TEXT FLY WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

TEXT PROBLEM WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164540

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 040 G19S Accession No. 3079

Author Gandhi, M.K.

Title Speeches and writings of M.K. Gandhi. 1922.

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

OF

M. K. GANDHI

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION BY

MR. C. F. ANDREWS

AND A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

THIRD EDITION

G. A. NATESAN & CO., MADRAS

RUPEES THREE

If we would classify him with any of the supreme figures of human history, it must be with such august religious prophets as Confucius and Lao-tse, Buddha, Zoroaster and Mohammed, and, most truly of all, the Nazarene! Out of Asia, at long intervals of time, have arisen these inspired witnesses of God. One by one they have appeared to teach men by precept and example the law of life, and therewith to save the race. To-day, in this our time, there comes another of this sacred line, the Mahatma of India. In all reverence and with due regard for historic fact, I match this man with Jesus Christ:—Rev. Dr. Holmes. —Minister of the Community Church, New York City.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

THIS is an exhaustive, comprehensive and thoroughly up-to-date edition of Mr. Gandhi's Speeches and Writings revised and considerably amplified, with the addition of a large number of articles from *Young India* and *Navajivan* (rendered into English.) The inclusion of these papers have almost doubled the size of the old edition and the present collection runs to about 1,000 pages of well-arranged matter ranging over the whole period of Mr. Gandhi's public life. It opens with a succinct biographical sketch of Mr. Gandhi bringing the account of his life down to the historic trial and sentence. The Volume begins with the Indian South African Question and covers his views on indentured labour and Indians in the Colonies, his jail experiences in South Africa, his pronouncements on the Khaira and Champaran affairs, his discourses on Rowlatt Bills and Satyagraha, and finally his *Young India* and *Navajivan* articles on the Non-Co operation movement, including select papers on the Khilafat and Punjab wrongs, the Congress, Swadeshi, Boycott, *Charka*, National Education and Swaraj. The additional chapters are arranged under suitable headings and include his messages on the eve of and after the arrest, his statement before the court, the trial and judgment.

Then follows a symposium of appreciations from such diverse men as Tolstoy and Tagore, Prof. Gilbert Murray and Dr. Holmes of New York besides excerpts from the British and American press. The book which is bound in cloth and indexed contains portraits of Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi and three characteristic pictures of Mr. Gandhi taken at different periods of his life.

MAY, *1922.* G. A. NATESAN & CO.

CONTENTS

Introduction
By Mr. C. F. Andrews
M. K. Gandhi: A Sketch
South African Indian Question
The Beginning of the Struggle .. 1
Deputation to Lord Selborne .. 30
Mr. Gandhi's Address .. 32
Deputation to Lord Elgin .. 43
Before the Court in 1907 .. 50
Attitude towards the Assailants .. 54
The Issue at Stake .. 56
The Marriage Question .. 61
Before the Court in 1913 .. 66
The Solomon Commission .. 69
Should Indians have full Citizen Rights? .. 77
A Truce with the Government .. 80
The Settlement .. 83
Farewell Speech at Durban .. 85
Address to the Indentured Indians .. 89
Address to the Tamil Community .. 91
Farewell Speech at Johannesburg .. 95
Farewell to South Africa .. 102
Reception in England .. 107
Letter to Lord Crewe .. 108
Farewell to England .. 109
Reception in Bombay .. 110
Reception in Madras .. 112
The Indian South African League .. 115
Advice to South African Indians .. 117
Railway Restrictions in Transvaal .. 119
Indians in South Africa .. 122
Indian Rights in the Transvaal .. 125
Another S. A. Commission .. 129

Indians in the Colonies

Reciprocity Between India and the Dominions .. 131
Indian and European Emigrants .. 133
Indentured Labour .. 136
Indian Colonial Emigration .. 139
The Iniquities of the Indenture System .. 144
Imperial Conference Resolutions .. 149

Jail Experiences .. 152

Passive Resistance

How the Idea Originated .. 179
Soul Force *v.* Physical Force .. 180
The Origin of the Movement in South Africa . 181
The Genesis of Passive Resistance .. 182
Passive Resisters in the Tolstoy Farm .. 183
A Lesson to India .. 184
A Message to the Congress .. 185
The Gains of the Passive Resistance Struggle 188

The Champaran Enquiry

Labour Trouble in Behar .. 193

The Kaira Question

The Situation in Kaira .. 196
The Vow of Passive Resistance .. 199
Statement on the Kaira Distress .. 200
Reply to the Commissioner .. 206
The Meaning of the Covenant .. 210
Reply to Kaira Press Note .. 211
End of the Kaira Struggle .. 217
The Last Phase .. 221

Earlier Indian Speeches

The Duties of British Citizenship .. 225
A Plea for the Soul .. 226
On Anarchical Crimes .. 229
Loyalty to the British Empire .. 232
Advice to Students .. 233
Politics and the People .. 238
The Reward of Public Life .. 241

Earlier Indian Speeches—*contd.*

Three Speeches on Gokhale—
Unveiling Mr. Gokhale's Portrait .. 242
The Late Mr. Gokhale .. 244
Gokhale's Services to India .. 247
Hindu University Speech .. 249
The Benares Incident .. 258
Reply to Karachi Address .. 263
The Gurukula .. 265
Swadeshi .. 273
Ahimsa .. 282
Economic *vs.* Moral Progress .. 286
The Moral Basis of Co-operation .. 293
Third Class in Indian Railways .. 301
Vernaculars as Media of Instruction . 307
Social Service .. 309
True Patriotism .. 314
The Satyagrahasrama .. 316
Indian Merchants .. 330
National Dress .. 332
The Hindu-Mahomedan Problem .. 334
Gujarat Educational Conference .. 335
Gujarat Political Conference .. 372
Address to Social Service Conference .. 397
The Protection of the Cow .. 407
On Womanhood .. 411
Plea for Hindi .. 418
The Ahmedabad Mill Hands .. 420
A Letter to the Viceroy .. 426
Recruiting for the War .. 430
The Montagu Chelmsford Scheme .. 437
Present Top-heavy Administration .. 439

The Rowlatt Bills & Satyagraha

Manifesto to the Press .. 440
The Pledge .. 442
Speech at Allahabad .. 443
Speech at Bombay .. 444
Speech at Madras .. 446

The Rowlatt Bills & Satyagraha—*contd.*

Appeal to the Viceroy .. 450
The Satyagraha Day .. 454
Satyagraha Day in Madras .. 455
Message to Satyagrahis .. 460
The Delhi Incident .. 461
Message to Madras Satyagrahis .. 462
Message to the Bombay Citizens .. 463
Distribution of Prohibited Literature .. 466
Message After Arrest .. 468
The "Satyagrahi" .. 470
Satyagraha and Duragraha .. 471
Speech at Ahmedabad .. 473
Temporary Suspension of the Movement .. 479

Non-Co-Operation

The Punjab & Khilafat Wrongs .. 481
The Amritsar Appeals .. 484
The Khilafat Question .. 487
"Why I have Joined the Khilafat Movement" 491
Congress Report on the Punjab Disorders .. 494
The Punjab Disorder: A Personal Statement 500
How to Work Non-Co-operation .. 507
Open Letter to Lord Chelmsford . 511
Political Freemasonry .. 515
Courts and Schools .. 520
Speech at Madras .. 524
Speech at the Special Congress .. 541
Swaraj in one Year .. 548
"To Every Englishman in India" .. 553
The Creed of the Congress .. 561
Appeal to Young Bengal .. 565
Open Letter to the Duke of Connaught .. 569
The Need for Humility .. 573
Strikes .. 574
The Malegaon Incident .. 577
The Simla Visit .. 579
The Ali Brothers' Apology .. 585
Violence and Non-Violence .. 593

Non-Co-Operation—*contd.*

Appeal to the Women of India .. 597
The Arrest of the Ali Brothers .. 601
Manifesto on Freedom of Opinion .. 606
The Great Sentinel .. 607
Honour the Prince .. 614
The Bombay Riots—
The Statement .. 617
Message to the Citizens of Bombay .. 623
Appeal to the Hooligans of Bombay .. 625
Appeal to his Co-Workers .. 628
Peace at Last .. 631
The Moral Issue .. 633
Civil Disobedience .. 636
The Moplah Outbreak .. 640
Reply to Lord Ronaldshay .. 642
The Round Table Conference .. 647
The Ahmedabad Congress Speech .. 650
The Independence Resolution .. 655
The Bombay Conference .. 657
Letter to H. E. the Viceroy .. 666
Reply to the Government of India .. 670
The Crime of Chauri Chaura .. 679
In Defence of the Bardoli Decisions .. 689
The Delhi Resolutions .. 695
Reply to Critics .. 703
A Divine Warning .. 720

On the Eve of Arrest

"If I am Arrested." .. 726
Message to Co-Workers .. 732
Message to Kerala .. 734

After the Arrest

The Arrest .. 735
The Message of the Charka .. 736
Letter to Hakim Ajmal Khan .. 737
Letter to Srimati Urmila Devi .. 742
Interview in Jail .. 742

After the Arrest—*contd.*

Letter to Moulana Abdul Bari .. 745
Message to the Parsis .. 746
Truth of the Spinning Wheel .. 747
Letter to Mr. Andrews .. 748

The Great Trial

Statement Before the Court .. 749
Written Statement .. 751
The Judgment .. 757
Mr. Gandhi's Reply .. 758
Message to the Country .. 758

Jail Life in India

The Meaning of the Imprisonments .. 759
Work in Gaols .. 763
A Model Prisoner .. 766

Miscellaneous

A Confession of Faith .. 769
Passive Resisters in the Tolstoy Farm .. 773
The Rationale of Suffering .. 774
The Theory and Practice of Passive Resistance 776
On Soul Force and Indian Politics .. 779
Rights and Duties of Labour .. 784
The Doctrine of the Sword .. 788
The Gujarat National University .. 793
Indian Medicine .. 798
Hindustani and English .. 800
Social Boycott .. 802
"Neither a Saint nor a Politician" .. 805
Hindu-Moslem Unity .. 811
Untouchability .. 815
Gokhale, Tilak and Mehta .. 818
The Fear of Death .. 823
Hinduism .. 826
National Education .. 834
From Satyagraha to Non-Co-Operation .. 838
Introspection .. 841
The Spinning Wheel .. 844
Love, not Hate .. 846

Appendix I

Mr. Gandhi's Religion .. 1
The Rules and Regulations of Satyagrahasrama 5
The Memorial to Mr. Montagu .. 10
The Swadeshi Vow .. 12

Appendix II—Appreciations.

Count Leo Tolstoy .. 17
Prof. Gilbert Murray .. 17
Lord Hardinge .. 20
Lord Ampthill .. 20
The Lord Bishop of Madras .. 20
Lord Gladstone .. 21
The Hon. Mr. Jameson .. 21
Sir Henry Cotton .. 21
Mr. Charles Roberts, M. P. .. 21
Senator W. P. Schreiner .. 22
G. K. Gokhale .. 22
Rev. Joseph Doke .. 23
Mrs. Annie Besant .. 24
Sir P. M. Mehta .. 24
Mrs. Sarojini Naidu .. 24
Dr. Subramania Iyer .. 25
Sir Rabindranath Tagore .. 25
Bal Gangadhar Tilak .. 25
Lala Lajpat Rai .. 26
Dr. J. H. Holmes .. 26
Mr. W. W. Pearson .. 27
Mr. Percival Landon .. 27
Col. J. C. Wedgwood, M. P. .. 28
Mr. Blanch Watson .. 28
Mr. Ben Spoor, M P. .. 28
Mr. S. E Stokes .. 30
Vincent Anderson .. 30
Sir Valentine Chirol .. 30
Mr. C. F. Andrews .. 30
S. W. Clemes .. 32
Mr. W. E. Johnson .. 32

Appendix II—Appreciations—*contd.*
The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri .. 33
Mr. H. S. L. Polak .. 38
Mr. K. Natarajan .. 45
Mrs. Sarojini Naidu .. 45
Babu Dwijendranath Tagore .. 46
Index .. i
Illustrations
Mr. & Mrs. Gandhi
Three Portraits of Gandhi

INTRODUCTION.

It appears to me unnecessary for any prefatory note to be written to the Life and Speeches of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi; they live and speak for themselves. Personally, I have had such a great shrinking from writing anything, during his life-time, about one whom I reverence so deeply, that I have many times refused to do so. But a promise given in an unguarded moment now claims fulfilment, and I will write very briefly.

To Mr. Gandhi, any swerving from the truth, even in casual utterance, is intolerable; his speeches must be read as stating uncompromisingly what he feels to be true. They are in no sense diplomatic, or opportunist, or merely 'political,' using the word in its narrower sense. He never pays empty compliments: he never hesitates to say, for the truth's sake, what may be unpalatable to his audience.

I shrink, as I have said, out of the very reverence that I have for him, from writing for the cold printed page about his character; but I may perhaps not offend by setting down something, however inadequate, concerning his intellectual convictions. It is of the utmost importance to understand these; because, in his case, they are held so strongly, as to bind fast his whole life and to stamp it with an originality, all its own.

The greatest of all these is his conviction of the eternal and fundamental efficacy of *ahimsa*. What this means to him, will be explained a hundred times over in the writings which follow. To Mr. Gandhi,—it would not be too much to say,—*ahimsa* is the key to all higher existence. It is the divine life itself. I have never yet been able to reconcile this with his own recruiting campaign, for war purposes, during the year 1918. But he was, himself, able to reconcile it; and some day, no doubt, he will give

to the world the logical background of that reconciliation. Leaving aside the question of this exceptional case, I do not think that there has been any more vital and inspiring contribution to ethical truth, in our own generation, than Mr. Gandhi's fearless logic in the practice of *ahimsa*. Sir Gilbert Murray's article in the *Hibbert Journal* has made this fact known to the larger world of humanity outside India.

A second intellectual conviction is the paramount use of religious vows in the building up of the spiritual life. Personally, I find it far more difficult to follow Mr. Gandhi here. Especially I dread the vow of celibacy which he, not unfrequently, recommends. It appears to me unnatural and abnormal. But here, again, he has often told me, I do not understand his position.

The further convictions, which are expressed in his writing, concerning the dignity and necessity for manual labour,—the simplification of society,—the healing powers of nature as a remedy for all disease,—the *Swadeshi* spirit, —the false basis of modern civilisation, —all these will be studied with the deepest interest. They will be seen, through Mr. Gandhi's Speeches, in a perspective which has not been made evident in any other writer. For, whatever may be our previous opinion, whether we agree or disagree with Mr. Gandhi's position, he compels us to think anew and to discard conventional opinion.

It is necessary to add to these very brief notes (which I had already published in an earlier edition of this book) a statement with regard to Mahatma Gandhi's intellectual position on the subject of the 'British Constitution' and the 'British Empire.'

I have heard him say, again and again, to those who were in highest authority: "If I did not believe that racial equality was to be obtained within the British Empire, I should be a rebel."

At the close of the great and noble passive resistance struggle in South Africa, he explained his own standpoint in Johannesburg, in his farewell words, as follows:—

"It is my knowledge, right or wrong, of the British constitution, which has bound me to the British Empire. Tear that constitution to shreds, and my loyalty will also be torn to shreds. On the other hand, keep it intact, and you hold me bound unreservedly in its service. The choice has lain before us, who are Indians in South Africa, either to sunder ourselves from the British Empire, or to struggle by means of passive resistance in order that the ideals of the British Constitution may be preserved,—but only *those* ideals. The theory of racial equality in the eyes of the Law, once recognised, can never be departed from; and its principle must at all costs be maintained,—the principle, that is to say, that in all the legal codes, which bind the Empire together, there shall be no racial taint, no racial distinction, no colour disability."

I have summarised, in the above statement, the speech which Mahatma Gandhi delivered on a very memorable occasion at Johannesburg, before a European audience, and I do not think that he has ever departed from the convictions which he then uttered in public. What has impressed me most of all, has been his unlimited patience. Even now, when he has again been imprisoned by the present rulers of the British Empire, who have charge of Indian affairs, he has not despaired of the British Empire itself. According to his own opinion, it is these rulers themselves who have been untrue to the underlying principle of that Empire.

A short time before Mahatma Gandhi's arrest, when I was with him in Ahmedabad, he blamed me very severely indeed for my lack of faith in the British connexion and for my publicly putting forward a demand for complete independence. He said to me openly that I had done a great deal of mischief by such advocacy of independence. If I interpret him rightly his own position at that time was this. He had lost faith in the British Administration in India,—it was a Satanic Government. But he had not lost faith in the British Constitution itself. He still believed that India could remain within the British Empire

on the basis of racial equality, and that the principle of racial equality would come out triumphantly vindicated after the present struggle in India was over. Indeed, he held himself to be the champion of that theory, and the upholder of the British Constitution.

Whether that belief, which he has held so persistently and patiently all these years, will be justified at last, time alone can show. I remember how impressed I was at the time by the fact that he, who had been treated so disgracefully time after time in South Africa, should still retain his faith in the British character. I said to him, "It would almost seem as if you had more faith in my own countrymen than I have myself." He said to me, "That may be true,"—and I felt deeply his implied rebuke.


I have gone through carefully the words he employed later at the time of his trial, and in spite of all that he said with such terrible severity concerning the evil effect of British Rule in India, I do not think that he has actually departed from the position which runs through all the speeches in this book from beginning to end. He still trusts that the temper and character of the British people will change for the better, and that the principle of racial equality will finally be acknowledged in actual deed, not merely in word. If that trust is realised, then he is prepared to remain within the British Empire. But if that trust is ultimately shattered, then he will feel that at last the time has come to sever once and for all the British connexion.

Shantiniketan,
May, 1922.

C. F. ANDREWS.



THREE CHARACTERISTIC PORTRAITS OF MR. GANDHI.



MR. AND MRS. GANDHI.

M. K. GANDHI

A SKETCH OF HIS LIFE AND WORK.

A Scene in Johannesburg

THE scene is laid in Johannesburg. Summer is coming and the days are lengthening out. At Park Station, at 6 o'clock on a Sunday evening, in September 1908, whilst it was still broad daylight, a small animated group of dark-skinned people might have been observed eagerly looking in the direction from which the mail train from Natal, that stops at Volksrust, was expected. The watchers were Madrassi hawkers, who were apparently awaiting the arrival of one affectionately regarded by them. Punctually to time, the train steamed in and there was observed, descending from a second-class compartment, attended by a prison-warder in uniform, a small, slim, dark, active man with calm eyes and a serene countenance. He was clad in the garb of a South African native convict—small military cap, that did not protect him from the sun, loose, coarse jacket, bearing a numbered ticket and marked with the broad arrow, short trousers, one leg dark, the other light, similarly marked, thick grey woollen socks and leather sandals. But it was plain that he was not a South African native, and upon closer scrutiny, one became aware that he, too, was an Indian, like those who respectfully saluted him, as he turned quietly to the warder for instructions. He was carrying a white canvas bag, which held his clothing and other effects found upon him when he was received by the gaol authorities, and also a small basket containing books. He had been sent by the Government to travel nearly two hundred miles, for many hours, without food or the means of procuring it, as the warder

had no funds for that purpose and but for the charity of a European friend—a Government official—he would have had to starve for twenty-four hours. A brief consultation ensued between the prisoner and the warder. The latter appeared to realise the incongruity of the situation, for he bore himself towards the prisoner with every reasonable mark of respect. The latter was evidently a person of some importance, to whom a considerable amount of deference should be shown. The subject of conversation was whether the prisoner preferred to go by cab or to walk to the gaol. If the former, he (the prisoner) would have to pay for it. He, however, declined the easier method of locomotion, choosing to walk three-quarters of a mile in broad day-light, in his convict suit, to the gaol and resolutely shouldering his bag, he briskly stepped out, the Madrassi hawkers shamefacedly following at some distance. Later, he disappeared within the grim portals of the Johannesburg gaol, above which is carved, in Dutch, the motto, "Union makes strength."

