appeal he clearly stated that he did not expect co-workers to adopt loin-cloth, unless they found it necessary to do so for their work.

In an address to Gurukul students Gandhiji pointed out: "Surely the style of the dress has some correspondence with our environment. ... An Indian wearing a shirt flowing over his pyjamas with a waist-coat on it without a neck-tie and its flaps hanging loose behind is not a very graceful spectacle." Gandhiji has shown in his loin-cloth that simplicity does not mean shoddiness. He is very sensitive to elegance in simplicity. Addressing gaudily dressed women he remarked: "I have fallen in love with the women of Malabar. Barring Assam I have not yet seen the women of India so simply yet elegantly dressed as the women of Malabar."

His sensitive mind reacts strongly against shoddiness and dirt. "How can a flag," he says, "that is a mere clout and is dyed anyhow evoke the feelings of great reverence that one associates with a national flag?"

Ever since his advent in public life he took keen interest in sanitation. It is for him "the very foundation of all constructive work and qualification for *swaraj*." "I have a horror of dirt," he says, "I should not eat out of a dirty plate nor touch a dirty spoon or kerchief. But I believe in removing dirt to its proper place where it ceased to be dirt."

Beauty of script, sound and language appeals to him as pictures would appeal to an art connoisseur. He praised Devanagari for its "symmetry or beauty." The magic sounds of Sanskrit words haunt him like music, and therefore, he recommends that all the Hindu religious ceremonies should be conducted in Sanskrit. "However good a translation may be, the magic sound of the words does not come out into it."

Bad printing he resents and calls it *himsa*. To him words come naturally though he scrutinizes them like a scientist. Style is the man, they say. In Gandhiji's case it is more than true. Like a poet he oozes out most beautiful literature and sometimes even forgets to recognize its author. On his birth-day in the Aga Khan Palace prison, Sarojini Naidu put a list of literary gems before him. He could not remember that he once wrote "The cow is a poem on pity." For sheer beauty of language, Gandhiji has hardly any peer today. He can be classed only with Ruskin, Thoreau or Tolstoy.

Music plays a very vital part in his life. It is part and parcel of his being.

"Music means rhythm, order. Its effect is electrical. It immediately soothes," observes Gandhiji. In his Sabarmati Ashram music was one of the important items of education. When he left the *ashram*, he advised Gujarat "to continue to take the interest awakened by the late Khare."

"Like our *shastras*, music has been the prerogative of the few," wails Gandhiji. "I would make compulsory a proper singing of national songs. And to that end I should have great musicians attending every Congress or every conference and teaching music." He dislikes the harmonium as anyone really fond of music should.

In a very enlightening interview Gandhiji told an art student from Santiniketan: "I find that I can do entirely without external forms in my soul's realisation. I can claim, therefore, that there is truly sufficient art in my life, though you might not see what you call works of art about me. This, however, does not mean I refuse to accept the value of productions of art ... The outward forms have value only so far as they are the expression of the inner spirit of man ... I see and find beauty in Truth or through Truth. All truths, not merely true ideas, but truthful faces, truthful songs, are highly beautiful ... Whenever men begin to see Beauty in Truth, then true art will arise. To a true artist only that face is beautiful which quite apart from its exterior, shines with the truth within the soul ... Socrates was to my mind beautiful, because all his life, he was striving after truth . . his outward form did not prevent Phidias from appreciating the beauty of Truth in him; though as an artist he was accustomed to see Beauty in outward forms also!"

These views might sound like metaphysics to students of "art for art's sake." But his great predecessors, Socrates, Ruskin and Tolstoy held similar views on art.

The Vatican galleries of art were opened for him specially when he was in Rome *en route* to India. The art treasures appealed to him greatly, he had the long, echoing, empty corridors to himself. The Sistine Chapel held him rapt in awe and wonder. "I saw a figure of Christ there. It was wonderful. I could not tear myself away. The tears sprang to my eyes as I gazed."

No refining of one's taste in matters of art or literature can ever take the place of one's sensitiveness to the life of the earth. This is the beginning and the end of a person's true education The culmination in one's inmost being of a thrilling sensitiveness to Nature is a slow and very gradual process. Gandhiji's love of Nature is well-known. "My room may have blank walls, and I may even dispense with the roof, so that I may gaze out upon the starry heavens overhead that stretch in an unending expanse of beauty. What conscious art of man can give me the panoramic scenes that open out before me, when I look above with all its shining stars? Anything, which is a hindrance to the flight of the soul, is a delusion and a snare."

This might lead one to believe that Gandhiji's attitude is *Mein Reich in der Luft*—the realms of the air, the vision of art. But on the contrary, like Lenin he says, "Whatever can be useful to starving millions is beautiful to my mind. Let us

give today first the vital things of life, and all the graces and ornaments of life will follow ... I want art and literature that can speak to millions."

In the famous controversy with Tagore, the great sentinel of culture, Gandhiji explained his point of view and immediate programme. "True to his poetic instinct, the poet lives for the morrow, and would have us do likewise. He presents to our admiring gaze the beautiful picture of the birds in the early morning singing hymns of praise as they soar into the sky. These birds had their day's food, and soared with rested wings in whose new veins new blood had flown from the previous night. But I have the pain of watching birds who for want of strength could not be coaxed even into a flutter of their wings. The human bird under the Indian sky gets up weaker than when he pretended to retire. For millions it is an eternal vigil or an eternal trance. It is an indescribably painful state which has to be experienced to be realised. I have found it impossible to soothe suffering patients with a song from Kabir. The hungry millions ask for one poem, invigorating food. They cannot be given it. They must earn it. And they can earn only by the sweat of their brow." Like Lenin and Gorky, Gandhiji and Tagore remained great friends even in the heat of controversy.

Sitting under a tree, before Kasturba's pyre, Gandhiji whispered: "I strongly believe thoughts travel, even if they are not expressed in words." The change we are seeing today in our attitude to culture is to a great extent due to Gandhiji's cultural philosophy which he has not expressed so much as he has lived. He has simplified our life and thus enabled us to build it anew and think freshly. If today we are conscious and proud of Ajanta, recognize in Nandalal a great artist, love Indian classical music, relish Kalidas and Tagore, adorn our homes with Indian art, prefer Indian designs and textiles, the credit mainly goes to Gandhiji. He released tremendous forces which alone could break the chains of our mental slavery Even today some of us call our parents "mum" and "pa," dance the rumba in Indian *saris*, teach children English in preference to our rich languages, sneer at Indian classical music and mix fox-trot melodies freely in our songs and ridicule Gandhiji's "loin-cloth mentality." This is a passing phase and only restricted to a club-loving minority who in no way influence the life of our rising nation.

Gandhiji today is not only enshrined in the minds of his people but occupies a place of high honour in the western civilized world. Romain Rolland, the very personification of culture, adorns his wall with eight studies of heads he loves to honour—Goethe, Beethoven, Tolstoy, Lenin, Gorky, Einstein, Tagore and Gandhi.

THE GANDHIAN WAY

By J. B. Kripalani

I BELIEVE there is as yet nothing like Gandhism. All "isms" come into existence, not at the initiative of those in whose names they are preached and promulgated, but as the result of limitations imposed upon the original ideas by the followers. Lacking the creative genius the followers systematise and organize. In so doing they make the original doctrines rigid, inelastic, one-sided and fanatical, depriving them of their original freshness and flexibility, which are the signs of youth. Moreover, Gandhi is no philosopher. He has created no system. He has from the beginning been a practical reformer. As such he deals with, and writes upon, problems as they arise. He is pre-eminently a man of action, and is rightly called a *Karmayogin*.

It may not, therefore, be possible to find in his speeches, writings and action any logical or philosophical system. In this he is like the prophets and reformers of old. They too were faced with practical day-to-day problems. They had a way of solving these, without involving them in rigid systems. The main psychological principles were perhaps laid down but the details were to be filled in by each individual according to his peculiar circumstances and needs. Philosophy, system and rigidity were the work of lesser persons whose outlook on life and breadth of vision were narrow.

Gandhi never claims finality for his opinions. He styles his activities as search for, or experiments with, truth. These experiments are being made. For anybody to take or claim these experiments as the truth would be presumptuous. True, some of his followers, more zealous than wise, claim finality for his opinions; but he himself makes no such claims. He admits mistakes and tries to rectify them. Only for two of his cardinal principles—truth and non-violence—does he claim any sort of infallibility. For the rest he is as willing to learn as he is to teach what he considers to be the truth as he sees it. Even as regards the two cardinal principles, in their application there is no rigidity. He freely admits that they may be applied differently in differing circumstances and situations.

It is this attitude of his that often puzzles his followers and others and makes any positive forecast of how he will act under a particular set of circumstances rather difficult. Being a growing and evolving personality, there can be no finally

fixed modes of thought and action for him. Those who have seen him at close quarters have observed this. It often comes out in his changing attitude to things and ideas. The undercurrent and the spirit guiding is the same, but the expression varies. This it is that gives him the freshness of youth and keeps him abreast of the times. While many of his young followers grow static and lose their vitality, he is ever dynamic, active and full of vigour. While others grow impatient of the youthful waywardness of the younger generation, he is ever understanding and patient, and examines new propositions with an open and comparatively unbiased mind. There is, therefore, as yet no such thing as Gandhism, but only a Gandhian way and outlook, which is neither rigid nor formal nor final. It merely indicates the direction without trying to fill in the details finally or for all time to come.

Gandhi's advent in the social and political field was due to the peculiar circumstances of our country. Like some of his better placed countrymen he went to England, qualified himself for the Bar and began his professional career to earn money and maintain himself and his family in ease and comfort. He was already a married man. In the course of his professional work he went to South Africa. Circumstances made him cast his lot with his countrymen there and fight their battles. Most of them were poor and illiterate. The few who were rich were there to make their pile. These lacked public spirit and political initiative. All needed guidance and leadership in a foreign land full of race-prejudice and economic jealousy. They suffered from various social and political disabilities, and were subject to various humiliating restrictions. Gandhi was drawn in the struggle of his countrymen to retain their vanishing rights in the land of their adoption. Once in, he brought to it all the weight of his sincerity, ability and intensity. He put his whole being in the cause and counted no cost. Soon he was the sole leader and guide of the Indians in South Africa.

In that struggle he evolved a new strategy to redress group wrongs, and discovered the broad principles of Satyagraha. As usual, the practice of the doctrine came first and the name and the theory afterwards. In the struggle Gandhi discovered that truth and non-violence were not only good conduct in personal and family relations but they were good and efficient weapons in settling inter-group relations. The doctrines were not new in human history. They had been practised and preached by several prophets of old. But no extensive effort had been made to apply them to political relations and disputes. To Gandhi belongs the credit of demonstrating on a large scale that the standards of moral and gentlemanly conduct that are good in individual relations are also good and efficient in inter-group relations. Also that truth and non-violence can be organized into external effective action making opposition difficult. He discovered that a fighter for a good cause, without indulging in violence, can, if he so chooses, get his wrongs redressed, that in truth and non-violence he has better and more effective weapons against wrong and iniquity than the customary weapons of violence.

Gandhi applied among others a simple test to prove that truth and non-violence

are at the basis of all successful activity. While truth does not need for its success the co-operation and support of untruth and violence, these latter in order to succeed always stand in need of the former. For any activity in life, however selfish and unsocial, must have its foundations in the keeping of faith with each other of those who have to engage in it. Commerce, for example, is a field where selfishness and greed have perhaps more free play than elsewhere. Yet in commerce no transaction (or even fraud) would be possible for any length of time if merchants did not keep faith with each other and if their word was not as good as a bond. Thieves and murderers have to keep faith with each other. Sometimes they have to keep this faith by sacrificing their individual advantage. No activity but must use as its basic principle some form, however limited, of truth. And so with non-violence. No extensive and organized violence would be possible if those engaged in it did not observe rules of non-violence within their own ranks. They cannot possibly carry on their fight with the enemy without this basic principle If an army believed merely in violence, then before it could make use of it against the enemy it would annihilate itself.

Realising these two to be the basic principles of all organized life, Gandhi uses them in the field of politics, a field where so far as results go, fraud and violence have ever been thought to be more efficient. Gandhi, however, does not rely merely on the efficacy of the abstract principles, leaving the working of the results in the hands of higher powers. He does not believe merely in the conversion of the heart of the opponent, though he desires that too. But above all he tries to organize and strengthen those suffering from iniquity and injustice. So that they may be properly organized, he wants them to shed all iniquity, all divisions, all fear, all selfish and petty interests. Having so strengthened and organized themselves, he wants them to withdraw the help that they have been rendering to inquity and tyranny. In short, he wants them to non-co-operate with the forces of evil.

Whatever may have been the case in the past, in the world as it is today, tyranny is made possible by the willing or unwilling, conscious or unconscious, free or forced, co-operation of those who are tyrannised over. If the latter refused all co-operation and were willing to suffer the consequences of such refusal, iniquity and injustice would find it hard to go on for long. This is seen in industrial disputes. Whenever labour has effectively withdrawn co-operation, the capitalists have invariably capitulated. Seeing the results in single isolated industrial disputes, labour today talks of general strikes for the redress of grievances and for political or revolutionary purposes. Now what is a strike externally but non-co-operation—Satyagraha? The inner spirit guiding an industrial dispute is different from that of Satyagraha as conceived by Gandhi, though it need not be, but the method of withdrawal of co-operation is common to both. If that withdrawal could yield tangible results in industrial disputes, why should there be scepticism about Satyagraha?

Satyagraha is a strike plus something more. That something more makes for better morale among those carrying on the fight. It means greater loss of morale to the opponent. It also means greater sympathy from neutrals. The external

weapons of withdrawal of co-operation are here helped and strengthened by more psychological and subtle influences. A Satyagrahi is a better non-co-operator or striker. His judgment is not clouded by passion, anger and hatred. He disarms his opponent. He gains more sympathy. He is also fortified with the belief that suffering voluntarily borne always makes for the advancement of the individual. But suppose that all these moral and psychological factors and forces working in his favour are taken away and one confines oneself merely to the external fact of withdrawal of co-operation, what is there mystical about the method, that is being used more or less successfully for the last one hundred and fifty years in industrial disputes and but for which there would be little talk today of general strikes, socialism or communism? Satyagraha is something mystic and spiritual only if the term stands for something unknown, unknowable and unpractical. A general strike is something practical, concrete and comprehensible.

Why should then Satyagraha be unintelligible? How easy it is for men to get entangled in phrases, words and names and thus create differences where there are no differences! Talk in the language of Gandhi, and in terms of Satyagraha, and a concrete, tangible, struggle becomes mystic, spiritual, idealistic and consequently unreal. Talk in terms of general strike and straightway that very same thing becomes scientific, nay, it becomes a historical necessity.

Not only in this matter of Satyagraha does the modern mind miss the essence but also in Gandhi's theory of truth as applied to politics. Truth in inter-group and international relations is today considered to be the vital necessity of the world situation. If diplomacy continues to be what it is, there is today a very great danger of the whole machinery of modern civilization falling to pieces. This was clearly understood by Dr. Woodrow Wilson and other very practical politicians in the last war. Now what is truth in politics but what has been called and applauded as open diplomacy? When Dr. Wilson kept this principle before the nations of the world and when he advised the formation of a League of Nations on this principle, nobody thought him to be a mystic, a spiritualist or unpractical politician. When Russia and socialism and communism talk of open diplomacy, the modern mind is not scandalised. Is it because these do not mean the thing seriously? But when Gandhi talks of truth in political relations all the learned and the wise raise their hands in horror and cry, it is not possible, human nature being what it is and politics being what they are and what they always have been.

As usual fanaticism fights about words. We have the illustration of this in religion. If the Christian says the Divine Spirit descended in the form of a dove, it is rational. But if the Hindu says that it descended in the higher form of man, it is all oriental superstition. If the Hindu reverences an idol it is again all superstition, but if a book of scripture is wrapped in hundreds of folds and kissed every time that it is touched or opened, it is rational. If one talks of open diplomacy one is a practical politician, but if one talks of truth in politics, straightway one becomes a mystic, a saint and therefore unpractical as a politician. Talk in terms of general

strikes and you are scientific, but talk of Satyagraha and you at once become unscientific and reactionary.

Gandhi found and evolved his method of fight and his strategy in South Africa. He used it there with some effect. He has used the same weapon of Satyagraha here on several occasions, in Champaran and in the three fights of non-co-operation. He has in all these instances, even when he has not attained his or the national objective, achieved substantial success. Even an armed insurrection does not succeed in the first rush or with one effort. In the prolonged war in defence of a cause there are many battles, skirmishes and sieges, reverses and successes. If a force succeeds in the minor engagements it must consider itself successful and may reasonably hope in course of time to achieve complete victory and reach its objective. Even if there is failure in minor engagements but if the army marches on uninterrupted and its morale remains undiminished and its power of resistance grows and if progressively it is able to give a better and better account of itself, then, even though the objective is not achieved, the method employed must be considered good.

Few can deny that with every struggle that the nation has waged under Gandhi, its progress has been forward, and its power of resistance has increased. Only prejudice can deny that the net result of these Satyagraha fights has been an advancement of the nation in terms of strength, sacrifice, organization, fearlessness and morale. Each struggle has brought greater hardship and suffering due to increased repression, but every time the response and the resistance has been greater. In 1930, the nation gave a better account of itself than in 1920-21. In 1932-33, the nation gave a still better account of itself. The outward result of the fight did not appear to be as favourable as in 1930, but the nation had a more prolonged fight and it resisted a greater shock. Repression was more ruthless and more thorough and though the nation had to suspend the fight through sheer weight of the enemy and consequent exhaustion, its inherent strength was much greater than in 1930. This was soon witnessed in the solid victory of the nation at the polls in the Assembly elections. The nation was not prepared to prolong its suffering at the time by persisting in Satyagraha but its heart was sound and its morale intact.

So whatever may have been the immediate result of the three fights, a defeat, a truce and a defeat again, the nation has been steadily advancing to its goal. After all, the final goal can be reached but once. Even a series of successes may not reach us to the final goal; but whether apparent success or failure, whatever leads us to greater strength must be considered essentially a success, as it brings us nearer to the final goal.

Let us see if the nation could have so advanced by the pre-Satyagraha methods. Except for those who are wedded to constitutional methods under all conceivable circumstances, every unbiased observer will admit that the method of Satyagraha is a definite improvement upon the method of constitutional agitation, of petition, prayer and protest that marked the Congress politics before the advent of Gandhi,

The critics may, however, say that though this method was an advance on the old and though it did take the nation a little farther, its function is now over and its mission complete. It can serve us no more. If so, then it is for such critic to suggest or advise a better and more efficacious method. Has any critic so far kept before us any new method of organized resistance?

On the contrary, it is obvious that all thoughtful people, even those belonging to the so-called advanced groups, believe that under the circumstances in which the world, and particularly India, is placed today the method of fight will have to be non-violent. With the present weapons of war and destruction being the monopoly of states and Governments even a firearm is no better than a *lathi* or bow and arrow of old. In an age of aerial and chemical warfare, the instruments of which are in the hands of Governments, even an armed people would find a physical conflict with the state a hopeless task. How much more so an unarmed nation like India?

Moreover, it is not possible to organize openly in a military sense. We can only organize ourselves by non-violent methods. And after all even in a physical fight the qualities that are of the utmost importance are moral, like organization, discipline, unity, bravery and sacrifice. Satyagraha brings out these qualities pre-eminently. Whatever may give the final blow, non-violence or violence, for the time being the qualities that the nation has been progressively acquiring under Gandhi are worth cultivating and worth having. They can be cultivated most extensively by peaceful methods. It is quite possible to have a small secret revolutionary group having all these moral qualities. But the nation as a whole or any extensive portion thereof cannot get these qualities by secret methods. Therefore even for a final violent struggle these qualities that Satyagraha has developed in the Indian character are good, for they are the basis of all fight, violent or non-violent.

So if not for ever, at least for many years to come, the method of Satyagraha or strike is the only method open to us. It is not possible nor desirable for the practical reformer to look very far in the future. He goes wrong if he thinks only of today. He does wrong again if he thinks in terms of a very remote future. He must strike between the two extremes a workable mean. This workable mean is supplied by our non-violent fight of Satyagraha for *swaraj*. So far, therefore, as any revolutionary programme of fight for the capture of political power goes, there is no party that has even remotely suggested any suitable substitute for the method of Satyagraha worked out and evolved by Gandhi.

In a revolutionary fight the actual struggle is as much of importance as periods when struggle is not possible, when owing to political repression or exhaustion the nation is not prepared for the risks and sufferings the actual fight involves. At such times the nation must be provided with some activity of a constructive and useful character. If this is not done the fighting ranks will be disorganized. The soldiers of Satyagraha must periodically retire to their camps. These must provide them with activities that would keep them fit and in good trim. Periods of comparative peace must be utilized also to strengthen the organization. If all this is neglected, at the

commencement of the new fight the nation finds itself disorganized and out of form. For such times of political depression and quiet, Gandhi has evolved what he calls his constructive programme. Khadi, village industry, village work, National Education, Harijan work, Hindustani *prachar* are some of the activities which he has organized and institutionalised. The activities are good in themselves and they keep the army of workers engaged. The nation too, by participating and helping in the activities, learns habits of public work and responsibility. This is not all. When civil disobedience is suspended local fights with the Government on particular issues go on. Bardoli was one such fight.

These constructive and partial activities also rope in people who either do not believe in direct political action or are more interested in social than in political work. Gandhi and his co-workers view these activities both from the social and political view-point. While they are engaged in these activities they never forget that they are the soldiers primarily in the fight for freedom. Therefore to view and style these activities as mere narrow social reform or as "old dame's work" or reactionary is needlessly to stigmatise them. It is to confuse the issues. All activity that is not of a militant character would, if superficially and unsympathetically viewed, appear as reformatory and not revolutionary. But if the aim and the objective are not forgotten, these very same activities become both reformatory and revolutionary--reformatory in their immediate results and revolutionary in their ultimate effect on the fight whenever that may come.

An army when it is not fighting and is in barracks does many things that appear to an untrained mind to have no direct relation with actual war. They dig trenches that have to be filled in again. They organize long marches that lead nowhere. They shoot the bull's eye and their shots kill nobody. They organize mock fights. All these activities, if they are taboo because they do not appear to have any particular relation with actual war, would disorganize the army and would make it useless when the time of actual action approaches.

Even revolutionary parties have their day-to-day reformatory programme. They are not solely to be judged by these programmes. If they are, such judgments would not be just. The city proletariat has got to be organized. How can it be done? It can only be done by means of trade unions. No trade union, however revolutionary its object might be, can be organized on a purely revolutionary basis. The basis must be the day-to-day needs and requirements of labour. These requirements have no relation to the revolutionary aim. For the time being the activities of labour unions will be concerned with a little reform here and a little reform there. They will be concerned with a little increase in the wages, a little diminution of hours of work and a little increase of social amenities. No trade union can ever be organized solely and purely on a revolutionary basis. The peasant organizations will have also to function similarly. For day-to-day work they will be reformatory, while their objective will be revolutionary. To decry all reformatory work as anti-revolutionary and reactionary, is to miss the different facets of a revolutionary movement, which is to be

carried on on all fronts.

I have not yet seen any group or party that has kept any substitute programmes for those laid down by Gandhi and accepted by the Congress. I have heard a good deal of talk about some radical and revolutionary programmes but I have not seen them illustrated in practice.

Take one item of Gandhi's constructive programme, the production, and sale of khadi. I have not yet heard what advice the revolutionary of the non-Gandhian type would give to the ordinary purchaser. He surely cannot recommend khadi, as that would be reactionary. Will he then recommend mill cloth? That he cannot do, for he would be asking the consumer to directly help those who daily and hourly exploit labour, while he has not the necessary political power to put a check upon their rapacity and avarice. Will he recommend foreign cloth? Apart from anything else such a recommendation would be psychologically harmful for the immediate political struggle. I have often heard it said that he would all the same recommend Indian mill cloth in the hope that as industrial life grew, there will be an increase in the number of the city proletariat which is always good material for the revolution. If he could even ensure this, his argument may be allowed to pass. But whatever he may say or do, he cannot extend and energise Indian industry. Thanks to the policy of the foreign Government, Indian industry is never allowed to go beyond certain narrow limits. Census reports show that it has not been able to keep pace with the growing population of India and that progressively more and more people have to fall back upon land. The proportion of industrial population to the whole population keeps diminishing.

The other argument advanced is that help to Indian industry gives us something on which we shall build our industrial life hereafter. This argument no more holds good. Russia has shown that after the capture of power a five or ten years' plan can industrialise a country completely. When we have the power, this antiquated and effete industry will render us precious little help in our future plans of industrial reconstruction. So to forego for the poor a sure advantage today for a doubtful advantage in the future will not be a wise policy. We may also profit by past experience. The *swadeshi* movement of the anti-partition days came to grief because the nation relied upon mill-agents. They raised the price of cloth and defeated the object of the politicians. The politicians relied exclusively upon the goodwill and patriotism of the industrialists. The result was disastrous.

If we are to benefit by *swadeshi* and if we are not to put ourselves helpless in the hands of an unpatriotic and short-sighted capitalism, we must have other resources to fall back upon. These have been created by Gandhi in his khadi and village industries movements. These movements also provide work for the leisure months of the peasants. In what way then are these activities reactionary? Some radical thinkers say that these activities by ameliorating the lot of the poor and by bettering their condition would take away their revolutionary zeal. If this is true of khadi it is true of every trade union activity including strikes. Even a strike is never

undertaken for general revolutionary purposes, but for some concrete reformatory objective. The gymnastic that it provides for revolution is only a by-product.

So far as khadi and village industries go, Gandhi can give ample proof that he is wide awake. Nothing can be more revolutionary than the fixing of a minimum living wage and this without political power. Yet Gandhi introduced this revolutionary measure in all organizations working under his advice and guidance. This he has done in spite of expert advice based upon commercial figures supplied by workers and organisers. He has ignored facts and proved his revolutionary vision and ardour. He had warning that whatever little of khadi had remained would be annihilated but he preferred the destruction of his pet scheme in favour of a distinctly just and revolutionary principle. His vision and faith have been justified. Khadi has not suffered much by the new experiments.

Take again industrial labour. There is one labour union guided and inspired by his ideas. In India today there is no union better organized and more financially stable than the Ahmedabad Mill Mazdoor Union. None has more real and paying membership. None has again more institutions attached to it in the shape of creches, day and night schools for children and adults, boarding houses, Harijan institutions, co-operative stores and the like.

Impatient as Gandhi is for *swaraj*, he lays out his plans on a vast scale and on a permanent basis. Even when he talked in terms of *swaraj* in one year he devised and organized his institutions on the basis of prolonged work. National Education, khadi, Hindustani *prachar*, Harijan work could not have been completed in one year. For, the schemes and the institutions were conceived in terms of many years. The immediate political objective was not attained but the institutions went on organizing and perfecting themselves and thus keeping the embers of revolution alive. These are all pioneer institutions. They may fail, they may have to be scrapped ; newer, better and bigger schemes may have to be devised in the future ; but the gain to the nation and the advance that the nation has made through these institutions can only be belittled or neglected by a very superficial student of the national movement.

It is easy to denounce and criticise. But when the critics themselves settle down to work and organize they will find that their activities in terms of their world vision of universal revolution are merely reformatory, concerned with day-to-day minor details that apparently bear no relation to the objective. Take a volunteer in a revolutionary movement who is assigned the task of pasting stamps on office envelopes. How is he to relate his, this humble, humdrum, monotonous task to the coming revolution contemplated by his party ? He has to requisition to his aid a broader vision and some living faith. Thus only can he think that even his humble task is a necessary contribution to the revolution.

Gandhi has the vision and the faith to understand this underlying principle of all work. Like a religious man who sees his *Paramatma* in every *atma*, Gandhi sees his God of *swaraj* in every little reformatory activity that he undertakes or advises others to undertake. He may be in the front of the fight shaking the mane of the

British lion, he may be perfecting the little *charkha* or sweeping the narrow lanes of the little village at Segaon, it is all for him the work for the revolution, work for his dream of *Purna Swaraj* in which the poor will come to their own. As he works in that faith he infects his followers and co-workers with like faith.

Thus Gandhi has evolved and kept before the nation his double programme, one for active and revolutionary periods when the tempo of political life is on the rise and the other for comparatively peaceful times, when the national life is sluggish and normal. No person or party has devised for these two necessary alternating periods better programmes. True, the programmes are conceived for independence, not for the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship or a peasants' and workers' republic. But his programme of work and even his *swaraj* is conceived in terms and in the interest of the masses of India. Speaking at the Round Table Conference, he declared that the goal represented by the Indian National Congress was "complete freedom from alien yoke in every sense of the term, and this for the sake of the dumb millions. Every interest, therefore, that is hostile to these interests, must be revised or must subside if it is not capable of revision."

It is quite possible that the interests of the masses may best be served by only a proletarian dictatorship. But as yet Gandhi does not think that such schemes would best serve the interest of the masses of India. In the meantime it is open to those who advocate a proletarian rule to devise their own double method and not only keep it in theory before the nation but demonstrate it in the working. Before we have such programmes in theory and practice, and more in practice than in theory, we may well be allowed to remain where we are. Gandhi did not invite people on the mere theory and ideology of truth and non-violence but along with it he kept programmes of work. His ideology may have been centuries ahead of world-thought, yet he did not wait for the time when his ideology will have permeated through the masses of India. He rather demonstrated the efficacy of his ideology by placing before the nation work conceived in terms of his ideology. He rightly thought that the best way even of preaching an ideology is to work it out in howsoever humble a fashion. Others who have similar ambitions had better follow in his footsteps if they are serious about their particular and peculiar ideologies.

After all we were new to Gandhi's ideology and his practice. It required a great wrench with our past, with our habits of thought and action, with our values, to join him. We may be trusted to do likewise if better and more workable programmes are offered to us by any individual or group. Gandhi kept poverty and suffering before his followers. If they can get some tangible results with less suffering and less sacrifice they are not such fools as would allow such opportunity to pass by. Some of them have left their professions and their incomes and are engaged in khadi and village industries work. This work gives perhaps a couple of annas to the poor and provides the workers with activity when the actual Satyagraha fight is not going on.

If anybody shows Gandhi's followers a way of putting a rupee or more in the

pockets of the poor and also shows them a surer and better way of fighting the foreign imperialism, they are not the ones who would reject such tempting offers. If they sacrificed what people think important in life—their professions and their incomes —for smaller things, they will not do less if higher and better things are placed before them. They have proved themselves apt pupils of the novel methods of Gandhi, methods that were never tried in history and for which there was no precedent. If more familiar and well-tried and easier methods are placed before them they would surely welcome such. But frankly speaking they do not see their way clear. As soon as they see any light they shall join those other friends from whom they differ now. In the meantime they should be allowed to work out their schemes unhampered. They in their turn are always prepared to allow other groups to work out their own schemes according to their own ideologies.

The question, however, arises : to whom shall the Congress machinery belong? Here also the Gandhian way may be a guide to us. In his Champaran fight he was offered Congress help. He refused it. He said the Congress was a big and important organization. It could not perform new and untried experiments. It could not risk its reputation for sanity and steadiness on an issue in which it may be involved unconsciously not knowing the full implications and the consequences. Gandhi asked only for moral support and no more. He wanted the Congress to follow its own path in accordance with the genius of its history and growth.

In 1920 also he had already started Satyagraha on the *Khilafat* issue. He came to the Congress with his proposals. He told the Congress that it would be good for the organization to take up this particular question ; but if it chose not to take it up he would go ahead. He did not say that his plans would be put in effect only if they were accepted by the Congress. Once again in the days of the Swaraj Party, even though the vote was with him, he retired and allowed the Swarajists free field. So let all parties keep their plans before the Congress but if these plans are not accepted they must go and work them out themselves and capture the Congress by the conviction they carry by showing concrete results. These results need not mean any success of the plans but they should be such that they are an earnest of organization, effort and final success. They should be such that sceptics may be enabled to see a few steps ahead. But if instead of field work in different directions the effort merely is to capture the machinery of the Congress from above, the successful party may soon find that it has killed the golden goose in its hasty anxiety to get as much out of it as is possible.

The Congress is not the Government whose machinery, when captured, leads one automatically to power. The Congress has no power except what is put in it by us, by our work in the country, our organization, our sacrifices and suffering. Therefore any hasty capture of the Congress machinery from above will not benefit any party. True, the Congress has a mighty prestige but this can only be exploited by those who work, organize and are prepared to suffer and sacrifice, not by anybody else.

I have placed before the reader the double programme of Gandhi, his programme

of direct action and his constructive activity. I have also indicated his attitude and his way of looking at the Congress machinery. By all these things we stand. We wait to see better substitutes for all the three methods and when we find them, I hope, following in the footsteps of Gandhi, who is ever willing to learn and is bound by no rigid and inflexible rules, we shall ever be found in the front rank of the fighters for the country's liberty. To that end, we hope, we have dedicated our lives and not to any particular doctrine or dogma.

A BATTLE OF FAITHS

By Mahadev Desai

GANDHIJI'S decision to be responsible no longer to guide the deliberations and policy of the Congress may have come upon the members of the Working Committee and upon the country with a certain amount of suddenness. But it was the natural conclusion of a series of events since 1934—or may I say since 1919? For his warning to the people first came to be uttered after the mob violence in Nadiad and Ahmedabad.

Gandhiji shocked his followers and amused his critics by proclaiming that in placing the remedy of civil disobedience in the hands of people who had not learnt the discipline to listen and to obey he had been guilty of a Himalayan blunder. Then came Chauri Chaura and the momentous Bardoli decision suspending Satyagraha indefinitely. This gave the followers an even greater shock than that given by the "Himalayan blunder." But Gandhiji was adamant. He knew that the country would realise the wisdom of the decision in course of time, and that it would be able to prepare itself for another struggle.

It took the country six or seven years—years punctuated by communal rioting and internecine strife—to develop non-violent strength to hurl defiance against the Government: We had learnt the virtue of non-violence, but it had with most of us a limited meaning and content. And yet it carried us through to a certain amount of success. Then came more organized repression on behalf of the Government, our limited non-violence proved a poor match for it, and with that came the third milestone on the march to non-violence—I mean the Patna decision of 1934 suspending civil disobedience and confining it only to himself.

Throughout this period of fourteen years he belonged to the Congress, he was a member of it, he attended meetings of the A.I.C.C. and of the Working Committee, and actively participated in the deliberations. But the Patna decision had set him thinking. Always anxious to lay the blame principally on himself, he had begun to discover that the arrest in the growth of the Congress and the corruption in its ranks was due to the fact that the Congress "had degenerated into an organization dominated by one personality, and that in it there was no free play of reason." There were vital differences between him and the Congressmen, but his personality, he felt,

had acted like an incubus on them and prevented their self-expression. That was unconsciously encouraging hypocrisy and a subtle piece of violence. Khadi and the spinning wheel were there on the Congress programme, "yet only a few Congressmen have a living faith in the India-wide potency of the wheel."

And as for non-violence, as he said in his historic statement issued in September 1934, "after fourteen years of trial it still remains a policy with the majority of Congressmen, whereas it is a fundamental creed with me. That Congressmen do not still regard non-violence as a creed is no fault of theirs. It is undoubtedly my faulty presentation, and still more its faulty execution, that are responsible for this failure. I have no consciousness of faulty presentation or execution, but it is the only possible inference from the fact that it has not yet become an integral part of the lives of Congressmen." We had paid lip-loyalty to non-violence, and even that non-violence was not of the strong but of the weak. "If we were non-violent through and through, our non-violence would have been self-evident. Nor were we able to show to the terrorists that we had greater faith in our non-violence than they in their violence."

The argument led irresistibly to the conclusion that he should leave the Congress organization as he was convinced that by being outside he would serve the Congress and the country better than by being in it. That was the fourth milestone—the step to withdraw from the Congress being solely dictated by the idea of making the experiment of non-violence in thought, word and deed more intense. "For this experiment," he said, "I need complete detachment and absolute freedom of action. I can only search Him through non-violence, and in no other way, and the freedom of my country, as of the world, is surely included in the search for truth. I cannot suspend this search for anything in this world or another." The wisdom of the decision, which was so to say ratified by the Bombay Congress, was proved by a very simple test. The amendment suggesting the substitution of the words "truthful and non-violent" for "peaceful and legitimate" was that simple test. The amendment was thrown out by the members of the A.I.C.C., and proved clearly the thinness of the faith of the bulk of Congressmen in truth and non-violence.

He retired from the Congress in October 1934 and threw himself with redoubled zeal and vigour into the only kind of work that was an expression of non-violence—revival and development of village industries, Harijan service, education through basic crafts, and fixing up one's abode in a village which offered in a nutshell all the problems of an Indian village. But this retirement was far from giving him the "complete detachment and absolute freedom" of action that he was longing for. For three years he had a certain amount of respite, but the decision to accept offices, taken by the Congress on his advice, drew him once again into active leadership.

Every step, throughout the period of fourteen or fifteen years, had been for him an experiment in the pursuit of truth and non-violence, and his advice to the Congress to take up the burden of office acceptance was another such experiment. The office

acceptance was not intended to work the Act of 1935 anyhow; "in the prosecution by the Congress of its goal of Complete Independence, it is a serious attempt on the one hand to avoid a bloody revolution and on the other to avoid mass civil disobedience on a scale hitherto not attempted." He declined to have any authority over the ministers or to have any power to issue instructions to them, but "in matters relating to the struggle for *swaraj* through non-violent action, I do claim special qualifications. For me office acceptance has a special meaning even in terms of the Congress manifesto and resolutions." The Congress was not only to replace an alien Government, but an alien method of governance. It was to rule, he made it clear in the very beginning, "not through the police backed by the military, but through its moral authority based upon the greatest goodwill of the people. It will rule not in virtue of authority derived from a superior armed power, but in virtue of the service of the people whom it seeks to represent in every one of its actions."

That was said in August 1937. Since then every pronouncement of his has been a commentary on the principle of action laid down in the very beginning. Trouble in the Sholapur Settlement of "Criminal Tribes" and labour unrest in Ahmedabad and Cawnpore gave him the first occasion to sound a warning. "Do we really believe in truth and non-violence, in sustained work and discipline, in the efficacy of the fourfold constructive programme? If we are not sure of our own chosen aims, we need not wonder, if one fine morning we discover that we had committed a grave blunder in embarking upon office acceptance. My conscience as *a* or *the* prime mover in the direction of office acceptance is quite clear. I advised it on the supposition that the Congressmen as a whole were sound not only on the goal but also on the truthful and non-violent means."

In 1938 came further storm signals, and they gave Gandhiji the opportunity of making the Congress position further clearer. The ministers were to rule by moral authority based on the greatest goodwill of the people, but what was the meaning of that goodwill? The Congress claimed to represent the whole of India, not only the so-called Congressmen—"to represent" meaning to serve their interests. And in that sense it had to serve the interests of non-Congressmen even better than those of Congressmen, if it was to be true to its creed of non-violence. "It should represent even those who are hostile to it and who will even crush it if they can. Not until we make good that claim shall we be in a position to displace the British Government and function as an independent nation." These words were uttered two years ago, but it seems as though they were uttered yesterday. The bulk of the Muslims and others belong to the non-Congressmen's camp. Have we the power—the non-violent power—to represent them today? If we have, we can function as an independent nation in spite of Britain.

But to proceed. The riots in some of the cities of the U. P. and the steps taken by the Congress ministry to quell them made Gandhiji pointedly ask the question: Is Congress non-violence non-violence of the weak and the helpless or of the strong and the powerful? "If it is the former, it will never take us to our goal and if

long practised may even render us for ever unfit for self-government. If the Congress non-violence does not come out of real strength, it would be best and honest for the Congress to make such a declaration and make the necessary changes in its behaviour. To the extent that the Congress ministries have been obliged to make use of the police and the military, to that extent in my opinion we must admit our failure."

His soul had already begun to get impatient. How long would this experiment last, how long could he continue to give his guidance if it was ultimately to be futile? We discover this impatience of the soul in numerous utterances of those days. To some co-workers he said: "I am ashamed that our ministries had to call to their aid the police and the military. I am ashamed that they had to use the language that they did in reply to the Opposition speeches. I feel as if the Congress had lost and the British had won. Why does our non-violence fail on such occasions? Is it the non-violence of the weak? Even the *goondas* should not move us from our faith and make us say, 'we will send them to the gallows or shoot them down.' They too are our countrymen. If they will kill us, we will allow them to do so. You cannot pit against organized violence the non-violence of the weak, but the non-violence which the bravest alone can exercise. We have, you will say, been sufficiently non-violent. We were non-violent during the civil disobedience campaign, we received *lathi* blows and worse. My reply is this : We did, but not sufficiently. We could not get Independence at the end of Dandi March, as ours was not the unadulterated non-violence of the bravest."

The question of external aggression has cropped up just now, but the question of internal unrest was already there as alive as today. Had we the strength then to say to the goondas, "Kill us, we will not kill you"? We had not. But Gandhiji lived in the hope that we should have that strength soon. "Supposing", he said to the Gandhi Seva Sangh people at Delang on March 25, 1938, "the Viceroy were to invite the President of the Congress to meet him and to state the Congress terms, do you think he would have the strength to say, 'The Congress is capable of taking charge of the administration, the British may go'? Do you think we could tell him that we should be able to do without the police and the military, that we should be able to come to terms with the Princes, the *zamindars* and the Mussalmans? I am afraid we could not honestly say we should easily be able to come to terms with these. And yet, if we had real non-violence in us, we should be able to say and do these things."

But if the situation was bad in the middle of 1938, it is worse in the middle of 1940. Someone asked Gandhiji the other day : "You think we have not the non-violence of the brave. Well, then, I ask you what would you do if Independence were to be offered to you today? Would you say No?" He said : "I would say No. I am giving an absurd answer to an absurd question. The question is absurd, for Independence is not going to be offered because we are not ready. If we were ready, it would be there without our asking it."

But I am anticipating events. There was impatience in the soul, but he was patient with the people. He was arguing with the ministries, arguing with the people.

"In spite of our having accepted the volunteer's pledge for 17 years we have not developed the irresistible strength that such acceptance of *ahimsa* means. The reason is that we have not troubled, we have not laboured, to organize such a non-violent army. If we cannot do so, if we cannot carry out the pledge, it would be well to reconsider our position. The tragedy is that the pledge is still in existence but it exists on paper. If we had on a sufficient scale such non-violent army as the pledge contemplates, we should not have had these riots; and if there had been, we would have quelled the riots or immolated ourselves in the attempt. We have heard of only one man who met his death. I admire his self-immolation. But my breast would have swelled with joy if there had been several Guptas."

"If", he said in an article written in that period, "the Congress non-violence is merely confined to abstention from causing physical hurt to the British officials and their dependants, such non-violence can never bring us Independence. It is bound to be worsted in the final heat. Indeed we shall find it to be worthless, if not positively harmful, long before the final heat is reached." And then this solemn warning: "If we feel that we shall not be able to displace the British power without a violent struggle, the Congress must say so to the nation and prepare accordingly. We must do what is being done all the world over—*forbear when we can, hit when we must.* If this is to be our creed or policy, we have lost precious seventeen years. But it is never too late to learn and mend."

The long tours of the Frontier Province that followed were with the sole purpose of preparing the promising field for the non-violence of the brave.

And it was not that the ministries wholly failed.

What's done we partly may compute,
But oft not what's resisted.

If we were to go minutely into the history of the work of the Congress ministries in the eight provinces, we would find that they had some triumphs of non-violence to their credit. But God fulfils Himself in many ways. If the ministries had continued, would they have been ultimately found wanting? May it not have been providential that the situation created by the War came as a godsend and compelled the ministries to resign? Who shall say? But again I am anticipating events.

The test had nearly come with the international crisis of September 1938 and the rape of Czechoslovakia. But the dictated peace at Munich saved us. The Working Committee sat and deliberated for some days, but the test in the shape of war did not come. Gandhiji placed the implications of non-violence before the Working Committee in a manner that could not be mistaken, and the Working Committee was so unanimously with him that he was in a position to report: "The Working Committee had almost come to the conclusion that it would deny itself the opportunity of striking a bargain with England, but would make its contribution to the world peace, to the defence of Czechoslovakia and to India's freedom by declaring to the world by its action that the way to peace with honour did not lie through

mutual slaughter of the innocents, but that it lay only and truly through the practice of organized non-violence even unto death."

And in the course of a private conversation he used words which had a prophetic ring, at least so far as he himself was concerned :

"You may rest assured that whatever happens there will be no surrender by the Government. For me, even if I stand alone, there is no participation in the war even if the Government should surrender the whole control to the Congress .... Who would have thought aeroplanes to be a practical reality fifty years ago ? Who would have imagined in this country, thirty years ago, that thousands of innocent men, women, and children would be ready smilingly to march to prison ? The weapon of *ahimsa* does not need supermen or superwomen to wield it. Beings of common clay can use and have used it before this with success. At any rate fifteen members of the Working Committee did express their readiness to put their *ahimsa* to the test. That was more than I was prepared for."

But we were not weighed, and our honour remained intact. At any rate we did not die before our death. What the Committee would have done if the crisis had actually come it is difficult to say, but as we have seen it filled Gandhiji with great hopes.

Exactly a year after this the crisis was upon us. In that first hour of trial, the Congress was weighed and not found wanting. It did not take the Working Committee long to issue its mandate to the Congress ministries to resign. Gandhiji heaved a sigh of relief. The questions that frequently tormented him ceased to trouble his soul. If the Congress had accepted his advice, in the initial stage, of offering unconditional co-operation, or if later the British Government had acceded to the Congress demand for a declaration and the Congress had offered co-operation in response, the position for Gandhiji would have been the same. For the co-operation he had contemplated was moral co-operation and no other. But who knows? It may be that even there there has been providential intervention. If the Working Committee had then taken the stand—the very honest stand indeed—that it has taken now, the difficulty both for the Committee and for Gandhiji would have been immense, the situation more delicate. But as I have said God intervened.

The crisis in the shape of the collapse of one European nation after another in quick succession came none too soon. Gandhiji had waited in patience so long, trying to steer a difficult course through rocks and breakers. He had voluntarily accepted the position of the Generalissimo. Was it wise? The speeches at the Ramgarh Congress were a mirror of the struggles of his soul. In private he had implored the Working Committee and the Maulana to relieve him of the position. It was simply with a view to being able to render greater service to the Congress. "I am putting upon myself an undue strain, but as it is not yet a strain on my conscience, I shall continue to serve you, if you will insist on my doing so. But it is a terrible strain, and I would implore you to free me. I should then pursue my experiment of *ahimsa*

with absolute freedom." I am quoting from memory, but that was the substance of his entreaty to the Working Committee. And when they did not relieve him he poured out the depths of his soul in the two speeches at Ramgarh.

But the soul's impatience continued. Would the Working Committee face or quail before the coming storm? Perhaps they were taken by surprise, but not Gandhiji. The European situation had for him a lesson that was unmistakably clear. "It fills me with the utmost non-violence," he said. "I cannot think of a better thing to offer to Britain and the defeated nations than non-violence. It is impossible for me to enthuse over the deeds of Hitler or of those who fought or failed to fight him. There is nothing to choose between the victory of Hitler and the defeat of others. But I have no doubt in my mind that even a patched-up non-violent army would take the wind out of Hitler's sails. I need not have his aeroplanes, tanks, etc. He need not destroy our homes. Our non-violent army would welcome him, and it may be that he would not dare to come. I know that this may be a day-dream. But I cannot belie the principle of a lifetime or wipe out my day-dreams of the past twenty years. If we have not the non-violent strength of the brave to fight anarchy and aggression, let us say so and reduce ourselves to a small minority hoping to develop non-violence of the strong in the days to come."

The Working Committee did some fierce thinking for days. Those were the days of heart-searching for them. The logic of Gandhiji's propositions was invincible, but could they go with those propositions to the people? Were they so thoroughly saturated themselves with the spirit of non-violence of the brave to be able to carry conviction to the people? Gandhiji even drafted a resolution for them. But fain as they would have it, sorely as they felt the wrench of having to do without his leadership and his advice, they could not be untrue to themselves. "We feel we could not accept your position with our mind and heart and soul, and we feel we should not entangle you," they said to him in effect. "And if that is so, why should we accept an untenable position merely to retain your connection? It would be a fraud on ourselves and others."

But if they could not be untrue to themselves, neither could Gandhiji be untrue to himself. He said to them : "I must be left free for my self-expression. I must be free to pursue my search, and I know you will believe me when I say that I go only to be of more effective service to the Congress, to you and the nation. Of course I shall be available when you want me. But I can no longer identify myself with the direction of your policy and programme. You will, therefore, try your best to do without me and have your meetings in future not in Wardha but elsewhere.

It was said of old by a Teacher to his disciples: "Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" Had those who for us have been "the salt of the earth" lost their savour? One cannot say. But there were these words also uttered of old: "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid." And they may yet be those lights. In the mean-

while Gandhiji waits and prays in silence. "I should work single-handed in implicit faith that what I fail to make clear to my countrymen today shall be clear to them some day of itself or, if God wills it, through some apt word which He may put in my mouth or some apt work which He may prompt me to do." These words were uttered in 1934, but they might have been uttered only the other day.

Harijan, July 13, 1940

AHIMSA IN ACTION

By Gangadharrao Deshpande

AHIMSA, the great principle associated with Gandhiji's name and with his whole life, is not altogether a new idea in the history of India's religion or philosophy. As a principle of self-purification, the importance of *ahimsa* was emphasised by our ancient teachers as no one else has done. Absolute non-injury has been the basis of all spiritual life in our country. But its value has been confined to the domain of individual salvation, freedom from the bondage of physical, worldly life. To guide one's life according to the principles of *ahimsa*, we have been taught, we must progressively renounce all ties with worldly activities and withdraw into ourselves, away from the incessant struggle which is human existence.

The interpretation given by Gandhiji to the principle of *ahimsa* is fundamentally different from this traditional view. He makes it not only the rule of the individual soul's march to the final beatitude but the rule on which humanity can and ought to establish all its social life. He has applied *ahimsa* to all problems, the entire field of politics, economics, and other activities. To put it in another way, he has taught us both by his teachings as well as conduct, that moral strength which in its purest form is *ahimsa* can overcome all evils, even political and social injustice, racialism, capitalist exploitation and greed for power and aggrandisement. Even the evil depending on and resulting from brute force can, according to him, be overcome by the sheer strength of *ahimsa* which is the same as spiritual strength. This interpretation means a wide and radical extension of the content of *ahimsa* far beyond the meaning given to it by our old teachers.

The most important corollary of this widening of the scope of *ahimsa* is that the gulf between an end and the means to achieve it is permanently bridged over in Gandhism. *Ahimsa*, includes both the end and the means. It is itself both. No end which infringes the rule of strict non-violence can be a legitimate end. Its apparent attainment by violent means defeats its own purpose and is, therefore, self-destructive. There can be no moral end which can or may be accomplished by immoral means. In a sense the end and the means are identical and cannot be separated from each other. This teaching of Gandhiji gives a death-blow to the maxim, so generally accepted in conduct if not in theory, that the end justifies the means.

...P.C.C., AUGUST 8, 1942

AHIMSA IN ACTION

When Gandhiji entered public life in India, terrorism professedly as a means to attain political freedom had taken deep roots in some minds. Those who defended this cult thought that the terrorist was a courageous, selfless and patriotic youth and whatever we may think of the means he was employing, his goal, the end in view, was the same as that of any of us. The appreciation of the end and of his motives as distinguished from the means was shared by many who sincerely condemned terrorist acts. Gandhiji, the apostle of love, set his face against this. And he succeeded to a very large extent in dissuading many a youth from this path. His moral influence did more than repression by Government to root out faith in the revolver and the bomb. But it must be confessed that the method of violence against violence, repression against terrorism goes on in an endless cycle.

The method of bargaining in politics, diplomacy as it is euphemistically called, pitching one's demands as high as possible to conceal one's readiness to be satisfied with less, is another form which faith in "end justifies means" takes. Gokhale was the first to attempt to "spiritualise" politics in our country. That probably explains why Gandhiji, the greatest exponent of direct action, or Satyagraha as he calls it, looks upon Gokhale, the moderate leader of his day, as his political *guru*. Gokhale's aim to spiritualise politics was given a philosophical foundation and a living structure by Gandhiji. Gandhiji turned the principle into a basis for mass movements, inspiring wonder and admiration even in the minds of opponents. Conquest of the hearts of others by self-suffering, not by hatred of others who oppose or uphold an evil but by love for even those who wish to smite, is the essence of all his activities. This is not only in one's personal individual dealings with others but in the international and internal spheres of action. It was because of Gandhiji's emphasis even on the means being pure that touched the hearts of millions of people in India, simple rustics living in the most inaccessible corners of the country. The hold he has established on the minds of his fellow-beings even outside his own country bears ample testimony to the potency of the moral force of *ahimsa* in all spheres of life.

Some of Gandhiji's critics point out the dual character of human nature, the mixture of good and evil in it, and contend that the evil part in its constitution may not be capable of being conquered by means of *ahimsa*. Gandhiji's answer has been that we need not be frightened out of our faith in the principle by the evil element in human nature. This so-called mixture is really our habit of bowing down to immoral forces which every person can, if he chooses, eradicate by determination to do so. If you fail once, twice or thrice, your failure is the result of your own weakness. The remedy is your attaining greater purity. Moreover, success or failure in stray cases does not matter For, what is that failure that deters one from pursuing the path of unadulterated *ahimsa?* There can be no failure in the fight between *ahimsa* and *himsa*, between truth and untruth. The very fact that you have fought the battle with the weapon of love and truth is its own success, its own reward.

Gandhiji has proclaimed again recently that "as a man wedded to truth and non-violence not merely as a matter of discipline or expediency but as a rule of

conduct in all walks of life," he could "endorse nothing untruthful and violent." "Suffice it to say," Gandhiji has further said, "that the experience has led me to the unshakable conviction that our success has been mathematically proportionate to the extent to which we have adhered to truth and non-violence. The phenomenal awakening of the masses during the last twenty-five years had been entirely due to the purity of our means. And to the extent that untruth and violence have crept in, they have hindered our progress." Prophetic words these, words which we can never afford to forget.

At one time in the course of the civil disobedience movement in 1932 I was appointed "dictator" by Sarojini Devi after her arrest. While directing the Satyagraha activities I came in contact with the movement in all parts of the country but more closely as it was carried on in Karnatak, my own province. My arrest and conviction followed in due course. When I was released, Mahadev Desai received me at the gate of the Yeravda Jail and at once took me to "Parnakuti" where Gandhiji was then convalescing after his fast. I found him conversing with a well-known leader of our country, the purity of whose long and distinguished public career is beyond question. I reported to Gandhiji the way in which the movement was carried on. I explained how the nature of the struggle involved secrecy, fraud and falsehood, disguises to evade arrests and such other methods. Anything short of injury to the human body was then considered as coming within the technique of non-violence. Satyagraha of Gandhiji's conception was not much in vogue and its implications were not much impressed on our minds. The leader who was present and heard the whole story was well pleased and exclaimed, "It was very clever." Gandhiji heard me very gravely. With his characteristic look, he said : "Yes, it may be very clever, but certainly it was not Satyagraha." How crest-fallen I felt!

This incident explains what value Gandhiji attaches to the means we employ in achieving our object.

Gandhiji's crowded life and his numerous writings and speeches fully explain the varied aspects of the principle of *ahimsa* and truthfulness as conceived by him. His life and work will always be a beacon-light to guide mankind in its struggle for a purer and happier life for individuals as well as for humanity as a whole.

HIS GREATEST GIFT

By R. R. Diwakar

GANDHIJI is the chosen instrument through whom is presented to a seeking, weary world an attitude and a method which are likely to prove the only hope of humanity. He has shown us a unique way of fighting social, economic, and political evils without rancour and bitterness. There have been men as great as Gandhiji and greater in their way of leading individual lives. But he alone has been able to shape and present to us a matchless weapon with which to resist social evil, to fight and solve social conflicts. Stricken humanity is indebted to him for the gift of Satyagraha which is his way of conquering evil by insistence on truth through non-violence or love. With rare insight and absolute originality he has drawn upon the ancient law of suffering and used it as a substitute for violence. He has shown the way to replace hate by love, fear by fearlessness, secrecy by openness, and killing by dying.

It was out of his truthful way of living that this new method evolved. Truth has been Gandhiji's greatest love since his early childhood. Prahlad, who stuck to truth at the risk of his life, and Harischandra, who kept his word at the cost of his kingdom, were his heroes in boyhood. Long before the word "Satyagraha" was coined in 1907, he was already following the law of *Ahimsa* and living the life of a Satyagrahi. He was adhering to truth through self-suffering. "Returning good for evil" had caught his imagination and is still his inspiration.

Gandhiji looks upon all life as one. That is the truth of life for him. Love, the principle of identity, of attraction, is the law of life. He loves and seeks the good of all through constant service and sacrifice. When in conflict, he invites suffering by clinging to truth but never contemplates injury to others. If death comes to him through an erring brother he considers it to be a triumph of the spirit over the body. He never harbours ill-will even against opponents. He is never dogmatic about his truth and seeks to rouse the sense of fairness and justice in the opponent's mind by suffering.

His attitude and conduct were those of a typical Satyagrahi at Maritzburg when he was unjustly ejected from a first-class compartment, at Pardeburg when he was brutally assaulted by a coach guard, at Durban when his life was threatened by a white mob, and at Johannesburg when he was bludgeoned by an erring Pathan

follower. He patiently bore the insults and attacks without ill-will, without retaliation and without recourse to law. These experiences helped him forge Satyagraha into a social weapon. Why not extend the use of self-suffering to the wider field of social conflicts, thought Gandhiji. He took an unalterable decision. Truth and non-violence became his guiding stars in public as in private life. He has sought to wipe away the double standard of morality which makes falsehood and murder, deceit and diplomacy virtues when groups are in conflicts and nations are at war. He seeks today to establish that pure means alone can lead to good ends and that good motives are no substitute for pure means.

Since the South African struggle in 1906, Satyagraha has been in action for nearly four decades. Its history has been colourful. It has been used for small as well as big purposes. If it was used in a small *taluka* like Bardoli for the reduction of land tax, it has been used on a national scale for securing Indian independence. As early as 1909, the author of Satyagraha said, "It might be a slow remedy but I regard it as absolutely a sure one, not only for our ills in Transvaal but for all political and other troubles our people suffer in India." In July 1943 he said, "The accumulated experience of the last thirty-eight years, the first eight of which were in South Africa, fills me with the greatest hope that in the adoption of non-violence lies the future of India and the world. It is the most harmless and equally effective way of dealing with the political and economic wrongs of the downtrodden portion of humanity." As recently as June 1944 he exclaimed, "Some friends have told me that truth and non-violence have no place in politics and worldly affairs. I do not agree. I have no use for them as a means of individual salvation. Their introduction and application in everyday life has been my experiment all along. Whatever strength I may have, is entirely due to the fact that I am a votary of truth and non-violence."

Thus from the very dawn of Satyagraha to this day his vision of it has been clear and undimmed, his faith in it unflinching and his use of it in all fields of life continuous and effective. It is not only the meek Hindu that fights with this weapon. The warlike Sikh took to it with avidity and fought his way to success in many a social conflict. The Pathan of the Frontier, who may be said to be born with a rifle, saw in it the salvation of his tribe.

It is not only in India that this new technique is appreciated. In every country there are thousands of honest men and women who are seriously thinking of a way out of bloody conflicts. The liberals, the pacifists, the conscientious objectors, the internationalists are all eager for an alternative method.

As early as 1910, William James voiced this yearning in his *Moral Equivalent of War*. He said, "So far war has been the only force that can discipline a whole community, and until an equivalent discipline is organized, I believe that war must have its way. I have no serious doubt that the ordinary prides and shames of social man, once developed to a certain intensity, are capable of organizing such a moral

equivalent as I have sketched, just as effective for preserving the manliness of type." Later in the same strain Walter Lippman writes, "It is not sufficient to propose an equivalent for the military virtues. It is even more important to work out an equivalent for the military methods and objectives. War is not a mere release of certain subjective impulses clamouring for expression. It is also one of the ways by which great human decisions are made. If that is true, then the abolition of war depends primarily upon inventing and organizing other ways of deciding those issues which have been hitherto decided by war."

Satyagraha can very well claim to be a moral equivalent for war. So far as India's struggle for freedom is concerned, Gandhiji has often said that it is a complete substitute for armed revolt. And so it has proved to be. If Satyagraha had not been in the field in India, the lovers of freedom would have gone the same way as in other countries who won it by violence. Even as regards the other countries, sooner than later a substitute will have to be found if mutual slaughter is to stop. At least at the present moment there is no other method that can replace violence except Satyagraha.

A comparison between war and Satyagraha is both instructive and interesting. Both are direct actions and are used as a last resort. They aim at final decisions and parties have to stake their all. Both have a compelling element. The heroism, sacrifice, spirit of adventure, endurance required are the same. Both invoke the utmost effort and lead to the glory of martyrdom.

Here the similarity ends. War seeks to coerce through physical force, Satyagraha aims at conversion or compulsion by moral pressure. War attacks the opponent's morale through fear, Satyagraha rouses his moral sense by self-suffering. War demands either destruction or submission of the enemy, Satyagraha stands for non-injury and for "live and let live." War involves utmost suffering on both sides, Satyagraha invites suffering from only one party which is sure to be far less than in war. War appeals to blind might, Satyagraha to reason through the heart. War can be waged for immoral purposes, Satyagraha can take up only just and moral causes. War leaves a legacy of hatred, anger, and revenge while Satyagraha has no use for them. War brutalises humanity, Satyagraha chastens it. Often enough a single man or a physically weak party can offer Satyagraha and hope to win while war requires at least equal physical strength. In contrast to war, C. F. Andrews calls Satyagraha a Christian method. This is the plain lesson that Gandhiji wants humanity to learn. C. E. M. Joad has rightly said, "Gandhi is a moral genius and his method belongs to the coming generation. He has announced a method for the settlement of disputes which may not only supersede the method of force, but as man grows powerful in the art of destruction, must supersede it, if civilization is to survive."

To Gandhiji Truth is God and non-violence or love is the only way to find Him. Given these two realities and their interrelation as end and means the philosophy of Satyagraha is easily worked out. Satyagraha seeks to express truth in

action. It is busy more with its application than its enunciation. It never allows helpless inaction or supine submission to pass under the name of non-violence. There is no place for cowards under Gandhiji's banner. Nor should Gandhiji's love of peace be mistaken for passivity.

Satyagraha is Gandhiji's greatest gift. As Romain Rolland says, "Mr. Gandhi's Satyagraha experiment is the sole chance now existing in the world of effecting transformation of humanity without violence. If this fails there will remain no other issue in human history but violence. This is why all those who have at heart the social harmony and the spirit of peace should help India with all their strength."



IS GANDHI A SOCIALIST?

By M. R. Masani

"I TOO claim to be a socialist," Gandhiji had said. Too respectful to challenge the claim, I had kept silent and contented myself with indulging in a doubting smile, just in case silence should be mistaken for consent. That was ten years ago—in May 1934. Gandhiji had been kind enough to extend to me an invitation to go with him on his walking tour in Orissa after the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee at Patna and I had seized the opportunity with alacrity. Our long discussions about socialism had left me rather bewildered and confused as to just where Gandhiji stood. At times one felt one had at last achieved understanding, only to have one's hopes dashed a little later by words from his lips which showed how far away one was from him after all. Most of the time one felt that Gandhiji did not move on the same plane of argument as oneself. It was, however, a great and rare opportunity and I was happy when at Juhu in May 1944, Gandhiji reminded me of that occasion and showed that he had not forgotten it.

If today I were confronted with the same claim on his part to be a socialist, what would be my response? It is a complex question this—of labelling people; particularly perplexing when dealing with someone as complex as Gandhiji. Perhaps that is not a fair description of him. As Louis Fischer has rightly put it, he is "all of one piece like good sculpture." The trouble is that he cuts across the boundary lines between the various "isms" and the various compartments into which western political science dovetails people these days.

Besides, to determine whether or not Gandhiji is a socialist, one has first to determine what is socialism. And to that question there can be manifestly diverse replies, with not much in common between some of them. Is it sympathy and solidarity with the downtrodden sections of society? Then Gandhiji is certainly a socialist. Is it a passion for social justice? Then nobody dare challenge his claim. Is it an economic means towards the free development of the human personality? Then certainly Gandhiji has an assured place in the crusade. Is it a peaceful international society free from exploitation of any kind? Then who as staunch a socialist as Gandhiji? Or is abolition of private property the crux of the matter? Is nationalization of the means of production, distribution and exchange its essence? Then Gandhiji

falls out of the ranks.

And since all these things are in varying measure part of socialism and the measure varies from socialist to socialist, obviously there can be no one answer to the question with which we are faced.

Certain outpourings from "scientific" socialists notwithstanding, Gandhiji's antipathy to capitalism is beyond cavil. Gandhiji has made no bones about it. He has referred to India's fight for freedom as largely an effort to divest vested interests, both British and Indian. "I do not fight shy of capital. I fight capitalism," he had written in *Young India* on October 7, 1926. On December 16, 1939, he was to repeat in *Harijan*: "I desire to end capitalism almost, if not quite, as much as the most advanced socialist or even communist. But our methods differ, our languages differ."

A desire to end the capitalist order is not enough qualification to be a socialist. It depends on what you put in its place. A fascist also desires to destroy capitalism. Is the new order that Gandhiji desires the same that is envisaged by socialists? While undoubtedly ends and means are inextricably intertwined, it would perhaps make it easier to provide an answer if we first compare the ends and then the means that socialists and Gandhiji in their turn stand for.

The socialist society may, in a sentence, be defined as a society of "the free and the equal," in which the state (i.e., the military and the police) have "withered away" and in which the economic system would function on the principle: "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his need." Since such a society could not for long co-exist with capitalist societies round about it and since the socialist thesis is that "the workers have no Fatherland," the new order would not only be libertarian and equalitarian but also international. This has been the dream of all socialists, of the Fabians as of the Marxists, of Robert Owen and Bernard Shaw as of Marx and Lenin.

Gandhiji too has had his dreams of the ideal society. On September 15, 1939, he told the A. I. C. C.: "Sometimes a man lives in his day-dreams. I live in mine, and picture the world as full of good human beings—not goody goody human beings. In the socialist's language, there will be a new structure of society, a new order of things. I also am aspiring after a new order of things that will astonish the world."

What is Gandhiji's dream? I think Lenin's society of "the free and the equal" is the best description of what, as far as one can ascertain, Gandhiji has in mind. Strong individualist and lover of liberty that he is, Gandhiji is a believer in the responsibility of each individual to his conscience, even to the extent of disobeying the dictates of the state. Here Gandhiji is very near to the anarchists.

Equality is about as dear to him as liberty. "My ideal," he wrote in *Young India* on March 17, 1927, "is equal distribution." So again, he wrote of his constructive programme: "The whole of this programme will be a structure on sand if it is not built on the solid foundation of economic equality."

At one with socialists in postulating a society that is at once democratic and equalitarian, a pacifist like Gandhiji can hardly be expected to cavil at an order that is also international.

It is difficult, therefore, to find any significant difference between Gandhiji and the socialists in so far as the aim or objective is concerned. That is not to say that Gandhiji has accepted the ideal worked out by socialists in the west. He has arrived at it independently, by the logic of his own thought. It may not be out of place to mention here that Gandhiji has always been affected singularly little by socialist literature. His latest contact with it has been to read Marx's *Capital* in the Aga Khan Palace. He is reported to have marked the termination of that feat of endurance with the remark: "I think I could have written it better assuming, of course, that I had the leisure for the study he has put in." It would be truer therefore to say that Gandhiji's objective includes and involves on its material side the socialist society than that he accepts the socialist objective.

The position is by no means as clear when we turn to the methods by which the common aim is to be achieved. One complicating factor here is that socialists among themselves have been by no means agreed as to their methods. Wherever political democracy has functioned, socialists have by and large confined themselves to waging the class war through trade unions and parliamentary parties and winning a majority vote for the change-over from capitalism to socialism. They have accepted the irksome limitations of the "inevitability of gradualness." Even after the acquisition of power, they would advance step by step, paying compensation to the owners of property taken away from them and socialised. Gradually, through the progressive abolition of private property, the inequalities between various classes would disappear and the equalitarian society would be achieved.

The communists under Lenin advanced an alternative methodology. Since the degeneration of the communist parties into appendages of the Russian Foreign Office, this view has been held by Trotsky's adherents in the Fourth International. This alternative is that the class struggle should be intensified till it bursts into violent revolution during which the party would seize power and, on behalf of the proletariat, establish a dictatorship. All property-owning classes and all other political parties would be "liquidated" (exterminated) and all power and all property would vest in the state. When a classless society had thus been achieved, the dictatorship would have served its purpose and would dissolve, restoring freedom to the people. The state itself would start "withering away" and the society of "the free and the equal" would emerge.

It will be noticed that what is common to both these schools of thought is the intensification of the class struggle, the abolition of private property in the instruments of production, distribution and exchange and their nationalization, that is, concentration in the hands of the state.

of transition, with one or other or both schools of thought. To my mind, these points of divergence all flow out of Gandhiji's insistence on non-violence at every step on the way, whether before or after socialist power is established.

If Marx's insistence that all history is the history of class struggles is a political translation of Darwin's theory of evolution, Gandhiji's understanding of society is based on Prince Peter Kropotkin's stress on mutual aid as the law of nature. Gandhiji does not deny the clash of interests between classes, but he also stresses their inter-dependence and common interests. He will fight exploitation by appealing not to the collective selfishness of the poor but to the sentiment of social justice and solidarity among both rich and poor. He has long anticipated much of what Peter Drucker has to say in *The End Of Economic Man.*

"The conviction has been growing upon me," he wrote as far back as May 12, 1920, in *Young India,* "that things of fundamental importance to the people are not secured by reason alone, but have to be purchased with their suffering. Nobody has perhaps drawn up more petitions or espoused more forlorn causes than I, and I have come to this fundamental conclusion that if you want something really important to be done you must not merely satisfy the reason, you must move the heart also. The appeal of reason is more to the head, but the penetration of the heart comes from suffering. It opens the inner understanding in men."

The adherence to non-violence has by no means proved such a handicap to the cause of labour as the Marxist might have anticipated. In his *War Without Violence,* Krishnalal Sridharani explains why :—

"The Ahmedabad success of non-violent direct action indicated that Gandhi's ideology has a mission even in the field of class struggle. Such a victory might well throw a doubt on Lenin's contention that the bourgeoisie is beyond repair. Still more important is the line of thought that was suggested at Ahmedabad. It became evident that so far as the workers are concerned (or, for that matter, any group weaker than its opponent), they are better off with non-violence than with violence.

"In other words, the workers have more chances of obtaining their ends through Satyagraha than through armed rebellion. For one thing, the capitalists or the vested interests have everything on their side when it comes to physical force. Given an excuse to match their brawn with that of the workers, the ensuing carnage will wipe out any trace of the labour movement and many of the labourers. But above all, the workers have more time, both for organization and mediation, under non-violence than under an ideology which encompasses bloodshed, and is not, consequently, smiled upon by the people at large."

If he had been writing today, Sridharani would probably have added that a comparative study of how the textile workers of Ahmedabad and of Bombay reacted to the political events of August 1942 and after would raise grave doubts as to the superior revolutionary value of a Marxist as against a Gandhian education for the working class.

IS GANDHI A SOCIALIST?

The Gandhian method of winning power—non-violent non-co-operation and civil resistance—has arisen out of the needs of a situation where political democracy does not exist. Gandhiji has, however, made it clear that even in a free and democratic India a minority or even an individual would have the right to resort to Satyagraha for resisting an unrighteous law and therefore, presumably, for effecting a desirable social change. Indeed, except in so far as he eschews weapons of physical force, he is perhaps nearest the anarchists in his attitude towards the state.

The Gandhian way makes what is probably its biggest detour from socialist orthodoxy at the point where socialist power is established. M. L. Dantwala has in his illuminating little book *Gandhism Reconsidered* given a description of the process of post-revolutionary reconstruction :—

"Gandhiji has made no secret of his strong disapproval of all exploitation by *zamindars* and capitalists. Angered by their misbehaviour we at once think of liquidating them. But according to the non-violent technique we miss a step. Effort is to be made to do away with the wrong before we do away with the wrong-doer. Gandhiji, therefore, pleads and argues with the *zamindars* and capitalists voluntarily to submit themselves to the discipline and restraints of trusteeship. Show them the right course. Impress upon them the justice of your scheme. Give them a chance to mend their way. If that succeeds evil will be ended and we will have gained a valuable citizen. Negatively there will be one less enemy.

"The technique which announces *a priori* expropriation gives an invitation for the organization of counter-revolution. The experience of all attempted revolutions shows that immensely more difficult than the *coup d'etat* is the problem of resisting counter-revolutionary sabotage and intervention. The non-violent revolution is brought about in a more favourable atmosphere. It does not throw up hatred and violence which may undo the achievements of the revolution. With this technique, therefore, the work of post-revolution reconstruction will be easier. We may need fewer concentration camps and fewer mass treason trials. It is a method of change which may be given a fair trial. But the chances are we may not succeed. Even then, nothing would be lost. The trustee will have to be deposed, because our non-violence does not mean toleration of an evil.

"In conformity with the Gandhian method even this deposition will be enforced as far as possible with the sanction of the community concerned and not that of the state. That the alternative method of immediate suppression does not achieve quicker results is potently demonstrated by the socialist experiment in the U. S. S. R., where sabotage and treason were causing constant troubles as late as 1939, two decades after the revolution.

"Examining this question of state sanction against communal sanction, it may be suggested that Gandhiji's preference for the latter arises logically from the application of the non-violent technique In this connection, Gandhiji's position is more like that of the anarchists, with a distrust of all constituted authority. To the usual

argument that this involves a confusion between the immediate and the ultimate, that the state can wither away but slowly, and that it is sheer irresponsible romanticism to do away with its sanction from the very start, Gandhiji's reply will be that since in a non-violent revolution power is not 'seized' by but gradually accrues to the people, there will be no need for the transitional period of dictatorship, for by the time the revolution has run the last lap, the community will have gathered considerable strength for the enforcement of sanctions.

"The non-violent technique permits the fruit (new order) to ripen on the tree itself, while if you pluck the fruit when it is yet raw you will have to keep it in artificial heat (of state sanctions). To change the metaphor, it does not involve any mopping-up process and the work of reconstruction can start at once. The post-revolutionary society will be in a much more advanced state than the one which may confront us after a revolutionary *coup d'etat*. Since power is not 'captured', the revolutionary achievement does not need to be 'preserved' from foreign or counter-revolutionary intervention. Since there was no resort to 'necessary evils', no treatment is necessary."

There is a real danger that socialization of a highly industrialised country's entire economy may, at the present stage of human evolution, lead to such concentration of power in the hands of the ruling clique that the issue would be, not a society of "the free and the equal", but a totalitarian collectivism (call it Fascism or Managerial State as you like) of the German or Russian model. Gandhiji has a very different conception of the nature and extent of industrialisation which guards against any such menace. It may be that the Gandhian way provides an escape from the *cul de sac* of the Managerial State to which western socialism appears to lead. To Gandhiji that state is the best which governs the least.

Gandhiji is often represented to be an opponent of large-scale industry and of the use of machinery. That this is a caricature of the true position is shown by just two or three quotations from what Gandhiji has said on this point: "My object is not to destroy the machine but to impose limitations to it... I welcome the machine that lightens the burden of crores of men living in cottages and reduces man labour... If we could have electricity in every village home I shall not mind villagers plying their implements and tools with electricity."

Gandhiji has explained his objections to headlong mechanisation: "I consider it a sin and injustice to use machinery for the purpose of concentrating power and riches in the hands of the few. Today the machine is used in this way... We should not substitute lifeless machines for the living machines scattered over the seven lakhs villages of India. The machine is well used if it aids men's labour and simplifies it. Today it is used to pour wealth in the pockets of the chosen few. Little attention is paid to crores of people from whom the machine snatches away their bread... I have no objection if all things required by my country could be produced with the labour of 30,000 instead of that of three crores. But those three crores

must not be rendered idle or unemployed."

What Socialist can quarrel with these statements? There are other social, non-material reasons, however, why Gandhiji sees dangers in mechanisation at the present stage of human development and man's limited capacity to control the machine. Gandhiji himself pointed out this difference in *Harijan* on September 29, 1940: "Pandit Nehru wants industrialisation because he thinks that, if it is socialized, it would be free from the evils of capitalism. My own view is that the evils are inherent in industrialism, and no amount of socialization can eradicate them."

Perhaps the most recent expression of Gandhiji's picture of a decentralised economy is to be found in his discussion with Louis Fischer as reported in *A Week with Gandhi.*

"You see," Gandhi began, "the centre of power now is in New Delhi, or in Calcutta and Bombay, the big cities. I would have it distributed among the seven hundred thousand villages of India. That will mean that there is no power. In other words I want the seven hundred thousand dollars now invested in the imperial bank of England withdrawn and distributed among the seven hundred thousand villages. Then each village will have its one dollar which cannot be lost."

"The seven hundred thousand dollars invested in the imperial bank of India," Gandhi continued, "could be swept away by a bomb from a Japanese plane, whereas if they were distributed among the seven hundred thousand shareholders, nobody could deprive them of their assets. There will then be voluntary co-operation between these seven hundred thousand units, voluntary co-operation— not co-operation induced by Nazi methods. Voluntary co-operation will produce real freedom and a new order vastly superior to the new order in Soviet Russia."

"What will the villages do with the dollar that has come back to them from the imperial bank of England?" I asked.

"One thing will happen", Gandhi asserted. "Today the shareholders get no return. Intermediaries take it away. If the peasants are masters of their dollars they will use them as they think best."

"A peasant buries his money in the ground," I suggested.

"They will not bury their dollars in the ground," Gandhi said, "because they will have to live. They will go back to the bank, their own bank, and utilize it under their direction for purposes they think best. They may then build windmills or produce electricity or whatever they like. A central government will evolve, but it will act according to the wishes of the people and will be broad-based on their will."

In a country of peasants such as India, the norm of property is land. Gandhiji's attitude as to its ownership should therefore be of crucial significance: "Real socialism has been handed down to us by our ancestors who taught 'All land belongs to Gopal, where then is the boundary line? Man is the maker of that line,

and he can therefore unmake it.' Gopal literally means shepherd; it also means God. In modern language it means the state, i.e. the people. That the land today does not belong to the people is too true. But the fault is not in the teaching. It is in us who have not lived up to it... I have no doubt that we can make as good an approach to it as is possible for any nation, not excluding Russia, and that without violence.

While Gandhiji 'would base his new order on prosperous, semi-self-sufficient village communities, he by no means rules out the participation of large-scale key industries and public utilities which would provide transport, power, modern tools, implements and machines for serving the needs of agriculture and village industries. These would socialize: "I am socialist enough to say that such factories should be nationalized, or state controlled. They ought only to be working under the most attractive and ideal conditions, not for profit, but for the benefit of humanity, love taking a place of greed as the motive. It is an alteration in the conditions of labour that I want. This mad rush for wealth must cease, and the labourer must be assured, not only of a living wage, but a daily task that is not a mere drudgery. The machine will, under these conditions, be as much a help to the man working it as to the state or the man who owns it. The present mad rush will cease, and the labourer will work (as I have said) under attractive and ideal conditions... The village communities or the state would own power houses, just as they have their grazing pastures."

Since basic and key industries and services and the land are to be socialized and since, for the rest, the unit of production, whether agricultural or industrial, is to be the small producer, the question arises just what place the "trustee" is to occupy in the scheme of things. One can guess that the trustee has a place only in the immediate post-revolutionary period until the community can take charge of and administer its heritage, like the communist "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" which also is nothing but a trusteeship of the party until the classless society is able freely to administer its heritage.

We have now briefly traversed the ground on which Gandhiji and the socialists meet and part. We have seen that while their ultimate objective is one and the same, Gandhiji's stress on non-violence colours the transition he envisages from capitalism rather differently from that conceived by most socialists, and certainly from that postulated by communists. With the latter, indeed, Gandhiji holds hardly anything in common. Their axiom that "the end justifies the means" is the direct antithesis of Gandhiji's choice of truth and non-violence. It was a great socialist, Ferdinand Lassalle, who prayed:

Show us not the aim without the way,
For ends and means on earth are so entangled
That changing one, you change the other too;
Each different path brings other ends in view.

The communists changed the traditional socialist way of liberty and love for that

of dictatorship and hate. In the result, their aim has also changed, as can be seen from the way Russia has been and is going.

Gandhiji would be justified if he were to say today: "I could have told you so." He has not done so, but he has categorically rejected the fruits of the Russian experiment in his talks with Louis Fischer: "Some say there is ruthlessness in Russia but that it is exercised for the lowest and the poorest and is good for that reason. For me it has very little good in it."

The communists on their part have, except for occasional public pronouncements made tongue in cheek, always recognised Gandhiji as the greatest opponent of their creed. Putting aside the puerile characterisation by the Indian communists of Gandhiji as an agent of Indian capitalism and a retarder of the revolution, the fundamental communist objection is best stated by Ivanov, the new-model communist, in Koestler's *Darkness at Noon*: "The greatest criminals in history are not of the type of Nero and Fouche, but of the type of Gandhi and Tolstoy. Gandhi's inner voice has done more to prevent the liberation of India than the British guns. To sell oneself for thirty pieces of silver is an honest transaction; but to sell oneself to one's own conscience is to abandon mankind. History is *a priori* amoral; it has no conscience. To want to conduct history according to the maxims of the Sunday school means to leave everything as it is."

While for those who equate socialism with Marxism, Gandhiji's contribution is either "reactionary" or has no significance, in the broad stream of those who through history have played a part in the fight for social justice Gandhiji has an assured place. It may indeed be argued that his contribution is as much of an advance over that of Marx as that was over the thought of those contemptuously called the "Utopian" socialists who went before him. "Marx is the prophet of an age ushered in by the Industrial Revolution, Gandhiji of the age of Fascism and Totalitarianism," writes Dantwala. "Technology has undergone a revolution undreamt of by Marx... New ills require new remedies. Socialization is no specific against the onslaught of technology... Marx supplied an antidote to nineteenth century capitalism; Gandhiji, possessing the advantage of having witnessed the twentieth century, prescribes a remedy for a later disease, capitalism plus totalitarianism."

It is yet too early to attempt any definitive assessment of the part that Gandhiji's ideas are destined to play in the great struggles for social liberation that lie ahead. For one thing, neither Gandhiji's thought nor any socialism worth the name is static. They evolve with the times. On June 14, 1934, after studying the programme of the newly formed Congress Socialist Party, Gandhiji had written to me: "I welcome the rise of the Socialist Party in the Congress. But I can't say that I like the programme as it appears in the printed pamphlet. It seems to me to ignore Indian conditions and I do not like the assumption underlying many of its propositions which go to show that there is necessarily antagonism between the classes and the masses or between the labourers and the capitalists, such that they can never work for mutual

good. My own experience covering a fairly long period is to the contrary."

In 1940, Jaiprakash Narayan (who had been largely responsible for drafting that same programme rejected by Gandhiji) placed before him on the eve of the Ramgarh session of the Indian National Congress a draft resolution embodying his picture of a Free Indian State. It is worth quoting this almost *in extenso* because undoubtedly Jaiprakash Narayan's is the authentic voice of Indian socialism. Here is Jaiprakash's picture:—

"The free Indian nation shall work for peace between nations and total rejection of armaments and for the method of peaceful settlement of national disputes through some international authority freely established. It will endeavour particularly to live on the friendliest terms with its neighbours, whether they be great powers or small nations, and shall covet no foreign territory.

"The law of the land will be based on the will of the people freely expressed by them. The ultimate basis of maintenance of order shall be the sanction and concurrence of the people.

"The free Indian state shall guarantee full individual and civil liberty and cultural and religious freedom, provided that there shall be no freedom to overthrow by violence the constitution framed by the Indian people through a Constituent Assembly.

"The state shall not discriminate in any manner between citizens of the nation. Every citizen shall be guaranteed equal rights. All distinctions of birth and privilege shall be abolished. There shall be no titles emanating either from inherited social status or the state.

"The political and economic organization of the state shall be based on principles of social justice and economic freedom. While this organization shall conduce to the satisfaction of the natural requirements of every member of society, material satisfaction shall not be its sole objective. It shall aim at healthy living and the moral and intellectual development of the individual. To this end to secure social justice, the state shall endeavour to promote small-scale production carried on by individual or co-operative effort for the equal benefit of all concerned. All large-scale collective production shall be eventually brought under collective ownership and control, and in this behalf the state shall begin by nationalizing heavy transport, shipping, mining and the heavy industries. The textile industry shall be progressively decentralised.

"The life of the villages shall be reorganized and the villages shall be made self-governing units, self-sufficient in as large a measure as possible. The land laws of the country shall be drastically reformed on the principle that land shall belong to the actual cultivator alone, and that no cultivator shall have more land than is necessary to support his family on a fair standard of living. This will end the various systems of landlordism on the one hand and farm bondage on the other.

"The state shall protect the interests of the classes, but when these impinge upon

the interests of those who have been poor and downtrodden, it shall defend the latter and thus restore the balance of social justice

"In all state-owned and state-managed enterprises, the workers shall be represented in the management through their elected representatives and shall have an equal share in it with the representatives of the Government.

"In the Indian States, there shall be complete democratic government established and in accordance with the principles of abolition of social distinction and equality between citizens, there shall not be any titular heads of the states in the person of Rajas and Nawabs."

Owing to some technical objection, the resolution was not put by the Working Committee before the Ramgarh session, but Gandhiji liked it so much that he commented on it in *Harijan* of April 20, 1940, as follows:—

"As an ideal to be reduced to practice as soon as possible after India comes into her own, I endorse in general all except one of the propositions enunciated by Shri Jaiprakash.

"I have claimed that I was a socialist long before those I know in India had avowed their creed. But my socialism was natural to me and not adopted from any books. It came out of my unshakable belief in non-violence. No man could be actively non-violent and not rise against social injustice, no matter where it occurred. Unfortunately western socialists have, so far as I know believed in the necessity of violence for enforcing socialistic doctrines.

"I have always held that social justice, even to the least and the lowliest, is impossible of attainment by force. I have further believed that it is possible by proper training of the lowliest by non-violent means to reduce redress of the wrong suffered by them. That means non-violent non-co-operation... It therefore gladdens me to find Shri Jaiprakash accepting, as I read his draft, non-violence for the purpose of establishing the order envisaged by him...

"Shri Jaiprakash's propositions about land may appear frightful. In reality they are not. No man should have more land than he needs for dignified sustenance. Who can dispute the fact that the grinding poverty of the masses is due to their having no land that they can call their own?...

"But it must be realised that the reform cannot be rushed, if it is to be brought about by non-violent means, it can only be done by education both of the haves and have-nots ... If the end in view is to be achieved, the education I have adumbrated has to be commenced now. An atmosphere of mutual respect and trust has to be established as the preliminary step. There can be then no violent conflict between the classes and the masses.

"Whilst, therefore, I have no difficulty in generally endorsing Shri Jaiprakash's proposition in terms of non-violence, I cannot endorse his proposition about the Princes. In law they are independent. It is true that their independence is not worth

much, for it is guaranteed by a stronger party. But as against us they are able to assert their independence. If we come into our own through non-violent means, as is implied in Shri Jaiprakash's draft proposals, I do not imagine a settlement in which the Princes will have effaced themselves. Whatever settlement is arrived at, the nation will have to carry out in full.

"I can therefore only conceive a settlement in which the big states will retain their status. In one way this will be far superior to what it is today; but in another it will be limited so as to give the people of the states the same right of self-government within their states as the people of the other parts of India will enjoy. They will have freedom of speech, a free press and pure justice guaranteed to them. Perhaps Shri Jaiprakash has no faith in the Princes automatically surrendering their autocracy. I have. First, because they are just as good human beings as we are, and secondly, because of my belief in the potency of genuine non-violence. Let me conclude, therefore, by saying that the Princes and all others will be true and amenable when we have become true to ourselves, to our faith, if we have it, and to the nation. At present we are half-hearted. The way to freedom will never be found through half-heartedness. Non-violence begins and ends by turning the searchlight inward."

It is thus possible to see how in the space of a few years Gandhiji's view-point as well as that of Indian socialists has shifted, until today there is a large amount of inter-penetration of thought.

What then is the reply—Is Gandhiji a socialist? Most present-day socialists would say "No." So would a large majority of "Christians" repudiate Christ if he were to come in their midst again. The average socialist's rejection of Gandhiji is largely, I think, due to the fact that Gandhiji does not speak his jargon. It is open to question whether that is not rather slender reason for rebutting Gandhiji's oft-repeated claim to be a socialist.

A NEW SYNTHESIS

By M. L. Dantwala

MANY people are prepared to accept that Gandhiji, in spite of his friendly associations with the capitalists, is no supporter of the capitalist economic order. His emphasis on economic equality, his rejection of the acme of capitalist wisdom, "buying the cheapest"—be they men or material—and even his principle of trusteeship, implying as it does the negation of rights of private property, have brought him very near the socialist economic thought. Yet many people are unable to subscribe both to his anti-machine ideology and to his principle of trusteeship.