Five years have passed. On the dusty, undulating road from Standerton to Greylingstad, for a distance of three miles, is seen a long, trailing "army" of men who, on closer inspection, are recognisable as Indians of the labouring classes, to the number of some two thousand. Upon questioning them, it would be found that they had been gathered from the coal mines of Northern Natal, where they had been working under indenture, or as "free" men, liable to the £3 annual tax upon the freedom of themselves, their wives, their sons of 16 years and their daughters of thirteen. They had marched from Newcastle to Charlestown, whence they had crossed the border into the Transvaal, at Volksrust. They were now marching stolidly and patiently on, until they reached Tolstoy Farm, near Johannesburg, or they were arrested, as prohibited immigrants, by the Government. Thus they had marched for several days on a handful of rice, bread and sugar a day, carrying with them all their few worldly belongings, hopeful that, at the end, the burden of the hated £ 3 tax would be removed from their shoulders. They appeared

to place implicit trust in a small, limping, bent, but dogged man, coarsely dressed, and using a staff, painfully marching at the head of the straggling column, but with a serene and peaceful countenance, and a look of sureness and content. A nearer inspection of this strange figure discloses the same individual that we have already seen entering the forbidding portals of the "Fort," at Johannesburg. But how much older looking and care-worn! He has taken a vow to eat only one poor meal a day, until the iniquitous tax upon the honour and chastity of his brothers and sisters shall have been repealed. Upon him, as the foremost protagonist of the movement, has fallen the main burden and responsibility of organising one of the greatest and noblest protests against tyranny that the world has ever seen during the preceding seven years. Time has left its mark upon him!

Nine more years have passed. Bent down by the weight of years, but resolute of heart, that same figure is yet the cynosure of all eyes. The scene is laid now in Ahmedabad where thousands of Khadder-clad pilgrims march in solemn array to the court-house and await "the man of destiny." It was twelve noon on the 18th of March. That same frail figure in a loin cloth, with the dear old familiar smile of deep content, enters the court-house. The whole court suddenly rises to greet the illustrious prisoner. "This looks like a family gathering," says he with the benignant smile of his. The heart of the gathering throbs with alternate hopes and fears but the august prisoner, pure of heart and meek of spirit, is calm like the deep sea. In a moment the great trial had begun; and as the prisoner made his historic statement, tears were seen trickling down the cheeks of the stoutest of hearts. "I wish to endorse all the blame that the Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders," says he with perfect candour. "To preach disaffection to the existing system of Government has become almost a passion with me. * * * I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here therefore to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what

appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen." And then follows the terrible inditement of the Government. The judge himself is deeply moved. He feels the greatness of the occasion and in slow and deliberate accents he says: "It will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that in the eyes of millions of your countrymen you are a great patriot and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and even saintly life." But, Oh, the irony of it! "I have to deal with you in one character only * * to judge you as a man subject to the law who has by his own admission broken the law and committed, what to an ordinary man must appear to be, grave offences against the state." A sentence of six years' simple imprisonment is passed; but the judge adds: "that if the course of events in India should make it possible for the Government to reduce the period and release you, no one will be better pleased than I" And the prisoner thanks the judge and there is perfect good humour. Was there ever such a trial in the history of British Courts or any other court for the matter of that? And finally he bids farewell to the tearful throng pressing forward to touch the bare feet of him whose presence was a benediction!

The man is Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Dewan's son, Barrister-at-Law, scholar, student, cultured Indian gentleman "farmer, weaver," and leader of his people. Because he preferred to obey the dictates of conscience, because he placed honour before comfort or even life itself, because he chose not to accept an insult to his Motherland, because he strove so that right should prevail and that his people might have life, a civilised, Christian Government in a Colony over which waves the British flag, deemed that the best way to overcome such dangerous contumacy was to cast his body into gaol, where at one time he was compelled to herd with and starve upon the diet of the most degraded aboriginal native felons, men barely emerging from the condition of brute beasts, or rather, with all their

human aspirations and instincts crushed out of them by the treatment accorded to them under the "civilising" process of the Transvaal's colour legislation. And, again obeying the behests of conscience, believing that he best serves India so, he has again chosen the refuge of prison, convinced like Thoreau that he is freer than his gaolers or those who mourn for him, but do not liberate themselves from bondage.

EARLY LIFE AND EDUCATION

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born on the 2nd October, 1869. Though he has a Brahmin's spirituality and desire to serve and teach, he is not a Brahmin. Though he has a Kshattriya's courage and devotion, he is not a Kshattriya. He belongs to an old Bania family resident in Kathiawar, politics being a heritage of the family. His forefathers were Dewans of the State of Porbandar in that Province, his father having been Dewan of that State for 25 years, as also of Rajkote and other States in Kathiawar. He was likewise, at one time, a member of the Rajasthanik Sabha, having been nominated thereto by the Government of Bombay. Mr. Gandhi's father was known to and loved by all with whom he came in contact and he did not hesitate, if need came, to oppose the will of the Rana of Porbandar and of the Political Agent, when he thought that they were adopting a wrong or unworthy line of conduct. This particular trait has evidently descended to his youngest son. Mr. Gandhi's mother was an orthodox Hindu lady, rigid in her observance of religious obligations, strict in the performance of her duties as wife and mother, and stern in determination that her children should grow up good and honest men and women. Between her youngest son and herself existed a strong affection and her religious example and influence left a lasting impression upon his character. Mohandas Gandhi received his education partly in Kathiawar and partly in London. It was only with the greatest difficulty that his mother could be prevailed upon to consent to his crossing the waters, and before doing so, she exacted from

him a threefold vow, administered by a Jain priest that he would abstain from flesh, alcohol and women. And this vow was faithfully and whole-heartedly kept amidst all the temptations of student life in London. Young Gandhi became an under-graduate of the London University and afterwards joined the Inner Temple, whence he emerged in due course a barrister-at law. He returned to India immediately after his call, and was at once admitted as an Advocate of the Bombay High Court, in which capacity he began practice with some success.

VISIT TO SOUTH AFRICA

In 1893, Mr. Gandhi was induced to go to South Africa, proceeding to Natal and then to the Transvaal, in connection with an Indian legal case of some difficulty. Almost immediately upon landing at Durban, disillusionment awaited him. Brought up in British traditions of the equality of all British subjects, an honoured guest in the capital of the Empire, he found that in the British Colony of Natal, he was regarded as a pariah, scarcely higher than a savage aboriginal native of the soil. He appealed for admission as an Advocate of the Supreme Court of Natal, but his application was opposed by the Law Society on the ground that the law did not contemplate that a coloured person should be admitted to practise. Fortunately, the Supreme Court viewed the matter in a different light and granted the application. But Mr. Gandhi received sudden warning of what awaited him in the years to come.

In 1894, on the urgent invitation of the Natal Indian community, he decided to remain in the Colony, in order that he might be of service in the political troubles that he foresaw in the near future. In that year, together with a number of prominent members of the community he founded the Natal Indian Congress, being for some years its honorary secretary, in which capacity he drafted a number of petitions and memorials admirable in construction, lucid and simple in phraseology, clear and concise in the manner of setting forth the subject matter. He took a leading part in the successful attempt to defeat the Asiatics' Exclusion Act passed by the Natal Parliament

and in the unsuccessful one to prevent the disfranchisement of the Indian community, though the effort made obliged the Imperial authorities to insist that this disfranchisement should be effected along non-racial lines. At the end of 1895, he returned to India, being authorised by the Natal and Transvaal Indians to represent their grievances to the Indian public. This he did by means of addresses and a pamphlet, the mutilated contents of which were summarised by Reuter and cabled to Natal, where they evoked a furious protest on the part of the European colonists. The telegram ran thus : " 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. The *Times of India* advocates an enquiry into these allegations "

This message was certainly not the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, though it had elements of truth in it About the same time, Mr. Gandhi returned to Durban with his family, and with him, though independently of him, travelled several compatriots. The rumour arose that he was bringing with him a number of skilled Indian workers with the express object of ousting the European artisans from the field of employment, and the two circumstances combined to stimulate in the colonists, high and low alike, all the worst passions, and feeling ran so high that the Attorney-General, Mr. Escombe, felt himself obliged to side with the popular party, and accordingly gave instructions that the vessels bringing Mr. Gandhi and his companions should be detained in quarantine. The quarantine was only raised when the ship-owners announced their intention of taking legal action against the Government. The vessels now came alongside the wharf, but the crowd that assembled became so hostile that a police inspector, who came on board, warned Mr. Gandhi of his own personel danger if he landed then, and urged him to delay the landing until night. A little later, however, a well-known member of the Natal Bar came on board specially to greet Mr. Gandhi and offer his services, and Mr. Gandhi at once determined to land without waiting for darkness to

come, trusting, as he himself expressed it, to the British sense of justice and fair-play. He was soon recognised, however, set upon, and half-killed, when the wife of the superintendent of police, who recognised him, ran to his rescue, and, raising her umbrella over him, defied the crowd and accompanied him to the store of an Indian friend. Mr. Gandhi was, however, in order to save his friend's property, obliged to escape disguised as a police constable.

The affair was at an end, popular passions calmed down, and the newspapers apologised to him, though the incident demonstrated the temper of the mob towards the resident Indian community. Years afterwards, meeting Mr. Gandhi one day, Mr. Escombe expressed profound regret at his connection with this unsavoury business, declaring that, at the time, he was unacquainted with Mr. Gandhi's personal merits and those of the community to which he belonged. Half-an-hour later he was found dead in the streets, stricken down by heart-disease.

BOER WAR AND THE INDIAN AMBULANCE CORPS

In 1899, at the outbreak af the Anglo-Boer War, Mr. Gandhi, after considerable opposition, induced the Government to accept the offer of an Indian Ambulance Corps. The Corps was one thousand strong and saw active service, being on one occasion, at least, under heavy fire, and on another, removing the dead body of Lord Robert's only son from the field. The Corps was favourably reported on, and Mr. Gandhi was mentioned in despatches and afterwards awarded the war medal. His object in offering the services of a body of Indian to do even the most menial work was to show that the Indian community desired to take their full share of public responsibilities, and that just as they knew how to demand rights, so they also knew to assume obligations. And that has been the keynote of Mr. Gandhi's public work from the beginning.

Writing in the *Illustrated Star* of Johannesburg in July 1911, a European, who had taken part in that campaign, says :—

My first meeting with Mr. M. K. Gandhi was under strange circumstances. It was on the road from Spion Kop, after the

fateful retirement of the British troops in January, 1900. The previous afternoon I saw the Indian mule-train moved up the slopes of the Kop carrying water to the distressed soldiers who had lain powerless on the plateau. The mules carried the water in immense bags, one on each side, led by Indians at their heads. The galling rifle-fire, which heralded their arrival on the top, did not deter the strangely-looking cavalcade, which moved slowly forward, and as an Indian fell, another quietly stepped forward to fill the vacant place. Afterwards the grim duty of the bearer corps, which Mr. Gandhi organised in Natal, began. It was on such occasions the Indians proved their fortitude, and the one with the greatest fortitude of all was the subject of this sketch. After a night's work which had shattered men with much bigger frames. I came across Gandhi in the early morning sitting by the roadside—eating a regulation Army biscuit. Every man in Buller's force was dull and depressed, and damnation was heartly invoked on everything. But Gandhi was stoical in his bearing, cheerful, and confident in his conversation, and had a kindly eye. He did one good. It was an informal introduction, and it led to a friendship. I saw the man and his small undisciplined corps on many a field of battle during the Natal campaign. When succour was to be rendered they were there. Their unassuming dauntlessness cost them many lives, and eventually an order was published forbidding them to go into the firing-line. Gandhi simply did his duty then, and his comment the other evening in the moment of his triumph, at the dinner to the Europeans who had supported the Indian movement, when some hundreds of his countrymen and a large number of Europeans paid him a noble tribute, was that he had simply done his duty.

RETURN TO INDIA

In 1901, owing to a breakdown in health, Mr. Gandhi came to India, taking his family with him. Before he went, however, the Natal Indian community presented him, Mrs. Gandhi, and his children with valuable gold plate and jewellery. He refused, however, to accept a single item of this munificent gift, putting it on one side to be used for public purposes, should the need arise. The incident but endeared him the more to the people, who realised once again how selfless was the work that he had so modestly and unassumingly undertaken. Before the Ambulance Corps left for the front, its members had been publicly entertained by the late Sir John Robinson, then Prime Minister of Natal, and on the occasion of the presentation to Mr. Gandhi by the Indian community, he addressed a

letter to the organisers of the ceremony, in which, after excusing his unavoidable absence, he said :—

It would have given me great pleasure to have been present on the occasion of so well-earned a mark of respect to our able and distinguished fellow-citizen, Mr. Gandhi. . . . . Not the less heartily do I wish all success to this public recognition of the good work done and the many services rendered to the community by Mr. Gandhi.

On his arrival in Bombay Mr. Gandhi once more resumed practice, as he then had no intention of returning to South Africa, believing that with the end of the war, a new era had arrived.

BACK TO SOUTH AFRICA

Scarcely, however, had he returned from the Calcutta Congress, where, under Mr. Wacha, he did some very useful organising work unobtrusively, when he received an urgent telegram from Natal, peremptorily calling him back to South Africa to draft the memorials to Mr. Chamberlain, whose visit was imminent, to take charge of the work required to secure the removal of existing grievances and to place Indian affairs finally on a higher level. Without a moment's hesitation he obeyed the call of duty, and a new chapter opened in his life. In Natal, he had been able to overcome official prejudice and was high in the esteem of all those heads of departments and ministers with whom his public duties brought him into contact. But when, after heading a deputation to Mr. Chamberlain in Natal, he was called to the Transvaal for a similar purpose, he found all officialdom hostile, and he was refused the right to attend upon Mr. Chamberlain as a member of a deputation of Transvaal Indians; and it was only after the utmost endeavours that he prevailed upon the Indian community to send a deputation that did not include him. Finding that the situation was becoming rapidly worse and being without a trained guide, the Transvaal Indians pressed him to remain with them, and this he at last consented to do, being admitted to practise as an Attorney of the Supreme Court of the Transvaal. In 1903 together with other communal leaders, he founded the Transvaal British Indian Association, of which until his final

departure from South Africa, he was the Honorary Secretary and principal legal adviser.

FOUNDING OF "THE INDIAN OPINION"

About the middle of 1903, it had occurred to him that, if the South African Indians were to be brought into closer association with each other and with their European fellow-colonists, and to be politically and socially educated, it was absolutely necessary to have a newspaper, and, after consultation, he provided the greater part of the capital for its inauguration, with the late Mr. M. H. Nazar as editor, and thus the *Indian Opinion* was born. It was first published in English, Gujarati, Hindi and Tamil. For various reasons it afterwards became necessary to dispense with the Tamil and Hindi columns. But although Mr. Gandhi, had, in theory, delegated much of the work of conducting the paper to others, he was unremitting in his own efforts to make it a success. His purse was ever open to make good the deficits that continually occurred owing to the circumstances of its production, and to its English and Gujarati columns he contributed month after month and year after year out of the fund of his own political and spiritual wisdom and his unique knowledge of South African Indian affairs.

Towards the end of 1904, however, finding that the paper was absorbing most of the money that could be spared without making any appreciable financial headway, he went to Durban to investigate the situation. During the journey he became absorbed in the perusal of Ruskin's "Unto this Last," and he received certain impressions that were confirmed whilst on a visit to some relatives, who had started a trading enterprise in an up-country village. His conclusions were that the town conditions in which the paper was produced were such as almost to compel unlimited waste, to act as a check upon the originality and individuality of the workers, and to prevent the realisation of his dearest desire to so infuse the columns of the paper with a spirit of tolerance and persuasiveness as to bring together all that was best in the European and Indian communities, whose fate it was to dwell side by side, either

mutally hostile to or suspicious of each other, or amicably co-operating in the securing of the welfare of the State and the building-up, of a wise-administration of its assets.

THE PHŒNIX SETTLEMENT

Accordingly, he determined that the very first thing to be done was to put an end to the divorce of the workers from the land, and from this determination arose what has since become known as the Phoenix Settlement. Phoenix is situated about 12 miles from Durban, in the midst of a sugar-growing country, and Mr. Gandhi invested his savings, in the purchase of an estate of about 100 acres of land about two miles distant from the station, on which were erected the press buildings and machinery. A number of selected Indians and Europeans were invited to become settlers, and the original conditions were these—that they should have entire management of all the assets of the press, including the land itself; that each should practically vow himself to a life of poverty, accepting no more £3 (Rs. 45) a month, expenses being high in South Africa, and an equal share in the profits, if any; that a house should be built for him, for which he should pay when able, and in whatever instalments might seem suitable to him, without interest; that he should have two acres of land as his own for cultivation, payment being on similar conditions, and that he should devote himself to working for the public good, *Indian Opinion* being meanwhile the mainspring of the work. Whilst the fundamental principles remained, it became necessary later, in the light of further experience, to modify these conditions. Subsequently the Phoenix settlers extended the scope of their labours, to the task of educating some at least of the children of the lakh-and-a-half of Indians in South Africa. It is true that, in comparison with the magnitude of the task, only a small beginning was made, but this was principally due to the lack of qualified workers and also to the state of the exchequer.

SERVICE IN PLAGUE AREAS

In 1904, an outbreak of plague occurred in the Indian Location, Johannesburg, largely owing to gross negligence

on the part of the Municipal authorities, in spite of repeated warnings of the insanitary conditions prevailing. A week before the official announcement of the outbreak, Mr. Gandhi sent a final warning that plague had already broken out, but his statement was officialy denied. When, however, a public admission of the existence of plague could no longer be withheld, but before the Municipal authorities had taken any steps to cope with the disease, he at once organised a private hospital and nursing home, and, together with a few devoted friends, personally tended the plague patients; and this work was formally appreciated by the Municipal authorities. In the same year, owing to arbitration proceedings between expropriated Indian standholders in the Location and the Johannesburg Municipality, in which he was busily engaged, he earned large professional fees which he afterwards devoted in their entirety to public purposes.

LEADING A STRETCHER BEARER CORPS

In 1906, a native rebellion broke out in Natal due to many causes, but realising that bloodshed was imminent and that hospital work would necessarily ensue therefrom, Mr. Gandhi offered, on behalf of the Natal Indians, a Stretcher Bearer Corps, which, after some delay, was accepted. Meanwhile, he had sent his family to Phoenix, where he thought it was most proper that they should live, rather than in the dirt, noise, and restlessness of the town. He himself volunteered to lead the Corps, which was on active service for a month, being mentioned in despatches and publicly congratulated and thanked by the Governor for the valuable services rendered. Each member of the Corps has had awarded to him the medal especially struck for the occasion, and as an indication of the manner in which the Transvaal Government appreciated the work so selflessly performed by Mr. Gandhi and his Corps, it may be noted that, together with at least three other members of the Corps, as well as some who belonged to or helped to fit out the old Ambulance Corps, he was flung into gaol, to associate with criminals of the lowest type. The work of the Corps was, besides that of carrying stretch-

ers and marching on foot behind mounted infantry, through dense bush, sometimes thirty miles a day, in the midst of a savage enemy's country unarmed and unprotected to perform the task of hospital assistants and to nurse the wounded natives, who had been callously shot down by the colonial troopers, or had been cruelly lashed by military command. Mr. Gandhi does not like to speak his mind about what he saw or learnt on this occasion. But many times he must have had searchings of conscience as to the propriety of his allying himself, even in that merciful capacity, with those capable of such acts of revolting and inexcusable brutality. However, it is well to know that nearly all his solicitude was exercised on behalf of aboriginal native patients, and one saw the Dewan's son ministering to the needs and allaying the sufferings of some of the most undeveloped types of humanity, whose odour, habits and surroundings must have been extremely repugnant to a man of refined tastes—though Mr. Gandhi himself will not admit this.

ANTI-ASIATIC LAW AND PASSIVE RESISTANCE

Scarcely had he returned to Johannesburg to resume practice (he had left his office to look after itself during his absence), than a thunderbolt was launched by the Transvaal Government by the promulgation of the Draft Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance, whose terms are now familiar throughout the length and breadth of India. After years of plotting and scheming, the anti-Asiatics of the Transvaal, having first secured the willing services of an administrative department anxious to find an excuse for the continuance of its own existence, compelled the capitulation of the executive itself with the afore-mentioned result. Mr. Gandhi at once realised what was afoot, and understood, immediately that, unless the Indian community adopted a decided attitude of protest, which would be backed up, if necessary, by resolute action, the whole Indian population of South Africa was doomed, and he accordingly took counsel with the leading members of the community, who agreed that the measure must be fought to the bitter end.

Mr. Gandhi is chiefly responsible for the initiation of the policy of passive resistance that was so successfully carried out by the Indians of South Africa during the next eight years. Since that day, Mr. Gandhi's history has been mainly that of the Passive Resistance struggle. All know how he took the oath not to submit to the Law on the 11th September, 1906; how he went to England with a compatriot in the same year, and how their vigorous pleading induced Lord Elgin to suspend the operation of the objectionable piece of legislation: how, when the law finally received the Royal assent, he threw himself into the forefront of the fight, and, by speech, pen, and example, inspired the whole community to maintain an adamantine front to the attack that was being made upon the very foundations of its religion, its national honour, its racial self-respect, its manhood. No one was, therefore, surprised when, at the end of 1907, Mr. Gandhi was arrested, together with a number of other leaders, and consigned to gaol! or how, when he heard that some of his friends in Pretoria had been sentenced to six months' imprisonment with hard labour, the maximum penalty, he pleaded with the Magistrate to impose the penalty upon him too, as he had been the acknowledged leader and inspirer of the opposition against this Law. To him it was a terrible shock that his followers were being more harshly treated than he himself, and it was with bowed head and deep humiliation that he left the court, sentenced to two months' simple imprisonment only. Happily, the Government realised the seriousness of the situation, and after three weeks' imprisonment of the leading passive resisters, General Smuts opened negotiations with them, and a compromise was effected between him and the Indian community, partly written, partly verbal, whereby voluntary registration, which had been repeatedly offered, was accepted conditionally upon the Law being subsequently repealed. This promise of repeal was made personally to Mr. Gandhi by General Smuts in the presence of official witnesses. When, shortly afterwards, Mr. Gandhi was nearly killed by a few of his more fanati-

cal countrymen (who thought he had betrayed them to the Government) as he was on his way to the Registration Office of carry out his pledge to the Government, he issued a letter to the Indian community in which he definitely declared that promise of repeal had been made. General Smuts did not attempt to deny the fact and, indeed, did not do so until several months later. No one was, however, astonished to find Mr. Gandhi charging General Smuts with breach of faith, and absolutely refusing to compromise himself or the community that he represented by accepting further legislation that would, in the end, have still further degraded the Indians of South Africa. Having convinced his colleagues that such acceptance on their part was impossible, the struggle recommenced.

Twice more, during this period of passive resistance, was he sent to gaol, and then the Government sought to seduce his followers from their allegiance, by imprisoning them in hundreds and leaving him free. In 1909, whilst his friend and fellow-worker, Mr. Polak, was in India, on behalf of the South African Indian community, he and a colleague had gone to England to endeavour to arouse the public conscience there to the enormities that were being perpetrated in South Africa in the name of the British people. Whilst he failed in his main purpose to secure from General Smuts, through the mediation of the Imperial Government, the removal of the racial bar in the Immigration Law, he nevertheless sowed the seeds of the subsequent settlement, for his suggestions were embodied, and their adoption was recommended by the Imperial Government in their despatch to Lord Gladstone, shortly after the creation of the Union of South Africa in the following year.

MR. GOKHALE'S HISTORIC VISIT

In 1911, the second "provisional settlement" was effected after the Union Government had, notwithstanding, prolonged and sympathetic negotiations with Mr. Gandhi found themselves unable to discover a formula acceptable alike to the Indian community, the Government them-

selves and Parliament. Nor did the year 1912 show any better promise in the direction of a final settlement. Meanwhile, there occurred the historic visit to South Africa of India's great statesman-patriot, the Hon. Mr. Gokhale, who, even then, was suffering from ill-health. Mr. Gandhi, who, for years had regarded him as his own political leader, had invited him to South Africa, not primarily for political reasons, but so that he might nurse his *guru* back to health. Circumstances combined, however, to impose upon Mr. Gokhale a greater physical strain than had been anticipated, in spite of Mr. Gandhi's own devoted personal service. It was pathetic and beautiful to observe the way these two old friends refused to see anything but the best in each other, in spite of their fundamental differences of temperament and often of outlook. To Gandhi, Gokhale was the gallant and selfless paladin, whom the whole of India looked up to as her noblest son. To Gokhale, Gandhi was the very embodiment of saintly self-abnegation, a man whose personal sufferings, splendid and chivalrous leadership and moral fervour, marked him out as one of the most outstanding figures of the day, the coming leader of his people, who had made the name of his adored Motherland, revered and honoured throughout the Empire and beyond, and who had proved beyond dispute the capacity of even his most insignificant countrymen to live and die for her.

FURTHER STAGES OF THE STRUGGLE

During his visit, Mr. Gokhale extracted a promise (afterwards denied) from the principal Union Ministers, that they would introduce legislation repealing the £3 tax. When therefore in 1913, Mr. Gandhi discovered that the Government were not going to fulfil their pledges of 1911, and that they refused to repeal the £3 tax, he denounced the "provisional settlement," and, in September, announced the revival of Passive Resistance and its bodily extension to Natal, where he promptly organised and carried through the now historic strike. The events of this last phase of the struggle are still fresh in the public memory and therefore need no more than the barest recapitulation—the

campaign of the Indian women whose marriages had been dishonoured by a fresh decision of the Supreme Court at the instigation of the Government, the awakening of the free and indentured labourers all over Natal, the tremendous strikes, the wonderful and historic strikers' march of protest into the Transvaal, the horrible scenes enacted later in the effort to crush the strikers and compel them to resume work, the arrest and imprisonment of the principal leaders and of hundreds—many thousands—of the rank and file, the enormous Indian mass meetings, held in Durban, Johannesburg, and other parts of the Union, the fierce and passionate indignation aroused in India, the large sums of money poured into South Africa from all parts of the Motherland, Lord Hardinge's famous speech at Madras, in which he placed himself at the head of Indian public opinion and his demand for a Commission of Inquiry, the energetic efforts of Lord Ampthill's Committee, the hurried intervention of the Imperial authorities, the appointment over the heads of the Indian community of a Commission whose *personnel* could not satisfy the Indians, the discharge from prison of the leaders whose advice to ignore the Commission was almost universally accepted, the arrival of Messrs. Andrews and Pearson and their wonderful work of reconciliation, the deaths of Harbat Singh and Valliamma, the strained position relieved only by the interruption of the second European strike, when Mr. Gandhi, as on an earlier occasion, undertook not to hamper the Government whilst they had their hands full with the fresh difficulty and when it had been dealt with, the entirely new spirit of friendliness, trust, and co-operation that was found to have been created by the moderation of the great Indian leader and the loving influence spread around him by Mr. Andrews as he proceeded with his great Imperial mission.

All these things are of recent history, as are the favourable recommendations of the Commission on practically every point referred to it and out of which Passive Resistance had arisen, the adoption of the Commission's Report in its entirety by the Government, the

introduction and passing into law of the Indians' Relief Act, after lengthy and remarkable debates in both Houses of the Legislature, the correspondence between Mr. Gandhi and General Smuts, in which the latter undertook, on behalf of the Government, to carry through the administrative reforms that were not covered by the new Act, and the final letter of the Indian protagonist of Passive Resistance—formally announcing the conclusion of the struggle and setting forth the points upon which Indians would sooner or later have to be satisfied before they could acquire complete equality of civil status—and the scenes of his departure for his beloved Motherland, enacted throughout the country, wherein the deaths and sufferings of the Indian martyrs, Nagappan, Narayanasamy, Harbat Singh and Valliamma, were justified and sanctified to the world.

MR AND MRS. GANDHI IN LONDON

Faithful to his instinct for service, Mr. Gandhi hurried to England, where he heard that Gokhale was critically ill, and arrived, on the outbreak of the Great War, to find that his friend was slowly recovering from the almost fatal attack that had overwhelmed him. Here, too, his sense of responsibility revealed itself. He recognised that it was India's duty, in the hour of the Empire's trial, to do all in her power to help, and he at once set about the formation of the Indian Volunteer Ambulance Corps in London, enrolling himself and his devoted wife, who had herself been barely snatched from the jaws of death but a few weeks earlier, amongst the members. But the years of strain, his neglect of his own physical well-being, and his addiction to long fasts as a means to spiritual purification, had undermined a never very robust constitution, and his condition became so serious that private and official friends insisted upon his proceeding immediately, with Mrs. Gandhi, to India.

RETURN TO THE MOTHERLAND

Since his arrival in his Motherland, at the beginning of 1915, his movements have been much in the popular eye. His progress through India, from the day of the

public landing and welcome at the Apollo Bunder, was in the nature of a veritable triumph, marred only by the sudden death of his beloved teacher, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, who had sacrificed health and life itself upon the altar of his country's welfare.

The Government of India marked their appreciation of Mr. Gandhi's unique services by recommending him for the Kaiser-i-Hind gold medal, which was conferred upon him by the King Emperor amongst the 1915 New Year Honours. To Gokhale he had given a promise to make no public utterance on Indian affairs until at least a year had passed, and he had visited the principal centres of public life in India. This promise, which was faithfully kept, was exacted, because Gokhale, hoping to see in him his own successor, had been somewhat disturbed by the very advanced views expressed by Mr. Gandhi in the proscribed pamphlet, *Hind Swaraj*, whose pages, we now know, were written to show the basic similarity of civilisation the world over, the superiority of India for the particular Indian phase of that civilisation, and the stupidity of the barriers of luxury erected by the modern industrial civilisation of the West, that constantly separate man from man and make him a senseless machine drudge, and that threaten to invade that holy Motherland that stands in his eyes for the victory of spirit over matter. He had condemned some things of which he had disapproved, in Gokhale's opinion, somewhat hastily, and the older man had thought that, after an absence from India of so many years, during which he had perhaps idealised certain phases of Indian life, a year's travel and observation would be a useful corrective. Which of the two, if either, has correctly diagnosed the situation, time alone can show.

SATYAGRAHASHRAM

Mr. Gandhi, however, made his headquarters at Ahmedabad, the capital of his own Province of Gujarat and here he founded his *Satyagrahashram*,* where he is endeavouring to train up from childhood public servants upon a basis of austerity of life and personal subordination

* For a full account of the Ashram, see appendix.

to the common good, the members supporting themselves by work at the hand-loom or other manual labour.

TRAVELS IN INDIA

True to his promise to Gokhale, Mr. Gandhi, on his return to India, started on an extensive tour through the country. Though his idea was merely to visit every place of importance and acquaint himself thoroughly with the conditions of the country and thus acquire first-hand knowledge of men and things, he had of course to speak wherever he went. He was given a warm and enthusiastic welcome at every station and the magnificent demonstrations in his honour bore eloquent testimony to the great regard in which his countrymen have always held him. Mr. Gandhi accepted these marks of affection and respect with his accustomed grace, but spoke out his mind on every subject, as the occasion demanded. One characteristic feature of these speeches is that Mr. Gandhi seldom repeats second-hand opinions and his views on every subject are, therefore, refreshingly original. Undeterred by fear or any exaggerated sense of conventional respectability he retains his independence, indifferent to the applause or contumely of his listeners. Speaking at the Students' Hall, College Square, Calcutta, in March 1915, when the Hon. Mr. Lyon presided he said with reference to

ANARCHICAL CRIMES :

Whatever his personal views were, he must say that misguided zeal that resorts to dacoities and assassinations cannot be productive of any good. These dacoities and assassinations are absolutely a foreign growth in India. They cannot take root here and cannot be a permanent institution here. History proves that assassinations have done no good. The religion of this country, the Hindu religion, is abstention from "himsa," that is taking animal life. That is, he believes the guiding principle of all religions. The Hindu religion says that even the evil-doer should not be hated. It says that nobody has any right to kill even the evil-doer. These assassinations are a western institution and the speaker warned his hearers against these western methods and western evils.

LOYALTY TO THE BRITISH RAJ

At the Madras Law Dinner in April of the same year he observed in proposing (at the request of the President

the Hon. Mr. Corbett, the Advocate-General) the toast of the British Empire :—

As a passive resister I discovered that a passive resister has to make good his claim to passive resistance, no matter under what circumstances 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*).

ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS

Addressing the students of Madras at the Y. M. C. A. when the Hon. Mr. (now the Rt. Hon) V. S. Srinivasa Sastri presided, he pointed out :—

I am and I have been a determined opponent of modern civilisation. I want you to turn your eyes to-day upon what is going on in Europe and if you have come to the conclusion that Europe is to-day groaning under the heels of the modern civilisation then you and your elders will have to think twice before you can emulate that civilisation in our Motherland. But I have been told, "How can we help it, seeing that our rulers bring that culture to our Motherland." Do not make any mistake about it at all. I do not for one moment believe that it is for any rulers to bring that culture to you, unless you are prepared to accept it, and if it be that the rulers bring that culture before us, I think that we have forces within ourselves to enable us to reject that culture without having to reject the rulers themselves.

He concluded :—

I ally myself to the British Government, because I believe that it is possible for me to claim equal partnership with every subject of the British Empire. I to-day claim that equal partnership. I do not belong to a subject race. (*Applause*). But there is this thing : it is not for the British Governors to give you, it is for you to take the thing. I want and I can take the thing. That I want only by discharging my obligations. Max Muller has told us,—we need not go to Max Muller to interpret our own religion—but he says, our religion consists in four letters "D-u-t-y" and not in the five letters "R-i-g-h-t." And if you believe that all that

we want can flow from a better discharge of our duty, then think always of your duty and fighting along those lines you will have no fear of any man, you will fear only God.

UNVEILING MR. GOKHALE'S PORTRAIT

In May Mr. Gandhi went to visit some cities in the south where he discoursed on social reform and the vexed question of untouchability which is somewhat rampant on the banks of the *Kaveri* and its environs. He spoke with characteristic candour somewhat to the chagrin of the orthodox.

Later he was invited to Bangalore to unveil the portrait of Mr. Gokhale, when he made a brief and highly suggestive speech:—

I saw in the recitation,—the beautiful recitation that was given to me,—that God is with them whose garment was dusty and tattered. My thoughts immediately went to the end of my garment; I examined and found that it is not dusty and it is not tattered; it is fairly spotless and clean. God is not in me. There are other conditions attached; but in these conditions too I may fail; and you, my dear countrymen, may also fail; and if we do tend this well, we should not dishonour the memory of one whose portrait you have asked me to unveil this morning. I have declared myself his disciple in the political field and I have him as my *Raja Guru*: and this I claim on behalf of the Indian people. It was in 1896 that I made this declaration, and I do not regret having made the choice.

Later in the year he presided over the anniversary function at the Gurukul and spoke in Hindi on the meaning of true Swadeshism, the doctrine of Ahimsa and other kindred topics.

HINDU UNIVERSITY SPEECH

On Feb. 4, 1916, he attended the Hindu University celebrations and delivered an address which unfortunately was intercepted. But the regrettable incident of which far too much was made, revealed the hold that he possesses upon the esteem and affection of his countrymen, for his version of what transpired was generally accepted. Since then Mr. Gandhi has been taking a prominent part in the building-up of the Indian nation along his own peculiar lines. For, he teaches both by precept and by example

But he goes his own way, untrammelled by precedent, carefully analysing the criticism to which he is naturally subjected, holding himself answerable, however, to his own conscience alone. For he is of the prophets, and not merely of the secondary interpreters of life.

The same month he came to Madras and on the 10th spoke on Social Service to a large audience presided over by Mrs. Whitehead. On the 14th he spoke on Swadeshi before the Missionary Conference and a couple of days later gave a lucid account of his Satyagrahashram to a large gathering of students in the precincts of the Young Men's Christian Association, Madras, the Hon. Rev. G. Pittendrigh of the Christian College presiding. He then went back to Ahmedabad to look after his Ashram. Late in the year on December 22, he made a remarkable speech on "Economic *versus* Moral Progress" at the Muir Central College, Allahabad, Mr. Stanley Jevons presiding. The address contains some of his most mature and thoughtful reflections on life, and both in style and sentiment is one of the most characteristic of Mr. Gandhi's utterances.