With regard to the first, it is argued that the abandonment of technological achievements will mean a return to barbarism and will needlessly subject humanity to toil and poverty. The two major evils of machinery, as worked at present,—unemployment and glaring economic inequalities—can, it is contended, be cured by socialization of the machine, reduction of the hours of work and a perpetually rising standard of material plenty.

That socialist ownership of machinery will eliminate economic inequality and exploitation may be readily accepted. But its capacity to cure unemployment without recourse to imperialism or wars is very much open to doubt. The experience of all the industrialised countries and of countries moving in that direction, goes to prove that they cannot escape the dilemma of over-production or unemployment. Assuming that socialism will be able to resolve this dilemma, a socialist and peaceful society will have to face yet another, though of a different nature. That one will be of super-production or enforced idleness, which euphemistically may be called leisure. If all able-bodied men and women are to be given the most technologically advanced instruments of production, there will be an embarrassing abundance either of goods or of leisure.

There are, however, people who see nothing so embarrassing in either of them—abundance of goods or of leisure. Here is a fundamental difference between them and Gandhiji. Gandhiji is a staunch advocate of a philosophy of life which, though not tolerating enforced poverty, would like to diminish the dependence of human happiness on material abundance.

In a world yet steeped in poverty, such an anxiety regarding abundance, may

appear premature and unwarranted if not suspicious and retrograde.. Yet it is, after all, a question of values, and socialist thought will enrich itself by reducing the accent on mere abundance of material goods and this can be done only by restraining the machine. Socialist thought has given some penetrating analysis of imperialism and wars. It has after clearing up much idealistic confusion laid bare the fact that at the root of both these is economic greed. If England and Japan have to eschew imperialism, how can they do so unless the Englishman and the Japanese reconcile themselves to the economic limitations imposed by nature on them! It is this gold-rush, this hunt for economic abundance, that leads to imperialisms and wars. The lasting cure, therefore, for both these is to instil values which do not equate happiness with material plenty. It will be a happier day when the bulwark of international socialism and peace will be right values rather than the Red Army.

The worship of technology is a typically capitalist, or, may I say, bourgeois norm. Capitalism and its allies, imperialism and wars, cannot exist without it. The only way in which a poor country like England or a defeated yet greedy one like Germany can grow rich is to worship at the altar of technology. Technology supplies them instruments for imperialism—goods for export at lower costs and for war, in case the march of imperialism is resisted. That a country experimenting with socialism has to go the same way is a weakness of international socialism, not its strength.

The argument that the use of large machines must inevitably lead to the creation of two camps, one of the unskilled worker and the other of the expert, does not as yet find favour with many. The bigger the machine, the greater the division of labour, and the splitting up of productive processes into numerous dull mechanical operations. As Karl Marx put it, "If it develops a one-sided speciality into perfection at the expense of man's working capacity as a whole, it also begins to make speciality of the absence of all (total) development." This makes the life of the majority of workers dull, mechanical and perhaps, as Dr. Mannheim points out, irrational. It must also leave society—as is happening in the sphere of politics, with the increased complexity of the administrative structure of the state—to the mercy of the professional expert. We shall be exchanging the expert for the capitalist as our master. People's rule, as in politics, will then once again become, at best, a myth.

Regarding the principle of trusteeship, people see the doings of our capitalists and *zamindars*, shrug their shoulders and exclaim, "Will these be our trustees?" Here is a basic misconception which needs to be removed. A capitalist of today will not automatically be elevated into a trustee of tomorrow. The whole complex of rights and obligations of the two is different. The capitalist will not be retained as a trustee unless and until he agrees to surrender totally his economic sovereignty. Neither his wealth—except a small percentage—nor its usufruct will belong to him. If Kishorelal Mashruwala can be accepted as the authorised exponent of Gandhiji's ideas, the personal wealth of the trustee will under no circumstances exceed twelve times that of the poorest man in the country. The change-over, if not accomplished by persuasion, will be secured by non-violent resistance.

Thus under the new society there may or may not be a continuity of the personnel but there will certainly be no continuity of either the functions or the privileges of the capitalist class—if such it can be called under its altered status. A capitalist of today will be permitted to be a trustee only if he agrees to shed the immense privileges which today accrue to him from the ownership of wealth. Much misunderstanding arises because critics miss this step of divestment involved in the change-over from the capitalist to the trustee.

The following dialogue between Mahatmaji and the well-known journalist, Louis Fischer, will prove illuminating in this connection. Explaining the *modus operandi* of civil disobedience, Gandhiji remarked, "The peasants will stop paying taxes... Their next step will be to seize the lands."

"With violence?" asked Fischer.

"There may be violence, but then again the landlords might co-operate."

"You are an optimist," said Fischer.

"They may co-operate by fleeing," was the witty reply Gandhiji gave. Summarising the conversation, when Fischer put it to Gandhiji, "You feel then it must be confiscation without compensation!" Gandhiji affirmed, "Of course, it will be financially impossible for anybody to compensate the landlords."

In spite of such categorical statements, there are occasions when one feels very uneasy regarding Gandhiji's stand on these questions. For example, recently while answering his critics over the question of his intimate associations with the wealthy, Gandhiji is reported to have remarked that he thereby seeks to utilize their wealth towards humanitarian ends. Such utterances by Gandhiji invest these gentlemen with a moral prestige, which many of them, if the means by which this wealth is acquired are looked into, will not deserve. It is enough to lay down a code for the manner in which a person may utilize his wealth. It is equally necessary to prescribe a code by which he can acquire wealth. For, one thing is certain: no one can accumulate a colossal fortune without committing a breach of humanitarian values. An economic thought, which while emphasising the ends to which wealth should be applied, remains silent as to the means by which it may be acquired is incomplete, if not faulty.

The foundation of Gandhian philosophy is the emphasis on the individual and the distrust of purely institutional remedies. This according to many thinkers is its greatest weakness. To seek to cure society by curing the individual is considered romantic, utopian and unscientific. Such an effort, it is alleged, will create the anomaly of "moral man and immoral society." It was Marx and the Historical School which rescued socialism from Utopians and Romantists like Ruskin, St. Simon and Fourier, who were committing this very error. Men they argued are made by environment; the accent must, therefore, be on the institutions, not the individuals.

But the experience of all reforms as well as revolutions teaches us that ideas have often met their death in institutions. Democracy died in parliaments and socialism in the Communist party. The fate of these two hopes of mankind, and the perversities

to which their institutionalization reduced them, must awaken men to the limitations of institutional remedies. Very often we forget that new and better men are required for the new and better institutions.

Gandhiji's philosophy exudes this distrust of institutional remedies. Its accent is on man. In Gandhiji's scheme of things—trusteeship, for example -greater reliance is placed on the man rather than on the institution. The motive-spring of Gandhian society will be the New Man. It is, therefore, that we hear so much about the "change of heart." No revolution is complete until this is accomplished. Without it there may be a revolution but no progress. And it is because you have ultimately to deal with hearts that your approach must be of love (non-violence) and not of hate (bullet). The question is through whom can you make new values effective—through new institutions or new men? In Gandhiji's society the primary responsibility of working the new society will be on men and in order that institutions may not devour ideas, the social mechanism is sought to be kept as simple as possible.

This reversal of accent from institutions to individuals, may appear to be retrograde to men whose excessive attachment to what they think to be "scientific objectivity" has reduced man to a mere robot of reflex actions. Men who assess man's capacity to do good or evil higher plead for a new synthesis of ideas, individuals and institutions, as a weapon of reconstruction.

THE INDIAN REVOLUTION

By Humayun Kabir

NEVER before has an inhabitant of a dependent country achieved such position and prestige in contemporary world history as Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. There are people who regard him as not only a great statesman and political leader but as a leader of thought with a new message for mankind. The principles of Christianity are said to constitute the basis of modern European civilization. Yet westerners admit that they have been exemplified more completely in the life and practice of this half-naked Fakir of the east than in that of any other individual of the modern world.

What is the secret of Gandhiji's strength? There are among his admirers some who think that his power and influence are derived from spiritual and super-normal sources which defy analysis. This, however, is hardly any answer. For whatever the sources of his power, it operates on the plane of material facts and natural events. Without a human background and field of activity, there is no scope for the manifestation of even superhuman powers. The problem of Gandhi must be explained in human terms. It is his deep sense of unity with the starving, naked, and ignorant masses of India which is the secret of his power. The contrast between his energy and their passivity which at first baffles us is itself the clue to his influence.

The revolutionary significance of Gandhi lies in his attempt to release the energies contained in the endurance of the Indian people. Even though he has not succeeded in transforming the entire world, he has everywhere stirred the mind of man. To achieve complete success is, perhaps, impossible in such cases. On the other hand, the imminence of Indian freedom is itself evidence that his endeavours have borne fruit.

Gandhi's great political effort has always been to restore the spiritual unity of the Indian People. The impact of the west had sundered this unity so that Indians found themselves a people of divided consciousness. The classes and the masses drifted from one another till they had hardly any point of contact. Gandhi set out to restore the points of contact and re-establish unity. It is this which has made him a revolutionary leader of the first importance. He was born at a time when the magnificence of British power dazzled the Indian intellect and influenced even the feelings and the will of the people. The memories of the struggle of independence of 1857 had not yet faded out of public consciousness. The Indian Muslims were divid-

ed, inactive, and full of bitterness, though among the Hindus, there was not the same sense of defeat or bitterness. The political leadership of the British was accepted almost as an axiom not only in India but elsewhere in the world.

The advance of scientific knowledge opened a new world of immense possibilities. On the material plane, it led to an unprecedented development in technology. On the intellectual plane, it gave rise to nineteenth century rationalism. On the political plane, its finest manifestation was liberal democracy and the nation-state. The promise of untold achievement inspired Indian intellectuals as well. European influence transcended the intellectual plane and deeply affected the world of emotion. Even Indian aspirations for freer and fuller life acquired a European texture. British co-operation and help were regarded as necessary elements in any endeavour for liberty. The Indian intellectuals were so dazzled by European civilization that they attempted a synthesis of culture without the co-operation of the Indian people themselves. It was because the attempts at achieving a new culture had no roots in the life of the people that the forms and conventions of society became objects of ridicule.

Gandhi's main contribution to the development of Indian political life lies in the fact that he diverted the stress and direction of Indian politics from Europe to India. Instead of attempting an *Ersatz* Europe, he sought to build up a genuine India. Indian statesmen had worked for the people of the land before he appeared on the scene but the sense of their own superiority prevented them from identifying themselves with the masses. In consequence, the political activities and movements in India before the advent of Gandhi centred mainly round the middle and the upper classes. The dumb, inert, and inactive Indian people hardly understood them and did little to respond to their appeal.

Gandhi realised that the restoration of spiritual community is not an easy task. The first step towards its achievement must be the realisation of a common life. His first demand on Indian political workers has, therefore, been that they must in mode of conduct and life, speech and thought, habit and clothing, food and habitation identify themselves with the starving, naked and illiterate masses of Indian humanity. He has adopted the language of the people for all political transactions. His mode of life is indistinguishable from that of the Indian people. They also have found in him their own leader and representative, a leader who speaks their language, wears their clothes, eats their food. The alien imperialist has sought to ridicule him as a half-naked Fakir. Such ridicule is only evidence of the obtuseness and stupidity of the imperialist. The scoffer has not realised that what he has regarded as an object of ridicule contains in fact the secret of Gandhi's strength.

Nor is this all. The inertia and inaction of the Indian character have been transformed by Gandhi into sources of strength and energy. He has found for them a function in the political life of the country and this is, perhaps, his greatest achievement. Twenty years ago the constitution of the Indian masses was such that there was hardly any possibility of an active and energetic revolution in India.

Gandhi did not quarrel with facts but sought to use them for his purpose. Instead of an aggressive and militant struggle, he built up a movement of non-co-operation which was based on the passivity and endurance of the people.

Gandhi's experiments were not exhausted by his attempt to Indianise the social and political policies of the country. He has also attempted to evolve a new conception of society and the state which will reconcile the traditions and inherent genius of the Indian people with the requirements of the modern age. His claim to leadership in thought is based on his experiments which seek to transform the whole attitude to life itself. He has offered the outlines of a philosophy of life and action that has attracted the interest and admiration of thinkers all over the world. His methods seem to suggest a way out of the impasse to which political and social problems have been brought by the traditional modes current in the west today.

The experiences of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have taught men that political freedom often conceals economic slavery of the worst type. Children under twelve were employed in hard labour for sixteen continuous hours on the plea of freedom of contract and the right of the individual to sell his labour as he liked. Lawyers, politicians, doctors and even bishops came forward to defend such employment on legal, political, medical and religious grounds. Early in the nineteenth century the demand arose that the state must not only assure the external forms of political freedom but ensure conditions of economic freedom for the individual.

In theory everyone accepted the contention that only a state and society which could guarantee freedom from want and fear could claim the allegiance of man. The unanimity disappeared when men thought of ways and means to realise that end. The liberal rationalist saw the possibility of progress in the improvement of existing social forms through the extension of the power of the state. The revolutionary anarchist found the promise of a new heaven in his ideal of abolition of the state. Gandhi was influenced by all these modes of thought. Their conflict and discrepancy provoked him to attempt his own synthesis. His philosophy of life was evolved as a result of his attempt to reconcile these conflicting claims against the background of Indian history and tradition. It is this integration of western cross-currents into an Indian background that explains the revolutionary possibilities in the social and political thought of Gandhi.

The denial of industrial and machine civilization is impossible in the context of the modern world. Climatic and physical disabilities are being continually overcome through the application of science to the satisfaction of our needs. Such application at first serves only a few in society but is invariably extended and can ultimately benefit every single individual of the world. It is the misuse of the machine that has led to concentration of wealth in single hands Gandhi's repugnance to the machine can be understood not as repudiation of the machine as such but only as a protest against the debasement of humanity.

The spinning wheel and the oil press are also machines. No doubt, they are

small and worked through human power, but this does not change their character as machinery. It is, however, only the large-scale machinery that gradually dehumanises man. It was the danger of large scale industrialisation which led Gandhi to conceive of the autonomous and self-contained village as the unit of society. As far as possible, every village must regulate its own economic and political life. In such small units the human relationship between individuals would be strong and not merely mechanical and impersonal. In village communities, there would be scope for individual freedom but there would be no risk of its exaggeration into licence or anarchy. The absolute dictatorship of the state and the absolute anarchy of statelessness are both attended with many risks. In the small village unit, men would avoid both these dangers.

Gandhi's objective is the creation of a new type of civilization. It will seek to avoid the defects inherent in rural economy and the pitfalls revealed in the working of modern civilization.

The petty jealousies and wastefulness of village life must be overcome if rural culture is to contribute to the future civilization of the world. The evolution of a new culture in which the best elements of the past and the present will be fused demands resilience of spirit. The situation has been radically transformed by the substitution of electricity for steam as the main source of energy in the modern age. Where electricity is the motive power, the concentration of multitudes in industrial towns and slums is no longer inevitable. Electricity makes the distribution of industry over a large area possible. It offers a possibility of restoring conditions analogous to those which obtained in the days of rural crafts. It promises to combine the finest elements in the rural and the civic cultures of the past. Rich human relations can now be combined with increase in the riches of the world. Deep emotional vitality side by side with conditions of plenty for everybody can release human energies for new creative ventures. In his insistence upon decentralisation of industry and the creation of small and autonomous units, Gandhi is the harbinger of the future civilization.

Gandhi's experience of European civilization has made him realise the importance of the economic independence of the individual. He has, however, felt that the equality which is the basis of economic independence must be achieved through peaceful and non-violent methods. Freedom may be and has often been achieved through bloody revolution. Those who have taken to the sword have more often than not perished by the sword. The results of a violent revolution are always liable to be upset by a counter-revolution. It is because of this realisation that Gandhi has so strongly urged that the economic and political freedom of man must be achieved through a conquest of hatred.

When first Gandhi appeared on the scene, political activity in India was restricted to petitions and prayers to the British authorities. Gandhi discovered in Indian traditions the technique of struggle best suited to the land. He did not overlook

the disabilities under which he had to work, but neither did he allow them to overawe and immobilise him. To a people weakened and emasculated through the oppression of centuries, he brought back self-respect, the spirit of struggle and resistance. He knew that he must slowly inure them to sacrifice and hardship. He at first set them the task of overcoming the fear of arrest and imprisonment. He transformed the temper of Indian politics by deliberate defiance of unacceptable laws with a full consciousness of the possible consequences. Today we can hardly imagine the psychological revolution he brought about. Imprisonment for a political cause carries with it an element of martyrdom in contemporary India. In the early twenties of the present century, jails had not yet lost their terror. By overcoming the fear of jail, Gandhi broke the first link in the chain that restricted Indian political advance.

There are some who profess great admiration for Gandhi but in the same breath condemn not only his policy but the man himself as a conscious saboteur. According to them, Gandhi sabotaged the struggle for Indian independence, not once, not twice but on three different occasions—in 1922, 1931 and 1939 on the outbreak of the present war. They characterise the suspension of the non-co-operation movement after the incident of Chauri Chaura as a deliberate sabotage of a revolutionary mass movement that threatened to get out of hand. Many hold that it was not the initiation but the suspension of the non-co-operation movement that was a Himalayan blunder. But for Gandhi there was no alternative. Non-violence is of supreme value to him and he would not recognise the distinction between ends and means. Besides, for Gandhi the individual was valuable in and by himself. Gandhi felt that the only freedom he could value must be realised by the individual through the discipline of non-violence. Whether we agree with Gandhi or not, we must admit that in suspending the non-co-operation movement he acted consistently with his own principles and objectives.

Marxists at any rate are not entitled to criticise Gandhi. They proclaim their belief in historical necessity and the operation of unalterable economic laws that guide the destinies of man. It does not lie with them to say that Gandhi prevented the achievement of Indian independence in 1922 by his decision to suspend the non-co-operation movement. If it is superstitious to believe that a single individual can bring about the freedom of a country, it is equally superstitious to hold that a single individual can prevent the realisation of freedom. With his intimate knowledge and deep community of spirit with the masses, Gandhi realised that it would be a mistake to put too severe a strain on their newly found strength. The first step in struggle and sacrifice must necessarily stop short of the supreme test. It was enough that the masses had shaken off their fear of jail. In spite of spasmodic outbursts of mass frenzy, they were not yet ready to sacrifice life or even property for the achievement of their goal.

The second stage in the growth of revolutionary consciousness was marked by the civil disobedience movement of 1930-31. Gandhi's aim this time was to free the

people from the fear of loss of property. After their experience of the non-co-operation movement, the Government also had discovered that it was more effective to hit the pocket than the person. People who thought little of imprisonment or even physical assault hesitated when it meant permanent impoverishment. The civil disobedience movement destroyed this fear in large numbers of men and women and prepared the country for a further advance. Here again Gandhi acted as a wise general who conserves his strength and does not stake his all on one mad frantic throw.

The utter unreality of so-called Marxist criticism is revealed when one considers attacks on Gandhi for not having launched what the critics would call a revolutionary mass struggle at the outset of the present war. A struggle in 1939 would have taken place in conditions of rising prices and wages. The risk implicit in a struggle would be justified only if the Indian masses were economically and politically hardened enough to fight on more than one front. Gandhi knew that the struggle would be a long and bitter one and did not allow of any heroics. He, therefore, experimented with selected individuals in preparation for a larger struggle.

The crisis of the war was reached in 1942. Internationally, the contending powers held one another in a precarious balance, while within India the rising prices had left rising wages far behind. The increasing economic and political difficulties had turned the mind of the people from their petty communal wrangles to the supreme need of achieving the freedom of the land. Internally and externally, the stage was set for India's fight for liberty, and Gandhi once more gave the call.

The British dared not allow Gandhi to conduct the revolution of 1942. What shape or course it would have taken if he had been at the helm can only remain a matter for speculation. One thing is certain, Gandhi conceived the struggle for 1942 as the final stage in the fight for India's freedom. It would be non-violent in scope and method.

The secret of Gandhi's versatile and dynamic personality is to be found in his revolutionary readiness to face facts. He rarely approaches a problem with preconceived notions or ready-made prejudices. His deep sense of community with the people makes him conscious of their hopes and fears before these are clearly formulated by themselves. Like Lenin, he can also feel the pulse of the masses and derives his strength and inspiration from his contacts with them. His integration in the life of the people has enabled him to transform insipid political formalities into revolutionary urges of the people. This has liberated his thought from the thraldom of the west and enabled him to experiment with new social ideals and methods. Still more important, it has prevented ossification and allowed him continually to change and grow. Utter sincerity and amazing vitality have characterised all his thought and action. Even today at his age he is one of the most progressive and revolutionary forces of the contemporary world.

NON-COOPERATION: ITS BEGINNINGS

By S. A. Brelvi

TODAY Mahatma Gandhi is the undisputed leader of India. So accustomed have we become to his sway over the minds and hearts of most of us that his leadership is taken by us for granted and few of this generation realise the true inwardness of the revolution he has brought about in the political life of the country. Those of us, who lived through the early years of this century, may, perhaps, have some conception of it.

Phirozeshah Mehta was the uncrowned king of political India during that period, his was the determining voice in the counsels of the Congress. Gokhale, another great figure of those days, seemed to be the inevitable successor to Phirozeshah. There were some others, too, who dominated the political scene—eloquent Surendranath Banerjee, silver-tongued Malaviya, impetuous Dinshah Wachha and the "extremist" trio, Lal, Bal and Pal (Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bepin Chandra Pal). But Phirozeshah Mehta and the Congress leaders of those days were, above all, constitutionalists. True, Lala Lajpat Rai had been deported to Burma and Lokamanya Tilak had been sentenced several times, his last sentence being of six years' duration. But, as yet, the idea of extra-constitutional mass action to achieve political ends had not been even born. The Congress had brought about a remarkable political awakening. Dadabhai Naoroji had, at the Calcutta Congress of 1906, proclaimed the *mantra* of *swaraj*; Tilak had declared from the prisoner's dock that, if by his suffering in jail the cause of the country was served, he would cheerfully bear the suffering; and the Home Rule agitation, led by him, Mrs. Besant and many others, during the first Great War, had roused the unbounded enthusiasm of the people.

But the *mantra* of *swaraj* lacked the appropriate action to make it real. The sacrifices of Tilak and Lala Lajpat Rai and some others were admired but not emulated and the pressure of the Home Rule agitation was not strong enough to bend the bureaucracy to the will of the people. Not that the material for a revolutionary effort was lacking. The people of India were bitterly disillusioned after a war that they had helped to wage in order "to save the world for democracy" and to vindicate "the right of self-determination" of every nation, small as well as big. They were

humiliated, as few people in history had been, by the martial law atrocities in the Punjab. The hearts of Muslims were lacerated by a breach of faith with them, which was responsible for the dismemberment of Turkey and the imposition of foreign domination over their Holy Lands. The patience of the people was exhausted and their indignation inflamed. They were ready for action. Unarmed their action might have taken the form of unorganized violence provoking the organized violence of the Government. Fortunately for the world as well as India, the people found in Gandhiji the leader and in Satyagraha the weapon needed to translate their unexpressed anguish into appropriate action.

How the people of India used the weapon under their leader's guidance has often been told. Sir George Lloyd, the Governor of Bombay, was obliged to admit that the first non-co-operation movement had come within an inch of success. Sir George was one of the Governors who strove hard to crush the movement; he was also largely responsible for the arrest of the Ali brothers and other *Khilafat* leaders as well as Mahatma Gandhi. Such a tribute from him to the movement brings into relief the fact that for the first time in the world's history a nation almost succeeded in winning its freedom without resorting to violent means.

Some critics of Gandhiji have expressed the view that he committed a great blunder in identifying himself and the Congress with what is known as the *Khilafat* movement and they have attributed the present difficulties and complications of the Hindu-Muslim problem to that "blunder". These critics, however, forget that the non-co-operation movement itself owed its origin to the *Khilafat* agitation. In his manifesto of March 10, 1920, Mahatma Gandhi for the first time indicated his plan of non-co-operation and the immediate inspiration for it He wrote in the course of the manifesto: "Non-co-operation is the only remedy left open to us. It is the clearest remedy, as it is the most effective, which is absolutely free from all violence. It becomes a duty when co-operation means degradation or humiliation or an injury to one's cherished religious sentiment. England cannot expect a meek submission by us to an unjust usurpation of rights which to Muslims means a matter of life and death..."

The publication of the terms of peace with Turkey on May 14, 1920, roused the indignation of the Muslim world. The *Khilafat* committee met in Bombay on May 28, 1920, and adopted a programme of non-co-operation. Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya in his *History of the Congress* writes : "It was about this time that Gandhi resolved to refer the question of non-co-operation, which was mainly concerned at this time with the *Khilafat* movement, to a conference of leaders of all parties which met at Allahabad on June 2, 1920. At this conference the policy of non-co-operation was decided upon, and a committee was appointed, composed of Gandhi and some Muslim leaders, to draw up the programme. The committee published their programme which comprised the boycott of schools and colleges and law courts. As a matter of fact, the All-India *Khilafat* Conference held at Delhi in November 1919 had resolved to

withdraw co-operation from Government under Gandhiji's advice—a decision which was reaffirmed by Muslim meetings in Calcutta and elsewhere, as well as by the Madras *Khilafat* Conference on April 17, 1920, where the progressive scheme of non-co-operation was further defined as renunciation of titles and posts and memberships of councils, appointments in the police and military and refusal to pay tax."

It is thus clear that the original impulse to the non-co-operation movement, as projected by Mahatma Gandhi, came from the *Khilafat* agitation. To quote again from Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya's *History of the Congress*: "By the summer of 1920, the 'Triveni' of *Khilafat* and Punjab wrongs and the invisible flow of inadequate reforms became full to the brim and by their confluence enriched both in volume and contact the stream of national discontent. Even the Lokamanya promised to abide by the decision of the All-India Congress Committee." The non-co-operation programme was formally inaugurated on August 1, the day on which the Lokamanya died. The special session of the Congress held in September at Calcutta decided by 1,886 votes against 884 that there was no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-co-operation inaugurated by Mahatma Gandhi until the *Khilafat* and Punjab wrongs were righted and *swaraj* was established. In December of that year the non-co-operation resolution was reaffirmed by an overwhelming majority of delegates at the Nagpur session of the Congress. The Nagpur Congress marks a turning point in the history of modern India. There the people of India decided to make the struggle for freedom their own.

It is difficult to say that the non-co-operation programme would not have been sanctioned by the Congress if Gandhiji had decided not to identify himself and the Congress with the *Khilafat* agitation. It must, however, be admitted that the *Khilafat* movement was the mainspring of the non-co-operation movement. The political situation in the country was such as to make it difficult for Gandhiji and the Congress to refrain from identifying themselves with the former. All Indians, whether they wanted the *Khilafat* or the Punjab wrong to be righted, were convinced that the attainment of *swaraj* was the only way and they were prepared to burn their boats and make the sacrifices which Gandhiji demanded of them in order to hasten the advent of *swaraj*. Hindus and Muslims fought shoulder to shoulder, as they had never fought before, and, apart from Gandhiji, the two leaders who, more than others, were responsible for bringing about this happy co-operation were the Ali brothers.

The then Viceroy of India characterised the non-co-operation movement as "the most foolish of all foolish schemes." But very soon he and others, who shared his views, realised that the movement shook the foundations of the British Empire in the country and "came within an inch of succeeding." It did more. It demonstrated to a sceptical world the immeasurable potentialities of non-violence as a means for achieving national aims. Speaking as the president of the Cocanada Congress of 1923, Maulana Mohamed Ali summed up the achievements of the first non-co-operation movement in these words: "Never before in the annals of India have the people felt

as intensely as they have done since the dawn of non-co-operation, and the marvel is not that the fury of the mob has resulted in so much bloodshed, but that the manhood of India has been successfully revived with so little of it. I challenge any one to show another instance in the history of mankind where hundreds of millions of people have been roused to stand up for their liberties and have remained so peaceful as the people of India led by Mahatma Gandhi." Such was the miracle wrought by Mahatma Gandhi who also inspired the people with an unshakable confidence that, under his leadership, no power on earth could stand between them and the freedom of their country. It was also Maulana Mohamed Ali who tersely defined the country's struggle as a combination of the minimum of co-operation with the British Government with the maximum of co-operation among the people of India. That was an outstanding lesson of the first non-co-operation movement.



FRONTIER REVOLUTION

By Khan Sahib

THE Pathan is a brave and fearless man and is attracted to Mahatma Gandhi because he is the bravest and most fearless man in the world. Gandhiji had friends among the few Pathans that were in South Africa and some of them were his clients. The Pathans fully participated in the Satyagraha struggle and none of them submitted to the Black Act. When Gandhiji advocated voluntary registration in 1908 under the terms of his first settlement with General Smuts, some Indians were opposed to it and converted some Pathans to their view. One day when Gandhiji was going to the Registration Office, Mir Alam, an old client of his, and his companions gave him blows with a cudgel. Gandhiji fell on the ground. They gave him more blows and kicks. The noise attracted European passers-by and Mir Alam and his companions were caught and taken into police custody. When Gandhiji regained consciousness he was asked how he felt. But his first thought was about Mir Alam. When he was told that Mir Alam had been arrested along with the rest, Gandhiji said, "they should be released" and sent a wire to the Advocate-General that he did not hold Mir Alam and others guilty for the assault on him and that in any case he did not wish them to be prosecuted. Mir Alam later became Gandhiji's friend.

In a statement to the Indian community, Gandhiji said: "Seeing that the assault was committed by a Mussalman or Mussalmans, the Hindus might probably feel hurt. If so, they would put themselves in the wrong before the world and their Maker. Rather let the blood spilt today cement the two communities indissolubly—such is my heart-felt prayer. May God grant it."

The bravery and sacrifice of Gandhiji's gesture appealed to the Pathans in India and they thought that he was really the man to lead us to our objective. Thereafter the Pathans became friends and followers of Gandhiji. Non-violence is a strange thing for the Pathans to understand, but they have gradually grasped it.

It was during the 1920 session of the Congress at Calcutta that my brother, Badshah Khan (Frontier Gandhi), first came in contact with Gandhiji, though I came to know him personally only after my release from jail in 1933. The year 1930 marked the closer association of the Frontier people with Gandhiji and the Congress.

When civil disobedience was started, the repression by the Frontier Government was very intense and we did not know which way to turn for help. We wanted the rest of India to know what was happening in the Frontier. We approached the Muslim League first for help, but it was refused. Our approach to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, however, was fruitful. The Patel Enquiry Committee was appointed. But they were not allowed to enter the Frontier. They stayed at Rawalpindi and we arranged to send them evidence. The committee's offices were raided by the Government, but luckily they had completed their report and had already despatched it to safer places for publication. The report still remains under ban.

When the Gandhi-Irwin negotiations started, the Frontier Government tried their utmost to persuade Badshah Khan to leave the Congress. They sent different people from different provinces to prove to him that it was in the interest of his community to make a separate truce with the Government. But he refused even to see them. Gandhiji also was pressed by the Government to come to terms with them leaving the Frontier out but he was adamant and would not agree to such a thing. After the release of my brother which followed the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, the Red Shirts became a part of the Congress organization.

The starting of the Red Shirts was a historic event, their conversion to non-violence was even more so. One day after the meeting of the Afghan Jirga in September 1929, Badshah Khan collected a few workers to discuss the formation of an active volunteer corps. He suggested that he wanted workers who would serve humanity irrespective of any religious or other prejudices. So, he gave the name *Khudai Khidmatgar*—"Servants of God"—for the organization. Some of the young Frontier people who attended the Lahore Congress of 1929 got the inspiration to adopt a uniform. In the beginning, the uniform was just of white khadi which got dirty very soon. One of the volunteers dyed his clothes in a solution of red brick powder and the first Red Shirt was born.

The first official meeting of the Red Shirt was held on April 18-19, 1930, a few days before the starting of the civil disobedience movement. About 200 Red Shirts attended the meeting. Civil disobedience started on April 23. Badshah Khan was arrested before he could reach Peshawar. There was firing by the police in the city. Thousands of people surrounded the Charsada sub-division Government offices where Badshah Khan was kept. I motored down to Charsada to persuade the people to remain non-violent. Next day when Badshah Khan was taken in a car towards Mardan, people lay on the road to stop the car. But he told them that they should allow the military to take him away.

The Red Shirts then had their baptism of non-violence. A meeting was to be held in Utmanzai next day and there was a possibility of an outbreak of violence. So I motored down from Peshawar to Utmanzai. I reached the place a couple of hours before the appointed time of meeting and was successful in taking away whatever arms the people had with them. Here I made my first political speech in a

public place. When I finished my speech somebody came and told me that the Guides Cavalry had arrived. I announced that those who were not prepared to face the situation should leave the meeting. But none left. I ordered the Red Shirts to get on the platform. The commander of the Cavalry announced that they were going to open fire and the meeting should be dispersed. But people took no notice. The commander asked me if I could help him. I told him that the meeting was finished, we had done our work, "the best thing for you would be to go back and we will march to our destination. But if you want to do any shooting you must start now because once we leave the place shooting would not be a very brave thing." The commander tried to bluff me but eventually left with his men and the Red Shirts accompanied by their bands marched to a place next to a mosque.

There they were divided into groups and ordered to march to their respective stations. On their way they were attacked by a squad of the British Cavalry. Mohamed Aslam Khan, who was in command of the Red Shirts, ordered them to fall on the ground. The Cavalry charged them, but always stopped just when they reached the first row. After trying this for a couple of times, they retired. The officials lost their heads and repression was intense. But the result was that by the end of September we had over 80,000 volunteers. After the Gandhi-Irwin Pact the number of volunteers shot up so quickly that we were unable to cope up with the work.

The name "Red Shirts" was given to the organization by British officials on the pretext that we were connected with Russia. That was an excuse for their attempt to destroy the organization. I told an official once that we had nothing to do with Russia and that I would give him an undertaking in writing that he could hang me, if only he could prove it. Later in the House of Commons an official announcement was made that we had no connection with Russia.

Gandhiji is naturally proud of the Red Shirts; for non-violence has taken a deep root among them. Once a Pathan when surrounded and beaten by the police pulled out his revolver, threw it on the ground saying, "I am told to be non-violent. Otherwise it is not difficult for me to finish you all before you can approach me." That has been the spirit of the Frontier since 1930.

The Red Shirt is deeply interested in the fight for freedom. He has adapted Gandhiji's constructive programme to the peculiar conditions of his province. The organization is on a military basis but strictly non-violent. The Red Shirt volunteer may not be a good spinner but he is a good worker. He cleans the houses and streets even of people who are very much against him. He decides disputes, most of which relate to land, non-violently. He helps the people in practically all their troubles. There is no regular organization of women but they have taken a large share in the work and are active helpers from behind the scenes. Badshah Khan is at the top of the whole organization and his hold on people is unique.

The two "Gandhis" are brave people engaged in the same struggle against

imperialism, a struggle against great odds. They are both fearless and selfless and naturally think and act alike. When we consciously or unconsciously fail to carry out what we profess to the people, we think and act differently. To those who are ready to sacrifice there is only one line of action. That is the case with Badshah Khan and Mahatma Gandhi.

MAN AND MACHINE

By Maurice Frydman

DURING my last stay in Segaon a peculiar delegation came to interview Gandhiji. A *respectable middle-aged locomotive, in company with a bus lorry, a power* loom, a sewing machine, a wireless set, an electric stove and some more minor nick-nacks crowded round the little hut of Mahatmaji. The Spirit of Machinery was also present, a well-knit, springy, steel-sinewed, rubber-muscled, stove-enamelled and chromium-plated fellow, a well-modulated loud speaker with a pair of bright grey television cells under his highly phosphorescent forehead. He carried under his arm a double classification card index, containing letters of authorisation from all kinds of machinery existing in the world.

I guess Pyarelal was diffident whether Mahatmaji would agree to receive such a collection of iniquities, but mercy proved again to be the only limitless thing in this world and the delegation was duly ushered in the presence of Gandhiji, except the locomotive which remained outside and got a temporary phone connection.

The Spirit of Machinery clicked and began: "Mahatmaji, we have heard that your intention is to wipe out our kind from the face of the earth and full of dismay and misgivings, we hastened here not to ask for mercy but for justice. Would it have been a lesser being than you, we would leave our Mother, Mrs. Time, to take care of him, but your influence on our father, Mr. Human Mind, is already great and steadily growing and we are afraid that you may turn him away from creating our kind and romping in the midst of his children. We are coming to defend our case ourselves and we shall submit to your verdict of total extinction, if you convince us that we are really detrimental to the welfare of humanity, material or spiritual or both."

"You will have a hard task to convince me," smiled Gandhiji.

"We thought so until we came to Segaon. Here we have found so many brethren of ours as regular inmates of the *ashram* that we are almost ready to believe that our fears were ill-founded. The spectacles on your most venerable nose have given us the first hint that our case is not hopeless. We see our little darling genius, Brother Watch, by your side, and we understand that you have got a special affection for him. Miss Fountain Pen is also with you, and Blood Pressure Meter Esq. visits

you every day. Your cream is made by Mr. Centrifugal Separator and your fields are irrigated by the Rt. Hon. Persian Wheel. His Honour the Motor Car finds often that his services are quite welcome here and Her Excellency the Railway finds nothing but words of praise for your unfailing patronship. We see stamped envelopes and telegraph forms near you, which tell us in unmistakable terms that the grudge we have heard that you bear against us is grossly exaggerated, if not totally unfounded. Because whoever uses post and telegraph services uses almost every representative of our kind, from a bicycle to television."

"You are mistaken," said Gandhiji so cooly, that the Spirit felt his temperature regulator coiling up its bimetallic springs with a bang. "I am not using machinery of my own will. I have to in a heavily infected world, and however careful I may be I caught the infection, in a mild form, of course. If you voluntarily stay with lepers, you get leprosy, which does not mean that leprosy is welcome. I must use some machinery in a machine-ridden world to help to get rid of machinery. A homoeopathic dose of it, you will admit. I have no tender feelings for Master Watch and Miss Fountain Pen. My real home is in the timeless, and in the spaceless, where means of communication have got no meaning at all."

The Spirit shuddered,—"Mahatmaji, in time and space we live and move and have our being. There is a place for time in the timeless and a place for space in the spaceless. And, therefore, there is a place for us also in the mind of the Creator of our creators."

"I admit that as long as I am bound to space and time, I must make use of an organism, physically and mentally. But why should I complicate the organism with appendices? Why not be satisfied with the minimum? Why increase the range of my vision, and hearing, the speed of my movements? I am a *baniya* by caste and a honest deal is a law for me. Therefore I ask 'what is the price?' And I find that what I am gaining materially I am losing spiritually. The price is too high for me. I refuse the deal."

"Mahatmaji, you are mistaken or we do not grasp your point. What do you lose spiritually by riding a bicycle or buying a bus ticket?"

"My very body being a limitation, any extension of its powers increases the limitation."

"Then why not cast off the body along with us all?"

"I would gladly do so, but in the legitimate way, through natural death or self-realization. I have no right to destroy it."

"And what right have you got to destroy us?"

"The right of the creator. In my foolishness I have created you and in my wisdom I will destroy you."

"We are coming nearer to the point," said the Spirit with a sigh of relief. "How do you justify your assertion that we owe our existence to foolishness? When the first man cut the first stick and chipped the first stone and made the first axe,

was he a fool? When he lighted the first fire and stitched the first blanket was he a fool? Was he a fool to build a house and was he a fool to cook his food? Was he a fool to turn the potter's wheel and the grinding stone? Was it foolish to make the water to grind his corn and the wind to fill his sails? Was it foolish to use animal power when its own was insufficient? First animal, then water and wind, then steam and electricity. Where to stop? Why not more and more power? Atomic energy is coming, then cosmic, then some other, who knows? In what way is a man on a donkey more spiritual than a man in an atomic rocket?"

"My friends, your reasoning is false."

"Please explain. Do not dismiss us summarily. We are fighting for our very life."

"Which does not prove that you are right. Firstly I question your statement about the first man and the first axe. I do not think that technological progress is a single mounting curve. It is rather a series of peaks and valleys, of rising and falling civilizations. Who knows how many have gone into oblivion before the present arose? And where is the guarantee that this civilization will never perish? So many have. Why not this?"

"This is the first world civilization. All others were local. It will perish with the world, not otherwise."

"I am not so sure. It already contains the seeds of its own destruction. It is bound to perish and the world will remain the happier for it."

"I see what you are driving at. We are admittedly misused by our creators and often made a tool of their own undoing, but it is their fault, not ours. There is nothing in our nature that calls for misuse. Man did not learn to hate after inventing the axe. He was hating before and killing too, strangling and clawing. The axe made him more efficient, that is all, for good and evil."

"It is hard to rear and easy to kill. Therefore, increased all-round efficiency is bound to bring about wholesale destruction."

"History proves the contrary. The population of the world has increased. Take away fire, clothing and tools and the memory of them and the world will relapse into the ape-man period within a year's time."

"I am not against fire and clothing and shelter for man. I am against machinery. A tool like an axe, a knife, a plough is not a machine."

"There is no definite demarcation line between tools and machinery. You are deifying the *charkha*. Make it bigger and slightly modified and you can ride on it. The *charkha* and the bicycle are blood relations. So are the water-wheel and the hydro-electric generator. So are the sail and the steam turbine."

"I am for the *charkha*, because it cannot be put to a wrong use. Its very nature is beneficent."

"Mahatmaji, please believe us, we do not defend weapons and war machinery. We are ashamed of them. They are outcast amongst us."

"You are all the same obedient tools in the hands of a humanity crazy with hate, greed and fear."

"Will humanity become sober if you exterminate us?"

"If you are not exterminated, it will have no time to become sober. It will destroy itself long before."

"You cannot exterminate us so easily. Our creators will not allow it. You are merely wasting your efforts. Humanity will not give us up. But it can be taught to use us constructively. You do not take away a pen from the child because it scribbles instead of writing. You simply insist it should write properly."

"The comparison does not hold. You do take away a dangerous weapon."

"A power loom is not a dangerous weapon. And surely not a watch."

"A power loom is infinitely more dangerous than a bomber."

"A humble *takli* can be made into a lethal weapon. It is not the fault of the *takli*."

"You do not want to see. A power loom is automatically destructive of human life and happiness. You do not require to be wicked for it. It works by itself. It cannot but destroy."

"No, Gandhiji, the power loom is innocent. All depends on the user."

"If I would have humanity to my liking, I would have made all perfect and we would not be here to discuss matters. Humanity is not perfect and we have to take it as it is with all its potentialities for good and evil. And being as it is, it does misuse machinery. I cannot change it in a day. But I can change it in the long run. And the first step is to take away the temptation for further mischief. Productive machinery is not intrinsically wicked, but it definitely is a tremendous temptation for wickedness. Therefore it must go."

"We are glad you have admitted that we are not intrinsically wicked."

"Don't be so glad. Nothing in this world is intrinsically good or bad. All depends on the use humanity puts it to."

"Is there no hope that one day humanity will put us to proper use?"

"Human needs are limited. Productive capacity is practically unlimited."

"In a well-organized society it means unlimited leisure for all."

"Except for a few willing or unwilling slaves—turning the ladder only. Now you have a few masters rotting in leisure and a multitude of slaves degraded by stultifying drudgery. In your machine Utopia you will have a multitude of masters rotting in leisure and a few slaves servicing the machinery."

"Why slaves? Highly qualified technicians, inventors, scientists."

"Admitted, but then it will be still worse. A technological world dictatorship of a group of technicians, keeping the vast herd of humanity in good health and form just to satisfy their own greed for power, transforming the world into a breed-

ing house of human pets, well-built, well-educated, taught games and arts, and getting daily injections of admiration for their benefactors."

"Either slaves or exploiters. No other solution for mankind?"

"Yes, neither slaves nor exploiters."

"That is where we come in. Without machinery how can a man be free from drudgery? Drudgery creates the desire to escape from it. The stronger will turn his fellow beings into slaves, the more intelligent will design a machine. Only in the age of plenty for all there is freedom from temptation to exploit or to enslave."

"No, because there is no such thing as the age of plenty. Human needs are limited, but not human desires. Today a man desires to visit England, tomorrow he will desire to visit the moon."

"What is wrong with visiting the moon?"

"Not more than with visiting England. It is unnecessary."

"How? Is human curiosity not to be satisfied?"

"There is no end to it."

"Why should there be?"

"My friend," said Gandhiji, with the resigned air of a man who knows that he talks well above the heads of his audience, "after all you are only machines, children of a momentary aberration of your creators. You are due to a mistake. But you will never admit it."

"We want to know at least the nature of the aberration."

"Humanity had plenty without machinery. Plenty of food and clothing and shelter and time to think."

"History denies it."

"What do you know of history? The last few thousand years are only the end of an era. But what do we know of the era? Plenty of food, clothing and shelter, plenty of clear heads and loving hearts do not leave marks. A mud hut will return to mud, however happy and wise were the people that lived in it. Brass monuments and stone pillars are erected by bad consciences. The happy people leave no traces. If machinery stands for culture, then all great teachers of humanity were barbarians. But they stand for real culture, free from the obsession of material efficiency."

"Is efficiency bad?"

"Too much of it makes natural human needs so easy to satisfy that more needs are bred artificially. And once the creation of artificial needs is started, there is no end to them. Verily the man possesses the world, but loses his soul."

"So you want culture and not a technological age of plenty. But how can there be culture for all without highly developed means of communication?"

"Your newspapers and novels and magazines and cinemas and gramophones and

wireless and television are an abomination. We have had it since so many years and we are as near damnation as can only be. Truth and kindness are the foundations of all real culture. Where are they? Falsehood, greed and hatred are broadcasted, published, advertised, made accessible, available, cheap. We teach people to read and we give them to read rubbish."

"So you have no mercy even for the printing press?"

"My friend, the greatest teachings of humanity were transmitted either orally or in manuscripts When a man had to memorise or copy by hand, he used to take good care that it was well worth the trouble."

"The right man will select the right book even if it is printed."

"Before almost all books were good books, now not even one in a thousand."

"Nobody forces you to read the bad ones."

"But they are there and they mislead or simply waste time. Books have become a respectable drug."

"What then is your ideal of culture?"

"It is not a machine-made culture first of all. It is entirely individualistic. It has nothing to do with material plenty. The normal needs of man are those which when satisfied keep the body and mind fit for work and well under control. Because they have got a work to do."

"What work?"

"The hard work of finding the Real, the Infinite Truth and Love. Humanity has no other task. And if it works for anything else, it works for its own destruction."

"The goal of life of our creators is beyond our scope, we agree. But we can be helpful yet in producing good food and clothing and shelter, if nothing else."

"We can have them with the simplest tools."

"With our help you will have more leisure."

"Search for the real is not a spare time occupation. Work is a part and parcel of it. Not the drudgery at a machine, of course, but the happy sunlit work in the field, or the garden or amongst friends and family."

"But science has still a place in your scheme of things."

"Only as far as it leads to the Supreme Science."

"And Art?"

"Only as far as it leads to the Supreme Beauty."

"And the spirit of exploration?"

"Only as far as it leads to the Supreme Discovery."

"Mahatmaji, there is no place for us in your scheme. It is clear now. We shall go and take shelter with those who are not so one-pointed as you are. Yours is the way to the Creator away from creation. There may be another way— through creation, through plenty of everything. There is still a place for us that way."

"All ways lead to the same goal. On all the ways you will be ultimately discarded. I am doing it from the very start. Because on the way to Truth and Love the man in the fastest rocket takes the longest time. Not even one step is needed to enter one's own heart."

"Good-bye, Gandhiji. If you are right, we shall return to you one day in the shape of nice little knives and spades and ploughs."

"Good-bye and don't return. We do not need ready-mades. Rust away on the mother earth."

The dejected delegation left the hut. I was with them to see them off. The Spirit of Machinery looked at me suspiciously and the power loom examined despairingly my khadi shirt. But when I introduced myself as an engineer, they were all honey.

"A creator amongst destroyers," shrilly whispered the locomotive. "What for? Do you plan to convert them?"

"I am sorry it is not the exact purpose of my stay here," said I. "It looks rather that I am out for being converted."

"So you are one of their victims?"

"Not exactly. I am not in search of a philosophy but of facts about India and humanity. Gandhiji knows India, he is India. To understand him is to understand his country. He contains the essence of all that is Indian and, therefore, he is supremely human."

"You have heard our conversation," said the Spirit. "It is plain. He wants to return to the flint axe and the fur blanket."

"Not exactly. He welcomes inventiveness, but not of the kind that leads to complication of needs, centralisation of production and over-interdependence of mankind. To pick up a stone, a piece of wood, a handful of cotton or wool, a few dry leaves or pieces of bark from a tree growing near by and with the simplest means to create a piece of art or ingenuity, where the creative thought and aesthetic intuition are so intense that the *charkha* or the loom or the piece of cloth are spiritualised by an overwhelming preponderance of soul over matter. There is no such preponderance in a locomotive or a power loom."

"Why not? Generations of inventors have brought us to the present stage."

"It is like a picture painted by generations of artists. There is no individuality about it."

"But otherwise how can there be any progress?"

"True ingenuity and true inventiveness are like true art. A spontaneous creative urge using the simplest means for obtaining a thing immediately useful and beautiful. Machinery is too inaccessible for the man in the street. He cannot make, nor even admire it."

"Then what?"

"Gandhiji wants everybody to be a creator, not just the few experts."

"How will he achieve it?"

"By encouraging creativeness of the right kind. By giving opportunities for creativeness. By taking away obstacles."

"Please explain."

"When mass-scale production goes and every village has to produce for its immediate consumption, millions of craftsmen will be engaged in making tools and implements. They will have to use local materials, follow up the local technique and traditions and exercise fully their individual judgment, both with regard to design and to finish. There is no doubt that this will give infinitely more scope for inventiveness and creativeness than the present system, where a few specialised brains heap up complications over complications and the vast majority thoughtlessly manufactures and uses them."

"But is there any place for us?" asked the Spirit of Machinery.

"Take the case of art. The film claims to be art but is a machine-made art, an art for sale, and therefore hardly any art at all. A villager seeing a film in the nearest city does come out the poorer for it emotionally and aesthetically. But when all in the village collaborate enthusiastically in staging a play composed by local talent and all village craftsmen are given a full chance to show their skill and inventiveness and no tickets are sold, all expenses being paid by willing contributions in kind and cash, then everybody is the richer for it and nobody poorer. In the same way when millions of yards of yarn are produced in a mill it is a tremendous social waste. Not only waste of money, but also of the creative pride of the craftsman, of the little crop of cotton, of the quiet afternoon hour of spinning in the midst of children."

"No hope for us then? No place at all in your scheme?"

"Man cannot risk to serve you. You usually crush your servants to pulp. But when you become easy to make, simple, efficient and beautiful, little friends of the household or the farm, Gandhiji, I am sure, will have nothing but affection for you. What you require is a rebirth. The spinning jenny should become again the sweetly singing *charkha*, the power loom should become again the weavers' faithful friend. And so all of you."

"We thank you for the glimpse of hope," said the Spirit. "We are what you make us. It is for you, creators, to see that we do not destroy you. We are your children."

"You are children of our greed and frenzy. Therefore you will go. But you will come back as children of love and pity, wonderfully simple, beautifully intelligent. And you will remain with us for ever, things radiant with all the riches of heart and mind of your creators."

GANDHI AND THE CHURCH

By S. K. George

GANDHIJI'S attitude towards Christian missions in India is a question that he has tirelessly discussed with Christian missionaries and in his journals, *Young India* and *Harijan*. Gandhiji's views are crystal-clear but Christian missionaries find it difficult and are perhaps unwilling to make up their minds and to act accordingly. As Gandhiji put it to Dr. John R. Mott, who during his second visit to the Mahatma wanted to know if there was any advance in understanding and reconciliation between them on the issues they had discussed two years earlier: "I deliberately say 'no advance' in action. What I have noticed is that there is a drift in the right direction so far as thought is concerned. Right conviction to be of use has to be translated into action."

Gandhiji's contact with Christianity and Christian missions dates from his very early days. As a young student in London, as a lawyer and social worker in South Africa and as the undisputed leader of India's masses, he has been approached, preached at and prayed for by Christians of all shades of belief and all varieties of practice, ranging from the Plymouth Brethren of England to Dr. Kagawa of Japan, from devout Quakers to ardent Catholics. It is sometimes said by Christians, who regret Gandhiji's non-acceptance of Christianity, that he has been unfortunate in his Christian contacts. That was what Lady Emily Kinnaird told Gandhiji at their meeting: "You did not meet the right kind of people." Gandhiji told her how in his young and impressionable days he had come across Christians like Dr. F. W. Mayer, Andrew Murray and Spencer Walton and in later life Charlie Andrews, John R. Mott and Kagawa. "It was F. W. Mayer who after a long talk with me asked the other Christian friends to let me alone," he told her. But they have not let him alone. If Gandhiji is not a Christian today it is not because Christianity has not been pressed on him or because he has not come across the best and noblest expressions of it.

Gandhiji's whole life has been and still is an experiment with Truth and he has followed it in the realm of religion as in all other spheres of life. In a very frank address to missionaries in Calcutta in 1925, Gandhiji told them how he went to see one of the biggest of Indian Christians, Kali Charan Banerjee, "in fulfilment

of a sacred promise I have made to some of my dearest Christian friends that I will leave no stone unturned to find out the true light. I told him that I had given my friends the assurance that no worldly gain would keep me away from the light, if I could but see it. I came away not sorry, not dejected, not disappointed, but I felt sad that even Mr. Banerjee could not convince me."

Along with these personal contacts had gone a careful reading of the Bible. Characteristically enough Gandhiji persisted in his Bible reading, even though the earlier books of the Old Testament, especially the Book of Numbers, repelled him. "The New Testament produced a different impression, especially the Sermon on the Mount which went straight to my heart." Gandhiji has remained a close student of the Bible and treasures it among his few cherished books. In fact he had once to defend himself against many irate correspondents who charged him with being a Christian in secret, for consenting to read and interpret the New Testament to the boys of the Gujarat National College.

These experiments with Truth, carried on not merely in the realm of the intellect or the emotions but in the laboratory of a life of the most intense activity, have led Gandhiji to certain conclusions. It is not that he feels he has finally attained or has sealed his mind against fresh or further light. That is against his fundamental concept of Truth as God. He is still as open and receptive as a child, still a humble seeker after Truth. But the truth he has so far seen he has stated in the most unambiguous terms and without mental reservations. And he is very insistent that those who deal with him, especially in religious matters, should respond to him without such reservations. The conclusion he has reached, after a prayerful study not only of Christianity and Hinduism but of other religions as well, is "that all religions are true and that all religions have some error in them."

So strongly and so clearly does Gandhiji hold this doctrine of tolerance, the equality of religions, that he has included it among the principal tenets of his *ashram*. The following are the cardinal points in it: "This admission (of the imperfection of one's own faith) will be readily made by a seeker of Truth, who follows the law of Love. If we had attained the full vision of Truth, we would no longer be mere seekers, but would have become one with God, for Truth is God. But being only seekers we prosecute our quest and are conscious of our imperfection. And if we are imperfect ourselves, religion as conceived by us must also be imperfect. We have not realised religion in its perfection, even as we have not realised God. Religion of our conception, being thus imperfect, is always subject to a process of evolution and re-interpretation. Progress towards Truth, towards God, is possible only because of such evolution. And if all faiths outlined by men are imperfect, the question of comparative merit does not arise. All faiths constitute a revelation of Truth, but all are imperfect and liable to error. Reverence for other faiths need not blind us to their faults. We must be keenly alive to the defects of our own faith also, yet not leave it on that account but try to overcome those defects. Looking

at all religions, with an equal eye, we would not only not hesitate, but would think it our duty to blend into our faith every acceptable feature of other faiths."

Again, he emphasises: "Even as a tree has a single trunk, but many branches and leaves, so there is one true and perfect religion, but it becomes many as it passes through the human medium. The one religion is beyond all speech. Imperfect men put it into such language as they can command, and their words are interpreted by other men equally imperfect. Hence the necessity for tolerance, which does not mean indifference towards one's own faith, but a more intelligent and purer love for it. Tolerance gives us spiritual insight, which is as far from fanaticism as the North Pole from the South. True knowledge of religion breaks down the barriers between faith and faith. Cultivation of tolerance for other faiths will impart to us a truer understanding of our own. Tolerance obviously does not disturb the distinction between right and wrong, or good and evil. The reference here throughout naturally is to the principal faiths of the world. They are all based on common fundamentals. They have all produced great saints."

Like his other precepts, Gandhiji has practised this and found it stand the test of practice. In his *ashrams* in South Africa and India he has had Christians and Muslims, besides Hindus, as inmates sharing to the full in the religious inspiration of the fellowship. The names of Jesus, of Allah, of Hormazd, have all been used in the place of his own favourite *Ramanama* in the *ashram* prayers, with equal acceptance and inspiration to all. Some of his favourite hymns are drawn from Christian hymnology. Readings from the Koran and the Bible are frequently used at the *ashram* devotions. And these are not demonstrations for special occasions or to please stray visitors, but as sustenance for the sacrificial living in which he and his associates have been engaged amid the stresses of a storm-tossed career.

It is this doctrine of the equality of religions that the Christian missionary finds it difficult to grant and many battles royal have been joined by reputed missionaries with Gandhiji on this issue. In the first place there is the exclusive and unique claim made for Christianity as the one true religion and for Jesus as the one and only incarnation of God, the only begotten Son of God. Gandhiji has specifically denied this exclusive claim for Jesus. "To believe that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God is to me against reason, for God can't marry and beget children. The word 'Son' there can only be used in a figurative sense. In that sense every one who stands in the position of Jesus is a begotten Son of God. If a man is spiritually miles ahead of us, we may say that he is in a special sense the Son of God, though we are all children of God. We repudiate that relationship in our lives, whereas this life is witness to that relationship." He further deprecates all attempts to assess the degrees of divinity of the great Saviours of mankind. "To say that Jesus was 99 per cent divine and Mahomed 50 per cent and Krishna 10 per cent is to arrogate to oneself a function which really does not belong to man." On another occasion he said: "He (Jesus) affects my life no less because I regard him as one among the

many begotten Sons of God. The adjective 'begotten' has for me a deeper, possibly a grander meaning than its literal meaning. For me it implies spiritual birth. In his own times he was the nearest to God."

With regard to the Christian claim of a unique act of God, once and for all time in history, Gandhiji is equally explicit. "I may suggest that God did not bear the Cross only 1,900 years ago, but He bears it today. It would be poor comfort to the world if it had to depend upon a historical God who died 2,000 years ago. Do not then preach the God of history, but show Him as He lives today, through you," he told the missionaries. Challenged as to whether he himself experiences the presence of the living Christ he answered: "If it is the historical Jesus surnamed Christ that you refer to I must say I do not. If it is an adjective signifying one of the names of God, then I must say I do feel the presence of God—call Him Christ, call Him Krishna, call Him Rama, and if I do not feel a presence of God within me, I see much of misery and disappointment every day that I would be a raving maniac and my destination would be the Hooghli."

The other reason why the Christian missionary finds it difficult to accept the doctrine of equality of religions is his obsession with the crudities of so much of popular Hinduism, especially with the animism of the outcastes of Hindu society. These at any rate, the missionary would say, ought not to be tolerated; and the outcaste weaned of his superstition belongs to the religious propagandist who is sufficiently interested in him to perform that service. But Gandhiji's tolerance extends even to the animist. In the first place he would deprecate the assumption of superiority that justifies the sweeping aside even of their crude beliefs. He would agree with Miss Evelyn Underhill when she says, "All worship is sacred, since in its most degraded forms, among the most ignorant and foolish of worshippers, there has yet been some seeking after the Divine and between these and the most glorious ritual or the highest philosophic certainty there lies so small a space that we may believe the Saints in Paradise regard it with a smile." "What have I," Gandhiji asks, "to take to the aborigines and the Assamese hillmen except to go in my nakedness to them? Rather than ask them to join my prayer, I would join their prayer." The Christian claim to preach to them has been to him an instance of arrogance going in the garb of humility.

Deeply painful to him was the Christian endeavour to grab as many of these untouchables they could in an unseemly competition with other militant faiths in the land, when the lure of political power was awakening even these unfortunate millions to a consciousness of their present state and future possibilities. Gandhiji had sworn at the Round Table Conference to lay down his life to stop the vivisection of Hinduism, the segregation of the Depressed Classes as a separate community. It was to him an issue going far beyond its political and communal repercussions. The Harijans are to him bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of Hindu society. They have from times immemorial been absorbed in Hinduism. They are of the

soil and their roots lie deep there. His dedication to the cause of the removal of untouchability is prior to and deeper than any of his other devotions. The removal of their disabilities, the opening of temples to them, is to him an act of reparation, of atonement, that the caste Hindu owes to the outcaste. It does not matter to him whether the outcaste, in his justifiable resentment and impatience, does not want temple-entry and leaves the Hindu fold. "I should insist on Hindu temples being thrown open to Harijans even if the Harijans in India were converted to another religion, and there was only one Harijan left in the Hindu fold. Hinduism can only be saved when it has become purified by the performance of our duty without the expectation of any return whatsoever from the Harijans. It is this religious attitude that isolates the Harijan question from all other questions and gives it a special importance."

In this struggle with the age-old monster of untouchability, risking his life and reputation on it, it hurt Gandhiji to see Christian missions joining with rival faiths in taking advantage of this ferment to attract the Harijans to their folds. With rare individual exceptions they claimed to see a new awakening of spiritual hunger in the untouchable masses, calling for feverish effort on their own part. They professed to see in Dr. Ambedkar a modern Moses leading an exodus of his submerged people to a new promised land, which each rival sect fondly hoped would be its own particular fold. The Church Mission Society, for example, appealed for "an emergency fund of £25,000 to enable extra grants to be made during the next five years to those areas where *this big movement* is taking place," and appealed to the whole church to support it in this effort.

Gandhiji sought in vain for evidences of this new spiritual hunger and of the conversion of thousands of India's untouchables to Christianity, along with a large number of high-caste Hindus. Even well-meaning attempts by certain Indian Christians, interested in the welfare of the country and the future of Christianity in the land, fell between two stools, in their attempt to allay suspicion on the one hand and to cling to the right of conversion on the other. Gandhiji referred to their manifesto as "an unfortunate document," which failed to accomplish its double purpose of soothing the ruffled feelings of Hindus and of turning the Christian missions from their irreligious gamble for converts. "The big movement" led nowhere. Dr. Ambedkar still remains a Hindu, or at least has not yet sighted his promised land, while the masses of India's untouchables are fast being assimilated into the general Hindu community. They are finding, as they naturally ought to, satisfaction for their spiritual hunger in an awakened Hinduism, purified of the blight of untouchability that had also contaminated other religions including Christianity. A Christian church really caring for spiritual values, really concerned for the regeneration of India, would have unreservedly rejoiced at the purification of a sister religion and lent it the right hand of fellowship, instead of adding to its perplexities and asserting its own rights.

The Christian missions would desperately cling to this right of conversion, to go about in these days of irreligion and materialism to awaken spiritual hunger in all and to gather people into their fold. But Gandhiji would draw a distinction between a right and a duty in this matter. "When a duty becomes a right it ceases to be a duty. Performance of a duty requires one quality—that of suffering and introspection. Exercise of a right requires a quality that gives the power to impose one's will upon the resister through sanctions devised by the claimant or the law whose aid he invokes in the exercise of his right. The duty of taking a spiritual message is performed by the messenger becoming a fit vehicle by prayer and fasting. Conceived as a right it may easily become an imposition on unwilling parties."

The Christian's duty to bear witness to the saving he has experienced in Christ is one which Gandhiji would be the last to deny. It is one which he has ever welcomed. Quite recently it was reported in the daily press that Dr. Stanley Jones, the reputed evangelist, told a meeting in New York that Gandhiji gave four suggestions for weaving Christianity into the national fabric of India: "You Christians must practise your religion without adulterating it or toning it down. You Christians, especially missionaries, should begin to live more like Christ. You should spread more of the gospel of love and you should study non-Christian faiths to have a more sympathetic understanding of their faiths." The gospel of Jesus, according to him, needs no adventitious propaganda to make itself felt and accepted. Time and again has he brought in the parable of the rose to illustrate his meaning. "Let your life speak to us," he constantly tells the missionaries, "even as the rose needs no speech but simply spreads its perfume. Even the blind who do not see the rose perceive its fragrance. That is the secret of the gospel of the rose. But the gospel that Jesus preached is more subtle and fragrant than the gospel of the rose. If the rose needs no agent, much less does the gospel of Christ need any agent."

Gandhiji's demand on the missionary is that he should cease to be a propagandist of his faith and should live it out in the land of his adoption. It is a far more challenging thing, demanding greater and not less consecration, fuller and more wholehearted devotion, than the missionaries have yet given to their faith and the land and people they come to serve. It is because he sees in the essence of Christianity a faith akin to his own that he expects more of them and is content with nothing less than the best. That is why there is a yearning note of disappointment in his contact with missionaries, even of the better type. That was why he could not help being disappointed at the interview with even such an outstanding Christian like Dr. Kagawa of Japan. He was all admiration for the splendid record of Kagawa's cooperative and economic achievements, as he is for the efficient Good Samaritan services of Christian missions in India. But Gandhiji cannot be content with these. Holding as he does that religion must touch and transform the whole of life he could not help asking Dr. Kagawa what attitude he had taken on the question of Japanese aggression in China. Dr. Kagawa could only reply that, in spite of his pacifist and Christian convictions, he had desisted from practising the way of the Cross in declaring his

views against the aggressive policies of his nation and "in so doing make Japan live through your death." "The conviction is there. But friends have been asking me to desist," replied Dr. Kagawa. "Well, don't listen to friends, when the Friend inside you says 'Do this'," counselled Gandhiji.

It has often been said by Christian friends who regret Gandhiji's not joining the church that he would have been a far greater force for the Kingdom of God in India if he had become a professed Christian. Dr. Kagawa's instance perhaps proves the contrary. It is the very fact of Kagawa's cutting himself off from the community of his birth, which forms the largest element in his country, that prevents him from challenging that community to its depths on the vital issues confronting it, whereas Gandhiji by remaining a Hindu feels no hesitation in so challenging his people. The Cross would shine all the more clearly before him in a nationalist India. It is conviction like that of Dr. Kagawa, carried into action to the point of ascending the Cross, that Gandhiji in all humility would demand of the missionary in facing the problem of India's relationship with Britain. He appreciates the trend towards toning down the denationalizing tendencies of Christianity in India as preached by the missionaries and practised by the large majority of Indian Christians ; but he asks for far more from those who would present Christ to India. The challenge comes all the more pointedly from one who has testified that "though I cannot claim to be a Christian in the sectarian sense, the example of Jesus's suffering is a factor in the composition of my undying faith in non-violence, which rules all my actions, worldly and temporal. Jesus lived and died in vain if he did not teach us to regulate the whole of life by the eternal Law of Love."

When this challenge is squarely and sincerely met Christian preaching will cease to be an offence and will win acceptance in an unprecedented manner. Christian apprehensions regarding discrimination against them in nationalist India will then vanish like mist before the rising sun. Gandhiji has laid bare his heart on the topic and there is no justification for pestering him further on the matter. "I should love," he said once speaking in Ceylon, " all the men, not only in India, but in the world, belonging to the different faiths, to become better people by contact with one another and if that happens, the world will be a much better place to live in than it is today. I plead for the broadest toleration, and I am working to that end. I ask people to examine every religion from the point of view of the religionists themselves. I do not expect the India of my dream to develop one religion, that is wholly Hindu, or wholly Christian or wholly Mussalman, but I want it to be wholly tolerant, with its religions working side by side with one another."

FRIEND OF ISLAM

By K. A. Abbas

IT was one of those memorable evenings on the Juhu beach. Ten thousand people were assembled to join Gandhiji in his evening prayers. Still as a statue he sat listening to the prayers of different faiths intoned by his *ashramites*.

The Sanskrit hymn and the devotional song in Hindi by Tulsidas were familiar to the ears of those present. But suddenly the still evening air was filled with a strange new melody, resonant and yet soft, soothing and yet inspiring. *Bismillah-ir-Rehman-ur-Rahim*—in the name of God who is merciful and benevolent. *Alhamdu lillahi rabbi'l alameen. Arrah-man ur Rahim o malik-e-yaum ud deen* . .—all praise is for God who is the lord of all the universe, who is merciful and the master of the day of judgment.

Hardly one per cent of the crowd present realised that a verse from the Holy Koran was being recited and that Gandhiji never regards his prayers complete unless they include some verses from the scripture of Islam. And even among those who did few paused to ponder over the significance of the occasion.

How can it be that the man who is so often accused by fanatical communalists of being an enemy of the Muslims and Islam should find inspiration in the verses from the Koran?

On that fateful morning of August 9 when he was being taken away by the police, he asked for time to offer his prayers. These included verses from the Koran. With him he took less than half a dozen books. One of these was the Koran.

Could it be hypocrisy? A politician's device to placate the Muslims? The answer is a conclusive "No." For, Gandhiji's interest in and respect for Islam is at least fifty years old, much older than his political leadership. And throughout his life there has never been a period when he has not enjoyed the confidence and affection of a host of Muslim friends and co-workers. Whatever else may be said about his religiosity, no one can ever accuse him of possessing an exclusive, dogmatic faith.

In his autobiography Gandhiji records how from his very boyhood he "got an early grounding of toleration for all branches of Hinduism and sister religions" His father had "Mussalman and Parsi friends, who would talk to him about their own faiths, and he would listen to them always with respect, and often with interest. I

often had a chance to be present at these talks. There many things combined to inculcate in me a toleration for all faiths."

The real quest for, and understanding of, religion was, of course, to come to him later. But curiously enough, the birth of a spirit of religious enquiry coincided with a phase of his life in which he was to come in intimate friendly contact with a number of Muslims. It should be recalled that it was at the invitation of a Muslim merchant, Abdullah Sheth, that Gandhiji, then a promising barrister, proceeded to South Africa. This is how he describes his first contact with Abdullah Sheth and, through him, with Islam: "He (Abdullah Sheth) was proud of Islam and loved to discourse on Islamic philosophy. Though he did not know Arabic, his acquaintance with the Holy Koran and Islamic literature in general was fairly good. Illustrations he had in plenty, always ready at hand. Contact with him gave me a fair amount of practical knowledge of Islam. When we came closer to each other, we had long discussions on religious topics."

It was during his prolonged stay in South Africa that Gandhiji undertook a comparative study of religions, delving into not only *Upanishads* and philosophical works interpreting Hinduism but the scriptures of Christianity, Islam and Zoroastrianism. "All this," he records in his autobiography, "enhanced my regard for Hinduism, and its beauties began to grow upon me." But he was far from becoming a fanatic or an exclusive dogmatist. For, he says, "It did not, however, prejudice me against other religions." He read extensively on the lives of the founders of the great religions, particularly on the Prophet of Islam. "These books," he says, "raised Mohammed in my estimation." It will be seen, therefore, that as his interest in religion grew, so did his tolerance and humanity, so that he developed a reverence for all the religions along with that of his birth. More, "the study stimulated my self-introspection and fostered in me the habit of putting into practice whatever appealed to me in my studies." Thus, out of this comparative study of religions, emerged not a bigoted, narrow-minded Hindu but a practical humanitarian, deriving faith and inspiration from the deepest and the most universal impulses of religion, and being inspired by them to serve humanity at large, irrespective of creed or colour.

It is not surprising to find, therefore, that the Hindu barrister soon won the affection and confidence of the entire Indian community in South Africa, a large and influential section of which comprised Muslims. Before he formally joined the Indian National Congress, Gandhiji started a counterpart of it in the Natal Indian Congress with the active assistance of his Indian Muslim friends and fellow-workers in South Africa, particularly Dada Abdullah. Indeed, throughout his long stay in Africa, Gandhiji's fight to secure civic rights for Indians was a fight on behalf of the Muslims who constituted the bulk of the Indian community. All his activities were directed towards safeguarding the rights of all the Indians, irrespective of their religious affiliations or social and economic status. The Natal Indian Congress, under his leadership, was a non-communal and democratic organization fighting for the rights of indentured labourers with as much vigour as for the rights of the merchants.

On his return to India he lost no opportunity in establishing friendly contact and fraternal relations with the leaders of Indian Muslims who were then engaged in a sharp conflict with the authorities over the Turkish question. It was during this period that he made friends with the Ali brothers, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abdul Bari, Abdul Majid Khwaja, Shuaib Qureshi, Dr. Ansari, Mazharul Haq and others. As he records in his autobiography, "I was seeking the friendship of good Mussalmans, and was eager to understand the Mussalman mind through contact with their purest and most patriotic representatives. I, therefore, never needed any pressure to go with them, wherever they took me, in order to get into intimate touch with them."

During the next few years, as he threw himself heart and soul into the *Khilafat* movement and the Ali brothers became sturdy pillars of the Congress, the three of them became inseparable companions in their tours and came to be regarded by the millions of their countrymen as the symbols of Hindu-Muslim unity. It was truly astonishing how completely he identified himself with the emotions and aspirations of the Muslims and caused such a phenomenal wave of fraternization that Hindus were actually invited to address Muslim meetings in mosques.

"Friends and critics have criticised my attitude regarding the *Khilafat* question," he writes in his autobiography. "In spite of the criticism I feel that I have no reason to revise it or to regret my co-operation with the Muslims. I should adopt the same attitude, should a similar occasion arise."

In a letter to the Viceroy, Gandhiji clearly described the reasons for his support to the *Khilafat* movement: "I would like you to ask His Majesty's Ministers to give a definite assurance about the Muslim States. I am sure you know that every Indian Muslim is deeply interested in them. As a Hindu I cannot be indifferent to their cause. Their sorrows must be our sorrows."

It is also to be remembered that Gandhiji steadfastly refused to make this issue a bargaining counter between the Hindus and Muslims. "If the *Khilafat* question had a just and legitimate basis, as I believe it had, and if the Government had really committed a gross injustice, the Hindus were bound to stand by the Mussalmans in their demand for the redress of the *Khilafat* wrong. It would ill become them to bring in the cow question in this connection, or to use the occasion to make terms for the Mussalmans, just as it would ill become the Mussalmans to offer to stop cow slaughter as a price for the Hindus' support on the *Khilafat* question."

The memorable presidential address delivered by Maulana Mohamed Ali at the 1923 session of the Congress held at Cocanada began with "*Allah O Akbar*" (God is Great) and ended with "*Mahatma Gandhi ki Jai.*" In this address, the Maulana paid striking tributes to Gandhiji who was then in prison:—

"More than ever we need our great chief, Mahatma Gandhi, today. . . . although the man who was most responsible for Mahatma Gandhi's incarceration hoped that by 'burying him alive' as he called it, he would kill the spirit that the Mahatma had

infused into the nation, I feel certain that it lives just as surely as the Mahatma lives himself... Friends, the only one who can lead you is the one who had led you at Amritsar, at Calcutta, at Nagpur and at Ahmedabad, though each session of the Congress had its own elected President. Our generalissimo is a prisoner of war in the hands of the enemy, and none can fill the void that his absence from our midst has caused... Self-purification through suffering; a moral preparation for the responsibilities of Government; self-discipline, as the condition precedent of *swaraj*--this was Mahatma's creed and conviction; and those of us who have been privileged to have lived in the glorious year that culminated in the Congress session at Ahmedabad have seen what a rapid change he wrought in the thoughts, feelings and actions of such large masses of mankind."

It was in the same address that Maulana Mohamed Ali declared that "that staunch Hindu, Mahatma Gandhi, went to jail for advocating the cause of Islam" and that "his action in so selflessly leading the *Khilafat* movement was characteristically generous and altruistic." I wish some—nay most—of the present very vociferous traducers of Mahatma Gandhi read Mohamed Ali's tributes and asked themselves the question where they were and what they were doing when the "staunch Hindu" went to jail for advocating the cause of Islam.

That "staunch Hindu" has never allowed his Hinduism to tamper with his humanism, his religion has not been restricted to one particular dogma but has embraced all the noble ideals that are the basic fundamentals of all true religions—so well exemplified by his prayers. It is not surprising, therefore, that the "staunch Hindu" has counted many "staunch Muslims" among his closest friends and political associates —men like the Ali brothers, Imam Bawazer, Abbas Tyebji, Dr. Ansari, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana A. Bari, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. It is, indeed, remarkable that the really religious-minded Muslims have been particularly close to Gandhiji, even when those who were Muslims only in name were raising the cry of "Islam in danger" for purely political reasons, to alienate the Muslims from Gandhiji, the Congress and the freedom movement. To plan a scheme of national education, Gandhiji chose an eminent Muslim educationist like Dr. Zakir Husain. And during the last twenty years, there has not been a major decision taken by him without the advice of the late Dr. Ansari or Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

Gandhiji remains, as ever, a staunch friend of Islam and of Muslims. The man who courted imprisonment in the cause of Islam in 1922 would surely never allow the legitimate interests of Muslims to suffer, much less Islam to be in danger. For, here is one who has risen above the petty considerations of race, caste, creed or colour, and who has summed up his religion in seven significant words:

There is no other God than Truth!

WOMAN THE COMRADE

By Kamaladevi

A MAN resembles closely the soil he springs from. This gives a clue to Gandhiji's attitude towards women and what his philosophy and way of life have meant for them. The tradition built up from the Indian soil has been one of dignity and high status for women. But every great personality's relationship with society and his attitude towards any section of it is largely determined by the balance of social forces prevailing at the time. For, his mission is ever to help every maladjusted constituent part of society to adjust itself with the whole, and help society to find its balance in a constantly changing world. A great leader is a force which operates as a lever to the progressive currents. To that extent the leader's mental bent is likely to be shaped by the existing maladjustments. In the India of Gandhiji's era, the maladjustment is political as well as social, and the two are both interrelated and interdependent. Any outstanding personality under the circumstances has to be both a political and a social leader, if a natural harmony is ever to be restored to the country and the people.

Against this background Gandhiji's role in society becomes clear. "He who possesses talent should also possess courage," wrote the Danish writer Brandes. It is certainly the most fruitful of all combinations of human qualities. For, talent is the sensitive seed which can only be nurtured and made to fructify with courage, or it will get stultified and lie barren. Gandhiji's most outstanding characteristic is courage, the courage to think originally and venture to cut new paths away from the beaten track. Yet he is bound by tradition, for he is close to the soil and therefore to his people. But traditions are to him what banks are to a flowing river. He never lets them become an impediment. A leader has also to have a philosophy which is rooted in some basic concept, what one might call his life's ideal, his guiding star, his motto in action. With Gandhiji it has been non-violence and without an appreciation of this vital force in him, one cannot get the clue to his philosophy or his attitude towards the various sections of society, such as women. "My country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind", was the motto of William Lloyd Garrison, the great crusader against slavery. Slavery was then an international evil. It still is, though in other forms and guises, and will continue to

be so as long as man continues to subjugate man through weapons of violence.

Gandhiji is a world leader too. He could not but be, for the Indian problem, he realises only too well, is but part of the world problem. He sees India's freedom as not an end in itself, but only as a means to an end. He visualises it as the edifice on which the freedom of the world is to be built. To him the Indian people's freedom can have meaning only in relation to humanity's freedom. Therefore, his philosophy is an entire whole. It covers every aspect of life. No detail of human life is insignificant enough to be left out of account. For, his philosophy of non-violence can be realised only in a society composed of highly developed men, women, and children.

Gandhiji's approach to women is best defined in his own inimitable words: "My contribution to the great problem lies in my presenting for acceptance truth and *ahimsa* in every walk of life, whether for individuals or nations. I have hugged the hope that in this woman will be the unquestioned leader, and, having thus found her place in human evolution, will shed her inferiority complex... I really believe that if Europe will drink in the lesson of non-violence, it will do so through its women... Passive resistance is regarded as the weapon of the weak, but the resistance for which I had to coin a new name altogether is the weapon of the strongest. I had to coin a new word to signify what I meant. But its matchless beauty lies in the fact that, though it is the weapon of the strongest, it can be wielded by the weak in body, by the aged, and even by the children if they have stout hearts. And since resistance in Satyagraha is offered through self-suffering, it is a weapon pre-eminently open to women. We found that women in India, in many instances, surpassed their brothers in suffering and the two played a noble part in the campaign. For, the idea of self-suffering became contagious and they embarked upon amazing acts of self-denial. Supposing that the women and the children of Europe became fired with love of humanity, they would take the men by storm and reduce militarism to nothingness in an incredibly short time. The underlying idea is that women, children and others have the same soul, the same potentiality. The question is one of drawing out the limitless power of truth."

Gandhiji's high intuitive sense is equally scientific. This is what makes his definition of the relationship between the sexes idealistic as well as practical. For, an ideal can have reality and therefore practical value only if it has a scientific foundation whether one arrives at the conclusions intuitively or through a process of scientific formulæ. Non-violence can be the natural expression of only a well adjusted society. But such an adjustment can only come out of a balance of the free elements, a society whose every constituent is untrammelled, whose natural growth and expression not thwarted. Where one section dominates over the other, the harmony is disturbed, for tyranny and suppression can never balance each other. These maladjustments must lead to hatred, conflict, strife, and breach of peace. Non-violence is the counterpart of peace. One cannot dwell without the other.

Our society today is riddled with many maladjustments, between the rich and the poor, the rulers and the ruled, the high castes and the low castes, between men and women. They are all but phases of the same principle. He who stands for a harmonious social existence must champion the restoration of the balance between these various forces. A maladjusted society is built upon force, the stronger parts dominating over the weaker through their brute strength. That is why every great leader must necessarily stand for a proper adjustment of sex relationships.

Writing on this question Gandhiji says: "My own opinion is, that just as fundamentally man and woman are one, their problem must be one in essence. The soul in both is the same. The two live the same life, have the same feelings. Each is a complement of the other. The one cannot live without the other's active help... The division of the spheres of working being recognised, the general qualities and culture required are practically the same for both the sexes... Woman is the companion of man, gifted with equal mental capacities. She has the right to participate in every minutest detail in the activities of man, and she has an equal right of freedom and liberty with him. She is entitled to a supreme place in her own sphere of activity, as man is in his. This ought to be the natural condition of things, and not as a result only of learning to read and write. By sheer force of a vicious custom, even the most ignorant and worthless men have been enjoying a superiority over women which they do not deserve, and ought not to have. Many of our movements stop half way because of the condition of our women. Much of our work does not yield appropriate results... Man and woman are of equal rank, but they are not identical. They are a peerless pair, being supplementary to one another; each helps the other, so that without the one the existence of the other cannot be conceived, and therefore, it follows as a necessary corollary from these facts, that anything that will impair the status of either of them will involve the equal ruin of them both..."

He realises only too well that ancient usages outgrow their use, that a path once clear gets overrun by wild growth, that a well once clear can become contaminated by fungus, that to pursue such a way is to get lost in a wilderness, that to continue to drink at such a well is to suck in disease germs. Commenting on the attitude of the *smritis* towards women, Gandhiji says: "The saying attributed to Manu that 'for woman there can be no freedom' is not to be sacrosanct. It only shows that, probably, at the time when it was promulgated, women were kept in a state of subjection ... It is irreligion to give the religious sanction to a brutal custom. The *smritis* bristle with contradictions. The only reasonable deduction to be drawn from the contradictions is that the texts, that may be contrary to known and accepted morality, more especially to the moral precepts enjoined in the *smritis* themselves, must be rejected as interpolations. Inspiring verses on self-restraint could not be written at the same time and by the same pen that wrote the verses encouraging the brute in man ... It is sad to think that the *smritis* contain texts which can command no respect from men who cherish the liberty of women as their own, and who regard

her as the mother of the race."

He lashes out against obsolete customs, which masquerading under religious guises, inflict untold suffering upon the weak and the helpless. Like Christ in the Temple of Jerusalem, his strong arm grips the broom to sweep the place clean of unclean things, for surely God can dwell only where man can live in dignity and health. "The honour of a country," declared Mazzini, "depends much more on removing its faults than on boasting of its qualities."

The ancient is, therefore, not sacrosanct to Gandhiji if it has turned to dross. His heart bleeds for those who suffer under the burden of traditions. Amongst these, perhaps, the child widow takes the first place. All through his life he has pleaded movingly, passionately, vigorously for justice for these helpless victims. Like Jehovah's mighty wrath his righteous anger has burnt into society. "This custom of child-marriage is both a moral as well as physical evil," says he. "For, it undermines our morals and induces physical degeneration. By countenancing such customs, we recede from God as well as *swaraj*. A man who has no thought of the tender age of a girl has none of God. And undergrown men have no capacity for fighting battles for freedom, or, having gained it, for retaining it. Fight for *swaraj* means not mere political awakening but an all-round awakening, social, educational, moral, economic and political ... What is *kanyadan* in case of little children? Has a father any rights of property over his children? He is their protector, not owner. And, so he forfeits the privilege of protection when he abuses it by seeking it to barter away the liberty of his ward ... It is a crime against God and man to call the union of children a married state, and then to decree widowhood for a girl whose so-called husband is dead ... The statement that widows attain *moksha* if they observe *brahmacharya* has no foundation whatsoever in experience. More things are necessary than mere *brahmacharya* for the attainment of the final bliss. And *brahmacharya* that is super-imposed carries no merit with it, and often gives rise to secret vice that saps the morals of the society in which that vice exists."

His sense of justice as well as his sense of proportion urges him to offer a remedy for those tender ones who have already been victimised by these brutal customs. That is where he advocates widow re-marriage, one of the many tangled Indian problems on which he has come into conflict with orthodox Indian opinion. So he pleads again and again: "I have repeatedly said that every widow has as much right to remarry as every widower. All the young widows therefore ... should have every inducement given to them to remarry, and should be sure that no blame would be attached to them if they chose to remarry, and every effort should be made to select for them suitable matches ... The least that a parent, who has so abused his trust as to give in marriage an infant to an old man in his dotage or to a boy hardly out of his teens, can do is to purge himself of his sin by remarrying the daughter when she becomes widowed. As I have said in a previous note, such marriages should be declared null and void from beginning ... In the giving away of a little girl by ignorant or heartless parents, without considering the welfare of the

child and without her knowledge and consent, there is no marriage at all. Certainly, it is not sacrament, and, therefore, remarriage of such a girl becomes a duty."

But Gandhiji is not content with a mere general appeal. He seeks to give it a practical shape by trying to enlist the active co-operation of students in this arduous task. He addresses the students directly thus: "What I would like you, young men around me, to do is that you should have a touch of chivalry about you. I want you to make this sacred resolve that you are not going to marry a girl who is not a widow, you will seek out a widow-girl and if you cannot get a widow-girl you are not going to marry at all. Make the determination, announce it to the world, announce it to your parents, if you have them, or to your sister . . Do you suppose that we can possibly call ourselves men, worthy of ruling ourselves or others or shaping the destiny of a nation containing 40 crores, so long as there is one single widow who wishes to fulfil her fundamental want but is violently prevented from doing so? It is not religion, but irreligion."

His vision penetrates through the tough overgrowth right into the heart of things. It is the core which matters to him and not the rind. Once when a case of *sati* was reported to him, forthright came his reaction : "Self-immolation at the death of the husband is not a sign of enlightenment, but of gross ignorance as to the nature of the soul. The soul is immortal, unchangeable and immanent ... Again, true marriage means not merely union of bodies. It connotes the union of the souls also."

Even clearer and more unequivocal are his views on the duties of the wife. Marriage is probably the oldest social institution and the most abused. In this unequal struggle of women against social tyrannies imposed on them, nothing has played so high a part as marriage. It is in fact the base from which the continuous attacks on them are made. For men it is a cloak which covers a multitude of their failings, their betrayals of their social obligations. Many a great leader has fought shy of touching this convenient cloak. But Gandhiji's search after truth knows no frontiers. He has wrenched the sham aside to boldly reveal the naked reality. "Hindu culture has erred on the side of excessive subordination of the wife to the husband, and has insisted on the complete merging of the wife in the husband. This has resulted in the husband, sometimes, usurping and exercising authority that reduces him to the level of the brute. The remedy for such excesses, therefore, lies not through the law, but through the true education of women."

He to whom all problems have a vital reality is not content with mere expression of views, what one might call lip sympathy. Gandhiji is essentially a man of action. With him to be convinced is to act. He is not deterred by the present impediments. To him absence of legal provision is no excuse for sitting still. He gives clear direction: "When either wife or husband holds views out of the ordinary there is danger of jars. In the case of the husband, he has no scruples. He does not consider himself under any obligation to consult his partner's wishes. He regards his wife as his property. And the poor wife, who believes in the husband's claim, often suppresses herself. The wife has a perfect right to take her own cause, and meekly

brave the consequences when she knows herself to be in the right, and when her resistance is for a nobler purpose ..."