MR. GANDHI IN CHAMPARAN

Then came the Champaran incident which has since become historic. In the Lucknow Congress of December 1916, Mr. Gandhi, though pressed by some of the citizens of Behar, declined to talk about the grievances of the labourers in the Behar plantations without first-hand knowledge of the real state of affairs. This he resolved to acquire soon after the Congress session : and in response to an insistent public demand, to inquire into the conditions under which Indians work in the indigo plantations, Mr Gandhi was in Muzaffarpur on the 15th April 1917, whence he took the mid-day train for Motihari. Next day he was served with a notice from the Champaran District Magistrate to quit the district "by the next available train" as his presence "will endanger the public peace and may lead to serious disturbance which may be accompanied by loss of life." But the local authorities in issuing this mandate counted without the host. For Mr. Gandhi, who had initiated the Passive

Resistance Movement in South Africa, replied in a way that did not surprise those who had known him :—

Out of a sense of public responsibility, I feel it to be my duty to say that I am unable to leave this district, but if it so pleases the authorities, I shall submit to the order by suffering the penalty of disobedience.

I most emphatically repudiate the Commissioner's suggestion that "my object is likely to be agitation." My desire is purely and simply for "a genuine search for knowledge" and this I shall continue to satisfy so long as I am left free.

Mr. Gandhi appeared before the District Magistrate on the 18th, when he presented a statement. Finding that the case was likely to be unnecessarily prolonged he pleaded guilty and the judgment was deferred pending instructions from higher authorities. The rest of the story is pretty familiar. The higher authorities subsequently issued instructions not to proceed with the prosecution, while a commission of enquiry was at once instituted to enquire into the conditions of the Behar labourers with Mr. Gandhi as a member of that body. As usual, Mr. Gandhi worked in perfect harmony with the other members and though with the findings of his own private enquiry he could have raised a storm of indignant agitation against the scandals of the plantations, he refrained from using his influence and knowledge for a merely vindictive and vainglorious cry. He worked quietly, with no thought of himself, but absorbed in the need for remedial measures ; and when in December 1917 the Champaran Agrarian Bill was moved in the Behar Legislative Council, the Hon. Mr. Maude made a frank statement of the scandals which necessitated an enquiry by a Commission and acknowledged Mr. Gandhi's services in these handsome terms :—

It is constantly asserted, and I have myself often heard it said, that there is in reality nothing wrong or rotten in the state of affairs ; that all concerned are perfectly happy so long as they are left alone, and that it is only when outside influences and agitators come in that any trouble is experienced. I submit that this contention is altogether untenable in the light of the history of the last fifty years. What is it we find on each individual occasion when fresh attention has been, at remarkably short intervals, drawn once more to the conditions

of the production of the indigo plant? We do not find on each occasion that some fresh little matter has gone wrong which can be easily adjusted, but we find on every occasion alike that it is the system itself, which is condemned as being inherently wrong and impossible, and we see also repeated time after time the utter futility of bringing the matter to any lasting or satisfactory settlement by the only solutions that have so far been attempted, namely, an enhancement of the price paid for indigo and a reduction of the tenant's burden by reducing the limit of the proportion of his land which he would be required to earmark for indigo cultivation. Repeatedly those expedients have been tried—repeatedly they have failed to effect a lasting solution, partly because they could not be universally enforced, but chiefly because no thinking can set right a system which is in itself inherently rotten and open to abuse.

The planters of course could not endure this. They took occasion to indulge in the most rapid and unbecoming attacks on Mr. Gandhi. One Mr. Irwin earned an unenviable notoriety by writing all sorts of scurrilous attacks touching personalities which have nothing to do with the subject of enquiry. Columns of such stuff appeared in the pages of the *Pioneer*: but Mr. Gandhi with a quiet humour replied in words which should have made the soul of Irwin penitent. The controversy on Mr. Gandhi's dress and Mrs. Gandhi's stall-keeping reveals the character of the two men, Mr. Irwin, fussy, vindictive, violent, ill-tempered, writhing like a wounded snake in anger and agony, and Mr. Gandhi secure in his righteousness, modest, quiet, strong and friendly with no malice and untainted by evil passions.

THE CONGRESS-LEAGUE SCHEME

By this time Mr. Gandhi had made the Guzerat Sabha a well-equipped organisation for effective social service. When in August 1917 it was announced that Mr. Montagu would be in India in connection with the scheme of Post-War Reforms the Guzerat Sabha under the direction of Mr. Gandhi devised in November the admirable scheme of a monster petition in connection with the Congress League Scheme. The idea and the movement alike were opportune. Mr. Gandhi himself undertook the work in his province of Guzerat and carried it out with characteristic thoroughness. The suggestion was taken up by

the Congress and the Home Rule League and the piles of books containing the monster signatures were duly presented to Mr. Montagu at Delhi.

Meanwhile Mr. Gandhi was not idle. On the 17th September he presided over the Bombay Co-operative Conference. On Nov. 3, he delivered a remarkable address as president of the Guzerat Political Conference and later, of the Guzerat Educational Conference. Then came the Congress week in Calcutta in December and he presided over the First Session of the Social Service League when he made a striking speech.

Mr. Gandhi has always travelled in the third class in all his journeyings and the grievances of the third-class passengers are driven home in this address to the Social Service League. But even before this he had already sent a letter to the press on the subject on the 25th September, 1917, in which he gave a vivid and true account of the woes of the third-class passengers.

FAMINE IN THE KAIRA DISTRICT

After his return from the Calcutta Congress of Dec. 1917, Mr. Gandhi was occupied in connection with the famine in the Kaira district. The facts of the story can be easily told in Mr. Gandhi's own words uttered at a meeting in Bombay on Feb 5, 1918.

The responsibility for the notice issued by the Guzerat Sabha of Ahmedabad was his; and nobody expected that the Government would misinterpret the objects of the notice. The Guzerat Sabha had sufficient proof of the plight of the people in the Kaira District and that the people were even obliged to sell their cattle to pay taxes, and the notice was issued to console those suffering from hardships. The Sabha's request was to suspend the collection of dues till negotiations were over. If the Commissioner of the Division had not been angry with the deputation and had talked to them politely, such crises would not have happened. He fully expected that the deputation which would wait on the Governor would be able to explain the situation to His Excellency and the people's cause would succeed in the end. Public men had every right to advise the people of their rights. He trusted that those who had given the people the right advice would stand by them and would not hesitate to undergo hardships in order to secure justice.

The first and last principle of passive resistance is that we should not inflict hardships on others but put up with them ourselves in order to get justice, and the Government need not fear anything if we make up our mind as we are bent on getting sheer justice from it and nothing else. We can have two weapons on occasions like this:—Revolt or passive resistance, and my request is for the second remedy always. In order to remove distress through which the Guzerat people are passing, it is my firm conviction that if we tell the truth to the Government, it will ultimately be convinced and if we are firm in our resolve, the Kaira District people shall suffer wrongs no more.

INTEREST IN SOUTH AFRICA

In spite of all these activities in India, Mr. Gandhi has not forgotten the scene of his early labours. His South African friends and fellow-workers are always dear to him. In a communication to the *Indian Opinion* he wrote under date 15th December, 1917 :—

When I left South Africa, I had fully intended to write to my Indian and English friends there from time to time, but I found my lot in India to be quite different from what I had expected it to be. I had hoped to be able to have comparative peace and leisure but 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. My South African friends will, I hope, forgive me for my apparent neglect of them. Let me assure them that not a day has passed but I have thought of them and their kindness. South African associations can never be effaced from my memory.

I note, too, that our people in South Africa are not yet free from difficulties about trade licences and leaving certificates. My Indian experience has confirmed the opinion that there is no remedy like passive resistance against such evils. The community has to exhaust milder remedies but I hope that it will not allow the sword of passive resistance to get rusty. It is our duty whilst the terrible war lasts to be satisfied with petitions, etc., for the desired relief but I think the Government should know that the community will not rest until the questions above mentioned are satisfactorily solved. It is but right that I should also warn the community against dangers from within. I hear from those who return from South Africa that we are by no means free of those who are engaged in illicit traffic. We, who seek justice must be above suspicion, and I hope that our leaders will not rest till they have urged the community of internal defects.

AHMEDABAD MILL STRIKE

Passive Resistance in some form or other has always been Mr. Gandhi's final panacea for all ailments in the body politic. He has applied it with resolute courage, and has at least as often succeeded as he has undoubtedly failed. But success or failure in the pursuit of a righteous cause is seldom the determining factor, with men of Mr. Gandhi's moral stamina. When in March 1918 the mill hands at Ahmedabad went on strike, Mr. Gandhi was requisitioned to settle the dispute between the millowners and the workmen. He was guiding the latter to a successful settlement of their wages when some of them betrayed a sense of weakness and despair; and demoralisation was apprehended. At a critical stage in the crisis Mr. Gandhi and Miss Anusuyabhai took the vow of fast. This extreme action on the part of Mr. Gandhi was disquieting to friends and provoked some bitter comments from the unfriendly. He, of course, would be the last person to resort to such a method of forcing the millowners by appealing to their sense of pity, knowing that they were his friends and admirers. He explained the circumstances in a statement issued subsequently:—

I am not sorry for the vow, but with the belief that I have, I would have been unworthy of the truth undertaken by me if I had done anything less. Before I took the vow I knew that there were serious defects about it. For me to take such a vow in order to affect in any shape or form the decision of the millowners would be a cowardly injustice done to them, and that I would so prove myself unfit for the friendship which I had the privilege of enjoying with some of them. I knew that I ran the risk of being misunderstood. I could not prevent my fast from affecting my decision. That knowledge moreover put a responsibility on me which I was ill-able to bear. From now I disabled myself from gaining concessions for the men which ordinarily in a struggle such as this I would be entirely justified in securing. I knew, too, that I would have to be satisfied with the minimum I could get from the millowners and with a fulfilment of the letter of the men's vow rather than its spirit and so hath it happened. I put the defects of my vow in one scale and the merits of it in the other. There are hardly any acts of human beings which are free from all taint. Mine, I know, was exceptionally tainted, but better the ignominy of having unworthily compromised by my vow the position and indepen-

dence of the mill-owners than that it should be said by posterity that 10,000 men had suddenly broken the vow which they had for over twenty days solemnly taken and repeated in the name of God. I am fully convinced that no body of men can make themselves into a nation or perform great tasks unless they become as true as steel and unless their promises come to be regarded by the world like the law of the Medes and Persians, inflexible, and unbreakable, and whatever may be the verdict of friends, so far as I can think at present, on given occasions, I should not hesitate in future to repeat the humble performance which I have taken the liberty of describing in the communication.

DELHI WAR CONFERENCE

Mr. Gandhi was one of those invited to attend the Delhi War Conference in April 1918. At first he refused to participate in the discussions on the ground that Mr. Tilak, Mrs. Besant and the Ali Brothers were not invited to the Conference. He however waived the objection at the pressing invitation personally conveyed by H. E. the Viceroy in an interview. At the Conference he spoke briefly, supporting the loyalty resolution. He explained his position more clearly in a communique issued by him soon after the Conference. He pointed out:—

I recognise that in the hour of its danger we must give, as we have decided to give, ungrudging and unequivocal support to the Empire of which we aspire in the near future to be partners in the same sense as the Dominions Overseas. But it is the simple truth that our response is due to the expectation that our goal will be reached all the more speedily. On that account even as 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, and I am sure that it is this faith which has enabled many members of the Conference to tender to the Government their full-hearted co-operation. If I could make my countrymen retrace their steps, I would make them withdraw all the Congress resolutions and not whisper "Home Rule" or "Responsible Government" during the pendency of the War. 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 this very act, would become the most favoured partner in the Empire and racial distinctions would become a thing of the past But practically the whole of educated India has decided to take a less effective course, and it is no longer possible to say that educated India does not exercise any influence on the masses.

I feel sure that nothing less than a definite vision of Home Rule to be realised in the shortest possible time will satisfy the Indian people. I know that there are many in India who consider no sacrifice is too great in order to achieve the end, and they are wakeful enough to realise that they must be equally prepared to sacrifice themselves for the Empire in which they hope and desire to reach their final status. It follows then that we can but accelerate our journey to the goal by silently and simply devoting ourselves heart and soul to the work of delivering the Empire from the threatening danger. It will be a national suicide not to recognise this elementary truth. We must perceive that, if we serve to save the Empire, we have in that very act secured Home Rule.

Whilst, therefore, it is clear to me that we should give to the Empire every available man for its defence, I fear that I cannot say the same thing about the financial assistance. My intimate intercourse with the raiyats convinces me that India has already donated to the Imperial Exchequer beyond her capacity. I know that, in making this statement, I am voicing the opinion of the majority of my countrymen.

It is interesting to note that even so early as this Mr. Gandhi foreshadowed his views on the Khilafat question of which we shall hear so much indeed in the subsequent pages. Mr. Gandhi wrote these words in a letter to the Viceroy:—

Lastly, I would like you to ask His Majesty's Ministers to give definite assurance about the Muhammadan States. I am sure you know that every Muhammadan is deeply interested in them. As a Hindu I cannot be indifferent to their cause. Their sorrows must be our sorrows. In the most scrupulous regard for the rights of these States and for the Muslim sentiment as to the places of worship and in your just and timely treatment of the Indian claim to Home Rule lie the safety of the Empire. I write this, because I love the English nation and I wish to evoke in every Indian the loyalty to Englishman.

LORD WILLINGDON AND HOME RULERS

On June 10, 1918, Lord Willingdon, then Governor of Bombay, presiding over the Bombay War Conference, happened to make an unfortunate reference to Home Rulers. Mr. Tilak who was on the war-path resented what he deemed an unwarranted insult to Home Rulers and instantly launched on a downright political oration. His Excellency ruled him out of order and one by one the Home Rulers left the Conference. Mr. Gandhi was asked

to preside over the protest meeting in Bombay held on the 16th June. He spoke as follows :—

Lord Willingdon has presented them with the expression Home Rule Leaguers distinguished from Home Rulers. I cannot conceive the existence of an Indian who is not a Home Ruler; but there are millions like myself who are not Home Rule Leaguers. Although I am not a member of any Home Rule League I wish to pay on this auspicious day my humble tribute to numerous Home Rule Leaguers whose association I have ever sought in my work and which has been extended to me ungrudgingly. I have found many of them to be capable of any sacrifice for the sake of the Motherland.

RECRUITING FOR THE WAR

Mr. Gandhi did a great deal to stimulate recruiting for the war. Though he did not hesitate to criticise the bureaucracy for individual acts of wrong, he went about in the Districts of Kaira calling for recruits. Time and again he wrote to the press urging the need for volunteers and he constantly spoke to the educated and the illiterate alike on the necessity for joining the Defence Force. On one occasion he said in Kaira where he had conducted Satyagraha on an extensive scale :—

You have successfully demonstrated how you can resist Government with civility, and how you can retain your own respect without hurting theirs. I now place before you an opportunity of proving that you bear no hostility to Government in spite of your strenuous fight with them.

You are all Home Rulers, some of you are members of Home Rule Leagues. One meaning of Home rule is that we should become partners of the Empire. To-day we are a subject people. We do not enjoy all the rights of Englishmen. We are not to-day partners of the Empire as are Canada, South Africa and Australia. We are a Dependency. We want the rights of Englishmen, and we aspire to be as much partners of the Empire as the Dominions Overseas. We wish for the time when we may aspire to the Viceregal office. To bring such a state of things we should have the ability to defend ourselves, that is the ability to bear arms and to use them. As long as we have to look to Englishmen for our defence, as long as we are not free from the fear of the military, so long we cannot be regarded as equal partners with Englishmen. It, therefore, behoves us to learn the use of arms and to acquire the ability to defend ourselves. If we want to learn the use of arms with the greatest possible despatch, it is our duty to enlist ourselves in the Army.

The easiest and the straightest way to win *Swarajya*, said Mr. Gandhi, is to participate in the defence of the Empire. This argument, doubtless, went home, and he appealed in the following words :—

There are 600 villages in the Kaira District Every village has on an average a population of over 1,000. If every village gave at least twenty men the Kaira District would be able to raise an army of 12,000 men. The population of the whole district is seven lakhs and this number will then work out at 17 per cent.—a rate which is lower than the death-rate. If we are not prepared to make even this sacrifice for the Empire and Swarajya, it is no wonder if we are regarded as unworthy of it. If every village gives at least twenty men they will return from the war and be the living bulwarks of their village. If they fall on the battle-field, they will immortalise themselves, their villages and their country and twenty fresh men will follow suit and offer themselves for national defence.

THE MONTAGU REFORMS

We have noticed how Mr. Gandhi took a leading part in the agitation for post-war reforms and how his idea of a monster petition was taken up by every political body of importance in the country. It must, however, be noted with regret that his enthusiasm for the reforms was not kept up as he was absolutely engrossed in other affairs. On the publication of the Joint Report in July 1918, Mr. Gandhi wrote to the *Servant of India* at the request of the Hon. Mr. (now the Rt. Hon.) V. S. S. Sastri for an expression of opinion :—

No scheme of reform can possibly benefit India that does not recognise that the present administration is top-heavy and ruinously expensive and for me even law, order and good government would be too dearly purchased if the price to be paid for it is to be the grinding poverty of the masses. The watchword of our Reform Councils will have to be not the increase of taxation for the growing needs of a growing country, but a decrease of financial burdens that are sapping the foundation itself of organic growth. If this fundamental fact is recognised there need be no suspicion of our motives and I think I am perfectly safe in asserting that in every other respect British interests will be as secure in Indian hands as they are in their own.

It follows from what I have said above that we must respectfully press for the Congress-League claim for the immediate granting to Indians of 50 per cent. of the higher posts in the Civil Service.

THE ROWLATT BILLS AND SATYAGRAHA

But soon there began a movement which was to tax the utmost energies of Mr. Gandhi, a movement fraught with grave consequences. The Government of India persisted in passing a piece of legislation known as the Rowlatt Laws which were designed to curb still further what little liberty is yet possessed by Indians in their own country. The legislation was presumed to be based on the Report of the Rowlatt Committee which announced the discovery of plots for the subversion of Government. Friends of Government, solicitous of the peaceful and well-ordered condition of society, warned it of the danger of passing such acts which betrayed a tactless want of confidence and trust in the people at a time when Responsible Government was contemplated. The bill was stoutly opposed by the public and the press. It was denounced by every political organisation worth the name. It was severely and even vehemently attacked in the Imperial Council. Irrespective of parties, the whole country stood solid against a measure of such iniquity. The Hon. Mr. Sastri and Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and in fact every one of the non-official members condemned the bill as outrageous and forebode grave consequences if it should be passed. But Government was obstinate and the bill was passed in the teeth of all opposition.

Mr. Gandhi who travelled all over the country and wrote and spoke with amazing energy was not to be easily silenced. Every other form of constitutional agitation having failed he resorted as usual to his patent—Satyagraha. On February 28, 1919, he published a momentous pledge which he asked his countrymen to sign and observe as a covenant binding on them. The pledge ran as follows:—

"Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. 1 of 1919, and the Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill No. 11 of 1919, are unjust, subversive of the principle of liberty and justice, and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these Bills

becoming law and until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a committee to be hereafter appointed may think fit and further affirm that in this struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property."

He then started on an extensive tour through the country educating the learned and the unlearned, in the principles and practice of Satyagraha. At Bombay, Allahabad, Madras, Tanjore, Trichy, Tuticorin and Negapatam he addressed large gatherings in March. Sunday the 6th April was appointed the Satyagraha Day when complete *hartal* was to be observed, prayers offered and the vow to be taken amidst great demonstrations Delhi observed the Satyagraha day on the 30th, and there ensued a scuffle between the people and the police. It was alleged against the Delhi people at the Railway Station

(1) that some of them were trying to coerce sweetmeat sellers into closing their stalls; (2) that some were forcibly preventing people from plying tramcars and other vehicles; (3) that some of them threw brickbats; (4) that the whole crowd that marched to the Station demanded the release of men who were said to be coercers and who were for that reason arrested at the instance of the Railway authorities; (5) that the crowd declined to disperse when the Magistrate gave orders to disperse.

Swami Shraddhananda (the well-known Mahatma Munshi Ram of the Gurukula, who had taken the orders of the Sannyasi) denied the first three allegations. Granting they were all true there was no need, argued Mr. Gandhi, for the interference of the military who were called on to fire on the unarmed mob. But the crowd was completely self-possessed and though there was some loss of life, it spoke volumes in praise of the Delhi people that they conducted a meeting of 40,000 in perfect peace and order. But the Delhi tragedy had burnt itself into the soul of Mr. Gandhi and his friends. The incident he said, "imposed an added responsibility upon Satyagrahis of steeling their hearts and going on with their struggle until the Rowlatt Legislation was withdrawn." The whole country answered Mr. Gandhi's call in a way that was at

once significant and impressive. Tens and hundreds of thousands gathered in different cities, and never within living memory have such demonstrations been witnessed.

In the meanwhile the Satyagraha Committees in different centres of India were actively carrying on their propaganda. The Central Committee of which Mr. Gandhi was the president, advised that for the time being laws regarding prohibited literature and registration of newspapers might be civilly disobeyed. Accordingly on the 7th April Mr. Gandhi issued a notice to organise, regulate and control the sale of these publications. A leaflet called *Satyagrahi* was at once brought out as also some early writing of Mr. Gandhi's which was pronounced to be seditious. The first print stated among other things :

"The editor is liable at any moment to be arrested, and it is impossible to ensure the continuity of publication until India is in a happy position of supplying editors enough to take the place of those who are arrested. It is not our intention to break for all time the laws governing the publication of newspapers. This paper will, therefore, exist so long only as the Rowlatt Legislation is not withdrawn."

Meanwhile as contemplated by Mr. Gandhi he was arrested at Kosi on his way to Delhi on the morning of the 10th April and served with an order not to enter the Punjab and the District of Delhi. The officer serving the order treated him most politely, assuring him that it would be his most painful duty to arrest him, if he elected to disobey, but that there would be no ill-will between them. Mr. Gandhi smilingly said that he must elect to disobey as it was his duty, and that the officer ought also to do what was *his* duty. Mr. Gandhi then dictated a message to Mr. Desai, his secretary, laying special emphasis in his oral message that none should resent his arrest or do anything tainted with untruth or violence which was sure to harm the sacred cause.

Mr. Gandhi arrived in Bombay on the afternoon of the 11th April, having been prevented from entering the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi. An order was soon after served on him requiring him to confine his activities within the limits of the Bombay Presidency. Having heard

of the riots and the consequent bloodshed in different places he caused the following message to be read at all the meetings that evening: —

I have not been able to understand the cause of so much excitement and disturbance that followed my detention. It is not Satyagraha. It is worse than *Duragraha*. Those who join Satyagraha demonstrations are bound one and all to refrain at all hazard from violence, not to throw stones or in any way whatever to injure anybody.

I therefore suggest that if we cannot conduct this movement without the slightest violence from our side, the movement might have to be abandoned or it may be necessary to give it a different and still more restricted shape. It may be necessary to go even further. The time may come for me to offer Satyagraha against ourselves. I would not deem it a disgrace that we die. I shall be pained to hear of the death of a Satyagrahi, but I shall consider it to be the proper sacrifice given for the sake of the struggle.

I do not see what penance I can offer excepting that it is for me to fast and if need be by so doing to give up this body and thus prove the truth of Satyagraha. I appeal to you to peacefully disperse and to refrain from acts that may in any way bring disgrace upon the people of Bombay.

But the *Duragraha* of the few upset the calculations of Mr. Gandhi, as he had so constantly been warned by many of his friends and admirers who could not however subscribe to his faith in civil disobedience. The story of the tragedy needs no repeating. It is written on the tablet of time with bitter memories, and the embers of that controversy have not yet subsided. But Mr. Gandhi, with a delicacy of conscience and a fine appreciation of truth, which we have learnt to associate with his name as with that of Newman, felt for the wrongs done to Englishmen with the same passionate intensity with which he felt for those inflicted on his own countrymen. Few words of remorse in recorded literature are more touching than those uttered by Mr. Gandhi in his speech at Ahmedabad on the 14th April 1919. They are in the supreme manner of Cardinal Newman's *Apologia:*

Brothers, the events that have happened in the course of the last few days have been most disgraceful to Ahmedabad, and as all these things have happened in my name, I am ashamed of them, and those who have been responsible for them have thereby not honoured me but disgraced me. A rapier run

through my body could hardly have pained me more. I have said times without number that Satyagraha admits of no violence, no pillage, no incendiarism; and still in the name of Satyagraha we burnt down buildings, forcibly captured weapons, extorted money, stopped trains, cut off telegraph wires, killed innocent people and plundered shops and private houses. If deeds such as these could save me from the prison house or the scaffold I should not like to be so saved.

It is open to anybody to say that but for the Satyagraha campaign there would not have been this violence. For this I have already done a penance, to my mind an unendurable one, namely, that I have had to postpone my visit to Delhi to seek re-arrest and I have also been obliged to suggest a temporary restriction of Satyagraha to a limited field. This has been more painful to me than a wound, but this penance is not enough, and I have therefore decided to fast for three days, *i. e*, 72 hours. I hope my fast will pain no one. I believe a seventy-two hours' fast is easier for me than a twenty-four hours' fast for you. And I have imposed on me a discipline which I can bear.

In consequence of the violence, he ordered a general suspension of the movement on the 18th April only to be resumed on another occasion which was soon to follow in the heels of the Punjab tragedy.

THE PUNJAB DISORDERS

Before passing to a consideration of the Khilafat question and Mr. Gandhi's lead which made it such a potent and All-India agitation we must say a word on the aftermath of the Punjab tragedy. It is unnecessary to recount the extraordinary happenings in the Punjab as time and vigilant enquiries have laid bare the unscrupulous methods of that Government For over a year, the tale of the Punjab atrocities, the shooting down of a defenceless and unarmed gathering of some 2,000 men, women and children in cold blood at the Jallianwallah Bagh, the monstrous methods of martial law administered by Col. Johnson and Bosworth Smith, the outrageous indignities to which the poor people of the place were subjected, the callous disregard of life and respect with which Sir Michæl O'Dwyer and Brigadier Dyer were inflicting some of the worst features of Prussianism on a helpless people—the crawling order and the public flogging—these have been the theme of countless articles and speeches. The Punjab revelations have shocked the conscience of the civilized world which could

scarcely believe that such frightful acts of brutality could be possible in the British Government till the Hunter Commission confirmed their worst apprehensions.

But it was long before the Government could be forced to appoint a Commission of Inquiry. And at last only a Committee was appointed while all India was anxious for a Royal Commission. It was therefore decided to proceed with an independent enquiry. Mr. Gandhi headed the Congress Sub Committee and carried out a most searching and thorough investigation. It was a pity he could not lead the Congress evidence before the Hunter Committee, owing to certain differences between the two Committees in regard to the freedom of certain witnesses then under confinement. Suffice it to say that the Congress Committee decided not to give evidence, or in any way participate with the Hunter Committee.

But under the able and indefatigable guidance of Mr. Gandhi the Congress Committee collected a great mass of material for judging the Punjab disorders. They examined over 1,700 witnesses and recorded the evidence of no less than 650. Mr. Gandhi's participation in the Committee was itself a guarantee to its merit as an authoritative and responsible body. In fact no name could carry more weight than Mr. Gandhi's in the matter of veracity in such an undertaking—an undertaking likely to prejudice and warp the judgment of many. When in April 1920 the Report was published it was hailed everywhere as an unanswerable document—the result of patient industry and dispassionate judgment on a most brutal and savage episode in contemporary history.

Soon after, the Hunter Report which was for many months in the hands of the Cabinet, was also issued, accompanied by a despatch by the Secretary of State. The Report recorded indeed many of the facts published already in the Congress Report, laid stress on the evils of Satyagraha, condoned the bloody exploits of Gen. Dyer as "an error of judgment" (a diplomatic euphemism for the slaughter of the innocents) and vindicated the statesmanship of Sir Michæl O'Dwyer! The force of perversion

could no further go! Mr. Montagu, however, passionately denounced Gen. Dyer's savagery as inconsistent with the principles of British Government but curiously enough paid a tribute to Sir Michæl's sagacity and firmness and the Viceroy's policy of masterly inactivity! This was bad enough from the Indian point of view. But there sprang up a wild scream from the Anglo Indian Press, and Mem-Sahebs in search of sensation and notoriety discovered in Gen. Dyer the saviour of British India. The *Pioneer* and other prints followed the lead of the London *Morning Post* and appealed for funds towards a memorial to this gallant soldier who shot men like rabbits, while a section of the Indian Press urged that "Chelmsford must go." Then followed the debate in the House of Commons which was looked forward to with some excitement. The House ultimately retained its honour in the debate and though Mr. Montagu, Mr. Asquith and Mr. Churchill spoke with a profound sense of justice and carried the day, there was no doubt of the mentality of the average Englishmen. But it was left to the House of Peers to betray the utter demoralisation that had set in. Lord Finlay's motion condoning Gen. Dyer was passed in spite of the masterly speeches of Lord Curzon and Lord Sinha. Though the noble Lords' action could have no constitutional value it was yet an index to the depth of English ignorance and prejudice. Above all, some officers who had misbehaved in the late tragedy still continued to exercise authority in the Punjab, and Mr. Lajpat Rai started a propaganda to boycott the New Councils so long as they were not dispensed with. Mr. Gandhi who had already made up his mind to offer Satyagraha in varying forms in connection with the Khilafat question readily joined the Lala and issued the following note in July 1920:—

Needless to say I am in entire accord with Lala Lajpat Rai on the question of a boycott of the Reformed Councils. For me it is but one step in the campaign of Non-Co-operation, as I feel equally keenly on the Punjab question as on the Khilafat. Lala Lajpat Rai's suggestion is doubly welcome. I have seen a suggestion made in more quarters than one that Non-Co-operation with the Reforms should commence after the process of election has been gone through. I cannot help saying that

it is a mistake to go through the election farce and the expense of it, when we clearly do not intend to take part in the proceedings of these Legislative Councils. Moreover, a great deal of educative work has to be done among the people, and if I could I would not have the best attention of the country frittered away in electioneering. The populace will not understand the beauty of Non-Co-operation, if we seek election and then resign; but it would be a fine education for them if electors are taught not to elect anybody and unanimously to tell whosoever may be seeking their suffrage that he would not represent them if he sought election so long as the Punjab and Khilafat questions were not satisfactorily settled. I hope, however, that Lala Lajpat Rai does not mean to end with the boycott of the Reformed Councils. We must take, if necessary, every one of the four stages of Non-Co-operation if we are to be regarded as a self-respecting nation. The issue is clear. Both the Khilafat terms and the Punjab affairs show that Indian opinion counts for little in the Councils of the Empire. It is a humiliating position. We shall make nothing of the Reforms if we quietly swallow the humiliation. In my humble opinion, therefore, the first condition of real progress is the removal of these two difficulties in our path, and unless some better course of action is devised, Non-Co-operation must hold the field.

The Khilafat Question

We have referred more than once to Mr. Gandhi's connection with the Khilafat question. The country was in the throes of a tremendous agitation—an agitation which gained enormously in its intensity and popular appeal by the mere fact of Mr. Gandhi's participation in it. It would take us far afield to discuss the whole question of the history of the Khilafat movement. Briefly put, it resolves itself into two primary factors. The first was the Premier's pledge and promise, that after the war nothing would be done to disturb the integrity of the Ottoman Empire both as a concession to Muslim loyalty and in accordance with the principles of self-determination. The second was that the violation of imperial obligation was thoroughly immoral and should at all costs be resisted by all self-respecting Mahomedans. In this gigantic enterprise Hindus must help Mahomedans and join hands with them as a token of neighbourly regard. This at any rate was the interpretation put upon the Khilafat question by Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Gandhi would not stoop to consider

that the Government of India could possibly have no voice in the determination of an international negotiation. He knew that the Government of India had represented the Indian feeling with some warmth and that Mr. Montagu and Lord Sinha had done their best to voice the claims of India at the Peace Table. But he held that the Government of India had not done all in their power and when the terms of Treaty with Turkey were published with a lengthy note from the Government of India to soothe the injured sentiment of the Muslim people, Mr Gandhi wrote a remarkably frank letter to H. E Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy, on June 14, 1920, in which he pointed out:—

The Peace terms and Your Excellency's defence of them have given the Mussulmans of India a shock from which it will be difficult for them to recover. The terms violate Ministerial pledges and utterly disregard the Mussulman sentiment. I consider that as a staunch Hindu, wishing to live on terms of the closest friendship with my Mussulman countrymen I should be an unworthy son of India if I did not stand by them in their hour of trial. In my humble opinion their cause is just. They claim that Turkey must not be punished if their sentiment is to be respected. Muslim soldiers did not fight to inflict punishment on their own Khalifa or to deprive him of his territories. The Mussulman attitude has been consistent throughout these five years. My duty to the Empire to which I owe my loyalty, requires me to resist the cruel violence that had been done to Mussulman sentiment. So far as I am aware the Mussulmans and Hindus have as a whole lost faith in British justice and honour.

The report of the majority of the Hunter Committee, Your Excellency's despatch thereon, and Mr. Montagu's reply have only aggravated the distrust. In these circumstances the only course open to one like me is either in despair to sever all connection with British Rule or if I still retained the faith in the inherent superiority of the British Constitution to all others at present in vogue, to adopt such means as will rectify the wrong done and thus restore that confidence.

Non-Co-operation was the only dignified and constitutional form of such direct action. For it is a right recognised from times immemorial of the subjects to refuse to assist the ruler who misrules. At the same time I admit Non-Co-operation practised by the mass of people is attended with grave risks. But in a crisis such as has overtaken the Mussulmans of India, no step that is unattended with large risks can possibly bring about the desired change. Not to run some risks will be to count much greater risks if not the virtual destruction of law

and order; but there is yet an escape from Non-Co-operation. The Mussulman representation has requested Your Excellency to lead the agitation yourself as did your distinguished predecessor at the time of the South African trouble, but if you cannot see your way to do so and Non-Co-operation becomes the dire necessity, I hope Your Excellency will give those who have accepted my advice and myself credit for being actuated by nothing less than a stern sense of duty.

THE NON CO-OPERATION PROGRAMME

And what was the Non-Co-operation programme that Mr. Gandhi had worked out for the adoption of the country for rectifying the wrongs done to Muslim sentiment? He enunciated the four stages in the programme of Non-Co-operation in clear and unambiguous terms.

The first was the giving up of titles and honorary offices; the second was the refusal to serve Government in paid appointments or to participate in any manner in the working of the existing machinery of civil and judicial administration. The third was to decline to pay taxes and the last was to ask the police and the military to withdraw co-operation from the Government. From the first Mr. Gandhi realised the full scope of the movement and he had no doubt of its far-reaching effects. It cannot therefore be said that he started the movement in a fit of indignation. Far from it he had worked out his programme to the farthest limits of its logic and had a clear grasp of all its implications. From time to time he set right many a misconception in the mind of the non co-operationists, such for instance, in regard to the position of the non co-operationist Vakil. There is no ambiguity in what Mr. Gandhi said. The Vakil should quietly wash his hands off the court, cases and all. Mr. Gandhi took care to explain that no stage would be taken until he had made sure that he was on firm ground. That is, he would not embark on the last two stages till he had created an indigenous panchayat to dispense justice and an organization of volunteers to maintain peace and order. In any case, violence should be completely avoided.

Now it must be admitted that many people had only a vague and hazy notion of Mr. Gandhi's programme. There were of course those who plainly told Mr. Gandhi of

the impracticability of his scheme and the dangers involved in it. Many Liberal League organisations implored Mr. Gandhi not to lead the country to a repetition of the Punjab tragedy. Moderate leaders like Sir Narayan Chandavarkar argued the futility of methods leading to anarchy and chaos. But the most amusing, even at such serious times, was the attitude of some Congressmen. These were variously divided. All hailed Non-Co-operation in theory. But when the time came for practising it, they flooded the country with a mass of literature of the most tortuous kind; casuistry was dealt in abundance. Aspirants after Council honours refused to commit what they called "political suicide" by "boycotting the New Councils". Others affected to believe in the possibilities of further efforts of constitutional agitation. Still others detected illegalities in some stages of Non-Co-operation. And yet some would not commit themselves but await the verdict of the Special Congress. A minority would contest at the elections only to resign again and yet some others would join the New Councils just to wreck the Reforms! What a cloud of words and mystification of meaning! To all this warfare of words Mr. Gandhi's own direct and simple statements are in refreshing contrast. He spoke and wrote strongly on the subject. There could be no doubt of his intentions or his plans. There was no ambiguity in his language. His words went straight as a bullet and he had a wholesome scorn of diplomatic reserves in opinion. Whatever one may think of his views Mr. Gandhi's leadership was faultless and he held his ground with the fervour of faith. In no case would he play to the gallery nor make light of his cherished convictions even if he found the whole mass of the people ranged against him. He would not be led away by the passing gusts of popular frenzy and he has a wholesome contempt for sycophancy of any kind, even to the people. He has a noble way of bearing the brunt of all toil and trouble. He would not like many other "leaders" throw the followers into the fray while they continue to remain in comparative security. He

has an inconvenient way of urging the leaders really to lead. Accordingly on the 1st of August, as he had already announced he led the movement by returning his *Kaiser-i-hind* gold medal to the Viceroy. In returning it he wrote a letter to His Excellency from which we must quote the following sentences :—

"Events that have happened during the past month have confirmed me in the opinion that the Imperial Government have acted in the Khilafat matter in an unscrupulous, immoral, and unjust manner and have been moving from wrong to wrong in order to defend their immorality. I can retain neither respect nor affection for such a Government.

* * *

Your Excellency's light-hearted treatment of official crime, your exoneration of Sir Michæl O'Dwyer, Mr. Montagu's despatch, and above all the shameful ignorance of the Punjab events and callous disregard of the feelings of Indians betrayed by the House of Lords have filled me with the gravest misgivings regarding the future of the Empire, have estranged me completely from the present Government and have disabled me from rendering as I have hitherto—whole-heartedly tendered, my loyal co-operation.