Gandhiji's revolutionary mind overleaps the little barriers of common conventions. His inner eye is fixed on the spirit which lies hidden. "Chastity is not a hot-house growth," he asserts. "It cannot be superimposed. It cannot be protected by the surrounding wall of the *purdah*. It must grow from within, and to be worth anything, it must be capable of withstanding every unsought temptation. It must be a very poor thing that can't stand the gaze of men. Men, to be men, must be able to trust their women-folk, even as the latter are compelled to trust them. Let us not live with one limb completely or partially paralysed ... Morality is rooted in the purity of our hearts ..." His whole being has revolted against the nauseating caging of delicate flowers. Writing of his reactions to a "*purdah* meeting" he commented sadly: "The sight of the screen behind which my audience, whose numbers I did not know, was seated, made me sad. It pained and humiliated me deeply. I thought of the wrong being done by men to the women of India by clinging to a barbarous custom which, whatever use it might have had when it was first introduced, had now become totally useless and was doing incalculable harm to the country. All the education that we have been receiving for the past hundred years seems to have produced but little impression upon us, for I note that the *purdah* is being retained even in educated households, not because the educated men believe in it themselves, but because they will not manfully resist the brutal custom and sweep it away at a stroke ..." He puts the finger on the right spot when he says: "Good sense must govern the relations between the two sexes. There would be no barrier erected between them. Their mutual behaviour should be natural and spontaneous..."

Gandhiji is the embodiment of service. "The true life is the common life of all, not the life of the one. All must labour for the life of the others," said Tolstoy, whose great influence over himself Gandhiji acknowledges. It is his way of self-realisation, and to many others, especially the women, he has pointed this noble way. To him this offers a solution to many a problem that confronts women. The sense of suppression, helplessness, and of futility felt by widows or deserted wives, the stultification which is the lot of the idle rich, the aimless drift of the educated young, can thus be magically transformed into a meaningful life filled with purposeful action and rich experience. Addressing a group of students he stressed: "Your parents do not send you to school to become dolls; on the contrary, you are expected to become sisters of mercy ... She becomes a sister of mercy immediately she thinks less of herself, and more of those who are poorer and more unfortunate than herself ..."

If Gandhiji occupies today a pre-eminent position in the heart of the Indian people, it is because he touched the heart of the common man and made him realise that he too has a great destiny before him, he too has an important role to play in the larger national affairs. The women, along with the suppressed common man, had been amongst the forgotten, unwanted ones. Then Gandhiji came like a magician.

He has often been described as the "wizard." One might almost believe in his supernatural powers, so dynamic, so swift, so revolutionary are his achievements, so spectacular his performances. But he is too human to be superhuman. That is the secret of his greatness. He is just one of us, he is Bapu. He is not God the Father, handing down tablets from Mount Sinai. He is shot through with our own weakness and sentiments. He suffers and he rejoices with us. That is why he is so close to us. That is why his voice stirred the slumbering inert mass which was India.

The women, like the rest, had grown apathetic, lost all initiative, all sense of dignity and self-respect. They were content to be the domestic drudges and the appendages of men. They had slipped so imperceptibly from their high pedestal, that even that ancient memory had become blurred. Their life had ceased to have any direction of its own. It moved impelled by the one single pole-star—man. Over the calm surface came his voice. And in his case, word was truly made flesh. "More often than not a woman's time is taken up, not by the performance of essential domestic duties, but in catering for the egoistic pleasure of her lord and master and for her own vanities," he wrote. "To me, this domestic slavery of woman is a symbol of our barbarism. In my opinion, the slavery of the kitchen is a remnant of barbarism mainly. It is high time that our womankind was freed from this incubus. Domestic work ought not to take the whole of a woman's time ..."

Gandhiji compelled women to extricate themselves. For the first time woman grew conscious of herself as an entity, of her mission in life, grew to a realisation that in her shackles was society fettered, that in pushing her down the alley man had slipped headlong after her, that her regeneration was intrinsically bound up with the regeneration of the nation. She stirred from her bad dream of weakness and helplessness to the waking awareness of strength and power. That she counted vitally and in infinite ways was to her now a real experience. She was the vehicle of national fulfilment. Her mission went beyond her old domestic frontiers, even beyond the national ones. Gandhiji's clarion voice rang out: "In this non-violent warfare, their contribution should be much greater than men's. To call woman the weaker sex is a libel; it is man's injustice to woman. If by strength is meant brute strength, then indeed, is woman less brute than man. If by strength is meant moral power, then woman is immeasurably man's superior. Has she not greater powers of endurance, has she not greater courage? Without her, man could not be. If non-violence is the law of our being, the future is with women."

The ancient wall of tradition crumbled as did once the walls of Jericho. The helpless maiden of yesterday was the valiant soldier of today. History had turned a whole page at the gentle touch of this little man. I recall pleading with him for a special message to call out the women, during his Dandi march. "But why do you suppose they need a special message from me?" he asked. "Because women have not yet become sufficiently aware. They are still lost in their ancient slumber. They may lose the chance, this one chance of our life-time, if you don't strike a special note," I replied in a sort of helpless impatience. "If that is your estimate,

all I can say is, you don't know your sisters," he replied, with a knowing indulgent smile. He handed out the message, nevertheless, if only perhaps to prove me wrong.

The great day came when Gandhiji picked salt on the Dandi shore, with almost an impish delight and India witnessed a few incredible sequences. But none so startling as the sight of woman marching in the forefront of the battle. Women with pale eyes and blushing cheeks, they who had been gently nurtured behind silken curtains, women who had never looked upon a crowded street, never beheld a strange face, stripped aside those silken curtains, threw off their gossamer veils and flung themselves out into the blinding glare of day, unshaded, unprotected. Women whose feet were as velvety as rose petals, habituated to sink but into soft Persian carpets, walked unshod on hard stony paths, unmindful of scars and bleedings. They who had been nurtured on the lightest of delicacies crunched bravely the tough sandy jail *rotis*. Their delicate limbs now reposed on the rough blankets. They faced perils and privations with a happy light in their eyes and a spring in their limbs. Almost overnight their narrow domestic walls had given way to open up a new wide world in which they had a high place. Their traditional duties had enlarged even as their courtyard. Their life had expanded and taken on a new meaning. Their thoughts and actions now mattered and made an infinite difference to the lives of 400 millions The unlettered and untaught proved as capable and efficient as the tutored. They assumed high offices and fulfilled their duties with care and diligence. They became dictators and captains. They organized and ran the entire foreign cloth boycott and picketing programme giving shape to an old dream of Gandhiji. They faced persecution, beatings, assaults with indomitable courage. It was hard to bend them, and impossible to break. They gave a meaning and reality to this non-violent struggle which they alone could have given. "The part that women played in this struggle should be written in letters of gold," said Gandhiji.

This undoubtedly is one of Gandhiji's greatest achievements. For, it is not what the women actually did in the Satyagraha movement which matters so much as what the movement did to her. It changed the face of Indian society. What social reformers had been struggling to achieve over half a century, Gandhiji did almost overnight. The status of women was completely transformed, for in life there is rarely a going back. The women of today carry themselves with new dignity and a consciousness of their larger responsibilities.

Gandhiji's vital relationship with the women can be best gauged by surveying his own life. Two of the most intimate influences in his life were those of women, that of his mother and his wife. The intimacy of a child with the mother is said to colour its entire relationship with the world. The relationship between the two was a most ennobling influence on Gandhiji. This is certainly confirmed by the story of his life where his mother's strong hand is seen moulding his early life

Equally great was the influence of his wife, though perhaps only the few who had the opportunity to come into close contact with them realised it. There is a general belief that she was the typical much-suppressed Indian wife. Nothing could

be further from the truth. His strong will was matched by hers. To the last she retained her own individuality even while she adjusted herself to him and the terrific changes he wrought in their lives. She had a mind of her own that was never allowed to be crushed. She did not hesitate when she felt moved to do so to stand up to him on whose glance millions hung, he before whom millions bowed in awe, he whose every single word was law to millions. There was perfect ease and freedom between the two, which made for not only a happy union, but also his happy relationship with womanhood in general. Even as he became Bapu, she became Ba to the world, on her own, not as an appendage to him. That is most significant. She could talk with him the most mundane affairs and find in him a most attentive and responsive mate. That was the secret of their happy comradeship. Whatever the agony and effort, they had attained it. She was not the wife who walked in his shadow, she was one who shed a light of her own.

To the woman, however, Gandhiji is much more than a leader to revere and respect. He is also the father whom they love and have faith in, to whom they can carry their little troubles and quarrels.

Gandhiji expects much more from women, for they are the ballast which gives weightage and stability to his work. In his khadi and Harijan work, the two closest to his heart, he has assigned women a high place. "The restoration of spinning to its central place in India's peaceful campaign for deliverance from the imperial yoke, gives the women a special status. In spinning they have a natural advantage over man... The main burden of spinning must, as of old, fall on your shoulders. Two hundred years ago, the women of India spun not only for the home demand but also for foreign lands ... The economic and moral salvation of India thus rests mainly with you. The future of India lies on your knees for you will nurture the future generation. You can bring up the children of India to become simple, God-fearing and brave men and women, or you can coddle them to be weaklings, unfit to brave the storms of life ... It is for the women of India, a large number of whom do not get even an anna per day, that I am going about the country with my spinning wheel and my begging bowl ..."

In these soul-stirring words which surely no woman can withstand, Gandhiji has placed a great duty on the shoulders of the women of India. Equally great and responsible is the task he has allotted them in his Harijan programme. In no uncertain terms he defines the desire of his heart when he addresses the women in the following words:

"I want you, above everything else, to root out untouchability from your hearts and serve the Harijan boys and girls as you would serve your own children. You should love them as your own relatives, your own brothers and sisters, children of the same Mother India. I have worshipped women as the living embodiment of the spirit of service and sacrifice. Man can never be your equal in the spirit of selfless service with which Nature has endowed you. Woman has a compassionate heart which melts at the sight of suffering. If, then, the suffering of Harijans move

you and you give up untouchability and with it the distinctions of high and low, Hinduism will be purified and Hindu society will take a great stride towards spiritual progress. It will ultimately mean the well-being of the whole of India, that is of 35 crores of human beings. And the wonderful purificatory process that one-fifth of the human race will undergo, cannot but have a healthy reaction on the whole of humanity ..."

Is it any wonder that before such heart-rending appeals, women, even the hardest and vainest among them, young maidens and even little girls, so readily strip off their jewels and put them in Bapu's lap? For who can resist his cry, the call of our better selves, to banish this evil stench from our midst?

A CHARTER FOR LABOUR

By Gulzarilal Nanda

IN India and outside attention is riveted on Gandhiji's ceaseless struggle for the emancipation of the Indian people from foreign yoke. It is not adequately appreciated that through the entire course of his public activity, he has been adding brick by brick to the foundation of a new social and economic structure. It is, indeed, a vision of the new order of society which has provided the urge and the inspiration for his unique efforts to lead the Indian nation towards the goal of complete independence. An attempt is here made to deal with the significance and value of what Gandhiji has done for the working class.

The scene of Gandhiji's activities in the labour movement is laid, for the most part, among the textile workers of Ahmedabad. But his interest and solicitude for labour are of a much earlier origin and have embraced the worker in transport, factory, mine, field, and plantation in every part of India.

Responding to an appeal made by Anasuyaben on behalf of the weavers employed in Ahmedabad mills in February 1918, Gandhiji rushed from Champaran to Ahmedabad. This marks his first entry into the labour movement of the country. Since then, Gandhiji has come to the rescue of the workers on many occasions. But the weavers' struggle will always be recalled as the most memorable event in the history of the Indian working class. Gandhiji conducted the campaign personally from beginning to end. Before he led the workers, he made a close examination of the merits of the dispute. It was a demand for a wage increase. At his instance, Shankerlal Banker made an investigation of the living conditions of the workers and collected their family budgets. This was, perhaps, the first piece of field work of this kind in our country.

Gandhiji opened negotiations with the employers and strained every nerve to obtain a peaceful settlement. The millowners would not listen. His offer to submit the dispute to arbitration was rejected. The millowners could not brook the interference of any outsider. Gandhiji then proceeded to launch his famous non-violent struggle for an equal voice for the workers in the determination of their terms of employment. After a course of preliminary training, Gandhiji administered to them a pledge of abstention from work till either their proffered terms or arbitration was

accepted. Gandhiji kept himself in constant touch with them, addressed mass meetings and issued pamphlets daily. Every day the workers paraded the streets in peaceful procession.

In about three weeks, demoralization set in among the workers on strike. Some of them began to waver. They said they had no food for themselves and their families. On the morning of March 12, 1918, facing a meeting of the strikers, Gandhiji made an unexpected announcement. He declared he would himself touch no food till the workers' pledge was redeemed. This was Gandhiji's first fast on a public issue in India. It electrified the workers and restored their morale. This was its sole aim. The millowners on their side were touched. They shed their complacency and bestirred themselves to find a way out. At the end of three days, arbitration was agreed to and Gandhiji broke his fast. The principle and procedure of arbitration which have played so large a part in making the Textile Labour Association what it is today were thus introduced in the industrial relations in this country for the first time.

On February 25, 1920, Gandhiji inaugurated the first regular union of the workers in the textile industry. In May he asked the employers to reduce the hours of work from twelve to ten and make a substantial addition to the wages of the operatives Agreement not having been reached between the arbitrators either regarding the terms of the award or the choice of the umpire, Gandhiji took the workers out on a strike which lasted ten days. Work was resumed when a joint award was issued introducing a ten-hour day in the industry and effecting an increase in wages ranging from 25 per cent to 62½ per cent for different occupations. To the workers Gandhiji declared on this occasion that it was not their triumph but the triumph of justice and hence a victory for both the sides.

After this, Gandhiji has had to intervene frequently in the disputes between the employers and the employees in Ahmedabad. Notwithstanding his preoccupation with urgent affairs of the country, Gandhiji has always found time to attend to the difficulties of the workers and has given them help and advice. The awards which he has recommended in the capacity of a member of the arbitration board on behalf of labour constitute the basis of a Magna Charta for Indian labour.

Just a mention may be made of some of Gandhiji's numerous contacts with labour in other parts of the country. Labour at Jamshedpur remembers with gratitude his good offices on its behalf. In response to an appeal from the workers in Madras during a lock-out in 1918, he deputed C. F. Andrews on a mission of help. Gandhiji met and addressed workers in several industrial centres in Madras, Bihar and other provinces in the course of his all-India tours. He has kept himself in touch with the labour situation in Bombay, though the workers there were prevented from availing themselves of his services. In South Africa, he devoted much of his time to service of the labourers there giving them legal and other aid.

In his own writings and speeches, Gandhiji has not provided a systematic

exposition of his views on the question of labour. He has offered no complete theory or plan which others may take over bodily to interpret and apply. His ideas and suggestions were born under the impulse of the occasion when labour sought his aid. These are numerous and what he has written and said would fill a large volume. Here labour can find an answer to most of its problems.

"Dignity of labour" is an old phrase. Gandhiji put into it life and meaning for the intelligentsia of this country. Addressing a workers' meeting on February 25, 1920, he said he was proud to call himself a labourer. His own day-to-day life and that of his associates, his insistence on a certain amount of useful manual work by everyone, the adoption of the spinning franchise by the Congress, and the role of handicrafts in Gandhiji's educational scheme, demonstrate the principle and strengthen the tradition of assigning to manual work a high rank in the social life of this country.

As early as October 1921, Gandhiji explained at a meeting of the Ahmedabad workers that their position in the country in relation to the employer was that of an equal partner. On one occasion, he warned the employers that they erred grievously if they assumed that their relation with their employees was just that of master and servant. The workers are not servants but co-owners. They bring into the concern their labour power while the capitalist contributes his money. Labour in itself is real capital because it is the source of all wealth. Gandhiji seeks to place the lowest among the toilers on a footing of equality as a citizen with the most powerful in the land. The principle and procedure of arbitration which Gandhiji has struggled so hard to introduce into the mutual relations of employers and employees is just one way of implementing this equality of status. The stress he has laid in his writings on the need of establishing economic equality has a special application with reference to the problems of labour.

In his exhortations to the millowners, he has repeatedly told them that their dealings with the employees should express the same love and consideration as would be expected of a father towards his children. If, however, the employer ignores the just claims of the workers, neglects their welfare, does not desist from exploiting them, and seeks to impose his arbitrary will on them, they are told to resist.

A brief enumeration is made below of the rights of labour on the basis of Gandhiji's expressed views, most of which are embodied in the awards given by him in the various labour disputes submitted for arbitration.

1. Labour is entitled to an equal voice in the determination of its conditions of employment. In the case of disagreement, the decision of an impartial tribunal should prevail.

2. Labour has the right to a share in the administration and control of the industry. The claim of labour in this respect is superior to that of shareholders. Labour should be provided with the fullest information about the position and transactions of the industry. The employer should have the consent of the workers for

any amount that might be withdrawn from the industry for his own use.

3. The remuneration of all engaged in the industry should be as nearly equal as possible. A living wage for the worker is the first charge on the gross surplus of the industry. The depressed condition of an industry does not, at any time, create any justification for a cut in wages which fall short of a living wage standard unless their continued payment means a progressive encroachment on the capital originally invested. This should be decided with reference to the average condition of the industry and not the position of one or more units.

In the ordinary course, an industry which cannot afford a living wage to the workers forfeits the right to exist as it is. The exceptional treatment indicated here applies to a transitional period when the productivity of industry generally in the country is too low to furnish a full living wage to the workers after every available measure for promoting efficiency and effecting economies has been adopted. But there is also an irreducible minimum—an amount just "adequate for maintenance" —which, in the opinion of Gandhiji, cannot be subjected to a cut in any circumstances.

4. According to Gandhiji's conception of the living wage standard, the earnings of every male adult worker should enable him to meet full requirements of health and efficiency of the entire family and to make a reasonable provision for conventional necessaries and the various exigencies of life. Women and children should not have to be pressed into the service of the industry owing to the inadequacy of the wages of the male worker.

5. The duration and the processes of work should not prove fatiguing to the workers. They should have sufficient leisure for recreation and for attending to their domestic and social obligations.

6. The working conditions and the quality and quantity of materials should not be such as to impose undue strain on the workers or affect adversely their health or other interests.

7. Adequate provision should be made for the creature comforts of the workers during the period of employment. Gandhiji has laid special stress on the duty of the employer to provide decent accommodation for rest and refreshments, sufficient water and satisfactory sanitary facilities.

Gandhiji's pronouncements in this connection date back to the days when legislation on the subject was either non existent or in a very rudimentary stage.

8. In the opinion of Gandhiji, the responsibility of the industry extends to the supply of suitable housing accommodation for all the employees without curtailing the freedom of the workers in any way.

9. The workers have an inalienable right to organize, form unions, and bargain collectively. The employers should not obstruct the formation of a union or its working or victimize any worker for his activities in this connection. No elected representative of the workers in the mills should be dismissed without previous reference to the labour union. It is the employers' duty to provide facilities for the collec-

tion of the union subscription at the place of employment. Where a union adhering to arbitration is functioning, the employers should not take labour through any other agency.

10. In the case of a refusal of arbitration or failure or undue delay in implementing an award, the workers have an unrestricted right to strike work.

In the course of his speeches and writings, Gandhiji had stressed the duties of the workers even more than their rights. The list of their obligations is long and the standard for their conduct exacting. The worker is first asked to do his duty by himself and his family. He must lead a clean life, abstain from drink and other vices, take an intelligent interest in his surroundings, increase his store of knowledge and observe scrupulous fairness in all his dealings. The welfare of women and children is to be ensured by keeping them out of factory work, by giving them proper education and training, and by providing for them a suitable environment. Leisure must be employed for self-culture and innocent recreation and not wasted in idle gossip or harmful pursuits. Increased earnings should be absorbed in better rearing of children, education of women, improved nutrition and clothing and in raising the standard of living conditions generally. The keynote of the workers' personal life should be self-restraint and not self-indulgence.

The worker is expected to evince a high sense of duty in the discharge of his obligations to the industry. There is to be no waste of time, no unbecoming demeanour towards those in authority, and no desire to coerce the other party into acceptance of unfair demands He has to satisfy the requirements of discipline and efficiency. When aggrieved, he should represent his case and seek redress through the proper channel. He must not make false and exaggerated demands. There should be no strike till all the prescribed steps culminating in the request for arbitration have been taken. Violence has to be eschewed in all forms and only thoroughly peaceful methods should be followed during employment as well as during periods of strikes. The worker must develop a broad outlook and equip himself for the discharge of his wider responsibilities towards his less fortunately placed brethren as well as in respect of the affairs of the country. The progress of the working class depends on how far each worker is ready to sacrifice his individual interest for achieving the general good.

Nowhere in this country have the workers come within sight of the status visualised for them by Gandhiji. His conception of the rights of labour has not been realised even in Ahmedabad. What ground is there for the hope that while the present production, property relations and political system remain intact, labour can ever come into its own? Gandhiji is not content with the existing order. In the society of the future in India as envisaged by Gandhiji, there will be "no have-nots, no unemployment and no disparity between classes and masses such as we see today." Gandhiji has defined economic equality as the levelling down of the few rich and the levelling up of the semi-starved naked workers.

Gandhiji too wants a revolution—a peaceful revolution. By replacing the outer shell in which the society is encased, altering its legal basis and giving it a glittering

name, you do not get anything really very different. What matters most is the inner substance—the attitudes and reactions of the people, their habits of thought and action, and the extent of their understanding and capacity. They will find for themselves a suitable garb. The outer covering is likely to accommodate itself to the inside variations. If, however, it offers excessive resistance it would break. Even this can be effected by a gentle operation. Some such process and some such end was visualised by Gandhiji when in the year 1926, he introduced in the constitution of the Ahmedabad Textile Labour Association a sub-clause making the following addition to the aims and objects of the organizations—"and lastly, in due course, to secure nationalization of the textile industry."

It is evident that Gandhiji has always emphasised the vital role of internal improvement. He regards it as the decisive factor in genuine social change. Such change cannot be brought about by a fiat. It is a slow and difficult process. Short cuts will not avail very much. It is not denied, however, that man himself is influenced to a very considerable extent by his environment. There is no ban on any remaking of the environment if thereby humanity can be helped to move forward in the desired direction with greater ease. He can see that a great deal of social legislation will be needed to translate into the lives of the people the ideal of economic and political equality for all.

Gandhiji has a keener horror of exploitation than the "scientific socialists." He smells its possibilities in unsuspected places. He is not content to take away power and wealth from the hands of a small oligarchic group. He insists on avoiding a reconcentration in the hands of any other group, whatever name or colour it may take for itself. He is for a general diffusion of both wealth and power among the people at large. He is deeply conscious of the fact that the modes and organization of production have a direct and intimate bearing on the distribution of political power as well as on the cultural life of the people. This will explain the secondary place which he assigns to mechanised large-scale industry in our economic life. He is also aware that between the decay of one order of society and the actual emergence of another, there has to be a period of transition. For this the communists have the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gandhiji would rather cover it with the help of his doctrine of trusteeship.

"The means to be adopted for the furtherance of the objects (of the association) shall always be based on truth and non-violence"—this clause was incorporated in the constitution of the Textile Labour Association in 1926. It was clearly understood to be the basis of the labour movement in Ahmedabad from the moment of its inception. An extensive technique has been developed on this foundation for a distinctive approach to the problems of labour, for the conduct of routine work and the handling of difficult situations, for evolving standards of just treatment, for securing access to peaceful means of redress of grievances, and for creating sanctions to overcome obduracy and callousness. The first thing to do is to make strenuous

efforts for developing internal strength. The strength of numbers, necessary as it is, will fail in a crisis if the quality of the individual soldier is poor. He cannot afford to carry the burden of vice, ignorance, and intolerance if he is to win battles and march from victory to victory. If he is not able to exercise discrimination and restraint, he will be swept off his feet. By little acts of service and self-denial from day to day he should train himself up to face the severest ordeals which may demand heavy sacrifices. The strength that is thus engendered must be conserved and employed with consideration.

The worker is not to submit to injustice but while standing up for his rights, he must fortify himself with the consciousness of having done his own duty honestly. Let there be no loophole in his own armour. He has to rely on plain truth and ask for no more than is strictly fair. He has to make a sincere endeavour to convince the opponents by skill in persuasion and array of facts. He should be prepared to submit unresolved differences to arbitration; for, there is no guarantee that his view of truth in a particular set of circumstances may not after all be coloured by self-interest or dimmed by imperfect knowledge. The machinery and the personnel of arbitration may be far from perfect. Awards may cause heart-burning at times. But reckoning the cost of a struggle and the uncertainty of the outcome, the workers have found this mode of settlement far more profitable than any other. Would this not lead to a perpetuation of the *status quo* in the existing productive relations and the system of distribution while the avowed aim of the labour movement is not merely a progressive betterment of conditions but also the ushering in of a new social order? It is not so. The conceptions of social justice which will guide the arbitrators are bound to mirror a transforming public opinion. This can itself be influenced favourably by a ceaseless campaign of enlightenment and education in social issues. Any gap which remains will be filled by social legislation brought about by the political activities of labour in co-operation with the other mass interests through organizations like the Indian National Congress.

It is not contemplated, however, that labour can reach its destination by a succession of easy stages. It is not likely to be a course of smooth progress. Even the right of reference to arbitration has to be wrested from unwilling hands and maintained by a frequent use or display of organized strength. For more radical changes, labour may have to await a keen struggle on an extensive scale. For this, Gandhiji offers to labour a whole range of weapons from the armoury of Satyagraha. Satyagraha is truth in action. The outstanding truth of human affairs is that recourse to violence can bring no lasting benefit in the field of social change. The non-violent approach is far more economical in the long run. But Satyagraha is not non-resistance. It has its militant aspect. A strike conceived and carried out in the spirit of truth and non-violence is Satyagraha *par excellence*. It differs from our familiar notion of strikes in its insistence on self-examination and self-discipline, a living consciousness of the justice of the cause, freedom from bitterness and hostility

towards individuals and consequently absence of violent manifestations of any kind at any stage. Before undertaking responsibility for the strike of the Ahmedabad weavers in 1918, Gandhiji secured their assent to the following four points as the conditions of a successful strike:

1. Never to resort to violence.
2. Never to molest blacklegs.
3. Never to depend upon alms.
4. To remain firm, no matter how long the strike continued, and to earn bread, during the strike, by any other honest labour.

Gandhiji has always insisted that the unsatisfied demand which becomes the ground for a strike must be so potently just, feasible and without any room for bargaining that the people around should find no difficulty in recognising it as such. Time and again, experience has proved this to be an essential requisite for success in strikes.

Once on strike, the worker is expected to stay away for an indefinite period. He must guard himself against being reduced to submission by starvation. Every worker should have an alternative occupation on which he can fall back in time of unavoidable unemployment. The training for such work should be imparted while the worker still holds a job. The first experiment in self-support during a strike was made in March 1918, when the weavers, in the course of their historic struggle, earned a few pice a day, per head, by carrying basketloads of sand needed for construction work at the newly established Satyagraha Ashram. Several times since then the Textile Labour Association has had recourse to this method on a large scale.

For a successful strike or non-violent militant action of any other type an indispensable first step is to achieve solidarity and form well-knit organizations. The workers should pay their contributions regularly so that the unions may have adequate resources for their various functions.

Gandhiji looks forward to the day when the workers will be able to run their own organizations without outside help. It is realised that the working class has not yet made enough progress to be self-sufficient in the matter of leadership and organizing capacity. Congressmen and others who enter the labour movement are advised by Gandhiji to conduct themselves as servants of labour. They should help the workers to secure just decisions and not merely advocate their claims irrespective of the merits. Gandhiji has at all times set his face against any exploitation of the working class for political or other ends. Labour must act with full consciousness of the implications of every step that it takes.

Gandhiji performed his first labour experiment in Ahmedabad in 1919. The number of workers engaged in the textile industry in that centre was about 40,000. The industry now employs 125,000. Numerous problems and situations confronting the workers have claimed his attention since then. The course and development of

working class life in Ahmedabad inside and outside the mills and to a considerable extent the life of the industry itself bear ample evidence of the impact of his ideas. Those stationed among the workers to translate Gandhiji's message to them have their obvious limitations. The workers are now a large and increasing mass with an ever-changing composition. Their numerous problems have not yet received adequate attention. Owing to unstable political conditions, continuity of work could not always be maintained. The work in Ahmedabad, therefore, does not represent in full the possibilities which inhere in the dynamic ideas of Gandhiji in relation to the labour movement. But this work looks impressive enough when set against the ineffectiveness and disorganization to be found in other places.

The Textile Labour Association has now a membership of 55,000. It is more than 50 per cent of the potential union strength of this area. Together with the unions which are conducted on the same lines and under the same direction, the membership exceeds 75,000. The figure is confined to those who pay their contributions regularly for each pay period and cannot be compared with the published record of the trade union membership in this country. The constitution provides for recourse to a strike in the event of the failure of arbitration. The use of this weapon has had to be made on a number of occasions with gratifying results in most cases. The course of the struggle has every time been perfectly peaceful. The conditions of work in the mills leave a great deal to be desired and the level of remuneration of the workers still remains below a living wage standard. Relatively, however, the improvement that has occurred is remarkable. The wage scale in force in the Ahmedabad industry is higher than in any other industrial centre in the country for the same type of work. The Textile Labour Association interests itself in the life of the worker outside the mills. In his dealings with the landlord, the merchant, the municipality and the officialdom, he can count on its advice and aid. Work for the social uplift of labour fills a very large place in the activities of the association. Its Social Betterment Department conducts schools, hostels, literacy classes, libraries, recreation centres, a hospital and a savings bank. It has a weekly newspaper for its members—the *Mazdoor Sandesh*—of which 27,000 copies are issued. It has a press and a khadi store of its own. The social welfare work of the association cost Rs. 86,000 in 1943-44. During the last 25 years approximately Rs. 14 lakhs have been expended on this activity.

The Ahmedabad workers have participated actively in every political campaign initiated by the Congress and a large number have undergone imprisonment and other hardships. As a protest against the arrest and detention of Mahatma Gandhi and the members of the Working Committee on August 9, 1942, the entire body of workers engaged in the textile industry of Ahmedabad left work spontaneously within a few hours of receiving the news. There was a complete strike and it continued without any help in cash or kind from any source for a period of 105 days.

These facts will help towards a clearer appreciation of Gandhiji's observation in

his pamphlet *Constructive Programme—Its Meaning and Place*: "If I had my way, I would regulate all the labour organizations of India after the Ahmedabad model. It has never sought to intrude itself upon the All-India Trade Union Congress and has been uninfluenced by the Congress. A time, I hope, will come when it will be possible for the Trade Union Congress to accept the Ahmedabad method and have the Ahmedabad organization as part of the All-India Union. But I am in no hurry. It will come in its own time."

PRINCES AND PEOPLE

By H. C. Dasappa

"THE existence of this gigantic autocracy is the greatest disproof of British democracy and is a credit neither to the Princes nor to the unhappy people who have to live under this undiluted autocracy. It is no credit to the Princes that they allow themselves powers which no human being, conscious of his dignity, should possess. It is no credit to the people who have mutely suffered the loss of elementary human freedom. And it is perhaps the greatest blot on British rule in India. But we are too near the event to realise the falsity called 'Princes' India' or 'Indian India.' The system will break under its own intolerable weight. My humble non-violent effort is to induce all the three parties to wash the triple sin. Even one of them can take the decisive step and it will affect all. But it will be glorious if the three together realise the enormity of the sin and by a combined effort wash it"—in these words Gandhiji has summed up his attitude towards the vexed problem of the Indian States.

The Indian National Congress has always claimed to represent all India and has striven for a free and united nation. At the Second Round Table Conference held in London in 1931, Gandhiji, as the sole plenipotentiary of the Congress, said: "Above all, the Congress represents in its essence the dumb semi-starved millions scattered over the length and breadth of the land in its 700,000 villages, no matter whether they come from British India or what is called Indian India."

Though there was thus no difference as to the goal between the British and the Princely halves of India, in the matter of approach to the problems of both, however, there were different lines of action. Gandhiji was largely, if not wholly, responsible for this difference. The Congress generally adopted a policy of non-interference in regard to the States from the beginning. It was first conceived in 1920. In 1928 the Calcutta session of the Congress urged on the Princes to introduce responsible government in the States and to guarantee the fundamental rights of citizenship. Mere sympathy was no more enough. People urged on Gandhiji the need for active help to the States. In July 1934, in a letter to N. C. Kelkar, President of the All-India States People's Conference, Gandhiji clarified his attitude. Reiterating that the Congress policy of non-interference in the affairs of the States was wise and

sound, he said that the policy was not dictated by any want of appreciation or will but by "our helplessness" and that any such interference could only damage the cause of the people of the States. Gandhiji was sure that the time-spirit would work the needed change and that whatever happened in British India was bound to affect the States.

The elections under the Government of India Act of 1935 in the provinces and the assumption of office by the Congress in several of them gave a new fillip to popular movements in the States. The time-spirit was working irresistibly. It was natural for the people in the States to feel discontented at their lot and to resent their being penalised for the sin of being subjects of a State. At that time the Congress Committees could function in the States but they had mostly confined themselves to constructive programmes. Nowhere in a State had the Congress developed into a powerful political party. In Mysore, however, it did become powerful when in October 1937 a fusion of all parties under the Congress flag took place. To the authorities this was strange and portentous. Arrests of leaders only increased tension and repression followed. The A.I.C.C. at Calcutta passed a resolution protesting against the repressive measures of the State government and sympathising with the movement. Gandhiji felt that such a resolution militated against the accepted policy of non-intervention. But the need for a reconsideration of the position without departing from the main policy of non-intervention was widely felt.

At Haripura in February 1938, the whole question was reviewed and the policy of the Congress in relation to the States was laid down in a comprehensive resolution. It stated that *Purna Swaraj* or complete independence, which was the objective of the Congress, was for the whole of India, inclusive of the States. It was the privilege and right of the Congress to work for this objective in the States. The Congress stood for full responsible government and the guarantee of civil liberty in the States. But freedom movements were likely to develop more rapidly if they drew strength from the people of the States and it was, therefore, laid down that for the present, States Congress Committees should not engage in parliamentary activity nor launch on direct action in the name and under the auspices of the Congress. Independent organizations should be started, or continued where they existed within the States.

Gandhiji's insight proved unerring. The years 1938 and 1939 saw a great awakening among the States people. The resolution was fully justified and "had put the States' people on their mettle." When he saw, however, that the State authorities would not relish even friendly advice or help of the Congress and quoted the resolution against the Congress he clarified the matter. "Non-intervention," he said, in October 1938, "was never regarded as a principle. It was a limitation imposed on itself by the Congress for its own sake and that of the people of the States." A couple of months later, he said, "If the Congress feels it has the power to offer effective interference it will be bound to do so, when the call comes."

Later, at Ludhiana Jawaharlal Nehru said: "There was no question of non-

intervention. The Congress as representing the will of the Indian people recognises no bars which limit its freedom of activity in any matter pertaining to India and her people." The limitation, if any, is of its own making. Gandhiji was soon to see in Jaipur and Rajkot, as in other States, that the struggles there were "part of the struggle for the liberation of India." In Jaipur, Jamnalal Bajaj, member of the Working Committee of the Congress and president of the Jaipur Praja Mandal, and himself a subject of Jaipur had to offer Satyagraha. In Rajkot Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel took charge of the movement, Kasturba offered Satyagraha and later Gandhiji himself had to intervene. In explaining his warning that the examples of Jaipur and Rajkot "might easily lead to an all-India crisis" he clarified again the position. "The policy of non-intervention by the Congress was, in my opinion, a perfect piece of statesmanship when the people of the States were not awakened. That policy would be cowardice when there is an all-round awakening among the people of the States and a determination to go through a long course of suffering for the vindication of their rights. If once this is recognised, the struggle for liberty, wherever it takes place is the struggle for all India. Whenever the Congress thinks it can usefully intervene, it must intervene." Differences between Congressmen on this question were bridged. Gandhiji explained the evolution: "My words and deeds are dictated by prevailing conditions. There has been a gradual evolution in my environment and I react to it as a Satyagrahi."

Left to their own resources, the freedom movements in the States took root in the soil, grew strong and wide. It looked as though they were not so many different struggles but were all a part of one great struggle of a people thirsting for liberation. These organizations had the rich experience of the Congress before them and fell in line with the rest of India without much difficulty. The struggles in Travancore, Mysore, Rajkot, Jaipur, Hyderabad, Jodhpur, Talchar, Dhenkanal, Limbdi and other States are well-known. Instinctively Gandhiji responded to the call and practically all the movements in the States came under his guidance. "It is in the fitness of things," said Nehru in his Ludhiana address, "that at this moment of vital crisis for the States, India's leader, ever thinking of her freedom and jealous of her honour, should step out and in his ringing voice of old that we remember so well give faith and courage to our people."

The Government of India Act of 1935 denied the people of the States the right to share the common citizenship of the federation along with the people of the provinces and sought to bring about a union between autocratic rulers and democratic governments in the provinces. The hostility of the nationalist elements in the country to such a federation, and more than that, perhaps, the failure on the part of the requisite number of States to accede to federation, left that part of the act in cold storage. The Cripps proposals in 1942 suffered from a similar defect. Sir Stafford Cripps suggested that the States representatives on the constitution-making body might be appointed (not elected) by the States on the same population basis and

with the same powers as the British Indian representatives who would be elected. The Working Committee of the Congress rightly characterised it as a negation of both democracy and self-determination.

If nationalist India was willing to welcome the rulers into partnership in a federation provided they came as free agents representing the will of their people, the rulers were intent on guarding against any encroachment on their treaty rights. For purposes of paramountcy the office of the Governor-General had given place to that of Viceroy as Crown Representative. The Maharaja of Bikaner and others claimed for the States an independent status apart from the Crown and would not admit that there was either any obligation to part with power to their people or to transfer their present allegiance to the future Government of India. Their view was that the States would revert to the independent existence they had before their treaties with the Crown. In his illuminating treatise, *Status of Indian Princes*, which is based on authentic records, Pyarelal has exposed what exactly this sovereignty amounts to in reality. Lord Reading's celebrated letter to the Nizam is quoted: "The sovereignty of the British Crown is supreme in India and therefore no ruler of an Indian State can justifiably claim to negotiate with the British Government on an equal footing... Paramountcy must remain paramount." The Butler Committee's conclusion on this aspect is important: "It is not in accordance with historical facts that when the Indian States came into contact with the British Power they were independent Some were rescued, others were created by the British."

Gandhiji's call to the Princes is as friendly as it is clear and sincere. It is, perhaps, his very outspokenness which the Princes fail to appreciate. On August 2, 1942, he reminded them of their real position in India and their obvious duty. He said: "The present incumbents are also the creation of the imperial power. Its simple frown can undo them. But they need not feel so helpless, if they could consider themselves as an integral part of the nation instead of being, as they are, an integral part of the imperial machine ... India shall not always be a slave country. Will the Princes march with the times or must they remain tied to the imperial chariot wheel?" Even if they could not make common cause with the nation, Gandhiji said, they could adopt the middle course of "earning the goodwill of their people by sharing their powers with them."

There are some like Jaiprakash Narayan and others who would urge the elimination of States altogether. Gandhiji differs, at any rate so far as the bigger States are concerned. He desires not their abolition, "but conversion of their autocracy into trusteeship, not in name but in reality." There, however, will remain the question of the smaller States many of which are hardly larger than estates. Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency in his *The Indian States and Indian Federation* (1942), by no means friendly to the Congress, says they "are still so numerous in India that they offer a grave conundrum in evolution to which no solution is at present forthcoming ... Their disappearance and absorption would, of course, be inevitable if Britain ever ceased

to be the supreme power as regards India." Gandhiji would have the smaller States "to abdicate the powers they should never have possessed." Again he says, "I do not imagine a settlement in which the Princes will have effaced themselves ... I can therefore only conceive a settlement in which the big States will retain their status .. In one way this will be far superior to what it is today, but in another, it will be limited so as to give the people of the States the same right of self-government within their States as the people of the other parts of India will enjoy." And yet there are rulers who refuse to see that the change will mean a superior status and who would remain tied to the imperial chariot wheel. In a very recent statement made at the end of July 1944, the Nizam stated, "It will be possible at no time for Indian States to sever their historical alliance with the Paramount Power because history illustrates that their existence is connected with the British Government" and "it is a boon never to be given up." Pyarelal's reply to this is apt: "To contend that the past and present governments of India were acceptable to the Princes because they were essentially foreign in their composition and not responsible to the Indian electorate, and that the future Government of India will not be acceptable because it will be responsible to their own countrymen is neither dignified nor patriotic." But is one sure, after all, whether it is their unwillingness or helplessness that is responsible for their attitude?

The simultaneous awakening in the States all over took the rulers by surprise. They did not know which was better, repression or appeasement. The attempt of some States to appease was not welcomed by the other States. They conceived then the policy of "kicks and kisses" and the policy of "divide and rule," for which the soil is so fertile. The freedom struggles in the States moved more or less on the same lines as in British India, guided by the same principles of truth and non-violence. But there were more handicaps in the States. The States were isolated and independent. There was less check on oppression and tyranny than in British India. What is worse, the Paramount Power, if it did not actually encourage repression, did nothing to counsel restraint. The people of the States naturally sought the guidance of Gandhiji. The rulers should ever be grateful, as indeed the people are, for the wise manner in which he guided the movements in the States and led them strictly on the path of non-violence. But sad to think that neither the rulers nor the Paramount Power appreciated his moderating influence

Such advice as Gandhiji gave to the people of the States carried no condition of acceptance. It was always given on the understanding that it was open to them to accept or reject it. In fact, he would ask them to adopt it only if it appealed to their heads and hearts and tallied with their own reading of the local situation of which they were the better judges.

If Gandhiji spoke plainly to the Princes, he did no less to the people. His advice to them was largely influenced by the result of his experience in Rajkot. Rajkot was to him "a priceless laboratory." Gandhiji held that in the past he had not insisted

on unadulterated non-violence but had compromised with himself and was satisfied with mere abstention from physical violence. It was because the people were not ready to pay the price that they had not met with success. He advised the States people that "the pitch of the immediate demands should be lowered if necessary, in order to quicken the progress towards the final goal," the minimum to consist of the rule of law, as distinct from personal rule, civil liberties, an independent judiciary and a fixed privy purse. In the armoury of non-violence there was always room for honourable negotiation with the authorities. This was the new technique propounded by Gandhiji in his discourses and writings after the Rajkot affair.

The part played by the Paramount Power during these years of turmoil in the States would be a revealing story. The great awakening and the increasing and insistent demand for responsible government in the States gave rise to the strange plea on the part of the rulers that responsible government was not consistent with the treaty obligations. But Earl Winterton in Parliament and Lord Linlithgow in India made it clear that while no pressure would be brought upon a ruler for his adopting such constitution as was best suited to the needs of his people, no obstruction would be placed in his way by the Paramount Power should he wish to give effect to constitutional advances consistent with his treaty obligations. These declarations roused high hopes among the people of the States at the time, for, they were not asking for anything inconsistent with the treaties but for responsible government under the aegis of the respective rulers. The rulers, however, far from responding to the aspirations of the people stiffened further. The Paramount Power seems to have so acted that the promise of freedom to the Princes to inaugurate reforms bore no fruit. "It is an open secret," Gandhiji said, "that the Princes dare not do anything that they guess is likely to displease the Paramount Power."

When tyranny and oppression increased in States such as Dhenkanal, Talchar and Limbdi, Gandhiji was not slow in reminding the Paramount Power that "the treaties, if they oblige the British Government to protect the Princes, equally compel them to protect the rights of the people." As early as 1875 Lord Northbrook had laid down that "misrule on the part of a Government which is upheld by the British Power is misrule in the responsibility of which the British Government becomes in a measure involved." If the findings of the Butler Committee, which had a definitely imperialistic bias, could be any guide nothing should prevent the Paramount Power from "giving advice" to or even exerting "pressure" on the Princes to introduce constitutional changes to bring States in line with British Indian Provinces. Professor Barriedale Keith has put the constitutional aspect very clearly: "It is impossible for the Crown's advisers to contend that the peoples of the States shall be denied the rights of Indians in the provinces, and it is their clear duty to advise the King-Emperor to use his authority to secure that the Princes shall enter upon constitutional reforms which will result at no distant date in securing responsible government therein. No federation can be deemed in the interest of India, if in it representatives of the

people of the provinces are compelled to sit with the nominees of irresponsible rulers. There is, in fact, no answer to Mr. Gandhi's claim that the Princes are bound to follow the Crown in its transfer of authority to the people."

One cannot but be struck with astonishment how Gandhiji can take up the burden of so many responsibilities on his already bent shoulders and do everything with such thoroughness. He has a technique all his own in handling men and matters. If he has to guide the people of a State he will have a representative of theirs at his own seat in Sevagram. Thus are forged indissoluble bonds between the States people and himself, while the message of non-violence is transmitted to the actual theatre of the struggle.

The public only read Gandhiji's writings about the States. But much of his work for them is done in private, through friendly correspondence or negotiations. He *might be counselling moderation to a people eager to give fight and holding them back,* but that would not mean he was keeping quiet. He would be tackling the State concerned with the sanction of the intrinsic moral justice of his case and of the non-violent strength of the people. If the State would not yield to moral persuasion he would then take it up in the columns of *Harijan,* provided it would serve the cause of the people. He would always stretch a point in favour of the rulers. If there were charges made against an administration by the people he would scrutinize them. He would often bring the changes to the notice of the State authorities to know their view-point before making the next move. On some important occasions when the situation demanded it he would depute a trusted representative of his own to the States.

Gandhiji's identification with the cause of the people of the States has been complete. They could feel secure that in whatever settlement he may have to play a part, their interests were safe. Only recently on July 13, 1944, while convalescing at Panchgani, in explaining to the press his new proposals for ending the deadlock, he said: "One fundamental element in my attitude is that I shall never be a party to the sale of the rights of the people of the States for the sake of the freedom of the people of British India. At the same time I am no enemy of the Princes. I consider myself to be their friend and if anybody cares to understand I am prepared to suggest a solution, at once honourable to them and to the people." Let us hope that Gandhiji's earnest appeals to the Princes "to read the signs of the times" will not go in vain.



MEDICINE FOR THE MASSES

By Sushila Nayyar

ALL sorts of notions are current about Gandhiji's attitude towards medicine. Many people think that he is a confirmed opponent of science and everything that is modern; they conclude he must hate allopathy and could never touch allopathic drugs. Others think that though originally he was an out-and-out believer in naturopathy, he is a prey to doctors who are constantly poisoning his system with drugs; in other words, they complain that Gandhiji has gone back on his life-long beliefs. Others wonder why his love of *swadeshi* does not induce him to confine himself to the Ayurvedic form of treatment.

Like many others, I also once imagined that Gandhiji disliked all scientific advances of modern times and that he wanted to take the country back to medieval times in every sense of the term. But I soon discovered my mistake. If we admit that the aim of science is to find out the truth about things, then Gandhiji, being a seeker after truth, is essentially a man of science. He approaches and deals with every problem of life in a scientific manner and in many things, I have not met a more modern man than he is. But, besides being a seeker after truth, he is a votary of *ahimsa* and where scientific research and modernisation part company with *ahimsa*, he has to say good-bye to the former.

It is Gandhiji's all-embracing *ahimsa* that makes him such an implacable opponent of vivisection and, therefore, a severe critic of the allopathic system of medicine, because vivisection is an integral part of modern medical research and even medical education so far as allopathy is concerned. Gandhiji's manner with patients is so gentle, his touch so soothing, that I once remarked, "Bapuji, you should have been a doctor." "I myself have always wanted to be one," replied Gandhiji. "In South Africa I used to go to a doctor's dispensary every day in spite of my busy legal practice," he continued. "There I dispensed medicines, dressed wounds and rendered whatever other help I could. I must have worked there for at least a year. This experience was of great help to me when I later organized an ambulance corps during the Boer War. The work interested me deeply and after the war when I went to England I actually thought of taking up the medical course. But on making enquiries I learnt that I would have to do vivisection. There was no escape from that

if I wanted to go through the regular course of medical studies. I could not do that, and so I had to give up the idea of becoming a doctor."

Gandhiji is a great admirer of allopathy. He has paid unstinted compliments to master allopaths for their spirit of research, for their industry, and the sacrifices they have made in order to bring allopathy to where it stands today. "And even now they do not sit idle gloating over the achievements of their predecessors," he said to some friends a short while ago. "They are constantly trying to improve their knowledge. In fact allopathy is the only branch of medicine that may be said to be alive. All the others are static, they are dead." But, in spite of his admiration, his indictment of allopathy is severe. "I call your science *asuri* (of the devil)," he said once to me. "You are devil's disciples in so far as you will keep a man alive at all costs. Is human life so very precious that the whole creation should become subservient to it? The mere thought of it horrifies me. For me all life is one, and even if disease could become extinct as a result of research carried out through vivisection, I will not have it."

I agreed with him that it was horrible to torture animals in order to keep man alive. But if suffering could be eliminated through those experiments, would he revise his opinion? Science could not progress unless one carried out experiments on animals, I pleaded. No, he could not permit vivisection even if it could be made painless. "I have no objection to your dissecting dead bodies, and I have no objection to your holding post-mortem examinations," he said. "In fact, I think every dead body should be utilized in this manner. Similarly, I do not mind if you dissect dead animals in order to understand their anatomy, but vivisection I cannot allow. If medical research suffers on this account, I would sacrifice that much addition to human knowledge. But to tell you the truth, I do not think that research will really suffer in the long run if vivisection is stopped. In order to pump water to a higher level, you have to stop the lower outlets. Similarly, when you have eliminated certain methods of research, you will exercise your brains and ultimately find out some other humane means of doing the same thing."

Gandhiji is a firm believer in the principle that a healthy mind keeps the body healthy. Health of the mind, of course, includes strict adherence to general rules of health and an all-round continence. It means control over one's emotions and thoughts and a well regulated life in general. He has often said that the fact that he suffers from high blood pressure shows that he has not gained control over his mind as well as he should have. Disease is an outcome of sin, he says and whoever sins by breaking the rules of health, should be prepared to pay the price for it. Therefore, he thinks it wrong on principle to cut short an attack of illness by means of drugs. For instance, he says, if a man has overeaten and suffers from indigestion in consequence, he should fast instead of resorting to a dose of carminative mixture. The fast would cure the indigestion and at the same time teach him a lesson not to overeat in future.

MEDICINE FOR THE MASSES

But while Gandhiji believes in the ideal of doing without drugs altogether, he is a most rational individual. His reasonableness and his practical nature tell him that though on principle a sinner must pay for his sins, in practice amnesty is often used to reduce the punishment. A dose of castor oil for instance reduces the sufferings of an attack of gastro-enteritis consequent on overeating, and Gandhiji has no hesitation in making use of it. But he would never tolerate prescribing a dose of digestive mixture in order to enable one to attend a dinner party.

When a white friend from South Africa developed an attack of malignant malaria at Sevagram, Gandhiji had no hesitation in persuading him to take quinine. He happened to be one of Gandhiji's earliest disciples. He had, for years, looked upon medicine as poison, and was amazed that Gandhiji should advise him to take quinine. But Gandhiji succeeded in persuading him in the end.

During his recent attack of malaria, Gandhiji wanted to do without quinine. He tried to treat himself by fasting and thus eliminating the poisons from his system, for three days. But the fever persisted. It was explained to him that at his age and in his present state of health, he must not risk having any more rigors. He yielded, and after the first two doses of quinine, the malaria vanished.

Because Gandhiji has always avoided drugs his system has become so sensitive that drugs act on him in much smaller doses than in the case of others. During his recent attack of malaria, he had just 33 grains of quinine spread over a period of five days, and his blood was free of malaria parasites on repeated examinations. He never had a relapse. It is possible that even the first two doses of three grains each might have sufficed. Gandhiji ascribes it to his three days' fasting prior to the taking of quinine. He takes and advises taking drugs when it is absolutely necessary and when he knows that the drug has a specific action. Then too, he would take the minimum quantity possible. He simply cannot understand the attitude of a patient who is not satisfied unless he is given a bottle of medicine.

Even in the taking of medicines, Gandhiji thinks in the terms of the masses. The fact that the spirit of commercialisation has crept into medicine hurts him deeply. It is a noble profession. It should rise above commercialisation. But so long as it does not do so, what is he to do? He announced his decision recently at Juhu that he would not take any patent medicines. He would confine himself to herbal medicines as far as possible, because they are available to the poorest of the poor.

Although Gandhiji co-operates with allopaths and *vaidyas* and *hakims* as far as it becomes necessary, his preference remains for naturopaths. Naturopathy is his pet child. It is his hobby, as he puts it. If disease is a result of breaking nature's laws, nature should be able to rectify it if left alone, he argues. He has practised nature cure methods for more than fifty years. But there is no fanaticism about him. In fact, what he has practised might be termed medicine for the masses. He has made use of ordinary home remedies, hydrotherapy, earth treatment, fasting and dietetics to the extent that they can be tried in the home. He is aware of the limita-

tions of naturopathy and never pushes it beyond the limits of safety. He has such strong common sense that he has never had an occasion to regret his experiments.

Gandhiji yearns to see naturopathy evolve into a complete science. This is what he wrote to a naturopath friend recently: "I am a confirmed believer in naturopathy but I am sorry to note that naturopaths do not work hard. They do not go deep into things. They do not stake their all in order to develop their art. They do not study and they do not mix, with each other and organize their profession." He realises that naturopathy may not be able to deal with all diseases. Therefore, he wrote to another naturopath friend: "You should find out from all naturopaths in India as to what their conception of naturopathy is. What all does the term include, and what are the results of their own experience?" To another friend he said, "I would like to be clear in my mind how far it can take me."

But even in the matter of naturopathy, Gandhiji does not want to make it into a highly specialised complex art beyond the means of the poor. A naturopath friend has for some time past been asking for his help to put into practice a scheme for research in nature cure. After several days of thought, Gandhiji came to the conclusion that an ideal nature cure institute of his conception would be a sort of a model village. He would place at the friend's disposal a big plot of land in a healthy locality. He should grow there plenty of fruit trees and vegetables, and erect simple huts where simple experiments in dietetics, hydrotherapy and earth treatment can be carried out. The place should become self-supporting so that even the poorest of the poor could go there and take a course of nature cure treatment. It should have a simple but effective system of sanitation. The preventive aspect of medicine should be emphasised, and the patients who come there for treatment should go back to their villages able to guide their friends and neighbours in all matters pertaining to health and prevention of disease.

The friend was taken aback to begin with. This was not what he had asked for. "But what can I do without electricity and other modern appliances?" he pleaded. "You will be able to do quite a lot with this much," replied Gandhiji. "As for modern appliances you will have to convert me to your point of view and you will have them. I want something that can be multiplied by the thousand. That and that alone can give relief to the villages. That is the one thing that I am after." The naturopath friend wanted to take help from vivisection in order to carry out research in naturopathy along modern scientific lines. But Gandhiji would have none of it. "If naturopathy cannot get recognition in scientific circles without the help of vivisection, I shall not grieve," he said. "I would rather let it remain in a primitive state than soil it by introducing vivisection into it."

As a lover of *swadeshi*, Gandhiji would love to see the Ayurvedic and Unani systems of medicines come into their own, but here again, he has found much to disappoint him. In spite of his deep love for them, he has often had to say hard things to Ayurvedic and Unani physicians. He deplores their lack of industry. They

have lived long enough on the credit of their forefathers. They must do something to increase the knowledge that they have inherited. Again, the spirit of secrecy, the handing over of potent prescriptions from father to son, has hurt him deeply. Lack of a uniform pharmacopoeia and absence of standardisation of drugs is another great handicap in his opinion. On learning from some Ayurvedic friends that at an Ayurvedic College, they were trying to analyse the crude drugs, he remarked, "But why should you not analyse your finished products and have a uniform strength for all your preparations? I should like to see all your bottles with a label bearing the results of the analysis."

The spirit of commercialisation in Ayurved oppresses him. "I criticise allopathy because it is too expensive for the poor villager. But if Ayurvedic treatment also becomes expensive, where am I to turn to?" he complained to some Ayurvedic friends. He was disappointed to learn that the Ayurvedic College at Poona did not have its own garden of medicinal plants. He would like Ayurvedic physicians to go and settle down in the villages. He would like them to confine themselves to medicines that can be locally procured. They should grow medicinal plants and make each village self-sufficient at least so far as herbal medicines are concerned.

His preference for naturopathy notwithstanding, Gandhiji is not wedded to any particular system of medicine. He feels that, the human body being one, finally there is bound to be one system of medicine to cure its ailments. How much of it will come from naturopathy, how much from allopathy and how much from Ayurved and Unani he does not know. But he would like this science of prevention and cure to confine itself to humane methods of research and treatment. Above all, he is most concerned to see that the treatment should not be beyond the reach of the poorest of the poor. He would like to see free state medical service giving relief to rich and poor alike. He would prefer prevention to cure.

BASIC EDUCATION

By K G. Saiyidain

MAHATMA Gandhi has an amazingly varied genius which has expressed itself in many different ways. Who would have thought, however, that this busy politician and social reformer will find not only the time and the energy but also the insight and the imagination to make a permanent and far-reaching contribution to the complicated problem of Indian education? Not that it is an unusual thing for laymen to dabble in education. But most of them either talk platitudes or make impracticable suggestions or simply do not know what they are talking about. Mahatma Gandhi's intervention has, however, been a welcome exception. His insight into the educational problem of the country is neither the result of book study nor of ordinary teaching experience; it springs from his first-hand knowledge of human nature and of the Indian social situation.

The significance of his educational contribution is two-fold. On the one hand, it is the peculiar response of the Indian genius to the Indian educational situation, a spontaneous outgrowth from the soil and not an importation from without. On the other hand, it has certain elements of universal validity which bring it into line with the progressive educational thought of the age—a fact which would, and probably did, come as a surprise to Mahatma Gandhi himself who has had no intellectual contacts with modern educational movements in foreign countries.

It seems Gandhiji has a special technique of work. Whenever he inaugurates any new social, political or cultural movement, he puts his ideas—deliberately, I think—in such a drastic form that people are startled out of their indifference and their smugness. He is able, in this way, to provoke a more furious discussion and to challenge established routine more successfully than a more cautious and reasonable approach would. This is what he did when he wrote a series of articles on education in *Harijan* seven years ago. It provoked great controversy and opposition, for a variety of reasons, but it also made people ponder over the fundamentals of the educational situation, not in limited pedagogical terms, but in a series of clear-cut propositions. Now that the scheme has been given a reasonable trial in many parts of the country, it would be worth while to examine these propositions and the criticism on them.

What does Gandhiji actually postulate? Firstly, that mass education should be

made free, universal and compulsory. There is nothing new in this demand except its pointed urgency, and it is an objective which practically all civilized countries have already achieved. Secondly, that this mass education should not be perfunctory, cut short at the end of four or five years when the children have barely achieved literacy and their chances of acquiring any useful knowledge or social training are negligible. The minimum duration of this "Basic National Education"—as the expression developed later—should be seven years, covering the period of seven to fourteen years of age. Would it be right to regard this as a too high-pitched demand when, Great Britain for instance, has found this period too short for compulsory primary education? Thirdly, that this education should be given through the mother tongue. It is only in a country like India that it is necessary to ask for such an elementary right! Fourthly—and this is the central *educational* basis of the scheme—that this mass education should be given through village crafts like spinning and weaving and (not primarily) through books, that children should actually produce articles that are marketable and these should be sold to make education self-supporting. Gandhiji also suggested that the state should not devote its resources to secondary and higher education—which should either be left to private enterprise or should be provided by the different professions and industries like law, medicine and engineering—but should primarily concentrate on the education of the masses.

What was the reaction of the country to these educational "heresies"? The reception was inevitably mixed. The people, who differed from Gandhiji fundamentally on socio-economic questions and were out for industrialisation, regarded the scheme as not only impracticable but as dangerous, calculated to arrest India's industrial development and keep it at the cottage craft level. They overlooked the somewhat obvious point that an education given through work is more likely to produce skilled and competent industrial workers than a predominantly bookish education, and that crafts are nearer to industries than theoretical learning. Then, there were the orthodox educationalists who were dismayed at the idea of craft work challenging the age-long supremacy of the text-book in schools and at small children wasting their time in manual labour. Their apprehension was that such a scheme of education will not produce an Iqbal or a Tagore—nor, perhaps, their own infinitely precious selves. They failed to realise that genius is not produced to order, that different types of human beings find their self-expression and self-fulfilment in infinitely different ways and that the book is not the only avenue to culture and by itself—divorced from life and work—not an avenue to culture at all. Again, there were Gandhiji's devout disciples to whom every word of the Mahatma is scripture, and they were naturally prepared to accept everything *in toto*. These did not, perhaps, in the first flush of their enthusiasm, remember that Gandhiji's proper function was not to present a complete educational picture but only to suggest certain broad and fruitful ideas to be scrutinized, modified and implemented by educationalists.

But Gandhiji is greater and more open-minded than both his doctrinaire admirers and his critics-on-principle. He did not regard his ideas as gospel truth but as start-

ing points for further inquiry. So he entrusted his outline scheme for proper formulation and scrutiny first to a conference of educationalists and then to a committee, for which he happily selected Dr. Zakir Husain as the chairman. Dr. Zakir Husain belongs to a small and select group of educationalists, who were trying, in their several ways, to bring about a radical transformation of the educational system and who had registered an emphatic protest against the over-academic bookish traditions of education. They saw great possibilities in the new scheme, and its central idea, at which Gandhiji had arrived intuitively, appealed to them powerfully, because it was in consonance with the best trends of progressive educational thought.

What was this idea? That work, done with integrity and intelligence, is ultimately the only proper medium through which human beings can be truly educated and that schools must become active centres of "doing" and "learning by doing" both organized in integral relationship with each other This appreciation of the intrinsic relationship between doing, learning and living is no accidental off-shoot, which Gandhiji's philosophy of life has put forth; it springs from the deepest sources of his thought. He has been a worker—and in contact with workers—throughout his life He knows, through first-hand experience and observation, that all real value is created through honest work and that true culture is even more emphatically a product of the field, the farm and the workshop than of the library and the lecture room. He deplored the isolation of the educated class from the dynamic of national life, and suggested, as a remedy, that, during the formative years, youths should be thrown into the matrix of real work at school, where they should learn to grapple with obstinate raw materials like cotton and wool and wood, and the earth as the field of agriculture. In the course of this real, purposeful work, they will not only produce marketable articles but will acquire much necessary practical knowledge, and turn to books, under the spur of a felt need, as sources of further useful knowledge. Thus, books will become not substitutes for, but aids to, activity, and the knowledge gained will be integrated into character and personality. Such knowledge, even if limited in range, is to Gandhiji's way of thinking more valuable and effective than much wider knowledge, which is mechanically borrowed from books and remains a mere passive possession of the learner. It would be wrong to presume that Gandhiji is primarily interested in the children acquiring skill in crafts and is comparatively unconcerned about the wider objectives of education In his introductory remarks to the report on Basic National Education, he makes this observation: "Education through village handicrafts means that teachers are expected to educate children in their villages, so as to draw out all their faculties through some selected village handicrafts in an atmosphere free of super-imposed restrictions and interference." Would not this insistence on education through productive work and education in an atmosphere of freedom delight the heart of any new educationalist?

It may be worth while at this stage to point out that what Gandhiji has advocated is not, in its essence, an entirely new educational doctrine as, curiously, both his staunch disciples and his critics believe Gifted teachers in all ages have acted on

his principle of education through activity, consciously or unconsciously. More recently through educational movements like the Project Method and the Activity School, this doctrine has been given a place of honour in schools in Europe, America and Soviet Russia. The special significance of Gandhiji's contribution lies, firstly, in the fact that it is he who has made it and, secondly, in that no one in India had stressed the principle so emphatically and unambiguously before, or sought to make it basic to the entire educational process. The "academic" tradition in education had persisted in India for centuries with the result that culture had become divorced from work, and manual labour was regarded as positively dishonourable. Gandhiji struck at the citadel of this prejudice—others had been doing so but not, perhaps, so effectively—and stipulated that every child, whether rich or poor, high-born or low-born, should whole-heartedly participate in actual manual work. The justification for this step, I need hardly repeat, is as much social as psychological, for the education of the worker is, in a very real sense, "the door to the education of the man." Productive work thus becomes not only a dominant part of the curriculum; its spirit begins to inspire the methods of teaching also.

The most controversial feature of the scheme is that this education through work should be made self-supporting so far as recurring expenditure is concerned. At the conference the idea was modified to the extent that it should gradually be able to cover the remuneration of Basic school teachers calculated at the rate of Rs. 25 a month. Now, why did Gandhiji place so much insistence on this feature of the scheme? This was, I think, partly due to his serious apprehension that, unless some emergency financial measures are devised, it will not be possible for India, a poor country, to make provision for Basic Education on a mass scale. That the apprehension is not ill-founded is shown by the financial implications of Basic Education, as worked out by the Educational Adviser to the Government of India, which appear to be frankly prohibitive, unless, through a policy of vigorous industrialisation, the wealth of the country is multiplied several-fold. As Gandhiji does not favour out-and-out industrialisation, there was no alternative for him but to make such a proposal.

There is also another more valid, psychological reason for this idea. If craft work is to be anything more than a mere hobby or pastime, it must inculcate thoroughness, efficiency, the economic use of time and resources and the other habits and qualities associated with true craftsmanship. To ensure this, a measurable check has to be imposed on the products of children's craft activity and, obviously, a rough and ready test on a large scale is their marketability. The Zakir Husain Committee has particularly stressed this consideration, quite apart from the financial aspect of the proposal. Unless we insist on the articles produced being of a sufficiently good quality to be saleable—after several years of training, of course—there would be no safeguard against half-hearted and slipshod work. It has also been suggested that this proposal will turn schools into factories and revive child labour in an invidious form. This apprehension reveals a failure to appreciate the basic difference in spirit, approach and atmosphere between a good school and a bad factory. The real objection to child

labour rests on the inhuman and insanitary conditions under which children are condemned to work in factories and in the divorce between purpose and activity, which characterises its processes. The child is not averse to work as such; in fact, its active spirit is always craving for work and protesting against purposeless book learning. If the working conditions in "activity schools" are healthy and mentally stimulating, if the children's native interests are properly enlisted, if, in the words of Gandhiji, the "why and wherefore" of the processes, in which they are engaged, are fully discussed and brought out, manual and skilled work would become a powerful ally in general or liberal education. There is, of course, the danger that some short-sighted teachers may fail to strike the right balance between the practical and cultural objectives of their work, but can there ever be a fool-proof educational scheme, which unintelligent teachers cannot defeat? If the inner meaning of the scheme is rightly understood, there is nothing in it which is repugnant to the healthy, all-round development of children. I say so not on *a priori* grounds. I have seen a large number of Basic schools at work, and the evidence they have provided is conclusive.

But Gandhiji is not primarily interested in the problems of methods and curricula. To him—as to every great educationalist (in the wider sense of the word)—the most important question is: what should be the basic ideology to inspire educational effort? It is here that we find the identity of ideals and purposes between his general and educational philosophy. If we examine Gandhiji's speeches and writings carefully, we shall find certain basic ideas running through them consistently. He envisages a social order in which every individual would be a productive member, proud of the characteristic contribution which he or she can make to the common good through co-operative endeavour. He visualises a conception of culture, which would reject the traditional dualism between learning and doing, between knowledge and action. He seeks to bridge the gulf, which the existing system has created between the educated and the uneducated classes, making the culture of the former superficial and cut off from its natural roots in the soil, and leaving the latter in ignorance and superstition. He aims at exalting co-operation above competition, service above exploitation, non-violence above violence. Above all, his educational scheme—as it has finally emerged from the committee—is inspired by the hope that, by making all children learn co-operatively through craft work thus sharing the life and labour of the masses, it will not only release their productive powers for the service of the common good but deepen their sense of humanity and kinship with their fellowmen all over the world.

What practical success has the scheme so far achieved? I do not suppose Gandhiji himself would be very much concerned about it, because he is more interested in the rightness of an idea than in its general acceptance. Education is naturally a plant of slow growth, and educational changes can come about only very gradually. This scheme, however, has met already with an unexpected measure of success. It has created a real ferment of thought and heart-searching in educational circles and, directly or indirectly, influenced the attempts at educational reconstruction in different

provinces and states. There is no part of India where Basic schools have not been established, either experimentally or on a large scale, with the object of providing a demonstration of their possibilities. The general principles underlying the scheme have been accepted by the Central Advisory Board of Education of the Government of India, and its recent report definitely contemplates that the education of the masses will be organized on Basic lines.

This is no small success for a scheme, which originated only a few years ago from politically suspect sources and which was looked upon by highly placed educational officials and administrators as yet another "fad" of Gandhiji's—interesting but entirely impracticable! Wherever the Basic schools have been properly run, they have triumphantly vindicated the soundness of its underlying principles. Over and over again, I have found—when inspecting the Basic schools in the Kashmir State—that the children in them are mentally more alert, more happy and more co-operative than children in corresponding primary schools. And what greater ambition can a teacher have than making the life of the children rich and joyous and drawing out their latent powers in an atmosphere of happiness and freedom? It is true that many people have honest differences of opinion either with certain aspects of the ideological background of the scheme or with some of its details. But there are many who have opposed it either for entirely extraneous reasons or because they have failed to study and understand it. I feel convinced, however, that when political controversy has died down and educational problems are studied calmly and dispassionately, the scheme of Basic National Education will stand out as a bright landmark in the history of Indian education, and Gandhiji's name will be honoured not only as that of a great statesman and social prophet but also as that of a great educational reformer.

VILLAGE INDUSTRIES

By V. L. Mehta

NOT being merely an idealist, Gandhiji does not rest content with giving expression to his hostility to machinery and his preference for decentralised production. He has during the last twenty-five years put his theories into practice, through the revival first of the *charkha* and, subsequently, of the other village industries which are to the *charkha* what the planetary system is to the sun. The All-India Spinners' Association and the All-India Village Industries Association, are the two bodies through which this economic programme is executed, resulting in the diffusion of employment coupled with a guarantee of minimum subsistence for all workers. Simultaneously, there is the dispersal of industry involving the decentralisation of initiative and authority, linked with a drive for technical investigation and improvement in the interest of the producer.

The All-India Spinners' Association was formed in 1925 in pursuance of the following resolution adopted by the All-India Congress Committee:

"It is resolved that the Congress do now take up and carry on all such political work as may be necessary in the interest of the country and for this purpose do employ the whole of the machinery and funds of the Congress save and except such funds and assets as are specially earmarked and such funds and assets as belong to the All-India Khaddar Board and Provincial Khaddar Boards, which shall be handed over with all existing financial obligations to the All-India Spinners' Association started by Mahatma Gandhi as an integral part of the Congress organization but with independent existence and full powers to administer these and other funds for the fulfilment of its objects."

The association has the following aims and objects:

"Through hand-spinning and through the manufacture and distribution of hand-spun and hand-woven khaddar and all processes incidental thereto—(a) to give relief to the poor by providing them with whole-time or part-time employment; (b) to secure for them as far as possible a living wage; (c) to provide them insurance and security against unemployment, particularly in times of famine, failure of crops or other natural calamity; (d) generally and incidentally to provide them educational, medical and other facilities; (e) to open, establish or to give aid to institutions for

giving instruction and carrying on research in processes of hand-spinning and the manufacture and distribution of khaddar and all other processes incidental thereto; and (f) to engage in such other activities as may be germane to the objects aforesaid."

The association enrolls ordinary associates and life associates. The former group consists of persons who are over 18 years of age, who habitually wear and use khaddar, and who donate each a monthly subscription of 1,000 yards of well-twisted and uniform self-spun yarn or pay an annual subscription of Rs. 12; their membership on June 30, 1942, was a little over 3,000. The latter group comprises persons over the age of 18, who wear and use khaddar habitually and contribute Rs. 500 in lump sum. The affairs of the association are managed by a board of trustees consisting of life members and annual members in whom are vested the funds and property. The board has power to establish branches. Each branch is managed by a secretary who acts under the direction and control of the board.

KHADI WORK



= 10,000 Villages = 10,000 Villages Served

The A. I. S. A. covers no less than 15,110 villages and engages 3,54,257 artisans. For the period of eighteen months ending June 30, 1942 (later figures are not available because of non-publication of the report for 1942-43 due to the absence of the office-bearers in jail) the value of the khadi produced was Rs. 1,20,02,430 of khadi sold Rs. 1,49,84,513 and of the wages disbursed about Rs. 80 lakhs. During the eighteen years of existence of the A. I. S. A., it produced khadi of the value of Rs. 6,83,57,862 the value of the sales being Rs. 9,01,89,231. The total wages dis-

bursed have amounted to Rs. 4,10,30,031 representing nearly 60 per cent of the cost of production as against 22 per cent in the organized large-scale textile industry. The aggregate funds employed in the activities of the association have amounted to about half a crore of rupees.

The artisans benefiting from the work of the A.I.S.A. fall mainly under two groups: spinners numbering 3,24,391 and weavers 25,024. The number of ginners, carders and other artisans was only 4,842. Their respective shares in the wage bill were Rs. 2,04,20,425, Rs. 1,57,85,288 and Rs. 48,24,368. Of the total number of artisans 74,051 were Muslims and 23,968 Harijans. The sales of goods are transacted through depots or *bhandars*, some run by the A.I.S.A. and others certified by it. The former numbered 249 and the latter 94, making a total of 343. Similarly, production centres are either run by the A.I.S.A. or are certified by it; the number of the former was 517 and of the latter 343.

There are two distinct aims the A.I.S.A. has placed before itself. The first is to see that every home has at least one spinning wheel and every village has at least one loom; self-sufficiency in clothing is always in the forefront of the programme. But equally important is the other aim of adding to the volume of rural employment by stimulating the production of hand-spun yarn and of hand-woven cloth by agriculturists and other sections of the rural population. Employment has to be organized, however, on a basis which provides for the artisan a standard living wage.

During the last ten years, efforts have been made gradually to raise the scale of wages for both spinners and weavers, particularly the former. The principle of a living wage was definitely adopted in 1935, notwithstanding the effect such an increase may have on the selling price of khadi. The wage increase has been made possible by an improvement in the tools and technique of production. The problem of reviving the industry by strengthening its foundations has engaged the attention of the A.I.S.A. all the time; but during the last ten years especially much progress has been made in improving the processes and tools of production. The local branches of the A.I.S.A. manufacture various improved implements such as hand-gins, carding bows, slivering sets, *taklis*, spindles, winders, *charkhas* and looms. The Yeravda *Charkha*, the Magan *Charkha* and the Dhanusha *takli* represent almost a revolution in the technique of spinning—the result of constant investigation, research and experiment carried on at Sabarmati, Wardha, Bardoli and numerous other centres. It is these improvements that made it possible to keep down the price of khadi in pre-war times despite the payment of wages on a gradually increasing scale, as also to effect a vast improvement in the quality, durability and finish of the cloth. Another factor that has helped in this direction is the systematic training given to all grades of workers in the production of yarn and the technique and economics of the industry. There is a central training institute at Sevagram and some of the branches also have arrangements for training.

The All-India Village Industries Association was established much later, in

VILLAGE INDUSTRIES

December 1934, in pursuance of the following resolution adopted by the Indian National Congress at its forty-eighth session:

"Whereas organizations claiming to advance *swadeshi* have sprung up all over the country with and without the assistance of Congressmen, and whereas much confusion has arisen in the public mind as to the true nature of *swadeshi*, and whereas the aim of the Congress has been from its inception progressive identification with the masses, and whereas village reorganization and reconstruction is one of the items in the constructive programme of the Congress, and whereas such reconstruction necessarily implies revival and encouragement of dead or dying village industries besides the central industry of hand-spinning, and whereas this work, like the reorganization of hand-spinning, is possible only through concentrated and special effort unaffected by and independent of the political activities of the Congress, Shri J. C. Kumarappa is hereby authorised to form, under the advice and guidance of Gandhiji, an association called the All-India Village Industries Association as part of the activities of the Congress. The said association shall work for the revival and encouragement of the said industries and for the moral and physical advancement of the villages and shall have power to frame its own constitution, to raise funds and to perform such acts as may be necessary for the fulfilment of its objects."

The object of the association has been defined as village reorganization and reconstruction, including the revival, encouragement and improvement of village industries and the moral and physical advancement of the villagers of India. The association, under the constitution, is to work under the guidance and advice of Gandhiji and is empowered to carry on research work, publish literature, organize propaganda, establish agencies, devise measures for the improvement of village tools and do everything that may be necessary for the furtherance of its objects.

There is a permanent board of management which is responsible to a board of trustees who are in charge of the funds and property of the association. As the scope of the work of the association is extensive and covers the entire field of social and economic life of the village, it is not the closely knit body that the A. I. S. A. is. Deliberately, therefore, the range of its activities in the direction of production and distribution has been restricted. Apart from the boards of trustees and of management, the association consists of two grades of members, ordinary members and agents. Persons who subscribe to the creed of the association and promise to devote the best part of their energy and talents to the furtherance of its objects—the relief and service of the poor—in the villages are enrolled as members. They have to pledge themselves to live up to the ideals of the association and to prefer village manufactures to any other. The pledge also requires that the member shall seek the assistance and co-operation of all those who may be willing to give them irrespective of differences in politics and shall refrain from participating in civil disobedience so long as he remains in the association. Agents have to sign a similar pledge; in addition, they have to render honorary service in the village or villages or district where they choose to work.

They are selected by reason of their knowledge of the area of their jurisdiction, their organizing ability and their local influence. At the end of 1942, the number of members was 214 and of agents 132. Members and agents are expected to send quarterly reports of work done by them.

Production and distribution are not a distinctive or essential feature of the work of the A. I. V. I. A. The constitution, therefore, provides for work being carried on through institutions which undertake to abide by the rules prescribed by the association and secure affiliation, recognition or certification. Affiliation is intended mainly for educational and such other bodies which have as their object the promotion of village industries and the welfare of villagers. The office-bearers are required to live up to the ideals of the association and to supply to it reports of the work done in furtherance of its objects. Recognition is granted to production centres and certification to distributing agencies on the following conditions: (*a*) The lowest wage paid in the production of the article must not be lower than the minimum wage of three annas a day for eight hours' efficient work. (*b*) The raw materials used in its manufacture must not be factory-made or imported. If some of them are, they must be enumerated and the percentage of the cost of such raw materials in relation to the cost of the manufactured article must be stated. Whenever possible, raw materials must be obtained from producing centres recognised by the association, or it must be guaranteed that such materials conform to the requirements laid down under rules (*a*), (*b*), (*c*). (*c*) The article in all its stages of production must be produced by hand or bullock power only. If at any stage other power is used, that must be stated, and its cost in relation to the total cost of production must be given.

Certified sellers will be expected to obtain their supplies from producing centres recognised by the association. Where this is not possible, they may get their supplies from elsewhere provided they guarantee that the articles conform to the above requirements.

For the present, the rules provide for the grant of recognition or certification only in respect of the following articles: hand-pounded rice, hand-ground flour, *ghani*-pressed oil, village-made *gur*, hand-made sugar, *ahimsak* honey, hand-made paper and stationery, soap from indigenous materials, leather goods from the hides of non-slaughtered cows, bullocks and buffaloes tanned on a cottage industries basis, and pottery. The number of affiliated institutions at the end of 1942 was 14 and of recognised and certified centres 20 and 37 respectively.

All these items form part of the programme of work drawn up by Gandhiji for the guidance of the association when it was started. The programme is being worked out at the headquarters of the association at Maganwadi, Wardha, and through the affiliated and certified bodies as well as members and agents. The immediate programme consists in encouraging home-processed or hand-made products required for daily consumption by large masses of the population. The fullest use of local raw materials, with the aid of local labour and local tools in the people's homes in villages, is the method promoted by the association.

One of these articles is hand-pounded unpolished rice and another hand-ground whole wheat flour. Both these are recommended because of their greater nutritive value and because of the employment they provide in rural areas. Medical authorities hold the view that among the labour population in the Far East where rice formed the staple diet, there was scarcely any single factor so responsible for the growth of malnutrition as the consumption of mill-polished rice. This is due to the fact that owing to the process of polishing, half the mineral matter, a fourth of the proteins and practically the whole of its vitamins and fats are removed from the rice. Besides, the process involves a wastage of one-sixth of the grain. Owing to the lack of minerals and vitamins, the body fed on polished rice is starved of what it essentially needs and is unable to assimilate what is of value in other foods. Very similar are the considerations which should induce a reversal of the growing use of milled flour. This does not contain enough suitable proteins nor enough suitable vitamin A nor enough of certain essential mineral salts. According to Sir Robert McCarrison, the bread made from white flour even with the aid of yeast is not nearly so good as that made from freshly ground wheat flour. Encouragement of hand-processing is, thus, a programme that has a special appeal from the point of view of national economy when the nation's food resources have to be conserved and utilized to the best advantage.

Two other items of this programme may be referred to. Village-made *gur* is recommended in preference to refined sugar, for encouraging a rural industry and for its superior dietetic value. Modern science tells us that white refined sugar contains only the energy-giving carbohydrates while *gur* has a number of useful minerals in addition. Ordinary sugar is thus regarded as a chemical product which is a somewhat questionable luxury rather than a necessary article of diet. *Gur* made from sugarcane is available in abundance all over India. In addition, the A.I.V.I.A. has encouraged the preparation of *gur* from the sweet unfermented juice tapped from the numerous varieties of palm trees found all over India.

Oil-pressing is one of the basic industries of our countryside and the A.I.V.I.A. has devoted considerable attention to its extension and improvement. Sweet oil freshly extracted by village *ghanis* possesses better nutritive value than mill-pressed oil or vegetable ghee and its use keeps alive an industry which is in danger of languishing. The improvements effected by the A.I.V.I.A. aim at increasing the output, reducing the strain on the animals and lowering the overhead charges. But along with the improvements, the A.I.V.I.A. visualises the development—or rather the revival—of co-operation between the producer and the consumer which enabled the former to carry on his industry without being called upon, as is the case at present, to carry a large stock of oil-seeds and thereby to sustain losses in a fluctuating market.

As a bye-product of the basic industry of oil-pressing, there are two other industries the A.I.V.I.A. seeks to reorganize—soap-making and the manufacture of lamps for burning vegetable oils. The use of soap is on the increase, but the increased demand is met by the mill-made product. There are raw materials available in parts of the

country which, without resort to imported chemicals, can well be utilized for building up a local soap industry. Efforts in this direction at Wardha and Sabarmati have been successful. To meet the modern need for hurricane lanterns and reading lamps, the A.I.V.I.A. has experimented with various designs of lamps suitable for burning the various non-edible oils available in large quantities all over the country. The researches have resulted in the designing of the "Magan Deep"—the new vegetable oil lamp. This design enables lamps and lanterns fed with kerosene oil to be adapted for burning vegetable oil. The utility of such a change-over in a period when there is an acute shortage of kerosene oil need scarcely be stressed.

Paper-making, though not one of India's foremost industries, developed sufficiently during the Muslim period to meet the country's requirements. In modern India, these requirements have grown enormously and they are all met by imported paper or paper made by Indian mills from foreign pulp or local raw materials. The war has shown our helplessness, our dependence on imports of pulp and paper and the sad consequences of the neglect of the indigenous hand-made paper industry. For the last ten years, the A. I. V. I. A. has sought to popularise the use of hand-made paper and to increase its output and improve its quality. Researches and investigations have enabled these improvements and helped in the use of local raw materials.

Only next in importance in the national economy to the manufacture of cloth—which is the special province of the A. I. S. A.—is the tanning and leather industry which is vital for every village. This industry, like others, has decayed with the impact of the new social economic forces. Dead animals have become a burden to their owners and while the hide is handled roughly and tanned in a crude manner for immediate export, the rest of the carcass is a waste and a nuisance to the locality. The experiments and researches made under the auspices of the A. I. V. I. A. have led to the devising of simple, economical and practicable methods of disposal of carcasses in villages. The carcasses are now removed with care and flayed in such a way as to avoid unnecessary cuts. Every part of the dead animal is put to some use. From the fleshing glue is made, while the entrails and the intestines are converted into guts. The fat can be used for lubricating and industrial purposes, and manure is obtainable from the powder made out of the boiled flesh and bones. Both bones and horns are suitable materials for the manufacture of articles of daily use such as combs, hair-pins knife or umbrella handles. Chrome tanning has also been developed as a cottage industry.

Along with its sister institution, the A. I. S. A., the A. I. V. I. A., too, has arrangements for the training of village workers and of specialists in various industries. The industries in which systematic training is provided at the institute at Wardha are paper-making and oil-pressing, while there are short courses of instruction in soap-making, bee-keeping, *gur*-making, hand-processing of cereals. Auxiliary and allied institutions provide facilities for training in tanning and leather work, manufacture of matches, button-making, horn work and the coir industry.


PRODUCTION SQ. YDS
SALES RUPEES
PRODUCTION RS.
135
105

VILLAGE INDUSTRIES

The way in which Gandhiji wishes to see the revival of village industries to take place may well be described in his own words: "I hold that the machinery method is harmful when the same thing can be done easily by millions of hands not otherwise occupied. It is any day better and safer for the millions spread in the seven hundred thousand villages of India, scattered over an area nineteen hundred miles long and fifteen hundred broad, that they manufacture their clothing in their own villages as they prepare their own food. These villages cannot retain the freedom they have enjoyed from time immemorial, if they do not control the production of the prime necessaries of life."

The path of non-violence with its corollary in the sphere of economic life which Gandhiji wishes India and humanity to pursue may be long and arduous. But it is certain to lead mankind to its cherished aim of giving every individual security of life and liberty and establishing a just and stable society.

A CALL TO STUDENTS

By Ralph R. Kaithahn

"STUDENTS are the hope of the future. . The future leaders of the nation are to rise from the students." Such is Gandhiji's expressed faith. Such is the momentous challenge to the Indian students. Revolution is universal and comprehensive. We are in that world process. Are we to take great steps forward or are we to flounder, at the mercy of the forces of selfishness, violence, exploitation and injustice?

The student in India inherits one of the richest cultures of the world; only the Chinese student is equally privileged. He has immense resources, material, human and spiritual, at his disposal. The world hungers for nothing more than the gift that India might make at this time out of her own rich past clothed in a modern, acceptable dress. Gandhiji has pioneered along lines which students might well follow up with their own contribution. Western civilization is destroying itself because it has not yet worked out a technique of settling its differences creatively and non-violently. Gandhiji has experimented most courageously and devotedly in this field. His nation has gone with him to a most remarkable degree.

Most significant results have followed this non-violent struggle. India has built up her self-respect and dignity; a large and important group of devoted, constructive nation-builders are now to be found throughout the country. India commands the respect of the best of nations. Lovers of peace look eagerly to India for a new way by which the conflicts of mankind may be solved in peace—for a method through which a selfless, pioneering humanity may be created. We have but started on this long and upward trail. Devout students with the scientific mind and method, with the courage of the prophet and the determination and patience of the pioneer are needed to carry on the torch as it is handed to them by the builders of the new India.

India has been a relentless searcher for Truth for centuries Truth for India is something far more than mere scientific truth, the search for which the western world has been giving so much of its time and energy in recent centuries. India's educational system follows the lead of the west. But she needs also the larger outlook, the larger challenge of Truth itself. Gandhiji calls our attention to this repeatedly. For him. Truth and God are one. Here is the link between the *rishi* of the Himalayas and the *rishi* of the modern scientific laboratory. India is turning to modern science

most rapidly. It is good that man develops the techniques of control of our material resources that he may have better tools with which to carry on his vocation. However, unless he also carries on unceasingly the search for Truth in its fullest sense he will not know his calling; and his tools will become his worst enemies as is so evident in the mechanised world of today.

It is in such a setting that we must evaluate Gandhiji's contribution. He never casts aside an efficient and helpful tool. He has a definite place for the machine in the society of his dream. His point is that the machine must be such that it is available to all alike and truly promotes the welfare of humanity. Gandhiji is a scientist if ever there was one but a scientist of the New Era, one who combines the best of both the western and eastern *rishi*. He has but indicated the direction. It is for consecrated Indian youth to catch the vision of the New Day.

India is the home of man's undefeated search for Truth or God. Every nation has its sanitary drains, Gandhiji himself once reminded us. But few nations are so blessed with Beauty, Goodness and Truth as India. Most students are too little aware of this glorious past. If there are true students they must delve into their own past and make it their own. No one has done this more creatively than Gandhiji himself.

Let us forget the past for the moment. Active as students are they would naturally be impatient with a dead leadership. Indian students rightly demand a national leadership worthy of these days. But they have been so trained in a false environment, so thoroughly weaned away from their own past in most cases that it may be difficult for them to appreciate their own great leadership which has drawn so largely from its own rich past. But Gandhiji is his own challenge to the student. He will remain so for many generations. He is what he asks us to be.

Gandhiji has not merely talked about New Life for India. From the student halls, from the centres of money-making he moved to the village. For, there is where India lives. There lies the salvation of India. Sevagram has become his home, his centre of work, his sanitarium, his all. As a student, which he always is, Gandhiji has studied the village. He saw clearly its many problems: poverty, hunger, ill-health and insanitation. Very early he discovered one old, old tool of man that he sensed might help to solve these many and great problems. It had been tucked away among the rafters of the village hut. It was the spinning wheel. This was Gandhiji's greatest gift to India—his great challenge to the modern student. A good student should study the role of the spinning wheel from 1920 to today. A very humble instrument, it has worked wonders. One might write a fascinating tale of that old, old extension of the cleverness of the human finger.