"In my humble opinion the ordinary method of agitating by way of petitions, deputations, and the like is no remedy for moving to repentance a Government so hopelessly indifferent to the welfare of its charge as the Government of India has proved to be. In European countries condonation of such grievous wrongs as the Khilafat and the Punjab would have resulted in a bloody revolution by the people. They would have resisted, at all costs, national emasculation. Half of India is too weak to offer violent resistance, and the other half is unwilling to do so. I have therefore, ventured to suggest the remedy of Non-Co-operation, which enables those who wish to dissociate themselves from Government, and which, if it is unattended by violence and undertaken in ordered manner, must compel it to retrace its steps and undo the wrongs committed; but whilst I pursue the policy of Non-Co-operation, in so far as I can carry the people with me, I shall not lose hope that you will yet see your way to do justice, I therefore respectfully ask Your Excellency to summon a conference of recognised leaders of the people, and, in consultation with them, to find a way that will gladden Mussulmans and do reparation to the unhappy Punjab."

Soon after, Mr. Gandhi started on an extensive campaign preaching Non-Co-operation to large audiences. In August he came to Madras where he delivered a power-

ful speech advocating his scheme. Mr. Gandhi went to Tanjore, Trichy, Bangalore and other places and discoursed on the same subject with his accustomed energy, while his weekly *Young India* was replete with regular contributions from his indefatigable pen. Week after week *Young India* came out with a series of articles from Mr. Gandhi's pen answering objections and formulating methods of Non-Co-operation.

Congress and Non-Co-operation

Mr. Gandhi's immediate objective was to convert the Special Congress to his creed. For as we have said though many had jubilantly proclaimed their faith in his programme, it was found that as time drew near for putting his plans into practice they were busy finding loopholes to escape the rigours of Mr. Gandhi's discipline. Everybody would throw everybody else into the struggle. A body of men who had sworn by Mr. Gandhi and denounced those who had the courage to differ from him were suddenly faced with an awkward dilemma. They felt the inconvenience of suffering and sacrifice and would fain be relieved of their unwitting words of bravado. But Mr. Gandhi would stand four square to all the winds that blow. Nor could they with any grace secede from the Congress, having so violently denounced as treason the Moderates' disregard of the Delhi and Amritsar Resolutions. There was to their mind only one course left open, *i. e.*, to thwart Mr. Gandhi's resolution in the open Congress. But Mr. Gandhi had prepared the ground with characteristic thoroughness. Khilafat specials from Bombay and Madras had flooded the Congress with delegates sworn to vote for him. There was a tough fight in the Subjects Committee which sat for eight long hours without coming to any apparent decision. Over forty amendments were brought in by different members, twelve of them were ruled out as mere verbal repetitions and there remained no less than 28 amendments to consider. The speeches in the Subjects Committee were remarkably frank. Messrs. Malaviya, Das, Pal, Jinnah, Baptista, all attacked the original resolution with warmth while Mrs. Besant vigorously assailed the very principle of

Non-Co-operation. The debate was most exciting. The President, Mr. Lajpat Rai himself, spoke strongly against certain important provisions of the Resolution. He would not agree to the withdrawal of boys from schools nor could he think it at all possible to call upon lawyers to leave their practice. He was personally in favour of the principle of Non-Co-operation but he doubted the wisdom of committing the Congress to those extravagant and far-reaching items in Mr. Gandhi's programme.

Boycott of Councils

But by far the most contentious item in the Resolution was that relating to the boycott of councils. The bulk of the nationalists were strangely enough opposed to it and by a curious stretch of logic they considered obstruction *in* the council as preferable to wholesale boycott.

Mr. C. R. Das, who was in charge of the main resolution on behalf of the Reception Committee, agreed to Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal's amendment of his resolution, but if it was defeated, he would stand by his own. Mr. Pal's amendment was put to the vote and was lost, 155 voting for and 161 against. Then another vote was taken on Mr. Das's resolution and Mr Gandhi's resolution as amended by Pundit Motial Nehru and as accepted by Mr. Gandhi himself. It is said that in the final voting a poll was taken 133 voting for Mr. Das's resolution and 148 for Mr. Gandhi's, thus giving a majority to Mr Gandhi of 15 votes and thus showing that the voting was very close. It is clear that the Subjects Committee consisted of 296 members present and that 15 of whom remained neutral. The greatest excitement prevailed both inside the Committee room and outside when it was known that Mr. Gandhi won the day. Nearly two thousand people collected outside and shouted "Gandhi Mahatma Kee Jai" and "Bande Mataram."

Excitement in the Congress

That gives the clue to the mentality of the Congress. If Mr. Gandhi could win in the Subjects Committee itself there was no doubt of his triumph in the open Congress. Still Mr. Das proposed to bring his amendments to the

open Congress and take the verdict. That verdict was a foregone conclusion. The Nationalists complained (what an irony of things!) that the Khilafats had packed the house and manœuvred a majority. There is no doubt that each party strove for victory. When the Congress met the next day, Sir Asutosh Choudhuri moved for adjournment of the question in the right legal way. Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao seconded it but the motion was lost by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Gandhi then rose to move his resolution amidst thunderous applause. The Resolution ran as follows :—

This Congress is of opinion that there can be no contentment in India without redress of the two aforementioned wrongs and that the only effectual means to vindicate national honour and to prevent a repetition of similar wrongs in future is the establishment of Swarajya. This Congress is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent Non-Co-operation until the said wrongs are righted and Swarajya is established.

And inasmuch as a beginning should be made by the classes who have hitherto moulded and represented public opinion and inasmuch as Government consolidates its power through titles and honours bestowed on the people, through schools controlled by it, its law courts and its legislative councils, and inasmuch as it is desirable in the prosecution of the movement to take the minimum risk and to call for the least sacrifice compatible with the attainment of the desired object, this Congress earnestly advises:

(*a*) surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in local bodies;

(*b*) refusal to attend Government levees, durbars, and other official and semi-official functions held by Government officials or in their houour;

(*c*) gradual withdrawal of children from schools and colleges owned, aided or controlled by Government and in place of such schools and colleges establishment of national schools and colleges in the various provinces;

(*d*) gradual boycott of British courts by lawyers and litigants and establishment of private arbitration courts by their aid for the settlement of private disputes;

(*e*) refusal on the part of the military, clerical and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service in Mesopotamia;

(*f*) withdrawal by candidates of their candidature for election to the Reformed Councils and refusal on the part of the

voters to vote for any candidate who may despite the Congress advice offer himself for election.

(*g*) And inasmuch as Non-Co-operation has been conceived as a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice without which no nation can make real progress, and inasmuch, as an opportunity should be given in the very first stage of Non-Co-operation to every man, woman, and child, for such discipline and self-sacrifice, this Congress advises adoption of Swadeshi in piecegoods on a vast scale, and inasmuch as the existing mills of India with indigenous capital and control do not manufacture sufficient yarn and sufficient cloth for the requirements of the nation, and are not likely to do so for a long time to come, this Congress advises immediate stimulation of further manufacture on a large scale by means of reviving hand-spinning in every home and hand-weaving on the part of the millions of weavers who have abandoned their ancient and honourable calling for want of encouragement.

In moving the resolution, Mr. Gandhi spoke with compelling fervour. "I stand before you, in fear of God," he said, "and with a sense of duty towards my country to commend this resolution to your hearty acceptance." Mr. Gandhi said that the only weapon in their hands was Non-Co-operation, and non-violence should be their creed. Dr. Kitchlew seconded the resolution in Urdu.

Mr. Pal then placed his amendment which proposed a mission to England to present our demands and meanwhile to establish national schools, formulate arbitration courts and not to boycott the councils.

Mr. Das in supporting the amendment made an appeal to Mr. Gandhi to consider the practical effect of his victory. Mrs. Besant opposed both the resolution and the amendment, while Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Jinnah preferred the latter. Messrs. Yakub Hasan, Jitendra Lal Banerjea, Nehru and Rambhuji Dutt supported Mr. Gandhi whose resolution was finally carried.

The Congress reassembled on the 9th and the whole morning was devoted to the taking of votes, province by province, for and against Mr. Gandhi's motion. Out of twelve provinces only the Central Provinces and Berar showed a majority against Mr. Gandhi's motion, while in the remaining ten provinces the majority of votes were in

his favour. The president announced that out of 5,814 delegates, the registered number of delegates who took part in voting was 2,728 while 63 did not vote. Actual voting showed that 1,855 voted for and 873 against Mr. Gandhi's motion.

After this fateful decision it is no wonder that Congressmen who were avowedly against Non-Co-operation found themselves in a difficult predicament. They hastily called for a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee and it was resolved to find a way out of the mess the Congress had made.

The mandatory nature of the Congress Resolution was relaxed at the instance of Pandit Malaviya and a few others who thought it suicidal to let slip the benefits of the new reforms. It was, however, thought inexpedient to impair the authority of the Congress and Congressmen like Mr. Patel in Bombay, Mr. Das in Bengal, Pandit Motilal Nehru in U. P., Messrs. Madhava Rao and Vijayaraghavachariar in Madras—though they had opposed the Resolution in the Congress— decided to abide by it, and withdrew their candidature from the forthcoming elections. Many leading Congressmen resigned their honorary offices and relinquished their titles While Mr. Gokaran Nath Misra, one of the Secretaries of the All-India Congress Committee, and several office-bearers in the Provincial Congress Committees who were opposed to the Resolution resigned their offices so as to leave the Congress organisations free to work out Mr. Gandhi's programme.

If Mr. Gandhi's influence was so decisive at the Special Congress as to set at naught the opinons of Congressmen like C. R. Das and Bepin Chandra Pal, his authority was supreme at the Nagpur Session in December. Nagpur in fact, witnessed the turning point in the history of the Congress, as in that year Mr. Gandhi, with an overwhelming majority completely captured this institution and converted its leading spirits to his creed. Here it was that the old creed of the Congress was discarded for the new one of indifference to British overlordship.

With the change of creed and the wholesale adoption of the programme of Non-Co-operation the old Congress was virtually dead. The New Congress was inspired by a new hope and sustained by new methods altogether alien to the faith of men like Dadabhai and Gokhale who had guided it in its years of infancy and adolescence.

Mr. Gandhi was not slow to use his great authority over the Congress to further the movement of which he was the directing head. At his command were all the Congress and Khilafat organisations, and he set out on an extensive tour of the country preaching the new cult with the fervour of a prophet. Everywhere he was received with ovation. His Nagpur triumph was the beginning of an agitation before which even his Satyagraha demonstrations were as nothing. Mr. Gandhi, as might be expected of one of his ardent and generous impulse, staked his life on the agitation, and day after day he was unwearied in his services and unsparing of himself in his devotion to what might be called the most supreme and desperate adventure of his life.

As he went from place to place accompanied by the Ali Brothers the movement became popular among the ignorant and the literate. His fourfold programme of boycotting schools, cloths, councils and Government Service was the theme of his multitudinous discourses. But the most painful result (at any rate to those who are not of his pursuasion) was the calling away of youths from their schools and colleges. Many a lad, led away by the glamour of the great ideal and the irresistable appeal of a saintly leader, gave up their school education, the only education available at present.

THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

At Aligarh and Benares great efforts were made to call away the students from the Muslim and Hindu Universities, if they could not nationalise them. They were not quite successful though a few joined the Congress, but in Bengal, at the instance of Messrs. C. R. Das and Jitendralal Banerjea, a large number of students flocked to their standard and deserted the schools. It was such appeals

that enthused the youth of Bengal who created a profound sensation by throwing themselves in their thousands at the steps of the Calcutta University Hall, that the few who did attend the examination had to do so by walking over their bodies.

One peculiarity of the programme was that emphasis was laid on each item as the occasion demanded. At one time it was the boycott of schools, again it was the collection of a crore of rupees for the Swarajya Fund, a third time it was the burning of mill cloths and yet again it was the boycott of the Duke or the good Prince. Each was in turn to bring Swarajya within the year. Thus in February the agitation centred on the boycott of the Duke of Connaught to whom Mr. Gandhi addressed a dignified if uncompromising letter. Mr. Gandhi wrote:—

> Our non-participation in a hearty welcome to Your Royal Highness is thus in no sense a demonstration against your high personage, but it is against the system you come to uphold. I know individual Englishmen cannot even if they will, alter the English nature all of a sudden. If we would be the equals of Englishmen we must cast off fear. We must learn to be self-reliant and independent of schools, courts, protection and patronage of a Government we seek to end if it will not mend.

By May the spirit of lawlessness had spread far and wide and strikes and hartals became the order of the day. Mr. Gandhi, however, resolutely discountenanced all violence and he was seldom sparing in his admonition of those who took part in the incident at Malegaon and other places. Again and again, he spoke strongly against the spirit of non-violence which for a time broke out as often as he decried it in all earnestness.

INTERVIEW WITH THE NEW VICEROY

It was about this time too that Lord Chelmsford retired and his place was taken by Lord Reading, who came to India with a great reputation. An Ex-Lord Chief Justice of England and sometime British Ambassador at Washington during the fateful years of war—the new Viceroy inspired great hopes. His reputation for justice, strengthened by his repeated assurances, and his reputation for tactful dealing of delicate questions were just the things of

momentous need for India. No wonder, an air of hope and expectancy hung over the whole country.

Soon after Lord Reading arrived in India, an interview was arranged by Pandit Malaviya between the new Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi. This interview, which lasted many hours, took place at Simla in May 1921. Much speculation was rife as to its result and Mr. Gandhi explained the circumstances and the results of his talk in an article in *Young India* under the title "The Simla Visit." What was the upshot of the visit? The leader of the Non-Co-operation movement and the head of the Government of India got to know each other. It was a great thing.

But the immediate result of this was the statement issued by the Ali Brothers—a statement in which they regretted their occasional lapse into excessive language and promised to refrain from writing or speaking in any manner likely to provoke violence. This "definite result of the interview" was claimed as a victory for the Government. Others claimed that it was a victory for Mr. Gandhi who explained that it was no apology or undertaking to the Government but a reassertion of the principle of non-violence to which the Ali Brothers had subscribed. It was a statement to the public irrespective of what the Government might or might not do with them. In answer to criticisms against his advice to the Brothers, Mr. Gandhi stoutly defended his action, and praised the Brothers' attitude.

Indeed Mr. Gandhi's loyalty to his colleagues and particularly his affectionate and fraternal regard for the brothers is beautiful and touching to a degree. And when in September 1921 the Brothers were prosecuted by the Bombay Government, Mr. Gandhi with fifty others issued a public manifesto that "it is the inherent right of every one to express his opinion without restraint about the propriety of citizens offering their services to, or remaining in the employ of the Government whether in the civil or the military department."

THE ETHICS OF DESTRUCTION

Another feature of Mr. Gandhi's activity which for a a time threw a baleful light over the movement was the cult of destruction, as typefied in the burning of foreign cloth. Rabindranath Tagore and C. F. Andrews and several others, horrified at the wanton waste, pointed out from time to time the evil effects of this burning business. Mr. Gandhi, mercilessly logical as ever, would heed no such counsel but continued literally to feed the flames. With that cultivated sense of distinction between the deer and the thing done, which is ever present in men such as he, there might be some efficacy in this form of purification and self-denial. But many were the critics who held that his *bonfire* mania was the surest way to rouse all the evil passions of the multitude and as surely lead to hatred and civil strife.

THE BOMBAY RIOTS

Whatever the root cause of the breaking out of violence and hooliganism, the landing of the Prince of Wales in Bombay on the 17th November was made the occasion of a ghastly tragedy. Mr. Gandhi had since the announcement of the Royal visit appealed to his countrymen to refrain from participating in the functions got up in honour of the Prince. Non-Co operators all over the country had organised what are known as 'hartals,' closing of shops and suspending all work, and boycotting the Prince. In Bombay such activities resulted in a great riot in which all parties suffered owing to the hooliganism of the mischievous elements in the mob who violated Mr. Gandhi's injunctions to be non-violent and brought about a terrible riot. Mr. Gandhi was then in Bombay and after witnessing the scene of the tragedy, wrote some of the most stirring letters which, coupled with the exertions of men of all parties, restored peace in the city.

As a penance for this ghastly tragedy he pledged himself to fast till complete peace was restored. Strangely enough, the situation was well in hand in a couple of days and on the fourth day in breaking the fast in the

midst of a gathering of Co-operators, Non-Co-operators, Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsis and Christians, Mr. Gandhi made a thrilling statement.

I am breaking my fast upon the strength of your assurances. I have not been unmindful of the affection with which innumerable friends have surrounded me during these four days. I shall ever remain grateful to them. Being drawn by them I am plunging into this stormy ocean out of the heaven of peace in which I have been during these few days. I assure you that, in spite of the tales of misery that have been poured into my ears, I have enjoyed peace because of a hungry stomach. I know that I cannot enjoy it after breaking the fast I am too human not to be touched by the sorrows of others, and when I find no remedy for alleviating them, my human nature so agitates me that I pine to embrace death like a long-lost dear friend. Therefore I warn all the friends here that if real peace is not established in Bombay and if disturbances break out again and if as a result they find me driven to a still severer ordeal, they must not be surprised or troubled. If they have any doubt about peace having been established, if each community has still bitterness of feeling and suspicion and if we are all not prepared to forget and forgive past wrongs, I would much rather that they did not press me to break the fast. Such a restraint I would regard as a test of true friendship.

And then Mr. Gandhi drove the moral home to the gathering as also to the eager and anxious public all over India.

Warned by the disasters at Bombay and the Moplah rebellion which was still going on in Malabar, it was expected that Mr. Gandhi would reconsider his position and stop short of the extreme steps in Non-Co operation. But that was not to be. The Congress had by this time become an organ for registering his decrees. And the Committee met frequently to devise methods in pursuance of Non-Co-operation. Thundering resolutions, alternating with hopes and warnings, came in quick succession. Province after Province vied with one another for the exciting novelty of civil disobedience.

Though the author of the Civil Disobedience movement in India, Mr. Gandhi was always alive to its dangers. He therefore insisted that his conditions should be fulfilled in toto before any Taluka could embark on a campaign of

Civil Disobedience. And those conditions were very rigorous indeed.

The Calcutta Hartal

Meanwhile the hartal organised by Non-Co operators in connection with the Prince's visit was more or less successful in many places. It was alleged that by intimidation and otherwise, the hartal in Calcutta on the day of the Prince's landing in Bombay was phenomenally complete. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce and the Anglo-Indian press took an alarmist view of the situation and expressed grave indignation against the passivity of the Government. With a view to suppress the activity of the Congress in this direction Government resuscitated part II of the Criminal Law Amendment Act which was then literally under a sentence of death. When volunteering was declared unlawful Congress leaders took up the challenge and called on the people to disobey the order and seek imprisonment in their thousands. Men like Messrs. C. R Das in Calcutta and Motilal Nehru in Allahabad openly defied the order and canvassed volunteers in total disregard of legal consequences. They sought imprisonment and called on their countrymen to follow them to prison. The situation was grave. It was then that Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sir P. C. Ray and others thought that the time had come when they should step into the breach and try to bring about a reconciliation between Government and Non Co-operators. With this view Pandit Madan Mohan and others interviewed leading Non-Co operators and those in authority Lord Ronaldshay, in his speech at the Legislative Council referred to the gravity of the situation and defined the firm attitude of Government.