The student is naturally in the school or college. These are but modern human factories for exploitation. A tremendous sense of frustration has come over our students as they have growingly realised this fact. Gandhiji was not merely content to point out the fact. He has inspired people to pioneer with the New Education. Today a most ambitious scheme of education proposed for India shows clearly the

imprints of the little scientist of the village. Basic Education, although still a wailing child, has made every earnest educationist in India think seriously as to the new village school. The student ought to carry on this great experiment.

Gandhiji's constructive programme is a complete and challenging blue-print for the future. He starts always from the village as any true builder of India must.

But the most significant contribution of Gandhiji—his greatest challenge to the student—is his method. For him the method does make a difference. As he struggles against injustice, as we all must if we would build anew in these days, he builds even as he struggles. There is not an intermediary and terrible period of destruction, of preparation for days of construction in the period of peace ahead. No, with attention fixed definitely on the sore spot, with a conviction that the base of the problem is our own selves, he starts the struggle on a basis of purification—purification of all concerned. He has reached back to the past and taken for his use those great concepts of life, *satya* and *ahimsa*. He has brought them together, with his own original and delicate touch into what we might call a new scientific discovery, Satyagraha—a new and creative approach on the part of a selfless, self-suffering community to problems of exploitations, selfishness and violence. It is a revolutionary method of "sweet reasonableness." It is firm insistence that right and justice must prevail. An adequate understanding of his gift and of its challenge to us necessitates a careful study of the use of this most potential weapon during the past twenty-five years. A great corps of research workers is needed to devote their entire life and strength to the carrying on of this great experiment, the results of which are anxiously awaited by all lovers of peace.

Here is the programme of action for the students: 1. Make the village your laboratory and centre of action. 2. Be true *brahmacharis* (searchers of truth). Develop strong and pure bodies, minds and spirits. Always act in the open and in truth. Be courageous. Guide all energies into productive channels. Live to a studied schedule and never waste a moment. Thus lay the foundation for a creative and pioneering personality. 3. Maintain a strong, living faith in Truth or God. Cultivate the spirit of true humility and reverence, devoted in never-tiring, selfless service with the unprivileged and needy. 4. Spin and wear khadi. Learn the dignity of labour. Promote economic freedom. 5. Work incessantly for India's unity. Rid yourselves of all caste and class feelings and actions. Learn and teach the *rashtra bhasha*. Be faithful to your mother tongue. 6. Work for purposeful and creative education. Pass on your learning to the illiterate and unstudied. 7. Work for clean, healthy and thriving villages; for prohibition; for a well-fed nation. 8. Look upon every woman as your equal, as your mother or sister and treat her as a co-worker in building New India. 9. Be active and responsible citizens. Do not dabble in party politics. Be students of the best in your nation. Give Mother India your all in times of crises.

"I have fixed views on students," Gandhiji said to me recently. "If they want to work they must come out of their schools and colleges and give their full time." Are we ready for that challenge?

WHAT GANDHIJI SHOULD DO!

By Gaganvihari Mehta

OVER a year ago, the Government of India published an elaborate document called *Congress Responsibility for the Disturbances.* This, I feel, was a modest and somewhat misdirected indictment. It is really Gandhiji's responsibility and that responsibility is not merely for the August (including September-October) disturbances but for all that has gone amiss, all that is wrong and harmful in our political, social, economic and cultural life during the last forty years.

It is now no secret even to the Indian public (from whom all secrets are scrupulously guarded) that the delay in the invasion of Burma in the autumn and winter of 1942 was due to Gandhiji. It is true that there was no such movement in 1943, but experts are busy finding out how he was also responsible for the postponement of the invasion in that year as well as for the Jap infiltration in the Imphal area this year. Similarly, the responsibility for the terrible famine (called "food shortage" by the authorities) in Bengal and elsewhere has been directly traced by these authorities themselves to none else than Gandhiji who undermined public confidence in Government's currency and credit and thus brought about a crisis while he was in jail—although, of course, public confidence in the powers-that-be continues as strongly as ever.

Fundamentally, it is Gandhiji who is standing between this country and its freedom. India is always on the verge of independence as after the Montagu Reforms, the R. T. C, the Hoare Constitution and the Cripps Offer but does not get it because of him. I do not know if Gandhiji was also responsible for the delay in the Second Front, slow advance in Italy and Russo-British-American misunderstandings, and there is hardly any doubt that he is mainly, if not solely, responsible for the present political frustration and economic plight of the country. The British would have, but for him, taken this country miles ahead in progress in collaboration and co-operation with other parties and leaders—though I don't know what prevents them doing so still. Is it not, therefore, essential to ascertain Gandhiji's responsibility for the ills we suffer from?

This, I suggest, is all the more imperative now that he is free and is being approached by various leaders and followers and neutrals and nonentities advising him of the course he should now adopt in order to resolve the present deadlock

(which according to some authorities does not exist) and unravel the communal tangle—not to mention several other minor wrangles. It is true that most of us are not clear about our own responsibilities and obligations and duties, and cannot see our own way clearly, nor are we able to practise our vaunted principles. But we are all definite as to what Gandhiji should or should not do, how he should act and retract, what are his functions and duties and what errors and blunders he has committed from time to time

Consequently, he is being asked by some to withdraw the August resolution and others to stick to it and stand by it; he is being warned not to see the Quaide-e-Azam as also to fall at his feet; he is being advised to co-operate in the war effort and not to let down his followers, to recognise as well as to ignore the Unionist Party, to support and condemn the Bombay Plan. In short, if I were in his place (which fortunately is not likely), I should not only be bewildered by the completely opposite views and mutually contradictory advices of friends, admirers, foes, followers and nincompoops but would in all probability retire from public life for good or even seriously think of committing suicide. However, after having discussed the question of what Gandhiji should do with several people of different schools of thought, I am fully convinced that if Gandhiji behaved and conducted himself as we all would like him to do, he could save not only the country but even himself!

I met, for example, a full-blooded hundred per cent Anti-Fascist who definitely and warmly held that Gandhiji must now openly declare himself a Friend of the Soviet Union and throw in his lot with the world struggle against Fascism, Nazism, Japanism.

"Including Franco?" I timidly asked.

"Yes. This war is an ideological war—whatever Churchill might say about not meddling with the internal affairs of other countries. Those who are not with us—except Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, and South America—are against us. Gandhiji's influence, I am sorry to say, is by and large reactionary."

"You need not be sorry. But what exactly is meant by this term reactionary?" I enquired.

"That to which, in our opinion, Stalin's Government is opposed for the time being. For example, it was reactionary to support this war until June 22, 1942, but, it is reactionary now to oppose it. To prop up Badoglio was terribly reactionary until the Soviet itself did so. Now Gandhiji because of his indifference to and ignorance of world forces and movements is totally reactionary. His principle of non-violence is reactionary and therefore, effete in politics where, according to Sorel, violence is the sole arbiter. He sapped the fervour of the Bengal revolutionaries and has at various times scotched the spirit of national resistance. But for him, we would have had a genuinely revolutionary mass movement before the war and a revolutionary war front after it."

"But surely," I protested, "the country, if not the Congress itself, has other leaders. Why did they not start a revolution in one direction or its opposite?"

The Anti-Fascist friend was emphatic. "That is the real difficulty. Gandhiji so hypnotises the national mind and mesmerises our credulous and gullible people that no one is able to oppose him openly. They are all 'yes men' round him who afterwards do exactly as they please. This blind faith is irrational and highly inimical to national progress."

"But is it Gandhiji's fault?"

"Assuredly. Our people are uncritical and prone to follow blindly. But it is the duty of the revolutionary leader to change their psychology and create rebels. His leadership is a burden on the Congress."

"Then, I take it, it was good he once resigned from the Congress?"

"Not at all! Are leaders ever entitled to retire from their sphere of activity? Does that show a sense of responsibility? Leadership is neither a profession nor service that one can retire: it is an obligation to be fulfilled until death. Gandhiji must not retire, he must make the Congress the spearhead of a revolutionary movement."

On the other hand, the view of a Liberal leader was that Gandhiji had put the country on the wrong path for the last sixteen years and had followed revolutionary methods which had done infinite harm to the people.

"Is he revolutionary?" I asked.

"Emphatically, yes. What is this programme of civil disobedience and jail-going, law-breaking and resistance to authority and refusal to pay taxes? Non-violence is itself a revolutionary principle because it leads to mass upheaval and eventually to violence. But through these movements of non-co-operation and civil disobedience, there was no change of heart among the rulers nor a paralysis of the administration. Gandhiji, with all respect, is an anarchist if there is one. He believes on opposing authority and disbelieves in security. But if he henceforth follows the path of moderation, he will be successful; if he allows his extremist tendencies to get the better of him, the deadlock and political chaos will continue. If he cannot now undergo apprenticeship under a Liberal leader like, say, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, the least he should do is to listen to their sound and sober advice and come back to the path of constitutionalism and abandon the barren track of non-co-operation, resistance, disobedience etc."

A pillar of the Hindu Mahasabha and *Sangathan* was vigorous in his opinion that Gandhiji was responsible for Hindu-Muslim dissensions by giving exaggerated importance to the Muslims since the *Khilafat* days and by conceding everything to the Muslims at the sacrifice of Hindu interests. "He does not condemn Muslim atrocities in riots and even on the Communal Award, the Congress took up a neutral attitude neither accepting nor rejecting it. He has always preached that *swaraj* is not possible without communal unity. He is prepared even to concede Pakistan.

The Mahatma should, therefore, now leave off wooing the Muslims and courting insults from Jinnah. If he cannot join the Mahasabha, he should at least do nothing from now on to weaken it and should strive for the unity and strength of the Hindus to fight the Muslims."

My Muslim League friend also held that Gandhiji was the root cause of the communal trouble because he always ignored the importance of this issue and now maintained that communal unity was not possible without first achieving freedom. Fundamentally, he said, he is a Hindu leader and not a national leader because he gives importance to such things as untouchability and fasts and Hindu ritual in politics. He has refused to concede anything to the Muslims all these years and hence the demand for Pakistan. But the key to the unity is with him; he must agree to divide the country and accept Mr. Jinnah's terms.

A capitalist-industrialist was furious at the very mention of strikes and industrial unrest. He said it was all due to Gandhiji and his movement. He is responsible for putting all sorts of crazy ideas in the heads of the workers and peasants; he calls them *Daridranarayan* which is not only an insult to God but an intoxicant to the poor.

"Few perhaps know that he is opposed to class war and has a theory of trusteeship," I intervened.

"Yes! Yes!" he said impatiently. "But it is your Mahatma himself who has said times without number that the British rule this country with the help of the propertied and rich classes meaning that they are traitors and the real patriots are the poor. He says people with real vested interests are the poor and that their welfare should be the test of the measures and policies of *swaraj* government; he would even have all titles to property investigated by a sovereign national government. Who would be safe in such *swaraj*? No wonder the Congress ministries under his inspiration increased the burden on the textile industry, levied taxes on property and wanted to penalise money-lenders and sugar manufacturers. Even khadi he advocates as a measure for more equitable distribution of wealth so that the millowners might not get money. No, sir! We don't want such *swaraj* where property will not be safe, profits will disappear, labour will become insolent and undisciplined, tenants will defy *zamindars* and officials. The best that Gandhiji can now do is to admit all his errors and faults and not do anything which would weaken the economic security and stability and development of the country."

The labour leader, on the other hand, could not control his indignation against the Mahatma for his counter-revolutionary trend and pro-capitalist bias. "He is the last bulwark of capitalism and the propertied classes in this country," he declared with *red* eyes. When I mildly suggested that Gandhiji was trying to identify himself with the masses of his country and his heart bled for the downtrodden and the poor, he curtly discounted such ideas. "Such conceptions as 'heart' and 'bleeding' are mere sentimental bourgeois notions which do not fit in with the realism of

the materialist dialectics of Marxism. What we want are heads, not hearts— even heads ready to be broken in the historic struggle of the world proletariat. Gandhiji should be prepared to throw in his lot with this tremendous world movement and agree to abolish capital and private property in this country. Otherwise the poor people will have no interest in the national struggle. Why should they suffer and sacrifice to substitute our own tyrants and exploiters for alien ones? Why not then continue the present rule which is fundamentally more anti-Fascist than a possible national government dominated by plutocrats and merchant princes? People do not want *swaraj* for the freedom to spin; they have it even now. Unless Gandhiji leads the poor against the rich, no widespread movement is now possible."

The Dewan of an Indian State said that it was Gandhiji who was responsible for poisoning the traditional cordial relations between the Indian Princes and their subjects and encouraging defiance of authority. "Who knew of boycotts and hartals and black flags and picketing and non-payment of taxes and violation of laws and courting imprisonment before he came? Do you remember he criticised the pomp and show of the Princes years ago at the opening of the Hindu University in Benares? Don't you remember Rajkot? It is he who is primarily responsible for all the troubles and dissensions in the Indian States. Hands off the States, I say! He should no longer meddle with them if he wants self-government in British India which is the concern of the British and British Indians," he concluded in one breath.

But a representative of the Indian States People's Conference told me that Gandhiji's ideas about the States are medievel and feudal. "He has a bias in favour of the Princes who, he thinks, are amenable to Indian sentiments and views because after all they are our own kith and kin. Is this not racial discrimination? Do we want freedom to substitute Indian bureaucracy for the British? Is not the system in the States more retrograde and undemocratic than even in British India? Gandhiji must first tackle the problem of the Indian State subjects without which no solution of the Indian problem is possible. *Swaraj* will only be won through the States."

An eminent economist held that Gandhiji must now give up antediluvian ideas and pre-historic notions like *charkha* and khadi which are an economic waste and must turn to large-scale industrialisation and support modern economic development.

Another student of economics, however, said that he could not understand why Gandhiji concerned himself only with cloth and not with the far more important question of food. Why does he not pay attention to the reform of our agriculture and organize a national food campaign? He describes himself frequently as a peasant, so why not go back to land? Gandhiji must really see that our economic life becomes full and varied and suited to our own conditions. He must now busy himself with the vital economic problems of the day like food, price control, inflation, sterling balances, transport etc. instead of mere political piffle.

A practical politician was of the firm opinion that Gandhiji is not fit for nor meant for politics. He is a moral ascetic, a saint—a sort of prophet, if you will, who is temperamentally utterly unsuited for the intrigues and squabbles of political life. It is easier to worship than to follow him. He is one of our great religious leaders and reformers—in the line of Buddha, Chaitanya, Kabir and Swami Vivekanand. He should leave politics to those who can stoop down to its level and know how to fight the wiles of British diplomacy and the bluff of the Muslim League. He should get out of politics now.

But a student of politics I met said that Gandhiji was pre-eminently the man for our political life: he has foresight and daring, he can compromise and take risks—he is the one man who is a match for the British. But the difficulty only arises when he allows his mystical and metaphysical notions and his religious susceptibilities and qualms of conscience and the "inner voice" to intrude in the sphere of his public work and political activities. These intrusions create enormous complications in our political development and divert national energies. Because we accept his political leadership, we are not bound to acquiesce in his religious doctrines and tenets. Can he not do something to that mysterious "inner voice" of his? If he leaves his religiosity and becomes modern in his outlook, he would become an ideal political leader of the nation.

As a result of all these discourses, dialogues and discussions, I have come to the conclusion that Gandhiji should lead a revolutionary mass movement and should also not transgress the limits of constitutionalism; that he should strive for Hindu-Muslim unity and also ignore the question completely and should at once surrender to and defy the Muslim League; that he should become the guardian of property and wealth and should lead a movement of the proletariat for the expropriation of the capitalist; that he should not interfere in the affairs of the Indian States but must take into hand immediately the problem of their subjects; that he should give up his antiquated methods of economic regeneration and at the same time expand their scope; that he is quite unfit for political life but is also so qualified that he should leave off all other activities and devote himself entirely to it.

I have also come to the conclusion that although Gandhiji is mainly responsible for all our failures and defeats and frustration, all the work of the nation should be taken up by him and the burden borne by him.

It is also clear that he should join all the parties and organizations at one and the same time.

Is it a small achievement of ours that we have come to realise so fully and acutely what are Gandhiji's duties and now know precisely what he should and should not do?

TOURS AND MARCHES

By M. Chalapathi Rau

IN October 1913, hundreds of Indians, men, women, and children, crowded into the town of Newcastle in Natal under the leadership of a thin, little, limping man who had taken a vow to eat only one poor meal a day. They were mostly miners from Northern Natal and were on strike as a protest against the £3 tax levied on their freedom and the freedom of their wives, sons and daughters. They had no homes for they had given up the quarters provided by their masters and had no worldly goods except wearing apparel and blankets. They had only the sky for their roof, the open veldt for their bed and their faith in their leader. And, luckily, that leader was Gandhiji and even in those days he seemed dogged and had a look of "sureness and content." He found shelter with a middle class Indian who had a small plot of land and a small house. The house became a caravanserai and the kitchen fire knew no rest day and night. More and more men came trudging along the muddy roads in inclement weather. Soon the crowd increased to thousands and some of them were ex-criminals. But there were no incidents and the days passed quietly.

How am I to house and feed them, thought Gandhiji. There seemed a way out. Why not turn these pilgrims of faith into soldiers of Satyagraha? Why not take this 'army' into the Transvaal and see them deposited in jails or settled at Tolstoy Farm where good Kallenbach would make the necessary arrangements? But the strength of the army was now about 5,000, there was no money for railway fare and the Transvaal border was distant. Gandhiji decided to march on foot.

"I had no alternative except to harden my heart," writes Gandhiji of that historic decision. The miners had their wives and children with them but none of them would go back to the mines. The rules of the march were read out. There was to be a daily ration of only a pound and a half of bread and an ounce of sugar for each soldier. They were not to keep more clothes than necessary, nor touch any one's property on the way. They were to welcome arrest, bear patiently with abuse, and even flogging.

On October 28 the caravan started on its march and safely reached Charlestown, a small border town of 1,000 people, where only the women and children could be

lodged. The rest camped in the open and did their own scavenging and sweeping More labourers arrived from Newcastle and the kitchen was active all the twenty-four hours. The ration now consisted of rice and *dal*. But there were hungry looks and the commissariat had its limitations. Gandhiji was the leader among the cooks and assumed the thankless task of serving the food. There was either too much water in the *dal* or the food was insufficiently cooked but the army gulped it down cheerfully. There was no indiscipline, no display of temper. The stream of labourers still continued by rail and road. Two women with grim courage reached the camp though their children died on the way. Gandhiji telegraphed to the Government that the marchers could be arrested at Charlestown itself before reaching the Transvaal border. There was no reply for a week. Fresh instructions were issued to the army. They were to trudge twenty to twenty-four miles a day for eight days till they reached Tolstoy Farm or were arrested on the way.

On November 6 at 6 a m. 2,037 men, 127 women and 57 children offered prayers and began the march "in the name of God." Mounted police were on duty at the border gate, a mile from Charlestown. Gandhiji went up to them instructing the army to cross over when he signalled. But while he was still talking to the policemen, the mass of cheering, shouting Indians, in their ragged clothes, made a rush and crossed into Volksrust, on the other side of the border. The police did not arrest them. In a few minutes there was order and the march into the Transvaal began. As the procession passed through the streets of Volksrust, the Europeans who had threatened violence gave no trouble. Eight miles more and in the evening the pilgrim band reached Palmford. They took their scanty rations and spread themselves in the air. Some talked, some sang *bhajans*. But some of the women, who had carried their children in their arms, were exhausted and had to be left behind as lodgers with an Indian shop-keeper. At dead of night Gandhiji was arrested. But the march continued in the morning and Gandhiji who was released on bail rejoined them. He was again arrested at Standerton but again released on bail. He rejoined the pilgrims before they had proceeded hardly three miles.

The programme was kept up to schedule. They were nearing Johannesburg and only four days' march was in front of them. Their spirits rose higher and higher and the Government was getting more and more anxious. On November 9, Polak, who had been sent for by Gokhale from India, joined the party at Teakworth. On the same day Gandhiji was arrested for the third time in four days and taken to Heidelberg. Polak assumed leadership of the army. At Greylingstad, while the night wind was howling and they lay about in the rain, they were informed that arrangements were complete for their arrest. Next morning they reached Balfour, thirteen miles away, in three hours and found three special trains drawn up. They were after all to be deported to Natal. But they were obstinate and asked for their thin, little, limping man and promised to board the train if he advised them. Polak tried persuasion and they finally agreed to board the train, about 2,000 humble heroes, without homes, without jobs and now without their leader. They had to suffer great

hardships on the way and later languish in jails. Their chief leaders were imprisoned, Gandhiji in Bloemfontein, Kallenbach in Pretoria and Polak in Germinston. There were spontaneous riots throughout Natal and protests from India. The pilgrims won in the end. The £3 tax was abolished. Truth gained a great victory.

There was to be a more fateful march about twenty years later in the ampler regions of India. But, since those anxious hours of vigil on the road to the Transvaal, life has been one long march to Gandhiji. Soul force came to have its own strategy and Phoenix Settlement and Tolstoy Farm, Sabarmati and Sevagram have been but resting places for the march of truth. On his final return from South Africa to India, Gandhiji started on a tour of the country in 1915, true to his promise to Gokhale. It was a tour of transfiguration, for himself and for the country. The tumultuous welcomes and magnificent receptions left him untouched. His aim was to acquire first-hand knowledge but the result was an education for the country. Before students in Calcutta in March he condemned assassinations at a time when secret societies and terrorism were in fashion. At the Madras Law Dinner in April, he proposed the toast of the British Empire and enunciated "the right to rebel" as the inalienable right of a British citizen. Again in Madras he declared that in tolerating foreign rule, India had never bargained for foreign culture. At Mayavaram he touched on social reform and *swadeshi*. The speeches of 1915 constitute a gospel which has not become stale after thirty years -the gospel of non-violence, anti-untouchability, *swadeshi*, and the right to rebel.

Gandhiji elaborated the theme in his 1916 tour with a true grace and economy of speech unknown so far to the country. At Madras he spoke on social service to the public, on *swadeshi* to missionaries, on his Satyagraha Ashram to students. On December 22, he made a remarkable speech on "Economic versus Moral Progress" at Allahabad. It was Bihar that was to know him first as a man of action. The Champaran campaign of 1917 was brief but brilliant. To the district magistrate's notice to quit, he replied he was unable to leave the district: "My desire is purely and singly for a general search for knowledge." 1919 was a busy year. In Gujarat he undertook with characteristic thoroughness to organize a monster petition in connection with the Congress-League scheme. Famine in Kaira district took him deep into the villages. At this time he was so busy that in a letter to *Indian Opinion* he wrote, "I have been irresistibly drawn into many activities... I hardly cope with them and local daily correspondence. Half of my time is passed in the Indian trains."

There was to be more travelling in trains and more trudging in the countryside. The agitation against the Rowlatt Bill took him on flying visits to Bombay, Allahabad, Madras, Tanjore and as far as Negapatam. The gatherings were large and the distances long but his energy was phenomenal. Outbreaks of violence found him in a penitent mood. "It is not Satyagraha," he emphasized again and again. There was a lull but it was short. The non-co-operation movement inaugurated by

Gandhiji in a letter to Lord Chelmsford on June 12, 1920, was perhaps the most stirring campaign in the strategy of Satyagraha. After his great moral victory at the Calcutta session of the Congress, he marched from triumph to triumph. The Congress and *Khilafat* organizations were at his command. The Ali brothers accompanied him. It was a tour of mass conversions to the new creed symbolised by the spinning wheel and the Gandhi cap. Remarkable scenes, to become common later, were witnessed for the first time. In a Bihar village when Gandhiji and his party were stranded in the rain, an old woman came seeking out Gandhiji. "Sire, I am now one hundred and four," she said, "and my sight has grown dim. I have visited the various holy places. In my own house I have dedicated two temples. Just as we have had Ram and Krishna as *avatars*, so also Mahatma Gandhi has appeared as an *avatar*, I hear. Until I have seen him death would not appear." This simple faith moved India's millions and the Mahatma, who was no longer a mere name but living flesh and blood, had to endure the tyranny of love. In Assam, he put it bluntly to a crowd of 25,000. Would they content themselves with merely hearing him speak and then quietly return to their homes? Or would they work for *swaraj*? Twenty-five thousand voices greeted him: "We can never allow you to leave us." If they were genuine, Gandhiji said, let them surrender their foreign cloth. A huge bonfire followed.

The long, triumphal tour was illuminated throughout with bonfires. The people were in a mood of self-surrender. They would wait from dawn to dusk for him. Villagers came from distant places and waited at wayside stations with torchlights for his *darshan* in the nights. So, from Aligarh to Dibrugarh and then as far as Tinnevelly he went from village to village, from town to town, sometimes speaking in temples and mosques. He could be seen huddled up in third-class compartments writing letters in the running train, or sleeping on the bare platform among motley crowds in the most unconcerned manner. The prostitutes of Barisal, the Marwari merchants of Calcutta, Oriya coolies, railway strikers, Santals eager to present khadi *chaddars*, all claimed his attention. There were local problems, the grazing tax in Andhra, the Moplah trouble in Malabar. Why had the Bengalis become pleasure-loving? Why were the Tamils, such good workers in South Africa, so slow in taking to khadi? These questions troubled him. It was on this tour that Gandhiji, in a moment of excruciating self-inquisition, took to loin-cloth. The country was thrilled, awed and hushed. Great events seemed imminent.

The trials and sufferings of 1922-24 could not quench Gandhiji's spirit. To the Belgaum Congress in December 1924, he re-asserted his faith: "Satyagraha is search for Truth and God is Truth. *Ahimsa* is the light that reveals the Truth to me. *Swaraj* is part of that Truth... Go through your districts, spread the message of khadi and Hindu-Muslim unity and take up in hand the youngsters of the country and make them real soldiers of *swaraj*." Soon after this he undertook a tour of preparation in 1925. There was still orthodoxy in the Kathiawad villages and he went there for the third time. The untouchables flocked to him with complaints and found

great comfort. But he had his own complaint against them. "Give up carrion and spin," he remonstrated to them. At Mangrol he insisted on the orthodox people leaving rather than allow Harijans to sit in a separate corner to hear him. With little parables and stories and rebukes Gandhiji effected a transformation till Dhed musicians sang in a Jain gentleman's household and even Brahmin priests held meetings of Harijans.

In May and June, Gandhiji visited Bengal villages and found it a satisfying sight. Comilla set up a new standard for public addresses: "Two per cent wear khadi; six per cent wear mill-khadi; 20 per cent half-khadi and half mill-khadi; two per cent spin regularly..." and so it went on and Gandhiji was delighted with this marshalling of facts. Fiery and passionate words flowed from him in those days of fulfilment. "Understand that the slavery of India is coarser than the coarsest khadi," he told the citizens of Chittagong, "that the pauperism of India is infinitely coarser than the coarsest Chittagong khadi." In Bogra district, he found to his delight seven-year old girls and 80-year old women belonging to the Muslim community pulling away yarn at the rate of 500 yards without knowing who Mahatma Gandhi was. There were also moments of merciful chastisement. He went to Travancore and Cochin and chastised the people for untouchability and the drink evil. He went to U.P. and chastised the people for Sanskritised Hindi and Persianised Urdu. At Santiniketan Borodada, elder brother of Rabindranath Tagore, summed up the effect of the tour to Gandhiji, "All those that oppose you will disappear like the bubbles of time. Truth will conquer!"

Four years of preparation and by 1929 there was a new spirit in the country and Mahatma Gandhi dropped ominous hints of a struggle: "A man who is made for freedom has got to take tremendous risks and stake everything." There was a tempo of disaffection everywhere and men were tired of merely talking in councils. On March 2, 1930, Gandhiji sent his 11-point ultimatum to the Viceroy through Reginald Reynolds: "If you cannot see your way to deal with these evils and my letter makes no appeal to your heart, on the eleventh day of this month I shall proceed with such co-workers of the *ashram* as I can take to disregard the provisions of the Salt Laws." The Viceroy's reply was curt, brief and wooden. "On bended knees I asked for bread and received a stone instead," wrote Gandhiji. On March 11, on the banks of the Sabarmati, he gave his "last message and testament": "Our case is strong, our means the purest and God is with us. There is no defeat for the Satyagrahis till they give up the truth. I pray for the success of the battle which begins tomorrow."

Truth was once again on the march and Dandi became known to the whole world. It was not a heterogeneous, unprepared and baffled crowd like the marchers of Newcastle whom Gandhiji led this time. He took care in the selection of Satyagrahis. There was no little difficulty. Many were clamouring but few could be chosen. Women were eager to join but Gandhiji gave a reason for his refusal which appealed to them: "I must be considerate to the opponent. If we put women in

front, the Government may hesitate to inflict on us all the penalty that they might otherwise inflict. A delicate sense of chivalry is what decides me against including the women in the first batch." Miraben and Reginald Reynolds, the aged Imam Saheb and Mahadev Desai were to be left behind for "greater and far more sacred tasks"—to conduct the activities of the *ashram*. In *Young India* of March 12, a list of 79 Satyagrahis, all practically from the *ashram*, ranging from Gandhiji aged 61 to boys of 16 appeared. They included khadi students, graduates of the Gujarat Vidyapith, untouchable weavers, a former postman from Burma, a dairy expert, a dyeing teacher, an editor, a Sanskrit scholar in charge of the *ashram* tannery.

Day after day Mahatma Gandhi explained his programme, answered questions, preached his message at morning prayers. There was no limit to the number of visitors to the *ashram* and press reporters broke the sanctity of prayer grounds. There was a cryptic letter from the Revolutionary Party to "Comrade Gandhi," giving him three years' time to try his non-violence. A German doctor sent a beautiful drawing executed by himself along with the letter that in "far-off Germany, a humble fellow pilgrim is praying for him and his work every morning and evening." "God guard you," said a New York message from John Haynes Holmes. Persistent rumours were afloat of Gandhiji's impending arrest and deportation. On March 11, the crowd swelled to about ten thousand when the evening prayers were held.

On the morning of March 12 at six, with the whole world watching on, Gandhiji started with his 79 Satyagrahis on the historic march to Dandi A huge crowd followed. For miles and miles, roads were watered and bestrewn with green leaves, and flags and festoons gave the appearance of a festival to the march of law-breakers. At the head of the procession Gandhiji set a fast pace with his staff in hand. "Like the historic march of Ramachandra to Lanka the march of Dandi would be memorable," exclaimed Motilal Nehru in a message. "Like the exodus of Israelites under Moses," said P. C. Ray. The Satyagrahi band had a fatiguing journey through the heat and dust of the Kheda villages. At Aslali, Gandhiji declared that he would not return to the *ashram* until he got the salt tax repealed.

The enthusiasm of the crowds was so great that even four days after the commencement of the march, Mahadev Desai had difficulty in seeing Gandhiji at Nadiad. It was six in the evening and thousands were thronging the wide space outside the famous temple of Santram. Gandhiji was being gently massaged in an attic while he spoke to the workers: "I see that you have miscalculated the distances between places. I had no intention of covering more than ten or twelve miles at the outset but we have been doing fifteen miles daily." He decided to have a day of rest every week on Monday. Two or three members of the party had felt the effects of fatigue and had to use a bullock cart "God willing, I hope to do the whole march on foot," said Gandhiji "My feeling is like that of the pilgrim to Amarnath or Badrinarayan ... for me this is nothing less than a holy pilgrimage." After further discussion the programme was altered. Gandhiji's energy at this time was amazing. At four in the morning he was seen writing letters by the moonlight as


DANDI

the little lamp had gone out for want of oil and he would not wake up anybody.

On March 29, at Bhatgam, in the Surat district, he made what he called an "introspective" speech. The local workers had ordered milk from Surat to be brought in a motor lorry, had provided for a labourer to carry a kitson burner on a stool for the night journey and incurred other expenses. He rebuked them severely: "In the light of other discoveries, what right have I to criticise the Viceroy's salary? This is not a battle to be conducted with money." The march continued and the message came in clearer and firmer tones. In an eloquent note in *Young India*, Jawaharlal Nehru, Congress President, wrote, "Today the pilgrim marches onward on his long trek. Staff in hand he goes along the dusty roads of Gujarat, clear-eyed and firm of step..." Eighteen members of the party had to take two days' rest at the Broach Sevashram. There was a mild case of small-pox. One of them had fever for a short time. But the rest of the company were fit and marching daily. Dandi was reached on April 5. The 200-mile march came to an end.

Next day Gandhiji took his volunteers to the sea after prayers, broke the salt law and called on the whole country to break it. Then followed an amazing campaign for which there is no adequate parallel even in the long and picturesque history of Gandhian Satyagraha. Day after day, he went to the surrounding villages and delivered the message of disobedience. Meanwhile he was sending his weekly dispatches to *Young India*, brief descriptions of the march, editorial comments of varying length and detailed instructions to workers: "Let me distinguish between the call of 1920 and the present call. The call of 1920 was a call for preparation, today it is a call for engaging in the final conflict." The "war news" poured in. Government repression was intense, brutal. Gandhiji wrote an article under the heading "Goonda Raj": "Even Dyerism pales into insignificance. The duty before the people is clear. They must answer this organized hooliganism with great suffering." Civil disobedience everywhere was answered with firing and *lathi* charges. Gandhiji's own reaction was to make a more definite breach of the salt law at Dharasna. A notice to the Viceroy was prepared. It was to be a gruelling battle, the climax of the campaign.

But on May 4, Gandhiji was arrested in a strange manner. At 12-45 a.m. the district magistrate of Surat, two Indian police officers armed with pistols and some 30 policemen armed with rifles silently and suddenly came into the peaceful little compound where Gandhiji and the Satyagrahis were sleeping. They surrounded the party. The British officer went up to Gandhiji's bed, turned a torchlight on him and said, "Are you Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi?" "You want me?" enquired Gandhiji gently and added, "Please give me time for ablutions." There was no objection. While Gandhiji cleaned his teeth, the officers, time-piece in hand, stood watching him. As the volunteers gathered round Gandhiji the police made a cordon. Soon the cordon was relaxed and the volunteers had access to their leader. "Mr. District Magistrate, may I know the charge under which I am arrested? Is it under Section 124?" asked Gandhiji, remembering, perhaps, the "great trial" of 1922

under that "prince of sections." "No, not under section 124. I have got a written order," replied the magistrate. "Would you mind reading it to me," asked Gandhiji. The magistrate read it out. The arrest was under Regulation XXV of 1827. It was now nearing 1 a m. Gandhiji packed up his few necessities and handed over papers to a volunteer. "Please give me a few minutes more for prayer," he asked. This was granted. He asked one of the Satyagrahis to recite his favourite hymn with which they had begun their march. Gandhiji stood up, his eyes closed, his head bent, while the hymn was sung. All of the party then bowed before him one by one and bade an affectionate farewell. A police constable took charge of his two khadi satchels and a small bundle of clothes At ten past one they put him in the lorry and soon he was out of sight. "At dead of night, like thieves they came to steal him away," observed Miraben.

It is difficult to say whether Truth won in that terrific campaign of 1930 or received a setback because the Government broke the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. But by 1933 Gandhiji was on the march again. Men's spirits were weary and the background was different. "*Do rupiye ek bar, theen rupiye, panch rupiye,*" drawled on the thin little man with a smile on his face this time. The scene was to become familiar soon throughout the country. On November 7, 1933, he started from Wardha on a strenuous tour for uplift of Harijans, seventy million people, depressed and lowly and downtrodden for whom he had suffered and fasted and won triumphs. He had no rest from work and no respite from crowds and could often snatch sleep only while travelling in car.

Barrister, Sandal-maker, Satyagrahi General, he was now an indefatigable auctioneer. Welcome addresses, caskets, even garlands were auctioned on the spot. Harijans were his first love and he must collect money for them. Even Europeans would bid, Sanatanists would come to argue with him and go away converted, children rose to the heights of renunciation and would freely give away their ornaments. But the auctioneer would insist on getting yet more everywhere and there are many accounts of those little epics of persuasion. A little girl put flowers in his hand. He asked, "Why don't you present your ring to the Harijan fund?" "Yes, I give it now," she said. "No, please don't. Your mother or father will question you, if you give it away," he said. "No, Sir, never mind, you keep the ring." She hung her head, pulled a long face, she pleaded. "Give it then," he said and it was given. He took a citizens' casket at one place and started: "Its price is Rs. 250." "Its price is Rs. 75," he corrected himself. "Rs. 300," offered somebody. "I have got Rs. 1,000 for caskets," said the great auctioneer. "Rs. 300, once, Rs. 300 twice. I expect more. Come along." The bid went up. "Where are the purses?" he insisted when a district board address was presented. The same good humour and impishness prevailed everywhere. Meeting an Ayurvedic doctor, he asked, "Is there a cure for untouchability?" But a palmist had short shrift. He was asked to pay Rs. 1,000. "I am a Harijan worker, my time is precious," said Gandhiji.

"Give me a quarter anna, half an anna, anything you can", was the refrain

throughout in C.P., in Berar, in Delhi, in the remote south. "Andhras are no Scotsmen," he said and Andhras loosened their fists. One man offered to pay down Rs. 116 for every minute of Gandhiji's stay in his house. Gandhiji would often attend to little details of life. He lifted up the chin of a Harijan child and said, "Blow your nose clean." He made stirring speeches in Kerala where Harijans had yet to win their victories. At Trivandrum he found time to correct the accounts of the Harijan Hostel. The crowds were as large as when he went on his political campaigns, not to collect money and to rebuke people for their sins but to ask them to defy the laws which they hated. At the beach meeting in Madras there was a crowd of 100,000. The four months' tour was cut short reluctantly because there was a more insistent call from Bihar. "How much have you collected?" asked inquisitive Americans towards the close of the tour. "Three lakhs and fifty thousand," he said. "How do you propose to spend it?" "In constructive work, not for propaganda," he answered.

Bihar, where the great earthquake of 1934 had swallowed up thousands and done immense damage, claimed his attention next. It was not a tour of mere sympathy or help, it was a tour of education. Addressing women in *purdah* at a place he said, "Has this calamity taught you nothing? Why this foolishness (*purdah*)?" The collections went on, women again rose to the occasion and surrendered their jewellery. He exhorted people again and again: "To give money for bad work or no work at all is to make beggars. We do not want to turn India into a land of beggars. And you must put away untouchability from your hearts and lives." "Work, work! Do not beg, but work! All for work," he would say.

In all his moments of triumph and of agony, Gandhiji has preached the same gospel. In 1937 after the temple-entry proclamation he went on a pilgrimage of peace to Travancore and even the Nambudris opened temples to Harijans. But he wanted more. He has always wanted more. He alone knows how to ask of his people or when to chastise them or when to call them for greater efforts. His nearness to the people of all provinces has been unique. He has found much to bemoan but he has also found much to inspire him. He found a handloom in every Assamese home and was delighted with a people whom he had by mistake once classed with the Bhils and Pindaris. In Eastern Bengal he found great work amidst great poverty. The beauty of the landscape of Travancore, the simplicity of the people of Malabar in spite of their social sins, have been an inspiration to him. Among the brave Pathans he has found friends. And while he has moved among the people, they in their turn have come to understand the transfiguration of a mere man into a Mahatma.

In the many moving stories told by Mahadev Desai with inimitable charm we see the closeness of the parallel to the preaching of Christ's gospel. But Gandhiji has never encouraged belief in miracles except the miracle of faith and work. When a Namasudra told him that he had been cured of paralysis by uttering Gandhiji's name, he was severely rebuked. "It was God that cured you, not I," said Gandhiji.

Often he has broken into a cry of agony: "When I hear shouts of 'Victory to Mahatma Gandhi' every sound of the phrase pierces my heart like an arrow. If only I thought for the moment that the shouts could win *swaraj*, I could reconcile myself to my misery. When I find that people's time and energy was spent in mere useless shouting, while at the same time real work is given the go-by, how I wish that they should instead of shouting my name, prepare and light up a funeral pyre for me and that I might leap into it and once for all extinguish the fire that is scorching my heart." No acclamations, no caskets, no canonisation, no monuments for him but the creation of a moving faith in the hearts of men. That has been the unsparing gospel for thirty years since those early troubled days in October 1913 in Newcastle.

AT SEVAGRAM

By Mahadev Desai

I AM not giving away any secrets when I begin this article with an anecdote connected with Gandhiji's last meeting with the Viceroy. When both the Viceroy and Gandhiji realised that there was, for the time being, no meeting ground between them, the Viceroy wondered if they should meet again. But if there was going to be no fresh approach, where was the good of each wasting the other's time? But would not the public be shocked at such an abrupt ending to the "negotiations"?

The Viceroy said he agreed that it would be a manly course to let the public know the naked reality rather than allow them to beguile themselves with false hopes. "Then when will you leave for Segaon?" H. E. wondered.

"This evening, if I can. Of course, I am at your disposal as long as you should need me. I can easily stay until the 13th," said Gandhiji. "But if there is no need I should like to rush back to Segaon at once. My heart is there. I have left a number of patients there. They are among the most valued of my co-workers, and I am happiest when with them."

Those who have not come in close touch with Gandhiji might well exclaim: "What a queer thing this! No public man in the world has yet been known to talk in this fashion."

Quite right. But that is at once his strength and weakness. Nursing those who are ailing mentally and physically has been a passion with him throughout his life. But for his fundamental objection to vivisection, he might have been a physician and a surgeon.

But though he chose law as his profession and then public life claimed the bulk of his time, the passion has remained and developed from what it once was- a hobby—to a sort of spiritual need.

In one of his most intimate articles recently written in Gujarati, he wrote: "I needed the solitude of Sevagram. It has been my experience that I can draw my inspiration only from my natural setting—the surroundings in which I live. Since the discovery of Satyagraha I have been fixing up my abode in what are called *ashrams* and pursuing my *sadhana* there. But Sevagram I have hesitated to call by the name of *ashram*. I had originally thought of living and working there in solitude.

"But in spite of myself the place has developed into an *ashram* without any rules and regulations. It is growing and new huts are springing up. Today it has become a hospital. In jest I have called it a 'Home for the Invalids.' I am physically and even mentally an invalid and I have collected about myself a crowd of invalids.

"I have even likened it to a lunatic asylum—by no means an inappropriate comparison. Surely *swaraj* through the spinning wheel can be the proposition only of a lunatic. But luckily lunatics are unaware of their lunacy. And so I regard myself as sane."

Well, it is these ailing and the infirm and the so-called lunatics that give him his inspiration. When we are away from headquarters the letters to be placed on the top of the day's post must be from these. His most concentrated work, his most important talk or interview, may be interrupted by anyone seeking his advice about the diet, bath and treatment of these patients

Curiously enough, everyone knows his weakness in the matter, and so only with one or two rare exceptions has the Working Committee met outside Wardha. The formal meetings have been held in Wardha but the informal and more important ones have been held in the little mud hut where Gandhiji dwells, the smallest and yet the neatest little tenement in the colony.

It is there that men like Lord Lothian and Sir Stafford Cripps have had talks with him. There is no furniture but the Sevagram-made palm-leaf mats spread on the floor, a stool being sometimes provided for those who cannot manage to sit cross-legged.

Though the absence of furniture leaves enough floor-space, we are sometimes hard put to it when there are deputations of ten to fifteen people wanting to interview him. The walls are decorated with palm trees in clay relief done by Miraben, for whom the hut was originally made, but whose gipsy blood will not allow her to stay in one hut for any length of time.

A palace he could have, did he but wish it; a summer villa midst the pine-clad hills; but all he wants is just a simple mud hut and leisure for the cure of others' ills. The luxury of Ind could well surround him, the pomp and panoply of great display; but he prefers the spinning wheel and children. The simple life is Gandhiji's chosen way. At first at Sevagram he sought seclusion, but round his hut his *ashram* grew apace. For how can he seclude himself who's known to and sought by men of almost every race?

There are two classes of people, says Karel Capek; one class loves to collect odds and ends until their abode is littered with them, the other class will have as few things for themselves as they possibly can. Gandhiji combines in himself both the types having the fewest possible needs and yet collecting all kinds of odds and ends.

Even like his memory, which retains the essentials and rejects the unessentials, his odds and ends, which you find collected in the hut, have their uses for him, and

the moment he needs a nail or a pin or some card-board or an envelope made by the hand from waste-paper, his finger unerringly falls on the proper place.

But to turn to the mud hut, whatever the number of visitors and whatever the time, the little hut remains the scene of Gandhiji's various activities from morning until night. At 11 o'clock everyday it is turned into a dining-room, for Gandhiji's instructions regarding the diet of the patients are final, in spite of their general treatment being in charge of Dr. Sushila Nayyar.

So the patients—among whom have been distinguished people like Jairamdas Doulatram, member of the Working Committee—have their meals served before Gandhiji, who looks into every little detail.

Within an hour after this the hut becomes office with the day's post and newspapers, and after he has heard the main items or cast his eye over the post, it becomes his siesta-room, the time being utilized by his many helpers too for the same purpose.

Then writing or the giving of interviews begins, sometimes these taking place as he is lying on his back with a mud poultice on his abdomen. This is part of his permanent treatment for blood pressure—not prescribed by any doctors but by himself.

In the hot season a mud-bandage on the head is an additional item, and to wondering visitors he often delights in describing the wonderful properties of mother earth: "That is why, instead of treading upon it, I have it on my head and on my abdomen."

Then comes spinning, almost always being accompanied by the giving of interviews. But sometimes one finds him engrossed in examining the details of the latest model of *charkha* and making suggestions to the designer.

Perhaps very few people know that it was Gandhiji who, by numerous experiments in Yeravda Prison, perfected the portable spinning wheel which was originally designed by a Surat friend called Vimawala. It is therefore that the perfected wheel goes by the name of "Yeravda Charkha," even as the pact that was sealed with a fast in the same prison goes by the name of the Yeravda Pact.

But I have digressed. At five o'clock goes the bell for the final meal of the day and the patients foregather in the hut, which has again become the dining-room. Babu Rajendra Prasad who with his inseparable companion asthma is always a patient, often turns up with tough questions on the day's business and stays to have his meal with the patients.

The dinner over, the hut is deserted by the many occupants who go out for their evening constitutional. And after evening prayers the hut is converted, along with a little verandah attached to it, into a bed-room.

The morning and the evening constitutionals are as much part of Gandhiji's regular routine as the prayers. Plenty of business is transacted during these walks—details about the kitchen, or the crops, or the latest born calf in the dairy being dis-

cussed with those in charge of them Many of the workers in Wardha, in charge of the tannery or the Village Industries Association, do not ask for separate time for themselves but simply walk out with Gandhiji to finish their business.

Often enough interviews of a serious nature do take place on these walks, but when there is no such interviewer, the day's fatigue is lightened by Gandhiji chatting away and amusing himself with the tiny tots who accompany him. These little grandchildren are responsible for some of the most hilarious moments that Gandhiji has during the day.

"Bapuji," asks the little grandson, "you are going to Delhi?"

"Yes."

"Why?"

"To see the Viceroy."

"But you always go to see the Viceroy. Why does not the Viceroy come to see you?" And everyone has a hearty laugh.

Another grandson who is just 16 months old tugs at his stick every now and then, and laughs and makes everyone laugh when he gets no response from Gandhiji (who is silent) to his repeated "Bapuji," "Bapuji."

But I must say that these moments have become too few with ever-increasing work. Press people seeking interviews at all hours of the day and the night run up from Nagpur with the latest statement of Lord Zetland or the latest pronouncement of Lord Linlithgow, asking for Gandhiji's reaction. These are read out to him on the walk and the statement dictated on return or written out at odd moments during the day.

As a matter of curiosity, I may mention here that the statement on Lord Zetland's latest interview on the Indian situation was written while Gandhiji was having a massage and a shave. The hand-writing, none too legible normally, becomes during the triple operation the despair not only of the poor typist but sometimes even of Gandhiji himself.

Is it possible to do any work under these conditions, one wonders. It is not only possible but it is being done. What makes it possible is Gandhiji's extraordinary capacity for concentration or his mental poise. Can a man, interesting himself equally in his patients and his cows, the latest complaint from a disgruntled inmate of the *ashram* and the latest pronouncement from Simla or London, do justice to any of these?

But even a carping critic would certify that Gandhiji does justice to all these and a multitude more of items, grave or gay, important or unimportant. For nothing that he has to deal with is too trivial for him.

Everything that comes whether from the highest or from the lowliest, from the wisest or from the most unsophisticated, has for him the same sacredness that is due to it from one who above everything else calls himself a votary of truth. For truth often lies hidden in untruth, even as God lies hidden even in things evil.

It is this philosophy of life that lends purpose and reality to everything that he takes up or deals with, and it is his infinite faith in God that gives him the patience of Job and his unfailing good humour. That is why he can suffer fools gladly, whilst leaders of men like Pandit Motilal or Das could not, and Jawaharlal or the Sardar cannot.

One of us went to him on Independence Day and presented him with a number of conundrums of the pledge. "What should you advise me to do? And why should you have framed a pledge capable of so many interpretations?"

"Don't you know," replied Gandhiji with a smile, "*the Vedas* are capable of innumerable interpretations? Our pledge is like the *Vedas*. If you have the intelligence and the courage to interpret it take the pledge; if not, don't take it."

One of the things that he invariably reads and often the only thing he has time for—in *The Times of India*—is the "Thought for the Day" on top of the leading article. There was one some time ago that he consciously practised throughout his life, inasmuch as it is an aspect of non-violence, and it now adorns one of the walls facing his seat. "When you are in the right, you can afford to keep your temper," reads the text, "and when you are in the wrong, you cannot afford to lose it."

Objectively he would read the motto with a slight alteration: "When your opponent is in the wrong, you can afford to keep your temper, and when your opponent is in the right you cannot afford to lose it."

That is why an irritating statement by a high dignitary or a grotesque speech by a public man fails to irritate or ruffle him. Tulsidas' *Ramayan* is an eternal source of inspiration for him and occupies the same place in his prayers as the *Bhagavad Gita*.

A text that is often on his lips may well be said to be his motto, a free translation of which is: "All things—with or without life—the Lord has created with their good and bad points. The good, like the discerning swan, separate the good milk and reject the adulterated water."

"There is a soul of good in things evil if men observingly distil it out," said Shakespeare. But what Tulsidas has said has a charm of its own.

I shall permit myself to cite a few more anecdotes in this connection.

"The papers say," said Sardar Vallabhbhai one day to him, "that Lord Linlithgow sent an advance copy of his speech to you. Was it for suggestions or alterations?"

"It is a delicious lie which needs no suggestions or alterations, but a summary rejection."

"But," said the Sardar, laughing, "you have a knack of pleasing all gods. In the very article where you have a good word to say for the Viceroy's speech, you have something nice to say for Jaiprakash and the socialists too!"

"Oh, yes," says Gandhiji joining the laughter, "that was what my mother taught

me. She would ask me to go to the *Haveli*, and also to the Shiva Temple, and you may be interested to hear that when we married we were taken to worship not only to all the Hindu shrines but to a fakir's shrine as well!"

An American press correspondent came one afternoon to interview him. Just as he was about to be called in, someone came running through the fields to inform him that Aryanayakam's little boy was passing away. Half an hour ago the bright little boy was playing about with other youngsters and we could not believe this news.

Gandhiji rushed across the fields and sat consoling the mother whilst the boy was in a swoon, from which he was never to recover. He, however, remembered to ask me to request the American visitor to wait until he could return. The boy, as we found the next day, had swallowed a bottleful of sugarcoated quinine pills mistaking them for sweets and poisoned himself.

Everyone was in a state of great agitation, but as soon as Gandhiji found that all was over he returned and called the American interviewer in. He had no particular question to ask but asked generally about the world situation.

"I am like a frog in the well," immediately came the reply, "and the whole of the universe for me is contained in India and in Sevagram. I do not study world affairs as some of my colleagues do."

Next question: "Will there be any news during the next six months?"

"There won't be any fireworks," said Gandhiji, instinctively reading the American friend's meaning behind the question. "The pressure we may have to put will be the gentlest. What we do non-violently in India can't produce one-tenth so much sensation as the violent doings in the west can. And you must not forget that for us the *charkha* is the only instrument of war."

"But won't there be any trouble?" asked the friend, almost regretting that the prospect would be too dull for the press people at any rate without it.

"Well," said Gandhiji, "if the British officials want trouble they could always get it. That is to say, if they goad us there may be trouble. But I do not think they want it. And I at any rate am not aching for a fight."

"And now, sir, how is your health?"

Promptly came the answer: "Middling like this pencil!" and he held out his pencil to show the word "Middling" printed on it!

The interviewer saw that Gandhiji could laugh and make him laugh whilst the sudden passing away of the boy had filled the atmosphere with gloom.

But often enough he shuts himself up in the shell of his silence to escape not only these visitors but the disturbing factors about him. That is his most reliable form of escape from the things that jar and worry and annoy. And often during these days of travail he has observed perpetual silence, breaking it only for the patients or for pressing interviews.

It is not only a never-failing way of escape, it is an unfailing source of inspiration. "I feel life more in tune with the infinite when I am silent, though I agree that we should always be in tune with it, whether we are silent or speaking, whether we are in the solitude or in a bustling crowd," he said once to a friend who wanted to know the secret of silence.

"I started it originally in order to have a silent day of undisturbed work. When I want to do concentrated work, I do often take silence even when it is not a Monday. But though I began it for material ends, it has become a great spiritual aid, and during my moments of uninterrupted silence for days, I feel the presence of God more and more."

As I have already indicated, Sevagram was originally intended to be a solitary home. Gandhiji did not want anyone to accompany him, not even Kasturba. When Dr. John Mott interviewed him in 1937, he did so in the only hut then on the premises, and that one-room hut was occupied by five or six people who had gathered there for village work. But workers from far and near began to gravitate here and he had not the heart to say "No."

He had no idea of having a dispensary on the premises. He himself in the early days used to prescribe fasting or semi-fasting, and castor oil, sodium bicarbonate, quinine and iodine were the only drugs he used for those who came with their troubles.

But the number began to grow larger every day and with the coming of a doctor we had a little bit of a dispensary. Thanks to Sushila Nayyar, whilst cholera was raging in the surrounding villages, Sevagram escaped with only three deaths. Dr. Sushila gave some 400 injections and treated several cases successfully.

In spite of our emphasis on prevention, there is no escaping the great fact that one discovers almost immediately one gets in touch with villagers that there is a woeful lack of medical aid in these villages. Though the bulk of the cases are malaria, there are every now and then emergency cases which need immediate attention, and none is available.

However much we may idealise the villages, there is as much moral rot in the villages as in towns. The difference is that many townspeople get treatment; in villages the disease is not even diagnosed.

A woman came the other day walking several miles from another village. She had been having fever for several days and it looked like enteric. A place was improvised for her and she began to receive treatment. It was soon discovered that she had a fell sexual disease besides, and she did not know it. The wretched husband, who is a factory hand in the town, had given it to her. She received careful treatment and was discharged cured.

A boy who had peritonitis would have died had not Dr. Sushila rushed him immediately to the Civil Hospital in Wardha and had him operated on. And that is how we have now a fair-sized dispensary, and we may soon have to have a hospital.

With the introduction of the Wardha Scheme of Education the Aryanayakams who were in Wardha were attracted to Sevagram and started the experiment in its proper environment. With the growing population and the milk-needs of the patients came into being the dairy, with someone to take charge of it.

All the milk, butter and other milk products needed for the colony are produced on the premises, and so too the vegetables and part of the cereals. That necessarily means a herd of cattle, not to mention the goats.

So it is the *sanyasi's* story over again. The *sanyasi* had a cat, a cow was needed to give it milk, then someone to take care of the cow, and so on. And I have little doubt that even if Gandhiji were to retire to the Himalayas, the *sanyasi's* story would be repeated there in all its vivid detail.

But how did the "menagerie", the name which Sardar Vallabhbhai often gives to the *ashram*, come into being? In a word, I can say that it sprung out of Gandhiji's loyalty to his co-workers and his weakness for birds of the same feather. However radical he may be he is conservative in his tastes and attachment to friends and co-workers. Old co-workers gravitate towards him and he gravitates towards them!

At the head of the queer crowd is Bhansali, as unlike the rest as anything could be. Once a professor in the Gujarat Vidyapith, and then a jail-bird, he ultimately turned recluse, went to the length of fasting for weeks, and ultimately betook himself to the forest, where he wandered for years without a shred of cloth on him. He took a vow of silence for several years, sewed up his lips with a copper ring, and lived on raw wheat flour and *neem* leaves.

Once during his wanderings he stumbled upon Gandhiji and stayed. Gandhiji gently nursed him back to ordinary life, and the man who questioned the necessity for work, and hated it as a kind of bondage, now puts in about seventeen hours of it every day. He cards his cotton, spins for eight to ten hours and teaches for seven hours. He not only speaks now—but fills the *ashram* and its neighbourhood with roars of laughter. He is now civilized to the extent of wrapping a piece of cloth round his waist, but has no weakness for the belongings to which ordinary human beings are slaves.

In a place infested with scorpions and poisonous snakes he moves about without a lantern and without shoes, believing that these creatures of God are no less his brothers than the human beings among whom he lives. He often harks back to his life of fiery penance and comes in with a request to Gandhiji for permission to hang down a well head-over-heels! But, thank God, he accepts Gandhiji's discipline.

There is among us a Japanese *sadhu* (monk) who works like a horse and lives like a hermit, doing all the hard chores of the *ashram* and going about merrily beating his drum early every morning and evening, filling the air with his chanting of *Om Namyo Hom Renge Kyom.* He is, of course, pro-Japanese and believes that Japan is out to serve and civilize China. But I do not believe there is an iota of

truth in the charge some people have levelled at him of being a Government spy. If he is a spy, spies must be most amiable specimens of humanity and I should like to be one. To my mind he lives up to the gospel of *ahimsa* better than any one of us not excluding Gandhiji.

Among the patients there is a leper. He was a political jail-bird with us in Yeravda and got leprosy there, or had it diagnosed there, I forget which. He is a profound Sanskrit scholar and talks with you in Sanskrit, making you feel as though it was as easy as your mother tongue. After having wandered for years as a castaway, having even gone on an indefinite fast out of loathing for the fell disease which is now in a considerably advanced stage, he rolled in here one fine morning, saying he wanted to lay his bones here, that he knew he would have shelter here and would not go even if he was turned out.

"How can I say 'no' to you?" said Gandhiji. "If I harbour a son-in-law suffering from tuberculosis, why should I not harbour you? There is Ba to look after him. Of Valji Desai everyone is fond and I am sure he would be taken care of. But who will look after you if I don't? I shall build you a hut right near my hut, and you make the place your abode. Even if no one remains here you at least shall stay.

An addition to this mosaic, Maurice Frydman, a mechanical genius whose restless spirit has now brought him here. He belongs to the nation which is reduced to ashes by Germany and has in him the fire that is hidden under the cinders.

He might have made a pile in Mysore as an engineer, but he came under the influence of Ramana Maharshi, became a *sanyasi*—Bharatanand is his new name—worked in Aundh, and has now come here. His inventive genius is ever active and why should it not be? President Mosciki of Poland had scores of inventions to his credit, and so many has Bharatanand —in a way more unique than others, for he swears by the gospel of a handicraft civilization based on non-violence.

There are many others whom I would fain mention, but these specimens should suffice. There is always a floating population, and like Gandhiji's own hut Kasturba's hut too has the elasticity of accommodating as many as may be necessary. Women guests she has to take in, but sometimes she has inconvenient guests too.

When those "Satyagrahis" from the Scheduled Class came in order to fast against some fancied grievance of their community, Gandhiji placed the whole *ashram* at their disposal and thus stole their thunder.

"You select the place where you will stay. I will vacate this hut for you if you like," he said to them. And they selected part of Kasturba's hut and her verandah.

"But where shall I stay?" she asked smiling.

"Well, you do not need much room, and you know that I offered them my room?"

"You did that because they are your children," she said.

"But are they not equally yours?" said Gandhiji, and she capitulated. She sleeps and spins and rests in that little hut often with as many as half a dozen guests.

"Quite a motley crowd that," some one will exclaim. They have not only their idiosyncrasies, but their angularities and weaknesses too. But their love for Gandhiji and his work is a common bond that binds them. And with a will and a cheer they cook their own food, wash their own clothes, clean their own latrines, and so on.

In their midst Gandhiji lives and works, beginning his day at three o'clock in the morning, never missing his prayers or spinning, more regular than anyone else, and turning out more work than most public men I know—though he describes himself as physically and mentally an invalid.

With its mud and bamboo houses built without much of a plan, without any guest house and without anything like the art that lends charm to many another institution, the Sevagram Ashram still attracts the attention of numerous visitors and even workers.

There must be something indefinitely attractive not only about Gandhiji but about the crowd itself! Or else why should one like Rajkumari Amrit Kaur choose to cast in her lot with it? And why should I madly scribble such a lot about it?

But what about the work for which Gandhiji made the irrevocable decision to come and settle down in a village which was chosen because it was most difficult to tackle? Has he been able to do it justice? Is the village changed for the better after three-and-a-half years of Gandhiji's stay?

I confess the answer cannot be given in a resounding affirmative. All we have been able to do is to give a fair number of people employment on a meagre wage, we have given a fairly bad blow to untouchability, we have introduced a few spinning wheels in the village and interested the children in our work and the Basic system of education, and we have given medical aid to many of them.

But there is a hiatus between the villagers and us. There is yet no living link between us. We have our morning and evening prayers, but they touch not these simple folks.

May be we have, with the best wishes in the world, not succeeded in coming down to their level and becoming one with them. Like Basic Education the passion to revive the village has come rather late in Gandhiji's life, when he has pre-occupations which leave him no time and energy to tackle the life problem of the village as he would like to do.

And not the least handicap is the gathering about him of people like the present writer, each good in his or her own way but not fit to bear or even to share the burdens he has taken upon himself.

Our consolation is that there are hundreds of others in the country who are fitter instruments, and whether the work in Sevagram goes on or not, elsewhere it will go on.

Besides, the Sevagram Ashram is but an experiment in truth and non-violence. He has collected so many men and women of vastly dissimilar temperaments, some

with little literary education, some having nothing more than that education, and also of different creeds. It gives him enough exercise in the practice of *ahimsa* in the domestic field, and its successful practice would mean its automatic extension to the political field.

That is why he always longs to get back to his laboratory in order to be free for more self-examination and more experimentation. That difficult instruments make his immediate task more difficult is true, but it is also true that they make him all the fitter for the larger task.

1940

REMINISCENCES

By G. A. Natesan

MY acquaintance with Gandhiji dates almost from the beginning of the Indian struggle in the Transvaal under his lead, now over four decades ago. I came to know him personally only after his return to this country from South Africa in 1915. As Secretary of the Indian South African League in Madras, it was my privilege to be in frequent correspondence with him. Gandhiji was carrying on with the help of his compatriots a tremendous campaign of passive resistance to laws which were enforced with all the rigour and vigilance of the Boer Executive. In this great task, his countrymen in the colony almost to a man gathered round him, inspired by faith in the justice of the cause. They followed him with implicit trust in his leadership.

What a leader and what a following! The thin, emaciated, little pigmy of a man marching at the head of a great procession of Indians of all communities and diverse occupations—Gujarati tradesmen, Madrasi hawkers, artisans from the United Provinces and Bengal, peasants from Bihar and Assam, men and women of all faiths, rich and poor alike, prepared to follow his lead loyally unto the ends of the earth! Forsaking all, comforts, home and property, they braved privation and the terrors of the prison and courted suffering with a cheerfulness and fortitude that were truly infectious.

The mother country watched this great drama with bewildering anguish and pride and tried to render what little moral and material help she could render to her children abroad, so bravely vindicating her honour. As Gokhale once said, Mr. Gandhi was making heroes out of clay. Yet with characteristic modesty, Gandhiji wrote to me from Johannesburg at the height of the struggle in July 1910: "We derived inspiration for all the work that we have endeavoured to do here from the great leaders in India. I do not think therefore that there is any occasion to exaggerate the merits of the passive resisters."

Though with habitual modesty he refrained from making any mention of his own part in the struggle, he never could forget the glorious part played by his followers who had undergone infinite trouble and hardship. "The wonder is", he wrote to me, "there has been so little grumbling. The credit is all due to the men who

are fighting so nobly, so bravely and so uncomplainingly."

The story of the South African struggle and the part played by Gandhiji and his compatriots have passed into history. I must quote the noble words of Lord Hardinge to show how profoundly the Government, no less than the people of this country, were moved by the stirring episode in South African history: "Recently your compatriots in South Africa have taken matters into their own hands, by organizing what is called passive resistance to laws which they consider invidious and unjust, an opinion which we who watch their struggles from afar cannot but share. They have violated, as they intended to violate, those laws with full knowledge of the penalties involved and ready with all courage and patience to endure those penalties. In all this they have the sympathy of India—deep and burning—and not only of India, but of all those who, like myself, without being Indians themselves, have feelings of sympathy for the people of this country."

Gandhiji was the soul of this movement and it was left to a great Christian divine, Bishop Whitehead of Madras, to assess the true measure of his leadership in the great struggle: "I frankly confess, though it deeply grieves me to say it, that I see in Mr. Gandhi, the patient sufferer for the cause of righteousness and mercy, a truer representative of the Crucified Saviour, than in the men who have thrown him into prison and yet call themselves by the name of Christ."

Gandhiji's fame had reverberated from end to end of the empire, and a right royal welcome awaited him when he landed in Bombay in January 1915. Gandhiji had always a warm corner for Madras and the many Tamils who had made common cause with him. He was never tired of praising their heroism and steadfast loyalty, and it was just like him to seek out the friends and relatives of these village Hampdens—people in humble circumstances, living in remote villages, unknown, unheeded.

He arrived in Madras one fine April evening accompanied by his wife. There, on the platform was a strong contingent of leading citizens waiting with garlands to welcome them, and a great cheering crowd had gathered outside the station, waiting for *darshan*. Gandhiji, in those days, was not so sparsely dressed as now. He was wearing his white homespun in true Gujarati fashion and his head was draped in a prodigious turban. The two alighted from a third-class compartment with a bundle of clothes as though they were no more than a family of poor peasants come to see the city from the interior. It was all so unlike what was expected of the hero of a hundred adventures in a far-away land.

It was my privilege to be his host. In spite of all that we had read of him, we had no precise idea of the utter simplicity of his way of life. With due care and many consultations and anxious thought for his comforts, I had furnished his apartments in my office premises in Esplanade with what seemed to me the minimum requisites of decent accommodation—two cots, a cushion-chair, a table and a desk. When I showed him his rooms, he stood gazing for a while and then burst into a

loud laugh. He asked for the removal of the cots and the rugs covering the floor and all furniture from Kasturba's quarters. They preferred the bare unfurnished rooms—and not until these emblems of luxury were removed, would he make himself at home.

The citizens of Madras gathered to do honour to the Gandhis on their home-coming at a great demonstration held at the Victoria Public Hall on April 21. Sir S. Subramanya Ayyar presided I recollect an eloquent message from the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Madras, President of the Indian South African League, conveying his deep sympathy with the meeting to welcome Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi "who had carried on their noble struggle in South Africa on behalf of their fellow-countrymen." As Secretary of the League, it fell to me to read the address which was couched in beautiful terms: "In the ample roll of those that have served this common motherland of ours few can rival and none can excel you in the record of the things accomplished ... You embody to the present generation the godliness and profound wisdom of the saint. Mrs. Gandhi is to us the incarnation of wifely virtue, living in and for her husband and following him like a shadow in plenty and in poverty, in joy and tribulation, at home, in gaol, and on the march."

Gandhiji's reply to the address was remarkable for its earnestness and simplicity. For the first time, we heard him speak on a public platform. There was no thunder in his eloquence, no passion, no demonstration in his utterance. The voice was even and the manner grave, and the words fell with simple grace and dignity. But there was something in the speech that went home to the hearts of the listeners as no finished oratory could do. And when he passed on to recount the exploits of the brave martyrs from Madras, the effect was tremendous:

"Sir, if one-tenth of the language that has been used in this address is deserved by us, what language do you propose to use for those who have lost their lives, and therefore finished their work on behalf of your suffering countrymen in South Africa? What language do you propose to use for Nagappan and Narayanaswamy, lads of seventeen or eighteen years, who braved in simple faith all the trials, all the sufferings, and all the indignities for the sake of the honour of the Motherland? (Cheers) What language do you propose to use with reference to Valliamma, that sweet girl of seventeen years who was discharged from Maritzburg prison, skin and bone, suffering from fever to which she succumbed after about a month's time? (Cries of "shame")

"It was the Madrasis who of all the Indians were singled out by the great Divinity that rules over us for this great work. Do you know that in the great city of Johannesburg, it is considered among the Madrasis to find a single Madrasi dishonoured if he has not passed through the jails once or twice during this terrible crisis that your countrymen in South Africa went through during these eight long years? You have said that I inspired these great men and women, but I cannot accept that proposition. It was they, the simple-minded folk, who worked away in faith, never

expecting the slightest reward, who inspired me, who kept me to the proper level, and who compelled me by their great sacrifice, by their great faith, by their great trust in the great God to do the work that I was able to do. (Cheers) It is my misfortune that I and my wife have been obliged to work in the limelight, and you have magnified out of all proportion (Cries of "No, no") this little work we have been able to do."

"They deserve the crown which you would seek to impose upon us," he continued : "These young men deserve all the adjectives that you have so affectionately, but blindly, lavished upon us. It was not only the Hindus who struggled, but there were Mohammedans, Parsis and Christians, and almost every part of India was represented in the struggle. They realised the common danger, and they realised also what their destiny was as Indians, and it was they, and they alone, who matched the soul-force against the physical force." (Loud applause)

It was a new experience for Madras: the words were few, but thrilled us through and through. There was not much in the manner, but a great deal in the matter of his speeches He seldom repeated second-hand opinions and his views on every subject were refreshingly original. Whether he spoke in denunciation of anarchical crimes or on loyalty to the British *Raj*, there was always something out of the common, and the attractive turn he gave to his thoughts was a perpetual surprise to his audience. He brought a fresh mind to play upon the problems of the old country and his solutions were a continual surprise.

"As a passive resister," he said, proposing the toast of the British Empire at the Madras Law Dinner at which I happened to be present, "I discovered that a passive resister has to make good his claim to passive resistance, no matter under what circumstance he finds himself, and I discovered that the British Empire had certain ideals with which I have fallen in love, and one of those ideals is that every subject of the British Empire has the freest scope possible for his energies and honour, and whatever he thinks is due to his conscience. I think that this is true of the British Empire, as it is not true of any other Government. (Applause) I feel, as you here perhaps know, that I am no lover of any Government and I have more than once said that that Government is best which governs least. And I have found that it is possible for me to be governed least under the British Empire. Hence my loyalty to the British Empire." (Loud applause)

But I must pass on to an yet more interesting phase of his sojourn in Madras. While staying with me in my house in Thumbu Chetty Street, he brought with him one day a *panchama* boy whom he called Naicker. With Gandhiji action must correspond with aspiration and utterance. And so, all unconscious of the novelty of his act, Gandhiji took the *panchama* boy right into our house, whose inmates, including my old mother—rigidly orthodox in their way of life—were horrified by the "desecration." Only a couple of years before, I had presided over a Depressed Classes Conference in Madras and condemned strongly the treatment meted out by

the higher classes to the untouchables. Gandhiji had read my speech and must have naturally concluded there could be no difficulty in bringing the boy into my household.

Frankly, I was in a fix—respect for Gandhiji and his opinions pitted against my affectionate regard for the susceptibilities of my old mother! The situation was truly ironic. Gandhiji, realising the queer posture of affairs, set about in his own quiet and effective way to deal with it. The opportunity presented itself when Naicker fell ill and hour by hour Gandhiji was to be seen sitting by the side of the patient and nursing him back to health. This quiet action was more eloquent than any amount of preaching, and I discovered that my old mother was steadily reconciling herself to the new situation. The transformation was wrought almost silently and Gandhiji referred to it in one of his letters to me: "You saw how nobly she behaved over Naicker. You doubted your ability to carry her with you. It is a habit into which we reformers have fallen—never to think of beginning with our own homes. We now find it difficult to mend ourselves."

I think such experiences were at the back of his mind when he made a sensational speech on Brahmins and *panchamas* at Mayavaram. He uttered some home truths in that centre of orthodoxy, which provoked a bitter controversy. But on the question of untouchables there could be no compromise. We know how, locked up in Yeravda jail, he began to combat the forces of reaction in the country in his own spiritual way. Like the saints of medieval India, Gandhiji gave pathetic expression to the deep-moving cry: "I do not desire to be born again, but if I am really born again, I desire to be born amidst the untouchables, so as to share their difficulties and to work for their liberation."

That has been his consistent position. The ban against untouchability is one of the cardinal points of the Satyagraha pledge as of the conditions of *swaraj*. But a leader of Gandhiji's type could not be content with mere declarations of faith or eloquent expositions of principle.

Some incidents of equal significance linger in my memory. I remember accompanying him to the house of the great patriot and journalist, G. Subrahmanya Ayyar, who, in spite of a dire disease and much suffering, continued to do his bit for the country. Ayyar expressed the country's pride in Gandhiji's doing and referred mournfully to his own lot—as one disabled by a gruesome disease to be of any use to the country. He burst into tears as he lamented his helpless condition. Gandhiji consoled him by saying that he had done great work for the country and there was no cause for lament. So saying, he began at once to wipe off his sores with the end of his garment. I and my friend, V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, who witnessed this extraordinary scene, were deeply moved.

I must say a word about the way Gandhiji has brought up his boys. Never believing in the efficacy of present-day education, he kept his sons free from any such "taint." Gandhiji, with all his endless occupations, undertook to teach his sons

himself, I remember Gandhiji sending Devadas to Madras to stay with me to do propaganda for Hindi in 1918. "I do not want him to be with a Gujarati family," he wrote. "He has to learn Tamil and teach Hindi." That is the Gandhi way of education. Devadas should take care of himself. If he fell ill, it was his fault. Once, on hearing of his illness in my house, he wrote to me: "I had hoped that Devadas would not behave quite so indecently as to fall ill."

I recollect also an incident connected with his second son—Manilal. Manilal, (now editor, *Indian Opinion*, South Africa), was an inmate of the Satyagraha Ashram, which Gandhiji had founded. As an *ashramite* he was bound by the rules of the *ashram*. The rules forbade the owning of private property. It would appear that Manilal had a small balance in the savings bank before he joined the *ashram*. A brother of his, who was away, wrote to Manilal for some money and the latter, with the double object of helping his brother and disposing of that unauthorised money, withdrew it from the bank and sent it away to him. In due course, the receipt came to the *ashram*—and to Gandhiji's hands. That a son of his should so far forget the discipline of the *ashram* as to be guilty of owning private money to be used at his pleasure, was to Gandhiji's mind a crime which should be expiated by proper penance. Notwithstanding the boy's explanation and his mother's pleading, Gandhiji insisted on sending him out of the *ashram*.

This was revealed to me by Manilal when one night he turned up at my residence in George Town and presented his father's letter, in which among other things, Gandhiji had stated that Manilal should be subjected to severe discipline and should be made to cook his own food and learn spinning.

Yet another incident, which I can never forget. During their stay in Madras, I found Mrs. Gandhi in a disconcerted mood on more than one occasion. I brought this matter to the notice of Gandhiji. He did not pause for a reply, but forthwith told me that it was of her own making. "She wants me to give her money for buying costly clothes for her grand-children." I jocularly observed that he was a cruel husband. Quick came Gandhiji's retort: "Look here, you are hard on me; it is a question of my forsaking my principles if I begin to yield to her wishes in these and other matters. She knows full well my views and is quite acquainted with my way of living. I have more than once implored her to live away from me and save herself from the discomforts and live happily with her children. But she would not. She, like the faithful Hindu wife, insists on following me wherever I go." That is just like Gandhiji the disciplinarian for all his habitual tenderness.

Another incident which I recall is Dr. Besant's invitation to Gandhiji to visit her headquarters at Adyar. We were received on the beautiful grounds of the Theosophical Society and entertained with gracious courtesy and charm. Gandhiji had the highest respect and admiration for the venerable lady who had so completely dedicated her life to the service of the country. Dr. Besant conducted the distinguished guest through the splendid hall and the well-furnished apartments and

then led us on to an unpretentious shed in the neighbourhood of which was the school for the untouchables. Dr. Besant was, in a sense, a pioneer in the matter of affording facilities for the education of the *panchamas*. But to Gandhiji, the contrast between the palatial residence for one set of people and the mean quarters for another was too much to be tolerated.

He felt it so poignantly that he decided on changing the programme for staying there for the night and insisted on returning to his quarters in George Town. I remonstrated with him and pointed out that it would cause deep pain to Dr. Besant and that she would be seriously annoyed with me also. Gandhiji was firm in his decision. Late in the night, he bade adieu to the quarters in Adyar.

One of the most beautiful friendships of our time was that between Gokhale and Gandhiji. Gokhale was only three years his senior; yet, Gandhiji always regarded him as his political *guru*, and in spite of obvious differences in temperament and outlook, they continued to hold each other in the highest esteem. It was touching to observe the way they refused to see anything but the best in each other. To Gandhiji, "Gokhale was the gallant and selfless paladin to whom the whole of India looked up as her noblest son." Gokhale's reaction to Gandhiji was characteristic: "Only those who have come in personal contact with Gandhi as he is now can realise the wonderful personality of the man." "He is without doubt made of the stuff of which heroes and martyrs are made." "In all my life", he continued, "I have known only two men who have affected me spiritually in the manner that Mr. Gandhi does —our great patriarch Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and my late master Mr. Ranade—men before whom not only are we ashamed of doing anything unworthy, but in whose presence our very minds are afraid of thinking anything that is unworthy."

That is high praise but not a bit overdrawn. But Gokhale had a shrewd suspicion that Gandhiji, owing to long absence from India, had perhaps idealised certain phases of Indian life, and he commended a year's travel and observation as a useful corrective—advice which was scrupulously followed. Gokhale, who perhaps hoped to see him as his successor at the head of the Servants of India Society, was evidently disturbed by the very advanced views which Gandhiji had expressed in the then proscribed pamphlet *Hind Swaraj*. Though at bottom the two leaders were one in their passion for service to their country and their ascetic devotion to duty, it was clear that the way of the constitutionalist brought up on British Liberalism was not exactly the way of the downright revolutionary who had drawn his inspiration from Tolstoy and Thoreau. Gandhiji sensed the feeling of the members of the Society and decided not to embarrass them With a delicacy and magnanimity all his own, he refrained from joining an organization which at his time of life and with settled views, he was bound to affect rather than be affected by it.

In 1920, a similar problem confronted him in connection with the Home Rule League, and he frankly sought the advice of friends in these terms: "They have asked me to join the All-India Home Rule League. I have told them that at my

time of life and with views firmly formed on several matters, I could only join an organization to affect its policy and not be affected by it. This does not mean that I would not now have an open mind to receive new light. I simply wish to emphasise the fact that any new light will have to be specially dazzling in order to entrance me."

What wonder that the Congress, which he joined ultimately, is now so completely affected by his teachings that it may well be called the Gandhi Congress. The Congress and Gandhiji have become synonymous.

Gandhiji used to attend regularly the Subjects Committee meetings at every session of the Congress, but sat almost mute. I asked him: "How is it you are mum and take no part in the deliberations of these committees?" His answer I still remember: "Frankly, Natesan, these gatherings and discussions make no appeal to me. It is all between the intellectuals and the so-called educated people. I find in the organization little or no appeal to the masses. If the Congress is to be what it ought to be, something must be done to enable it to touch the hearts of the masses and a new and dynamic force should be brought into play." Every one knows how fully this has been realised since Gandhiji joined the Congress. He introduced the system of four anna membership and village Congress sessions with facilities for the masses to attend in large numbers.

One of the most singular characteristics of Gandhiji is his freedom from malice. He has suffered much, but not all the trials and imprisonments could embitter him. Another is his habitual tolerance of opinions not always shared by him. He stuck to his guns with a strange consistency not easily understood by his friends or colleagues but he never questioned the right of others to hold their own views. Through all the vicissitudes of an extraordinary public career, many who were with him had to part company with him owing to clash of convictions. Some of his old colleagues have joined opposing camps. But nothing could shake the cordiality of his relations with them. For my own part I have never concealed my lack of faith in certain aspects of his teaching or his public policy. But that could in no way affect his undeviating affection for an old friend. Even during his short visits to Madras and in the midst of crowded engagements he would make time to visit his "old home" as he used to describe my house. Gandhiji would think the less of any one who would compromise his opinions merely out of regard for him.

INTRODUCTION TO 'YOUNG INDIA'

By R. K. Prabhu

A COMBINATION of unforeseen circumstances had placed me towards the close of the year 1918, in editorial charge of *Young India*—the weekly journal, which soon after and for years to come was destined to exercise the profoundest influence on the course of Indian history. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, who was the declared editor of the journal, then being printed at the *Bombay Chronicle* Press, had proposed to me that I should look after the editorial affairs of the journal and I had consented. Hardly had three months passed since I took charge of the journal when Horniman, editor of the *Bombay Chronicle*, was suddenly whisked away to England from his sick-bed in Bombay and the *Bombay Chronicle* and its press were placed under official censorship. In consequence, the board of directors of *Young India* were obliged to suspend the publication of the journal.

This was in April 1919. When, a couple of weeks later, the censorship was ended and the *Chronicle* Press began to function again in a normal manner, offers were made to Gandhiji by the directors of both the *Bombay Chronicle* and *Young India* to place the journals in his hands. Gandhiji declined the offer of the *Chronicle* but accepted that of *Young India*, provided he was free to change the venue of the publication of the journal from Bombay to Ahmedabad. When the negotiations for the transfer of the control of *Young India* were completed, I was asked to see Gandhiji with a view to handing over my charge and giving him whatever information he might need regarding the editorial conduct of the journal.

At this time, Gandhiji was putting up at "Mani Bhavan," Gamdevi, as the guest of Revashankarbhai Jhaveri, and I proceeded there, accompanied by a journalist colleague of mine who was a regular contributor to the columns of *Young India*. I had always a feeling that this colleague of mine had a better command of the English vocabulary and idiom than I could claim and I had envied his gift. Arriving at "Mani Bhavan," we introduced ourselves to Gandhiji. Scanning the editorial columns of the last issue of *Young India*, of which I handed over to him a copy, Gandhiji wanted to know who the writer of a particular article in it was. It was, I recollect, some sharp criticism of one of Lloyd George's dubious utterances about

India. I told Gandhiji that I had written the article. Pointing his finger to another article, Gandhiji asked who had written it. "I wrote it," said my colleague.

After a brief pause, Gandhiji remarked: "I like this first article, whereas I don't at all like the second. In the first, you have said all that you wanted to say in a direct manner, while the writer of the second article indulges in all sorts of innuendos and says things which he does not really mean." "For instance, you write," said Gandhiji, looking at my colleague, "'we are afraid....' and so on. I don't like the phrase at all. Here, you don't really want the reader to believe that you are afraid —you mean just the contrary, don't you? When you want to say a thing, don't beat about the bush, don't indulge in euphemisms and pin-pricks, but tell it in a straightforward way."

These might not be the very words uttered by Gandhiji but they were to that effect as far as my memory goes. Of course, both my colleague and myself held our peace while this brief homily on the ethics of journalism was delivered to us. My colleague having left shortly after, Gandhiji looking at the page of *Young India* which was made up of news in brief, asked me who gathered those news items. Being told that I was responsible for them, he asked me whence I culled the news. I said I made the clipping from the latest issues of the various Indian journals which were received in exchange for *Young India* and the *Bombay Chronicle.*

"How much time do you spend in gathering these items?" he asked.

I replied that it took me hardly more than half an hour to clip and paste the news items required to make up the page.

"You spend only half an hour over them," he remarked in surprise. "Do you know," he added, "when I edited *Indian Opinion* in South Africa, we received some 200 papers in exchange and I used to go through all of them carefully throughout the week and I culled each news item only after I was fully satisfied that it would be of real service to the readers. When one takes up the responsibility of editorship, one must discharge it with a full sense of one's duty. That is the only way journalism should be practised—don't you agree with me?"

Shamefacedly I said, "I do." I went on to explain to Gandhiji that having a very busy time throughout the week as a member of the editorial staff of the *Chronicle,* I had to do things hurriedly for *Young India.* Practically the major portion of my work for the journal, including the writing of editorials, did not occupy me more than an afternoon.

"And how much are you paid for all this?" he next asked, somewhat abruptly.

I replied that I was paid at the rate of ten rupees per column—a column, by the way, which was hardly a dozen inches long and that too in fat 10-point type!—and that my earnings from *Young India* varied between one hundred and one hundred and fifty rupees a month.

"How much are you paid as a member of the *Chronicle* staff?" was the question next shot at me by the inexorable inquisitor.

"Four hundred rupees per month," I answered.

After a brief pause, which appeared to me like eternity, Gandhiji remarked: "Do you think you are justified in taking from *Young India* the amount that is paid to you? You know the journal is not a mercenary concern. It is a patriotic undertaking and I don't think it is even self-supporting. Are you justified in adding to the burdens of its conductors?"

I replied that I did not compel the proprietors of the journal to pay me what they did. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, I said, paid all contributors to *Young India* on a generous scale as he did to me. It was all voluntary on his part. I made no stipulation whatsoever regarding my remuneration.

"Still, if I were in your position, I would not take a pie from *Young India*," put in Gandhiji, and added, "You are handsomely paid at the *Chronicle* office for your full-time work and what you do for *Young India* is in your leisure hours. A person who gets paid adequately for his full-time work should not expect payment for what he does elsewhere during the same period. Don't you think so?"

Though he uttered these pointed remarks gently and half-smilingly, I could see that he made them in all seriousness. I was somewhat dazed by the new lesson in ethics which he sought to drive home to me. I could respond to his query only by a nod of humble acquiescence.

MIDNIGHT ARREST

By Vinayak S. Masoji

THIS is the story of Gandhiji's famous march to Dandi and of his arrest which I was privileged to paint.

With the idea of qualifying myself as a humble soldier in India's battle for freedom, I arrived at the Sabarmati Ashram, at dusk, during the hottest part of summer, after a tiring two and a half days' journey by rail. Mahatmaji had long before reached Dandi, and had successfully launched the Satyagraha movement. Most of the male members of the *ashram* had joined it, and *ashram* activities were now conducted by women workers. It was strange to see two of them going round the *ashram* with a lantern and a ladder lighting the compound lamps. Next morning I saw Miraben and others sweeping the roads and cleaning the latrines.

One noon, a young English gentleman by name Reginald Reynolds, who was an old inmate of the *ashram*, asked me whether I would accompany him to Dandi the next day, as he was going there to meet Bapu. I had not seen Mahatmaji before and I thanked the Englishman for giving me this unique opportunity of meeting Mahatmaji in the camp.

In a mango-grove midway between Dandi and the sea, stood a few small huts of palm and date leaves; this was the Satyagrahis' camp. A small neat hut of palm leaves slightly aloof from the others was pointed out as Bapu's. The bundle of letters given by Miraben for Bapu served as a permit for me to be ushered into the immediate presence of Mahatmaji. He enquired whether I had the intention of staying there and taking part in the daily activities. When I said "no," Mahatmaji said that was good. He expected everyone to work at one's own place.

The salt Satyagraha movement had spread in the country. In the camp, volunteers were entrusted with the task of removing the evil of drink. The poor being the worst sufferers, the movement started with them. Small groups of volunteers were sent out to educate the villagers to stop preparing toddy which was their most handy drink.

The food served in the camp was similar to that in the *ashram*. When the volunteers went out on their rounds they carried a small bag which hung from the shoulder containing dry eatables such as a handful of soaked or dried grams, a few

groundnuts and dates, and a piece of jaggery.

The day ended with evening prayers which Bapu conducted in the middle of the camp where the tricolour flew. It was a very solemn gathering under the open sky. All squatted on the ground around Bapu in perfect silence which was all the more overpowering because of the unceasing music of the crickets from the surrounding bushes, while from far away came the mellow murmuring of the sea. After prayers a long list of patriots arrested by the police was read out by the dim light of a lantern. All then dispersed in silence.

At about eight at night the young Englishman took his leave of Bapu. Bapu in a cheerful mood enquired whether they should not bid a long good-bye as no one knew what might happen the next hour. And so it happened! The following morning, on the train, the passengers whispered about the arrest of Mahatmaji at 2 a.m. I was stunned.

The impression of the peace-loving life led in the camp in the mango-grove by the sea was fresh in my mind and the sudden rude shaking awakened the memory of childhood days, the story of Christ's arrest at midnight in the garden of Gethsamene by a force of heavily armed, ignorant soldiers. I recalled how the Scribes and Pharisees pretended innocence about the whole affair. Also having wandered in the regions of the ancient Buddhist ruins in India, the memory of the image of Buddha in Nirvana blended with the picture of Bapu resting peacefully at night in the mango-grove by the sea.

The longing to paint that picture was fulfilled only after many years in the solitude of Mt. Abu.

When the painting was shown in the art gallery of the Congress exhibition, Mahatmaji happened to visit the gallery in the company of Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, Mahadev Desai and a few others. He was looking at "The Midnight Arrest" when the Rajkumari addressing Bapu asked whether that painting was a mere figment of the artist's imagination or whether it had happened like that.

Mahatmaji quietly and with a smile replied: "Yes, yes, exactly, exactly. They came like that."

ONE HOUR

By Bharati Sarabhai

October, 1939

YESTERDAY morning Bapu was eating when we reached Sevagram. They were waiting for an important document, the full text of the statement of the — —, the summary of which had been telegraphed the evening before and announced over the radio last night. There are no radio-sets here.

Jairamdasji came as usual to read out extracts from the daily papers to Bapu. Today it was the salute given by the Khaksar "army" in the United Provinces to Mohammed Ali Jinnah. Suddenly, in the middle of all this, Gandhiji asked me, in a Kathiawad phrase and a Kathiawad accent which he has not forgotten, which is the genuine manner of our simple and chivalrous people there (and which has therefore not been absorbed by ruder Gujarat), "Are you lunching here?"

"I have had my lunch."

"Then I shall have an extra portion of my milk and butter and vegetables left over!"

"It will be wasted, you mean," I said.

"Yes."

"But I never told you I was coming for food!"

"Liar!" he said and laughed, "Liar, didn't you tell me yesterday you would walk over in the morning from Wardha and stay on for the day?"

The little son of Krishnadas Gandhi ran in, playing his ball with gusto. He sat down in Rajkumari Amrit Kaur's lap. The ball rose high, fell near Bapu, hitting him a little. "Well, he, too, has turned a Khaksar!" said Bapu in Hindustani, with another burst of laughter. The Rajkumari kissed the unperturbed child; she had to kiss him again and again.

Just then Miraben came in, the document in her hand. It was the personal letter as well as the Declaration. Bapu read it out aloud but we could not catch all of it. He gave it to the Rajkumari. "You read it."

She proceeded to do it in style; a communication in the imperial British language, transmitted by an Indian in a village hut in India in faultless English accent; the articulation clear, the voice even, the modulation unexaggerated, the pace not slow,

not fast, not once having to go back.

Bapu sat as he was. He had stretched out his leg. His eyes were on a blank corner on the mud wall to the left, to the right of which was the emptiness of the door-space. Just as when he goes for his walk in the evenings, his eye is sometimes lowered to the ground, on a narrowed spot a little ahead of him, and fixed there.

At this time of the day an *ashram* girl or relation fans him. There was no one today. Jairamdasji began slowly to fan him.

The whole statement was read. The whole statement was heard. The Rajkumari said something to this effect, "So much good writing wasted."

Gandhiji said, "I had expected it to be better."

It seemed to me now that some emotion had risen in him, come to the surface like a cloud, like a cloud that is a shadow. It found a form for itself in this way.

At the foot of that document, under each page, considerable space had been left. Indeed the blank was generously granted. "They must have kept all this space for me to write on—they must have thought I would have many comments to make," exclaimed Bapu and he folded over all the pages at the end of the last line, just where the written portion ended. He pressed the paper hard. Then, holding it in both his hands, he started to tear the two parts, one from the other.

"Take care you don't cut the important portion," said the Rajkumari. She usually speaks in English.

"The more important part is *this*, this space," replied Bapu, pointing to the marginal blank. He, too, spoke to her in English.

"Even so, don't cut the lines!" the Rajkumari insisted.

"No fear," said Bapu, with impatience that was just noticeable, "I'll be able to do it!"

When he had come half way, Bapu stopped. He picked up the papers from the middle. He looked closely to examine his work. And indeed he had damaged one line.

Bapu said, with some seriousness, "That is because they've not printed this properly." And again, "They have not done it well."

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur looked at him and said with feeling, "Let me do it for you, Bapu!"

"No fear, I can do it just as well! You will see!"

"Look, you are cutting it again!" cried the Rajkumari.

"No fear," said Bapu impatiently. He looked. It was true. He had cut the line again. "Sorry," he said and then he had to take a pair of scissors.

Mahadevbhai came in. He brought the news that special official arrangement had been made to get Bapu's reply to the Declaration. Mahadevbhai and Bapu discussed the procedure. Bapu is actively concerned with the precise and optimum working out of every detail of practical life.

Mahadevbhai hurriedly looked over the statement. At one place he laughed and he laughed, and his irony was infectious. Having glanced at the momentous message, he turned his attention to the child and absorbed himself in his play-mate. His laughter had lightened everything.

Gandhiji said in Hindi, "I am thinking." He sat still. Then he picked up his writing material. He began to write. His answer was begun at that moment and completed there. Silence spread over that hut; only the newspapers being turned and the child trying his strength upon everything.

Bapu had finished. He said, "Now I would like to have a nap. Run away, all of you."

PRINCE OF BEGGARS

By S. N. Agarwal

GANDHIJI'S personality is unique in its richness and versatility but people usually do not realise that Gandhiji is a master beggar as well. His methods of begging are novel and original.

Malaviyaji is another prince among beggars. He has collected crores of rupees in lump sums from moneyed *seths* and wealthy Princes for the Benares Hindu University and other public institutions. Gandhiji is also capable of emulating Malaviyaji's example; but he has chosen to specialise in collecting copper in place of silver and gold. If he so desires, he can approach any rich friend or admirer for a lakh of rupees. But he prefers to collect one rupee each from a hundred thousand individuals. This is not his caprice or one of his "fads"; there is a definite principle behind this practice. He begs for public causes and institutions, and besides raising money for them, he propagates their aims and ideals. By extending his "begging bowl" before millions of his poor countrymen for Harijan or khadi work and filling it with numberless copper coins, he not only arranges for the necessary finances but diffuses the ideals of anti-untouchability and *swadeshi* among the millions. If one donates a lump sum, he does so, perhaps unconsciously, with some selfish motive, and Gandhiji gains only one more supporter and sympathiser for his cause.

During his travels, Gandhiji plays the role of an accomplished beggar. He is welcomed by crowds almost at every station. People flock towards his compartment to catch a fleeting glimpse of the Mahatma. How can the distinguished national beggar let such golden opportunities slip by in passively acknowledging the devotional greetings of the crowd? He must charge the "price" for his *darshan*; and so his begging hand is immediately stretched out of the window. "One pice for the Harijans!" calls out Gandhiji, and the people experience a glow of joy and satisfaction in placing copper coins in his palm. When one hand is full, the other is extended, and Gandhiji smartly collects a decent amount at every station, even during nights. A clever and experienced beggar as he is, Gandhiji takes special care to learn at least the word for "pice" in every language. He does not fret or fume at the crowds if they wake him up with vociferous cries of "Mahatma Gandhiki Jai!" The beggar of a poor nation cannot afford to lie sleeping while there are people

clamouring to give him "alms." And so quietly he gets up, opens the window if it is closed, and commences his work of collection.

I have witnessed scenes when, sometimes, being unusually tired, Gandhiji did not wake up at a certain station. A few persons entered his compartment and shook him up despite protests from the members of his party, and after placing some coins in his hands walked away with "Mahatma Gandhi ki Jai!" Gandhiji smiled, again lay down on the berth and fell into deep sleep. When an ordinary beggar receives any coin he feels delighted; but in the case of this strange Prince of Beggars, people feel obliged in placing coins in his hands. Sometimes an old, decrepit woman in torn and tattered garments would, with great difficulty, make her way through the crowd, put a pice in Gandhiji's palm, look at him intently with devotion for a while and then thread her way back. One is reminded of Christ attaching the highest value to the smallest contribution of a poor old woman quietly sitting in a corner of the church.

At times, when Gandhiji happens to reach the station-platform a little before the arrival of the train, a crowd collects round him and press correspondents get a good opportunity for asking questions. But Gandhiji cannot be so easily drawn in, and he often dodges their questions with his counter-questions. It was, perhaps, early in 1937 when the Congress was still wavering between office acceptance and non-co-operation, that a journalist enquired with curiosity: "Bapuji, will the Congress accept office?" "Why, do you wish to become a minister?" asked Gandhiji with a good-humoured chuckle. The poor correspondent was non-plussed and began to recede into the background. But Gandhiji would not let him off so easily. "Will you please let me use your hat as my begging bowl?" he asked. Of course, the hat was immediately surrendered and Gandhiji instantaneously stretched it before the owner himself to begin with. And the would-be minister had to surrender amid laughter a few silver coins too. What a queer and extraordinary beggar this half-naked Fakir is!

Gandhiji has reduced the art of begging to a perfect science. He uses with ingenious resourcefulness every occasion for collection for the Harijan Fund. To the albums of crazy autograph-hunters he would affix his signature but only on an advance payment of Rs. 5 for each autograph. He would auction a welcome address or any other article to the very person who presents it and collect some amount for Harijans into the bargain. His practice of collecting money from those who come to attend his morning and evening prayers is too well-known to need special mention. Gandhiji does not spare even doctors who examine him. Before allowing them to touch his body, he would, in his inimitable manner, demand his "fee," and the doctors cannot resist the powerful charm of this wizard of beggars.

But Gandhiji is not at all greedy even as a people's beggar; he never tries to accumulate unnecessary funds for any public institution. If an institution is really national and stands for the good of the people, it should never suffer for want of funds. If it does, it forfeits its moral right to be called a public institution, and,

as such, should cease to exist. That is why Gandhiji always maintains that the real need of institutions is the supply of good workers, for, if there are proper men, money will inevitably flow.

Some orthodox Hindus occasionally come to Gandhiji with an offer of a lakh or two and tell him: "Mahatmaji, the only condition attached to the donation is that it should not be used for the Muslims and Harijans." "Then you should seek out some other Mahatma!" would be Gandhiji's immediate answer, with his characteristic smile. How can he brook any communal considerations in his cultured and refined art of begging when he himself lives and is prepared even to die for India's unity?

Gandhiji is very particular in keeping detailed accounts of all his collections at railway stations, prayers and such other occasions. He would not tolerate a mistake even by a single pie, and those in charge of the accounts have to spend hours in detecting minor mistakes.

It is said that beggars cannot be choosers. But this rule does not apply to Gandhiji. With him, in fact, it is just the reverse. If you are wealthy, he would demand gold and silver; if poor, an honest penny; if you could spare no coins, he would ask you to pay in hand-spun yarn; if you cannot do even that, you have to fast and save and pay. Gandhiji is an inexorable beggar, a hard taskmaster. And yet so sweet, so loving, so forgiving.

THE ART OF THRIFT

By Appasaheb Patwardhan

IN the dining-shed in the *ashram* at Sevagram there hangs a board with this exhortation in Bapu's name: "I hope all will regard the property of the *ashram* as belonging to themselves and to the poorest of the poor. Even salt should not be allowed to be served in excess of one's needs. Water too may not be wasted." I have been a witness to this thrift ever since I joined Gandhiji for the first time in June 1919 at "Mani Bhavan" in Bombay. One of my duties then was to write letters as dictated or directed by him. Once after receiving his directions I took up notepaper and was about to begin a letter. But Bapu, who had been observing my movements, promptly reprimanded me with, "Will not a card do?" And so it did.

I took the hint and wanted to please my taskmaster by an essay in thrift. Office files for filing letters and other purposes were too few and fresh ones were required. I got hold of two pieces of a cardboard that had been lying about, punched them, stuck them together with a string and placed the improvised file before Bapu. I expected to be patted on the back for my thrift and ingenuity, but to my utter discomfiture he refused to touch my handiwork saying, "I don't want such shabby things."

Later I went to stay at the Satyagraha Ashram at Sabarmati. At the evening prayers the closing verses of the second chapter of the *Gita* were recited by all the *ashramites* together. Once it happened that the voices did not harmonise and the pace of recital was not uniform. At the end of the prayers, Bapu drew our attention to this defect. Maganlalbhai, the manager of the *ashram*, said, "Some go too fast. I think Appa was one of them." Gandhiji promptly put in, "I myself went fast. We could thereby save a few minutes." I was not quite sure whether he was really anxious to save time or to shield me.

Sabarmati Ashram was malarious and Gandhiji himself once caught the infection. Doctors advised the use of a mosquito curtain. But it was no good for the poor millions in the villages of India, thought Gandhiji. They must be shown such a means of protecting themselves from mosquito-bites as would cost them next to nothing. So Gandhiji used to go to bed carefully wrapped up in a sheet,

a few drops of kerosene rubbed on the face.

Before the invention, by Gandhiji himself, of the "Yeravda Charkha," which has now mostly replaced the old single-wheeled upright pattern, I had designed some minor innovations and economies in the wheel. I approached Gandhiji with my model. He scrutinized the *charkha* and took exception to the leather *chamarkhas* (spindle-bearings). "I prefer Laxmidasbhai's rag *chamarkhas* which cost nothing," he remarked. "The leather pieces will hardly cost a pice," I remonstrated. "But you have to multiply the pice by crores," came the prompt retort. He wanted crores of *charkhas* for every home in India and an additional pice per *charkha* meant a total expenditure of lakhs of rupees.

But the miser excelled himself on April 11, 1930, during the days of the memorable salt Satyagraha. Gandhiji camped at Dandi and each day visited different villages round about exhorting people to infringe the Salt Act *en masse*. I forget the name of the village which was the scence of mass Satyagraha on that particular day. A mammoth meeting was held by a marshy land which was encrusted with a thin layer of salt. Gandhiji addressed the immense crowd from a bullock-cart with a roof of matting which protected him from the scorching sun. At the end of the meeting the whole gathering proceeded to the marsh and each one, after Gandhiji, picked up a handful of the salty mud—mostly mud and only a little of salt Gandhiji then motored back to the village a distance of about two miles, all the way holding the muddy treasure in his hand. After reaching the house where he was to rest he washed his hand into a small tumbler and asked the attendant volunteers to let the mud settle down and then pour out the brine and boil it into salt. The idea was to procure and conserve every available grain of salt. In those days it was a fashion in Bombay to sell publicly packets of illicit salt at fabulous prices and give the proceeds to the Satyagraha Fund. But Gandhiji wanted to procure large quantities of salt and make the commodity available to the poor villagers at a very cheap rate.

On the way back to Dandi we passed through Mahadevbhai's village. Gandhiji halted to visit Mahadevbhai's house and see his mother. When we returned to the car someone from the party asked for water to drink. A villager brought a *lota* of water with a brass cup to drink from. In the meanwhile villagers had gathered round the car and offered money to Gandhiji. I was standing by the car with the *lota* of water in one hand and the cup in the other, about to pour out water for the thirsty friend Just at the moment I noticed a woman vainly trying to reach out a rupee coin to Gandhiji. My hands were engaged, so I picked up the coin in the empty cup in my right hand and immediately pouring it out into a handkerchief spread out in the car for the coins, filled the cup with water for the friend to drink. It was a hot afternoon and Gandhiji, as is his wont, had been holding a wet napkin on his head. Before I could pass off the water to the thirsty friend, Gandhiji put forward his napkin and asked me to pour the water on it. In the

bustle I could not hear him. I only caught his further remark, "The cup held the coin, so the water is not fit for drinking." I realised the uncleanliness of my procedure, shook the cup, threw off the water and refilled it for the thirsty friend. Gandhiji was so sorry that a cupful of water was spilt and wasted! It was unfit for drinking but he could very well use it for wetting the napkin on his head.

Even before the war began, while paper was neither dear nor scarce, Bapu would not allow paper written only on one side to be thrown into the waste-paper basket. All such *pastis* are carefully sifted out from his voluminous incoming correspondence. He utilizes the blank side for writing out drafts and other purposes. He cuts up one note-paper into half a dozen tiny pieces and writes out as many separate personal letters to the several *ashramites* despatching them all in one cover.

Indeed the Bapu, not only of the *ashramites* but of the famished millions of India, the votary of *Daridranarayan*, can ill afford to waste even a particle of food or a drop of water.

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

THE TRUE ARTIST

By Nandalal Bose

LANGUAGE is not my *metier*, and I feel a kind of constraint in writing for the public about one for whom my heart cherishes the deepest regard and love. This love prompts me to write of him as Bapuji, not Mahatmaji. I am tied to him by his love towards me and my love towards him: with this relationship the public are not concerned, a relationship that will never end.

I was first attracted to Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi by his manifold and unique qualities: Gandhi the steadfast and pure in heart, fearless in doing good, to whom every human being is dear, whose kindness to every living being is boundless, who has staked his life to restore fallen and oppressed India to her former glory, whose kindness forgives his enemies for their ignorance, who is above all *himsa* and pride, the repository of irresistible soul-power born of self-mastery, whose sympathy for the suffering and the distressed has made him a *sanyasin*, who has sacrificed his all so that he may devote himself completely to their welfare, Gandhi the reservoir of all virtues, the self-controlled, self-disciplined lover of God, the follower of the true dharma, the complete Satyagrahi.

I am a painter and, therefore, my understanding comes to me through visual, rather than aural channels; and that is why I had been wanting an opportunity to meet him; when I actually met him there was established between us a bond of love and friendship, rather than that of the admirer and the admired.

One day a message came from him inviting me to organize an exhibition of Indian paintings for the Lucknow Congress. What compelling power was in that call! I dared not refuse. I felt great hesitation in accepting responsibility for such an onerous task at a place so far away; nevertheless, it was impossible for me to evade that call. I took the burden on myself and, with his blessings, completed the work to my satisfaction.

I had heard it said that he was not very keen on matters relating to art; but that impression of mine turned out to be completely erroneous. He examined each and every painting displayed at the Lucknow Exhibition with keen artistic appreciation. A little episode revealed more clearly to me his intrinsic sense of beauty and proportion. The exhibition hall was decorated with simple materials such as

reeds, bamboos and bits of wood. That the use of such simple ingredients should not in any way detract from the general decorative effect was our constant concern; people noted for the first time that it was possible to create beauty by employing such ordinary materials although we in our *ashram* (Santiniketan) always use such materials for artistic effects.

Bapuji, too, is in favour of artistic creations by the use of commonplace materials. For this reason he warmly appreciated our work and was delighted with our efforts. Although the arrangements in the exhibition hall had been completed in all details, some one had carelessly left a bucket under the table. This had escaped our notice; but did not escape Bapuji's. He noticed it immediately he came into the hall and remarked, "Isn't this bucket marring the beauty of the place?" He used to come to the exhibition and spend a good deal of time there every day.

After this, when the Congress was convened at Faizpur, he wrote to me to come and take over the decoration arrangements. The essence of the letter may be thus expressed: "The heart, having got a little, hankers for all." In the same letter he requested me to proceed to Sevagram and meet him there. In reply I pointed out that I was merely a painter and knew little of architecture, and that, therefore, was not competent for the job. In reply he wrote to me a fine letter which prompted me to accept his invitation. The letter was in this strain: "I do not want an expert pianist but a sincere and devoted fiddler." Accordingly I proceeded to Sevagram. Mahadev Desai conducted me into his presence. As I took my seat in his cottage, I saw that he was busy ministering to Miraben and another Satyagrahi who were sick. They were occupying beds at two corners of the room and Mahatmaji was engaged in giving medicines to them. Though I was seated quite close to him, he asked me to move still closer and remarked that as there were patients in the room conversation would have to be conducted in low tones. I reverently touched his feet. I was deeply moved by his simple graciousness. How transparent and penetrating was his look! I felt as if he could see right into the innermost depths of the heart. I felt a constant urge to open out my heart before his gaze, to tell him all my inmost thoughts. And what a divine smile! It would indeed melt the hardest of hearts. His words were without any trace of hesitation or indistinctness; each word seemed to sparkle like a clear-cut diamond. Whatever I wished to say, as soon as I began saying it, he too gave his reply without waiting for me to finish it, as if he could read all my unspoken thoughts. The need for spoken language seemed to have become secondary. He asked Mahadev to request Jamnalalji to arrange for an escort to take me to Faizpur and to arrange for my return journey.

While I was thus engaged with Mahatmaji, a young American missionary asked him what religion he professed and what shape the future religion of India was likely to assume. His reply was very brief. Pointing to the two sick persons in the room, he said, "To serve is my religion; I do not worry about the future." He gave me letters of introduction to several Congress workers at Faizpur and told me

in particular to get acquainted with Vinobaji, saying, "You will greatly enjoy meeting him; he is a learned man and a lover of good people; he has renounced his all for the motherland." He added, "I want to tell you about a unique feature of the Faizpur Congress which is a novel idea of mine. This Congress will be for villagers and not for townspeople. Its setting should, therefore, be suited to villagers and should be made by village artisans out of materials commonly obtainable in the village. Every Congress servant will give you all assistance in your work. I am sure you will achieve success." He thus left the whole responsibility for the decorations on my shoulders.

I went to Faizpur, met the engineers there and began to equip myself for the task. The actual start was made with the help of a few pupils from our Kala-Bhavana a couple of months before the Congress was due to hold its session. A few days before the opening of the Congress, Mahatmaji inspected our work and was very pleased to find that the decorations were admirably suited to a village Congress.

I must mention here another event. In order to convey the Congress President, Jawaharlalji, to the *pandal* a chariot was constructed out of a multi-coloured country *jhoola* and it was to be drawn by six pairs of bullocks. After a few days of preparation for the Congress Mahatmaji sent for me and said, "I have laid a wager with a young girl whom I look upon as my grand-daughter that you will produce within two days a chariot similar to that which we have made for receiving Jawaharlalji, and set it up on the exhibition grounds complete with six pairs of bullocks—toy ones, of course. You must see to it that I win the bet." We artists were greatly tickled by the idea and set to work. We made six pairs of bullocks out of bamboo framework, attached them to the chariot and showed it to Mahatmaji. At the sight of it he burst out into loud laughter like a boy. Subsequently, in his public speech he made a special mention of the artistic work done by us.

For the Haripura Congress, I received the call again. This time the Congress was to be extensive in size and we, therefore, gathered there three or four months in advance. Bapuji's instructions about our work were that the exhibition should be such that the villagers could see the artists' creations while walking along the road. In other words, we were to convert the whole Congress Nagar into an exhibition of the fine arts. Accordingly, we painted about 400 pictures, of the *pata* class, and used them for adorning the triumphal arches and the houses of the town. There was an exhibition of pictures too. The pictures were so arranged that one could get a glimpse of the art-cultures of the different countries of the world. When Gandhiji came to Haripura and met me, he hailed me with "Well! You are still alive!" How beautifully these few words expressed both his admiration for my work and his love for me!

On another occasion I had an opportunity at Sevagram of having a few words with him on matters of art. He called me then in connection with repairing a temple

of Jamnalalji and doing some mural decorations in it. The condition of the temple, however, did not permit of any repairs. During the conversation, he said, "How about building another temple?" "There are so many temples," I remarked, expressing the view I then held. "Why build more?" He kept quiet for a long time and then said, "Temples have to be reared again and again, because whenever man will realise anew a true ideal he will feel an urge to dedicate a temple to it. Moreover, a temple that enshrines an ideal which is eternally true can never vanish from the earth." Here I made bold to ask him a question. I had a faint doubt still lurking in my mind that he did not give a high place to artistic creations in the domain of culture. He said that all artistic achievements were dear to him if they helped in realising the ultimate truth. Songs particularly brought him solace. He said further, "If I had not taken the vow of a Satyagrahi for the deliverance of my country I would probably have occupied myself only with songs. But now there is no help for it: I have taken upon myself this mission. In this life I shall not be able to divert myself to anything else, but that does not mean that I look down on the arts which are essential parts of human culture." With a smile he added, "I know I have earned notoriety as a philistine in art."

Mahatmaji may not be an artist in the same sense that we professional artists are, nevertheless I cannot but consider him to be a true artist. All his life he has spent in creating his own personality and in fashioning others after his high ideal. His mission is to make gods out of men of clay. I am sure his ideal will inspire the artists of the world.

Another aspect of his has remained unexplained to many—namely, why he is against the manufacture of goods by machinery. It would be a mistake to think that he does not approve of machines. We artists would interpret his view in this way. Machine-made articles may be useful and may add to the material wealth of nations, but they are totally incapable of expressing or communicating the spirit of creation. Mahatmaji's view represents the true feeling of artists. Any craft which does not bear the stamp of the artist's personality and his mind cannot express the *rasa* or the indwelling spirit of art. There is no universal way of expressing art; only the essence of art is universal. If it were otherwise, creation would not have had such wonderful diversity. To achieve harmony in a world of such diversity is the role of the Supreme Artist. This is true of the human artist as well. Art is eternally the same but its revelation to each individual artist is different and there lies the source of originality in art. Mass-produced articles may differ in kind from the artists' or craftsmen's handiwork and are detrimental to society and to the individual. They bring about barrenness, disharmony and maladjustment in society. Though machines add much to man's material wealth they leave his mind starved of the joys of creation. Instead of developing divine attributes man degenerates into a mere animal. To the best of their abilities artists endeavour to utilize simple materials and equipment in the creation of art. Artists use as few and as simple

materials as possible because they can thus express themselves better, and not because they have any inborn aversion to instruments or machines.

I shall now give an instance of how simple things can help in creating beauty and in drawing a sympathetic artist towards Nature. A description of my first meeting with Bapuji at Sevagram will illustrate my point. The cottage was slightly bigger than an average one in the village. It had verandahs on three sides, a tiled roof and a number of doors and windows for admitting light and air. The floor and the walls were plastered over with cow-dung; a mat was kept in one corner with a folded khaddar sheet and a pillow or cushion thereon for sitting and resting. To the right of the khaddar seat were a few packing cases of deal-wood and cardboard containing letters and files. In front was a packing case covered with khaddar to serve as a writing desk, on one side a large bottle of clear boiled drinking water, a small polished Gujarati *lota* of bell-metal covered with an iron-sheet shaped like a *pipal* leaf, and a small bamboo basket. Although the room was merely plastered over with cow-dung it had an atmosphere of cleanliness, tidiness and quiet beauty. There was no picture, photograph, figure or statue in the room. There were one or two niches, bordered by some reliefs made by Miraben out of clay.

Outside the room I could see Ba and Miraben moving to and fro, busy seeing to all arrangements for the comfort of the guests and the inmates of the *ashram*. Some villagers were sitting in the verandah; they used often to come and see Bapuji for various purposes. Just beside the room was a cowshed, which Mahatmaji used to superintend himself. He was sitting in the room sparsely clad, brown-skinned, simplicity itself. His dress consisted of a small piece of khaddar cloth worn tightly round the waist, from which was dangling a small watch; a pleasant smile was always playing on his lips. As I looked on him he appeared to me like a sword of fine temper, kept unsheathed, having all the attributes of the sword save that of *himsa*, and able to cut through the dark depths of human ignorance. We were talking now and then of art and craft, and of Santiniketan. Observing that my gaze was fixed on the *pipal* leaf of steel-sheet covering the *lota* he said, "Is it not beautiful? It bears the impress of Nature; moreover, a blacksmith of this very village has made it and given it to me as a token of his love. It is very precious to me." I think the complete explanation of the principles of artistic creation is to be found in these few words. Although there were no objects of art in the room, this *pipal* leaf made of steel had made complete amends for the deficiency. The picture of Bapuji's room that I have depicted bore at its corner, as the signature or the seal of the Goddess of Art, that burnished *pipal* leaf.

REBEL AND PROPHET

By Yusuf Meherally

MAHATMA Gandhi has been "the biggest name and the greatest voice" India has produced since the death of Akbar. Even if we should go far back into her history, there are only two other names of comparable stature—Buddha and Asoka. And there are not a few in the country today who would rank him above both the philosopher-kings.

He confronts our disturbed world in two different roles. First, as a rebel against British rule in India. Second, as the prophet of a new civilization and a new social philosophy.

To India his services have been unique. To a battered and oppressed people he gave a new hope and a new self-respect. He gave them a plan and a direction, a battle-cry and a remarkable weapon of struggle.

His services to the world at large are being increasingly recognised. What precisely is his contribution?

The problem of creating a new heaven on earth has perplexed mankind for ages. The world's greatest prophets, philosophers and statesmen have again and again faced the great question : How is oppression and exploitation to be fought? How is progress to be secured and how preserved? Can security be obtained only at the price of organized violence? Is history a succession of blood baths? Is there a way out? Gandhi has sought to supply the answer.

Gandhi was fourteen when Karl Marx died and twenty-six when Engels passed away. At that time, however, he was unaware of the contribution of either. He lived in a country where traditionally the arts of peace have been extolled above the ways of war, and where the seer who renounced the good things of life was the hero, rather than the bemedalled commander in all his transient glory. Moreover, he lived in a country that had been forcibly disarmed and emasculated by a powerful foreign imperialism. Is it to be wondered at that in a country where the objective facts suggested and history proclaimed it, Gandhi rather than any other figure on the contemporary scene should have worked out the non-violent solution as a fulfilment of life's mighty purposes?

To dynamic non-violence he allied the weapon of direct action. In doing so,

he set his face against both the caution of the gradualists and the impatience of the insurrectionists. His was the new middle way, the path of toil and trouble certainly, but one that by its very humanity dulled the edge of the opponent's resistance by an appeal to the very best in his nature. The gains of direct action thus obtained are in Gandhi's opinion more enduring than those obtained by a successful revolt. For the latter harbours in itself the germ of discontent, which has often led to an even more bloody counter-revolution.

His technique of action has been his very own. It firmly demands resistance to wrong. Not by retaliating in kind, but by touching the mind and heart of the opposing party, by the power of one's own suffering. Suffering borne and not returned, suffering endured patiently and cheerfully, that is the new talisman. This is designed not only to ensure the ultimate triumph of the sufferer but also to educate the wrong-doer himself in the process. It is designed to convert an erring and implacable opponent into a possible ally by a change of heart. In short, for the wrong implacable opposition, for the wrong-doer infinite compassion—that is the Gandhian approach.

The facts of his life give us an intimate glimpse into his personality and spiritual development. As often happens, the rebel was born into a conservative household. When he left for England at the age of nineteen to qualify for the Bar, he had already been married seven years and was a father.

He inherited his intense religious outlook on life from his mother. Possessed of a strong personality, her simple piety and deep devotion made an abiding impression on his mind. She fasted frequently. Not a day passed without her visiting the *Haveli*—the Vaishnava temple. Years later, Gandhi was to risk his life in one of his momentous fasts, in an appeal to orthodoxy to throw open the temples to the so-called untouchables. Intellectuals, who were sorely puzzled at Gandhiji's insistence on a right that they themselves did not prize, have a clue here—how from the Mahatma's subconscious store of memory there flashed the recollection of his daily visits to the temple with his mother and how devoutly she and others had prized the privilege. He now worked to share it with the Harijans in a supreme effort to break the social barriers that cruel custom had built around them.

For three generations his family had provided Prime Ministers to various Kathiawad States. The family pride was proverbial and so was its loyalty. On one occasion, State intrigues obliged his grandfather, who was Prime Minister of Porbandar, to seek refuge in a neighbouring State. There he saluted the ruler with his left hand. Asked to explain this glaring discourtesy, he stoutly declared that his right hand was pledged to Porbandar. The fact that he had not had a fair deal from the latter State did not shake his deep-seated loyalty.

His father, likewise, was Prime Minister of Rajkot and died a pensioner of the State. Gandhi led one of his spectacular campaigns of Satyagraha against the Rajkot ruler and his British advisers, under whose thumb he was, for grave breach of

faith. This was the occasion for another of his memorable fasts unto death, that shook the country from end to end.

The story of his struggles in South Africa forms an astonishing chapter in the history of human relationships. A law suit took Gandhi to South Africa. There, 150,000 of his countrymen lived in virtual semi-slavery, deprived by a ruthless colour bar of all political and social rights.

On his very first journey from Durban he was thrown out of the railway compartment at Maritzburg despite his first-class ticket. A night of spiritual agony decided him to stay on and face the worst. The arrogant white who threw Gandhi out had no idea he was making history. For the incident proved to be a turning point in his life. He not only stayed in South Africa, but remained for nearly two decades, despite endless humiliations. He received a thrashing for presuming to walk on a footpath. Efforts were made to prevent him from practising in the courts. His life was repeatedly threatened. But neither violence nor repeated terms of jail made any difference. The "coolie barrister" had become a nightmare. His campaigns of non-violent passive resistance won a settlement from the astounded and obstinate General Smuts. Later he gave up his very large and lucrative practice, founded the Phoenix Colony and started a new experiment in community living. Tolstoy was moved to declare that his efforts constituted "the most important of all the work now being done in the world."

Gandhi returned to his country with the realisation that South Africa would have to be fought and won in India. Here his profound loyalty to British rule received a great shock. At the close of the first World War, in spite of her great sacrifices, India was rewarded not with Home Rule but with the Rowlatt Act and the massacre of Amritsar and its incredibly brutal aftermath. A great wave of indignation swept over the country. Gandhi launched his campaign of non-co-operation. The Hindus and Muslims made common cause over the twin issues of the Punjab and *Khilafat* wrongs. At the height of the campaign he called off the struggle because of an act of mob violence at Chauri Chaura, an obscure townlet in the United Provinces. There was widespread consternation and chagrin at this decision. But for the Mahatma non-violence was all important. The crafty British Government seized the opportunity with evident relief. He was soon arrested, and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. The memorable trial has often been compared to another that took place at Jerusalem, 2,000 years ago.

A decade later he was leading another gigantic struggle against the British *Raj*. Over a hundred thousand of his supporters, men and women alike, suffered imprisonment, not to speak of innumerable other hardships. The foreign government was shaken to its core and made peace. The Gandhi-Irwin Pact between the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, and the half-naked Fakir of Mr. Winston Churchill's description, paved the way for the Mahatma to attend the carefully packed second Round Table Conference, as the sole representative of the Congress. Nothing came out of it, and on his return

he was forced to launch another campaign of civil disobedience. The *lathi* and the bullet, jail and martial law ruled India for the next two years.

In 1934 he retired from the Congress and public life and from his *ashram* in Sevagram devoted himself with zest to his favourite constructive programme. The problem of the intense poverty and exploitation of the rural masses, scattered over the 700,000 villages of India, underfed, underclothed and heavily in debt, was ever before his eyes. His efforts to help them has to a large extent been the story of the nationalist movement reaching the villages.

It is interesting to note that his earlier views on the industrial civilization have matured with time. His protest against the machine is now essentially a protest against the enslavement of humanity in the name of technological progress. The *charkha*, he declares, is itself an exquisite piece of machinery. What scares him probably are the Grapes of Wrath.

Gandhi's hand-made cloth has become the uniform of the nationalist movement. The All-India Spinners' Association founded in 1923 was servicing 15,110 villages in 1941-42, giving work to 3,54,257 artisans. It is well worth noticing that with a capital of only 50 lakhs of rupees, it is providing work for half as many people as the entire textile industry of India with a capital one hundred times as large. Similarly his Village Industries Association has been working for a revival of lost village crafts and providing subsidiary occupation to large numbers of the unemployed in the countryside.

The "Quit India" movement occupied the centre of the stage, after the failure of the mission of Sir Stafford Cripps It marked a new high in Gandhi's influence and popularity. It was the biggest thing of his life. Incidentally also, it was the biggest non-violent effort in the history of the world by a country struggling to be free.

Gandhi's many-sidedness has been truly amazing. His political activities have tended to overshadow the other aspects of his work. For example, all the social reformers in India put together during the last hundred years, have not done as much for the emancipation of Indian womanhood, as he single-handed. His work for the Harijans has sounded the death-knell of untouchability. Prohibition was introduced in Bombay and other select areas by the Congress Ministries, under his inspiration. He has been the most quoted journalist in India and his journals the most read periodicals in this country. His efforts have established Hindustani as the *lingua franca*. His Wardha Scheme of Education promises to revolutionise educational ideals and practice.

Other great leaders in the past as well as in present times have ruled and continue to rule men's minds and hearts by the power they wield as heads of powerful countries. To Gandhi alone belongs the distinction of being able to do so without any semblance of state power. This circumstance alone ensures for him the moral leadership of the world. It is open to doubt whether any other single

figure in world history has had a personal following even half as large as his. He has already passed into legend.

He is full of gaiety and laughter and has a most charming sense of humour. Acharya Kripalani, one of his most intellectual devotees, once remarked that the Congress represents the statesmanship of Gandhi, the *ashram* his austerity and the Gujarat Vidyapith his laughter.

Almost the first question that an Indian is asked in a foreign country is about Gandhi. In 1938 I happened to be travelling from New York to Mexico—a 3,000-mile journey by car. At the wayside service station the car halted for supplies. The attendant, scanning my Indian costume with interest for a while, could restrain himself no longer.

"What country do you come from?" he enquired.

"India," I replied.

"India, eh? How's good old Gandhi?"

"Fine."

"Is he still fasting?"

"Sure."

"How's the goat?"

"Going strong."

This was somewhere in the state of Virginia, many miles away from the nearest town. He and others plied me with other questions and when we were ready to leave refused to charge for refreshments. Such is the interest of the common man everywhere in Gandhi.

Another incident, under a very different setting, comes to mind. I was to speak on India before a select gathering of educationists, mostly attached to the Columbia University. On purpose, I devoted very much more than half my talk to the Wardha Scheme of Education, in an effort to ascertain their reactions. Not a little to my surprise, they vied with one another in praising its main ideas. One of them described it as "revolutionary and right." Another said it was "positively refreshing." A third remarked, "Wouldn't it be a joy to introduce it over here?" So emphatic was the chorus of praise that ultimately it was I who suggested objections to the Wardha Scheme so as to canalise discussion.

"Not many in India," I said, "believe that the scheme will be self-supporting."

"That, of course, is only too true," was the reply. "But that's hardly any objection on merits. Some of our universities have endowments running into millions and yet they are not self-supporting. So what? The deficit must come obviously from the public exchequer."

"Then," I proceeded, "look at the curriculum. Only one hour and twenty minutes, out of a five hours' study time, is devoted to the academic side, while

three hours and forty minutes are assigned to vocational training. Surely this is not a fair allocation of time?"

"The way I look at it," said a well-known professor, " is this." This Gandhi of yours seems a far more shrewd and practical person than we took him for. He knew very well that dons like us will pounce upon his scheme and tear it to bits. So he seems to have deliberately advocated this rather lopsided distribution of time as between academic and vocational training. I guess he would be only too willing to make concessions so as to secure a fifty-fifty arrangement"

The meeting ended by everyone asking for more particulars and more literature. It was an altogether exhilarating experience for me.

Gandhi truly belongs to all time and all mankind Whether one thinks of him as the world statesman or the Indian patriot, there is about him the unmistakable gesture of immortality. What better words could be found to epitomise so significant and so magnificent a career than that his ambition was "to wipe every tear from every eye"?



NINTH AUGUST

by BABU HERUR

TOLSTOY TO GANDHI

Kotchety, Russia,
September 7, 1910

I RECEIVED your journal, and was pleased to learn all contained therein concerning the passive resisters; and I felt like telling you all the thoughts which that reading called up to me.

The longer I live, and especially now, when I vividly feel the nearness of death, I want to tell others what I feel so particularly clearly and what to my mind is of great importance—namely, that which is called "Passive Resistance," but which is in reality nothing else than the teaching of love uncorrupted by false interpretations. That love, which is the striving for the union of human souls and the activity derived from it is the highest and only law of human life; and in the depth of his soul every human being (as we most clearly see in children) feels and knows this; he knows this until he is entangled by the false teachings of the world. This law was proclaimed by all—by the Indian as by the Chinese, Hebrew, Greek and Roman sages of the world. I think this law was most clearly expressed by Christ, who plainly said, "In love alone is all the law and the prophets."

But, foreseeing the corruption to which this law may be subject, he straightway pointed out the danger of its corruption, which is natural to people who live in worldly interests—the danger, namely, which justifies the defence of those interests by the use of force, or, as he said, "with blows to answer blows, by force to take back things usurped," etc. He knew, as every sensible man must know, that the use of force is incompatible with love as the fundamental law of life; that as soon as violence is permitted, in whichever case it may be, the insufficiency of the law of love is acknowledged, and by this the very law of love is denied. The whole Christian civilization, so brilliant outwardly, grew up on this self-evident and strange misunderstanding and contradiction, sometimes conscious but mostly unconscious.

In reality, as soon as force was admitted into love, there was no more love; there could be no love as the law of life; and as there was no law of love, there was no law at all except violence, i e. the power of the strongest. So lived Christian humanity for nineteen centuries. It is true that in all times people were guided by

violence in arranging their lives.

The difference between the Christian nations and all other nations is only that in the Christian world the law of love was expressed clearly and definitely, whereas it was not so expressed in any other religious teaching, and that the people of the Christian world have solemnly accepted this law, whilst at the same time they have permitted violence, and built their lives on violence; and that is why the whole life of the Christian peoples is a continuous contradiction between that which they profess and the principles on which they order their lives—a contradiction between love accepted as the law of life and violence which is recognised and praised, acknowledged even as a necessity in different phases of life, such as the power of rulers, courts, and armies. This contradiction always grew with the development of the people of the Christian world, and lately, it reached the ultimate stage.

The question now evidently stands thus: either to admit that we do not recognise any Christian teaching at all, arranging our lives only by power of the stronger, or that all our compulsory taxes, court and police establishments, but mainly our armies, must be abolished.

This year, in spring, at a Scripture examination in a girls' high school at Moscow, the teacher and the bishop present asked the girls questions on the Commandments, and especially on the Sixth, "Thou shalt not kill." After a correct answer the bishop generally put another question, whether killing was always in all cases forbidden by God's law, and the unhappy young ladies were forced by previous instruction to answer, "Not always"—that killing was permitted in war and in execution of criminals. Still, when one of these unfortunate young ladies (what I am telling is not an invention, but a fact told me by an eye-witness), after her first examination was asked the usual question, if killing were always sinful, she became agitated, and blushing, decisively answered, "Always"; and to all the usual sophisms of the bishop she answered with decided conviction, that killing always was forbidden in the Old Testament and not only killing was forbidden by Christ, but even every wrong against a brother. Notwithstanding all his grandeur and art of speech, the bishop became silent and the girl remained victorious.

Yes, we can talk in our newspapers of the progress of aviation, of complicated diplomatic relations, of different clubs and conventions, of unions of different kinds, of so-called productions of art, and keep silent about what that young lady said. But it cannot be passed over in silence, because it is felt, more or less dimly, but always felt, by every man in the Christian world. Socialism, Communism, Anarchism, Salvation Army, increasing crime, unemployment, the growing insane luxury of the rich and misery of the poor, the alarmingly increasing number of suicides—all these are the signs of that internal contradiction which must be solved and cannot remain unsolved. And they must be solved in the sense of acknowledging the law of love and denying violence.

Therefore, your activity in the Transvaal, as it seems to us, at this end of the

world, is the most essential work, the most important of all the work now being done in the world, wherein not only the nations of the Christian, but of all the world, will unavoidably take part.

I think that you will be pleased to know that here in Russia this activity is also fast developing in the way of refusals to serve in the Army, the number of which increases from year to year. However insignificant is the number of our people who are passive resisters in Russia who refuse to serve in the Army, these and the others can boldly say that God is with them. And God is more powerful than man.

In acknowledging Christianity even in that corrupt form in which it is professed amongst the Christian nations, and at the same time in acknowledging the necessity of armies and armament for killing on the greatest scale in wars, there is such a clear clamouring contradiction, that it must sooner or later, possibly very soon, inevitably reveal itself and annihilate either the professing of the Christian religion, which is indispensable in keeping up these forces, or the existence of armies and all the violence kept up by them, which is not less necessary for power. This contradiction is felt by all governments, by your British as well as by our Russian Governments, and out of a general feeling of self-preservation the persecution by them (as seen in Russia and in the journal sent by you) against such anti-government activity, as those above-mentioned, is carried on with more energy than against any other form of opposition. The governments know where their chief danger lies, and they vigilantly guard in this question, not only their interests, but the question: "To be or not to be?"

SATYAGRAHA CAMPAIGNS

I. IN SOUTH AFRICA

FIRST STAGE:

September 11, 1906: Started in Johannesburg

Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance seeking to curtail further rights of Asiatic settlers in South Africa published in Transvaal Government Gazette Extraordinary on August 22, 1906. About 3,000 delegates of the Indian settlers met at Johannesburg on September 11, 1906, and pledged solemnly, "with God as witness," to resist by non-violent means the bill, if it was passed into law. Civil resistance. Two hundred people with Gandhiji sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. On January 30, 1907, settlement between Gandhiji and General Smuts.

SECOND STAGE:

August 16, 1908: Resumed in Johannesburg

Smuts could not keep promise that the Ordinance would be repealed if Indians registered voluntarily. Satyagraha resumed with bonfire of 2,000 certificates of domicile in public meeting at Johannesburg, on August 16, 1908. Imprisonment, fines, persecution heaped upon Satyagrahis. Flogging and firing on large scale in mining areas.

THIRD STAGE:

October 28, 1913: March from Newcastle to Volksrust

Gandhiji led great march across Transvaal border from Newcastle in Natal Province. Over 6,000 Indian miners on strike. Hundreds courted jail. After due notice to Government, 2,037 men, 127 women, and 75 children began their march into the Transvaal area. Arrest of Gandhiji and marchers. Provisional settlement. Gandhiji released. Satyagraha suspended for last time on January 21, 1914, after correspondence with General Smuts.

Relief of Indians Act became law in July 1914 repealing the £3 tax and meeting almost all the demands of the Indian settlers.

II. IN INDIA

1. VIRAMGAM, GUJARAT, *1915*:

Customs passengers to Kathiawad harassed. Gandhiji took up question, made representations to Viceroy, asked people to be prepared for Satyagraha. Central Government removed customs in 1917. Decision hastened on account of preparations for Satyagraha.


President
Leaders
Guests
Public
Chorus
Band
Bugler
Standard-bearer
Captain
Volunteer

SATYAGRAHA CAMPAIGNS

2. CHAMPARAN, BIHAR, *April, 1917* :

European indigo planters compelled Champaran peasants to cultivate indigo in three-twentieths of their holdings and imposed a number of levies. Gandhiji went there to investigate into grievances. Served with a notice to quit Motihari *district on April 17, 1917. Disobeyed the order. Tried but not sentenced.* Government instituted inquiry and removed grievances within six months

3. BOMBAY, *May 1917* :

Satyagraha against the Indian Emigration Act. Labour recruited for work in sugar plantations in Crown Colonies. Meeting in Bombay fixed May 31 as date for stopping indentured labour. Deputation of women to Viceroy. Gandhiji proposed to picket ships on which labourers were sent. Chelmsford, Viceroy, saw danger of passive resistance struggle and called Gandhiji. Suspension of all further emigration for duration of war. Indenture system abolished on January 1, 1920.

4. AHMEDABAD, GUJARAT, *February 26, 1918* :

Gandhiji conducted 22-day labour strike for enforcing a claim for increased wages. When the morale of strikers seemed to sink, Gandhiji went on fast. Satisfactory settlement within three days. Labourers got 35 per cent increment on their 1917 July pay scale.

5. KHEDA, GUJARAT, *March, 1918* :

On account of failure of crops peasants demanded suspension of revenue according to rules. Authorities' refusal. Gandhiji advised people not to pay. Government conceded the demand in July after much suffering by people.

6. ROWLATT ACT SATYAGRAHA, *April 6, 1919* :

First all-India campaign that Gandhiji led. Protest against the enforcement of Rowlatt Act which deprived citizens of primary civic rights in the matter of trials for sedition etc. Gandhiji issued instructions from Madras on March 23, 1919. Fasting, prayer, *hartal*, protest meetings enjoined. Satyagrahis to break civilly press law and law regarding proscribed literature. One week set apart from April 6 to 13 for this. Police shooting and mob violence in half a dozen places. In Jallianwala Bagh, Amritsar, about 20,000 unarmed citizens assembled to protest. Military under General Dyer opened fire. According to official figures about 400 were killed and between a thousand and two wounded.

Gandhiji suspended movement on April 18, 1919, observed that he had miscalculated the forces of evil and committed "Himalayan blunder." Reiterated faith in Satyagraha and emphasised Satyagraha not cause of outbreak of violence but restraining influence.

7. NON-VIOLENT NON-CO-OPERATION, *August 1, 1920* :

Second all-India campaign. Against Punjab and the *Khilafat* wrongs and for the attainment of *swaraj*. The *Khilafat* committee adopted Gandhiji's programme. He surrendered his Kaiser-i-Hind medal on August 1 and inaugurated non-violent non-co-operation.

Non-co-operation adopted by special Congress session at Calcutta on September 4. Surrender of titles and honorary posts, boycott of Government schools and colleges, of law courts, of elections and legislatures, starting of national schools, establishment of *panchayats*, increase in Congress membership, spread of khaddar, collection of a *swaraj* fund were important features of programme. About 30,000 jailed by the end of 1921. Full programme of non-co-operation including no-tax campaign to be carried on in Bardoli *taluka* in February 1922. Meanwhile violence at Chauri Chaura and Gandhiji suspended Bardoli programme. Arrested on March 10 and sentenced to six years on March 18. In November 1922, movement suspended. Council-entry programme began to gain ground. Phenomenal awakening among the masses.

8. VYKOM, TRAVANCORE, *1924* :

Untouchables not allowed to pass by a public road at Vykom, village in Travancore. Volunteers started Satyagraha by trying to pass by road along with untouchables. State supported orthodox community with police aid. Barricades erected, police cordon formed. Gandhiji suggested volunteers should stand in front of barricades in prayerful mood. In the end, State withdrew its support and the orthodox gave way. In 1936, the Maharaja of Travancore threw open all State temples to all Hindus including untouchables.

9. MADRAS, *August, 1927* :

Some Congressmen in Madras started Satyagraha for removal of statue of Neill—a British general connected with 1857 rebellion. Gandhiji supported Satyagraha in *Young India*. Satyagraha discontinued after sometime. In 1937 Congress Ministry got statue removed.

10. BARDOLI, GUJARAT, *February 12, 1928* :

No-tax campaign against increment in land revenue by Settlement Revision Officers in Bardoli *taluka*. Struggle for over six months. Peasants suffered heavily. Attachments, forfeitures, arrests. Government ordered enquiry. Broomfield Committee gave finding in May 1929 that peasants were in the right and that the 22 per cent increase in land revenue was "sheer loot."*

11. CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE, *March 12, 1930*

Third all-India Satyagraha campaign. In December 1929, Congress declared complete independence as its creed and January 26, 1930, was observed as

Independence Day throughout India. Pledge taken by all to fight for *swaraj*. On March 12, Gandhiji started historic 200-mile march from Ahmedabad to Dandi. April 6 fixed for breaking the Salt Law. Millions broke law and courted jail. Raids on salt depots at Dharasna, Wadala, Shiroda, Sanekatta. *Lathi* freely used by police. In single raid at Dharasna 289 volunteers wounded. Breach of other laws. By March 1931, more than 95,000 jailed. Thousands suffered from *lathi* charges. Firing in some places. No-tax campaign in some areas. Gandhiji jailed in May 1930.

After negotiations for about a month Gandhi-Irwin Pact was signed on March 5, 1931. Ordinances withdrawn, salt law loosened, to enable poor people to use salt freely.

12. SIRSI, SIDDAPUR, HIREKERUR, *March, 1931* :

On account of failure of crops peasants of three *talukas* in Karnatak appealed to Government for suspension of revenue. Government refused, said it was political move—those were days of civil disobedience movement. Peasants resorted to no-tax campaign. Attachment of property, forfeiture and other harassments. Peasants firm. Even after Gandhi-Irwin Pact, campaign continued—as it was not political—with Gandhiji's moral support. Authorities agreed to some concessions in May 1931. Attached property returned, forfeiture notices withdrawn, arrested persons released, pending cases cancelled. In November more concessions in Sirsi and Siddapur.

13. CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE, *December 31, 1931* :

Gandhiji returned to India from R. T. C. on December 28, 1931. By that time, ordinances promulgated in U.P. and Frontier, Jawaharlal Nehru and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan arrested. Viceroy's refusal to discuss the ordinances and arrests with Gandhiji. Congress forced to declare resumption of civil disobedience on December 31. Gandhiji once more tried to negotiate but Willingdon's refusal of free interview. On January 4, 1932, Gandhiji and Vallabhbhai Patel arrested. Ordinances promulgated, Congress committees declared unlawful along with numerous national schools, kisan sabhas etc. Thousands of Congress workers detained or interned. Laws broken by thousands. Boycott of foreign cloth and foreign firms and business concerns tightened. No-tax campaigns in Gujarat, Karnatak, and Bengal. In September 1932 diversion on account of Gandhiji's Harijan fast. By the end of 1932, a lakh of people in jail. Shootings in Peshawar and other places. In May 1933 mass civil disobedience suspended, individual civil disobedience started. Continued till July 1934, when movement was suspended by the All-India Congress Committee on recommendation made by Gandhiji.

14. INDIVIDUAL SATYAGRAHA, *October, 1940* :

Freedom of speech the issue. Gandhiji's plea for freedom to express and

propagate one's view regarding war. But Government did not agree. Vinoba Bhave chosen by Gandhiji as first Satyagrahi to preach openly against war. Vinoba arrested and sentenced. About 30,000 participated in Satyagraha after giving notice to Government and were sentenced or detained. About 400 members from Provincial Legislatures, about 30 from the Central Legislature, and all Working Committee members took part. It was "Representative Satyagraha." Gandhiji himself not arrested. In December 1941, Government released all individual Satyagrahis as a gesture. Congress did not revive movement. Preoccupied with problem of self-sufficiency and self-defence since Japan was near India's border.

15. "QUIT INDIA" CAMPAIGN, *August 8, 1942* :

After failure of Cripps negotiations Gandhiji started "Quit India" campaign. British Government's refusal to recognise Indian independence and part with power. A.I.C.C. in Bombay on August 8, 1942, declared that India had no other way but to sanction non-violent mass struggle under Gandhiji's leadership for her right to freedom. After passing of resolution, Gandhiji said that he would communicate with Viceroy before launching movement. Government, however, did not wait and by the morning of August 9, arrested and detained Gandhiji and Working Committee members and thousands of Congressmen. Ordinances promulgated and Congress organizations declared unlawful.


SOUTH AFRICA
Ashr
Jail
Satya

GANDHIJI IN JAILS

I. IN SOUTH AFRICA

January 10, 1908	*Johannesburg*	Two months' simple imprisonment. Released on January 30, 1908.
October 15, 1908	*Volksrust and Pretoria*	About two months in different jails.
November 6, 1913	*Palmford*	Arrested and released on bail.
November 8, 1913	*Standerton*	Arrested and released on bail.
November 9, 1913	*Teakworth*	Arrested and taken to Dundee for trial.
November 11, 1913	*Dundee*	*Nine months' rigorous imprisonment.*
November 17, 1913	*Volksrust*	Three months' rigorous imprisonment; kept in jail for a few days.
November, 1913	*Bloemfontein*	Transferred from Volksrust. Released on December 18, 1913.

First imprisonment in Johannesburg on January 10, 1908. Sentenced to two months' simple imprisonment for disobeying an order to leave the Transvaal. Taken to the fort of Johannesburg in prison garb and thrown into a cell with negroes and Common Law criminals. Released on January 30, 1908, as a result of a settlement arrived at between him and General Smuts.

Struggle resumed on August 16, 1908, on account of breach of promise by General Smuts. But for two months in October-December, 1908, Gandhiji not put in prison till November 6, 1913.

While leading march of 2,037 men, 127 women and 57 children from Newcastle in Natal across Transvaal border, he was arrested at Palmford. Released immediately on bail.

Arrested again on November 8, 1913 at Standerton and released on bail. Arrested on November 9 at Teakworth again, he was taken to Dundee on November 11 to stand trial. Sentenced to nine months' rigorous imprisonment for inducing indentured labourers to leave Natal. Taken to Volksrust to stand second trial for aiding and abetting in prohibited persons entering Transvaal. Sentenced on November 17, 1913, to three months' rigorous imprisonment on second charge. Taken to Volksrust jail for a few days, then transferred to Bloemfontein, the capital of Orange Free State, to isolate him from Indian prisoners.

Released on December 18, 1913 for carrying on negotiations for a settlement.

II. IN INDIA

April 17, 1917	*Motihari*	Served with a notice to quit but not arrested.
April 10, 1919	*Kosi*	Arrested and escorted back to Bombay.
March 10, 1922	*Sabarmati*	Arrested for sedition.
March 18, 1922	*Yeravda*	Sentenced to six years and taken to Yeravda. Released on February 7, 1924.
May 5, 1930	*Yeravda*	Arrested at Karadi, taken to Yeravda. Released on January 26, 1931.
January 4, 1932	*Yeravda*	Arrested in Bombay and taken to Yeravda. Released on May 8, 1933.
July 31, 1933	*Yeravda*	Arrested and detained. Released but put under restraint order on August 4, 1933.
August 4, 1933	*Poona*	Sentenced to one year. Released on August 23, 1933.
August 9, 1942	*Aga Khan Palace*	Arrested in Bombay and detained in Aga Khan Palace. Released on May 6, 1944, on account of illness.

First clash with authorities in India on April 17, 1917. He had gone to Motihari to inquire into the grievances of Champaran peasants. Served with notice to quit district. Refused. Tried but not sentenced. Case withdrawn.

In 1919 while proceeding to Punjab on urgent call during Satyagraha Week—April 6 to 13—arrested on April 10 at Kosi near Delhi and escorted back to Bombay. No case launched.

Arrested on March 10, 1922, at Sabarmati for sedition for three articles in *Young India*. Sentenced to six years' simple imprisonment and sent to Yeravda. Attack of appendicitis. Released on February 7, 1924.

Dandi march on March 12, 1930. He encamped at Karadi and broke the salt law. Not arrested. On night of May 3, arrested under Regulation XXV of 1827 and lodged in Yeravda without trial on May 5. Released on January 26, 1931 for negotiations with Lord Irwin. Gandhi-Irwin Pact.

GANDHIJI IN JAILS

Civil disobedience resumed on December 31, 1931. Gandhiji arrested in the early morning of January 4, 1932, along with Sardar Patel. Detained without trial under Regulation III of 1818.

Gandhiji released on May 8, 1933, when he started purificatory fast for 21 days. Decided upon offering individual civil disobedience on July 31. Arrested and detained in Yeravda for a few days. Released and restraint order served on August 4. He broke it the very day. Sentenced to one year's simple imprisonment. Confined in Yeravda.

As protest against Communal Award, began fast which resulted in release. Decided to restrict himself to anti-untouchability work during unexpired period of sentence up to August 4, 1934.

Arrest in Bombay on August 9, 1942. Detained under section 26 of Defence of India Rules and confined in Aga Khan Palace. Released at 8 a.m. on May 6, 1944, on account of anaemia and other complaints which threatened to endanger his life.



GANDHIJI'S FASTS

1913, Phoenix: Penitential fast for a week for moral lapse of two inmates at Settlement. Took only one meal a day for next four and half months.

1914, Phoenix: Fourteen days' fast for similar reasons.

1918, March 12, Ahmedabad: Seeing weakness of Ahmedabad strikers Gandhiji declared: "Unless the strikers rally and continue the strike till a settlement is reached or until they leave the mill altogether I will not touch any food." Settlement reached after three days' fast.

1919, April 13, Sabarmati: Penitential fast for three days when attempts were made to pull off rails at Nadiad. Appeal to people to observe similar fast for a day. Suggested to those who had been guilty of violence to confess.

1921, November 9-13, Bombay: Five days' fast following rioting and bloodshed on occasion of Prince of Wales' visit

1922, February second week, Bardoli: Five days' fast in connection with Chauri Chaura incident.

1924, September 18, Delhi: 21 days' fast as a result of Hindu-Muslim riots in Kohat.

1925, November 24, Sabarmati: Seven days' fast after discovering error among *ashram* inmates.

1932, September 20, noon, Yeravda Prison: Gandhiji's decision to start "a perpetual fast unto death from food of any kind, save water with or without salt and soda" against MacDonald's Communal Award. At 5 p.m. on September 26, Gandhiji was handed a Government *communique*, which satisfied him. Fast broken.

1932, December 22, Yeravda Prison: Sympathetic fast with Appasaheb Patwardhan who asked for scavenger's work in jail and was refused by authorities. Within two days assurance was given and fast broken

1933, May 8, Yeravda Prison: Self-purificatory fast for 21 days; "a heart prayer for purification of myself and my associates for greater vigilance and watchfulness in connection with the Harijan cause." Government released Gandhiji on the same day. Fast concluded on May 29 at "Parnakuti" in Poona.

1933, August 16, Yeravda Prison: Gandhiji refused facilities granted before release in May. Harijan work not allowed from inside jail Fast. On August 20, removed to Sassoon Hospital, still a prisoner. By August 23 condition serious. Released unconditionally.

1934, August 7, Wardhaganj: Irate reformer attacked opponent of Harijan movement with *lathi*. Gandhiji took to seven days' fast as "penance for intolerance shown by opponents towards one another."

GANDHIJI'S FASTS

1939, March 3, noon, Rajkot · Gandhiji charged Rajkot ruler with breaking solemn pact with people Fast Viceroy suggested with ruler's assent arbitration by Chief Justice of India, Sir Maurice Gwyer. Fast broken at 2-20 p m, on March 7.

1943, February 10, noon, Aga Khan Palace · Three weeks' fast in detention—as appeal from Government to God for justice.

THE TRICOLOUR

1906:

THREE COLOURS: saffron with eight stars across, white with *Vande Mataram* and green with moon to right and sun to left. Proposed by some Indians in England and France who thought of an "Indian National Flag." Not recognised in India.

1916:

TWO COLOURS red and green, with five red and four green stripes. Emblem of Great Bear. Union Jack at top left. In vogue during "Home Rule" days.

1921:

THREE COLOURS: white, green and red, with *charkha* across all colours. Sponsored by Gandhiji at time of Bezwada session of A.I.C.C. Used at Congress sessions till 1931, though not officially accepted by Congress.

1931:

ONE COLOUR: saffron, with *charkha* at top left. Proposed by committee appointed by Working Committee after Karachi Congress. Not approved by Working Committee.

AUGUST:

THREE COLOURS: saffron, white and green, in horizontal bands, *charkha* in blue colour in middle across white strip. Length and breadth in proportion of 3:2.

Proposed by Working Committee. Form of flag suggested by Gandhiji retained with slight changes in order of colours and position of *charkha*.

Accepted by A I.C.C. officially in Bombay.

Colours not symbols of communities. Saffron represents courage and sacrifice, white truth and peace, green faith and strength. The *charkha* stands for the welfare of the masses.

April 26 has been observed as National Flag Day from 1931.


वंदेमातरम्
1906
1916
1921
1931
1931
August 1st.

GANDHIJI'S IDEAS

ON GOD
PRAYER
FIRST PLUNGE
THE DOCTRINE OF THE SWORD
SWADESHI
BIRTH OF KHADI
HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY
NATIONAL LANGUAGE
ROMAN SCRIPT?
WHY MANUAL TRAINING
UNTOUCHABILITY
A CRY FOR JUSTICE
WOMAN'S ROLE
MAGANLAL GANDHI
VALLIAMMA

Compiled by R. K. Prabhu

MY INCONSISTENCIES
ON VOWS
FASTING
DIET
PROHIBITION
CRIME AND PUNISHMENT
CALL OF THE VILLAGES
TRUE INTERNATIONALISM

ON GOD

THERE is an indefinable mysterious Power that pervades everything I feel it, though I do not see it. It is this unseen Power which makes itself felt and yet defies all proof, because it is so unlike all that I perceive through my senses. It transcends the senses. But it is possible to reason out the existence of God to a limited extent.

Even in ordinary affairs we know that people do not know who rules or why and how he rules, yet they know that there is a power that certainly rules. In my tour last year in Mysore I met many poor villagers, and I found upon enquiry that they did not know who ruled Mysore; they simply said some god ruled it. If the knowledge of these poor people was so limited about their ruler, I who am infinitely lesser in respect to God than they to their ruler need not be surprised if I do not realise the presence of God, the King of kings.

Nevertheless I do feel, as the poor villagers felt about Mysore, that there is orderliness in the universe; there is an unalterable Law governing everything and every being that exists or lives. It is not a blind law; for no blind law can govern the conduct of living beings; and thanks to the marvellous researches of Sir J. C. Bose, it can now be proved that even matter is life.

That Law, then, which governs all life is God. Law and the lawgiver are one. I may not deny the Law or the Law-Giver because I know so little about It or Him. Just as my denial or ignorance of the existence of an earthly power will avail me nothing, even so my denial of God and His law will not liberate me from its operation; whereas humble and mute acceptance of divine authority makes life's journey easier even as the acceptance of earthly rule makes life under it easier.

I do dimly perceive that whilst everything around me is ever-changing, ever-dying, there is underlying all that change a Living Power that is changeless, that holds all together, that creates, dissolves, and re-creates. That informing Power or Spirit is God; and since nothing else that I see merely through the senses can or will persist, He alone is.

And is this power benevolent or malevolent? I see it as purely benevolent. For I can see that in the midst of death, life persists; in the midst of untruth, truth persists; in the midst of darkness, light persists Hence I gather that God is Life, Truth, Light. He is Love. He is the supreme Good.

But He is no God who merely satisfies the intellect, if He ever does. God, to be God, must rule the heart and transform it. He must express Himself in every smallest act of His votary This can only be done through a definite realisation, more real than the five senses can ever produce Sense perceptions can be, and

often are, false and deceptive, however real they may appear to us. Where there is a realisation outside the senses it is infallible. It is proved, not by extraneous evidence, but in the transformed conduct and character of those who have felt the real presence of God within.

Such testimony is to be found in the experiences of an unbroken line of prophets and sages in all countries and climes. To reject this evidence is to deny oneself.

This realisation is preceded by an immovable faith. He who would in his own person test the fact of God's presence can do so by a living faith; and since faith itself cannot be proved by extraneous evidence, the safest course is to believe in the moral government of the world, and therefore in the supremacy of the moral law, the law of Truth and Love. Exercise of faith will be the safest where there is a clear determination summarily to reject all that is contrary to Truth and Love.

I confess that I have no argument to convince through reason. Faith transcends reason. All I can advise is not to attempt the impossible. I cannot account for the existence of evil by any rational method. To want to do so is to be coequal with God. I am therefore humble enough to recognise evil as such; and I call God long-suffering and patient precisely because He permits evil in the world; I know that He has no evil in Himself; and yet if there is evil He is the author of it and yet untouched by it.

I know, too, that I shall never know God if I do not wrestle with and against evil, even at the cost of life itself. I am fortified in the belief by my own humble and limited experience. The purer I try to become the nearer to God I feel myself to be. How much more should I be near to Him when my faith is not a mere apology, as it is today, but has become as immovable as the Himalayas and as white as the snows on their peaks?

1931

PRAYER

PRAYER has saved my life. Without it, I should have been a lunatic long ago. I have had my share of the bitterest public and private experiences. They threw me into temporary despair. If I was able to get rid of that despair, it was because of prayer. Prayer has not been a part of my life as truth has been. Prayer came out of sheer necessity. I found myself in a plight where I could not possibly be happy without prayer. The more my faith in God increased, the more irresistible became the yearning for prayer. Life seemed to be dull and vacant without it.

I had attended the Christian religious services in South Africa, but they failed to grip me. My Christian friends supplicated God, but I could not do so. I failed grievously. I started with a disbelief in God and prayer. And until at a late stage in life I did not feel anything like a void in life. At that stage, I felt that as food was indispensable to the body, so was prayer indispensable for the soul. In fact, food for the body is not so necessary as prayer for the soul. For starvation is often necessary in order to keep the body in health, but there is no such thing as prayer starvation. You cannot possibly have a surfeit of prayer.

Three of the greatest teachers of the world, Buddha, Jesus, and Mohammed, have left unimpeachable testimony that they found illumination through prayer and could not possibly live without it. Millions of Christians, Hindus and Mussalmans find their only solace in life in prayer. Either you vote them down as liars, or as self-deluded people. I will say that this "lying" has a charm for me, a truth-seeker, if it is "lying" that has given me that mainstay or staff of life, without which I could not dare to live for a moment. In spite of despair staring me in the face on the political horizon, I have never lost my peace. In fact, I have found people who envy my peace. That peace comes from prayer.

I am not a man of learning, but I humbly claim to be a man of prayer. I am indifferent as to the form. Everyone is a law unto himself in that respect. But there are some well-marked roads, and it is safe to walk along the beaten tracks trod by the ancient teachers...

—*Cultural World*

FIRST PLUNGE

FRIENDS, I wish to tender my humble apology for the long delay that took place before I was able to reach this place. And you will readily accept the apology when I tell you that I am not responsible for the delay nor is any human agency responsible for it. (Laughter) The fact is that I am like an animal on show, and my keepers in their over-kindness always manage to neglect a necessary chapter in this life, and that is pure accident. In this case, they did not provide for the series of accidents that happened to us—to me, keepers, and my carriers. Hence this delay.

Friends, under the influence of the matchless eloquence of the lady (Mrs. Besant) who has just sat down, pray, do not believe that our University has become a finished product, and that all the young men who are to come to the University, that has yet to rise and come into existence, have also come and returned from it finished citizens of a great empire. Do not go away with any such impression, and if you, the student world to which my remarks are supposed to be addressed this evening, consider for one moment that the spiritual life, for which this country is noted and for which this country has no rival, can be transmitted through the lip, pray, believe me you are wrong. You will never be able merely through the lip, to give the message that India, I hope, will one day deliver to the world. I myself have been "fed up" with speeches and lectures. I except the lectures that have been delivered here during the last two days from this category, because they are necessary. But I do venture to suggest to you that we have now reached almost the end of our resources in speech-making, and it is not enough that our ears are feasted, that our eyes are feasted, but it is necessary that our hearts have got to be touched and that our hands and feet have got to be moved.

We have been told during the last two days how necessary it is, if we are to retain our hold upon the simplicity of Indian character, that our hands and feet should move in unison with our hearts. But this is only by way of preface. I wanted to say it is a matter of deep humiliation and shame for us that I am compelled this evening under the shadow of this great college, in this sacred city, to address my countrymen in a language that is foreign to me. I know that if I was appointed an examiner, to examine all those who have been attending during these two days this series of lectures, most of those who might be examined upon these lectures would fail. And why? Because they have not been touched.

I was present at the sessions of the great Congress in the month of December. There was a much vaster audience, and will you believe me when I tell you that

the only speeches that touched the huge audience in Bombay were the speeches that were delivered in Hindustani? In Bombay, mind you, not in Benares where everybody speaks Hindi. But between the vernaculars of the Bombay Presidency on the one hand, and Hindi on the other, no such great dividing line exists as there does between English and the sister languages of India; and the Congress audience was better able to follow the speakers in Hindi. I am hoping that this University will see to it that the youths who come to it will receive their instruction through the medium of their vernaculars. Our language is the reflection of ourselves, and if you tell me that our languages are too poor to express the best thought, then say that the sooner we are wiped out of existence the better for us. Is there a man who dreams that English can ever become the national language of India? (Cries of "Never") Why this handicap on the nation? Just consider for one moment what an unequal race our lads have to run with every English lad.

I had the privilege of a close conversation with some Poona professors. They assured me that every Indian youth, because he reached his knowledge through the English language, lost at least six precious years of life. Multiply that by the number of students turned out by our schools and colleges, and find out for yourselves how many thousand years have been lost to the nation. The charge against us is that we have no initiative. How can we have any if we are to devote the precious years of our life to the mastery of a foreign tongue? We fail in this attempt also. Was it possible for any speaker yesterday and today to impress his audience as was possible for Mr. Higginbotham? It was not the fault of the previous speakers that they could not engage the audience. They had more than substance enough for us in their addresses. But their addresses could not go home to us. I have heard it said that after all it is English-educated India which is leading and which is doing all the things for the nation. It would be monstrous if it were otherwise. The only education we receive is English education. Surely we must show something for it. But suppose that we had been receiving during the past fifty years education through our vernaculars, what should we have today? We should have today a free India, we should have our educated men, not as if they were foreigners in their own land but speaking to the heart of the nation; they would be working amongst the poorest of the poor, and whatever they would have gained during the fifty years would be a heritage for the nation. (Applause) Today even our wives are not the sharers in our best thought. Look at Professor Bose and Professor Ray and their brilliant researches. Is it not a shame that their researches are not the common property of the masses?

Let us now turn to another subject.

The Congress has passed a resolution about self-government, and I have no doubt that the All-India Congress Committee and the Muslim League will do their duty and come forward with some tangible suggestions. But I, for one, must frankly confess that I am not so much interested in what they will be able to

produce as I am interested in anything that the student world is going to produce or the masses are going to produce. No paper contribution will ever give us self-government. No amount of speeches will ever make us fit for self-government. It is only our conduct that will fit us for it. (Applause) And how are we trying to govern ourselves?

I want to think audibly this evening. I do not want to make a speech and if you find me this evening speaking without reserve, pray, consider that you are only sharing the thoughts of a man who allows himself to think audibly, and if you think that I seem to transgress the limits that courtesy imposes upon me, pardon me for the liberty I may be taking. I visited the Viswanath temple last evening, and as I was walking through those lanes, these were the thoughts that touched me. If a stranger dropped from above on to this great temple, and he had to consider what we as Hindus were would he not be justified in condemning us? Is not this great temple a reflection of our own character? I speak feelingly, as a Hindu. Is it right that the lanes of our sacred temple should be as dirty as they are? The houses round about are built anyhow. The lanes are tortuous and narrow. If even our temples are not models of roominess and cleanliness, what can our self-government be? Shall our temples be abodes of holiness, cleanliness and peace as soon as the English have retired from India, either of their own pleasure or by compulsion, bag and baggage?

I entirely agree with the President of the Congress that before we think of self-government, we shall have to do the necessary plodding. In every city there are two divisions, the cantonment and the city proper. The city mostly is a stinking den. But we are a people unused to city life. But if we want city life, we cannot reproduce the easy-going hamlet life. It is not comforting to think that people walk about the streets of Indian Bombay under the perpetual fear of dwellers in the storeyed buildings spitting upon them. I do a great deal of railway travelling. I observe the difficulty of third class passengers. But the Railway Administration is by no means to blame for all their hard lot. We do not know the elementary laws of cleanliness. We spit anywhere on the carriage floor, irrespective of the thought that it is often used as sleeping space. We do not trouble ourselves as to how we use it; the result is indescribable filth in the compartment. The so-called better class passengers over-awe their less fortunate brethren. Among them I have seen the student world also, sometimes they behave no better. They can speak English and they have worn Norfolk jackets and therefore claim the right to force their way in and command seating accommodation.

I have turned the searchlight all over, and as you have given me the privilege of speaking to you I am laying my heart bare. Surely we must set these things right in our progress towards self-government. I now introduce you to another scene. His Highness the Maharajah who presided yesterday over our deliberations spoke about the poverty of India. Other speakers laid great stress upon it. But

what did we witness in the great *pandal* in which the foundation ceremony was performed by the Viceroy? Certainly a most gorgeous show, and exhibition of jewellery which made a splendid feast for the eyes of the greatest jeweller who chose to come from Paris. I compare with the richly bedecked noblemen the millions of the poor. And I feel like saying to those noblemen, "There is no salvation for India unless you strip yourselves of this jewellery and hold it in trust for your countrymen in India." ("Hear, hear" and applause) I am sure it is not the desire of the King-Emperor or Lord Hardinge that in order to show the truest loyalty to our King-Emperor, it is necessary for us to ransack our jewellery-boxes and to appear bedecked from top to toe. I would undertake, at the peril of my life, to bring to you a message from King George himself that he expects nothing of the kind.

Sir, whenever I hear of a great palace rising in any great city of India, be it in British India or be it in India which is ruled by our great chiefs, I become jealous at once, and say, "Oh, it is the money that has come from the agriculturists." Over seventy-five per cent of the population are agriculturists and Mr. Higginbotham told us last night in his own felicitous language, that they are the men who grow two blades of grass in the place of one. But there cannot be much spirit of self-government about us if we take away or allow others to take away from them almost the whole of the results of their labour. Our salvation can only come through the farmer. Neither the lawyers, nor the doctors, nor the rich landlords are going to secure it.

Now, last but not the least, it is my bounden duty to refer to what agitated our minds during these two or three days. All of us have had many anxious moments while the Viceroy was going through the streets of Benares. There were detectives stationed in many places. We were horrified. We asked ourselves, "Why this distrust?" Is it not better that even Lord Hardinge should die than live a living death? But a representative of a mighty sovereign may not. He might find it necessary even to live a living death. But why was it necessary to impose these detectives on us? We may foam, we may fret, we may resent but let us not forget that India of today in her impatience has produced an army of anarchists. I myself am an anarchist, but of another type. But there is a class of anarchists amongst us, and if I was able to reach this class, I would say to them that their anarchism has no room in India, if India is to conquer the conqueror. It is a sign of fear. If we trust and fear God, we shall have to fear no one, not Maharajahs, not Viceroys, not the detectives, not even King George.

I honour the anarchist for his love of the country. I honour him for his bravery in being willing to die for his country; but I ask him—is killing honourable? Is the dagger of an assassin a fit precursor of an honourable death? I deny it. There is no warrant for such methods in any scriptures. If I found it necessary for the salvation of India that the English should retire, that they should be driven out, I

would not hesitate to declare that they would have to go, and I hope I would be prepared to die in defence of that belief. That would, in my opinion, be an honourable death. The bomb-thrower creates secret plots, is afraid to come out into the open, and when caught pays the penalty of misdirected zeal.

I have been told: "Had we not done this, had some people not thrown bombs we should never have gained what we have got with reference to the partition movement." (Mrs. Besant: "Please stop it.") This was what I said in Bengal when Mr. Lyon presided at the meeting. I think what I am saying is necessary. If I am told to stop I shall obey. (Turning to the Chairman) I await your orders. If you consider that by my speaking as I am, I am not serving the country and the empire I shall certainly stop. (Cries of "Go on!") (The Chairman: "Please explain your object.") I am simply (another interruption). My friends, please do not resent this interruption. If Mrs. Besant this evening suggests that I should stop she does so because she loves India so well, and she considers that I am erring in thinking audibly before you young men. But even so, I simply say this, that I want to purge India of this atmosphere of suspicion on either side, if we are to reach our goal; we *should have an empire which is to be based upon mutual love and mutual trust.* Is it not better that we talk under the shadow of this college than that we should be talking irresponsibly in our homes? I consider that it is much better that we talk these things openly. I have done so with excellent results before now. I know that there is nothing that the students are not discussing. There is nothing that the students do not know. I am therefore turning the searchlight towards ourselves. I hold the name of my country so dear to me that I exchange these thoughts with you, and submit to you that there is no room for anarchism in India. Let us frankly and openly say whatever we want to say to our rulers, and face the consequences if what we have to say does not please them But let us not abuse.

I was talking the other day to a member of the much-abused Civil Service. I have not very much in common with the members of that Service, but I could not help admiring the manner in which he was speaking to me. He said: "Mr. Gandhi, do you for one moment suppose that all we, Civil Servants, are a bad lot, that we want to oppress the people whom we have come to govern?" "No," I said. "Then if you get an opportunity put in a word for the much-abused Civil Service." And I am here to put in that word. Yes; many members of the Indian Civil Service are most decidedly overbearing; they are tyrannical, at times thoughtless. Many other adjectives may be used. I grant all these things and I grant also that after having lived in India for a certain number of years some of them become somewhat degraded. But what does that signify? They were gentlemen before they came here, and if they have lost some of the moral fibre, it is a reflection upon ourselves. (Cries of "No")

Just think out for yourselves, if a man who was good yesterday has become bad after having come in contact with me, is he responsible that he has deteriorated or

am I? The atmosphere of sycophancy and falsity that surrounds them on their coming to India demoralises them, as it would many of us. It is well to take the blame sometimes. If we are to receive self-government, we shall have to take it. We shall never be granted self-government. Look at the history of the British Empire and the British nation; freedom-loving as it is, it will not be a party to give freedom to a people who will not take it themselves. Learn your lesson if you wish to from the Boer War. Those who were enemies of that empire only a few years ago have now become friends... (Interruption and movement on the platform to leave The speech, therefore, ended abruptly)

First political speech after Gandhiji's return from South Africa—February 4, 1916, on the occasion of the opening of the Benares Hindu University.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SWORD

I DO believe that, where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. Thus when my eldest son asked me what he should have done, had he been present when I was almost fatally assaulted in 1908, whether he should have run away and seen me killed or whether he should have used his physical force which he could and wanted to use, and defend me, I told him that it was his duty to defend me even by using violence. Hence it was that I took part in the Boer War, the so-called Zulu Rebellion and the late War. Hence also do I advocate training in arms for those who believe in the method of violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour.

But I believe that non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment. Forgiveness adorns a soldier. But abstinence is forgiveness only when there is the power to punish; it is meaningless when it pretends to proceed from a helpless creature. A mouse hardly forgives a cat when it allows itself to be torn to pieces by her. I therefore appreciate the sentiment of those who cry out for the condign punishment of General Dyer and his ilk. They would tear him to pieces, if they could. But I do not believe India to be helpless. I do not believe myself to be a helpless creature. Only I want to use India's and my strength for a better purpose.

Let me not be misunderstood. Strength does not come from physical capacity. It comes from an indomitable will. An average Zulu is anyway more than a match for an average Englishman in bodily capacity. But he flees from an English boy, because he fears the boy's revolver or those who will use it for him. He fears death and is nerveless in spite of his burly figure We in India may in a moment realise that one hundred thousand Englishmen need not frighten three hundred million human beings. A definite forgiveness would, therefore, mean a definite recognition of our strength. With enlightened forgiveness must come a mighty wave of strength in us, which would make it impossible for a Dyer and a Frank Johnson to heap affront on India's devoted head. It matters little to me that for the moment I do not drive my point home. We feel too downtrodden not to be angry and revengeful. But I must not refrain from saying that India can gain more by waiving the right of punishment. We have better work to do, a better mission to deliver to the world.

I am not a visionary. I claim to be a practical idealist. The religion of non-violence is not meant merely for the *rishis* and saints. It is meant for the common people as well. Non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit lies dormant in the brute, and he knows no law but that of

physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law—to the strength of the spirit.

I have therefore ventured to place before India the ancient law of self-sacrifice. For Satyagraha and its offshoots, non-co-operation and civil resistance, are nothing but new names for the law of suffering. The *rishis*, who discovered the law of non-violence in the midst of violence, were greater geniuses than Newton. They were themselves greater warriors than Wellington. Having themselves known the use of arms, they realised their uselessness, and taught a weary world that its salvation lay not through violence but through non-violence.

Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means putting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Working under this law of our being, it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honour, his religion, his soul, and lay the foundation for that empire's fall or its regeneration.

And so I am not pleading for India to practise non-violence because it is weak. I want her to practise non-violence being conscious of her strength and power. No training in arms is required for realisation of her strength. We seem to need it, because we seem to think that we are but a lump of flesh. I want to recognise that she has a soul that cannot perish and that can rise triumphant above every physical weakness and defy the physical combination of a whole world. What is the meaning of Rama, a mere human being, with his host of monkeys, pitting himself against the insolent strength of ten-headed Ravana surrounded in supposed safety by the raging waters on all sides of Lanka? Does it not mean the conquest of physical might by spiritual strength? However, being a practical man, I do not wait till India recognises the practicability of the spiritual life in the political world. India considers herself to be powerless and paralysed before the machine-guns, the tanks and the aeroplanes of the English, and takes up non-co-operation out of her weakness. It must still serve the same purpose, namely, bring her delivery from the crushing weight of British injustice, if a sufficient number of people practise it.

I isolate this non-co-operation from Sinn Feinism, for it is so conceived as to be incapable of being offered side by side with violence. But I invite even the school of violence to give this peaceful non-co-operation a trial. It will not fail through its inherent weakness. It may fail because of poverty of response. Then will be the time for real danger. The high-souled men, who are unable to suffer national humiliation any longer, will want to vent their wrath. They will take to violence. So far as I know, they must perish without delivering themselves or their country from the wrong.

If India takes up the doctrine of the sword, she may gain momentary victory. Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart. I am wedded to India because I owe my all to her. I believe absolutely that she has a mission for the world. She

is not to copy Europe blindly. India's acceptance of the doctrine of the sword will be the hour of my trial I hope I shall not be found wanting My religion has no geographical limits If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself. My life is dedicated to the service of India through the religion of non-violence which I believe to be the root of Hinduism

Young India
August 11, 1920



SWADESHI

SWADESHI is that spirit in us which restricts us to the use and service of our immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the more remote. Thus as for religion, in order to satisfy the requirements of the definition, I must restrict myself to my ancestral religion. That is the use of my immediate religious surrounding. If I find it defective, I should serve it by purging it of its defects. In the domain of politics I should make use of the indigenous institutions and serve them by curing them of their proved defects. In that of economics I should use only things that are produced by my immediate neighbours and serve those industries by making them efficient and complete where they might be found wanting. It is suggested that such *swadeshi*, if reduced to practice, will lead to the millennium, because we do not expect quite to reach it within our times. So may we not abandon *swadeshi* even though it may not be fully attained for generations to come...

I do not believe that religion has nothing to do with politics. The latter divorced from religion is like a corpse only fit to be buried... I feel that, if the attempt to separate politics from religion had not been made as it is even now made, they would not have degenerated as they often appear to have done. No one considers that the political life of the country is in a happy state. Following out the *swadeshi* spirit, I observe, the indigenous institutions and the village *panchayats* hold me. India is really a republican country, and it is because it is that that it has survived every shock hitherto delivered. Princes and potentates, whether they were Indian-born or foreigners, have hardly touched the vast masses except for collecting revenue. The latter in their turn seem to have rendered unto Caesar what was Caesar's and for the rest have done much as they have liked. The vast organization of caste answered not only to the religious wants of the community but it answered to its political needs. The villagers managed their internal affairs through the caste system, and through it they dealt with any oppression from the ruling power or powers. It is not possible to deny of a nation that was capable of producing from the caste system its wonderful power of organization...

We have laboured under a terrible handicap owing to an almost fatal departure from the *swadeshi* spirit. We, the educated classes, have received our education through a foreign tongue. We have therefore not reacted upon the masses. We want to represent the masses, but we fail. They recognise us not much more than they recognise the English officers. Their hearts are an open book to neither. Their aspirations are not ours. Hence there is a break. And you witness not in reality failure to organize but want of correspondence between the representatives and the represented. If during the last fifty years we had been educated through the vernaculars, our elders and our servants and our neighbours would have partaken of

our knowledge; the discoveries of a Bose or a Ray would have been household treasures as are the *Ramayan* and the *Mahabharat*. As it is, so far as the masses are concerned, those great discoveries might as well have been made by foreigners. Had instruction in all the branches of learning been given through the vernaculars, I make bold to say that they would have been enriched wonderfully. The question of village sanitation etc. would have been solved long ago. The village *panchayats* would be now a living force in a special way, and India would almost be enjoying self-government suited to its requirements, and would have been spared the humiliating spectacle of organized assassination on its sacred soil. It is not too late to mend...

Much of the deep poverty of the masses is due to the ruinous departure from *swadeshi* in the economic and industrial life. If not an article of commerce had been brought from outside India, she would be today a land flowing with milk and honey. But that was not to be. We were greedy, and so was England. The connection between England and India was based clearly upon an error. But she does not remain in India in error. It is her declared policy that India is to be held in trust for her people. If this be true, Lancashire must stand aside. And if the *swadeshi* doctrine is a sound doctrine, Lancashire can stand aside without hurt, though it may sustain a shock for the time being.

I think of *swadeshi* not as a boycott movement undertaken by way of revenge. I conceive it as a religious principle to be followed by all. I am no economist, but I have read some treatises which show that England could easily become a self-sustained country, growing all the produce she needs. This may be an utterly ridiculous proposition, and perhaps the best proof that it cannot be true is that England is one of the largest importers in the world. But India cannot live for Lancashire or any other country before she is able to live for herself. And she can live for herself only if she produces and is helped to produce everything for her requirements within her own borders...

This may all sound nonsensical. Well, India is a country of nonsense. It is nonsensical to parch one's throat with thirst when a kindly Mussalman is ready to offer pure water to drink. And yet thousands of Hindus would rather die of thirst than drink water from a Muslim household. These nonsensical men can also, once they are convinced that their religion demands that they should wear garments manufactured in India only and eat food only grown in India, decline to wear any other clothing or eat any other food. Lord Curzon set the fashion for tea-drinking. And that pernicious drug now bids fair to overwhelm the nation. It has already undermined the digestive apparatus of hundreds of thousands of men and women and constitutes an additional tax upon their slender purses. Lord Hardinge can set the fashion for *swadeshi*, and almost the whole of India will forswear foreign goods. There is a verse in the *Bhagavad Gita* which, freely rendered, means: masses follow the classes. It is easy to undo the evil if the thinking portion of the com-

munity were to take the *swadeshi* vow, even though it may for a time cause considerable inconvenience...

It has often been urged that India cannot adopt *swadeshi* in the economic life at any rate. Those who advance this objection do not look upon *swadeshi* as a rule of life. With them it is a mere patriotic effort not be made if it involved any self-denial. *Swadeshi,* as defined here, is a religious discipline to be undergone in utter disregard of the physical discomfort it may cause to individuals. Under its spell the deprivation of a pin or needle, because these are not manufactured in India, need cause no terror. A *swadeshist* will learn to do without hundreds of things which today he considers necessary. Moreover, those who dismiss *swadeshi* from their minds by arguing the impossible, forget that *swadeshi*, after all, is a goal to be reached by steady effort... *Swadeshi* is the only doctrine consistent with the law of humility and love...