The Viceroy who had invited the Prince was naturally very indignant at the strange form of "reception" that awaited the innocent scion of the Royal House. Could anything be done at all towards a rapproachment?

The Deputation to the Viceroy

A Deputation headed by Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya waited on His Excellency the Viceroy at Calcutta

on December 21 and requested him to call a Round Table Conference of representatives of people of all shades of opinion with a view to bring about a final settlement. Lord Reading replied at some length and defined the attitude of the Government. He regretted that "it is impossible even to consider the convening of a conference if agitation in open and avowed defiance of law is meanwhile to be continued." Mr. Gandhi's refusal to call off the hartal in connection with H.R.H. the Prince of Wales' visit to Calcutta on December 24, apparently stiffened the attitude of the Government. Interviewed by the Associated Press, Mr. Gandhi made the following statement regarding the Viceroy's reply to the Deputation:—

I repeat for the thousandth time that it is not hostile to any nation or any body of men but it is deliberately aimed at the system under which Government of India is being to-day conducted, and I promise that no threats and no enforcement of threats by the Viceroy or any body of men will strangle that agitation or send to rest that awakening.

The Ahmedabad Congress

Meanwhile the Annual Session of the Congress met at Ahmedabad, the headquarters of Mr. Gandhi. It was virtually a Gandhi Session. The President-elect, Mr. C. R. Das, was in prison and so were many other leaders besides. Hakim Ajmal Khan was elected to take the chair and the proceedings were all in Hindi and Gujarati. Mr. Gandhi was invested with full dictatorial powers by the Congress and the central resolution of the session, which he moved, ran as follows:

"This Congress, whilst requiring the ordinary machinery to remain intact and to be utilised in the ordinary manner whenever feasible, hereby appoints, until further instructions, Mahatma Gandhi as the sole executive authority of the Congress and invests him with the full power to convene a special session of the Congress or of the All-India Congress Committee or the Working Committee and also with the power to appoint a successor in emergency.

"This Congress hereby confers upon the said successor and all subsequent successors appointed in turn by their predecessors, all his aforesaid powers, provided that nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to authorise Mahatma Gandhi or any of the aforesaid successors to conclude any terms of peace

with the Government of India or the British Government without the previous sanction of the All-India Congress Committee, to be finally ratified by the Congress specially convened for the purpose, and provided also that the present creed of the Congress shall in no case be altered by Mahatma Gandhi or his successor except with the leave of the Congress first obtained."

There were yet some in the Congress who went a step further than Mr. Gandhi himself. Moulana Hazrat Mohani stood out for complete independence and it is interesting to note how valiantly Mr. Gandhi fought against the motion of absolute severance from Britain. Mr. Gandhi opposed all his amendments and pinned the Congress down to his own dubious resolution. Soon after the session, some of the Provincial organisations were busy preparing for a no-tax campaign. In U. P, Guzerat, the Andhra and in the Punjab the movement threatened to assume a serious turn. Mr. Gandhi, himself, while insisting that his conditions should be fulfilled before any taluka should embark on an offensive compaign, threw the onus of responsibility on the Province itself—Provincial autonomy with a vengeance! But then there were hopes of peace in the air.

The Bombay Conference

A conference of representatives of various shades of political opinion convened by Pundit Malaviya, Mr. Jinnah and others, assembled at Bombay on the 14th January, 1922, with Sir C. Sankaran Nair, in the Chair. On the second day Sir Sankaran withdrew and Sir M. Visveswaraya took up his place. Over two-hundred leading men from different provinces attended. Mr. Gandhi was present throughout and though he refused to be officially connected—an attitude resented by many— with the resolutions, he took part in the debates and helped the conference in framing the resolutions which were also ratified by the Congress Working Committee.

The Ultimatum

While negotiations were going on between the representatives of the Malaviya Conference and H. E. the Viceroy, Mr. Gandhi addressed an open letter to Lord

Reading. The letter was in effect an ultimatum threatening with the inauguration of offensive civil disobedience in Bardoli. The efforts of the Conference thus came to nothing as neither Mr. Gandhi nor the Viceroy would give up any one of their points. Compromise was impossible. And the Government of India in a *communique* published on the 6th February in reply to Mr. Gandhi's letter, repudiated his assertions and urged that the issue before the country was no longer between this or that programme of political advance, but between lawlessness with all its consequences on the one hand and the maintenance of those principles which lie at the root of all civilised governments. Mr. Gandhi in a further rejoinder issued on the very next day pointed out that the only choice before the people was mass civil disobedience with all its undoubted dangers and lawless repression of the lawful activities of the people.

The Chauri Chaura Tragedy

While Mr. Gandhi was about to inaugurate mass civil disobedience in Bardoli, there occurred a terrible tragedy at Chauri Chaura on the 14th February when an infuriated mob, including some volunteers also, attacked the *thana*, burnt down the building and beat to death not less than twenty-two policemen. Some constables and chaukedars were literally burnt to death and the whole place was under mobocracy. Mr. Gandhi took this occurrence as a third warning from God to suspend civil disobedience, and the Bardoli programme was accordingly given up. On the 11th the Working Committee met at Bardoli and resolved to suspend all offensive action including even picketing and processions. The country was to confine itself to the constructive programme of Khaddar manufacture. The Working Committee advised the stoppage of all activities designed to court imprisonment.

The suspension of mass civil disobedience in Bardoli, which was recommended by the Working Committee at the instance of Mr. Gandhi, was resented by some of his colleagues and followers. In reply to corre-

spondents who attacked him, he wrote as follows in *Young India* of February, 23:

I feel still more confident of the correctness of the decision of the Working Committee, but if it is found that the country repudiates my action I shall not mind it. I can but do my duty. A leader is useless when he acts against the promptings of his own conscience, surrounded as he must be by people holding all kinds of views. He will drift like an anchorless ship if he has not the inner voice to hold him firm and guide him. Above all, I can easily put up with the denial of the world, but any denial by me of my God is unthinkable, and if I did not give at this critical period of the struggle the advice that I have, I would be denying both God and Truth.

The All-India Congress Committee met on the 25th at Delhi to consider the Bardoli decisions and though the latter were endorsed it was not done without some important modifications, to feed the growing demand for aggressive action on the part of the extreme Non-Co-operators. From subsequent events it is fairly certain that the Delhi resolutions confirmed the Government's resolve to prosecute Mr. Gandhi, a resolve which was held in abeyance after the Bardoli programme was made known.

Mr. Gandhi's Arrest

For months past the rumour of Mr. Gandhi's impending arrest was in the air. Expecting the inevitable Mr. Gandhi had more than once written his final message. But in the first week of March the rumour became more widespread and intense. The stiffening of public opinion in England and Mr. Montagu's threatening speech in defence of his Indian policy in the Commons, revealed the fact that the Secretary of State had already sanctioned Mr. Gandhi's prosecution. Chauri Chaura and the Delhi decisions were presumably the immediate cause of Government's action on Mr. Gandhi. Realising that his arrest would not long be deferred, Mr. Gandhi wrote a farewell message in *Young India* calling on his countrymen to continue the work of the Congress undeterred by fear, to prosecute the Khadder programme, to promote Hindu-Muslim Unity and to desist from violence at any cost.

Meanwhile he was arrested at the Satyagraha Ashram, Ahmedabad, on Friday the 10th March. On the 11th noon

Messrs. Gandhi and Sankarlal Banker the publisher were placed before Mr. Brown, Assistant Magistrate, the Court being held in the Divisional Commissioner's Office at Sahibab. The Superintendent of Police, Ahmedabad, the first witness, produced the Bombay Government's authority to lodge a complaint for four articles published in *Young India*, dated the 15th June, 1921, entitled "Disaffection a Virtue", dated the 20th September, "Tampering with Loyalty" dated the 15th December, "The Puzzle and Its Solution" and "Shaking the Manes," dated the 23rd February 1922. Two formal police witnesses were then produced. The accused declined to cross-examine the witnesses. Mr M. K. Gandhi, who described himself as farmer and weaver by profession, residing at Satyagraha Ashram, Sabarmati, said :

I simply wish to state that when the proper time comes I shall plead guilty so far as disaffection towards the Government is concerned. It is quite true that I am the Editor of *Young India* and that the articles read in my presence were written by me and the proprietors and publishers had permitted me to control the whole policy of the paper.

The case then having been committed to the Sessions, Mr. Gandhi was taken to the Sabarmati Jail where he was detained till the hearing which was to come off on March 18. From his prison Mr. Gandhi wrote a number of inspiring letters to his friends and colleagues urging the continuance of the Congress work.

The Great Trial

At last the trial came off on Saturday the 18th March before Mr. C. N. Broomfield, I. C. S., District and Sessions Judge, Ahmedabad. Of the trial itself it is needless to write at length. For it will be long before the present generation could forget the spell of it. It was historic in many ways. Men's minds involuntarily turned to another great trial nineteen hundred years ago when Jesus stood before Pontius Pilate. Mr. Gandhi's statement (both the oral and the written statements) was in his best form, terse and lucid, courageous and uncompromising, with just that touch of greatness which elevates it to the level of a

masterpiece. Never before was such a prisoner arraigned before a British Court of Justice. Never before were the laws of an all-powerful Government so defiantly, yet with such humility, challenged. Men of all shades of political opinion, indeed all who had stood aloof from the movement and had condemned it in no uncertain terms, marvelled at the wisdom and compassion and heroism of the thin spare figure in a loin cloth thundering his anathemas against the Satanic system. And yet none could be gentler nor more sweetly tempered than the prisoner at the bar with a smile and a nod of thanks and recognition for every one, including his prosecutors. An eye-witness has given an account of the scene and we can not do better than quote his words :—

Mahatmaji stood up and spoke a few words complimenting the Advocate-General on his fairness and endorsing every statement he made regarding the charges. "I wish to endorse all the blame that the Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders", said Mahatmaji in pathetic earnestness, "and I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible for me to dissociate myself from the diabolical crimes of Chauri Chaura or the mad outrages of Bombay." These words of confession seemed to penetrate every heart throbbing in that hall and make those present there feel miserable over the mad deeds of their thoughtless countrymen. The speech finished and Mahatmaji sat down to read his immortal statement. It is impossible to describe the atmosphere of the Court-house at the time he was, and a few minutes after he finished reading his statement. Every word of it was eagerly followed by the whole audience. The Judge and the Advocate-General, the military officers and the political leaders all alike strained their ears and were all attention to hear the memorable statement of the Great Man. Mahatmaji took nearly 15 minutes to read his statement. As he proceeded with his reading, one could see the atmosphere of the Hall changing every minute, This historic production was the master's own. The ennobling confessions, the convincing logic, the masterly diction, the elevated thoughts and the inspiring tone—all produced instantaneous effect on the audience including the Judge and the prosecutor. For a minute everybody wondered who was on trial—whether Mahatma Gandhi before a British Judge or whether the British Government before God and Humanity. Mahatmaji finished his statement and for a few seconds there was complete silence in the Hall. Not a whisper was heard. One could hear a pin falling on the

The most unhappy man present there was perhaps the Judge himself. He restrained his emotion, cleared his voice, gathered his strength and delivered his oral judgment in careful and dignified words. No one could have performed this duty better. To combine the dignity of his position with the courtesy due to the mighty prisoner before him was no easy task. But he succeeded in doing it in a manner worthy, of the highest praise. Of course, the prisoner before him belonged of a different category from "any person he ever tried" or is likely try in future. And this fact influenced his whole speech and demeanour. His words almost fell when he came to the end and pronounced the sentence of simple imprisonment for six years.

And who is this Mr. Gandhi, who at the age of 53, has been sentenced to six years' imprisonment? He is the man whom the convicting judge himself described "as a great patriot and a great leader, as a man of high ideals and leading a noble and even saintly life," a man in whom, as Gokhale aptly described, 'Indian humanity has really reached its high water-mark' and in whom a Christian Bishop witnesseth 'the patient sufferer for the cause of righteousness and mercy.' Such a man has been condemned despite his public avowal of his huge mistake, his penitance for the same, his decision to suspend his aggressive programme, and his grave warnings that it would be "criminal" to start civil disobedience in the existing state of the country. Even some of the Anglo-Indian papers have condemned the action of the Government as a blunder; and one of these has gone so far as to characterise it as 'a masterpiece of official ineptitude.' And such a criticism cannot be described as altogether undeserved or unjust. Mr. Gandhi's agitation originated with the Rowlatt Act. It received strength on account of the calculated brutalities and humiliations of the Martial Law regime. And the climax was reached when the solemn pledges of the British Prime Minister in regard to Turkey were conveniently forgotton at Severs. The Rowlatt Act has since been repealed, the Punjab wrongs have been admitted and an appeal has been made to "forget and forgive." Mr. Gandhi's bitter complaint that the British Ministers have not sincerely fought for the redemption of the solemn pledges to the Mussulmans has been proved to

be well founded. And so the three great grievances for which Mr. Gandhi has been fighting—are grievances admitted by all to be just. In the opinion of Mr. Gandhi and most of his countrymen there would never have arisen these festering sores 'if we were in our country what others are in their own,' if in short, we too had been given "the Self-determination," for which elsewhere so much blood and treasure have been sacrificed. The whole question therefore reduces itself to one dominant problem—the Problem of Swaraj. And the problem of Mr. Gandhi is no less than that. But for the lost faith of the people in the sincerity of the British, even this question would not have assumed such an acute form as we find it to-day.

You cannot solve this problem by clapping its best, brightest and noblest exponent even though his methods may be novel and his activities inconvenient and sometimes dangerous. Sir John Rees was not far wrong when he observed that "Gandhi in Jail might prove to be more dangerous than Gandhi out of it." There is a world of significance in the warning of Professor Gilbert Murray:—

"Persons in power should be very careful when they deal with a man who cares nothing for sensual pleasures, nothing for riches, nothing for comfort or praise or promises but simply determines to do what he believes to be right. He is a dangerous and uncomfortable enemy because his body, which you can always conquer, gives you so little purchase upon his soul."

THE
South African Indian Question

THE BEGINNING OF THE STRUGGLE

The following is the full text of a lecture delivered at the Pachaiyappa's Hall, Madras, on October 26, 1896, by Mr. M. K. Gandhi on the "Grievances of Indian settlers in South Africa." The Hon. Mr. P. Ananda Charlu presided. Resolutions sympathising with the Indian settlers and expressing regret at the action of the Home and Indian Governments in having assented to the Indian Immigration Amendment Bill were passed. Mr. Gandhi said :—

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I am to plead before you this evening for the 100,000 British Indians in South Africa, the land of gold and the seat of the late Jameson Raid. This document will show you (here Mr. Gandhi read a credential from the people of Natal deputing him to plead their cause) that I have been deputed to do so by the signatories to it who profess to represent the 100,000 Indians. A large majority of this number are people from Madras and Bengal Apart, therefore, from the interest that you would take in them as Indians, you are specially interested in the matter.

South Africa may, for our purposes, be divided into the two self-governing British Colonies of Natal and the Cape of Good Hope, the Crown Colony of Zululand, the Transvaal or the South African Republic, the Orange

Free State, the Chartered Territories and the Portuguese Territories comprising Delagoa Bay and Beira.

South Africa is indebted to the Colony of Natal for the presence of the Indian population there. In the year 1860, when in the words of a member of the Natal Parliament, " the existence of the Colony hung in the balance," the Colony of Natal introduced indentured Indians into the Colony. Such immigration is regulated by law, is permissible only to a few favoured States, *e g.*, Mauritius, Fiji, Jamaica, Straits Settlements, Damarara and other States and is allowed only from Madras and Calcutta. As a result of the immigration, in the words of another eminent Natalian, Mr. Saunders, " Indian immigration brought prosperity, prices rose, people were no longer content to grow or sell produce for a song, they could do better." The sugar and tea industries as well as sanitation and the vegetable and fish supply of the Colony are absolutely dependent on the indentured Indians from Madras and Calcutta. The presence of the indentured Indians about sixteen years ago drew the free Indians in the shape of traders who first went there with a view to supply the wants of their own kith and kin ; but afterwards found a very valuable customer in the native of South Africa, called Zulu or Kaffir. These traders are chiefly drawn from the Bombay Memon Mahomedans and, owing to their less unfortunate position, have formed themselves into custodians of the interests of the whole Indian population there. Thus, adversity and identity of interests have united in a compact body the Indians from the three Presidencies and they take pride in calling themselves Indians rather than Madrasees or Bengalees or Gujaratees, except when it is necessary to do so. That however by the way.

These Indians have now spread all over South Africa. Natal which is governed by a Legislative Assembly consisting of 37 members elected by the voters, a Legislative Council consisting of 11 members nominated by the Governor who represents the Queen, and a movable Ministry consisting of 5 members, contains a European population of 50,000, a native population of 400,000, and an Indian population of 51,000. Of the 51,000 Indians about 16,000 are at present serving their indenture, 30,000 are those that have completed their indenture, and are now variously engaged as domestic servants, gardeners, hawkers and petty traders and about 5,000 are those who emigrated to the Colony on their own account and are either traders, shop-keepers, assistants or hawkers. A few are also school-masters, interpreters and clerks.

The self-governing Colony of the Cape of Good Hope has, I believe, an Indian population of about 10,000 consisting of traders, hawkers and labourers. Its total population is nearly 1,500,000 of whom not more than 400,000 are Europeans. The rest are natives of the country and Malays.

The South African Republic of the Transvaal which is governed by two elective Chambers called the Volksraad and an Executive with the President at its head has an Indian population of about 5,000 of whom about 200 are traders with liquidated assets amounting to nearly £100 000, The rest are hawkers and waiters or household servants, the latter being men from this Presidency. Its white population is estimated at roughly 120,000 and the Kaffir population at roughly 650,000. This Republic is subject to the Queen's suzerainty. And there is a convention between Great Britain and the

Republic which secures the property, trading and farming right of all persons other than natives of South Africa in common with the citizens of the Republic.

The other States have no Indian population to speak of, because of the grievances and disabilities except the Portuguese territories which contain a very large Indian population and which do not give any trouble to the Indians.

The grievances of the Indians in South Africa are two-fold, *i.e.*, those that are due to the popular ill-feeling against the Indians and, secondly, the legal disabilities placed upon them. To deal with the first, the Indian is the most hated being in South Africa. Every Indian without distinction is contemptuously called a "coolie." He is also called "Sammy," "Ramasawmy," anything but "Indian." Indian school-masters are called "coolie school masters." Indian storekeepers are "coolie storekeepers." Two Indian gentlemen from Bombay, Messrs. Dada Abdulla and Moos Hajee Cassim, own steamers. Their steamers are "coolie ships."