ADDRESS TO MISSIONARY CONFERENCE,

Madras, February 14, 1916

BIRTH OF KHADI

THE beginnings of the khadi movement had been more and more occupying my attention. I do not remember to have seen a handloom or spinning wheel till the year 1908, when I described it in my book *Hind Swaraj* as the panacea for India's growing pauperism. In that book I assume that anything that helped India to get rid of the grinding poverty of her masses would in the same process establish *swaraj*. Even in 1915, when I returned to India from South Africa, I had not actually seen a spinning wheel. When the Satyagraha Ashram at Sabarmati was founded we introduced a few handlooms there. But no sooner had we done this than we were hard up against another difficulty. All of us belonged either to the liberal professions or to business; none of us was an artisan. We needed a weaving expert to teach us how to weave before we could work looms. One was at last obtained from Palanpur, but he did not communicate to us the whole of his art. Maganlal Gandhi, however, was not the one to be easily baffled. Possessed of a natural gift for mechanics, he was able fully to master the art before long, and gradually several new weavers were trained up in the *ashram*.

The object that was set before us was to be able to clothe ourselves entirely in cloth manufactured by ourselves. We therefore discarded the use of mill-woven cloth made from Indian yarn. The adoption of this practice brought us a world of experience. It enabled us to know from direct contact the living conditions among the weavers, the extent of their production, the handicaps in the way of their obtaining their yarn supply, the manner in which they were being made victims of fraud, and their ever-growing indebtedness. We were not in a position immediately to manufacture the cloth we needed. So the time slipped by, and my impatience increased. I plied every chance visitor who was likely to have any information about hand-spinning with questions about the art. It had been confined to women. If there was some stray spinner still surviving, in some obscure corner, only a member of that sex was likely to find out her whereabouts.

In the year 1917 I was taken by my Gujarati friends to preside at the Broach Educational Conference. It was here that I discovered that remarkable lady, Gangabehn Majmudar. She was a widow, but her enterprising spirit knew no bounds. Her education, in the accepted sense of the term, was not much. But in courage and common sense she easily surpassed the general run of our educated women. She had already got rid of the curse of untouchability, and fearlessly moved among and served the suppressed classes. She had means of her own, and her needs were few. She had a well-seasoned constitution and went about everywhere without an escort. She felt quite at home on horseback. I came to know her more intimately





































at the Godhra Conference. To her I poured out my grief about the *charkha*, and she lightened my burden by a promise to prosecute an earnest and incessant search for the spinning wheel.

At last, after no end of wandering in Gujarat, Gangabehn found the spinning wheel in Vijapur in the Baroda State. Quite a number of people there had spinning wheels in their homes, but had long since consigned them to the lofts as useless lumber. They expressed to Gangabehn their readiness to resume spinning if some one promised to provide them with a regular supply of slivers and to buy the yarn spun by them. Gangabehn communicated the joyful news to me. The providing of slivers was found to be a difficult task. On mentioning the thing to Umar Sobani, however, he solved the difficulty by immediately undertaking to send a sufficient supply of slivers from his mill. I sent to Gangabehn the slivers received from Umar Sobani, and soon yarn began to pour in at such a rate that it became quite a problem how to cope with it.

I felt ill at ease continuously receiving slivers from him. Moreover, it seemed to me to be fundamentally wrong to use mill-slivers. So I suggested to Gangabehn to find carders who could supply slivers. She confidently undertook the task, and engaged a carder who was prepared to card cotton. He demanded thirty-five rupees per month. I considered no price too high at the time. She trained a few youngsters to make slivers out of the carded cotton. Gangabehn's enterprise thus prospered beyond expectation. She found out weavers to weave the yarn that was spun in Vijapur, and soon Vijapur khadi gained a name for itself.

While these developments were taking place in Vijapur, the spinning wheel gained a rapid footing in the *ashram*. Maganlal Gandhi, by bringing to bear all his splendid mechanical talent on the wheel, made many improvements in it. Wheels and their accessories began to be manufactured at the *ashram*. The first piece of khadi manufactured in the *ashram* cost seventeen annas per yard. I did not hesitate to commend this very coarse khadi at that price to friends, who willingly paid the amount.

I was laid up in bed in Bombay, but I was fit enough to make searches for the wheel there. At last I chanced upon two spinners, and brought them to the house where I was staying. The wheel began merrily to hum in my room, and I may say without exaggeration that its hum had no small share in restoring me to health. I am prepared to admit that its effect was more psychological than physical. But then, it only shows how powerful the physical in man reacts to the psychological. I too set my hand to the wheel, but I did not do much with it at the time.

From its very start the khadi movement evoked much criticism from the mill-owners. Umar Sobani, a capable mill-owner himself, not only gave me the benefit of his own knowledge and experience, but kept me in touch with the opinion of the other mill-owners as well. The argument advanced by one of these deeply impressed him. He pressed me to meet him, and arranged the interview. The mill-owner opened the conversation.

"You know that there has been *swadeshi* agitation before now?"

"Yes, I do," I replied.

"You are also aware that in the days of the Partition the mill-owners fully exploited the *swadeshi* movement. When it was at its height, we raised the prices of cloth, and did even worse things."

"Yes, I have heard something about it, and it has grieved me."

"I can understand your grief, but I can see no ground for it. We are not conducting our business out of philanthropy. We do it for profit; we have got to satisfy the shareholders. The price of an article is governed by the demand for it. Who can check the law of demand and supply? The Bengalis should have known that their agitation was bound to send up the price of *swadeshi* cloth by stimulating the demand for it."

I interrupted: "The Bengalis, like me, were trustful in their nature. They believed in the fullness of their faith that the mill-owners would not be so utterly selfish and unpatriotic as to betray their country in the hour of its need, and even go the length of fraudulently passing off foreign cloth as *swadeshi*."

"I know your believing nature," he rejoined, "that is why I put you to the trouble of coming to me, so that I might warn you against falling into the same error as these simple-hearted Bengalis."

With these words the mill-owner beckoned to his clerk who was standing by to produce samples of the stuff that was being manufactured in his mill. Pointing to it he said: "Look at this stuff. This is the latest variety turned out by our mill. It is meeting with a widespread demand. We manufacture it from the waste. Naturally, therefore, it is cheap. We send it as far north as the valley of the Himalayas. We have agencies all over the country, even in places where your voice or your agents can never reach. You can thus see that we do not stand in need of more agents. Besides, you ought to know that India's production of cloth falls far short of its requirements. The question of *swadeshi*, therefore, largely resolves itself into one of production. The moment we can increase our production sufficiently and improve its quality to the necessary extent, the import of foreign cloth will automatically cease. My advice to you, therefore, is not to carry on your agitation on its present lines, but to turn your attention to the erection of fresh mills. What we need is not propaganda to inflate demand for our goods, but greater production."

"Then surely you will bless my effort, if I am already engaged in that very thing," I asked.

"How can that be?" he exclaimed, a bit puzzled. "But may be you are thinking of promoting the establishment of new mills, in which case you certainly deserve to be congratulated."

"I am not doing exactly that," I explained, "but I am engaged in the revival of the spinning wheel."

"What is that?" he asked, feeling still more at sea. I told him all about the spinning wheel and the story of my long quest after it. "I am entirely of your opinion," I added, "it is no use my becoming virtually an agent for the mills. That would do more harm than good to the country. Our mills will not be in want of custom for a long time to come. My work should be, therefore, to organize the production of hand-spun cloth, and to find means for the disposal of the khadi thus produced. I am therefore concentrating my attention on the production of khadi. I swear by this form of *swadeshi* because through it I can provide work to the semi-starved, semi-employed women of India. My idea is to get these women to spin yarn, and to clothe the people of India with khadi woven out of it. I do not know how far this movement is going to succeed. At present it is only beginning. But I have full faith in it. At any rate, it can do no harm. On the contrary, to the extent that it can add to the cloth production of the country, be it ever so small, it will represent so much solid gain. You will thus perceive then that my movement is free from the evils mentioned by you."

"If," he replied, "you have additional production in view in organizing your movement, I have nothing to say against it. Whether the spinning wheel can make headway in this age of power machinery is another question. But I for one wish you every success."

From AUTOBIOGRAPHY

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

I AM asking my countrymen to adopt non-violence as their final creed, for the purpose of regulating the relations between the different races, and for the purpose of attaining *swaraj*. Hindus and Mussalmans, Christians, Sikhs and Parsis must not settle their differences by resort to violence, and the means for the attainment of *swaraj* must be non-violent. This I venture to place before India, not as a weapon of the weak, but of the strong. Hindus and Mussalmans prate about no compulsion in religion. What is it but compulsion, if Hindus will kill a Mussalman for saving a cow? It is like wanting to convert a Mussalman to Hinduism by force. And similarly what is it but compulsion, if Mussalmans seek to prevent by force Hindus from playing music before mosques? Virtue lies in being absorbed in one's prayers in the presence of din and noise. We shall both be voted irreligious savages by posterity if we continue to make a futile attempt to compel one another to respect our religious wishes.

I am sure that if we can but revert to our faith, if we ever had any, in non-violence limited only to the two purposes above referred to, the present tension between the two communities will largely subside. For, in my opinion, an attitude of non-violence in our mutual relations is an indispensable condition prior to a discussion of the remedies for the removal of the tension. It must be common cause between the two communities that neither party shall take the law into its own hands, but that all points in dispute, wherever and whenever they arise, shall be decided by reference either to private arbitration, or to the law courts, if they wish. This is the whole meaning of non-violence, so far as communal matters are concerned. To put it another way, just as we do not break one another's heads in respect of civil matters, so may we not do even in respect of religious matters. This is the only pact that is immediately necessary between the parties, and I am sure that everything else will follow.

Unless this elementary condition is recognised, we have no atmosphere for considering the ways and means of removing misunderstanding and arriving at an honourable, lasting settlement. But, assuming that the acceptance of the elementary condition will be common cause between the two communities, let us consider the constant disturbing factors.

My non-violence does not admit of running away from danger and leaving dear ones unprotected. Between violence and cowardly flight, I can only prefer violence to cowardice. I can no more preach non-violence to a cowardly man than I can tempt a blind man to enjoy healthy scenes. Non-violence is the summit of bravery. And in my own experience, I have had no difficulty in demonstrating to men trained

in the school of violence the superiority of non-violence. As a coward, which I was for years, I harboured violence. I began to prize non-violence only when I began to shed cowardice. Those Hindus who ran away from the post of duty when it was attended with danger did so not because they were non-violent, or because they were afraid to strike, but because they were unwilling to die or even suffer any injury. A rabbit that runs away from the bull terrier is not particularly non-violent. The poor thing trembles at the sight of the terrier and runs for very life.

The way however does not lie through *akhadas*. Not that I mind them. On the contrary, I want them for physical culture. Then they should be for all. But, if they are meant as a preparation for self-defence in the Hindu-Mussalman conflicts, they are foredoomed to failure. Mussalmans can play the same game, and such preparations secret or open do but cause suspicion and irritation. They can provide no present remedy. It is for the thoughtful few to make quarrels impossible by making arbitration popular and obligatory.

My Hindu instinct tells me that all religions are more or less true. All proceed from the same God but all are imperfect because they have come down to us through imperfect human instrumentality. The real *suddhi* movement should consist in each one trying to arrive at perfection in his or her own faith. In such a plan character would be the only test. What is the use of crossing from one compartment to another, if it does not mean a moral rise? What is the meaning of my trying to convert to the service of God (for that must be the implication of *suddhi* or *tabligh*) when those who are in my fold are every day denying God by their actions? "Physician, heal thyself" is more true in matters religious than mundane.

If Hindu-Muslim unity is endangered because an Arya Samaj preacher or a Mussalman preacher preaches his faith in obedience to a call from within, that unity is only skin-deep. Why should we be ruffled by such movements? Only they must be genuine. If the Malkanas wanted to return to the Hindu fold, they had a perfect right to do so whenever they liked. But no propaganda can be allowed which reviles other religions. For, that would be negation of toleration. The best way of dealing with such propaganda is to publicly condemn it. Every movement attempts to put on the cloak of respectability. As soon as the public tear that cloak down, it dies for want of respectability.

It is now time to examine the treatment of two constant causes of friction.

The first is cow slaughter. Though I regard cow protection as the central fact of Hinduism, central because it is common to classes as well as masses, I have never been able to understand the antipathy towards the Mussalmans on that score. We say nothing about the slaughter that daily takes place on behalf of Englishmen. Our anger becomes red-hot when a Mussalman slaughters a cow. All the riots that have taken place in the name of the cow have been an insane waste of effort. They have not saved a single cow, but they have on the contrary stiffened the backs of the Mussalmans and resulted in more slaughter. Cow protection should commence with

ourselves. In no part of the world perhaps are cattle worse treated than in India. I have wept to see Hindu drivers goading their jaded oxen with the iron points of their cruel sticks. The half-starved condition of the majority of our cattle are a disgrace to us. The cows find their necks under the butcher's knife because Hindus sell them. The only effective and honourable way is to befriend the Mussalmans and leave it to their honour to save the cow. Cow protection societies must turn their attention to the feeding of cattle, prevention of cruelty, preservation of the fast disappearing pasture land, improving the breed of cattle, buying from poor shepherds and turning *pinjrapoles* into model self-supporting dairies. Hindus do sin against God and man when they omit to do any of the things I have described above. They commit no sin, if they cannot prevent cow slaughter at the hands of Mussalmans, and they do sin grievously when in order to save the cow, they quarrel with the Mussalmans.

The question of music before mosques, and now even *arati* in Hindu temples, has occupied my prayerful attention. This is a sore point with the Mussalmans as cow slaughter is with the Hindus. And just as Hindus cannot compel Mussalmans to refrain from killing cows, so can Mussalmans not compel Hindus to stop music or *arati* at the point of the sword. They must trust to the good sense of the Hindus. As a Hindu, I would certainly advise the Hindus, without any bargaining spirit, to consult the sentiment of their Mussalman neighbours and wherever they can, accommodate him. I have heard that in some places, Hindus purposely and with the deliberate intention of irritating Mussalmans, perform *arati* just when the Mussalman prayers commence. This is an insensate and unfriendly act. Friendship presupposes the utmost attention to the feelings of a friend. It never requires consideration. But Mussalmans should never expect to stop Hindu music by force. To yield to the threat or actual use of violence is a surrender of one's self-respect and religious conviction. But a person, who never will yield to threat, would always minimise and, if possible, even avoid occasions for causing irritation.

I am convinced that the masses do not want to fight, if the leaders do not. If, therefore, the leaders agree that mutual rows should be, as in all advanced countries, erased out of our public life as being barbarous and irreligious, I have no doubt that the masses will quickly follow them

Hindus if they want unity among different races must have the courage to trust the minorities. Any other adjustment must leave a nasty taste in the mouth. Surely the millions do not want to become legislators and municipal councillors. And if we have understood the proper use of Satyagraha, we should know that it can be and should be used against an unjust administrator whether he be a Hindu, Mussalman or of any other race or denomination, whereas a just administrator or representative is always and equally good whether he be a Hindu or Mussalman. We want to do away with the communal spirit. The majority must therefore make the beginning and thus inspire the minorities with confidence in their *bona fides*. Adjustment is

possible only when the more powerful take the initiative without waiting for response from the weaker.

So far as the employment in Government departments is concerned, I think it will be fatal to good government, if we introduce there the communal spirit. For administration to be efficient, it must always be in the hands of the fittest. There should be certainly no favouritism. But if we want five engineers we must not take one from each community but we must take the fittest five even if they were all Mussalmans or all Parsis. The lowest posts must, if need be, be filled by examination by an impartial board consisting of men belonging to different communities. But distribution of posts should never be according to the proportion of the numbers of each community. The educationally backward communities will have a right to receive favoured treatment in the matter of education at the hands of the national government. This can be secured in an effective manner. But those who aspire to occupy responsible posts in the government of the country, can only do so if they pass the required test.

For me the only question for immediate solution before the country is the Hindu-Mussalman question. I agree with Mr. Jinnah that Hindu-Muslim unity means *swaraj*. I see no way of achieving anything in this afflicted country without a lasting heart-unity between Hindus and Mussalmans of India. I believe in the immediate possibility of achieving it, because it is so natural, so necessary for both, and because I believe in human nature. Mussalmans may have much to answer for. I have come in closest touch with even what may be considered a "bad lot." I cannot recall a single occasion when I had to regret it. The Mussalmans are brave, they are generous and trusting, the moment their suspicion is disarmed. Hindus living as they do in glass houses have no right to throw stones at their Mussalman neighbours. See what we have done, are still doing, to the suppressed classes!

God does not punish directly. His ways are inscrutable. Who knows that all our woes are not due to that one black sin? The history of Islam, if it betrays aberrations from the moral height, has many a brilliant page. In its glorious days it was not intolerant. It commanded the admiration of the world. When the west was sunk in darkness a bright star rose in the eastern firmament and gave light and comfort to a groaning world. Islam is not a false religion. Let Hindus study it reverently, and they will love it even as I do. If it has become gross and fanatical here, let us admit that we have had no small share in making it so. If Hindus set their house in order, I have not a shadow of doubt that Islam will respond in a manner worthy of its past liberal traditions. The key to the situation lies with the Hindus. We must shed timidity or cowardice. We must be brave enough to trust, and all will be well.

Hindu-Muslim Tension, 1924

NATIONAL LANGUAGE

I BELIEVE that:

1. Hindi, Hindustani and Urdu are words denoting the same language spoken in the north by Hindus and Mussalmans, and written in either Devanagari or Persian script;

2. Hindi was the name for this language used both by Hindus and Mussalmans before the word Urdu came to be used;

3. The word Hindustani also came to be used later (the date unknown to me) to denote the same speech;

4. Both Hindus and Mussalmans should try to speak the language as understood by the vast mass of the people in the north;

5. At the same time, many Hindus and many Mussalmans will persist in using Sanskrit words and Persian or Arabic words respectively and exclusively. This we shall have to bear so long as mutual distrust and aloofness continue. Those Hindus who care to know a certain class of Mussalman thought will study Urdu written in Persian script; and, similarly, those Mussalmans who care to know a certain class of Hindu thought will study Hindi written in Devanagari script;

6. Ultimately, when our hearts have become one and we all are proud of India as our country, rather than our provinces, and shall know and practise and relish different fruits of the same tree, we shall reach a common language with a common script whilst we shall retain provincial languages for provincial use;

7. The attempt to force one script or one form of Hindi on any province or district or people is detrimental to the best interests of the country;

8. The common language question should be viewed apart from the religious differences,

9. Roman script cannot and should not be the common script of India. The rivalry can only be between Persian and Devanagari. Apart from its intrinsic merit, the latter should be the common script for all India because most of the provincial scripts have their origin in Devanagari, and it is for them by far the easiest to learn. At the same time no attempt whatsoever should be made to foist it upon Mussalmans, and for that matter on those others who do not know it;

10. I served the cause of Urdu, if it may be distinguished from Hindi, when at Indore the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, at my instance, accepted the definition given in clause I, and when at Nagpur at my instance the Bharatiya Sahitya Parishad

accepted the definition and called the common language of inter-provincial intercourse Hindi or Hindustani, thus giving fullest scope to both Mussalmans and Hindus to identify themselves with the effort to enrich the common language and to interpret the best provincial thought in that language

—HARIJAN

July 3, 1937

ROMAN SCRIPT?

WHY should India which claims to be and is one nation have not one script? At the present moment insistence on Devanagari for Mussalmans is not to be thought of. Insistence on the adoption of Arabic script by the vast mass of Hindus is still less thinkable. What therefore I have suggested as the definition of Hindi or Hindustani is "that language which is generally spoken by Hindus and Mussalmans of the north, whether written in Devanagari or Urdu." I abide by that definition, in spite of protests to the contrary. But there is undoubtedly a Devanagari movement with which I have allied myself wholeheartedly and that is to have it as the common script for all the languages spoken in the different provinces, especially those which have a large Sanskrit vocabulary. Anyway an attempt is being made to transcribe in Devanagari script the most precious treasures of all the languages of India...

Different languages descended from or intimately connected with Sanskrit ought to have one script and that is surely Devanagari. Different scripts are an unnecessary hindrance to the learning by the people of one province the language of other provinces. Even Europe which is not one nation has generally adopted one script. I know I am inconsistent when I tolerate both Devanagari and Urdu scripts for the same language. But my inconsistency is not quite foolish. There is Hindu-Muslim friction at the present moment. It is wise and necessary for the educated Hindus and Muslims to show mutual respect and toleration to the utmost extent possible. Hence the option for Devanagari or Urdu scripts. Happily there is no friction between provinces and provinces. Hence the desirability of advocating a reform which means a closer knitting together of provinces in more ways than one. And let it be remembered that the vast mass of the people are wholly illiterate. It would be suicidal to impose on them different scripts for no other reason than a false sentiment and laziness to think...

I understand that some of the tribes in Assam are being taught to read and write through the Roman script instead of Devanagari. I have already expressed my opinion that the only script that is ever likely to be universal in India is Devanagari, either reformed or as it is. Urdu or Persian will go hand in hand unless Muslims of their own free will acknowledge the superiority of Devanagari from a purely scientific and national standpoint. But this is irrelevant to the present problem. The Roman cannot go hand in hand with the other two scripts. Protagonists of the Roman script would displace both. But sentiment and science alike are against the Roman script. Its sole merit is its convenience for printing and typing purposes. But that is nothing compared to the strain its learning would put upon millions. It

can be of no help to the millions who have to read their own literature either in their own provincial scripts or in Devanagari.

Devanagari is easier for the millions of Hindus and even Muslims to learn, because the provincial scripts are mostly derived from Devanagari. I have included Muslims advisedly. The mother tongue of Bengali Muslims, for instance, is Bengali as is Tamil of Tamil Muslims. The present movement for the propagation of Urdu will, as it should, result in Muslims all over India learning Urdu in addition to their mother tongue. They must, in any case, know Arabic for the purpose of learning the Holy Koran. But the millions whether Hindus or Muslims will never need the Roman script except when they wish to learn English. Similarly Hindus who want to read their scriptures in the original have to and do learn the Devanagari script. The movement for universalising the Devanagari script has thus a sound basis. The introduction of the Roman script is a superimposition which can never become popular. And all superimpositions will be swept out of existence when the true mass awakening comes, as it is coming, much sooner than any of us can expect from known causes. Yet the awakening of millions does take time. It cannot be manufactured. It comes or seems to come mysteriously. National workers can merely hasten the process by anticipating the mass mind.

HARIJAN
May 16, Aug. 15, 1936,
Feb. 11, 1939

WHY MANUAL TRAINING

I AM afraid, you have not sufficiently grasped the principle that spinning, carding, etc., should be the means of intellectual training. What is being done there is that it is a supplementary course to the intellectual course. I want you to appreciate the difference between the two. A carpenter teaches me carpentry. I shall learn it mechanically from him, and as a result I shall know the use of various tools, but that will hardly develop my intellect. But if the same thing is taught to me by one who has taken a scientific training in carpentry, he will stimulate my intellect too. Not only shall I then have become an expert carpenter but also an engineer. For the expert will have taught me mathematics, also told me the difference between various kinds of timber, the place where they come from, giving me thus a knowledge of geography and also a little knowledge of agriculture. He will also have taught me to draw models of my tools, and given me a knowledge of elementary geometry and arithmetic.

It is likely you do not correlate manual work with intellectual training which is given exclusively through reading and writing. I must confess that all I have up to now said is that manual training must be given side by side with intellectual training, and that it should have a principal place in national education. But now I say that the principal means of stimulating the intellect should be manual training. I have come to this conclusion because the intellect of our boys is being wasted. Our boys do not know what to do on leaving schools. True education is that which draws out and stimulates the spiritual, intellectual and physical faculties of the children. This education ought to be for them a kind of insurance against unemployment.

—HARIJAN

Sep. 11, 1937

UNTOUCHABILITY

I REGARD untouchability as the greatest blot on Hinduism. This idea was not brought home to me by my bitter experiences during the South African struggle. It is not due to the fact that I was once an agnostic. It is equally wrong to think, as some people do, that I have taken my views from my study of Christian religious literature. These views date as far back as the time when I was neither enamoured of, nor was acquainted with, the Bible or the followers of the Bible.

I was hardly yet twelve when this idea had dawned on me. A scavenger named Uka, an untouchable, used to attend our house for cleaning latrines. Often I would ask my mother why it was wrong to touch him, why I was forbidden to touch him. If I accidentally touched Uka, I was asked to perform the ablutions, and though I naturally obeyed, it was not without smilingly protesting that untouchability was not sanctioned by religion, that it was impossible that it should be so. I was a very dutiful and obedient child and so far as it was consistent with respect for parents, I often had tussles with them on this matter. I told my mother that she was entirely wrong in considering physical contact with Uka as sinful.

While at school I would often happen to touch the "untouchables," and as I never would conceal the fact from my parents, my mother would tell me that the shortest cut to purification after the unholy touch was to cancel the touch by touching any Mussalman passing by. And simply out of reverence and regard for my mother I often did so, but never did so believing it to be a religious obligation. After some time we shifted to Porbandar, where I made my first acquaintance with Sanskrit. I was not yet put to English school, and my brother and I were placed in charge of a Brahmin, who taught us *Ramraksha* and *Vishnu Poojan*. The texts *"Jale Vishnuh," "Sthale Vishnuh"*—there is the Lord (present) in water, there is the Lord (present) in earth—have never gone out of my memory. A motherly old dame used to live close by. Now it happened that I was very timid then, and would conjure up ghosts and goblins whenever the lights went out, and it was dark. The old mother, to disabuse me of fears, suggested that I should mutter the *Ramraksha* texts whenever I was afraid, and all evil spirits would fly away. This I did and, as I thought, with good effect. I could never believe then that there was any text in the *Ramraksha* pointing to the contact of the "untouchables" as a sin. I did not understand its meaning then or understood it very imperfectly. But I was confident that *Ramraksha*, which could destroy all fear of ghosts, could not be countenancing any such thing as fear of contact with the "untouchables."

The *Ramayana* used to be regularly read in our family. A Brahmin called Ladha Maharaj used to read it. He was stricken with leprosy, and he was confident that

a regular reading of the *Ramayana* would cure him of leprosy, and, indeed, he was cured of it. "How can the *Ramayana*," I thought to myself, "in which one is regarded nowadays as an untouchable took Rama across the Ganges in his boat, countenance the idea of any human beings being untouchable on the ground that they were polluted souls?" The fact that we addressed God as the "purifier of the polluted" and by similar appellations, shows that it is a sin to regard any one born in Hinduism as polluted or untouchable—that it is satanic to do so. I have hence been never tired of repeating that it is a great sin. I do not pretend that this thing had crystallized as a conviction in me at the age of twelve, but I do say that I did then regard untouchability as a sin. I narrated this story for the information of the Vaishnavas and orthodox Hindus.

I have always claimed to be a *Sanatani* Hindu. It is not that I am quite innocent of the scriptures. I am not a profound scholar of Sanskrit. I have read the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads* only in translations. Naturally, therefore, mine is not a scholarly study of them. My knowledge of them is in no way profound, but I have studied them as I should do as a Hindu and I claim to have grasped their true spirit. By the time I had reached the age of 21, I had studied other religions also.

There was a time when I was wavering between Hinduism and Christianity. When I recovered my balance of mind, I felt that to me salvation was possible only through the Hindu religion and my faith in Hinduism grew deeper and more enlightened.

But even then I believed that untouchability was no part of Hinduism; and that, if it was, such Hinduism was not for me.

True, Hinduism does not regard untouchability as a sin. I do not want to enter into any controversy regarding the interpretation of the *shastras*. It might be difficult for me to establish my point by quoting authorities from the *Bhagavat* or *Manusmriti*. But I claim to have understood the spirit of Hinduism. Hinduism has sinned in giving sanction to untouchability. It has degraded us, made us the *pariahs* of the Empire. Even the Mussalmans caught the sinful contagion from us; and in South Africa, in East Africa and in Canada, Mussalmans no less than Hindus came to be regarded as *pariahs*. All this evil has resulted from the sin of untouchability.

I may here recall my proposition, which is this: so long as the Hindus wilfully regard untouchability as part of their religion, so long as the mass of Hindus consider it a sin to touch a section of their brethren, *swaraj* is impossible of attainment. Yudhishthira would not enter heaven without his dog. How, can then, the descendants of that Yudhishthira expect to obtain *swaraj* without the "untouchables"? What crimes, for which we condemn the Government as satanic, have not we been guilty of towards our untouchable brethren?

We are guilty of having suppressed our brethren; we make them crawl on their bellies; we have made them rub their noses on the ground; with eyes red with rage,

we push them out of railway compartments—what more than this has British Rule done? What charge, that we bring against Dyer and O'Dwyer, may not others, and even our own people, lay at our doors? We ought to purge ourselves of this pollution. It is idle to talk of *swaraj* so long as we do not protect the weak and the helpless, or so long as it is possible for a single *swarajist* to injure the feelings of any individual. *Swaraj* means that not a single Hindu or Muslim shall for a moment arrogantly think that he can crush with impunity meek Hindus or Muslims. Unless this condition is fulfilled, we will gain *swaraj* only to lose it the next moment. We are no better than the brutes until we have purged ourselves of the sins we have committed, against our weaker brethren...

SUPPRESSED CLASSES CONFERENCE
Ahmedabad, April 13, 1921

A CRY FOR JUSTICE

IF people won't laugh at me, I would gently put forward a claim which I have always asserted that I am a "touchable" by birth, but an "untouchable" by choice: and I have endeavoured to qualify myself to represent, not the upper ten even among the "untouchables," because be it said to their shame there are castes and classes among them, but my ambition is to represent and identify myself with, as far as possible, the lowest strata of "untouchables," namely the "invisibles" and the "unapproachables," whom I have always before my mind's eye wherever I go; for they have indeed drunk deep of the poisoned cup. I have met them in Malabar and in Orissa, and am convinced that if they are ever to rise, it will not be by reservation of seats but will be by the strenuous work of Hindu reformers in their midst, and it is because I feel that this separation would have killed all prospect of reform that my whole soul has rebelled against it; and, let me make it plain, that the withdrawal of separate electorates will satisfy the letter of my vow but will never satisfy the spirit behind it, and in my capacity of being a self-chosen "untouchable" I am not going to rest content with a patched up pact between the "touchables" and the "untouchables."

What I want, what I am living for, and what I should delight in dying for, is the eradication of untouchability root and branch. I want, therefore, a living pact whose life-giving effect should be felt not in the distant tomorrow but today, and therefore, that pact should be sealed by an all-India demonstration of "touchables" and "untouchables" meeting together, not by way of a theatrical show, but in real brotherly embrace. It is in order to achieve this, the dream of my life for the past fifty years, that I have entered today the fiery gates. The British Government's decision was the last straw. It was a decisive symptom, and with the unerring eye of the physician that I claim to be in such matters, I detected the symptom. Therefore, for me the abolition of separate electorates would be but the beginning of the end, and I would warn all those leaders assembled at Bombay and others against coming to any hasty decision.

My life I count of no consequence. One hundred lives given for this noble cause would, in my opinion, be poor penance done by Hindus for the atrocious wrongs they have heaped upon helpless men and women of their own faith. I, therefore, would urge them not to swerve an inch from the path of strictest justice. My fast I want to throw in the scales of justice and if it wakes up Caste Hindus from their slumber, and if they are roused to a sense of their duty, it will have served its purpose. Whereas, if out of blind affection for me, they would somehow or other come to a rough and ready agreement so as to secure the abrogation and then go off to

sleep, they will commit a grievous blunder and will have made my life a misery. For, while the abrogation of separate electorates would result in my breaking the fast, it would be a living death for me if the vital pact for which I am striving is not arrived at. It would simply mean that, as soon as I call off the fast, I would have to give notice of another in order to achieve the spirit of the vow to the fullest extent.

This may look childish to the onlooker but not so to me. If I had anything more to give, I would throw that in also to remove this curse, but I have nothing more than my life.

I believe that if untouchability is really rooted out, it will not only purge Hinduism of a terrible blot but its repercussion will be world-wide My fight against untouchability is a fight against the impure in humanity.

—PRESS INTERVIEW, YERAVDA JAIL
Sept. 20, 1932

WOMAN'S ROLE

MY opinion is that, just as fundamentally man and woman are one, their problem must be one in essence. The soul in both is the same. The two live the same life, have the same feelings. Each is a complement of the other. The one cannot live without the other's active help.

But somehow or other man has dominated woman from ages past, and so woman has developed an inferiority complex. She has believed in the truth of man's interested teaching that she is inferior to him. But the seers among men have recognised her equal status.

Nevertheless there is no doubt that at some point there is bifurcation. Whilst both are fundamentally one, it is also equally true that in the form there is a vital difference between the two. Hence the vocations of the two must be different. The duty of motherhood, which the vast majority of women will always undertake, requires qualities which man need not possess. She is passive, he is active. She is essentially mistress of the house. He is the bread-winner, she is the keeper and distributor of the bread. She is the caretaker in every sense of the term. The art of bringing up the infants of the race is her special and sole prerogative. Without her care the race must become extinct.

In my opinion it is degrading both for man and woman that woman should be called upon or induced to forsake the hearth and shoulder the rifle for the protection of that hearth. It is a reversion to barbarity and the beginning of the end. In trying to ride the horse that man rides, she brings herself and him down. The sin will be on man's head for tempting or compelling his companion to desert her special calling There is as much bravery in keeping one's home in good order and condition as there is in defending it against attack from without.

As I have watched millions of peasants in their natural surroundings and as I watch them daily in little Sevagram, the natural division of spheres of work has forced itself on my attention. There are no women blacksmiths and carpenters. But men and women work on the fields, the heaviest work being done by the males. The women keep and manage the homes. They supplement the meagre resources of the family, but man remains the main bread-winner. The division of the spheres of work being recognised, the general qualities and culture required are practically the same for both the sexes.

My contribution to the great problem lies in my presenting for acceptance truth and *ahimsa* in every walk of life, whether for individuals or nations. I have hugged the hope that in this woman will be the unquestioned leader and, having thus found her place in human evolution, will shed her inferiority complex. If she is able to

do this successfully, she must resolutely refuse to believe in the modern teaching that everything is determined and regulated by the sex impulse. I fear that I have put the proposition rather clumsily. But I hope my meaning is clear. I do not know that the millions of men who are taking an active part in the war are obsessed by the sex spectre. Nor are the peasants working together in their fields worried or dominated by it. This is not to say or to suggest that they are free from the instinct implanted in man and woman. But it most certainly does not dominate their lives as it seems to dominate the lives of those who are saturated with the modern sex literature. Neither man nor woman has time for such things when he or she is faced with the hard fact of living life in its grim reality.

I have suggested in these columns that woman is the incarnation of *ahimsa*. *Ahimsa* means infinite love, which again means infinite capacity for suffering. Who but woman, the mother of man, shows this capacity in the largest measure? She shows it as she carries the infant and feeds it during nine months and derives joy in the suffering involved. What can beat suffering caused by the pangs of labour? But she forgets them in the joy of creation. Who, again, suffers daily so that her babe may wax from day to day? Let her transfer that love to the whole humanity, let her forget she ever was or can be the object of man's lust. And she will occupy her proud position by the side of man as his mother, maker and silent leader. It is given to her to teach the art of peace to the warring world thirsting for the nectar. She can become the leader in Satyagraha which does not require the learning that books give but does require the stout heart that comes from suffering and faith.

—HARIJAN,
Feb. 24, 1940

MAGANLAL GANDHI

HE whom I had singled out as heir to my all is no more. Maganlal K. Gandhi, a grandson of an uncle of mine, had been with me in my work since 1904. Maganlal's father has given all his boys to the cause...

Maganlal Gandhi went with me to South Africa in 1903 in the hope of making a bit of a fortune. But hardly had he been store-keeping for one year, when he responded to my sudden call to self-imposed poverty, joined the Phoenix settlement and never once faltered or failed after so joining me. If he had not dedicated himself to the country's service, his undoubted abilities and indefatigable industry would have made him a merchant prince. Put in a printing press he easily and quickly mastered the secrets of the art of printing. Though he had never before handled a tool or a machine, he found himself at home in the engine room, the machine room and at the compositor's desk. He was equally at ease with the Gujarati editing of *Indian Opinion*. Since the Phoenix scheme included domestic farming, he became a good farmer. His was, I think, the best garden at the settlement. It may be of interest to note that the very first issue of *Young India* published in Ahmedabad bears the marks of his labours when they were much needed.

He had a sturdy constitution which he wore away in advancing the cause to which he had dedicated himself. He closely studied and followed my spiritual career and when I presented to my co-workers *brahmacharya* as a rule of life even for married men in search of Truth, he was the first to perceive the beauty and the necessity of the practice, and though it cost him to my knowledge a terrific struggle, he carried it through to success, taking his wife along with him by patient argument instead of imposing his views on her.

When Satyagraha was born, he was in the forefront. He gave me the expression which I was striving to find to give its full meaning to what the South African struggle stood for, and which for want of a better term I allowed to be recognised by the very insufficient and even misleading term "passive resistance." I wish I had the very beautiful letter he then wrote to me giving his reasons for suggesting the name. He argued out the whole philosophy of the struggle step by step and brought the reader irresistibly to his chosen name. The letter, I remember, was incredibly short and to the point as all his communications always were.

During the struggle he was never weary of work, shirked no task and by his intrepidity he infected every one around him with courage and hope. When every one went to gaol, when at Phoenix courting imprisonment was like a prize to be won at my instance, he stayed back in order to shoulder a much heavier task. He sent his wife to join the women's party.

On our return to India, it was he again who made it possible to found the *ashram* in the austere manner in which it was founded. Here he was called to a newer and more difficult task. He proved equal to it. Untouchability was a very severe trial for him. Just for one brief moment his heart seemed to give way. But it was only for a second. He saw that love had no bounds...

He was my hands, my feet and my eyes. The world knows so little of how much my so-called greatness depends upon the incessant toil and drudgery of silent, devoted, able and pure workers, men as well as women. And among them all Maganlal was to me the greatest, the best and the purest.

As I am penning these lines, I hear the sobs of the widow bewailing the death of her husband. Little does she realise that I am more widowed than she. And but for a living faith in God, I should become a raving maniac for the loss of one who was dearer to me than my own sons, who never once deceived me or failed me, who was a personification of industry, who was the watchdog of the *ashram* in all its aspects—material, moral and spiritual. His life is an inspiration for me, a standing demonstration of the efficacy and the supremacy of the moral law. In his own life he proved visibly for me not for a few days, not for a few months, but for twenty-four long years—now, alas, all too short—that service of the country, service of humanity and self-realisation or knowledge of God are synonymous terms.

Maganlal is dead, but he lives in his work whose imprints he who runs may read on every particle of dust in the *ashram*.

—YOUNG INDIA
April 26, 1928

VALLIAMMA

HOW can I forget her? Valliamma R. Munuswami Mudaliar was a young girl of Johannesburg only sixteen years of age. She was confined to bed when I saw her. As she was a tall girl, her emaciated body was a terrible thing to behold.

"Valliamma, you do not repent of your having gone to jail?" I asked.

"Repent? I am even now ready to go to jail again if I am arrested," said Valliamma.

"But what if it results in your death?" I pursued.

"I do not mind it. Who would not love to die for one's motherland?" was the reply.

Within a few days after this conversation Valliamma was no more with us in the flesh, but she left us the heritage of an immortal name. Condolence meetings were held at various places, and the Indians resolved to erect "Valliamma Hall," to commemorate the supreme sacrifice of this daughter of India.. Whether or not a hall is built in stone and mortar, Valliamma's service is imperishable. She built her temple of service with her own hands, and her glorious image has a niche even now reserved for it in many a heart. And the name of Valliamma will live in the history of South African Satyagraha as long as India lives.

—SATYAGRAHA IN SOUTH AFRICA

Lancashire Block
Young India
Edited by M. K. Gandhi
INDIAN OPINION
Edited by M. K. Gandhi
Young India
To American Friends
HARIJAN
Editor MAHADEV DESAI
AHMEDABAD—SUNDAY, AUGUST 9, 1942
TWO ANNAS
AN APPROPRIATE QUESTION

MY INCONSISTENCIES

I MUST admit my many inconsistencies. But since I am called "Mahatma," I might well endorse Emerson's saying that "foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." There is, I fancy, a method in my inconsistencies. In my opinion there is a consistency running through my seeming inconsistencies, as in nature there is unity running through seeming diversity.

Friends who know me have certified that I am as much a moderate as I am an extremist and as much conservative as I am a radical. Hence perhaps my good fortune to have friends among these extreme types of men. The mixture is due, I believe, to my view of *ahimsa*.

Inconsistency is only apparent. It appears so to many friends because of my responsiveness to varying circumstances. Seeming consistency may really be sheer obstinacy.

I decline to be a slave to precedents or practice I cannot understand or defend on a moral basis. I have sacrificed no principle to gain a political advantage.

It has been my misfortune or good fortune to take the world by surprise. New experiments, or old experiments, in new style, must sometimes engender misunderstanding.

Those who have at all followed my humble career even superficially cannot have failed to observe that not a single act of my life has been done to the injury of any individual or nation.

I claim no infallibility. I am conscious of having made Himalayan blunders, but I am not conscious of having made them intentionally or having even harboured enmity towards any person or nation, or any life, human or sub-human.

I am not aware of having done a single thing in my life as a matter of expedience. I have ever held that the highest morality is also the highest expedience.

I have never made a fetish of consistency. I am a votary of Truth and I must say what I feel and think at a given moment on the question, without regard to what I may have said before on it ... As my vision gets clearer, my views must grow clearer with daily practice. Where I have deliberately altered an opinion, the change should be obvious. Only a careful eye would notice a gradual and imperceptible evolution.

I am not at all concerned with appearing to be consistent. In my pursuit after Truth I have discarded many ideas and learnt many new things. Old as I am in age, I have no feeling that I have ceased to grow inwardly or that my growth will

stop with the dissolution of the flesh. What I am concerned with is my readiness to obey the call of Truth, my God, from moment to moment.

There are eternal principles which admit of no compromise, and one must be prepared to lay down one's life in the practice of them.

ON VOWS

BEING accustomed from very childhood to taking vows I confess I have a strong bias in favour of the practice. It has come to my rescue in many a crisis, I have seen it save others from many a pitfall. A life without vows is like a ship without an anchor or like an edifice that is built on sand instead of a solid rock. A vow imparts stability, ballast and firmness to one's character. What reliance can be placed on a person who lacks these essential qualities? An agreement is nothing but a mutual interchange of vows; simultaneously one enters into a pledge when one gives one's word to another.

In old days, the word of mouth of illustrious persons was regarded as good as a bond. They concluded transactions involving millions by oral agreements. In fact our entire social fabric rests on the sanctity of the pledged word. The world would go to pieces if there was not this element of stability, or finality in agreements arrived at. The Himalayas are immovably fixed for ever in their place. India would perish if the firmness of the Himalayas gave way. The sun, the moon and other heavenly bodies move with unerring regularity. Were it not so, human affairs would come to a standstill. But we know that the sun has been rising regularly at its fixed time for countless ages in the past and will continue to do so in future. The cooling orb of the moon will continue always to wax and wane as it has done for ages past with a clock-work regularity. That is why we call the sun and the moon to be witness to our affairs. We base our calendar on their movements, we regulate our time by their rising and setting.

The same law, which regulates these heavenly bodies, applies equally to men. A person unbound by vows can never be absolutely relied upon. It is overweening pride to say, "This thing comes natural to me. Why should I bind myself permanently by vows? I can well take care of myself at the critical moment. Why should I take an absolute vow against wine? I never get drunk. Why should I forgo the pleasure of an occasional cup for nothing?" A person who argues like this will never be weaned from his addiction.

To shirk taking of vows betrays indecision and want of resolution. One never can achieve anything lasting in this world by being irresolute. For instance, what faith can you place in a general or a soldier who lacks resolution and determination, who says, "I shall keep guard as long as I can"? A householder, whose watchman says that he would keep watch as long as he can, can never sleep in security. No general ever won a victory by following the principle of "being vigilant so long as he could."

I have before me innumerable examples of spinners at will. Every one of them

has come to grief sooner or later. On the other hand, sacramental spinning has transformed the entire life of those who have taken to it; mountains of yarn stored up by them tell the tale. A vow is like a right angle. An insignificant right angle will make all the difference between ugliness and elegance, solidity and shakiness of a gigantic structure. Even so stability or unstability, purity or otherwise of an entire career may depend upon the taking of a vow.

It goes without saying that moderation and sobriety are of the very essence of vow-taking. The taking of vows that are not feasible or that are beyond one's capacity would betray thoughtlessness and want of balance. Similarly a vow can be made conditional without losing any of its efficacy or virtue. For instance, there would be nothing wrong about taking a vow to spin for at least one hour every day, and to turn out not less than 200 yards daily except when one is travelling or sick. Such a vow would not only be quite in form but also easy of observance. The essence of a vow does not consist in the difficulty of its performance but in the determination behind it unflinchingly to stick to in the teeth of difficulties.

Self-restraint is the very keystone of the ethics of vow-taking. For instance, one cannot take a vow of self-indulgence, to eat, drink and be merry, in short to do as one pleases. This warning is necessary because I know of instances when an attempt was made to cover things of questionable import by means of vows. In the heyday of non-co-operation one even heard the objection raised, "How can I resign from Government service when I have made a covenant with it to serve it?" Or again, "How can I close my liquor shop since I have bound myself by contract to run it for five years?" Such questions might appear puzzling sometimes. But on closer thinking it will be seen that a vow can never be used to support or justify an immoral action. A vow must lead one upwards, never downwards towards perdition.

God is the very image of determination or vow, God would cease to be God if He swerved from His own laws even by a hair's breadth. The sun is a great keeper of observances; hence the possibility of measuring time and publishing an almanac. It has won unequalled prestige for regularity, and therefore we hold ourselves safe in its keeping. All business depends upon men fulfilling their promises. Vows are thus seen to be a universal feature. How then can we do without them in character building or self-realisation? May we therefore never doubt for a single moment the vital importance of vows.

FASTING

FASTING is an institution as old as Adam. It has been resorted to for self-purification or for some ends noble as well as ignoble. Buddha, Jesus and Mohammed fasted so as to see God face to face. Ramachandra fasted for the sea to give way for his army of monkeys. Parvati fasted to secure Mahadev himself as her Lord and Master. In my fasts I have but followed these great examples, no doubt for ends much less noble than theirs.

Fast is a part of my being as, I hold it, it has been, to a large or small extent, of every seeker of Truth. I am making an experiment in *ahimsa* on a scale perhaps unknown in history. That I may be wholly wrong is quite possible, but quite irrelevant to the present purpose. So long as I am not conscious of the error, but, on the contrary, am sure, as far as it is humanly possible to be, of being in the right, I must go on with my pursuit to the farthest end.

Religious history tells us of those who survived their fast, because God listened to them, but it tells us nothing of those who silently and heroically perished in the attempt to win an answer from a deaf God. I am certain that many have died in that heroic manner, without their faith in God and non-violence being in the slightest degree diminished. God does not always answer prayers in the manner we want Him to. For Him life and death are one, and who is able to deny that all that is pure and good in the world persists because of the silent death of thousands of unknown heroes and heroines?

asting is not for everyone and for every occasion. Fasting without faith may even lead to disastrous consequences. All such spiritual weapons are dangerous when handled by unqualified persons.

Even fasts may take the form of coercion. But there is nothing in the world that in human hands does not lend itself to abuse. The human being is a mixture of good and evil, Jekyll and Hyde. But there is the least likelihood of abuse when it is a matter of self-suffering.

Fasting in Satyagraha has well-defined limits. You cannot fast against a tyrant, for it will be a species of violence done to him. You invite penalty from him for disobedience of his orders, but you cannot inflict on yourself penalties when he refuses to punish and renders it impossible for you to disobey his orders so as to compel infliction of penalty.

Fasting can only be resorted to against a lover, not to extort, rights, but to reform him, as when a son fasts for a father who drinks. I fasted to reform those who loved me. But I will not fast to reform, say, General Dyer, who not only does not love me, but who regards himself as my enemy.

FASTING

Fasting has a recognised place in religious practice. But it is considered a vulgar interpolation in politics by the ordinary politician though it has always been resorted to by prisoners in a haphazard way with more or less success. By fasting however they have always succeeded in drawing public attention and disturbing the peace of jail authorities.

Fasting is a Satyagrahi's ultimate weapon. Why should it be black-mail when a man under a sense of wrong crucifies his flesh?

Let me remind all of the historic fast of the late MacSwiney. I know that the British Government let him die in imprisonment. But he has been acclaimed by the Irish people as a hero and a martyr. Edward Thompson called Government's action a political blunder of the first magnitude.

Which is better, I ask, to take the opponent's life secretly or openly, or to credit him with finer feelings and evoke them by fasting and the like?

Again which is better, to trifle with one's life by fasting or some other way of self-immolation or to trifle with it by engaging in an attempt to compass the destruction of the opponent and his dependants?

My own fasts have always, I hold, been strictly according to the law of Satyagraha. Fellow Satyagrahis too in South Africa fasted partially or wholly. My fasts have been varied. There was the Hindu-Muslim unity fast of 21 days in 1924 started under the late Maulana Mahomed Ali's roof in Delhi. The indeterminate fast against the MacDonald Award was taken in the Yeravda prison in 1932. The 21 days' purificatory fast was begun in the Yeravda prison and was finished at Lady Thackersey's, as the Government would not take the burden of my being in the prison in that condition. Then followed another fast in the Yeravda prison in 1933 against the Government refusal to let me carry on anti-untouchability work through *Harijan* (issued from prison) on the same basis as facilities had been allowed me four months before. They would not yield, but they discharged me when their medical advisers thought I could not live many days if the fast was not given up. Then followed the ill-fated Rajkot fast in 1930. A false step taken by me thoughtlessly during that fast thwarted the brilliant results that would otherwise certainly have been achieved. In spite of all these fasts, fasting has not been accepted as a recognised part of Satyagraha. It has only been tolerated by the politicians. I have, however, been driven to the conclusion that fasting unto death is an integral part of Satyagraha programme, and it is the greatest and most effective weapon in its armoury under given circumstances. Not everyone is qualified for undertaking it without a proper course of training.

A complete fast is a complete and literal denial of self. It is the truest prayer. "Take my life, and let it be always, only, all for Thee" is not, and should not be, a mere lip or figurative expression. It has to be a reckless and joyous giving without the least reservation. Abstention from food and even water is but the mere beginning, the least part of the surrender.

Fasting can help to curb animal passion, only if it is undertaken with a view to self-restraint. Some of my friends have actually found their animal passion and palate stimulated as an after-effect of fasts. That is to say, fasting is futile unless it is accompanied by an incessant longing for self-restraint. It is a mistake to think that mere physical fasting can by itself effect self-restraint.

The physical and moral value of fasting is being more and more recognised day by day. A vast number of diseases can be more surely treated by judicious fasting than by all sorts of nostrums including the dreadful injections—dreadful not because of the pain they cause but because of the injurious bye-products which often result from their use. Increased vitality is almost the universal experience of those that have fasted. For real rest for body and mind is possible only during fasting. Suspension of daily work is hardly rest without the rest that the overtaxed and overworked digestive apparatus needs in a multitude of cases. It is my conviction that the body gains by a well-regulated fast. For during fasting the body gets rid of many of its impurities.

From a layman's and from a purely physical standpoint I should lay down the following rules for all those who may wish to fast on any account whatsoever:

1. Conserve your energy, both physical and mental, from the very beginning.
2. You must cease to think of food whilst you are fasting.
3. Drink as much cold water as you can, with or without soda and salt, but in small quantities at a time (water should be boiled, strained and cooled). Do not be afraid of salt and soda, because most water contains both these salts in a free state.
4. Have a warm sponge bath daily.
5. Take an enema regularly during the fast. You will be surprised at the impurities you will expel daily.
6. Sleep as much as possible in the open air.
7. Bathe in the morning sun. A sun and air bath is at least as great a purifier as a water bath.
8. Think of anything else but the fast.
9. No matter from what motive you are fasting, during this precious time, think of your Maker, and of your relation to Him and His other creation. You will make discoveries you may not have even dreamed of.

Out of the fullness of my own experience and that of fellow-cranks, I say without hesitation, fast (1) if you are constipated, (2) if you are anaemic, (3) if you are feverish, (4) if you have indigestion, (5) if you have a headache, (6) if you are rheumatic, (7) if you are gouty, (8) if you are fretting and fuming, (9) if you are depressed, (10) if you are overjoyed; and you will avoid medical prescriptions and patent medicines.

ON DIET

AS a searcher for truth I deem it necessary to find the perfect food for a man to keep body, mind and soul in a sound condition. It almost seems to me that it is reserved for lay enthusiasts to cut their way through a mountain of difficulties even at the risk of their lives to find the truth. I should be satisfied if scientists would lend their assistance to such humble workers.

I do not regard flesh-food as necessary for us at any stage and under any clime in which it is possible for human beings ordinarily to live. I hold flesh-food to be unsuited to our species. We err in copying the lower animal world, if we are superior to it. For one thing the tremendous vested interests that have grown round the belief in animal food prevent the medical profession from approaching the question with complete detachment.

Vegetarianism is one of the priceless gifts of Hinduism. It may not be lightly given up. By instinct and upbringing I personally favour a purely vegetarian diet and have for years been experimenting in finding a suitable vegetarian combination. Rightly or wrongly it is part of my religious conviction, that man may not eat meat, eggs, and the like. There should be a limit even to the means of keeping ourselves alive. Even for life itself we may not do certain things.

For me the question of diet was not one to be determined on the authority of the *shastras*. It was one interwoven with my course of life which is guided by principles no longer depending upon outside authority. The choice of one's diet is not a thing to be based on faith. It is a matter for every one to reason out for himself.

Abstemiousness from meat is undoubtedly a great aid to the evolution of the spirit, but it is by no means an end in itself. Many a man eating meat but living in fear of God is nearer his salvation than a man religiously abstaining from meat and many other things but blaspheming God in every one of his acts.

Experience teaches that animal food is unsuited to those who would curb their passions. But it is wrong to overestimate the importance of food in the formation of character or in subjugating the flesh. Diet is a powerful factor not to be neglected. But to sum up all religion in terms of diet, as is often done in India, is as wrong as it is to disregard all restraint in regard to diet and to give full reins to one's appetite.

It is necessary to correct the error that vegetarianism has made us weak in mind or body or passive or inert in action. The greatest Hindu reformers have been the activest in their generation and they have invariably been vegetarians.

There is a great deal of truth in the saying that man becomes what he eats. The grosser the food the grosser the body.

A man who wants to control his animal passions easily does so if he controls his palate. I fear this is one of the most difficult vows to follow. Unless we are prepared to rid ourselves of stimulating, heating, and exciting condiments we shall certainly not be able to control the over-abundant, unnecessary and exciting stimulation of the animal passion.

If we do not do that we are likely to abuse the sacred trust of our bodies that has been given us, and to become less than animals and brutes, eating, drinking, and indulging in passions which we share with animals. But have you ever seen a horse or cow indulging in the abuse of the palate as we do?

Do you suppose that it is a sign of civilization, a sign of real life, that we should multiply our eatables so far that we do not even know where we are; and seek dishes until at last we have become absolutely mad and run after the newspaper sheets which give us advertisements about these dishes?

It is my firm conviction that man need take no milk at all, beyond the mother's milk that he takes as a baby. His diet should consist of nothing but sunbaked fruits and nuts. He can secure enough nourishment both for the tissues and the nerves from fruits like grapes and nuts like almonds.

Eat only when you are hungry and when you have laboured for your food. One should eat not in order to please the palate but just to keep the body going. Passion in man is generally co-existent with a hankering after the pleasures of the palate. When each organ of sense subserves the body and through the body the soul, its specific relish disappears and then alone does it begin to function in the way nature intended it to do. Any number of experiments is too small and no sacrifice too great for attaining this symphony with nature.

But unfortunately the current is nowadays flowing strongly in the opposite direction. We are not ashamed to sacrifice a multitude of other lives in decorating the perishable body and trying to prolong its existence for a few fleeting moments, with the result that we kill ourselves both body and soul. In trying to cure one old disease, we give rise to a hundred new ones; in trying to enjoy the pleasures of sense we lose in the end even our capacity for enjoyment. All this is passing before our very eyes, but there are none so blind as those who will not see

Dieteticians are of opinion that the inclusion of a small quantity of raw vegetables like cucumber, vegetable marrow, pumpkin, gourd etc., in one's menu is more beneficial to health than the eating of large quantities of the same cooked. If one may take ripe fruit without cooking I see no reason why one may not take vegetables too in an uncooked state provided one can properly digest them. The ethical value of uncooked food is incomparable. Economically this food has possibilities which no cooked food can have.

The digestion of most people is very often so impaired through a surfeit of cooked fare that one should not be surprised if at first they fail to do justice to raw

greens, though I can say from personal experience that no harmful effect need follow if a *tola* or two of raw greens are taken with each meal provided one masticates them thoroughly.

I am sure that most people eat much too much. It is a well established fact that one can derive a much greater amount of nourishment from the same quantity of food if it is masticated well. The habit of proper mastication of food inculcated by the use of uncooked greens therefore, if it does nothing else, will at least enable one to do with less quantity of food and thus not only make for economy of consumption but also automatically reduce the dietetic *himsa* that one commits to sustain life.

Therefore whether regarded from the view-point of dietetics or that of *ahimsa* the use of uncooked vegetables is not only free from all objection but is to be highly recommended. Of course it goes without saying that if the vegetables are to be eaten raw extra care will have to be exercised to see that it is not stale, over-ripe or rotten, or otherwise dirty.

The unlimited capacity of the plant world to sustain man at his highest is a religion yet unexplored by modern medical science which through force of habit pins its faith on the shambles or at least milk and its bye-products. I submit that scientists have not yet explored the hidden possibilities of the innumerable seeds, leaves and fruits for giving the fullest possible nutrition to mankind. It is a duty which awaits eminent medical men whose tradition is vegetarian.

I believe that the search can only succeed with unfired food, and that in the limitless vegetable kingdom there is an effective substitute for milk, which, every medical man admits, has its drawbacks and which is not designed by nature for man but for babes and young ones of lower animals.

The fast developing researches about vitamins and the possibilities of getting the most important of them directly from the sun bid fair to revolutionise many of the accepted theories and beliefs propounded by medical science about food.

Diet reform is a limitless field of research fraught with the greatest consequences for the world and more especially for the famishing millions of India. To provide nourishing food for the nation is to give it both money and health. It means both health and wealth which according to Ruskin are one and the same thing.

The nation requires education as to the food to be taken and the manner in which it has to be prepared. I should count no cost too dear for making a search which in my opinion is so necessary from more points of view than one.

PROHIBITION

YOU will not be deceived by the specious argument that India must not be made sober by compulsion, and that those who wish to drink must have facilities provided for them. The state does not cater for the vices of its people. We do not regulate and license houses of ill-fame. We do not provide facilities for thieves to indulge their propensity for thieving. I hold drink to be more damnable than thieving and perhaps even prostitution. Is it not often the parent of both?

In India there can be no reason for any referendum, because drink and drug habits are universally recognised as a vice. Drink is not a fashion in India as it is in the west. To talk, therefore, of a referendum in India is to trifle with the problem.

I have not hesitated to give my opinion, that it was a wicked thing for the Imperial Government to have transferred this the most immoral source of revenue to the provinces and to have thus made this tainted revenue the one source for defraying the cost of the education of Indian youth.

Thieving will abide till doomsday. Must it, therefore, be licensed? Is thieving of the mind less criminal than thieving of matter? Illicit distillation to an extent will no doubt go on. Its quantity will be the measure of the Government's effort assisted by a vigilant public in the shape of continuous and sympathetic treatment of the drinker and the opium-eater. Moral elevation demands a price no less than material or physical elevation. But my submission is that this constructive effort is doomed to failure if it is not preceded by total prohibition. So long as the state not only permits but provides facilities for the addict to satisfy his craving, the reformer has little chance of success. Gipsy Smith was a powerful temperance preacher. It was a feature of his huge gatherings that several people took the vow of total abstinence under the spell of his song and precept. But I say from my experience of South Africa that the majority of the poor addicts could not resist the temptation to enter the palatial bars that faced them, no matter where they wandered, in the principal thoroughfares of cities, or the wayside inns when they strayed away from cities. State prohibition is not the end of this great temperance reform, but it is the indispensable beginning of it.

Of local option the less said the better. Was there ever opposition to the closing of these dens of vice? Option has a place where a whole population wants to drink.

Prohibition will remain a far cry, if the Congress is to count the cost in a matter of first-class national importance.

Let it be remembered that this drink and drugs revenue is a form of extremely degrading taxation. All taxation to be healthy must return tenfold to the tax-payer

in the form of necessary services. Excise makes people pay for their own corruption, moral, mental and physical. It falls like a deadweight on those who are least able to bear it. The revenue is largely derived, I believe, from industrial labour which together with field labour the Congress almost exclusively represents.

The loss of revenue is only apparent. Removal of this degrading tax enables the drinker, i.e. the tax-payer, to earn and spend better. Apart, therefore, from the tremendous gain, it means a substantial economic gain, to the nation.

The cry of great expenditure in preventing illicit distillation is thoughtless where it is not hypocritical. India is not America. The American example is a hindrance rather than a help to us. In America drinking carries no shame with it. It is the fashion there to drink. It reflects the greatest credit on the determined minority in America that by sheer force of its moral weight it was able to carry through the prohibition measure however short-lived it was. I do not regard that experiment to have been a failure. I do not despair of America once more returning to it with still greater fervour and better experience in dealing with it. It may be that if India carried out prohibition it will hasten the advent of prohibition in America. In no part of the world is prohibition as easy to carry out as in India for with us it is only a minority that drinks. Drinking is generally considered disrespectable. And there are millions, I believe, who have never known what drink is.

But why should prevention of illicit distillation cost any more than prevention of other crimes? I should make illicit distillation heavily punishable and think no more about it. Some of it will go on perhaps till doomsday as thieving will. I would not set up a special agency to pry into illicit distilleries. But I would punish anyone found drunk though not disorderly (in the legal sense) in streets or other public places with a substantial fine alternatively with indeterminate imprisonment to end when the erring one has earned his or her keep.

This, however, is the negative part. Voluntary organizations especially manned by women will work in the labour areas. They will visit those who are addicted to drink and try to wean them from the habit. Employers of labour will be expected by law to provide cheap, healthy refreshment, reading and entertainment rooms where the working men can go and find shelter, knowledge, health-giving food and drink and innocent fun.

Thus prohibition means a type of adult education of the nation and not merely a closing down of grog shops.

Prohibition should begin by preventing any new shop from being licensed and closing some that are in danger of becoming a nuisance to the public. How far the latter is possible without having to pay heavy compensation I do not know. In any case, generally, licenses that lapse should not be renewed. No new shops should be opened on any account. Whatever immediately is possible in law should be done without a moment's thought so far as the revenue is concerned.

But what is the meaning or extent of total prohibition? Total prohibition is

prohibition against sales of intoxicating drinks and drugs except under medical prescription by a practitioner licensed for the purpose and to be purchasable only at Government depots maintained therefor. Foreign liquors in prescribed quantity may be imported for the use of Europeans who cannot or will not do without their drink. These will also be sold in bottles in select areas and under authorised certificates. Hotels and restaurants will cease to sell intoxicating drinks.

But what about relief to the peasantry which is oppressed by excessive taxation, rack-renting, illegal exactions, indebtedness which can never be fully discharged, illiteracy, superstition and disease, peculiarly due to pauperism? Of course it comes first in terms of numbers and economic distress. But the relief of the peasantry is an elaborate programme and does not admit of wholesale treatment.

I know that many are sceptical about prohibition being achieved. They think that the financial lure will be too strong for them to resist They argue that the addicts will procure their drinks and drugs anyhow, and that when the ministers discover that prohibition means mere loss of revenue without any appreciable diminution in the consumption, though illicit, of drinks and drugs, they will revert to the tainted revenue and the then state will be worse than the present.

I do not share any such fear I believe there is the requisite moral momentum in the nation to achieve the noble end. If prohibition is to be a reality, we shall begin to see the end not with the end of the three years but inside of six months. And when the reality dawns upon India, those Provinces or States that have lagged behind are bound to bow to the inevitable.

We have the right, therefore, to expect the sympathy and support not only of all the parties in India including Europeans but the best mind of the whole world in this, perhaps, the greatest moral movement of the century.

If, then, prohibition is to mean a great moral awakening in India the closing of liquor shops should merely mean the indispensable beginning of the movement ending in the complete weaning from drink and narcotics of those poor people and some rich people whom the habit has ruined, body and soul. Such a consumption cannot be brought about by mere state effort. At the risk of repetition of what is stated by Mahadev Desai in his notes let me summarize what should, in my opinion, be the comprehensive programme:

1. A drink and drug map showing the locality of liquor and opium shops in each province.

2. Closing them as liquor shops on the expiry of the licenses.

3. Immediate earmarking of liquor revenue whilst it is still being received, exclusively for the purposes of prohibition.

4. Conversion, wherever possible, of the liquor shops into refreshment and recreation rooms in the hope that the original visitors will continue to use them, liquor contractors being themselves persuaded to conduct them if they will.

5. Employment of the existing excise staff for detection of illicit distillation and drinking.

6. Appeal to the educational institutions to devote a part of the time of teachers and students to temperance work.

7. Appeal to the women to organize visits to the persons given to the drink and opium habits.

8. Negotiation with the neighbouring States to undertake simultaneous prohibition.

9. Engaging the voluntary or, if necessary, paid assistance of the medical profession for suggesting non-alcoholic drinks and other substitutes for intoxicants and methods of weaning the addicts from their habit.

10. Revival of the activities of temperance associations in support of the campaign against drink.

11. Requiring employers of labour to open and maintain under first-class management refreshment, recreation and educational rooms for the use of their employees.

12. Toddy tappers to be used for drawing sweet toddy for sale, as such, or conversion into *gur*. I understand that the process of collecting sweet toddy for drinking as such, or for making *gur* is different from the one for fermenting toddy.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

PERSONALLY I do not believe in imprisoning by way of punishment even those who commit violence. My creed of non-violence does not favour the punishment of thieves and dacoits and even murderers. I cannot in all conscience agree to any one being sent to the gallows.

I would be participator in violence if I approved of the Penal Code and its sanctions. If I had my way I would fling open doors of prisons and discharge even murderers. But I know that in holding this opinion, I am in the proud position of being in the minority of one.

All crimes are different kinds of diseases and they should be treated as such by the reformers. That does not mean that the police will suspend their function of regarding such cases as public crimes, but their measures are never intended to deal with causes of these social disturbances.

To do so is the special prerogative of the reformer. And unless the moral tone of society is raised such crimes will flourish, if only for the simple reason that the moral sense of these perverts has become blunt. The only effective way I can conceive of, therefore, is for some enthusiastic reformers to gather together and take concerted measures to deal with one evil.

I am quite capable of recommending even punishment to wrong-doers under conceivable circumstances; for instance, I would not hesitate under the present state of society to confine thieves and robbers which is in itself a kind of punishment. I have no other remedy to suggest in such cases in the present state of society. I am, therefore, satisfied with advocating the use of prisons more as reformatories than as places of punishment.

But I would draw the distinction between killing and detention or even corporal punishment. I think there is a difference not merely in quantity but also in quality. I can recall the punishment of detention. I can make reparation to the man upon whom I inflict corporal punishment. But once a man is killed, the punishment is beyond recall or reparation. God alone can take life, because he alone gives it.

CALL OF THE VILLAGES

I HAVE believed and repeated times without number that India is to be found not in its few cities but in its 700,000 villages. But we town-dwellers have believed that India is to be found in its towns and the villages were created to minister to our needs. We have hardly ever paused to inquire if those poor folks get sufficient to eat and clothe themselves with and whether they have a roof to shelter themselves from sun and rain.

I have found that the town-dweller has generally exploited the villager, in fact he has lived on the poor villager's subsistence. Many a British official has written about the conditions of the people of India. No one has, to my knowledge, said that the Indian villager has enough to keep body and soul together On the contrary they have admitted that the bulk of the population live on the verge of starvation and ten per cent are semi-starved, and that millions have to rest content with a pinch of dirty salt and chillies and polished rice or parched grain.

You may be sure that if any of us were to be asked to live on that diet, we should not expect to survive it longer than a month or should be afraid of losing our mental faculties. And yet our villagers go through that state from day to day.

Over 75 per cent of the population are agriculturists. But there cannot be much spirit of self-government about us if we take away or allow others to take away from them almost the whole of the results of their labour.

We are guilty of a grievous wrong against the villagers and the only way in which we can expiate is by encouraging them to revise their lost industries and arts by assuring them of a ready market.

We have got to show them that they can grow their vegetables, their greens, without much expense, and keep good health. We have also to show them that most of the vitamins are lost when they cook the leaves.

What they need is not a knowledge of the three R's but a knowledge of their economic life and how they can better it. They are today working as mere automatons, without any responsibility whatsoever to their surrounding and without feeling the joy of work.

We have to teach them how to economise time, health and money. Lionel Curtis described our villages as dung-heaps. We have to turn them into model villages. Our village-folk do not get fresh air though they are surrounded by fresh air ; they don't get fresh food though they are surrounded by the freshest foods. I am talking like a missionary in this matter of food, because my mission is to make villages a thing of beauty.

The revival of village industries is but an extension of khadi effort. Hand-spun

cloth, hand-made paper, hand-pounded rice, home-made bread and jam are not uncommon in the west. Only there they do not have one-hundredth of the importance they have in India. With us their revival means life, their extinction means death to the villagers.

If we should have electricity in every village home, I should not mind villages plying their implements and tools, with the help of electricity. But then the village communities or the state would own power-houses just as they have their grazing pastures. But where there is no electricity and no machinery what are idle hands to do?

Villages have suffered long from neglect by those who have had the benefit of education. They have chosen the city life. The village movement is an attempt to establish healthy contact with the villages by inducing those who are fired with the spirit of service to settle in them and find self-expression in the service of villagers.

The village communities should be revived. Indian villages produced and supplied to the Indian towns and cities all their wants. India became impoverished when our cities became foreign markets and began to drain the villages dry by dumping cheap and shoddy goods from foreign lands.

It is only when the cities realise the duty of making an adequate return to the villages for the strength and sustenance which they derive from them, instead of selfishly exploiting them, that a healthy and moral relationship between the two will spring up. And if the city children are to play their part in this great and noble work of social reconstruction, the vocations through which they are to receive their education ought to be directly related to the requirements of the villages.

The village movement is as much an education of the city people as of the villagers. Workers drawn from cities have to develop village mentality and learn the art of living after the manner of villagers. This does not mean that they have to starve like the villagers. But it does mean that there must be a radical change in the old style of life.

We have got to be ideal villagers, not the villagers with their queer ideas, or absence of ideas, about sanitation and giving no thought to how they eat and what they eat. Let us not, like most of them, cook anyhow, eat anyhow, live anyhow. Let us show them the ideal diet. Let us not go by mere likes and dislikes, but get at the root of those likes and dislikes.

We must identify ourselves with the villagers who toil under the hot sun beating on their bent backs and see how we would like to drink water from the pool in which the villagers bathe, wash their clothes and pots in which their cattle drink and roll. Then and not till then we shall truly represent the masses and they will, as surely as I am writing this, respond to every call.

TRUE INTERNATIONALISM

IT is impossible for one to be internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism is possible only when nationalism becomes a fact, i.e. when peoples belonging to different countries have organized themselves and are able to act as one man. It is not nationalism that is evil, it is the narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is the bane of modern nations which is evil. Each wants to profit at the expense of, and rise on, the ruin of the other. Indian nationalism has struck a different path. It wants to organize itself or to find full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large.

I want the freedom of my country so that other countries may learn something from my free country, so that the resources of my country may be utilized for the benefit of mankind. Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the family has to die for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, and the province for the country, even so a country has to be free in order that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world. My love, therefore, or nationalism or my idea of nationalism is that my country may become free, that if need be the whole of the country may die, so that the human race may live. There is no room for race hatred there. Let that be our nationalism.

For me patriotism is the same as humanity. I am patriotic because I am human and humane. It is not exclusive. I will not hurt England or Germany to serve India. Imperialism has no place in my scheme of life. The law of a patriot is not different from that of the patriarch. And a patriot is so much the less a patriot if he is a lukewarm humanitarian. There is no conflict between private and political law.

I do want to think in terms of the whole world. My patriotism includes the good of mankind in general. Therefore, my service of India includes the service of humanity. The whole scheme for the liberation of India is based upon the development of internal strength. It is a plan of self-purification. The peoples of the west, therefore, can best help the Indian movement by setting apart specialists to study the inwardness of it. Let the specialists come to India with an open mind and in a spirit of humility as befits a searcher after Truth.

Isolated independence is not the goal of the world states. It is voluntary interdependence. The better mind of the world desires today not absolutely independent states warring one against another, but a federation of friendly interdependent states. The consummation of that event may be far off. I want to make no grand claim for our country. But I see nothing grand or impossible about our

expressing our readiness for universal interdependence rather than independence. I desire the ability to be totally independent without asserting the independence.

I do not believe that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in *advaita*, I believe in the essential unity of man, and for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him and if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent.

LETTERS from BAPU

Translated from Gujarati by Valji Govindji Desai

TO ASHRAM CHILDREN
TO ASHRAM SISTERS
TO ASHRAM WORKERS
TO LAXMIDAS GANDHI

TO KALLENBACH


Registered
3724
Laxmidas Karamchand Gandhi Esq
Porebunder
Kathiawad
India

M. K. GANDHI,
Attorney.

21-24 Court Chambers,
Corner Rissik & Anderson Streets.
P.O. Box 6522.

Johannesburg, ... 190

TO ASHRAM CHILDREN

Hardwar, Phalgun shudi 3, Monday

BOYS AND GIRLS,

Children are innocent, loving and benevolent by nature. Evil comes in only when they become older. They are innocent even in their mischief. If this holds good in your case, each of you should serve others, helping them to rise higher and saving them from a fall. You should watch and if necessary warn one another. Your watch should not be like that of a policeman but of God. God watches us all not with a view to punish but to chasten. Such should be the nature of your watch also. You must teach others what they do not know. Whoever speaks an untruth should be lovingly turned from it Remember, you must keep the promise you have made.

II

You are all students of the *Gita*. Every day you recite a portion of it at the morning prayers. If therefore you are troubled in mind upon hearing of my illness, you must have recourse to the *Gita* for relief. I fell ill just while I was translating the second chapter. I recall the lesson it teaches us and keep myself in good cheer. You, too, should cheer up in the same fashion. The body must suffer for its ill deeds We die to live once more, even as we live only to die at last. Life therefore is not an occasion for joy nor is death an occasion for sorrow. But there is one thing needful. We must ascertain our duty in life and continue to discharge it till we die. You know what is your duty either by faith or by conviction. See that you are not remiss in your performance of it. And having done your duty you will play your usual game of tipcat and dance in *rasa* as well even if you hear that I am no longer in the land of the living. Continue to do your duty as if nothing had happened and thus falsify the news of my passing away I depend upon you.

III

Chaitra vadi 9, day of silence

What fine fellows you are! Kaka Saheb complains that he used to write to you, but you had not the leisure to reply to his letters. Are things any better now? Must you go on expecting others to write to you, while you do nothing in return? Remember the phrase in the *Gita, Parasparam bhavayantah*. Benefits have to be mutual not only as between God and man, but also as between man and man, teacher and pupil, friend and friend. He who only receives but does not give is guilty of breaking the vow of *asteya* (non-stealing). *Yamas* like truth, non-violence and the like are obli-

gatory on all students, for one who does not keep these observances is not entitled to prosecute any studies.

I find I have passed from gay to grave. But never mind. There is no law against combining instruction with amusement.

IV

Nandi, day of silence

Your secretary has this time honoured me by writing a letter.

What have you all understood from the book which you are now reading as a text? I would enjoy it very much if each of you would, without consulting others, write it to me in clear handwriting on a good sheet of paper. It will also be your examination.

V

Vaishakh Purnima

You have flown away from the nest. So really speaking I should not write to you. But I am writing this to tell you that you may fly away wherever you like, but I still remember you and follow you with my eyes.

VI

Nandi, Vaishakh vadi 13

It is true that Kanti is out. But you have formed an association. So you have built up an organization. There is one advantage in an organization. It continues to exist whether the number of its members increases or decreases. *Mahajan*, Panch, Nation, Community, an organization—all these never die. If all the members whom we know today die, even then the organization continues to exist. There are many such organizations in the country even today. Your small organization must also become like that. A King may die but Government never dies. It lives for ever. So in France when the King died, it was said, "The King is dead, long live the King." This means that the throne of the King never remains vacant. So should it be with your association. I have continued to write to you every week, as far as I could, in spite of your holidays so that you may acquire such a habit. I will ask you to account for all the letters I have written during the holidays.

VII

Day of silence

I remembered you all very much during my Mysore tour because there were many more things which you could have seen than I could. My time for sight-seeing is over. I can live only for the work I have in hand. It would be a sin for me to take a single breath for anything else. But the natural beauty of Mysore, her various institutions, her gardens, music and paintings are things for you to see. But we are helpless in the matter. We can hardly do all that we wish to do: if we could

do everything at will, goodness knows how many worlds would already have been created and destroyed. Contentment is therefore the best of riches.

VIII

Day of silence

I understand why I cannot have letters from you regularly. You are all very busy nowadays. If your work is real service I am ready to take your letters as written. If the body serves but the mind is absent, our service can bear no fruit at all. There can be no self-indulgence in service. I hope the fragrance of your service will spread itself. A servant does not ask to become leader. He expects no service from others. He is satisfied with what he gets and has no complaints at all. He has only the right to serve. What matters if he does not get food or shelter in return? It is God's grace that there are undistressed persons even in the areas of distress. When all are in distress who can serve the nurses? So we must fend for ourselves when we go out to serve. We must not rely on others, but should be thankful to them for such help as they can afford to give.

IX

Day of silence

I would say that only now your classes are functioning in the right way. For you are having an object lesson in service. Literary education is intended only to quicken our spirit of service. Now that you have the opportunity to render service, pour your soul into it and learn to enjoy it thoroughly. When you serve, do not give yourself up to spiritual pride and say, "I do it." The service of the proud is nothing worth. The *Gita* is there to teach us that we do nothing, that we can do nothing. We are only the instruments of God's will. What is the difference between a watch and human being? A watch does not work by itself; it is set going by a man. In the same way, we do not move, we do not act by ourselves. The power that moves us is God. Just as a watch stops when its wound up spring has run out, so also when our spring is done, our cart comes to a dead halt. While that cart is still on the move, we feel that a certain freedom of action is granted to us. Let us use that freedom to learn and do the will of the great Carpenter.

TO ASHRAM SISTERS

Wardha,
Day of silence (Monday)
December 6, 1926

SISTERS,

The first thing for me to do after breakfast is to write you a letter. It is now five to seven; you are therefore all on your way to the prayer hall. You have to be punctual in reaching the hall at the fixed time. Those of you who have promised to attend the prayer daily should make it a point to be present except in circumstances beyond your control. I have suggested to Ramniklal that he should explain one or two verses from the *Gita* every day. But you are of course free to read something of your own choice Keep up the habit of writing, and always try to improve your hand. But all these things are not an end in themselves; they are only means to an end. The end is performance of one's allotted duty. The whole duty of man is to wish well and to do good to others. And as the first step towards discharging it, you should learn to love one another as your own blood sisters, and share one another's sorrows as well as joys.

BAPU'S BLESSINGS

II

Wardha,
December 15, 1926

Today also I remember you after breakfast. It is just 6-50, time for your prayer. We may miss many things in life but not prayer, which implies our co-operation with God and with one another. Prayer should be a bath of purification for the spirit of man. Our physical health suffers if we do not wash our bodies; similarly the spirit becomes unclean if the heart is not washed with prayer. Please therefore never be negligent in prayer.

The life of... provides an object lesson for you...She fills up every second of her time with purposeful activity. All of you should try to reach the same height of devotion, renunciation, and purity. Is it too much to expect that you will spread all over India after you have finished your training for service? I realise our lack of sisters of mercy every moment. Very few women come out to serve their fellow-countrymen. Women are the very incarnation of service, but at present they minister only to their own families. Why should they not extend the field of their ministry so as to embrace the whole of India? A truly religious person becomes a citizen of the world, but the service of one's own country is the stepping-stone to the service

of humanity. And where service is rendered to the country consistently with the welfare of the world it finally leads to self-realisation (*Moksha*).

III

January 1927

...At the women's meeting yesterday, I started a fresh piece of propaganda. Women here (in North Bihar) wear heavy ornaments of silver, do not comb their hair and keep their children dirty. I therefore condemned the wearing of jewellery, with the result that some of the sisters gave away their anklets and necklaces on condition that on no account should the jewellery donated be replaced. While receiving these gifts, I remembered all of you down there, for you could do this kind of work very much more effectively than I. And you must equip yourselves for it by renunciation and devotion. Ba has been very helpful to me these days.

Atmavat sarvabhuteshu. That is we must entertain the same regard for others as we have for ourselves. And if we did, we would be ashamed to find other people's children dirty as we would be if they were our own. So also if we found others in distress, we would make that distress our own and try to relieve it.

IV

January 1927

It is in the fitness of things that you have elected Gangabehn as your president. But may I suggest that after electing your president you have to help her to fulfil the duties of her office? Gangabehn is illiterate; still you have rightly appointed her president out of regard for her character. Rest assured that literary education is no good without character. President means chief servant. A ruler can issue orders only if he has acquired the highest qualification for service. His orders should be intended not to advance his own interests but the welfare of society. Rulers nowadays have lost sight of their duty, so that instead of setting an example of selflessness and devotion they give themselves up to pleasures and use their powers as an instrument of self-indulgence. But you have elected Gangabehn as president from a religious standpoint; you have therefore resolved that Gangabehn should be your leader in your endeavour to qualify as sisters of mercy.

V

Betia,

January 24, 1927

If at the Ashram we cannot train sisters for lifelong service to the country, where else can we hope to do so? It is true that you have not the health and strength, self-confidence, or the literary education requisite for the purpose. But if you have true *bhakti* (devotion), all these things will be added unto you. *Bhakti* means faith in God and in ourselves as His instruments, and it enables us to renounce our all. It is difficult to renounce for the mere sake of renunciation. A mother would never

by choice sleep in a wet bed but she will gladly do so in order to spare the dry bed for her child.

VI

Malvan,
February 28, 1927

There is always a women's meeting during the tour. I am therefore gathering fresh experiences every day. I feel that women hold the keys of *swaraj* in their hands. But who will bring about an awakening among them? Multitudes of women live in idleness; who will induce them to take to industry? Mothers spoil their children from their infancy, and load them with ornaments and superfluous clothes. They marry their young girls to old men. I am deeply pained when I see women heavily bedecked with ornaments. Who will explain to them that these trinkets are no aid to beauty? Real beauty is the beauty of the soul. And so on. But what is the remedy? The remedy will be readily found when some strong-willed Draupadi is thrown up by our people. You should resolve and try to acquire such capacity. Patience and perseverance overcome mountains.

VII

Day of silence (Monday)
April 25, 1927

There are men in the Ashram as well as women, but supposing that the men were out one day and thieves came to the Ashram, what would all of you do? Have you ever thought about this? If you haven't, think of it now and let me know what you would do. How I wish you would falsify epithets like *abala* (the weaker sex) and *bhiru* (the timid one) which are applied to women!

These epithets cannot properly be applied to all women, as for instance to women among the *Rani Paraj* or to the women in the west or in Africa or in Burma. Women in the west are doing much work that was supposed to be reserved for men. I do not mean that all their activities are worthy of imitation, but they have certainly upset many calculations of mere man. In Burma women manage everything. At the Ashram we are striving for self-realisation. The soul is neither male nor female, neither young nor old. The attributes belong to the body alone, as both scripture and experience testify. The soul is the same in both you and me. Therefore who am I to protect you? Only, if I have mastered the art of life, I have to teach it to you.

VIII

Nandi, Vaishakh shudi 15

I am very glad to know that you are not subject to fear. Why should one who knows that God is there to protect us all be afraid? But His protection does not mean that we may not be robbed or that we may not be bitten by a snake. Such

incidents do not show that He protects us any the less but that we had not enough faith in Him. The river is always willing to give its water to all, but how is the river to be blamed if some one does not fill his bucket at it or does not go near it believing the water to be poisonous? All fear is a sign of want of faith. But faith cannot be acquired by force of intellect. It comes but slowly after deep meditation and continuous practice. We pray, sing hymns, read books, seek the association of men of God, and perform the spinning sacrifice in order to attain that faith.

IX

Nandi, Vaishakh vadi 13

Does Mirabehn write to you occasionally? I can see from her letters that she is doing a great deal of work among the women as well as men. I will let you know one of the points in her letters. She writes that she finds all the sisters she meets very good-hearted but their ignorance is terrible. These sisters do not know even the simplest thing. If she talks to them about the spinning wheel, they are surprised, and they do not understand the idea of plying it for the poor. Religion for them is only worship in the temple. They hardly know what service means. This impression may be due to her not understanding them fully. But we do know how our womenfolk are ignorant of even ordinary things. Though the responsibility for this ignorance rests with men, women must prepare themselves to cure this evil. This is the task before you. I want all of you sisters to fit yourselves for it according to your capacity.

X

Jyeshtha shudi 14, Monday

I hope you are pronouncing the *shlokas* correctly, though we shall not be called to account for reciting the name of God incorrectly. God is a searcher of hearts only. If our hearts are pure, we will get full marks even if we stutter in our speech. Writing about this, I may describe the pleasant experiences we are having here. Mysore is a part of Karnatak. It has given us Kaka Saheb. Sisters here know Sanskrit and music very well. I heard their songs at Nandi, and the day before yesterday two sisters here sang in correct Sanskrit pronunciation a summary of the *Ramayana*. I think there were more than 100 *shlokas*. I could not detect a single mistake in them. One of them is still a student, and she knows the meaning of the verses also. But why am I writing to you about this? I value the work you are doing at present more than the study of Sanskrit. Become sisters of mercy, fearless and pure, and work as a team. This is a better education than any other. If a study of Sanskrit etc. could be added on to it, of course so much the better.

XI

Bhadrapad vadi

I am sure you have understood why I want you to make contacts with the labourers at the Ashram. To collect a few coppers from each of them for the relief

fund is merely an occasion for making them kinsmen. You should work for mutual good understanding and share one another's joys and sorrows You need not give much of your time for this What is wanted is a change of heart We should aim at feeding them with the kind of food we eat, and clothing them with the same dress as we wear. We should wish that they had a share in all the good things that we like and obtain for ourselves, and work for such a consummation

Do not be frightened by the wide implications of these views of mine There are always two meanings to everything—one wider and the other narrower We shall not be put out if we understand the wider implications but start with the narrower

XII

Trichinopoly,
Day of silence (Monday)

I visualise from here the work you are doing Whoever works according to her capacity has fulfilled her mission But in your work you must cultivate that attitude of mind which is inculcated in the *Gita*. That is to do everything with a view to serve, or as an offering to God, and if your action is an offering to God, you will never have the feeling "*I* am doing this." You will not then have ill-will for anybody and you will be generous to others You should always ask yourselves whether your smallest action is guided by these principles

KARAMCHAND UTTAMCHAND GANDHI

Inscription by Gandhiji—
'His son at his feet, Mohandas'

LAXMIDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI
Gandhiji's eldest brother

TO ASHRAM WORKERS

MY DEAR ...

There is no remedy except patience in such an ugly situation as described by C. I have no doubt in my mind that the approach should be the same in the mother country as in the Transvaal. But C.'s letter shows that we can prepare ourselves for it only in a place like Phoenix. A man should be free from fear even when he has to sleep in the cemetery, but if in the process of mastering fear he sleeps in the cemetery on the very first day, it is possible that he will only lose his life. India nowadays for you and me is a cemetery. We must prepare ourselves here to make our beds there and sing Mirabai's hymn, "Take thought of nothing except the name of God ..."

To be afraid of death is like being afraid of discarding an old and worn out garment. I have often thought of death and have the intellectual conviction that it is sheer ignorance which makes us afraid of death. I am however not sure that this conviction has become part and parcel of my spiritual being. I say this in view of my reactions when I see a snake for instance. And yet I feel that I will acquire the necessary strength to welcome death whenever and however it comes. I wish every one at Phoenix becomes equally fearless.

II

I have been thinking about the matter ever since you talked to me about it. The more I think of it, the more I am convinced that you should not take up that new activity. I see greed in it. I wish you would not take it up even in the manner I had suggested. If you have the energy to conceive new ideas,—and you must have it, as you look upon yourself as young—utilize that energy in opening up fresh avenues in your service of Harijans and Bhils. Even so you will not have time enough for your work. This work is more than enough not only for the life of a man like you but of many more besides. Greed for service has its limits. There is no end of misery in the world if we look for it. At every step we find there is scope for reform. Surely God does not expect us to redress all the wrongs. But if He has any such expectations, He has also taught us the art of doing it, and it is this: we must pick up even a little bit from that mountain of misery, apply our whole mind to the task of removing it and refuse to do anything else. Having done this we have as good as lifted the whole of the mountain. This is a simple principle, and if I have succeeded in impressing it upon your mind, I would ask you to take a vow that you will undertake nothing else but this two-fold service even if the kingdom of the earth is offered to you. If ever an occasion arises that in spite of engaging

yourself in this service, you have time on your hands, come to me, and I undertake to show you that you have forgotten to do many things in the field you have chosen.

III

I enjoyed the visit to art galleries in Rome and took great interest in the art, but what would be the value of an opinion expressed after a brief visit lasting only two hours? I am hardly qualified as an art critic. I liked immensely some of the things there. If I could live there for two or three months, I could observe the paintings and statues every day and make a study of them. I saw the statue of Christ on the Cross. It attracted me most. But I did not think that European art was superior to Indian art. Both these arts have developed on different lines. Indian art is entirely based on the imagination. European art is an imitation of nature. It is therefore easier to understand, but turns our attention to the earth; while Indian art when understood tends to direct our thoughts to Heaven. This is only for a person like you. I attach no importance to these views. It may be that my unconscious partiality for India or perhaps my ignorance makes me say so ... Take me for a parent who narrates stories from the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, as he knows them, to his children who know much less. You will see that I do enjoy art. But I have given up or have had to give up many such pleasures. I drank deep of those pleasures which have been incidental to my quest of the Truth, and am ready to partake of new pleasures of the same type. To a devotee of Truth his activities come in the natural course of things; he is therefore a follower of the third chapter of the *Gita* without an effort. I believe I was an aspirant of *Karma-yoga* even before I read the third chapter, but this is a digression.

I like your question about the Ashram. Labour is a prominent feature of the Ashram, because it is our duty to engage ourselves in physical work. One who avoids such work lives as a thief. Besides the work in the Ashram is not only for ourselves but for others also. The spinning wheel is the focal point of such work because it alone can be conceived as a subsidiary occupation besides agriculture to the millions in India. Its value is economic as well as spiritual. The Ashram exists not only for service to our country but also for service to humanity, and self-realisation through such service.

Every one cannot join the Ashram. The Ashram is not an infirmary or orphanage. It is for those men and women who wish to become brothers and sisters of mercy. Therefore it is not for those who are unable to do physical work. However, we may take a few of those who are disabled in body but have a keen desire for service. And we must not drive away those who have joined the Ashram and have subsequently been disabled. Many activities of the Ashram may outwardly appear contradictory, but this contradiction will disappear once you see their inner meaning.

It is not at all necessary that all those who have come in contact with me should be like me. It is even undesirable. That would be mere imitation. It would be worth while to adopt what is good in me only to the extent that they can assimilate

it. For instance Sardar takes tea, but no one thinks of stopping him. It may be that tea may be a necessity for him on medical grounds. Then what about some of those who stay with me and are my companions and who are meat-eaters? Only those who know that tea does not suit them or have thought about how tea is grown with sweated labour should give up tea. Ba takes tea in spite of the fact that she lives with me. She also takes coffee. I would even lovingly prepare it for her. Why is it so? I know your question was put only in fun. But we are prone to misunderstanding and intolerance in these matters and we must correct these errors.

TO LAXMIDAS GANDHI

Johannesburg
27-5-1906

RESPECTED BROTHER,

I have your letter of the 17th April. I do not know what to say. You are prejudiced against me. There is no remedy against prejudice. I am helpless. I can only reply to your letter in full.

1. I have no idea of separating from you.
2. I claim nothing there.
3 I do not claim anything as mine.
4 All that I have is being utilized for public purposes.
5 It is available to relations who devote themselves to public work.
6. I could have satisfied your desire for money if I had not dedicated my all for public use

I have never said that I have done much for brothers or other relations. I gave them all that I could save; and this I have mentioned not out of pride, and only to friends

Rest assured that I will cheerfully assume the burden of supporting the family in case you pass on before me You need have no fear on that score.

I am not now in a position to send you money as you desire.

It is well if Harilal is married; it is also well if he is not For the present at any rate I have ceased to think of him as a son.

I am willing to go to India to attend Mani's wedding if at all possible. But I cannot give you any idea of my present condition. I am so hard pressed for time that I scarcely know what to do Please cable the date of marriage, so that if at all possible I might hold myself in readiness to go.

I might perhaps inform you that I am in debt to Revashankarbhai.

You may repudiate me, but still I will be to you what I have always been.

I do not remember that I expressed a desire to separate from you when I was there. But even if I did, my mind is now quite clear, my aspirations are higher and I have no desire for worldly enjoyments of any type whatever.

I am engaged in my present activities as I look upon them as essential to life. If I have to face death while thus engaged, I shall face it with equanimity. I am now a stranger to fear.

I like those who are pure in heart. Young Kalyandas Jagmohandas's son is like Prahlad in spirit. He is therefore dearer to me than one who is a son because so born.

TO KALLENBACH

7 Buitensingle,
'Capetown,
March 16, '14

THE greatest grief imaginable has befallen me. My brother died yesterday, I suppose simply thinking up to his last breath of me. What a passionate wish it was on his part to meet me. I was hurrying everything on so that I could go to India with the quickest dispatch and fall down at his feet and nurse him. But it was not to be. Now I must go to a family of widows with my poor self as the head. You who do not know the Indian patriarchal cause do not quite realise what this may mean. Anyway my desire to get to India is keener than ever. And yet who knows? I doubt very much whether I shall ever realise that desire. However, I must prepare for the pilgrimage, and then leave it calmly in the hands of Him who wields the almighty power.

These shocks make in me still more intense fearlessness of death. Why should the event agitate one! The grief itself has a selfish touch about it. It is no calamity that my brother is dead if I am ready to meet death and consider it as the supreme and welcome crisis in life. It is because we fear death so much for ourselves that we shed tears over the deaths of others. How can I who know the body to be perishable and the soul to be imperishable mourn over the separation of body from soul! But it is a condition attached to a real belief and consoling doctrine. He who believes in it must not pamper the body but must be its ruler. He must regulate his wants so as to make it serve the dweller within and not allow the body to master him. Not to grieve over the death of others is to accept a state almost of perpetual grief. For this connection between body and soul is itself grievous.

These are the thoughts that rule me just now. I shall not write another letter just now. This has written itself.

GANDHI CHRONICLE:
1869-1944

By D. G. Tendulkar

1869: MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI, born at Porbandar (Kathiawad), otherwise known as Sudamapuri, on October 2, youngest son of Karamchand Gandhi, *alias* Kaba Gandhi, by his fourth wife, Putlibai, who bore him a daughter and three sons. For two generations Gandhis were Prime Ministers in Kathiawad States. In Porbandar Mohandas attended elementary school.

1876 (*Age 7*): Karamchand Gandhi left Porbandar for Rajkot to become a judge. Mohandas there in primary school for five years.

Betrothed to Kasturbai, daughter of Gokuldas Makanji, merchant, who was born six months before Mohandas.

1881-84 (*Age 12-15*): In Kathiawad High School at Rajkot. Remained there until he matriculated in 1887.

Married Kasturbai in 1883 when thirteen. "I can see no moral argument in support of such a preposterously early marriage."

While still in fourth standard went through religious crisis. One of his few friends led him astray. Wave of "reform" was sweeping through Rajkot. "Behold the mighty Englishman; he rules the Indian small, because being a meat-eater, he is five cubits tall," was a popular doggerel among school boys. "If the whole country took to meat-eating the English could be overcome," thought Mohandas. Gandhi family strenuously opposed to meat-eating. Mohandas chose secret place for experiment, which he persisted in for about a year. Then abjured meat for ever. Mohandas became fond of smoking, but later abandoned habit.

When fifteen he stole a bit of gold but confessed to father in writing with request for adequate punishment and pledged never to steal again. As father read letter, tears trickled down his cheeks. Mohandas also shed tears seeing father's agony. "Those pearl drops of love cleansed my heart and washed my sin away... This was for me an object lesson in *ahimsa*. Then I could see in it nothing more than a father's affection."

1885 (*Age 16*): Father died at age of 63, pensioner of Rajkot State.

On sick-bed father discussed with Parsi and Muslim friends about their faiths. Mohandas, nursing his father, listened to these discussions and developed toleration for all faiths.

The Indian National Congress inaugurated at Bombay in December 1885.

1887-88 (Age 18-19): Joined Samaldas College, Bhavnagar, Kathiawad. Found studies difficult and at the end of first term returned home. Family friend suggested law studies in England. Mother did not like idea of parting with him, but finally consented, Mohandas solemnly promising not to touch wine, women and meat. Orthodox caste people agitated over his going abroad. Mohandas refused to listen. Headman of community pronounced: "This boy shall be treated as an outcaste from today. Whosoever helps him or goes to see him off at the dock shall be punishable with a fine of one rupee and four annas."

Despite opposition, with help and permission of brother, Mohandas in company with Junagadh lawyer sailed from Bombay on Sept. 4, 1888. Reached Southampton towards end of month. On boat wore black coat and white flannel. Stepped ashore in white flannels—"only person wearing such clothes."

Purchased new clothes suitable for English society, also silk hat. Took six lessons in dancing but found it difficult to follow rhythm. Began learning violin to cultivate an ear for western music. Took lessons in elocution and French. Soon discontinued pursuing false ideal of becoming "gentleman," and determined to make complete change in life.

1889-91 (Age 20-21): Kept account of every farthing he spent. Decided to reduce cost of living by half. Lived by himself instead of with a family. Walked eight to ten miles a day and saved fare. Read books on simple living and began cooking breakfast. Lived on 1s. 3d. a day.

Made first public speech in gathering of vegetarians in London, broke down miserably over it.

Period of intensive study. Appeared for London Matriculation examination for second time and passed.

Towards end of second year in England met two theosophists with whom he read Arnold's *The Song Celestial*. Invited to read original (*Gita*) with them. He had never read *Gita* before either in Sanskrit or Gujarati. Book impressed him immensely. Later it became book of daily reading.

1891-93 (Age 22-24): Present at funeral of Bradlaugh, the atheist, on January 30. Attended lectures by Dadabhai Naoroji, but spoke to him only once.

Called to Bar, June 10, 1891. On June 12, sailed for India reaching Bombay in July. Sad news of mother's death, which had occurred while he was in England.

Lived in Rajkot for a time. Went to Bombay to gain experience in High Court. Found it impossible to establish practice there. Returned to Rajkot. On average earned Rs. 300 a month.

On behalf of brother saw Political Agent, known to him. He refused to hear Gandhi and turned him out. Sought advice of Sir Phirozeshah Mehta who observ-

ed, "Gandhi is still fresh from England... He does not know British officers... He has yet to know life."

Found life in Kathiawad choked with intrigue, and quarrel with Political Agent stood in way of practice.

Abdulla & Co., Muslim firm from Porbandar, offered work in South Africa, which he accepted.

1893-95 (Age 24-26): Gandhi left for South Africa in April 1893. Reached Natal towards close of May. Dressed in frock-coat and turban. Observed Indians were held in scant respect by Europeans. On second or third day visited Durban court. Magistrate asked him to take off turban, which he refused to do and left court. Wrote to press about incident defending wearing of turban. Press described him as "unwelcome visitor." Wide publicity.

Saw Indians divided. Muslim merchants called themselves Arabs, Parsi clerks Persians. Largest class composed of Tamil, Telugu and North Indian indentured labourers. Englishmen called them "coolies," and as majority belonged to labouring class all Indians were dubbed "coolie" or "sammy." Gandhi known as "coolie barrister."

On seventh or eighth day after arrival Gandhi left Durban for Pretoria. First-class seat booked. Same night at Maritzburg, capital of Natal, white passenger did not like "coloured man" occupying seat in same car. An official came to Gandhi and said, "Come along, you must go to the van." When Gandhi refused constable pushed him out. On station platform Gandhi sat and shivered in cold. Determined to try to root out colour prejudice and suffer hardships if necessary.

Same night he took train, reached Charlestown in morning. Then journeyed by coach. Conductor who usually sat by driver compelled Gandhi to sit outside, himself occupying seat inside. After few hours conductor occupied Gandhi's seat asking him to sit at his feet. On Gandhi refusing, white boxed his ears. Swearing at Gandhi, he dragged and belaboured him. Gandhi clung to brass rails on coach-box remaining still. After dark reached Standerton and was received by Dada Abdulla's friend. Wrote letter informing agent of coach company of whole affair, but had no intention of proceeding against assaulter.

Reached Johannesburg that night. Went to Grand National Hotel but refused accommodation. With devout Christians said prayers daily. Kept religious diary.

Gandhi now in full possession of facts about Indians in South Africa. Called meeting of Indians in Pretoria presenting picture of conditions in Transvaal. Principally attended by Memon merchants. Hindu population in Pretoria very small. Gandhi made his first political speech. Stressed necessity of truthfulness in business, cleanliness and unity among Indians of all communities. Contacted almost every Indian. Gave adult education.

Studied conditions of Indians in Transvaal and Orange Free State. Year's stay

in Pretoria most valuable experience. Had opportunities of public work and acquired capacity for it.

Read widely this year "quite eighty" books, whole Bible, Koran, Tolstoy's *Kingdom of God is within you*, Max Mueller's *India—What Can It Teach Us?*, *Sayings of Zarathushtra*, *Upanishads*, etc.

Case that had brought Gandhi to South Africa settled by arbitration in 1894. He returned to Durban *en route* to India. At farewell entertainment by Dada Abdulla, saw copy of *Natal Mercury*. Chanced to see paragraph under caption "Indian Franchise." Natal Government about to introduce bill to disfranchise Indians, who urged Gandhi to stay on. Consented to do so for some time.

Same night Gandhi drew up petition to be presented to Legislative Council of Natal. Committee appointed and telegram sent in its name to Government requesting postponement of Bill. First petition ever sent by Indians to South African Legislature. Within a month memorial with ten thousand signatures forwarded to Lord Ripon—Colonial Secretary. Meetings held every day, largely attended.

Gandhi asked leave to return to India but people urged him to stay on. Offered regular salary but declined remuneration for public work.

Gandhi applied for admission as advocate of Supreme Court of Natal. Natal Law Society opposed but Supreme Court granted application.

Temporary committee now placed on permanent footing. Gandhi had never attended Indian National Congress but out of respect for Dadabhai proposed organization in Natal be called Natal Indian Congress. It was founded on May 22, 1894. Unlike Indian Congress, Natal Congress worked throughout year. Only those who paid annual subscription of minimum £3 admitted to membership. About 300 members enrolled every month—Hindus, Muslims, Parsis and Christians. Meanwhile Lord Ripon disallowed Disfranchising Bill. This gave confidence to Indians.

With external agitation, questions of internal improvement taken up. Lectures delivered, debates held, and suggestions made at Congress meetings on sanitation, personal hygiene etc.

Under auspices of Natal Indian Congress, Natal Educational Association formed for benefit of young Indians.

There should be no exaggeration in propaganda, insisted Gandhi. Every possible occasion to co-operate with Europeans on terms of equality utilized. Newspapers supplied with as much information about Indian community as they could publish. Replies sent to unfair attacks on Indian community. Organizations formed in Transvaal and Capetown on Natal model.

1896 (Age 27): Gandhi spent two years and half in Natal, doing mostly political work. Established fairly good practice. Sensed people felt need of his presence. Therefore, made up his mind to fetch wife and children from India and settle in Natal.

GANDHI CHRONICLE

In middle of the year Gandhi went to India for six months. Saw Indian Congress leaders and others—Sir Phirozeshah Mehta, Justice Badruddin Tyabji, Justice Ranade, Lokamanya Tilak and Gopal Krishna Gokhale.

Preparation for celebration of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee. Gandhi joined Rajkot committee for the purpose. Taught British National Anthem to family children and students of Training College. Had learnt the anthem because it was sung in Natal at every meeting. "Hardly ever have I known anybody to cherish such loyalty as I did to the British Constitution." Later on "Scatter the enemies" etc. jarred on him.

Gandhi joined Plague Committee when plague broke out in Rajkot. Inspected city latrines etc. getting them cleaned.

Accounts of suffering Indians in South Africa stirred feeling in India. Reuter cabled to England highly coloured summary of pamphlet by Gandhi: "A pamphlet published in India declares that the Indians in Natal are robbed and assaulted and treated like beasts and are unable to obtain redress." In South Africa Gandhi charged with besmirching good name of colony.

While arranging meeting in Calcutta, Gandhi received cablegram from Natal asking to return at once. He returned to Bombay, immediately booked passage by first available steamer and with wife and children—eight and four years of age—set sail second time for Natal on November 28.

Following notice appeared in *Natal Advertiser* on December 30: "Wanted every man in Durban to attend a meeting on Monday, Jan. 4, for purpose of arranging demonstration to proceed to Point and protest against landing of Asiatics." About 2,000 people attended meeting. Speeches made clear Gandhi supreme object of reprobation. Preparations complete including list of men willing to use force.

1897-98 (Age 28-29): As soon as Gandhi landed on January 13, some European youngsters recognised him and shouted, "Gandhi, Gandhi!" Mr. Laughton, well-known advocate, hailed rickshaw, but youngsters would not let Gandhi get in. They pelted him with stones, brickbats and rotten eggs. Someone snatched away his turban, whilst others began to batter and kick him. He fell, catching hold of front railings of a house. Assailants did not allow him to recover breath but beat him. Wife of Police Superintendent, who knew Gandhi, happened to pass by and stood between crowd and him. This checked mob.

Meanwhile police made ring round Gandhi and escorted him to police station. A doctor friend rendered help. Gandhi asked to take refuge in station but declined offer. "They are sure to quiet down when they realise their mistake," Gandhi said. "Have trust in their sense of fairness." Escorted by police he arrived without further harm at Rustomji's house where his family was putting up.

Whites surrounded house. "We must have Gandhi," yelled crowd and Police Superintendent sent Gandhi message: "If you would save friend's home and property

and also your family, you should escape from the house in disguise, as I suggest." Gandhi put on Indian constable's uniform and wore on his head metal basin hidden under Madras turban Two detectives accompanied him, one disguised as Indian merchant, his face painted. Gandhi made his way through gunny bags, jumped fences and reached same police station where he had been offered refuge before.

Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary, cabled Natal Government to prosecute Gandhi's assailants. Gandhi replied Natal Government : "I do not want to prosecute anyone... I do not hold the assailants to blame. They were given to understand that I had made exaggerated statements in India about the whites in Natal, and calumniated them . . the leaders, and if you will permit me to say, you are to blame. I do not want to bring anyone to book. I am sure that when the truth becomes known they will be sorry for their conduct."

Whites ashamed of their conduct. Press declared Gandhi innocent and condemned mob. "Thus the lynching ultimately proved to be a blessing for me, that is, for the cause. It enhanced the prestige of the Indian community in South Africa, made my work easier, and the experience prepared me for the practice of Satyagraha."

Gandhi during this period made thorough change in life. Started washing his clothes. Bought book on washing, studied the art and taught it to wife. Refused entry in English hair-cutting shop in Pretoria, he purchased clippers and cut his hair before mirror.

Did not like idea of sending his sons to schools where others were not allowed. The boys acquired knowledge through his conversation with them, strictly in mother-tongue, Gujarati.

Gandhi longed for humanitarian work of permanent nature and daily worked a few hours in small hospital. It brought him in close touch with indentured Indians —Tamil, Telugu and North Indian men.

Studied *Advice to a Mother*, nursed his babies and served as midwife at birth of last baby. Did not desire any more children and began to strive after self-control. It became his conviction procreation and care of children inconsistent with public service.

1899-1900 (*Age 30-31*): October 10, Boer War. Gandhi's personal sympathies with Boers, but believed he had yet no right, in such cases, to enforce individual convictions. Loyalty to British rule drove him to participation with British. Held then that India could achieve emancipation only within and through Empire.

Collected corps of 1,100 strong, between 300 to 400 being ex-indentured Indians, with 40 leaders. With great difficulty got their services accepted as ambulance corps. Rank and file received ordinary bearer's pay ; leaders gave service free. Indian merchants supplied stores and uniforms.

On occasions party had to march 20 to 25 miles, bearing wounded on stretchers. Gandhi in charge of one of these parties When General Woodgate fell dying, Gandhi

helped carry sufferer from field-hospital to base-hospital, through heat and dust, lest he should die before reaching camp.

Corps disbanded in 1900 after six weeks' service. Newspapers published laudatory rhymes with refrain, "We are sons of Empire after all."

On return from war duty, Gandhi felt his work was more in India than in South Africa, and requested co-workers to relieve him. Had stayed there six years instead of one month originally intended. Request accepted on condition he should return, if within a year community needed him.

He awakened in Indian settlers sense of duty to motherland. They contributed handsomely for famine relief in India in 1897 and 1899. Indentured Indians gave their share.

1901-02 (*Age 32-33*): Gandhi left for India towards close of 1901. Overwhelming farewell. Gifts, gold, silver, diamonds, even a costly necklace, presented to Kasturbai, which he handed over to community to be held in trust for its service. "Conviction has ever grown on me that a public worker should accept no gifts."

Attended Indian Nation Congress at Calcutta in December 1901. Enrolled himself as volunteer. Gave volunteers some object lessons in sweeping and scavengering. Worked as clerk and bearer to one of the general secretaries to gain experience.

Moved resolution on situation in South Africa, thanks to Gokhale, who ever since Gandhi's arrival treated him as younger brother. Gokhale took keen interest in all his activities. Gandhi met Phirozeshah Mehta, Dinshah Wachha, Chimanlal Setalvad, Lokamanya Tilak, Motilal Ghosh and Surendranath Bannerjee. "I noticed the huge waste of time. I observed with sorrow even then the prominent place that the English language occupied in our affairs."

Paid flying visit to Burma.

Before settling down made tour through India travelling in third class. Gokhale gave him a metal tiffin box. Gandhi purchased canvas bag worth twelve annas and got a big coat of Chhaya wool. Bag was to contain the coat, *dhoti*, towel and shirt. He had blanket and water jug. Journey was from Calcutta to Rajkot. Gandhi planned to halt at Benares, Agra, Jaipur, and Palanpur *en route*. In each city he stayed one day, and put up at *dharmashalas* or with *pandas* like ordinary pilgrims. Spent Rs. 31 including train fare on journey. In travelling third class he preferred ordinary to mail trains.

At Benares visited temples. Waited on Annie Besant who was ill.

Gandhi opened his office in Bombay about March 1902. Hardly three or four months there when he received cablegram from South Africa stating situation serious. Wound up office and started by first available steamer near end of 1902.

1903-05 (*Age 34-36*): Reached Pretoria on January 1, 1903. Officials new and unapproachable. Asiatic Department was created, and those in charge had no sympathy with Indians. Gandhi attempted to contact Davidson, head of the Asiatic Depart-

ment, but failed. Only after repeated efforts was able to see Davidson, who referred him to his assistant. Assistant censured resident Indians for inviting their leader to Transvaal, saying that he was there to look after their interests. Rated Gandhi soundly for coming to colony. Officials afraid of Gandhi.

Became increasingly clear to Indians that Gandhi must remain in Transvaal and fight battle chiefly in law courts. Application for his admission as advocate made. In April, 1903, Gandhi enrolled as fully qualified attorney of Supreme Court. Founded Transvaal British Indian Association of which, until his final return to India, he was honorary secretary and legal adviser.

Increasing introspection stimulated by fresh reading of *Gita*. Learnt by heart no less than thirteen chapters. Read Vivekananda's *Rajayoga*, Patanjali's *Yoga Sutra*. *Gita* became book of reference. Words like *aparigraha* (non-possession) and *samabhava* (equality) gripped him. "I could not follow Him unless I gave up all I had. It became clear as daylight to me that non-possession and equality presupposed a change of heart, a change of attitude." Wrote to Bombay advising friends to allow his insurance policy worth Rs. 10,000 to lapse and wrote to brother that though he had placed at his disposal all that he had saved up to that moment, henceforth he should expect nothing from Gandhi. All future savings to be utilized for benefit of community.

On March 1, 1904, Gandhi received note that Indians were being brought from mines, dying or dead, stricken with plague. At once Gandhi took matter in hand.

About this time, 1904, Gandhi accepted responsibility for editing weekly, *Indian Opinion*, published in English, Tamil, Gujarati, and Hindi, dealing with problems of Indians in South Africa. Into it put his savings, about £2,000. Wrote series of articles in Gujarati on dietetics, later published in book form and translated into English called *Guide to Health*, which profoundly influenced lives of many readers in east and west.

Read Ruskin's *Unto this Last* in 1904 on way to Durban by train resulting in revolutionary change in outlook. Determined to change his life in accordance with its teaching.

First fruit of this determination was decision to remove *Indian Opinion* to a farm where everyone should labour, drawing same wage, and attend to press in spare time. Each individual's monthly allowance fixed at £3. Thus Phoenix Settlement established. Shed soon erected for press by help of Indian carpenters who had worked with him in Boer War. First number of *Indian Opinion* from settlement printed by hand-power as engine refused to work. "I had thought that hand-power would be more in keeping with the atmosphere where agricultural work too was to be done by hand."

Gandhi had to leave settlement soon for Johannesburg. Had to satisfy himself with what little he could achieve in rearranging his household in light of Ruskin's teaching. Liking for all physical labour increased. Dislike for medicine. Heard of

"No Breakfast Association" in Manchester and gave up breakfast. Read Just's *Return to Nature*, embarked on further dietetic and health experiments, including earth treatment.

1906 (Age 37): Zulu "Rebellion" in April. Gandhi decided to break up Johannesburg home, sent wife and children to Phoenix. As in Boer War, loyalty to empire made him offer services. Wrote to Governor volunteering to form Indian Ambulance Corps. Offer accepted.

Gandhi saw rebellion was virtually a no-tax campaign. Indian Corps worked for nearly six weeks. Whites not willing to nurse wounded Zulus. Wounded in Gandhi's charge taken prisoners as suspects and the General sentenced them to be flogged. Indian Corps attached to swift-moving column and twice or thrice Gandhi had to march 40 miles a day. "The rebellion was no war but seemed to be a man-hunt... I swallowed the bitter draught and salved my conscience by the thought that we were privileged to attend the wounded Zulus who but for us would have been uncared for." Gandhi had also to dispense prescriptions for whites.

In solemn hills of Zululand, Gandhi pondered over *brahmacharya* and its implications and discussed it with co-workers. On arrival at Phoenix took vow of *brahmacharya* for life. Kasturbai raised no objection.

News reached Gandhi of draft ordinance published in Transvaal Government Gazette Extraordinary of August 22, against Indian immigrants.

Protest meeting on September 11 at Empire Theatre, Johannesburg. Attended by Indian delegates from all Transvaal. Most important was famous Fourth Resolution. Indians solemnly determined never to submit to new ordinance but to suffer all penalties, if it became law. Business conducted in Hindi, Gujarati, Tamil and Telugu. Pledge of passive resistance taken at every centre in Transvaal.

Law passed on September 12.

Indian community decided to send deputation to England to present case to Colonial Secretary. Gandhi and H. O. Ali elected representatives. Memorial drafted on way to England.

Gandhi reached London on October 20, and left for South Africa in December. Dadabhai Naoroji helped Gandhi in agitation. Before Gandhi left he addressed meeting of about 100 members of the Commons explaining plight of Indians in South Africa. During stay, committee formed to watch interests of Indian immigrants.

Gandhi's mission only delayed evil day.

1907 (Age 38): "Black Act" proclaimed to take effect from July 1. Indians called upon to apply for registration before July 31. "Passive Resistance" movement took practical form. Resident Chinese, about 1,000, joined Indians because law applied to them also. Asiatics thrown into prison by thousands and as jails not large enough some kept in mine-pits.

Gandhi temporarily called movement "passive resistance." Small prize offered

through *Indian Opinion* to reader who invented best designation. Maganlal Gandhi coined word "Sadagraha" and won prize. But to make it clearer Gandhi changed it to "Satyagraha"—the force born of Truth and Love.

When movement started Gandhi was flourishing barrister, earning about five to six thousand pounds a year. Gave up practice, donated savings and voluntarily accepted life of asceticism.

In July Transvaal saw opening of permit offices for issue of registration certificates. Indian community decided to picket. On July 31, mass meeting of Indians held in open air in Pretoria mosque. September 18, Gokhale's telegram of encouragement.

Government extended last day of registration to November 30 but only 511 persons out of 13,000 complied. Consequently Gandhi and 24 others, including Quinn, leader of Chinese, were notified to appear before magistrate on December 28. Gandhi asked to leave Transvaal within forty-eight hours. In December Rev. J. J. Doke met Gandhi for first time. Soon after Doke wrote excellent account, *M. K. Gandhi—An Indian Patriot in South Africa.*

In addition to Black Act, Smuts carried through Transvaal Immigrants Restriction Bill which prevented entry of single new Indian into Transvaal.

1908 (Age 39): On January 10, Gandhi with companions called upon to attend court for sentence. None offered defence, all pleaded guilty. Gandhi in statement asked magistrate to impose on him heaviest penalty. Sentenced to two months' simple imprisonment. Hundreds of Indians as well as brother members of the Bar present in court. Gandhi at once removed into custody and driven to Johannesburg Jail. First jail experience.

Community resolved to fill up jails. Indian hawkers took lead. They refused to show licences, enough to ensure arrest. Number of Satyagrahis more than a hundred within a week. Soon rose to over 150.

On January 30, Gandhi summoned to see General Smuts at Pretoria. Proposed that prisoners should be released, and Black Act withdrawn if sufficient number of Indians registered voluntarily. Gandhi went to Johannesburg and there held meeting of 1,000 people at mosque at midnight. Meeting unanimously ratified settlement with exception of few Pathans.

On morning of February 10, Gandhi and a few co-workers went to take certificates of registration. Pathans led by Mir Alam followed. Mir Alam hit Gandhi on head who fell down unconscious. He was again beaten and kicked. Pathans arrested but Gandhi who was taken to Doke's place refused to prosecute them stating: "Let the blood spilt today cement the two communities indissolubly ... The large majority of Asiatics ought to give finger prints." Gandhi gave finger prints from sick-bed. During convalescence developed habit of falling asleep during work and waking after short time refreshed.

After a few days he held meeting at Durban and explained position to Pathan residents with little success. Left for Phoenix where his family was living.

Indians registered voluntarily but instead of repealing Black Act, Smuts took fresh step, making further provision for registration of Asiatics.

Gandhi wrote letter to Smuts and another to Transvaal Government saying: "If the Asiatic Act is not repealed in terms of the settlement, and if Government's decision to that effect is not communicated before a specific date, the certificates collected by the Indians will be burnt, and we shall humbly take the consequences."

Ultimatum to expire on same day that new Asiatic Bill was to be passed by Legislature. Gandhi received 2,000 certificates to be burnt. These were thrown into cauldron containing solution with paraffin and set ablaze in grounds of Hamidia Mosque, Johannesburg, on August 16.

Gandhi arrested and sentenced on October 15, for not being able, on his return from Natal, to show his certificate, which he had burned. Refused thumb impression. Sentenced to two months' rigorous imprisonment. To separate him from other Satyagrahis, Gandhi taken to Pretoria Jail and confined in solitary cell reserved for dangerous criminals. Marched under guard through streets, dressed in convict clothes, carrying his bundle. Released on December 13.

Meanwhile Boers and British anxious to effect union of the four colonies in Africa. Indians sensed that their status would worsen and resolved to send deputation to England.

1909 (Age 40): Gandhi and Haji Habib left for England on deputation on June 23. Smuts and others already there to present case for unification.

Union Bill passed. Gandhi left England on November 13. During stay had opportunity to watch women's suffrage movement and came in contact with prominent leaders.

Gandhi wrote to Tolstoy the first time. Tolstoy replied: "...received your most interesting letter... God help our dear brothers and co-workers in the Transvaal."

On return journey Gandhi wrote *Hind Swaraj*.

1910 (Age 41): On return to Capetown, Gandhi received cable that Ratanji J. Tata had given Rs. 25,000 to Satyagraha funds. Arranged that all Satyagrahis and families should live together. Kallenbach, German architect and close friend of Gandhi, gave use of farm of 1,100 acres, called Tolstoy Farm, 21 miles from Johannesburg, free of charge. Houses built in two separate blocks for men and women. Everything from cooking to scavenging done by members. Different communities from different parts of India settled. Members vegetarian by consent, drink and smoking totally prohibited. Handicrafts kept inmates busy. Gandhi learnt making sandals.

Children taught by Gandhi. All-round religious training received by all. As principal part of teaching, Gandhi told or read interesting stories. Teaching experiment not fruitless. They learnt how to live together, lessons of mutual service,

courtesy and industry. Gandhi never punished boys. Once angry, he gave a blow on boy's arm with a ruler. Still repents that violence. Remembers only one occasion when he physically punished one of his sons.

Farm members shaved and cut hair of one another. All put men's trousers and shirts of coarse blue cloth, imitated from prisoner's uniform. Women in charge of cooking and tailoring. Three meals a day. After evening meal, prayer at seven. They sang *bhajans* and read from the *Ramayan* or books on Islam. Everyone retired at 9 o'clock. Most of them fasted on their respective religious days.

They did not keep even commonest appliances of medicine. Gandhi's faith in nature cure. His booklet on health is a note-book of his experiments and his living faith in those days. Believed in earth bandages, fasting and change of diet. Not a single case of illness on farm.

Ebb and flow of Satyagrahis on farm. Gandhi acquired perfect capacity for bodily labour. Walked one day 55 miles.

Stray Satyagrahis now and then went to jail. In April Gandhi again wrote to Tolstoy and sent him *Hind Swaraj*. Signed himself Tolstoy's "humble follower" and asked Tolstoy to give opinion on book.

1912 (*Age 43*): Gokhale landed at Capetown on October 22 as mediator between Satyagrahis and Government. After seeing General Botha, he said Black Act and £3 tax would be abolished next year. Received enthusiastically everywhere. Lived a few days on Tolstoy Farm. Gandhi requested Gokhale to speak Marathi before Indians in Johannesburg and translated for non-Marathas. Gokhale left South Africa on November 17.

Reading about inhuman treatment accorded to cows, gave up milk and restricted himself to diet of fresh and dried fruit. *Guide to Health and Niti Dharma—Ethical Religion* by Gandhi published.

1913 (*Age 44*): Inhabitants of Tolstoy Farm preparing to renew Satyagraha struggle. Abolition of £3 tax as objective Undertaking given to Gokhale cleared way for Satyagrahis. When struggle resumed India rendered munificent help to Satyagraha funds. Andrews and Pearson went to South Africa from India. Indentured labourers participated in struggle. Gandhi decided to close Tolstoy Farm. Phoenix became centre of activities.

Penitential fast for moral lapse of two inmates at settlement. Took only one meal a day for next four and half months.

While preparations made for struggle, fresh grievance afforded opportunity even to women for participation.

On March 14, Cape Supreme Court nullified all marriages not celebrated according to Christian rites or not registered by Registrar of Marriages. This affected status of Indian married women.

Gandhi invited Indian women to enter struggle and they gladly joined. Along

with other women Satyagrahis Kasturbai sentenced. Valliamma, sixteen-year old girl, died of fever soon after release. Movement developed into mass Satyagraha involving labourers in mines. Gandhi asked miners to march to Transvaal border, distance of 36 miles to be covered in two days—October 28.

Gandhi wired to Government intention of crossing border. Government and employers used force and many labourers injured. Programme was to march at rate of 25 miles a day, until either the men were arrested or Tolstoy Farm reached. Next day—November 6—at 6-30 a.m. prayers were offered and non-violent army marched. Marching column composed of 2,037 men, 127 women and 57 children. Gandhi habitually addressed as *Bhai*. Clad only in shirt and trousers.

On November 6, warrant issued for arrest of Gandhi, who quietly surrendered. Tried at Volksrust for breach of Immigration Act., but bail granted. Gandhi rejoined march.

Re-arrested second time at Standerton on November 8, again released on bail.

On November 9, arrested for third time in four days and sentenced on Nov. 11 to nine months' rigorous imprisonment. Next day three long trains drawn up and marchers called upon to enter them to be taken back and imprisoned in Natal.

20,000 more labourers in Natal struck work, leading to repression and bloodshed.

On November 13, Gandhi taken to Volksrust for second trial and next day sentenced to three months' imprisonment along with Polak and Kallenbach.

Smuts released Gandhi unconditionally on December 18, in expectation of compromise. From time of release till settlement, Gandhi, as penance, took only one meal a day and put on indentured labourer's dress.

Karachi Congress voted its admiration "for heroic endeavours of Gandhi and his followers in South Africa."

Andrews and Pearson deputed by Gokhale to negotiate but arrived after Gandhi's arrest. Gandhi's first meeting with Andrews. Negotiations not smooth, and Gandhi fixed January 1, 1914, for renewing march. All-India indignation. Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, driven by public opinion, lodged protest against Government of South Africa.

1914 (Age 45): *Fourteen days' fast for moral lapse of inmates of Settlement.*

Harbatsingh, brave 75-year old Satyagrahi, died in jail on January 5.

Following number of interviews between Smuts, Andrews and Gandhi, provisional agreement arrived at and Satyagraha suspended for last time on January 21. Indian Relief Bill published abolishing £3 tax, legalising in South Africa all marriages deemed legal in India, and making a domicile certificate bearing holder's thumb-print sufficient evidence of right to enter Union.

Smuts, who in 1909 had said he would never erase measure, confessed in 1914 that he was glad to do away with it.

The great Satyagraha struggle in South Africa closed triumphantly.

On July 18, Gandhi sailed for England to meet Gokhale, accompanied by Kasturbai and Kallenbach.

War declared on August 4. Gandhi reached London on August 6. Gokhale stranded in Paris.

In consultation with Dr. Jivraj Mehta and others studying in England, Gandhi held meeting of Indian residents and advised them to participate in war. Lord Crewe accepted offer after hesitation. With about 80 volunteers Gandhi took six weeks' course in first-aid and passed examination. Kasturbai joined. Sarojini Naidu, then in London, participated in war work, came to know Gandhi first time.

In December, owing to serious attack of pleurisy, Gandhi obliged to return to India.

1915 (Age 46): Gandhi landed in Bombay on January 9. Welcomed at Apollo Bunder. Dressed in Kathiawadi cloak, turban and *dhoti*, all made of Indian mill cloth.

Country slowly recovering from effects of long-continued repression. Press Act and Seditious Meetings Act still in force. Many patriots in jail, though Lokamanya Tilak and Mrs. Besant released.

Moment Gandhi reached Bombay, Gokhale sent word that Lord Willingdon, Governor, was desirous of seeing him. Governor said: "I would like you to come and see me whenever you propose to take any steps concerning Government." Kaiser-i-Hind Gold medal conferred on Gandhi by Lord Hardinge in New Year Honours.

Gandhi went to Poona to see Gokhale and members of Servants of India Society. Gokhale wanted Gandhi to join Society but members felt otherwise. Gandhi wanted to settle down in Gujarat and found an *ashram* to which Gokhale agreed. Gokhale had taken promise from Gandhi that for a whole year after his arrival in India he would not undertake any political work but watch events.

From Poona Gandhi went to Rajkot and Porbandar to meet relations. Travelled third, adopted eight-anna worth of Kashmiri cap and draped cloak. At Wadhwan, a public worker told Gandhi about Viramgam customs and hardships. Gandhi asked, "Are you prepared to go to jail?" He replied in affirmative. Gandhi heard complaints everywhere in Kathiawad. Collected and read literature about it. Saw Lord Willingdon in vain. Viramgam customs cordon removed by Lord Chelmsford in 1917. In Bagasra (Kathiawad), he had referred to Satyagraha.

In letter dated February 18, Tagore referred to Gandhi as Mahatma. "I hope that Mahatma and Mrs. Gandhi have arrived in Bolpur."

On February 19, Gokhale died and Gandhi who was at Santiniketan came to Poona. Soon left with Maganlal Gandhi to assist in sanitary arrangements at Hardvar for the Kumbha fair. Even at Hardvar Gandhi's African struggle was known and

people flocked to have his *darshan.* Here he decided to limit his diet, and pledged never, whilst in India, to take more than five items, and never to eat after dark. Proceeded to Gurukul to meet Swami Shraddhanand—then Mahatma Munshiram. At Hrishikesh *sanyasi* insisted that Gandhi should wear sacred thread and *shikha* which he had given up before going to England. Gandhi agreed to *shikha,* declined sacred thread because countless Hindus have to go without it.

In speech at Mayavaram on May 12, he touched on social reform in that centre of orthodoxy: "In so far as I have been able to study Hinduism outside India, I have felt that it is no part of real Hinduism to have in its hold a number of people whom I would call 'untouchables.' If it was proved to me that this is an essential part of Hinduism, I for one would declare myself an open rebel against Hinduism itself."

Many friends pressed Gandhi to settle down in Ahmedabad. Being a Gujarati he thought he should be able to render greatest service through Gujarati language and could get monetary help from wealthy citizens. Ahmedabad was an ancient centre of handloom weaving and so favourable field for revival of the cottage industry of hand-spinning.

On May 25, Satyagraha Ashram founded with 25 inmates in rented bungalow at Kochrab, a small village near Ahmedabad. Members took vows of truth, *ahimsa,* celibacy, control of the palate, non-thieving, non-possession, *swadeshi,* fearlessness, removal of untouchability, education through vernaculars and khaddar.

All had meals in common kitchen, lived as one family. In a few months *ashram* accepted untouchable family—Dudabhai, his wife Danibehn and daughter Lakshmi—as inmates. Friends stopped monetary help and boycotted *ashram.* But soon after somebody gave Gandhi anonymously Rs. 13,000.

On November 5, Phirozeshah Mehta died.

Congress session in Bombay in December. Gandhi not elected to Subjects Committee. Nominated by Sir S. P. Sinha, President.

1916 (Age 47): At opening ceremony of Benares Hindu University on February 4, Gandhi said: "If I found it necessary for the salvation of India that the English should retire, that they should be driven out, I would not hesitate to declare that they would have to go, and I hope I would be prepared to die in defence of that belief."

Gandhi attended Lucknow Congress. Rajah of Muhmudabad and Jinnah present. For first time, a tenant placed grievances of Bihar tenantry. Congress condemned extensive use of Defence of India Act and Bengal Regulation III of 1818. Jawaharlal Nehru's first meeting with Gandhi.

"I am no socialist," Gandhi said in one of his few references to the subject.

1917 (Age 48): In February, Malaviya asked leave to introduce bill for immediate abolition of indenture system, but Lord Chelmsford refused.

Before starting agitation for abolition Gandhi sought interview with Viceroy which was granted. No definite official promise given.

Gandhi began tour from Bombay. Under auspices of Imperial Citizenship Association resolution passed specifying May 31 as latest date by which abolition should be announced.

Before May 31, Government announced that indentured emigration from India was stopped. Century-old evil terminated. Gandhi visited Karachi, Calcutta and other places. C.I.D. men shadowed him. Held several well-attended meetings.

On April 10, Gandhi reached Patna. Met Rajendra Prasad for first time. Acquainted himself with hardships of Champaran agriculturists.

Secretary of Planters' Association told Gandhi plainly that as outsider he had no business there. Commissioner advised him forthwith to leave Tirhut. Lawyers offered to work as his clerks. On April 16, Gandhi started for Motihari on elephant's back. Served with notice "to leave by next available train." Gandhi defied order. Received summons to stand trial next day. News spread. Thousands of villagers from distant places assembled near court. Congress practically unknown in those parts.

Lt.-Governor ordered case against Gandhi to be withdrawn. He was allowed to conduct proposed inquiry. Toured interior of district and saw tenants, planters and officials. Invited for interview by Lt.-Governor on June 4. Interview extended over three days resulting in appointment of committee of enquiry with Gandhi on it.

On June 16, Gandhi left for short visit to his *ashram*. Outbreak of plague compelled him to quit Kochrab. Chose new site of 20 acres on Sabarmati river, in vicinity of central jail. Within a week 40 persons joined *ashram*, living under canvas.

Dadabhai Naoroji's death on June 30.

In August, Montagu Reforms scheme announced. Gujarat Sabha under Gandhi organized monster petition in support of Congress-League scheme. Lead followed throughout country.

On September 25, Gandhi wrote strong letter to the press depicting conditions in Champaran. Committee signed unanimous report on October 3. Government translated recommendations in November into Champaran Agrarian Bill, passed into law early in March 1918.

In Bihar Gandhi was convinced work of permanent nature in villages impossible without proper education. Opened primary schools in six villages. Got assistance of excellent teachers from Maharashtra and Gujarat. Prof. Kripalani joined. Mahadev Desai and Narahari Parikh, with their wives, cast their lot with Gandhi.

Gandhi's co-workers swept roads and courtyards, cleaned wells, filled up pools near by and persuaded villagers to raise volunteers. Kasturbai participated.

At Champaran Gandhi received calls for help from Kheda and Ahmedabad. At Kheda crops had failed and peasants were unable to pay land revenue. At Ahmedabad mill labour ill-paid and over-worked.

In November Gandhi presided over first Gujarat Political Conference. He said: "I cannot forget that India is not Europe, India is not Japan, India is not China... I feel that India's mission is different from that of the others."

In Congress Week at Calcutta in December, he presided over first session of Social Service League.

1918 (*Age 49*): Ever since return home Gandhi watched interests of Ahmedabad millhands. At close of 1917 and beginning of 1918 relations between labour and millowners very strained.

Gandhi, with Shankarlal Banker and V. J. Patel, representatives of weavers, and Ambalal Sarabhai representing millowners, appointed to arbitrate. Before committee could commence work, millowners declared general lock-out on February 22. Gandhi's efforts for arbitration failed. Advised labourers on February 26 to strike work. In third week strike weakened. Gandhi felt responsible for weakness of strikers and declared: "Unless the strikers rally and continue the strike till a settlement is reached or till they leave the mill altogether I will not touch any food." Anasuyaben, Ambalal's sister, was with Gandhi. Strike called off after Gandhi fasted for three days. Settlement reached after 21 days' strike.

Soon after, Gandhi had to plunge into Kheda Satyagraha struggle. Conditions approaching famine in Kheda district owing to failure of crops. Gujarat Sabha, of which Gandhi was president, sent petitions and telegrams to Government. Government apathetic. After consulting co-workers, Vallabhbhai Patel, Shankerlal Banker, Anasuyaben, Indulal Yajnik, Mahadev Desai and others, Gandhi advised *patidars* to resort to Satyagraha.

Set up headquarters at Nadiad Anathashram. Satyagrahis on March 22, took solemn pledge: "We shall rather let our lands be forfeited, than that by voluntary payment we should allow our case to be considered false or should compromise our self-respect." Government began coercion, attached people's cattle and standing crops, seized movables.

Campaign ultimately successful. Well-to-do paid up, while poorer people were granted remission. Through Kheda campaign Satyagraha took firm root in Gujarat.

In April, Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, invited Gandhi to War Conference at Delhi. Ali Brothers in jail, Tilak and Mrs. Besant not invited. Gandhi, therefore, declined invitation. Applied for permission to visit Ali Brothers but not allowed. At Muslim League session at Calcutta Gandhi urged on Muslims to secure Ali Brothers' release. Later addressed Muslim College, Aligarh, and invited young men to be fakirs in service of motherland.

Viceroy succeeded in persuading Gandhi to attend War Conference. Gandhi seconded resolution on recruiting, in one-sentence speech in Hindustani: "With a full sense of responsibility, I beg to support the resolution"—the first instance of

Hindustani being spoken at meeting presided over by Viceroy. India contributed 985,000 men and made tremendous sacrifices.

After Conference, Gandhi sent letter to Viceroy through Mr. Ireland of Cambridge Mission saying it was grave blunder not to have invited Tilak, Mrs. Besant and Ali Brothers to conference. Explaining people's minimum political demand Gandhi said: "Even a performance of duty automatically confers a corresponding right. People are entitled to believe that the imminent reforms alluded to in your speech will embody the main general principles of the Congress-League Scheme. I would make India offer all her able-bodied sons as a sacrifice to the Empire at its critical moment, and I know that India, by the very act, would become the most favoured partner in the Empire, and racial distinctions would become a thing of the past."

Returning from Delhi, Gandhi started recruiting campaign in Kheda, but estrangement between people and Government had reached such a pitch that he was refused even bullock transport and food. Officials not satisfied with him. He issued leaflets: "Among the many misdeeds of the British rule in India, history will look upon the act depriving a whole nation of arms as the blackest. If we want to learn the use of arms, here is a golden opportunity."

Strenuous work of recruiting told heavily upon his frail body. For months he was confined to bed and seemed to be near death. Under pressure from doctor and Kasturbai began taking goat's milk, which he regarded as a violation of the spirit of the pledge not to take milk, though he then meant cow's and buffalo's milk. Learnt spinning during convalescence. Put discarded *charkha* in use.

As late as July 1918, he defined *swaraj* as part and partnership in the British Empire.

Elected in his absence, by the Delhi session of the Congress, December, as one of its three representatives at the Versailles Peace Conference. But had no ambition in these directions.

1919 (*Age 50*): Dr. Dalal performed on Gandhi successful operation for fissures.

Hardly on way to recovery, when Gandhi read in papers Rowlatt Committee's report, just published. Until 1919, Gandhi did not participate actively in Indian nationalist movement. After talks with Vallabhbhai Patel, Gandhi decided to call small meeting consisting of Sarojini Naidu, Horniman, Umar Sobani, Shankarlal Banker, Anasuyaben etc. at the *ashram*. Satyagraha pledge drafted and signed by all present on Feb. 28. Gandhi was not editing any journal but occasionally ventilated views through daily papers. Separate body called Satyagraha Sabha established with Bombay as headquarters. Gandhi became president.

Rowlatt Bill introduced in February.

Gandhi attended proceedings of India's Legislative Council for first time in his life, on occasion of Rowlatt Bill debate.

Rowlatt Bill became Act on March 18. Following day Gandhi told Rajagopal-

achari: "The idea came to me last night in a dream, that we should call upon the country to observe a general *hartal*."

On March 23, Gandhi issued brief appeal. Date of *hartal* originally fixed on April 1, changed subsequently to April 2, and later to April 6, a day of "humiliation and prayer."

After short tour in South India, Gandhi reached Bombay on April 4. Delhi had observed *hartal* on March 30 as news of postponement reached late. Swami Shradhanand invited to deliver speech in Jumma Masjid. Police checked *hartal* procession and opened fire, causing casualties. Firing in Lahore and Amritsar.

Hartal in Bombay complete success. Full preparations for starting civil disobedience. It was decided that civil disobedience might be offered in respect of such laws only as easily lent themselves to disobedience by masses. Gandhi suggested people might prepare salt from sea-water in their homes. Proscribed literature to be distributed and read. On evening of April 6, volunteers sold *Hind Swaraj* and *Sarvodaya*, Gujarati translation of Ruskin's *Unto this Last*, which were proscribed. Copies soon sold out.

Muslim friends invited Gandhi and Sarojini Naidu to deliver speeches in mosque.

On night of April 7, Gandhi started for Delhi and Amritsar. Mahadev Desai accompanied. Before train reached Palwal, Gandhi served with notice prohibiting entry into Punjab. Asked to get down from train which he refused. Put under police custody. Made to enter third-class carriage. At Muttra taken to police barracks. Early next morning put in goods train going to Bombay. At noon made to get down at Savai Madhopur. Then put in first-class compartment and requested to return to Bombay and not cross frontiers of Punjab. He refused and was taken to Bombay on April 11.

News of Gandhi's arrest incensed people. Pydhoni in Bombay scene of great excitement. Gandhi hurried there to see procession dispersed by mounted police. Held meeting at Chowpati sands and said, "A Satyagrahi is pledged to non-violence, and unless people observe it in thought and deed, I cannot offer mass Satyagraha."

Attempts made to pull off rails near Nadiad railway station. Ahmedabad under martial law. On April 13, Gandhi held meeting at Sabarmati Ashram and declared penitential fast for three days and appealed to people to observe similar fast for a day. He suggested to those who had been guilty of violence to confess.

Immediately after Gandhi went to Nadiad. There he first used the expression "Himalayan miscalculation." Realised training in civil disobedience not going to be rapid. With these thoughts he reached Bombay. Raised a corps of Satyagrahi volunteers. With their help commenced teaching significance of Satyagraha. Gandhi suspended Satyagraha on April 18.

Ruthless repression by Government. On April 10, in the Punjab, Dr. Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal spirited away. Crowd fired upon, it turned back into city. Five Englishmen killed.

Vaishakhi festival at hand, pilgrims had assembled. On April 13 a meeting was held in Jallianwala Bagh, Amritsar. Night before General Dyer issued order forbidding public meetings but none had heard about it. General, however, came to Jallianwala Bagh with troops armed with guns. Without warning, opened fire for about ten minutes on defenceless mass of people. As ground was surrounded by high walls no one could escape. According to official figures about 400 were killed and between a thousand and two wounded.

Following massacre, martial law proclaimed. Reign of terror in Punjab. Water and electric supply of Amritsar cut off for civilians. Public flogging common and the infamous "Crawling Order" imposed.

General Dyer's action approved by Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Governor, in telegram, "Your action correct." Censoring of news so strict that A.I.C.C. learnt news of Amritsar massacre in detail only in July in Calcutta.

B. G. Horniman, in whose hands the *Bombay Chronicle* had become a formidable force, was deported from Bombay by Governor, Sir George Lloyd. Gandhi asked by directors to take up responsibility of conducting paper, but soon Government suspended *Chronicle*. In view of this, management asked Gandhi to take up editorship of its weekly *Young India* in Bombay and turn it into bi-weekly.

Meantime, *Chronicle* resuscitated and *Young India* returned to its weekly form and was published in Ahmedabad. First issue came out on October 8. *Navajivan*, a Gujarati monthly in Ahmedabad, was placed at Gandhi's disposal and converted into a weekly. From start Gandhi took no advertisements and started own press in Ahmedabad.

Gandhi impatient to go to Punjab but did not want to break law as atmosphere in country was tense and Viceroy would say 'not yet' every time.

Hunter Committee appointed to inquire into Punjab martial law regime. Viceroy wired Gandhi that he could visit Punjab after October 17.

Owing to principal Punjab leaders being in jail, their place taken up by Malaviya, Motilal Nehru and Swami Shraddhanand. Here for first time Gandhi came in close contact with Motilal. They unanimously decided not to lead evidence before Hunter Committee. Non-official enquiry committee appointed by Congress with C. R. Das as member. Responsibility for organizing committee work devolved on Gandhi and he conducted extensive enquiry in many Punjab villages. Committee worked for over three months, examined nearly 2,000 witnesses and towards end of February 1920, prepared report. Not a single statement in report ever challenged.

Congress inquiry in Punjab had started when Gandhi received letter of invitation to join conference of Hindus and Muslims in November at Delhi. Among signatories were Hakim Ajmal Khan and Asaf Ali.

On October 17, known as *Khilafat* Day, imposing demonstration. Inauguration of All-India-*Khilafat* Conference on November 24. Gandhi presided and delivered speech in Hindustani.

Among numerous resolutions passed, one called upon Hindus and Muslims to take *swadeshi* vow and boycott foreign goods. "Let your boycott of foreign cloth stand... but give us something quicker," said Hasrat Mohani. Gandhi suggested non-co-operation, an expression he used for the first time.

Ali Brothers released on December 25. Became Congressmen at Amritsar Congress. Motilal Nehru presided. Congress attended by 36,000 delegates.

King's announcement on Reforms. Gandhi did not like it but advised acceptance of reforms. Das and Tilak for rejection.

On reforms resolution Gandhi arrived at suitable compromise with Tilak and Das. First and last time that Gandhi and Tilak stood on same political platform. Resolution passed offering welcome to Prince of Wales. Jinnah, Malaviya and Bepin Chandra Pal endorsed it.

Resolution on *swadeshi* recommending revival of ancient industry of hand-spinning and hand-weaving. Amritsar Congress turned its attention to condition of peasants and labourers.

Congress appointed Gandhi as one of the trustees of the Jallianwala Bagh Memorial Fund, for which he collected substantial sum. Appointed to remodel constitution in consultation with N. C. Kelkar. Old constitution was Gokhale's legacy.

About this appointment, Gandhi writes, "I may be said to have made my real entrance into Congress politics."

While Tilak sought to concentrate nation's attention on council-entry, Gandhi thinking out details of non-co-operation.

Khilafat agitation growing. In accordance with resolution at Delhi Conference, deputation headed by Mohamed Ali despatched to England with Gandhi's blessings.

India 1919, a Government publication, said: "Mr. Gandhi is generally considered a Tolstoyan of high ideals and complete selflessness... His readiness to take up the cudgels on behalf of any individual or class whom he regards as being oppressed has endeared him to the masses of his countrymen."

1920 (Age 51): Abul Kalam Azad's first meeting with Gandhi on January 18 in Delhi in connection with *Khilafat* delegation to Viceroy. Tilak also present.

Gandhi led deputation to Viceroy on January 19.

Peace conditions imposed on Turkey announced along with Viceregal message on May 14, admitting that they were disappointing but advising Muslims to accept the inevitable.

In May, Hunter Committee report published. Gandhi profoundly shocked. From a staunch co-operator became a non-co-operator.

On May 28, *Khilafat* sub-committee consisting of Gandhi, Shaukat Ali, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad adopted non-co-operation. Ratified on June 30 by Muslim Conference at Allahabad

Gandhi's open letter to Viceroy: "I have advised my Muslim friends to withdraw their support from Your Excellency's Government, and advised the Hindus to join them." Viceroy characterised non-co-operation as "the most foolish of all foolish schemes."

Gandhi announced non-co-operation would be preceded by fasting and prayer on July 31.

Everything ripe for non-co-operation. Tilak promised to abide by A.I.C.C. decision, but passed away on night of July 31. Gandhi exclaimed: "My strongest bulwark is gone."

On August 1, Gandhi wrote to Viceroy surrendering Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal and Boer War Medal. Rabindranath Tagore returned knighthood in 1919.

Meantime Muslims embarked upon *Hijrat* to Afghanistan. In August 18,000 people on way, but Afghan authorities forbade entry.

Special Congress session in Calcutta, September 4-9. On Motilal's request Gandhi included *swaraj* demand in resolution. Motilal first to join movement. Besant, Malaviya, Das present. Non-co-operation resolution passed after protracted discussion.

On October 2, A.I.C.C. resolved to raise All-India Tilak Memorial Fund and Swaraj Fund.

Pyarelal joined Gandhi in October.

In November, Gandhi founded National University of Gujarat.

Nagpur Congress, December 26, unanimously confirmed non-co-operation resolution with slight changes at instance of Lajpat Rai and Das. Resolution moved by Das and seconded by Lajpat Rai. C. Vijayaraghavachariar presided.

Congress constitution drafted by Gandhi accepted. Keen discussion on goal of Congress: "the attainment of *swaraj* within the British Empire, if possible, and without if necessary." Malaviya and Jinnah wanted *swaraj* within British Empire, but Congress adopted original draft. Resolutions on Hindu-Muslim unity, removal of untouchability and propagation of khadi.

Country asked not to participate in functions in honour of Duke of Connaught. Homage paid to memory of MacSwiney, Mayor of Cork, who died after 65 days' fast for Irish independence.

From this time onwards Gandhi and Congress became synonymous terms.

Took vow not to eat till daily quota of half hour's spinning was done.

1921 (Age 52): In January Jamnalal Bajaj who shed his title of Rao Bahadur donated one lakh rupees to Tilak Swaraj Fund.

In middle of January on appeal by Das, thousands of students left schools and colleges.

First Khadi Bhandar shop opened in Bombay in January by Gandhi.

GANDHI CHRONICLE

Gandhi visited Calcutta and opened National College on February 4. In less than four months, National Muslim University of Aligarh, Gujarat Vidyapith, Bihar Vidyapith, Kashi Vidyapith, Bengal National University, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapith and large number of national schools of all grades, with thousands of students on rolls started as result of impetus given to National Education.

At Working Committee meeting at Bezwada on March 31 and April 1, drive for collection of one crore rupees for Tilak Swaraj Fund, enlistment of one crore Congress members and introduction of 20 lakhs of *charkhas* enjoined. Organization of *panchayats* and discouragement of drink commended. Programme of non-payment of taxes deferred by Gandhi. Gandhi proposed a flag of three colours, white, green and red with *charkha* across. Not yet officially accepted but universally used.

Government started restraint orders. By second week of March, Government prohibited Das entering Mymensing, Rajendra Prasad entering Ariah, Lajpat Rai entering Peshawar.

In May, 12,000 workers struck in Assam Tea Gardens and were attacked by Gurkhas. Strikes by transport workers in Eastern Bengal. Gandhi did utmost to calm situation. Long interview with Lord Reading, new Viceroy.

On July 8, All-India *Khilafat* Conference met at Karachi. Mohamed Ali president. Decided, in absence of Gandhi, no Muslim should serve in army, threatened civil disobedience and proclamation of Indian Republic, if British attitude towards *Khilafat* did not change by December.

A.I.C.C. met in Bombay on July 28-30. Tilak Swaraj Fund oversubscribed by about 15 lakhs rupees. Number of *charkhas* risen to 20 lakhs. Committee recommended complete boycott of foreign cloth and functions in connection with Prince of Wales' visit.

In August Gandhi endorsed burning of foreign cloth. Huge bonfires all over country. Monster bonfire on August 1, in Bombay in Gandhi's presence, commemorating anniversary of Tilak's death. Tagore and Andrews protested.

Events moving fast. In September, Ali Brothers arrested and sentenced to two years' imprisonment on November 1.

Working Committee met in Bombay on October 5, and declared "that it is contrary to the national dignity and national interest for any Indian to engage or remain in the service of Government in any capacity." Authorised civil disobedience by individuals under authority of Provincial Congress Committees.

On October 16, Karachi Resolution signed by Gandhi and prominent Congress leaders. Passed from thousands of platforms throughout India.

Impetus to khadi. Gandhi gave up wearing shirt and cap and resolved to wear loin-cloth only. Khadi and *charkha* most important items in Congress programme for attaining *swaraj*.

Prince of Wales arrived in India on November 17. On day of arrival, rioting

and bloodshed lasting four days. In consequence Gandhi fasted five days—November 19-23—pending restoration of order.

Das arrested. Prince to visit Calcutta on December 25. Lajpat Rai, Motilal and Jawaharlal in jail.

Negotiations opened between Congress and Government. Gandhi and Das for release of all political prisoners. Gandhi for right of picketing also. Negotiations failed. Jinnah and Malaviya intermediaries.

In last week of December, Ahmedabad Congress held. President-elect in jail and Hakim Ajmal Khan elected. Hindu Mahasabha session in Delhi also elected him chairman of Reception Committee.

Enthusiasm for mass civil disobedience. Over 20,000 resisters already in jail. Muslim divines played prominent part in advising Congress on political matters. Gandhi invested with sole executive authority on behalf of Congress with power to appoint successor, in case ordinary machinery broke down. But peace to be concluded only with leave of Congress. Gandhi walked up to each delegate's camp explaining technique of civil disobedience.

1922 (Age 53): During December 1921 and January 1922 about 30,000 persons sentenced. Guntur declared no-tax campaign on January 12.

On January 14-16, All-Parties Conference convened to bring about peace. Attempt failed.

On February 1, Gandhi wrote to Viceroy, intimating intention to start civil disobedience in Bardoli under personal supervision. Government's prompt reply justifying repressive policy.

On February 5, at Chauri Chaura, United Provinces, 21 constables and sub-inspector pushed by mob into police station and burnt to death.

Working Committee met at Bardoli on February 12. Suspended mass civil disobedience, Gandhi imposing upon himself fast for five days.

A.I.C.C. at Delhi on February 24-25 endorsed Bardoli resolution permitting individual civil disobedience.

Since November 10, 1920, Gandhi expecting arrest. On March 9, he wrote: "Rivers of bloodshed by the Government cannot frighten me." Forbade *hartal* and demonstrations on his arrest and appealed to people to carry out constructive programme and stiffen civil disobedience.

On March 10, Gandhi along with Banker, arrested on charge of sedition for three articles in *Young India*. "The Great Trial" began on March 18 at Ahmedabad. After charge was read Gandhi pleaded guilty and made a statement. Prefaced it by saying he had begun preaching disaffection long before his connection with *Young India* Took full responsibility for occurrences in Madras, Bombay and Chauri Chaura and said: "I know I was playing with fire... I would still do the

same... the only course open to you, Mr. Judge, is... either to resign your post or to inflict on me the severest penalty."

Judge Broomfield sentenced Gandhi to six years' imprisonment: "You will not consider it unreasonable, I think, to be classed with Mr. Tilak." Gandhi stated he considered proud privilege to have his name associated with Lokamanya and thanked judge. Kasturba urged people to remain peaceful and concentrate on constructive programme.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth was first begun by Gandhi in Gujarati to a fellow political prisoner during his imprisonment in 1922-24. In 1925 published in serial form in *Navajivan*. Translated into English by Mahadev Desai and Pyarelal Nayyar, receiving Gandhi's careful revision. Miraben—Miss Slade—assisted in shaping final English form.

"Peace, non-violence, suffering," was the only message from jail.

By end of November 1922, Kemal Pasha took over civil administration in Turkey and the Sultan fled to Malta on British ship. Unexpected end of *Khilafat* question.

Congress session in December at Gaya proclaimed allegiance to Gandhi and non-co-operation. By 1,740 votes to 890 it rejected participation in councils. First khadi exhibition. British and Anglo-Indian press, at close of session, expressed surprise and disappointment at progress of popular movement.

1923 (Age 54): Political atmosphere polluted by communal differences.

On May 1, Gandhi wrote to jail superintendent declining special concessions until other political prisoners were allowed them.

In third week of September special Congress session at Delhi. Maulana Azad presided. Council-entry allowed. Propaganda against councils suspended. Constructive programme urged. Press advised to observe restraint on inter-communal relations. Boycott of foreign cloth through khaddar urged. Committee appointed to determine methods of encouraging *swadeshi* and boycott of British goods.

In November Gandhi asked prison authorities to restrict his diet, as a fellow prisoner was not allowed same latitude.

Cocanada Congress in December. Mohamed Ali presided. Congress gave call for constructive programme and preparation for intensive civil disobedience. Reaffirmed boycott of councils. Laid foundation of all-India volunteer organization—Hindustan Seva Dal.

1924 (Age 55): Gandhi's sudden illness with appendicitis on January 12 caused anxiety. Operated on by Colonel Maddock. The surgeon used electric torch, which fused half-way through operation. Nurse held hurricane lantern till operation finished. Left hospital on March 10. Gandhi unconditionally released on February 5. Went to Juhu to recoup health.

Das and Motilal giving new orientation to Congress policy. In general elections of 1923, Swarajists swept polls.

Gandhi wrote to Romain Rolland on March 22, his first letter --a prelude to friendship

In first week of April, Gandhi resumed editorship of *Young India* and *Navajivan* Jail diary and autobiography published serially.

Das and Motilal proceeded to Juhu to appraise Gandhi of new situation but he declined to fall in line with them. Issued a statement in May: "I should advise the no-changers not to worry about what the Swarajists are doing or saying, and to prove their own faith by prosecuting the constructive programme with undivided energy and concentration."

This paved way for A.I.C.C. decision at Ahmedabad on June 27-29. All elected members required to send 2,000 yards of even yarn every month. Emphasis laid on boycott of foreign cloth, law courts, schools, colleges, titles and legislatures. Dual policy of Government condemned. Resolution passed condemning murder of Earnest Day by Gopinath Saha. Das against it. Gandhi disappointed to find some associates voting against. Wept in public.

Communal troubles in Delhi, Gulbarga, Nagpur, Lucknow, Shahajahanpur, Allahabad, Jubbulpore and Kohat. Report on disturbances prepared by Gandhi and Shaukat Ali.

As result of Kohat happenings Gandhi decided on 21 days' fast. He said: "I blame no one, I blame myself alone." On September 18, started fast at Mohamed Ali's house. By September 26, leaders of all communities rushed to Delhi, held seven-day conference and pledged themselves "to do their utmost to ensure that Gandhi's resolutions are carried out and all violators are strictly condemned."

At A.I.C.C. meeting on November 23-24 Gandhi agreed with Das and Motilal on council-entry.

Gandhi presided over Congress in December at Belgaum. Briefest address on record. Only summary delivered at open session. Insisted on khaddar and boycott of foreign cloth. Council-entry allowed by Congress.

Jawaharlal Nehru elected working secretary of Congress at Gandhi's instance. On eve of Congress, Das divested himself of all property and left it as legacy to nation.

1925 (*Age 56*): After Belgaum Congress, Gandhi made extensive tour of India. Visited South India in March-April.

Untouchables not allowed to pass by a public road at Vykom, Travancore State. On Gandhi's advice Satyagraha started for redress of grievance. His presence helped to bring about settlement.

From South, Gandhi went to Calcutta. Address to the Rotary Club on the "economic and spiritual value of the *charkha*."

Visited Tagore at Santiniketan on May 29.

On death of Das on June 16 Gandhi made moving speech at Khulna. Prolong-

ed stay in Bengal. Collected ten lakhs of rupees to convert Das' house into hospital for women and children.

A.I.C.C., by a resolution passed at its Patna session on September 22, established All-India Spinners' Association for development of hand-spinning and khaddar, unaffected by political changes but as integral part of Congress. Gandhi has been its chief supporter. Political work made over to Swaraj Party. Swarajist members now called Congress members in councils.

Gandhi discovered lapses in *ashram*. Undertook seven days' fast on Nov. 24.

On December 26, Congress session at Cawnpore. Sarojini Naidu presided. Gandhi spoke for five minutes reviewing his five years' work. Said he had not one item to retrace or one statement to take back. "Today I would commence civil disobedience," he said, "if I thought that the fire and fervour are there in the people." Took vow of political silence.

Hindustani prescribed as language for proceedings of Congress and A.I.C.C. A.I.C.C. authorised to open Foreign Department to look after Indian interests abroad.

Gandhi gave guarded approval to socialism.

1926 (Age 57): Congress for first time took cognizance of oppressed nations of east. Commenting on Government's despatch of Indian troops to China, Gandhi said: "My mind goes to China. I wish I could help." Thought of accepting invitation of Chinese students to go to China and introduce there his methods of resistance. Work in India prevented him from going.

In *Young India* dated October 2 Gandhi commended killing of rabid dogs.

Gauhati Congress met on December 26. Srinivasa Iyengar presided. News flashed that Swami Shraddhanand had been shot on his sick-bed by a Muslim. Congress passed resolution of condolence moved by Gandhi, seconded by Mohamed Ali. Independence resolution moved. Gandhi opposed. Vow of political silence broken.

1927 (Age 58): Lord Irwin, Viceroy, invited Indian politicians to see him on November 5. Gandhi travelled from Mangalore to Delhi for interview. Irwin placed in his hands announcement regarding Simon Commission. When asked whether that was all the business, Irwin said "Yes." Public announcement on November 8.

In November, Gandhi spent three weeks in Ceylon collecting money for khadi work.

Congress session held in Madras on December 26. Dr. Ansari presided. "Non-co-operation did not fail us," he remarked in his address, "we failed non-co-operation."

Under Jawaharlal's influence Congress creed defined: "the goal of the Indian people to be complete National Independence." Gandhi wrote in *Young India*: "The Independence Resolution that was rejected last year was passed almost with-

out opposition. The Congress stultifies itself by repeating year after year resolutions of this character when it knows that it is not capable of carrying them into effect."

On December 29, Hakim Ajmal Khan died.

1928 (Age 59): On February 3, commission headed by Sir John Simon landed in Bombay. All political parties united in boycotting it. All-India *hartal* on day of arrival. Greeted everywhere with black flags and cries of "Go back Simon."

On February 22, Irwin declared whether Indian assistance was forthcoming or not Simon Commission inquiry would proceed.

Successful boycott. Government used coercion and terrorism. Lajpat Rai, aged 64, and Jawaharlal among those attacked with *lathis*. As result of blows Lajpat Rai died on November 17.

Famous Bardoli Satyagraha in Gujarat started on February 12, against increase in land revenue. Vallabhbhai led it with Gandhi's blessings. Bombay Government declared all resources of Empire would be used to crush no-tax campaign, but shortly after, settlement took place.

All-Parties Conference at Lucknow on August 28-30 to consider Nehru Committee Report.

Annual Congress session in Calcutta in December. As part author of all-parties' report, Motilal, President, pleaded for Dominion Status. Jawaharlal supported by Subhas Bose carried the day with emphatic resolution in favour of independence, if Dominion Status not granted by end of 1929. Resolution moved by Gandhi himself, as sort of compromise.

Monster demonstration of 50,000 workers marching by National Flag hoisted in Congress grounds. They passed resolution for independence and saluted flag.

Youth League organizations formed all over country playing important part in Simon Commission boycott.

Labour Research Department opened as branch of A.I.C.C. office.

1929 (Age 60): Gandhi invited to Europe. Intended European tour early in 1929. But in first week of February he said: "I have no voice from within prompting me to go. On the contrary, having put a constructive resolution before the Congress and having received universal support, I feel that I will be guilty of desertion if I now went away to Europe... Above all I must prepare myself for the next year's struggle, whatever shape it may take."

On March 20, Government struck suddenly at organized labour. Prominent workers arrested. Beginning of Meerut trial lasting four and half years.

Gandhi touring India passed Calcutta on way to Burma. Charged in connection with bonfire of foreign cloth. Gandhi proceeded to Burma and on return tried and fined Re. 1.

Simon Commission concluded labours in April. Hardly had they reached England when Conservative Government was defeated in general election in May, giving way to Labour Government with Ramsay MacDonald as Premier.

Subhas Bose and other prominent Congressmen on trial.

In August Jatindra Nath Das started hunger-strike as protest against differential treatment to Indians in jails. Died on sixty-first day, September 13.

Irwin's declaration on October 31, reiterating goal of British policy in India as progressive realisation of responsible government within British Empire. Announced intention to hold Round Table Conference in London. Churchill started campaign describing Dominion Status for India as "crime."

Leaders of all parties including Gandhi met at Delhi on November 16, and passed resolution appreciating sincerity of Viceroy. Jawaharlal and Subhas resigned from Working Committee.

On December 23, attempt made to bomb Viceroy's train on way to Delhi. On very day Gandhi with Motilal, Jinnah, Sapru and Vithalbhai Patel interviewed Viceroy. Gandhi concentrated on question of Dominion Status. Viceroy said he was not in position to extend invitation to R.T.C. with "any definite promise of Dominion Status."

Congress met at Lahore with Jawaharlal as president in December. At Gandhi's instance on December 31 at midnight, Congress declared idea of Dominion Status had lapsed and "*Swaraj* in the Congress creed shall mean Complete Independence." Immediately after, Jawaharlal and others with rank and file joined solemn flag salutation on first day of Indian Independence, 1930.

1930 (Age 61): Viceroy in speech to Legislature on January 25, made it clear self-determination was out of question. In answer Gandhi wrote in *Young India*: "H. E. Viceroy deserves thanks from every Congressman for having cleared the atmosphere and let us know exactly where he and we stand."

On January 26, pledge of independence taken all over country, and anniversary of that day is celebrated annually as Independence Day.

In *Young India* of January 30, Gandhi published his famous eleven points.

Government began arrests. Subhas and eleven others sentenced to year's rigorous imprisonment.

In obedience to Congress mandate, Congress legislators resigned. In *Young India*, February 6, Gandhi wrote: "Non-violence is not much of consequence if it can flourish only in congenial atmosphere."

Working Committee met at Sabarmati on February 14-16. Decided on civil disobedience for purpose of achieving *Purna Swaraj*. Gandhi gave informal advice to members assembled on breaking salt law.

Gandhi wrote article on February 27, "When I am arrested." Princely gift of Anand Bhawan by Motilal to Congress.

On March 22, Gandhi sent "ultimatum" to Irwin, beginning: "Dear Friend... Before embarking on civil disobedience and taking the risk I have dreaded to take these years, I would fain approach you and find a way out." Letter taken to Delhi

by Reginald Reynolds Irwin in reply merely regretted "to hear that Mr. Gandhi intended to contravene the law."

"On bended knees," Gandhi wrote, "I asked for bread and received a stone instead."

Vallabhbhai arrested in first week of March at Ras.

Gandhi prepared himself for immediate Satyagraha. On banks of Sabarmati, where 75,000 assembled, he exhorted people of India to join civil disobedience for "war of independence" under one condition, "absolute non-violence, as an article of faith."

On March 12, Gandhi set out on historic march to Dandi to break salt law, with 79 volunteers, inmates of the *ashram*, at 6-30 a.m., with determination not to return to *ashram* "until I succeed in getting the salt law repealed" "Either I shall return with what I want or else my body will float on the ocean." No women were taken "out of consideration for the Government."

Day preceding march devoted to fasting and prayer. Gandhi at head of non-violent army marching in rows of three, with staves in hands and bags of scanty belongings by their sides On route flowers and cocoanuts offered, streets watered and decorated with flags. Monster crowds from far and near for Gandhi's *darshan* and message.

Gandhi spoke at all halting places urging people to take to khaddar, stop drinking, give up co-operation with Government, and join Satyagraha. 390 village officers tendered resignations.

After 200-mile march, on morning of April 5 party reached village of Dandi on sea-coast where Gandhi prepared to break salt law.

A.I.C.C. met at Allahabad on March 21. Decided to start civil disobedience on arrest of Gandhi, or if he so directed, before his arrest by April 6.

Gandhi's prayer meeting on morning of April 6 marked by a solemn speech. He directed that if he was arrested, Congress should take orders from Abbas Tyabjee, and after that from Sarojini Naidu. Gandhi said: "The British rule in India has brought about moral, material, cultural and spiritual ruination of this country. I regard this rule as a curse. I am out to destroy this system of Government... We are not out to kill anybody but it is our *dharma* that the curse of this Government is blotted out."

Soon after prayers, Gandhi with followers, proceeded at 6 a.m., April 6, for bath in the sea. Large crowd including Mrs. Naidu accompanied party. Gandhi and volunteers broke salt law by picking up salt at 8-30 on sea shore. Mrs. Naidu hailed Gandhi as "law-breaker." No policeman on scene.

Immediately after Gandhi issued press statement: "Now that the technical or ceremonial breach of the salt law has been committed, it is open to anyone who would take the risk of prosecution under the salt law to manufacture salt wherever he wishes

and wherever it is convenient...the villagers should be fully instructed as to the incidence of the salt tax, and the manner of breaking laws .. I am becoming more and more convinced, women can make a larger contribution than men towards the attainment of independence."

Film of Dandi march banned.

Country ablaze from end to end. Monster public meetings in all big cities, audiences running into lakhs.

On April 14, Jawaharlal arrested. In Peshwar, military opened fire causing many deaths. Firing in Madras. Bengal Ordinance renewed on April 23. Karachi, Shiroda, Ratnagiri, Patna, Calcutta, and Sholapur in news.

On April 27, Viceroy promulgated Press Ordinance. Gandhi directed *Navajivan* Press to allow itself be forfeited rather than deposit security. *Navajivan* Press taken over. *Young India* issued in cyclostyle.

Vithalbhai Patel resigned membership and Speakership of Assembly.

Meanwhile Gandhi's activities continued, unabated. Addressing women in Surat on May 4, Gandhi said they should not attend his meetings in future without *taklis*. At Navsari, he warned people against social boycott of officials.

Gandhi drafted second letter to Viceroy and announced intention of raiding salt depots at Dharasna and Chharsada. He argued that natural salt, like air and water, was public property. Arrested under Bombay Regulation XXV of 1827, meant to deal with enemies of British.

District Magistrate and District Superintendent of Police and about 20 armed policemen reached Karadi at 12-45 a.m. They proceeded to cot where Gandhi was fast asleep. Directing flashlight on him, they woke him up and surrounded cot. Gandhi dictated message to people expressing satisfaction at way Gujarat had responded to his call. Placed in lorry and removed to Yeravda prison.

Gandhi's arrest followed by universal demonstration. One hundred and two American clergymen, headed by John Haynes Holmes, of the Community Church, New York, urged British Premier to come to terms with Gandhi and the Indian people, and save what would otherwise be a catastrophe to all mankind. Indians engaged in Panama staged 24-hour sympathetic *hartal*. French papers full of Gandhi's doings.

Complete *hartal* all over India. About 50,000 textile workers in Bombay downed tools. Railway workers joined. Cloth merchants on six-day *hartal*. Resignations of honorary officers and Government servants at frequent intervals.

Disturbances in Sholapur resulting in burning of six police stations. Twenty-five people killed and one hundred wounded as a result of police firing. Police also opened fire in Calcutta.

Working Committee met at Allahabad in May and expanded scope of civil disobedience.

Salt Satyagraha continued. Under lead of 63-year-old Imam Saheb, Gandhi's old colleague in South Africa, 2,500 raided Dharasna Salt Depot Police made several *lathi* charges, resulting in one killed and 290 wounded.

Several raids on Wadala Salt Depot Simultaneously with violation of Salt Act, law of sedition and prohibitory orders also broken Forest laws defied in Berar and other places; no-tax campaign started. Boycott of foreign cloth and picketing of liquor shops intensified, especially by women In Bombay alone Rs. 30 crores worth of foreign cloth sealed by Congress. Liquor excise revenue fell by about 70 per cent—Rs, 60 lakhs Decrease of Rs 16 lakhs from forests. Rs. 5½ lakhs land revenue uncollected In Bardoli, cultivators refused to pay rent to Government, burnt crops and migrated to Baroda In Midnapore, Government officials and supporters could get no supplies.

Government took drastic action. Before year was out no less than twelve ordinances promulgated by Viceroy. Total figure of convictions exceeded 100,000 of whom 12,000 were Muslims.

On June 1, 15,000 volunteers and spectators participated in raid at Wadala.

On June 30, Motilal arrested and sentenced to six months.

Public meetings prohibited. Firing in Peshawar on July 15. Frontier active under Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Women shed veils and fought shoulder to shoulder with men. In course of repression, some Garhwali soldiers refused to fire at people and were court-martialled. Sentences ranged from ten to fourteen years.

At request of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and M. R. Jayakar, Viceroy allowed facilities for interview with Gandhi, Motilal and Jawaharlal. Joint interview in Yeravda jail on August 14-15. Negotiations failed.

R.T.C. met on November 12, without Congress representation.

No Congress session in December as all leaders in jail.

1931 (*Age 62*): Mohamed Ali's death in England on January 4.

First R.T.C. concluded on January 18, after Premier's declaration defining British policy in India and message from King saying that they had opened "new chapter in history of India.. steps would be taken to enlist the services of Congressmen."

Working Committee met at Swaraj Bhavan, Allahabad, on January 21 Announced Congress not prepared to recognise so-called R.T.C. Rajendra Prasad presided. Malaviya present.

Irwin's declaration on January 25, announcing release of Gandhi and members of Working Committee unconditionally On following day Gandhi and about 30 leaders released and notifications against Congress organizations withdrawn.

Released leaders hurried to Allahabad where Motilal was seriously ill. Taken to Lucknow for treatment, he died on February 6.

GANDHI CHRONICLE

Gandhi interviewed Irwin on February 17 from 2-30 p.m. to 6-10 p.m. in Delhi. "The half-naked fakir," Churchill said, "strode up the steps of the Viceroy's palace." Working Committee session at Dr. Ansari's place. Gandhi given clear mandate and full authority.

On February 22, Gandhi addressed Council of Muslim League.

Visited Viceroy on February 27. On February 28, Gandhi sent note on picketing as desired, and Viceroy sent notes of proposed settlement. Viceroy wanted definite reply on March 1. Renewal of hostilities appeared inevitable. But on March 1, Viceroy's attitude friendly.

On March 4, Gandhi-Irwin pact signed. Boycott was to cease, but propaganda for *swadeshi* to be allowed. Peaceful picketing permitted. All organized defiance of laws to cease. All ordinances to be withdrawn. General amnesty. People on sea coast conceded right of picking up, manufacturing and selling salt. Congress representation on R.T.C. open to future discussion.

In fifteen days' negotiations, Gandhi visited Viceroy's house eight times and spent about twenty-four hours there. One afternoon, Viceroy asked Gandhi to join him at tea. "Thank you," said Gandhi, unwrapping a paper parcel, "I will put some of this legalised salt into my tea to remind us of the famous Boston tea-party." During negotiations Gandhi and Irwin had talks on commutation of death sentence on Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Sukhadev for alleged murder of Saunders in Lahore Conspiracy case.

Gandhi interviewed Viceroy on March 19, and discussed release of political prisoners.

Date of Bhagat Singh's execution kept secret, as authorities expected "trouble." European women warned to keep at least for ten days within European quarters. On night of March 23-24 Bhagat Singh executed.

Gandhi's position at Karachi Congress most difficult. On arrival at Karachi, young revolutionaries greeted him with black flags and presented him black flowers in token of sorrow.

Prior to Congress session Gandhi had talk with Subhas, leader of Navajavan Sabha, and persuaded him to fall in with Congress view.

On March 25, in public meeting Gandhi said: "Gandhi may die but Gandhism will live for ever."

Karachi Congress met on March 31 in open air. Sardar Vallabhbhai presided. Resolution of Bhagat Singh taken up first after condolence resolutions on Motilal and Mohamed Ali. Congress delegation to R.T.C. with mandate to demand *Purna Swaraj* with necessary adjustments in Indian interests. Congress adopted resolution on "fundamental rights of the people" embodying Gandhi's eleven points and a few more introduced by Jawaharlal.

On April 7, Gandhi opened session of Federation of Indian Chambers. Said *swaraj* meant the rule of justice, therefore, Englishman's rights must be protected.

Gandhi attended Sikh League at Amritsar. Returning to Ahmedabad presided over convocation of Gujarat Vidyapith.

On April 18, Irwin left India and Gandhi bade him good-bye in Bombay. Lord Willingdon assumed Viceroyalty. Gandhi saw new Viceroy at Simla.

Working Committee met on June 10, appointed Gandhi as sole representative of Congress on R.T.C.

On July 11, Gandhi wired Willingdon on non-observance of truce terms and received assurance

On August 1, Working Committee adopted Gandhi's National Flag with certain changes. Saffron, white and green. *Charkha* across white colour only. Saffron for courage and sacrifice. White for peace and truth. Green for faith and strength. *Charkha* for welfare of masses. A.I.C.C. adopted it officially at Bombay.

As time for Gandhi's departure for England drew near, situation in the country became serious on account of violation of peace terms by provincial Governments. Gandhi, Sarojini Naidu and Malaviya cancelled passages to London booked for August 15. Gandhi sent telegram to Viceroy on August 11. Willingdon hurried back to Simla, cutting short visit to Calcutta. Gandhi with Patel and Nehru proceeded there. After prolonged negotiation fresh agreement signed by Willingdon and Gandhi on August 27, reserving right of Congress to adopt defensive direct action. Enquiry over Bardoli dispute conceded.

Gandhi left Simla by special train on August 27. Reached Bombay in time to catch S. S. *Rajputana* on August 29 noon. He said, "I promise I will not disappoint you in your trust in me." Parting from India in a message he said: "I shall endeavour to represent every interest that does not conflict with the interest of dumb millions for whom the Congress predominantly exists." Malaviya, Sarojini Naidu, Sir P. Pattani, Devadas Gandhi, Miraben, Mahadev Desai, Pyarelal and G. D. Birla sailed with him.

At Aden, Arabs and Indians presented Gandhi address under Indian National Flag and purse of 328 guineas.

Nahas Pasha, President of Wafd Party, cabled greetings to "the great leader, Al Mahatma Gandhi." Except for some press correspondents authorities did not permit Egyptians to wait on Gandhi. At Port Said, Shaukat Ali joined. Had long talks with Gandhi.

At Marseilles Gandhi welcomed by Andrews, Prof. Privat, Romain Rolland's sister on behalf of brother who was ill, and students of Marseilles. Journey from Marseilles to Boulogne. Train *en route* had to be detained for Gandhi to address journalists.

On September 12, Gandhi reached London. Stayed in East End with Miss Muriel Lester at Kingsley Hall. Welcomed by Mayor of Poplar. Hundreds of poor men, women and children surrounded place merely to have look at him. His portrait appeared on front pages of dailies.

Fairy tales about Gandhi in press. George Slocombe represented Gandhi as prostrating himself before Prince of Wales when he came to India. "This does not do credit to your imagination even," said Gandhi. "I would bend the knee to the poorest scavenger, the poor untouchable in India, for having participated in crushing him for centuries. I would even take dust off his feet but I would not prostrate myself even before the King, much less before the Prince of Wales."

"Uncle Gandhi," bare of foot except for his sandals, bare of shirt except for his *chaddar,* was popular figure round whom gathered children of East End every morning. When once questioned about his dress, Gandhi said: "You in your country wear plus fours, I prefer minus fours."

On his second day in London, at invitation of old friend Bishop Fisher, author of *That strange little Brown Man, Gandhi*—proscribed in India—Gandhi gave half-hour broadcast address to America from Kingsley Hall. His first radio speech. "Do I talk into this thing," Gandhi said facing microphone. It was duly recorded in California. With shut eyes he bowed his head and then began: "... I personally would wait, if need be, for ages rather than seek to attain the freedom of my country through bloody means... perhaps it will be the privilege of the ancient land of India to show the way out."

Gandhi centre of interest when he attended meeting of Federal Structure Sub-Committee of R.T.C. on Monday September 14 over which Lord Sankey presided. Gandhi sat immediately to the left of Sankey. Did not speak during proceedings as it was his day of silence but occasionally wrote brief questions to chairman, who wrote his answers.

Gandhi spoke on September 15, at Committee. Said he did not wish at any stage to embarrass Government or colleagues at conference. Sketched aims of Congress. "I would love to go away with the conviction that there is to be an honourable and equal partnership between Britain and India."

Gandhi's birthday, October 2, day of great rejoicing at Kingsley Hall. Old English spinning wheel presented to him by Swedish woman.

Gandhi declared in Minorities' Committee on November 13 he would resist separate elections for Depressed Classes with life.

Conference concluded on December 1. Gandhi proposed vote of thanks to chair. "I do not know in what direction my path will lie, but it does not matter to me. Even though I may have to go in an exactly opposite direction, you are still entitled to a vote of thanks from the bottom of my heart."

Gandhi's attendance at R.T.C. only a small part of his activities in England. Met representatives of all classes and creeds. Invited to Buckingham Palace along with other delegates. Appeared in loin-cloth. Chatted with King George V and Queen Mary.

Visit to Manchester, centre of textile trade. Received with friendly warmth. Visited Eton, Oxford, and Cambridge. Welcomed by professors and students. Met

Bernard Shaw, Arthur Henderson, Lloyd George, Archbishop of Canterbury, Charlie Chaplin, Lord Irwin, Harold Laski and many other distinguished persons.

Pressing invitations from America, France, Germany, Italy, Palestine, Egypt, Hungary, Denmark and Ireland. Could not accept them.

Left England on December 5.

That evening, seated on table, in the biggest cinema in Paris, Gandhi spoke to citizens of French capital. A day in Paris. Left for Switzerland. Visited Romain Rolland on December 6 at his residence at Villeneuve. Stayed for five days.

At Rome Gandhi met Mussolini on December 12. Could not see the Pope, but visited Vatican Museum and Library.

Gandhi and party left Brindisi on December 14 and landed at Bombay on morning of December 28.

Before Gandhi landed, U.P. Congress had declared no-rent campaign. Ordinance rule in Frontier, U.P. and Bengal. On December 25, Abdul Ghaffar Khan and a few others arrested. In week's time over a thousand Red Shirts bound over. Jawaharlal arrested. In 1930-31, within ten months, 90,000 persons imprisoned.

On evening of December 28, Gandhi addressed mammoth meeting at Azad Maidan, Bombay. Regarding arrests he said, "I take these as gifts from Lord Willingdon, our Christian Viceroy, for is it not a custom during Christmas to exchange greetings and gifts?"

On December 29, Gandhi wired to Viceroy requesting interview. Viceroy declined to discuss political situation.

At midnight on December 31, Working Committee authorised Gandhi to renew Satyagraha.

1932 (Age 63): Correspondence between Gandhi and Viceroy for six days. Gandhi's last telegram on January 3. Working Committee called upon nation to resume civil disobedience under strict rules and invited "the free peoples of the world and their Governments to watch and study the progress of the movement."

Government offensive started on January 4. Congress organizations banned, numerous Congressmen arrested. Gandhi arrested at 3 a.m. on January 4 in Bombay under Regulation XXV of 1827 and detained at Yeravda Central Jail.

Subhas Bose, Vallabhbhai Patel, Dr. Ansari and other leaders detained. Within next few days *ashrams*, national schools and other national institutions declared unlawful, their property seized. Most leading Congressmen in jails. In many places non-payment of rent important feature of movement. Salt laws defied. Illegal literature in spate. Boycott of British goods in intensive form. Political prisoners *lathi*-charged. Punitive taxes and collective fines rigorously imposed. Firing common. Frontier suffered most.

When British Government's decision on communal question was imminent, Gandhi wrote to Sir Samuel Hoare on March 11, "In the event of the Government's decision

creating separate electorates for the Depressed Classes, I must fast unto death," in accordance with his declaration in London.

In April at Delhi, in spite of police vigilance 500 delegates attended Congress session. Malaviya, President-elect, arrested *en route*. Session held under Clock Tower in Chandni Chowk. Police, suspecting announcement regarding place of meeting as mere ruse, were looking for delegates somewhere else.

On August 17 MacDonald's Communal Award announced.

On August 18, Gandhi decided to fast and conveyed decision to Premier that fast would begin on noon of September 20. Premier replied on September 8 imputing to Gandhi inimical intention in respect of Depressed Classes.

September 9, Gandhi communicated final decision to Premier.

September 12, Gandhi-Hoare-MacDonald correspondence published.

September 15, Gandhi's letter to Bombay Government.

September 19, mass meetings all over country demanding withdrawal of disruptive electoral scheme, classing untouchables separate from Hindu community.

September 20 observed as day of fasting and prayer.

Gandhi's declaration of "a perpetual fast unto death from food of any kind, save water with or without salt and soda," from noon of September 20.

For five days, September 19-24, leaders of all communities in consultation among themselves and with Gandhi.

Temples, wells and other public places thrown open every day to untouchables henceforth called Harijans—God's own people.

On September 23 Gandhi's condition took turn for worse. Shaukat Ali's demand for Gandhi's release.

On September 24 Yeravda Pact signed in Gandhi's presence by leaders of Harijans, Hindus, and the Congress. Communicated to authorities. Dr. Ambedkar, M. C. Rajah, Malaviya, Rajagopalachari and Thakkar Bapa participated. Depressed Classes to forgo separate electorates, subject to important safeguards which caste Hindus were to concede.

On morning of September 26, Gandhi entered danger zone. At 4-15 p.m. he was handed a Government *communique*, which satisfied him. Fast broken at 5-15 p.m. amidst prayers and rejoicings. Gandhi warned Hindus he would resume fast if complete removal of social and religious disabilities of Harijans "is not relentlessly pursued and achieved within a measurable period." Rabindranath Tagore visited Gandhi. Simultaneous statements issued in England and India announcing acceptance of agreement. Nawab of Bhopal's offer of Rs. 5,000 to Hindu reform movement.

On September 30 all privileges regarding visitors and Harijan work conceded to Gandhi withdrawn. Jayakar not allowed to see him. Gandhi's protest against sudden deprivation of opportunities to serve Harijans. After protracted correspondence Government on November 7 removed all restrictions.

Gandhi's first statement announcing possibility of another fast over Guruvayur temple-entry question.

On December 22 Gandhi undertook sympathetic fast with Appasaheb Patwardhan who asked for scavenger's work in jail and was refused by authorities. Within two days assurance given and fast broken.

In third R.T.C. representatives like Sastri, Pheroz Sethna and Jinnah excluded.

1933 (Age 64): Gandhi had announced to undertake fast on January 1 in sympathy with Kelappan for getting Guruvayur temple opened to Harijans. Fast averted as result of referendum in which people voted overwhelmingly for temple-entry.

Harijan Sevak Sangh founded in February and *Harijan* started as a weekly.

Calcutta session of Congress in March held under ban.

Gandhi started on May 8 self-purificatory fast for 21 days. It was "a heart prayer for purification of myself and my associates for greater vigilance and watchfulness in connection with the Harijan cause." Government released Gandhi on same day. He issued statement that fast period would not be utilized for civil disobedience work. On Gandhi's advice Aney, acting President, suspended civil disobedience on May 9 for six weeks. Government stated on May 9, "There is no intention of negotiating with the Congress for withdrawal of civil disobedience or of releasing prisoners."

Vithalbhai Patel and Subhas Bose from Vienna declared, "The latest action of Gandhi in suspending civil disobedience is a confession of failure ... a new party will have to be formed within the Congress, composed of radical elements."

To hold a conference of workers to discuss situation with Gandhi, suspension of civil disobedience extended for six weeks further.

Gandhi concluded fast on May 29 at "Parnakuti" in Poona.

Informal conference of Congressmen at Poona on July 12. Conference authorised Gandhi to seek interview with Viceroy. Telegram to Viceroy on July 15. Interview declined. Mass civil disobedience suspended and individual civil disobedience allowed.

Gandhi inaugurated campaign of individual civil disobedience disbanding Sabarmati Ashram on July 26 as gesture of sympathy with those who lost property in movement. Invited *ashramites* to give up other activities and join struggle. Transferred movable property to public use, and offered land, building and crops to Government. When declined, Gandhi made it over to Harijan movement. True to his vow taken on April 12, 1930, he returned to *ashram* only on casual visit.

Gandhi had intended to commence march to village of Ras on August 1. At dead of previous night he and 34 inmates of *ashram* arrested. Gandhi released on morning of August 4 and served with order to leave Yeravda village and reside in Poona. Order disobeyed and within half hour of release Gandhi arrested and sentenced to one year's imprisonment.

Individual civil disobedience started in all provinces. Hundreds of workers courted imprisonment in very first week. Aney with 13 companions arrested on August 14, while starting on march from Akola. Everywhere Congress workers maintained civil resistance campaign from August 1933 to March 1934.

Gandhi refused facilities granted before release in May. Commenced fast on August 16. Condition worsened rapidly. On August 20 removed to Sassoon Hospital, still a prisoner. By August 23 condition precarious and, therefore, released unconditionally. He made it clear he would not regard himself as free to embark on civil disobedience till termination of period of sentence, August 3, 1934. Decided to devote intervening period to furtherance of Harijan cause.

On September 20, Annie Besant died.

On September 22, Vithalbhai Patel died.

On November 7, from Satyagraha Ashram, Wardha, Gandhi started on tour for Harijan uplift. In about ten months, he covered every province of India and made intensive study of problem. Tour had great educative value. Collected eight lakhs of rupees for cause this time.

1934 (Age 65): Earthquake shock, which did terrible damage in North Bihar and destroyed thousands of lives in less than three minutes, occurred at 2-15 p.m. on January 15. Terrestrial disturbances covered more than 15,000 square miles.

Gandhi's first instinct was to abandon everything else and rush to help of distressed, but felt Harijans his first concern. On receiving letter from Rajendra Prasad, immediately he set out for Bihar on night of March 11. In Bihar he toured and addressed meetings. He said, "What has this calamity taught you? This is no time for differences between Government and Congress, between Hindu and Muslim, between touchable and untouchable. If you take money from the relief funds, see that you earn it." To women, many of whom were in *purdah* in Bihar, Gandhi would say: "Has this calamity taught you nothing? Why this foolishness (*purdah*)? There is no place for *purdah*, except that of the heart." From the women he collected jewellery. Wherever he spoke, he said, "Work! work! Do not beg, but work! Ask for work to do, and do it faithfully." He walked from village to village on foot. After month's intensive tour in Bihar, he started on all-India Harijan work again.

Gandhi suspended civil disobedience movement on April 7. Most political prisoners released. He stated: "I feel that masses have not received the full message of Satyagraha owing to its adulteration in process of transmission."

Dr. Ansari in statement made it clear that with blessings of Gandhi, there would be fight both within and outside legislatures in future. A.I.C.C. meeting at Patna on May 18-19. Swaraj Party under Dr. Ansari became integral part of Congress to fight in legislatures.

First conference of Congress Socialist party held at Patna on May 17. Acharya Narendra Dev presided.

Harijan campaign not always smooth sailing. In Poona on June 25 an unknown and yet untraced person attempted to throw bomb at Gandhi during public function when Poona Municipality presented him address. Unsuccessful assassin mistook car for Gandhi's which arrived later. Seven injured.

About fortnight later irate reformer attacked determined opponent of Harijan movement with *lathi*. This led to seven days' fast by Gandhi in July as penance for intolerance shown by opponents towards one another.

Bombay Congress session held on October 24. Rajendra Prasad presided.

On October 26, All-India Village Industries Association formed. To be strictly aloof from politics and work under guidance of Gandhi. Maganwadi, near Wardha, headquarters.

Outstanding event of Bombay session was Gandhi's exit from Congress. Amendment—"truthful and non-violent" for "peaceful and legitimate" means—thrown out by A.I.C.C. Gandhi saw unpreparedness of Congress for truth and non-violence. Ceased to be even four-anna member. Threw himself with redoubled zeal and vigour in revival and development of village industries, Harijan uplift, and education through basic crafts. Reason for withdrawal: "I need complete detachment and absolute freedom of action." By amendment in Congress constitution, Working Committee to be chosen henceforth by President and not by A.I.C.C.

After Bombay session, country busy with elections to Central Assembly. Congress won convincing victory.

1935 (*Age 66*): Gandhi attended A.I.V.I.A. meeting at Wardha on February 1-4.

In *Harijan* dated February 15, Gandhi devoted front page to "Green leaves and their food value." "For nearly five months I have been living entirely on uncooked foods," he wrote. "The addition of green leaves to their meals will enable villagers to avoid many diseases from which they are now suffering." Wrote editorial "All About Rice" and recommended unpolished rice. Front page of February 22 devoted to "Cow's Milk vs. Buffalo's."

In second week of March, Gandhi's near associates started sanitation campaign in villages near Wardha. On March 23, Gandhi resorted to four weeks' silence to cope with arrears of work.

In April, Gandhi presided over Hindi Literary Conference at Indore. "It is the language of our peasants and our labourers that they can easily understand that can become the *lingua franca*. That will be true democracy in the domain of language." Gandhi also opened the first A.I.V.I.A. exhibition. "We who call ourselves civilized are entirely responsible for the ruin of our village industries," he said.

Visited Haffkine Institute, Bombay.

During Gandhi's stay in Borsad in June he got issued series of leaflets on elements of rat-proofing of houses and disease-proofing of human bodies.

GANDHI CHRONICLE

On August 4 Government of India Act received Royal assent. Rejected outright by Working Committee.

Council of All-India Spinners' Association held at Maganwadi on October 11-13. Gandhi presided. Resolved that wages of spinners be raised and minimum standard fixed.

Foundation of little hut at Segaon near Wardha laid on October 22. Miraben had gone to stay there on October 16.

Golden Jubilee celebrations of Congress on December 28 *History of the Indian National Congress* by Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya published on behalf of A.I.C.C.

1936 (Age 67) · Japanese poet, Yone Noguchi, visited Gandhi at Segaon in first week of January. Few weeks later Dr. Tomika Kora visited Gandhi to invite him to Japan.

Mrs. Margaret Sanger, leader of birth-control movement, visited Gandhi at Wardha in last week of January. He said: "If I can drive home to women's minds the truth that they are free, we will have no birth-control problem in India."

Wrote in *Harijan* of February 29 for first time. Nervous breakdown for over ten weeks.

Members and friends of Gandhi Seva Sangh had second annual meeting at Savli, during first week of March. Gandhi presided. "There is no such thing as Gandhism; and I do not want to leave any sect after me."

During second week of March Gandhi gave two hours' interview to Negro delegation at Bardoli.

Congress session at Lucknow in last week of March. Jawaharlal Nehru, immediately after return from Europe, presided. Act of 1935 denounced as imposition "to the accompaniment of widespread repression and suppression of civil liberties."

On March 22, Gandhi opened exhibition of khadi and village industries at Lucknow, organized by A.I.S.A. and A.I.V.I.A.

Visited Segaon, and made tentative decision to settle there.

At end of April presided over All-India Literary Conference at Nagpur. "If I had the power I should taboo all literature calculated to promote communalism, fanaticism, and hatred between individuals, classes or races."

In early morning of April 30 Gandhi walked to Segaon, about five miles from Maganwadi. His hut not yet ready. A place to sit and work rigged up out of split-bamboo matting and wicker-work walls fastened to tree to protect him from sun. Next day after evening prayer gave demonstration of spinning to villagers. Interview to Dr. Ambedkar.

On May 10, Dr. Ansari died.

In third week of May Gandhi opened training school for village workers at Maganwadi.

Abbas Tyabji died in June.

Congress issued election manifesto in August.

In October Gandhi presided over National Education Conference.

Presided over Gujarati Literary Conference at Ahmedabad in first week of November. "I want art and literature that can speak to the millions...our literature is a miserable affair," said Gandhi.

In last week of December, khadi and village industries exhibition held during Congress session at Faizpur. Nandlal Bose in charge of decor. Gandhi opened it. First village Congress session. Volunteers drawn from villages. Jawaharlal Nehru presided. He referred to growing menace of Fascism in Europe, civil war in Spain, need for constituent assembly for India and amelioration of conditions of workers and peasants.

Harijan of 1936 mainly devoted to village industries and khadi. Articles on snake-bites and malaria. Discussions on birth-control after Mrs. Sanger's visit. Several articles on Hindustani as India's *lingua franca*. Keen interest in barter system. Gandhi devoted his energy to Harijan uplift.

1937 (Age 68): In January Gandhi visited Travancore for anti-untouchability work. Roads and State temples made accessible to Harijans. Gandhi delivered speeches in temples. Pleaded for reform of temples from within.

As late as February Gandhi wrote to Polak that if Dominion Status with right to secede were offered, he for one would accept it.

February elections resulted in substantial victory for Congress. Control over eight out of India's eleven provinces. London *Times* remarked: "Congress Party alone is organized on more than a provincial basis. The Party has won its victories ... on issues which interested millions of Indian rural voters and scores of millions who had no votes."

In March A.I.C.C. adopted resolution authorising acceptance of office, but ministerships were not to be accepted until Congress was satisfied that Governors would not use special powers of interference. Formula drawn up by Gandhi. Parliamentary Sub-Committee formed to supervise Congress legislative activities.

Gandhi addressed Hindi Sahitya Sammelan in April at Madras. Presided over Bharatiya Sahitya Parishad. "Here it is a question of just shedding our provincialism and narrowness. There are no difficulties at all... I am not fond of literature for its own sake."

Annual meeting of Gandhi Seva Sangh in April at Hudli, village in Karnatak. Gandhi said: "The boycott of legislatures is not an eternal principle like that of truth and non-violence...we have to carry out our truth and non-violence there."

Congress took office in a number of provinces in July. This released mass energy, and *kisans* and workers began to play more active role.

Gandhi wrote: "I can see a vast opportunity is at the disposal of the ministers in terms of the Congress objective of Complete Independence if they are only honest, selfless, industrious, vigilant, and solicitous for the true welfare of the starving millions."

Gandhi suggested as urgent reforms prohibition, relief to peasantry, basic education and turning of jails into reformatories.

Prohibition experiment started in Salem in Madras province on October 1.

Vague but general feeling of dissatisfaction at A.I.C.C. meeting in October. Unhappily worded resolution regarding repression in Mysore passed. Gandhi strongly condemned it in *Harijan*. Jawaharlal thought of resigning.

During Gandhi's stay with Subhas Bose in Calcutta, ailing Rabindranath came to see Gandhi who had had break-down.

All-India Muslim League resolved at Lucknow on October 17 that Independence was its objective.

Educational Conference at Wardha on October 22-23. Gandhi presided. Put forward his theory of Basic Education before distinguished members

In *Harijan* of November 20, Gandhi condemned force used by Congress ministers in labour disputes and communal riots.

In December moved from Segaon to Juhu for reasons of health.

Hindu Mahasabha session at Ahmedabad in December under chairmanship of Savarkar adopted resolution of attainment of *Purna Swaraj* as its aim.

1938 (Age 69): After month's stay at Juhu, Gandhi returned to Segaon on January 8. Still suffering from blood pressure but took up problem of Andaman prisoners and Bengal detenus. Not permitted by doctors to attend to correspondence or to write for *Harijan*.

In January, Bombay Legislative Assembly passed temple-entry bill for Harijans. In last week it resolved that conferring of any titles of honour on any person in the province by the King or Viceroy was against the wish of Assembly. Other Congress provinces followed.

Gandhi had talks with Lord Lothian three days at Segaon.

Haripura session of Congress held in February. Subhas Bose presided. Ministerial crisis in U.P. and Bihar considered. Gandhi condemned Governor's interference regarding release of political prisoners. Gandhi made first speech after months of public silence at A.I.V.I.A. and Khadi Exhibition at Haripura.

Fourth conference of Gandhi Seva Sangh held at Dalang, March 25-31. Gandhi appealed for self-examination and emphasised power of non-violence.

In April, Jawaharlal wrote to Gandhi about his distress regarding "the turn events have taken in Congress politics... They are trying to adapt business far too much to the old order and trying to justify it... We are apt to be misled by the illusion that we possess power."

In April Gandhi sent Mahadev Desai to meet Khan brothers and study conditions in Frontier.

In second week of May, Gandhi along with Khan Sahib toured Peshawar District. Heartily welcomed by Pathans in villages. Stressed non-violence.

In May differences of opinion in C. P. Cabinet led to four ministers sending resignations to Premier, Dr. Khare. Khare acted against instructions of Working Committee. Resigned on July 18. Gandhi condemned role of C. P. Governor.

In *Harijan* of July 9, Gandhi once more upheld Congress non-intervention in affairs of States. "By its resolution of non-interference the Congress put the States people on their mettle."

In September, some Harijans started "Satyagraha" at Segaon. Demand for appointment of Harijan Cabinet minister in C. P. Insisted on fasting in Kasturba's hut. Gandhi allowed it.

On October 2-3 Conference of Provincial Ministers held in Delhi with Subhas in chair. National Planning Committee set up.

In October in regard to surrender of Czechs, Gandhi said: "Unarmed men, women and children offering non-violent resistance without any bitterness in them will be novel experience for them... I present Dr. Benes with a weapon not of the weak but of the brave."

Commenting on Munich Pact, Gandhi wrote, "The peace Europe gained at Munich is a triumph of violence; it is also its defeat... I suggest that if it is brave, as it is, to die to a man fighting against odds, it is braver still to refuse to fight and yet to refuse to yield to the usurpers."

In *Harijan* of November 26, Gandhi wrote, "My sympathies are all with the Jews ... If I were a Jew and were born in Germany and earned my livelihood there, I would claim Germany as my home even as the tallest Gentile German may, and challenge him to shoot me or cast me in the dungeon; I would refuse to be expelled or to submit to discriminating treatment."

On December 3, Gandhi wrote: "If the Princes believe that the good of the people is also their good, they would gratefully seek and accept the Congress assistance. It is surely in their interest to cultivate friendly relations with an organization which bids fair in the future, not very distant, to replace the Paramount Power."

National Planning Committee held its first session on December 17 with Jawaharlal Nehru as Chairman.

On December 24, Gandhi wrote in *Harijan* that "Prohibition in the Congress provinces is not going in the spirit in which it was conceived. Our freedom will be the freedom of slaves if we continue to be victims of the drink and drug habit."

Takaoka, member of Japanese Parliament, visited Segaon. Gandhi told him: "I do not subscribe to the doctrine of Asia for the Asiatics, if it is meant as an anti-European combination ... it has to relearn the message of Buddha and deliver it to

the world. I have no message to give you but this, that you must be true to your ancient heritage."

Christmas observed in quiet but picturesque manner at Segaon. Gandhi said: "I want the sympathy of the whole world for India if she can get it while she is making this unique experiment—Satyagraha."

1939 (Age 70): On January 4, Shaukat Ali died. Gandhi was moved and shed tears. *Sarkar* was the endearing appellation Shaukat Ali had given Gandhi.

In January Dr. Kagawa, Japanese admirer of Gandhi, visited Segaon. They discussed co-operative movement.

In *Harijan* of January 28, Gandhi wrote: "The movement for liberty within the States is entering a new stage."

On February 4, Gandhi wrote a leading article on Rajkot. "This wanton breach, instigated by the British Resident in Rajkot, of the charter of the liberty of its people is a wrong which must be set right at the earliest possible moment." Kasturba entered Rajkot to court arrest.

On February 4, Gandhi wrote in *Harijan*, referring to re-election of Subhas as Congress President: "Those who feel uncomfortable in being in the Congress may come out, not in a spirit of ill-will, but with the deliberate purpose of rendering more effective service."

Having heard about a statue to be raised to himself, Gandhi wrote: "I heartily dislike these exhibitions. I shall deem it ample honour if those who believe in me will be good enough to promote the activities I stand for."

On February 25, Vallabhbhai suspended civil disobedience in Rajkot according to Gandhi's instructions. On February 27, Gandhi reached Rajkot on mission of peace.

On March 2 Gandhi wrote to Thakore of Rajkot, intimating his plan of fast unto death from March 3. Charged ruler with breaking solemn pact with people.

Fast begun on March 3 at noon. Next day Gandhi wrote to Viceroy pleading for intervention.

Viceroy suggested with ruler's assent arbitration by Chief Justice of India, Sir Maurice Gwyer. Fast broken on March 7.

When Congress met at Tripuri in March, atmosphere tense. Subhas ill. Resolutions passed reiterating demand for national independence, and declaring support of Congress for movement amongst States people. Confidence in Gandhi and members of Working Committee who had resigned recorded.

Gandhi stayed in Delhi from March 15 to April 7. Interviewed Viceroy. On April 3, Chief Justice of India gave decision in favour of Vallabhbhai in Rajkot dispute. Gandhi decided to renounce award. On April 9 came back to Rajkot.

A.I.C.C. met at Calcutta in May. Subhas resigned. Rajendra Prasad elected President of Congress for 1939-40.

In May Gandhi expressed regret for coercive conduct in Rajkot and apologised to Viceroy, ruler and other people concerned.

On May 7 Gandhi Seva Sangh met at Brindavan. Gandhi advised self-purification to members.

On May 21, Subhas formed "Forward Bloc."

National Planning Committee held second session in June. In memorandum, Jawaharlal pointed out that plan must be "drawn up for a free and independent India."

On July 13 Gandhi requested Subhas to retrace steps in opposing prohibition campaign in Bombay. Toured Frontier for fortnight.

In July addressed open letter to Hitler appealing to him to desist from plunging the world into war.

On August 1, total prohibition declared in Bombay by Congress Government.

Working Committee on August 9-12 at Wardha anticipating crisis declared: "In this world crisis the sympathies of the Working Committee are entirely with the peoples who stand for democracy and freedom and the Congress has repeatedly condemned fascist aggression in Europe, Africa, and the Far East of Asia ... The Congress has further clearly enunciated its policy in the event of war and declared its determination to oppose all attempts to impose a war on India." As first step Committee called upon all Congress members of Central Legislature to refrain from attending next session. Committee requested Provincial Governments in no way to assist war preparations of British Government.

Subhas disqualified for grave indiscipline in continuing to be the President of Bengal Provincial Committee for three years.

Defence of India Bill, issued as an Ordinance, passed in Central Assembly on August 20.

Soon after declaration of war on September 3, Gandhi invited by Viceroy to Simla. He said: "I have returned from the Viceregal Lodge empty-handed and without any understanding. If there is to be any understanding, it would be between the Congress and the Government ... I told His Excellency that my own sympathies were with England."

Working Committee met at Wardha—September 8-15. Jinnah was invited to attend but declined. Subhas, Aney, Narendra Dev and Jaiprakash Narayan present by special invitation. Committee stated: "The Congress has further laid down that the issue of war and peace for India must be decided by the Indian people... Co-operation must be between equals by mutual consent for a cause which both consider to be worthy ... India cannot associate herself in a war said to be for democratic freedom when that very freedom is denied to her. In view, however, of the gravity of the occasion ... the Committee desire to take no final decision."

Working Committee appointed sub-committee consisting of Jawaharlal, Maulana Azad and Vallabhbhai Patel to deal with situation.

Gandhi's comment from Segaon on September 15 on Congress statement: "I was sorry to find myself alone in thinking that whatever support was to be given to the British should be given unconditionally... But I hope that the statement will receive the unanimous support of all the parties among Congressmen ... All that is required is mental revolution on the part of British statesmen."

War Sub-Committee's circular dated September 17 to Provincial Congress Committees giving instructions to Premiers of Congress provinces to place their views before Provincial Assemblies and Governors. Congress stayed its hands for a while, as Gandhi was holding negotiations with Viceroy. On September 30 further instructions issued to Congress Premiers to defer action on National Demand resolution. Meanwhile, ministers decided to rush through beneficial measures.

In reply to advance copy of Lords' debate on India, Gandhi wrote from Segaon on September 28, "As a friend of the British I appeal to English statesmen that they will forget the old language of imperialists and open a new chapter."

On October 2, Gandhi's seventieth birthday volume, *Mahatma Gandhi*, published. Edited by S. Radhakrishnan.

On October 3, Viceroy had talks with Rajendra Prasad and Nehru. A.I.C.C. session at Wardha, October 9-10, supported Working Committee's statement. Viceroy's statement on October 17. In effect he said: "At the end of the war His Majesty's Government will be very willing to enter into consultation."

On October 18 Gandhi said: "The Viceregal declaration is profoundly disappointing... The Congress will have to go into wilderness again before it becomes strong and sure to reach its objectives. The Congress asked for bread and it has got a stone."

Working Committee met at Wardha on October 22-23 and stated, "Any resistance that may have to be offered must be purged of all violence" and asked Congress Ministers to tender resignations. On November 1, Gandhi, Rajendra Prasad and Jinnah met Viceroy together at New Delhi. On November 5 Viceroy announced failure of talks.

By November 8, all Congress ministries resigned. After half-hearted attempts to set up alternative ministries section 93 of Government of India Act invoked and constitution suspended in "Congress" provinces.

Working Committee met at Allahabad on November 19-23 and stated: "Congress organization should explain to the people the message of the policy of the Congress programme for the future." Gandhi in *Harijan* of November 25 approved the idea of Constituent Assembly.

Working Committee met on December 18-22 at Wardha. Congress organizations asked to intensify constructive work and be prepared for call. Attention of all the Congress committees drawn to the importance of observing Independence Day on January 26, 1940

1940 (Age 71): Gandhi's interview with Viceroy on February 5. Gandhi's comment was: "I see no prospect of a peaceful and honourable settlement."

On February 17, Gandhi and Kasturba visited Santiniketan. Next day Tagore held formal reception in mango grove. Requested Gandhi to "accept this institution under your protection, giving it an assurance of permanence. Visva-Bharati is like a vessel carrying the cargo of my life's best treasure."

On February 21, Gandhi addressed annual conference of Gandhi Seva Sangh at Malkananda in Bengal and advised winding up of organization. Appointed committee of nine members to continue work. Visited Andrews lying ill in Calcutta.

On March 5, Segaon renamed Sevagram.

Maulana Azad elected Congress President in March and since then holds office.

Ramgarh Congress, March 19-20, declared: "Congressmen, and those under Congress influence, cannot help in the prosecution of the war with men, money or material." Gandhi addressing Subjects Committee said, "Every Congress Committee should become a Satyagraha Committee."

On April 5, C. F. Andrews, Gandhi's closest English friend, died in Calcutta.

In June France fell. When Working Committee met at Wardha on June 17-20, it struck a new note: "Problems which were distant are now near at hand and may soon demand solution...the problem of the achievement of national freedom has now to be considered along with allied one of its maintenance and the defence of the country against possible external aggression and internal disorder. The Wardha decision left the Working Committee of the Congress free to take political decisions without having to think of their implications in terms of violence and non-violence. It put forward a proposal for the acknowledgment of India's independence by Britain and immediate formation at the centre of a Provisional National Government. The Working Committee absolved Gandhiji for responsibility for the programme and activity which the Congress had to pursue in regard to external aggression and internal disorder."

"Gandhiji felt, and probably rightly, that he could not give up or tone down a message which he had for the world. He must have freedom to give it as he liked and not be kept back by political exigencies. So for the first time, he went one way and the Congress Working Committee another," remarked Jawaharlal.

Once more Viceroy sent for Gandhi. Long talk in Simla. On July 2 Gandhi issued famous appeal "To every Briton" to accept method of non-violence.

Working Committee met at Delhi on July 3-7. Non-violence weapon against foreign aggression repudiated. Demand for National Government. On eve of meeting Subhas arrested. Ghaffar Khan resigned from Working Committee because of his strict adherence to non-violence.

Gandhi said: "Rajaji's resolution represents the considered policy of the Congress. Non-Congressmen who were eager for the Congress to be free of my religious bias

to adopt a purely political attitude should welcome the resolution and support it wholeheartedly. So should the Muslim League and even the Princes who think of India more than their principalities." Gandhi did not attend next meeting of Committee, July 25-27, nor meeting of A.I.C.C., July 27-28. At Poona A.I.C.C. confirmed resolution passed at Wardha and Delhi.

Gandhi remarked: "Independence they cannot withhold unless the Government's wisdom is as much blurred as Rajaji claims that mine is."

Viceroy's declaration of August 8. Announced he was authorised to invite "a certain number of representative Indians...to join his Executive Council." Congress rejected Viceroy's invitation to join. Amery referring to Congress demand for National Government said: "It is a demand which really raises the whole unresolved constitutional issue."

Working Committee met at Wardha, August 18-23, and declared that "British Government's idea was to continue to hold India by the sword." Pledged Congress to act under Gandhi's command and requested him to guide Congress. Gandhi said: "I do not want England to be defeated; I do not want England to be humiliated ... they who are themselves in peril cannot save others...but the virtue of restraint cannot be carried to the extent of self-extinction...extinction of the national spirit wherever it may reside, whether among Congressmen or non-Congressmen. Freedom of speech and corresponding action is the breath of democratic life. Freedom of propagating non-violence as a substitute for war is most relevant when indecent savagery is being perpetrated by the warring nations."

Gandhi visited Viceroy on September 27 at Simla. Gandhi declared: "The immediate issue is the right to exist, which broadly put, means free speech. If the Congress has to die it should do so in the act of proclaiming its faith."

With approval of Working Committee, October 11-13, Gandhi launched campaign of individual Satyagraha. Vinoba Bhave chosen as first Satyagrahi. He inaugurated movement of moral protest by delivering anti-war speech on October 17 before rural audience, seven miles from Wardha. Arrested at Deoli on October 21, tried at Wardha and sentenced to three months' imprisonment. Satyagrahis daily went out shouting anti-war slogans and courted arrest.

On evening of October 31, Jawaharlal arrested and sentenced to four years' imprisonment.

On October 31, Gandhi suspended *Harijan, Harijanbandhu* and *Harijansevak.* Government had forbidden press to report progress of campaign.

Maulana Azad arrested at Allahabad on December 30 and sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment.

Gandhi suspended Satyagraha from December 25, 1940 to January 4, 1941, as good-will gesture for Christmas.

1941 (Age 72): Throughout 1941 movement continued and slowly spread to remote

corners of India. On January 5, lists of Satyagrahis prepared by local Congress committees. Several persons courted jail.

On August 7, Rabindranath Tagore died.

By December 3, when Government announced decision to release Satyagrahis all over India, nearly 25,000 had been arrested and convicted, and fines amounting to nearly six lakhs of rupees imposed. The same day Gandhi stated, "As far as I am concerned, the Government of India's decision cannot evoke a single responsive or appreciative chord in me." In Frontier and partly in Bengal Satyagrahis allowed to carry on their work without interference.

On December 7 Japan attacked Pearl Harbour.

From December 8, Gandhi lived for a month at Bardoli in Vallabhbhai's *ashram.*

Congress Working Committee met at Bardoli from December 23 to 30. Relieved Gandhi, on his request, of Congress leadership because of fundamental difference over interpretation of non-violence. According to Gandhi application of non-violence universal. Committee declared: "India can be in position to undertake the defence of the country on a national basis and to be of help in furtherance of the larger causes that are emerging from the storm of the war." Resolution adopted regarding the "recent extraordinary happenings in Burma and notably in the city of Rangoon." Publication of resolution banned by Government. Committee expressed sympathy for people of Malaya, Burma and East Indies, sent greetings to China and Russia, recommended to villagers increased growing of food crops, warned dealers against hoarding and profiteering, called upon people to remain cool and collected in face of danger, and resolved to start volunteer organizations to train and help people in self-defence and relief. This was first meeting since September 1940.

1942 (Age 73): Working Committee met at Wardha on January 13-14. A.I.C.C. meeting on January 15-16, when Gandhi consented to lead Congress on its own terms. He instructed all Congressmen to strengthen local organizations, enrol volunteers and make closer contact with people. "Every village should receive the message of the Congress and be prepared to face such difficulties as might arise." In this speech he said: "Jawaharlal will be my successor."

On January 18, Gandhi restarted *Harijan* and allied weeklies after lapse of 15 months.

On January 21, he addressed Benares University students on occasion of Silver Jubilee convocation. Criticised teachers and students for choosing English as medium of expression.

On February 11, Jamnalal Bajaj died.

Historic meeting between Gandhi and Marshal and Madame Chiang-Kai-shek at Calcutta on February 18. (Gandhi not invited by Viceroy to meet Marshal at Delhi.) Discussion lasted four and half hours. Madame, present in khaddar *sari* and with *kumkum* on forehead, acted as interpreter.

Rangoon fell on March 7.

Announcing Cripps Mission on March 11, Churchill Government stated: "The crisis in the affairs of India arising out of the Japanese advance has made the British wish to rally all the forces of Indian life to guard their land from the menace of the invader."

Working Committee called to meet at once at Wardha on March 17-18. Maulana Azad issued single-line statement: "We do not want to prejudge the statement."

Sir Stafford Cripps arrived at Karachi on Sunday March 22. Reached Delhi on March 23 and began to interview party leaders on March 25.

On March 27, Gandhi met Cripps in New Delhi and described proposals as "a post-dated cheque." On March 29, Cripps published proposals and said: "The defence of India will not be in Indian hands even if all parties want it."

At his first two press conferences he declared that there could not be any major fundamental alterations in the scheme.

Proposals rejected by all Indian Parties for different reasons. Working Committee conveyed its opinion to Cripps on April 1. During negotiations Azad and Jawaharlal interviewed General Wavell and Colonel Louis Johnson, U.S. Government's Special Representative in India, on April 3.

On April 5 Japanese air raids on Colombo. Next day first Japanese bombs fell on Indian soil at Vizagapatam and Cocanada.

On April 10, Gandhi visited Bombay for collections for Andrews Memorial Fund. Working Committee finally rejected Cripps proposals.

On April 12, Cripps left Delhi for England. General disappointment at failure of negotiations.

In *Harijan*, April 19, Gandhi described British plan as on "the face of it too ridiculous to find acceptance anywhere."

On April 23, Rajagopalachari addressed small gathering mainly of his old Congress supporters in Madras Legislature, and carried two resolutions, first recommending acceptance of Pakistan in principle as basis of settlement between Congress and League, second proposing restoration of responsible Government in Madras. Resentment among Congressmen. Rajagopalachari resigned from Working Committee.

Draft resolution sent by Gandhi for consideration by Working Committee when it met at Allahabad on April 28 not accepted.

A.I.C.C. met at Allahabad from April 29 to May 2. Rajagopalachari moved Madras resolution but got only 15 votes in house of 200. A.I.C.C. passed resolution: "In case an invasion takes place, it must be resisted. Such resistance can only take the form of non-violent non-co-operation as the British Government has prevented the organization of national defence by the people in any other way." Some resolutions banned for publication by Government.

Within a week by May 24, Gandhi collected five lakhs of rupees for Andrews Memorial in Santiniketan.

On May 26, Government raided A.I.C.C. office at Allahabad and seized certain notes of discussion of Working Committee.

Gandhi now leader of Congress Outlined policy in series of outspoken articles in Harijan. American journalists interviewed him at Sevagram. "Leave India in God's hands," he said on May 24, "in modern parlance, to anarchy... From it a true India will rise in place of the false one we see."

Louis Fischer, famous American journalist and author, stayed with Gandhi at Sevagram, June 3-10. Narrated his experiences and impressions in book *A Week with Gandhi* published in America in 1942. Pre-censorship order on his articles passed later by Government.

Working Committee met at Wardha on July 6. Gandhi present. "Quit India" resolution passed and published on July 14—Gandhi to lead and guide country in case of struggle. Resolution made clear that if Gandhi had changed his mind on question of immediate withdrawal of Allied troops from India, he insisted on immediate abdication of British rule.

Writing on August 2, Gandhi quoted with approval a statement of Azad that he had no objection to Britain handing over power to Muslim League or any other party provided it was real independence.

On August 5, Working Committee passed new resolution for submission to A.I.C.C. It declared that a free India would become an ally of the United Nations. "Power when it comes will belong to the whole people of India." It appealed to Indian people to face dangers and hardships with courage and endurance, and hold together under leadership of Gandhi and carry out his instructions as disciplined soldiers of Indian freedom.

Personal letter from Gandhi to Marshal Chiang Kai-shek written on eve of A.I.C.C. session: "I look forward to the day when a free India and free China will co-operate."

August 8, A.I.C.C. at Bombay passed "Quit India" resolution. Gandhi in address stated he contemplated sending letter to Viceroy before taking concrete action.

Governor-General-in-Council passed resolution saying that "the Government of India will discharge their task in the face of the challenge now thrown down by the Congress."

August 9, Government arrested Gandhi, Working Committee members and hundreds of Congress leaders and workers, under Defence of India Rules before daybreak. Gandhi with some close associates taken by special train to Aga Khan Palace near Poona.

August 10, Congress committees declared illegal. Restrictions on press regarding Congress news.

August 14, Gandhi wrote first letter to Linlithgow saying, "The Government of

India were wrong in precipitating the crisis... However much I dislike your action, I remain the same friend you have known me... Heaven guide you." Viceroy sent short reply on August 22.

August 15, Mahadev Desai, Gandhi's secretary and closest intimate, died in Aga Khan Palace. Severe restrictions on press led to suspension of several papers.

September 10, Churchill's statement in Parliament: "The Congress Party has now abandoned the policy of non-violence which Mr. Gandhi has too long inculcated in theory and has come into the open as a revolutionary movement... I may add that large reinforcements have reached India... are larger than at any time in the British connection... the situation in India this moment gives no occasion for undue despondency or alarm."

September 15-18, Central Assembly debate on situation. Demand for immediate release of Gandhi and other Congress leaders. Home Member blamed Congress.

September 22-24, Three-day debate in Council of State.

September 23, Gandhi's letter to Secretary, Home Department: "In spite of all that has been said to the contrary, I claim that the Congress policy still remains unequivocally non-violent. I feel that the Government, not the Congress, are responsible for the destruction that has taken place. Repression can only breed discontent and bitterness." Formal acknowledgment sent by Government to letter.

September 24, In Central Assembly, K. C. Neogy moved resolution recommending appointment of committee to inquire into allegations of police and military excesses in the country. Discussion resumed on February 12 and 18, 1943. Resolution rejected.

October 10, Allah Baksh, Premier of Sind, dismissed by Governor for "his recent renunciation of honours." Allah Baksh demanded creation of National Government.

November 11, Bhansali started fast in house of Aney, member of the Viceroy's Council, in Delhi as a protest against Chimur atrocities.

November 12, Rajagopalachari's request to meet Gandhi rejected by Viceroy.

November 16, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee, Minister for Finance in Bengal, resigned office as protest against Central Government's policy. His request to interview Gandhi and other Congress leaders rejected.

1943 (*Age 74*): All-India press *hartal* on January 6 as protest against press restrictions.

February 10, at noon Gandhi commenced three weeks' fast in detention in Aga Khan Palace. "I must resort to the law prescribed for Satyagrahis, namely a fast according to capacity. This fast can sooner end by the Government giving the needed relief."

Correspondence between Gandhi and Linlithgow and Gandhi and Home Secretary regarding responsibility for disturbances published by Government of India.

On first day of fast Gandhi reported to be quite cheerful.

On third day discontinued his daily morning walk and daily evening visit to spot where Mahadev Desai was cremated.

On February 13, Sir Richard Tottenham, Additional Secretary, Home Department, published *Congress Responsibility for the Disturbances*, 1942-43, "bearing on the responsibility of Mr. Gandhi and the Congress High Command for the disturbances."

On February 15, Dr. B. C. Roy arrived in Poona and remained in attendance till end of the fast. Health bulletins increasingly disquieting. Central Legislature's debate on fast.

February 16, Six doctors announced Gandhi's condition had "further deteriorated."

February 17, Sir H. P. Mody, N. R. Sarkar and Aney, members of Viceroy's Executive Council, tendered resignation on a fundamental issue—Gandhi's fast.

February 18, Anxiety deepened. Gandhi "did not show any inclination to talk since that morning, nor did he show same interest in visitors as earlier." In all 30 visitors permitted.

February 19-20, Two-day All-India Leaders' Conference at Delhi, comprising over 200 persons. Conference unanimously passed resolution demanding immediate release of Gandhi. Request turned down by Viceroy on February 21.

Largely attended public meetings all over India demanding Gandhi's release.

February 21, Crisis developed and doctors said if fast was not ended without delay it might be too late to save life. Doctors prevailed upon Gandhi to substitute orange juice for lemon juice, in terms of his declared intention of drinking water during fast mixed with "juice of citrus fruit" to make it palatable. British press correspondent spread malicious reports regarding this. Signs that Government were fully prepared to see fast end fatally. Police and military precautions taken.

William Phillips, Personal Representative of President Roosevelt, handed out to press correspondents cryptic statement: "Phases of the situation in India are being handled by high officials of the Government of the United States and Great Britain."

February 23, Gandhi's mind seemed cleared. Horace Alexander on behalf of Friends' Ambulance Unit made effort to bring about settlement. Mediation promptly rejected by Government.

February 27, Aney saw Gandhi.

February 28, With two more days to break fast, Gandhi more cheerful. Nausea absent.

March 3, Completion of fast. Inmates of prison sang Gandhi's favourite hymn *Vaishnava Jan To*, two stanzas from Tagore's *Gitanjali* and *Lead, Kindly Light*. Sarojini Naidu recited Tagore's poem, "This my prayer to meet my Lord." At 9-34 a.m. Kasturba handed Gandhi glass containing six ounces of orange juice diluted with water. He took twenty minutes to sip juice.

Requests made by Indian and foreign correspondents to grant permission to see Gandhi on last day of fast, or to be present when Gandhi broke his fast, rejected by Government. Gandhi expressed desire that Dr. B. C. Roy should pay him final medical visit at end of month but permission refused.

Ashes of Mahadev Desai, kept in prison, immersed in Indrayani river same morning as breaking of fast.

March 6, Gandhi took diluted goat's milk, fruit juice and some fruit pulp. No further health bulletins.

March 10, Statement signed by 35 prominent persons issued urging release of Gandhi and reconsideration of situation.

March 31, Dr. K. T. Gajjar examined Gandhi.

April 1, Proposed Sapru Conference deputation to Viceroy. Abandoned as procedure insisted upon by Viceroy precluded personal discussion. Viceroy refused leaders permission to meet Gandhi.

April 25, Phillips, in farewell chat with press correspondents on eve of his departure to America, stated: "I should like to have met and talked with Mr. Gandhi. I requested the appropriate authorities for permission to do so and I was informed that they were unable to grant the necessary facilities."

May 24, Non-Party Leaders' demand for impartial tribunal and for release of Gandhi and other Congress leaders.

May 26, Government press *communique* issued from Delhi: "The Government of India have received a request from Mr. Gandhi to forward a short letter from himself to Mr. Jinnah expressing a wish to meet him... The Government of India have decided that the letter cannot be forwarded and have so informed Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah."

May 28, In a statement, Mr. Jinnah said: "This letter of Mr. Gandhi can only be construed as a move on his part to embroil the Muslim League to come into clash with the British Government solely for the purpose of helping his release."

June 18, Wavell appointed Viceroy. Amery announced in Commons on June 24, "The new appointment does not imply any change in the settled policy of His Majesty's Government."

December 4, *communique* said, "Mrs. Gandhi had two further heart attacks in course of week." At her request Government of India agreed to her sons and grandsons seeing her in detention camp.

December 15, Question of Kasturba's illness raised in Lords when Under Secretary for India replied: "It would be in Mrs. Gandhi's own interests to remain where she is."

December 20, *Communique* reported another heart attack.

December 24, Government of India in press note said: "Her release would, however, involve separating her from her husband during her illness... there would

be no kindness... in removing her from the Aga Khan Palace."

1944 (Age 75) : February 20, Government *communique* announced : "Mrs. Gandhi's condition has been deteriorating for some days past and is now very grave."

February 22, Kasturba, wife and life-companion of Gandhi, died at 7-35 p.m. on *Shivaratri* day in the Aga Khan Palace.

February 23, Kasturba's body cremated at 10-40 a.m. Last rites performed by youngest son, Devadas. Over a hundred persons, relatives and friends of Gandhi family present.

February 25, *Asthi Sanchayan* ceremony of Kasturba's ashes performed in Aga Khan Palace.

Hartal observed in many towns and villages and tributes paid. Attempts to hold public meetings and processions led to numerous arrests.

March 5 observed throughout country as Kasturba Day responding to appeal by Malaviya.

April 6, Government of Bombay issued *communique*: "Mr. Gandhi has been suffering for last three days from malaria. He is feeling weak, but his general condition is as satisfactory as can be expected."

April 18, *Communique*: "Mr. Gandhi's temperature is normal for the last 48 hours and his progress satisfactory."

April 27, Amery told questioner in Commons that he had no further information.

April 28, Bombay Government's *communique*: "Although Mr. Gandhi has had no recurrence of fever, he had not recovered from his recent attack as hoped. His general condition is weak and is causing some anxiety."

April 29, *Communique*: "Mr. Gandhi was examined by Major-General Candy I.M.S., Surgeon-General to the Government of Bombay. His report shows that Mr. Gandhi's condition has shown a fair degree of improvement since yesterday ... He is in good spirits. He has been advised to take more nourishment and tonics."

April 30, "Mr. Gandhi's condition has continued to improve. No further bulletin will be issued unless necessary. Dr. B. C. Roy, who happens to be passing through Poona, has made a request to be allowed to examine Mr. Gandhi, and his request has been granted."

May 2, "A further examination by specialists is being carried on."

May 3, "There has been some worsening of Mr. Gandhi's anaemic condition and his blood pressure has fallen further. His general condition is again giving rise to severe anxiety."

May 4, "There has been no material change in Mr. Gandhi's general condition."

Agitation all over country for Gandhi's release.

May 6, New Delhi *communique* said: "In view of the medical reports of

Mr. Gandhi's health, Government have decided to release him unconditionally. This decision has been taken solely on medical grounds. The release takes place at 8 a.m., May 6." Gandhi taken by I.G. of Prisons in car to "Parnakuti." Dr. Sushila Nayyar, Dr. Gilder, Pyarelal and Mirabén also released. Before leaving detention camp Gandhi visited spot where bodies of Mahadev Desai and Kasturba had been cremated. Placed flowers.

Bulletin signed by Dr. Gilder and Dr. Sushila Nayyar issued: "Mahatma Gandhi was feeling out of sorts since April 10, when suddenly on April 14 he had high fever with rigor. Next day too he had temperature and on the 16th fever rose very high and there was a severe rigor. Whenever the temperature went high he was delirious. The blood showed infection of benign tertian malaria... He has become very weak and there is physical and mental exhaustion though he keeps cheerful."

May 8, Armed guards at gates and around grounds of Aga Khan Palace removed.

May 9, Gandhi paid visit to Aga Khan Palace to pay homage to memory of Mahadev Desai and Kasturba and placed flowers on the *samadhis*, after which prayers were offered.

May 11, Gandhi arrived in Bombay to stay at Gandhi Gram, Juhu.

May 14, Gandhi entered on fortnight's silence to ensure uninterrupted rest.

May 15, Dr. K. T. Gajjar diagnosed that Gandhi had contracted hookworm infection.

May 18, Under Gandhi's instructions letter dated May 8, 1943, written from detention camp to Jinnah released to press.

May 19, Gandhi driven for ninety minutes through areas devastated by explosion in Bombay in April. First time Gandhi left his shack at Juhu.

May 21, Gandhi saw a talkie for the first time. "Mission to Moscow" specially screened for him at Gandhi Gram.

May 22, received cablegram dated March 15 from Edmond Privat: "Rolland well, love from us both."

May 29, Gandhi broke his total "medical silence" at 3 p.m. Decided temporarily upon silence for 20 hours a day, speaking only between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m.

May 31, Gandhi released for publication his letter to Jayakar, dated May 20. "The country expects much from me. I do not know how you feel about this release. I am not at all happy. I feel even ashamed. I should not have fallen ill. I tried not to but failed at length. I feel that they will imprison me as soon as I am declared free from the present weakness. And if they do not arrest me, what can I do? I cannot withdraw the 'August resolution.' As you have very properly said, it is innocuous. You may differ about the sanction. It is the breath of life for me."

June 15, After over a month's stay in Juhu Gandhi left for Poona to stay in Dr. Dinshaw Mehta's clinic.

June 18, Portion of Gandhi's correspondence with Linlithgow and Wavell, while he was under detention, appeared in press.

June 20, Press note announced Government's intention to issue pamphlet containing letters exchanged between Gandhi and Government.

June 27, Gandhi telegraphed to Viceroy seeking permission to publish his letter of June 17.

June 29, "No" to Government is the key to *swaraj*, said Gandhi in his 35-minute talk to Maharashtra Congress workers.

July 1, Gandhi's letter of June 17 and Viceroy's reply of June 22 released. Viceroy wrote: "In consideration of the radical difference in our points of view, a meeting between us at present could have no value."

Addressing meeting of trustees of Kasturba National Memorial Fund held in Poona, Gandhi said: "The object of the Kasturba Fund is properly the welfare of village women and children."

July 2, Gandhi arrived in Panchgani for rest.

July 9, Formula for Congress-League settlement which Rajagopalachari had placed before Jinnah released. Rajagopalachari had discussed it with Gandhi in March 1943.

July 12, Authorised version of Gandhi's interview to *News Chronicle* correspondent released to press. Gandhi demanded contact with Working Committee. Explaining issue of National Government he said: "Viceroy would be like the King of England guided by responsible ministers."

July 13, "I live for the cause and if I perish it is for the cause," said Gandhi in informal talk. Differences with Cripps scheme explained.

July 14, Asserted there was no conflict between principles enunciated in August Resolution and what he had suggested in *News Chronicle* interview.

Plea for "humane treatment of prisoners, more especially when they are in detention on mere suspicion or found guilty of crimes created by special ordinances and not under the ordinary law."

July 16, "My plan contemplates an immediate recognition of full independence for India as a whole, subject to limitations for the duration of war to meet the requirements of Allied operations. The Cripps plan dealt more with the future than with immediate arrangements," said Gandhi in a press interview.

July 19, "I should not mind to climb down if it will result in the attainment of Indian independence," said Gandhi. Denied that the favourable war situation had anything to do with his proposals "if only for the simple reason that in the flush of approaching victory my proposal is not likely to receive a hearing." Declared that the fruition of his proposals would turn the war into a war for "liberation of exploited peoples of the world."

GANDHI CHRONICLE

July 22, Some young men shouted anti-Pakistan and anti-Congress slogans at the conclusion of Gandhi's public prayers at Panchgani.

July 25, In Lords Earl of Munster, Under-Secretary for India, said, "Gandhi is still clinging to precisely that claim which wrecked the Cripps mission ... he is no more prepared today ... to accept the formation of an interim Government with the Viceroy maintaining his existing reserve powers."

July 26, Jivanji Desai, secretary and manager of Navajivan Trust, took possession of building and press after addressing letter to District Magistrate; "without prejudice to the right of Navajivan Press to hold Government liable for all damages to property." (Government had taken possession of press in August 1942 and recently offered to hand it over to manager.)

July 28, In two-day India debate in Commons, Amery said that Gandhi had expressed his views on immediate situation and so long as that was basis of his proposals, they did not afford even a starting point for profitable discussion with Viceroy or with interned Congress leaders. Churchill took no part. Attendance very meagre.

In press interview Gandhi re-emphasised importance of constructive programme and advised underground workers, "you will discover yourselves and take the risk of being imprisoned, believing that imprisonment thus undergone itself helps the freedom movement." Categorically said that those who believed in sabotage harmed non-violence movement.

July 29, League Council authorised Jinnah to negotiate with Gandhi for settlement of communal problem, vesting in him full authority after hearing his statement. Jinnah in statement to League said August 1942 resolution was inimical to Muslims and it must collapse. Unconditional establishment of Pakistan, as condition precedent to Congress-League co-operation. He said Rajagopalachari's formula offered League a shadow and a husk, maimed, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan. Revealed he would be receiving Gandhi at his Bombay residence, about mid-August.

July 30, Gandhi in interview said, "British Government's rejection of my offer did not affect in any way the formula for a communal settlement ... The publication of the formula is in pursuit of negotiations for communal settlement. It is not idle method. It is conceived in all sincerity."

Commenting on Commons debate Gandhi said: "It confirms me in my opinion that the 'Quit India' resolution was no hasty cry, conceived in anger. To put the same in Parliamentary language it demands that India must be now governed by Indians, chosen by her own people—not a coterie but the whole mass of the people without distinction of race, creed or colour."

Gandhi said economic development of India dependent upon solution of political deadlock—a proper National Government at centre.

Commenting on war he said, "Must rivers of blood flow for such an empty victory?"

July 31, Gandhi-Jinnah correspondence released to press. Gandhi in letter dated 17, from Panchgani, wrote: "Brother Jinnah, there was a day when I could induce you to speak in the mother tongue. Today I take courage to write to you in the same language. I had invited you to meet me while I was in jail. I have not written to you since my release. But today my heart says that I should write to you. We will meet whenever you choose. Don't regard me as the enemy of Islam or of the Muslims of this country. I am the friend and servant of not only yourself but of the whole world. Do not disappoint me. I am enclosing herewith a translation of this letter in Urdu. Your Brother, Gandhi."

Jinnah replied on 24th from Srinagar: "Dear Mr. Gandhi ... I shall be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay ... hope that you will soon be all right. Yours sincerely, M. A. Jinnah."

All leading Russian newspapers published suggestion said to have been made by Roosevelt's envoy that Atlantic Charter should now be applied to India. First time Soviet touched on controversial Indian political news. Moscow Institute of World Affairs and World Politics published book on India dealing objectively with Indian history, Cripps plan, political parties, economics and the Princes.

August 1, Gandhi arrived in Poona *en route* to Sevagram. Large crowds of villagers lined the route from foot of ghats to Poona.

Kasturba Week, August 1-6.

August 2, Gandhi visited in morning *samadhis* of Kasturba and Mahadev Desai and offered prayers and flowers. Left for Wardha.

In interview to *Daily Worker* Gandhi said: "The allies are today making brave declarations about democracy and liberty which to me, or, to put it plainly, to the exploited nations mean nothing. Mere declarations pleasing to the ear can give no satisfaction to the sufferers. By the 'exploited nations' I mean the Asiatics and Africans. If the allies are fighting for democracy, their democracy should include all the exploited races of the earth. Facts, as I see them, prove the contrary. Almost all, if not all, parties agree that India was never so much under foreign domination as it is today."

American radio commentator, Raymond Graham Swing, regretted British Government's attitude of "complete lack of cordiality to Mr. Gandhi's latest proposals."

August 3, Six thousand persons present at Wardha station to greet Gandhi. On his way Gandhi walked to the spot in Gandhi Chowk where one Jangli had died as a result of firing during August 1942.

Gandhi drove to Sevagram Ashram in specially decorated bullock cart with volunteers lining part of the route. Reached *ashram* at 9 a.m.

Soon after visited Kasturba's cottage. Kasturba's portrait had been hung up and lamp was burning. Gandhi visibly moved.

August 4, "There is no objection if one can serve on his own terms on these

Government bodies. But that seems next to impossible," commented Gandhi in reply to a Congress worker's query about Food Advisory Committee started by Government.

August 5, Gandhi's statement from Sevagram: "I am aware that I do not represent the Congress mind always...The Working Committee is the only body which can legitimately and truly represent the Congress...As an old servant of the country, however, I can advise...the following. Ninth is a special occasion. There has arisen much misunderstanding about Congress purpose and mine. I must avoid all avoidable risks. Therefore in all places except in Bombay my advice is not to disregard special police prohibitions for that day. For Bombay, I have already given advice through the Mayor of Bombay ... I have selected Bombay as the most suitable place for the simple reason that it is most easily accessible to me and is the place where the historic meeting of August 1942 was held. Whatever it is to be, it will be a symbolic act...Curiosity is natural and pardonable. But I plead for restraint. The self-imposed curb will be good for the country. My work will be finished if I succeed in carrying conviction to the human family, that every man or woman, however weak in body, is the guardian of his or her self-respect and liberty. This defence avails, though the whole world may be against the individual resister. I have suggested the present symbolic procedure to see whether those who organize the demonstration have co-operation from the local public. Freedom of four hundred million people through purely non-violent effort is not to be gained without learning the virtue of iron discipline—not imposed from without, but sprung naturally from within. Without the requisite discipline non-violence can only be a veneer. The second thing that I should like done on the forthcoming Ninth August is for those who have gone underground to discover themselves. They can do so by informing the authorities of their movements and whereabouts or by simply and naturally doing their work in the open without any attempt to evade or elude the police. To go underground is to elude the police. Therefore real discovery is to discover oneself to the party eluded... Nothing should be done unless the conviction has gone home that a particular action is essential for the cause. In absence of such a conviction, those who see this note may ignore it and should follow what they consider best for the country... What everyone should do on the Ninth, whether they have the conviction as to non-violence or not, or whether they are Congressmen or not, is to carry out on the Ninth the whole or any part of the fourteen-fold programme reiterated in my recent note. Just for example... Hindus and Muslims may organize joint programme of prayers—God may bless the Quaide-e-Azam and me with wisdom, to reach a common understanding in the interest of India...The spirit of service and helpfulness should pervade the atmosphere everywhere... Let them (Englishmen and Americans) realise that the August Resolution was not conceived in hatred. It was an unvarnished statement of the natural right of the people of the land... If the demonstration is carried out in the spirit in which I have conceived it, I have no doubt that it will lead to an early end of the misery of the masses."

In press interview from Lahore Jinnah said: "Our desire is that there should be

freedom for every section of the population. We are meeting very soon. Give your blessings to me and Gandhiji so that we might arrive at a settlement. The third party is there and it will try. But we can come to a settlement in spite of them, knowing that Gandhiji is incorruptible and having that much faith in me." He referred to Gandhi's seven points and said: "This basis can only be worked out on the footing that the present constitution is to be scrapped and a new constitution be substituted for it."

August 8, "I would urge critics not to mind my inconsistencies, so called or real. Let them examine the question on merits and bless the effort, if they can," observed Gandhi in press interview. Commenting on Ninth August statement he said: "The statement asserts a universal right which becomes a duty when there is an attack upon its ordinary exercise. It therefore contemplates civil disobedience only if the Government want it."

New Delhi comment on Gandhi's statement: "It omits the important fact that the ceremony for which official permission was sought was to include the recitation of the full text of the "Quit India" resolution of August 1942, in the place chosen for all public meetings in Bombay. It is understood that permission was refused."

The District Magistrate, Wardha, issued an order prohibiting public meetings, processions and other public demonstrations in Wardha on August 9 and 10 without his previous permission. It was announced by beat of drum in the streets.

Third anniversary of the death of Rabindranath Tagore observed at Sevagram with prayers.

August 9, Congressmen who were arrested by the Bombay police, while marching in procession in the morning, were released about 7 p.m. same day. *Hartal* successful.

Members of the Sevagram Ashram observed August 9 by fasting, praying and spinning. *Hartal* successful in Wardha. No demonstrations.

August 10, Several underground Congress workers discovered themselves to police according to Gandhi's advice.

Over a thousand letters and articles, which were not delivered to Gandhi while in detention at Aga Khan Palace, now handed over.

Congressmen and Muslim Leaguers prayed together for the success of the forthcoming Gandhi-Jinnah meeting. At Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, prominent Congressmen and Muslim Leaguers adopted resolution for Hindu-Muslim unity.

Early in the morning flag ceremony in *ashram*.

"This day is different from other days. Today you pray that God may bless the Quaide-e-Azam and me with wisdom to reach a common understanding in the interest of India. Let this be your constant prayer as you go on spinning," said Gandhi opening non-stop mass spinning in the afternoon at Sevagram.

In reply to critics Gandhi stated: "The contrast between the two (Kasturba and

Mahadev) is too striking to be missed. The one was ready to drop off like a fully ripe fruit. The other had yet to ripen. Life still lay before Mahadev as ordinary standards go. He had aimed at living up to a hundred years. The amount of material that he had piled up in his voluminous note-books called for years of patient labour to work up and he had hoped to do all that. In his trunk was found a memo of my talks taken down on the day previous to his final end. Probably, none beside myself can today make them out, and even I don't know to what use he would have put them. He was the living example of the wise, who live and work as if they were born to immortality and everlasting youth. But, if all our dreams could be realised, life would become a phantasmagoria, and there would be utter chaos on earth. God in His mercy, therefore, has ordained that His will alone shall prevail on earth. Mahadev, though an idealist and dreamer, never allowed his feet to be taken off the firm earth. He, therefore, adorned everything that he attempted. To Mahadev's admirers, I can only offer this consolation, that he lost nothing by his associations with me. His dreams rose above scholarship or learning. Riches had no attraction for him. God had blessed him with high intellect and versatile tastes but what his soul thirsted for was the devotional spirit. Even before he came to me, he had assiduously sought and cultivated the company of devotees and men of God after his heart. One may say that it was in furtherance of this quest that he came to me and, not obtaining full satisfaction even with me, (shall I say) he turned his back upon me in the fullness of youth, leaving behind him his weeping relations and friends, and set forth to seek realisation of his quest in the bosom of his Maker. The only fitting service that I can render his memory is to complete the work which he has left behind him unfinished, and to make myself worthy of his devotion—obviously a more difficult task than merely raising a fund for his memorial. It can be fulfilled only through Divine grace. Mahadev's external goal was the attainment of *swaraj*; the inner, to fully realise in his own person his ideal of devotion, and if possible to share the same with others.

"The raising of a material memorial is outside my scope. This is a task for his friends and admirers to take up. Does a father initiate a memorial for his son? I was not responsible for the Kasturba Memorial... I have become the president of the committee only in order to ensure the use of the funds in accordance with its object. If friends and admirers of Mahadev similarly set up a committee to raise a memorial fund and invite me to become its president and give guidance for its proper use, I shall gladly accept it... A word to litterateurs. They know or should know that he put the *charkha* above literature. He took delight in spinning for hours. It was a daily duty. He would encroach upon his sleeping hours to finish his daily minimum of spinning. Why this insistence? Not, I assure them, to please me. He threw in his lot with me after much deliberation. I never knew him do a thing without conviction. He thought with me that the material salvation of India's teeming but famishing millions was bound up with the *charkha*. He discovered too that this daily labour with the hand enriched whatever literary work he did. It gave

it a reality which it otherwise lacked. The raising of funds is good and necessary. But a sincere imitation of Mahadev's constructive work is better. The monetary contribution to a memorial fund ought not to be a substitute for the more solid appreciation."

August 17, Jinnah's telegram to Gandhi: "Extremely sorry. Laid up with temperature. Doctors advise impossible meet you Saturday 19|8. Will intimate date immediately I am well enough."

Gandhi received Viceroy's letter dated August 15.

August 18, Gandhi-Wavell correspondence released by Government.

Gandhi had initiated correspondence on July 15. Requested Viceroy for facility to consult Working Committee, failing that personal interview. Viceroy replied on July 22: "If you will submit to me a definite and constructive policy I shall be glad to consider it." Gandhi wrote back on July 27: "Dear friend,...I am used to work in the face of disappointment. Here is my concrete proposal. I am prepared to advise the Working Committee to declare that, in view of changed conditions, mass civil disobedience envisaged by the resolution of August 1942 cannot be offered and that full co-operation in the war effort should be given by the Congress, if a declaration of immediate Indian independence is made and a National Government responsible to the Central Assembly be formed subject to the proviso, that during the pendency of the war, the military operations should continue as at present, but without involving any financial burden on India. If there is a desire on the part of the British Government for a settlement, friendly talks should take the place of correspondence. But I am in your hand. I shall continue to knock so long as there is the least hope of an honourable settlement."

Wavell replied on August 15: "Proposals such as those put forward by you are quite unacceptable...They are, indeed, very similar to the proposals made by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to Sir Stafford Cripps in April 1942...If however the leaders of the Hindus, the Muslims and the important minorities were willing to cooperate in a transitional Government established and working within the present constitution...good progress might be made...Until Indian leaders have come closer together than they are now, I doubt if I myself can do anything to help. Let me remind you too that minority problems are not easy. They are real and can be solved only by mutual compromise and tolerance."

Simultaneous with reply reaching Gandhi, Viceroy released entire correspondence to press, a day prior to day fixed for Gandhi-Jinnah meeting.

Interviewed on Viceroy's reply Gandhi said: "The published correspondence shows that I left no stone unturned to conform to the Viceregal requirements. The final Government reply is positive proof that the British Government have no intention of winning public support. I do not confine myself to the Congress, since its main demand has been backed by almost all political parties. It is as clear as crystal that the British Government do not propose to give up the power they possess over

the four hundred millions, unless the latter develop a strength enough to wiest it from them. I shall never lose hope that India will do so by purely moral means... Let us pray that the Quaide-e-Azam may be soon restored enough to see me and that God may so dominate our hearts as to lead us to a right solution... No solution is likely to last unless, on the face of it, it is right and is acceptable to the people of India as a whole."

August 19-20, "Here in India we see how the Viceroy refused even to see the peoples' representative or to allow him to meet his colleagues of the Working Committee," said B. G. Kher, ex-Premier of Bombay addressing a meeting of the Bombay Congress Legislative Party in the President's room at the Council Hall. Over fifty members attended meeting. Wholehearted support to demand for immediate declaration of India's independence and withdrawal of British Power from India as made by August 8 resolution. Meeting hailed C. R. formula as good basis for settlement with League, and extended support to Gandhi's proposals for ending deadlock.

August 30, Jinnah's telegram to Gandhi: "Your telegram. Hope you have received my letter of August 26. Shall be glad to meet you September 7 if convenient to you or any day thereafter. Please let me know."

August 31, In press interview Gandhi said: "I have seen a press report to the effect that I had consented to receive a salute from the Khaksars on my arrival in Bombay. I may say that I have given no such consent. I am going to Bombay as an individual. I can therefore receive no salutes. I invite individuals and organizations to devote themselves to silently praying that we may both be wisely guided by the Almighty. I would ask them too to avoid all demonstrations. Let leaders of all communities devise ways and means of cultivating friendly relations with one another."

Secretary of the All-India Anti-Pakistan Front and some volunteers picketed Gandhi's hut at Sevagram to dissuade him from seeing Jinnah. They carried posters and shouted anti-Pakistan slogans.

September 1-3, A. I. S. A. met at Sevagram. In course of talks to members Gandhi said that the knowledge that the Government could crush the Charkha Sangh, if it wanted to, had affected him deeply. He did not wish to exist at the mercy of the Government. Mercy he would have none except God's. 'Under the circumstances would it not be better that he should break up the Charkha Sangh himself and distribute the property of the Sangh among the villagers? If it had penetrated every home in the 7,00,000 villages of India who could crush it? The Government could not imprison forty crores of men and women, nor could it shoot down all of them. Even if one crore out of the forty crores were shot dead that would not retard but on the contrary would hasten the attainment of their goal. He had told them often enough that they should forget politics and concentrate on the wheel with all its implications. That and that alone he considered to be true politics, *satvic* politics. Every village that assimilated the message of the wheel would begin to feel the glow of

independence. If the Charkha Sangh was to fulfil his expectations, its members should be living examples of non-violence. Their whole life should be a demonstration of *ahimsa* in action, they should have healthy bodies and, healthy minds. If they had been what they should be the villagers would have taken to the *charkha* most enthusiastically. The problems of communal disharmony and untouchability etc. would have vanished like dew before the morning sun. It was in order to enable the Sangh to attain what it had failed to attain so far that he had suggested breaking it up into its component parts. He would suggest distributing the money that the Sangh possessed among able workers who should go to the villages with the determination of devoting their lives to the spread of the wheel. Today Charkha Sangh was a highly centralised institution. Tomorrow it would become completely decentralised. All the workers who go to the villages would run their independent centres. The Central Office would inspect their work and give them necessary guidance so that the principles for which the Sangh stood did not suffer neglect. A joint board of Charkha Sangh, Gram Udyog Sangh and Talimi Sangh should be formed and it should issue necessary directions from time to time for giving effect to the new policy. They should consider themselves jointly responsible for the full evolution of *ahimsa*. Its full evolution would mean complete independence. The independence which could bring relief and happiness to the lowliest and the lost could only come through *ahimsa*, that is to say through the wheel. Therefore if they could make the Sangh serve that purpose, they would have all his co-operation. If not, they could continue as a mere philanthropic organization but that would not be enough for him. In that case they must leave him to plough his lonely future.

September 9, Saturday, Gandhi arrived in Bombay. Got down at Sion railway station at 1 p.m. and drove to Birla House. Since morning entire Malabar Hill area protected by police pickets assisted by military police.

Gandhi arrived at Jinnah's residence at five minutes to four accompanied by Pyarelal. Received by Jinnah. Jinnah enquired after Gandhi's health. Gandhi put his arm round Jinnah's shoulder gripping it affectionately. Said he was well. Jinnah requested Gandhi to satisfy cameramen.

Gandhi and Jinnah walked into study. Closeted till 7 p.m. At end of meeting Jinnah on behalf of both of them dictated following statement to pressmen: "We have had frank and friendly talks for three hours and we are resuming our talks on Monday at 5-30 p.m. Tomorrow is the 21st day of Ramzan and, therefore, all Mussalmans have to observe it. And I have, therefore, requested Mr. Gandhi to oblige me not to have a meeting on the 21st day of Ramzan."

When Jinnah used the words: "I have requested Mr. Gandhi to oblige me," Gandhi with a smile said, "No obliging; willing to surrender."

On September 11, addressing the prayer congregation in Hindustani in the evening just after his talks with Jinnah, Gandhi said, all he could say at the present stage was that Jinnah and he had met as old friends on Saturday and again that day.

Jinnah and he had only God between them as witness. "My constant prayer these days is that He may so guide my speech that not a word may escape my lips so as to hurt the feelings of Jinnah Saheb or damage the cause that is dear to us both. I am sure the same is the case with Jinnah Saheb ... Our goal is the attainment of independence for the whole of India. It is for that that we pray and are pledged to lay down our lives...we are fully alive to our responsibility and are straining every nerve to come to a settlement."

In an interview to the American paper, *P.M.*, Sir Stafford Cripps commenting on Gandhi-Jinnah talks said : "No outside authority can force an agreement upon the Congress and League. When these two major parties have come to some agreement, there will still be necessity of convincing larger outstanding minorities that they will be given adequate protection in the new constitution."

September 12, at 10-30 a.m. Gandhi went to Jinnah's residence. The talks lasted till 1 p.m. Again resumed from 5-30 to 7 p.m. Gandhi's midday and evening meals were carried to him at Jinnah's residence. No statement issued. Gandhi walked the distance from Jinnah's residence to the prayer grounds where a large crowd had gathered for prayers.

September 13, Gandhi-Jinnah talks continued for the fourth day from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 5-30 p.m. to 7 p.m. Gandhi had his usual long thin file and Jinnah a small thin book with green cover. Gandhi had his evening meal served in Jinnah's house.

September 14, Celebration of Gandhi's 75th birthday according to Hindu calendar. Greetings from all over India.

Fifth day of Gandhi-Jinnah talks which lasted from 5-30 p.m. to 7 p.m.

September 15, Jinnah made a short statement to the press: "I want to tell you that I have received any number of telegrams and letters multiplying and increasing in thousands and I find it physically impossible to reply to all of them, particularly as we are engaged in our talks here. I want to assure all those, who have sent me their good wishes, that I appreciate and thank them for it. All those who have sent their suggestions or proposals or any ideas for me to consider, I assure them that I have most carefully examined them and have paid them my best attention, and if I am not able to acknowledge them it is because it is physically impossible. I hope they will not misunderstand me."

Gandhi-Jinnah talks continued from 5-30 to 7-10 p.m. Jinnah announced to the press: "Tomorrow we are not going to meet because it is a big day in the month of Ramzan and it is the day on which the Koran was revealed, a Revelation Day. Therefore it is observed as a holiday. Thereafter we continue to meet at the same time as before ... till further announcement."

September 16, Great interest roused by the visit of a C.I.D. official to Gandhi in the afternoon. Approached by pressmen the official refused to say anything on the matter.

Before commencement of prayers in the evening Gandhi made short speech appealing to people to maintain a peaceful atmosphere during prayers and not to crowd round.

An appeal to the public not to be misled by any statement that the Gandhi-Jinnah talks would fail but to pray sincerely for their success was made by Rajagopalachari at the 120th birth anniversary celebrations of Dadabhai Naoroji.

September 17, Dr. Gilder and Dr. Jivraj Mehta examined Gandhi in the morning.

Gandhi-Jinnah talks resumed in the evening at 5-30 p.m. and continued till 7 p.m.

There were to be no talks on Monday as Gandhi would not be breaking his silence till after 7 p.m. There were to be no talks on Tuesday too if the moon was visible and Id observed on that day.

The talks would continue till further announcement, observed Jinnah to pressmen.

September 18, Day of silence. Police took extra precautions during evening prayer congregation. Jinnah in his Id message said: "... This is an acid test ... let us resolve once again, on this most auspicious day ... to make any sacrifice till we have achieved complete independence and successfully marched to our goal of Pakistan."

September 19, Gandhi-Jinnah talks from 5-30 p.m. to 7 p.m. On account of Id; talks postponed to 21st evening.

Gandhi on conclusion of evening prayer said that his earnest prayer to all present was that if they had the good of the country at heart and wanted India to be free and independent at the earliest moment, they should establish the closest bonds of friendship between Hindus and Mussalmans and members of all other communities. That was the least that every one of them was expected to do and could do. Was there any one among them who doubted that if they could become one of heart, the coming of independence would be accelerated? Ever since his return to India, he had been proclaiming that truth from house-tops. That did not mean that they could afford to rest in idleness and freedom would by itself drop into their lap. If that was realised, many other things would follow as a matter of course.

September 26, Gandhi-Jinnah talks fail.

October 2, Gandhi's 75th birthday celebrations according to English Calendar. Kasturba Memorial Fund of Rs. 80,05,975-12-4, presented to Bapu at Sevagram. Also —"Gandhiji—His Life & Work"—the 75th Birthday Volume.



I shall work for an India in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country, in whose making they have an effective voice, an India in which there shall be no high class and low class of people, an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony... There can be no room in such India for the curse of untouchability or the curse of intoxicating drinks and drugs. . Women will enjoy the same rights as men ... This is the India of my dreams.

M K Gandhi

PHOTO-CHRONICLE

1890

Law student, London

1905

Johannesburg

1906

Leader, Indian Ambulance Corps, 'Zulu Rebellion'

Courtesy : Gandhi Sangraha, Ahmedabad

1899

Inspection by Lieutenant-General Sir A. Lyttelton, London.

Courtesy
Gandhi Smarak Sangrahalaya

1899

With Indian Ambulance Corps, Boer War

Courtesy
R. K. Prabhu

1906

With Indian Ambulance Corps, 'Zulu Rebellion'

1912

With Gokhale in South Africa

Courtesy :
Gandhi Sangraha

1914-15

With Kasturba

i. In London

ii. In India

Courtesy :
Gandhi Sangraha

1921

With Mrs. Besant and Srinivasa Sastri

Courtesy :
R. K. Prabhu

At Tolstoy Farm
h Kallenbach (1910)

Leader of Satyagraha,
South Africa (1913)

Non-cooperation days
(1920)

President, Belgaum Congress
(1921)

Courtesy
Gandhi Smarak

of foreign cloth, Bombay (1921)

Courtesy R. K. Prabhu

Rest house, Dandi March

SALT SATYAGRAHA, 1930

Addressing en rout

Baton charge

Courtesy Gandhi Sangraha

"March to t

Death of volunteer, Babu Genu

Women vol

On S. S Rajputana

With Charlie Chaplin

At the rudder

On deck

In sculptor's studio

At 10 Downing Street

Courtesy :
Kusumben N Desai

On bridge

R. T. C. VISIT 1931

R T C. session

On way to R T C



Fast, 'Parnakuti,' Poona (1933)

Harijan tour (1934)
Courtesy N Jayan

Presiding at Gujarati Sahitya Parishad (1935)

Courtesy
Gandhi Sangrahalaya

Fasting (1933)

Courtesy
R K Prabhu

Rajkot fast (1939)

Courtesy
N Jayan

Literacy campaign (1939)

Photo D G Tendulkar

Last day at Sabarmati (1933)

Courtesy Gandhi Sangrahalaya

Harijan tour (1934)

Visit to Tuticorin

Simla (1939)

With Louis Fischer at Sevagram (1942)

With Vinoba Bhave, Individual Satyagraha (1940)

Journey by bus

Photos Kanu Gandhi

August 1942

Inset - Bhansali's fast

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADHIKARI, G.:

Gandhism—A review, 1940, Bombay.

ALEXANDER, H. G.:

The Indian Ferment, 1929, Williams & Norgate, London.

India since Cripps, 1944, Penguin, London.

ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE:

Congress and War Crisis, 1940, Allahabad.

ANDREWS, C. F.:

Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas, 1929, Allen & Unwin, London.

Mahatma Gandhi: His own Story, 1930, Allen & Unwin, London.

Mahatma Gandhi at Work, 1931, Allen & Unwin, London.

ATHALYE, D. V.:

Life of Mahatma Gandhi, 1923, Swadeshi Publishing Co., Poona.

BARDOLI INQUIRY COMMITTEE:

Report, 1928, Bombay.

BASU, NIRMAL KUMAR:

Studies in Gandhism, 1940, Indian Associated Pub. Co., Calcutta.

BOSE, SUBHAS CHANDRA :

The Indian Struggle, 1935, Wishart, London.

BRAILSFORD, H. N.:

Rebel India, 1931, Victor Gollancz, London.

BROCKWAY, FENNER A.:

The Indian Crisis, 1930, Victor Gollancz, London.

CONGRESS INQUIRY COMMITTEE:

Report on Civil Disobedience, 1922, Tagore & Co., Madras.

COUPLAND, PROF. R.:

The Constitutional Problem in India, 1944, Oxford University Press, London & Bombay.

DANTWALA, M. L.:

Gandhism Reconsidered, 1944, Padma Publications, Bombay.

DESAI, MAHADEV:

The Epic of Travancore, 1937, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Gandhiji in Indian Villages, 1927, S. Ganesan, Madras.
The Story of Bardoli, 1929, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
With Gandhiji in Ceylon, 1928, S. Ganesan, Madras.

DOKE, JOSEPH J.:

M. K. Gandhi, 1909, G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras.

DURANT, WILL:

The Case for India, 1930, Simon & Schuster, New York.

DUTT, R. PALME:

India Today, 1940, Victor Gollancz, London.

ELWIN, V., and WINSLOW, J.:

The Dawn of Indian Freedom, 1931, Allen & Unwin, London.

FIELDEN, LIONEL:

Beggar My Neighbour, 1943, Secker & Warburg, London.

FISCHER, LOUIS:

A Week with Gandhi, 1942, Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York.

FUELLOP-MILLER, RENE:

Gandhi and Lenin, 1930, Putnam, London.
Gandhi the Holy Man, 1931, Putnam, London.

GANDHI, M. K.:

Christian Missions, 1941, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Constructive Programme, 1941, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Conquest of Self, (compiled by R. K. Prabhu & U. R. Rao), 1943, Thacker & Co., Bombay.
Cent per Cent Swadeshi or The Economics of Village Industries, 1938, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Economics of Khadi, 1941, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Ethical Religion, 1930, S. Ganesan, Madras.
From Yeravda Mandir, 1937, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Gandhi Series, (Edited and published by A. T. Hingorani, Karachi.)
To the Students, 1935.
To the Women, 1941.
To the Hindus & the Muslims, 1942.
To the Princes & their People, 1942.
Our Language Problem, 1942.
My Appeal to the British, 1942.
Gandhiji's Correspondence with the Government (1942-44), 1945, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gita the Mother (Edited by Jag Parvesh Chander), 1932, Lahore.
A Guide to Health, 1921, S. Ganesan, Madras.
Hind Swaraj, 1938, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Hindu-Muslim Tension, 1924, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Indian States' Problem, 1941, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Jail Experiences, 1922, Tagore & Co., Madras.
My Early Life (Edited by Mahadev Desai), 1932, Oxford University Press, Bombay.
My Soul's Agony, 1932, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Nation's Voice, (Edited by C. Rajagopalachariar and J. C. Kumarappa), 1931, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Non-Violence in Peace & War, 1945, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Poona Statements (Correspondence between Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru), 1933, Lucknow.
Quit India (Edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao), 1942, Padma Publications, Bombay.
Rowlatt Bills and Satyagraha, 1919, G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras.
Satyagraha in Gandhiji's Own Words (1910-1935), 1935, All-India Congress Committee, Allahabad.
Satyagraha in South Africa, 1928, S. Ganesan, Madras.
Self-Restraint versus Self-Indulgence, Part I, 1930, Part II, 1939, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Speeches and Writings, 1933, G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras.
The Story of My Experiments with Truth, Vol. I (1927), Vol. II (1929), One Volume Edition, 1940, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Swadeshi, True and False, 1939, Poona.
Wheel of Fortune, 1922, Ganesh & Co., Madras.
Women and Social Injustice, 1942, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Young India, Volumes 1, 2, 3 (1919-22, 1924-26, 1927-28), Ganesan, Madras.
Indian Opinion, 1904-14, Natal.
Young India, 1919-1932, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Harijan, 1933-1940, 1942, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.

GEORGE, S. K.:

Gandhi's Challenge to Christianity, 1939. Allen & Unwin, London.

GHOSH P.C.:

From Nagpur to Lahore, 1931, Abhoy Ashram, Comilla.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA:

Congress Responsibility for the Disturbances (1942-43), 1943, New Delhi.
Correspondence with Mr. Gandhi, 1944, New Delhi.

GREGG, RICHARD B.:
A Discipline for Non-violence, 1941, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Economics of Khaddar, 1928, S. Ganesan, Madras.
The Power of Non-violence, 1938, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
The Psychology and Strategy of Non-violence, 1929, Madras.

HINDUSTAN TIMES:
India Unreconciled, 1943, New Delhi.
Gandhi-Jinnah Talks, 1944.

HINDUSTANI TALIMI SANGH:
Basic National Education, Syllabus, 1939, Sevagram.
Educational Reconstruction, 1940, Sevagram.
One Step Forward, 1940, Sevagram.

HOYLAND, J. S.:
Indian Crisis, 1944, Macmillan, New York.
The Case for India, 1929, London.

HUXLEY, ALDOUS:
Ends and Means, 1937, Chatto & Windus, London.

INDIAN OPINION:
Golden Number, (Passive Resistance Movement in South Africa, 1906-14), 1914, Phoenix, Natal.

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN:
Gandhiji's Leadership & The Congress Socialist Party, 1940.

KALELKAR, D. B.:
The Gospel of Swadeshi, 1922, S. Ganesan, Madras.

KRIPALANI, J. B.:
The Gandhian Way, 1938, Vora & Co., Bombay.

KRISHNADAS:
Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi, 1928, S. Ganesan, Madras.

KUMARAPPA, J. C.:
Why the Village Movement, 1936, Hindustan Publishing Co., Rajahmundry.

LAJPAT RAI, LALA:
Unhappy India, 1928, Banna Publishing Co., Calcutta.

LESTER, MURIEL:
Entertaining Gandhi, 1932, Ivor Nicholson & Watson, London.

MASHRUWALA, K. G.:
Practical Non-violence, 1941, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NATESAN, G. A.:
Mahatma Gandhi: The Man and His Mission, 1943, Madras

NEHRU, JAWAHARLAL:
An Autobiography, 1936, John Lane, London.
Eighteen Months in India, 1938, Kitabistan, Allahabad.
The Unity of India, 1941, Lindsay Drummond, London.

PATIL, S. K.:
March of Events, 1940, Bombay.

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE:
Correspondence between Mahatma Gandhi and P. C. Joshi, 1945, Bombay.

PESHAWAR CONGRESS INQUIRY COMMITTEE:
Report, 1930, Bombay.

POLAK, MILLIE GRAHAM:
Mr. Gandhi: The Man, 1931, Allen & Unwin, London.

PRABHU R. K. & RAU U. R.:
The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi, 1945, Oxford University Press, Bombay.

PRASAD, RAJENDRA:
Gandhiji in Champaran, 1928, S. Ganesan, Madras.

PUNJAB SUB-COMMITTEE, INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS:
Report, Vols. I & II, 1920, Lahore.

PYARELAL:
The Epic Fast, 1932, Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.

RADHAKRISHNAN, S.:
(Edited by), *Mahatma Gandhi*: Essays and Reflections on His Life and Work, 1939, Allen and Unwin, London.

REYNOLDS, REGINALD:
India, Gandhi and World Peace, 1931, London.

ROLLAND, ROMAIN:
Mahatma Gandhi, 1924, Allen & Unwin, London.

SHRIDHARANI, K.:
War Without Violence, 1939, Harcourt Brace & Co., New York.

SITARAMAYYA, PATTABHI:
Gandhi & Gandhism, Vols. I & II, 1924, Kitabistan, Allahabad.
History of the Indian National Congress, 1935, Allahabad.

SPRATT, P.:
Gandhism—an Analysis, 1939, Madras.

SUNDERLAND, J. T.:
India in Bondage, 1928, Modern Review, Calcutta.

THOMPSON, EDWARD:
Enlist India for Freedom, 1940, Victor Gollancz, London.

WALKER, ROY:
The Wisdom of Gandhi, 1943, Andrew Dakers Ltd., London.

ZACHARIAS, H. C. E.:
Renascent India, 1933, Allen & Unwin, London.