There is a very respectable firm of Madras traders by name, A Colandaveloo Pillay & Co. They have built a large block of buildings in Durban, these buildings are called "coolie stores" and the owners are "coolie owners." And I can assure you, gentlemen, that there is as much difference between the partners of that firm and a "coolie" as there is between any one in this hall and a coolie. The railway and tram-officials, in spite of the contradiction that has appeared in official quarters which I am going to deal with presently, I repeat, treat us as beasts. We cannot safely walk on the foot-paths. A Madrassi gentleman, spotlessly dressed, always avoids

the footpaths of prominent streets in Durban for fear he should be insulted or pushed off.

We are the "Asian dirt" to be "heartily cursed," we are "chokeful of vice" "and we live upon rice," we are "stinking coolies" living on "the smell of an oiled rage," we are "the black vermin," we are described in the Statute Books as "semi-barbarous Asiatics, or persons belonging to the uncivilised races of Asia." We "breed like rabbits" and a gentleman at a meeting lately held in Durban said he "was sorry we could not be shot like them." There are coaches running between certain places in the Transvaal. We may not sit inside them. It is a sore trial, apart from the indignity it involves and contemplates, to have to sit outside them either in deadly winter morning, for the winter is severe in the Transvaal, or under a burning sun, though we are Indians. The hotels refuse us admission. Indeed, there are cases in which respectable Indians have found it difficult even to procure refreshments at European places. It was only a short time ago that a gang of Europeans set fire to an Indian store in a village (*cries of shame*) called Dundee in Natal, doing some damage, and another gang threw burning crackers into the Indian stores in a business street in Durban. This feeling of intense hatred has been reproduced into legislation in the various States of South Africa restricting the freedom of Indians in many ways. To begin with, Natal, which is the most important from an Indian point of view, has of late shown the greatest activity in passing Indian legislation. Till 1894, the Indians had been enjoying the franchise equally with the Europeans under the general franchise law of the Colony, which entitles any adult male being a British subject to be placed on the voters' list, who possesses immoveable

property worth £50 or pays an annual rent of £10 There is a separate franchise qualification for the Zulu. In 1894, the Natal Legislature passed a Bill disfranchising Asiatics by name. We resisted it in the Local Parliament but without any avail. We then memorialised the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and as a result that bill was this year withdrawn and replaced by another which, though not quite so bad as the first one, is bad enough. It says that no natives of countries (not of European origin) which have not hitherto possessed elective representative institutions, founded on the Parliamentary Franchise, shall be placed on the voters roll unless they shall first obtain an exemption from the Governor in Council. This bill excepts from its operation those whose names are already rightly contained in any voters' list. Before being introduced it was submitted to Mr. Chamberlain who has approved of it. We have opposed it on the ground that we have such institutions in India, and that, therefore, the Bill will fail in its object if it is to disfranchise the Asiatics and that therefore also it is a harassing piece of legislation and is calculated to involve us in endless litigation and expense. This is admitted on all hands. The very members who voted for it thought likewise. The Natal Government organ says in effect:—

> We know India has such institutions and therefore the bill will not apply to the Indians. But we can have that bill or none. If it disfranchises Indians, nothing can be better. If it does not, then too we have nothing to fear! for the Indian can never gain political supremacy and if necessary, we can soon impose an educational test or raise the property qualification which, while disfranchising Indians wholesale, will not debar a single European from voting.

Thus the Natal legislature is paying a game of "toss up" at the Indians' expense. We are a fit subject for vivisection under the Natal Pasteur's deadly scalpel and

knife, with this difference between the Paris Pasteur and the Natal Pasteur that, while the former indulged in vivisection with the object of benefiting humanity, the latter has been indulging in it for the sake of amusement out of sheer wantonness. The object of this measure is not political. It is purely and simply to degrade the Indians in the words of a member of the Natal Parliament, "to make the Indian's life more comfortable in his native land than in Natal," in the words of another eminent Natalian, "to keep him for ever a hewer of wood and drawer of water." The very fact that, at present, there are only 250 Indians as against nearly 10,000 European voters shows that there is no fear of the Indian vote swamping the European. For a fuller history of the question, I must refer you to the Green Pamphlet. The London *Times* which has uniformly supported us in our troubles, dealing with the franchise question in Natal, thus puts it in its issue of the 27th day of June of this year :—

> The question now put before Mr. Chamberlain is not an academic one. It is not a question of argument but of race feeling. We cannot afford a war of races among our own subjects. It would be a wrong for the Government of India to suddenly arrest the development of Natal by shutting all the supply of immigrants, as it would be for Natal to deny the right of citizenship to British Indian subjects, who, by years of thrift and good work in the Colony, have raised themselves to the actual status of citizens.

If there is any real danger of the Asiatic vote swamping the European, we should have no objection to an educational test being imposed or the property qualifications being raised. What we object to is class legislation and the degradation which it necessarily involves. We are fighting for no new privilege in opposing the Bill, we are resisting the deprivation of the one we have been enjoying.

In strict accordance with the policy of degrading the Indian to the level of a raw Kaffir and, in the words of the Attorney-General of Natal, "that of preventing him from forming part of the future South African nation that is going to be built," the Natal Government last year introduced their Bill to amend the Indian Immigration Law which, I regret to inform you, has received the Royal sanction in spite of our hopes to the contrary. This news was received after the Bombay meeting, and it will, therefore, be necessary for me to deal with this question at some length, also because this question more immediately affects this Presidency and can be best studied here. Up to the 18th day of August, 1894, the indentured immigrants went under a contract of service for five years in consideration for a free passage to Natal, free board and lodging for themselves and their families and wages at the rate of ten shillings per month for the first year to be increased by one shilling every following year. They were also entitled to a free passage back to India, if they remained in the Colony another five years as free labourers. This is now changed, and, in future, the immigrants will have either to remain in the Colony for ever under indenture, their wages increasing to 20 shillings at the end of the 9th year of indentured service, or to return to India or to pay an annual poll-tax of £3 sterling, equivalent to nearly half a year's earnings on the indentured scale. A Commission consisting of two members was sent to India in 1893 by the Natal Government to induce the Indian Government to agree to the above alterations with the exception of the imposition of the poll-tax. The present Viceroy, while expressing his reluctance, agreed to the alteration subject to the sanction of the Home Govern-

ment, refusing to allow the Natal Government to make the breach of the clause about compulsory return a criminal offence. The Natal Government have got over the difficulty by the poll-tax Clause.

The Attorney-General in discussing that clause said that while an Indian could not be sent to gaol for refusing to return to India or to pay the tax, so long as there was anything worth having in his hut, it will be liable to seizure. We strongly opposed that Bill in the local Parliament and failing there, sent a memorial to Mr. Chamberlain, praying either that the Bill should be disallowed or emigration to Natal should be suspended.

The above proposal was mooted 10 years ago and it was vehemently opposed by the most eminent colonists in Natal. A Commission was then appointed to inquire into various matters concerning Indians in Natal. One of the Commissioners, Mr. Saunders, says in his additional report :—

Though the Commission has made no recommendation on the subject of passing a law to force Indians back to India at the expiration of their term of service, unless they renew their indentures, I wish to express my strong condemnation of any such idea, and I feel convinced that many, who now advocate the plan ,when they realise what it means, will reject it as energetically as I do. Stop Indian emigration and face results, but don't try to do what I can show is a great wrong.

What is it but taking the best of our servants (the good as well as the bad), and then refusing them the enjoyment of the reward, forcing them back (if we could, but we cannot) when their best days have been spent for our benefit, Whereto? Why back to face a prospect of starvation from which they sought to escape when they were young. Shylock-like, taking the pound of flesh, and Shylock-like we may rely on it meeting Shylock's reward.

The Colony can stop Indian immigration, and that, perhaps, far more easily and permanently than some 'popularity seekers' would desire. But force men off at the end of their service, this the Colony cannot do. And I urge on it not to discredit a fair name by trying.

The Attorney-General of Natal who introduced the Bill under discussion expressed the following views while giving his evidence before the Commission :—

With reference to time-expired Indians, I do not think that it ought to be compulsory on any man to go to any part of the world save for a crime for which he is transported. I hear a great deal of this question; I have been asked again and again to take a different view, but I have not been able to do it. A man is brought here, *in theory with his own consent in practice very often without his consent*, he gives the best five years of his life, he forms new ties, forgets the old ones, perhaps establishes home here, and he cannot, according to my view of right and wrong, be sent back. Better by far to stop the further introduction of Indians altogether than to take what work you can out of them and order them away. The Colony, or part of the Colony, seems to want Indians but also wishes to avoid the consequences of Indian immigration. The Indian people do no harm as far as I know; in certain respects they do a great deal of good. I have never heard a reason to justify the extradition of a man who has behaved well for five years.

And Mr. Binns who came to India as one of the Natal Commissioners to induce the Indian Government to agree to the above-mentioned alterations gave the following evidence before the Commission ten years ago :—

I think the idea which has been mooted, that all Indians should be compelled to return to India at the end of their term of indenture, is most unfair to the Indian population, and would never be sanctioned by the Indian Government. In my opinion the free Indian population is a most useful section of the community.

But then great men may change their views as often and as quickly as they may change their clothes with impunity and even to advantage. In them, they say, such changes are a result of sincere conviction. It is a thousand pities, however, that unfortunately for the poor indentured Indian his fear or rather the expectation that the Indian Government will never sanction the change was not realised.

The London *Star* thus gave vent to its feelings on reading the Bill :—

These particulars are enough to throw light upon the hateful persecution to which British Indian subjects are being subjected. The new Indian Immigration Law Amendment Bill, which virtually proposes to reduce Indians to a state of slavery, is another example. The thing is a monstrous wrong, an insult to British subjects, a disgrace to its authors, and a slight upon ourselves. Every Englishman is concerned to see that the commercial greed of the South African trader is not permitted to wreak such bitter injustice upon men who alike by proclamation and by statute are placed upon an equality with ourselves before the Law.

The London *Times* also in supporting our prayer has compared the state of perpetual indenture to a "state perilously near to slavery." It also says :—

The Government of India has one simple remedy. It can suspend indentured immigration to South Africa as it has suspended such immigration to foreign possessions until it obtains the necessary guarantees for the present well-being and the future status of the immigrants. . . . . It is eminently a case for sensible and conciliatory action on both sides. . . . But the Indian Government may be forced to adopt measures in connection with the wider claim now being urged by every section of the Indian community and which has been explicitly acknowledged by Her Majesty's Government at home—namely, the claim of the Indian races to trade and to labour with the full status of British subjects throughout the British Empire and in allied States.

The letters from Natal informing me of the Royal sanction to this Bill ask me to request the Indian public to help us to get emigration suspended. I am well aware that the idea of suspending emigration requires careful consideration. I humbly think that there is no other conclusion possible in the interests of the Indians at large. Emigration is supposed to relieve the congested districts and to benefit those who emigrate. If the Indians instead of paying the poll-tax, return to India, the congestion cannot be affected at all. And the returned Indians will rather be a source of difficulty than anything else as they must necessarily find it difficult to get work and cannot be expected to bring sufficient to live upon the interest of their capital. It certainly will

not benefit the emigrants as they will never, if the Government can possibly help it, be allowed to rise higher than the status of labourers. The fact is that they are being helped on to degradation.

Under such circumstances I humbly ask you to support our prayer to suspend emigration to Natal, unless the new law can be altered or repealed. You will naturally be anxious to know the treatment of the Indians while under indenture. Of course, that life cannot be bright under any circumstances ; but I do not think their lot is worse than the lot of the Indians similarly placed in other parts of the world. At the same time they too certainly come in for a share of the tremendous colour prejudice. I can only briefly allude to the matter here and refer to the curious Green Pamphlet wherein it has been more fully discussed. There is a sad mortality from suicides on certain estates in Natal. It is very difficult for an indentured Indian to have his services transferred on the ground of ill-treatment. An indentured Indian after he becomes free is given a free pass. This he has to show whenever asked to do so. It is meant to detect desertion by the indentured Indians. The working of this system is a source of much irritation to poor free Indians and often puts respectable Indians in a very unpleasant position. This law really would not give any trouble, but for the unreasonable prejudice A sympathetic Protector of Immigrants, preferably an Indian gentleman of high standing and knowing the Tamil, Telugu and Hindustani languages, would certainly mitigate the usual hardships of the indentured life. An Indian immigrant who loses his free pass is, as a rule, called upon to pay £3 sterling for

a duplicate copy. This is nothing but a system of blackmail.

The 9 o'clock rule in Natal which makes it necessary for every Indian to carry a pass if he wants to be out after 9 P.M., at the pain of being locked up in a dungeon, causes much heart-burning especially among the gentlemen from this Presidency. You will be pleased to hear that children of many indentured Indians receive a pretty good education; and then wear as a rule the European dress. They are a most sensitive class and yet unfortunately most liable to arrest under the 9 o'clock rule. The European dress for an Indian is no recommendation in Natal. It is rather the reverse. For the flowing robe of a Memon frees the wearer from such molestation. A happy incident described in the Green Pamphlet led the police in Durban some years ago to free Indians thus dressed from liability to arrest after 9 P.M. A Tamil school-mistress, a Tamil school-master and a Tamil Sunday school-teacher were only a few months ago arrested and locked up under this law. They all got justice in the law courts, but that was a poor consolation. The result, however, was that the Corporations in Natal are clamouring for an alteration in the law so that it might be impossible for such Indians to get off scot-free in the Law Courts.

There is a Bye-Law in Durban which requires registration of coloured servants. This Rule may be and perhaps is necessary for the Kaffirs who would not work, but absolutely useless with regard to the Indians. But the policy is to class the Indian with the Kaffir whenever possible.

This does not complete the list of grievances in Natal. I must beg to refer the curious to the Green Pamphlet for further information.

But, gentlemen, you have been told lately by the Natal Agent-General that the Indians are nowhere better treated than in Natal; that the fact that a majority of the indentured labourers do not avail themselves of the return passage is the best answer to my pamphlet, and that the railway and tram-car officials do not treat the Indians as beasts nor do the Law Courts deny them justice.

With the greatest deference to the Agent-General, all I can say as to the first statement is that he must have very queer notions of good treatment, if to be locked up for being out after 9 P.M. without a pass, to be denied the most elementary right of citizenship in a free country, to be denied a higher status than that of bondman and at best a free labourer and to be subjected to other restrictions referred to above, are instances of good treatment. And if such treatment is the best the Indians receive throughout the world, then the lot of the Indians in other parts of the world and here must be very miserable indeed, according to the commonsense view. The thing is that Mr. Walter Peace, the Agent-General, is made to look through the official spectacles and to him everything official is bound to appear rosy. The legal disabilities are condemnatory of the action of the Natal Government and how can the Agent-General be expected to condemn himself? If he or the Government which he represents only admitted that the legal disabilities mentioned above were against the fundamental principles of the British Constitution, I should not stand before you this evening. I respectfully submit that statements of opinions made

by the Agent-General cannot be allowed to have greater weight than those of an accused person about his own guilt.

The fact that the indentured Indians as a rule do not avail themselves of the return passage we do not dispute, but we certainly dispute that it is the best answer to our complaints. How can that fact disprove the existence of the legal disabilities? It may prove that the Indians who do not take advantage of the return passage either do not mind the disabilities or remain in the Colony in spite of such disabilities. If the former be the case, it is the duty of those who know better to make the Indians realise their situation and to enable them to see that submission to them means degradation. If the latter be the case it is one more instance of the patience and the forbearing spirit of the Indian Nation which was acknowledged by Mr. Chamberlain in his Despatch in connection with the Transvaal arbitration. Because they bear them is no reason why the disabilities should not be removed or why they should be interpreted into meaning the best treatment possible.

Moreover, who are these people who, instead of returning to India, settle in the Colony? They are the Indians drawn from the poorest classes and from the most thickly populated districts possibly living in a state of semi-starvation in India. They migrated to Natal with their families, if any, with the intention of settling there, if possible. Is it any wonder, if these people after the expiry of their indenture, instead of running 'to face semi-starvation,' as Mr. Saunders has put it, settled in a country where the climate is magnificent and where they may earn a decent living? A starving man generally would stand any

amount of rough treatment to get a crumb of bread.

Do not the Uitlanders make out a terribly long list of grievances in the Transvaal? And yet do they not flock to the Transvaal in thousands in spite of the ill-treatment they receive there because they can earn their bread in the Transvaal more easily than in the old country?

This, too, should be borne in mind that in making his statement, Mr. Peace has not taken into account the free Indian trader who goes to the Colony on his own account and who feels most the indignities and disabilities. If it does not do to tell the Uitlander that he may not go to the Transvaal if he cannot bear the ill-treatment, much less will it do to say so to the enterprising Indian. We belong to the Imperial family and are children, adopted it may be, of the same august mother, having the same rights and privileges guaranteed to us as to the European children. It was in that belief that we went to the Colony of Natal and we trust that our belief was well-founded.

The Agent-General has contradicted the statement made in the pamphlet that the railway and tramcar officials treat the Indians as beasts. Even if the statements I have made were incorrect, that would not disprove the legal disabilities which and which alone have been made the subject of memorials and to remove which we invoke the direct intervention of the Home and the Indian Governments. But I venture to say that the Agent-General has been misinformed and beg to repeat that the Indians are treated as beasts by the railway and the tramcar officials. That statement was made now nearly two years ago in quarters where it could have been contradicted at once. I had the honour to address

an 'open letter' to the members of the Local Parliament in Natal. It was widely circulated in the Colony and noticed by almost every leading newspaper in South Africa. No one contradicted it then. It was even admitted by some newspapers. Under such circumstances, I ventured to quote it in my pamphlet published here. I am not given to exaggerate matters and it is very unpleasant to me to have to cite testimony in my own favour, but since an attempt has been made to discredit my statements and thereby the cause I am advocating, I feel it to be my duty for the sake of the cause to tell you what the papers in South Africa thought about the 'open letter' in which the statement was made.

The *Star*, the leading newspaper in Johannesburg, says:—

> Mr. Gandhi writes forcibly, moderately and well. He has himself suffered some slight measure of injustice since he came into the Colony, but that fact does not seem to have coloured his sentiment, and it must be confessed that to the tone of the open letter no objection can reasonably be taken. Mr. Gandhi discusses the questions he has raised with conspicuous moderation.

The *Natal Mercury*, the Government organ in Natal, says:—

> Mr. Gandhi writes with calmness and moderation. He is as impartial as any one could expect him to be and probably a little more so than might have been expected, considering that he did not receeive very just treatment at the hands of the Law Society when he first came to the Colony.

Had I made unfounded statements, the newspapers would not have given such a certificate to the 'open letter.'

An Indian, about two years ago, took out a second class ticket on the Natal railway. In a single night journey he was thrice disturbed and was twice made to change compartments to please European passengers. The case came before the Court and the Indian got £10

damages. The following is the plaintiff's evidence in the case :—

Deponent got into a second class carriage in the train, leaving Charlestown at 1-30 P.M. Three other Indians were in the same compartment, but they got out at New Castle. A white man opened the door of the compartment and beckoned to witness, saying "come out, Sammy." Plaintiff asked, "why," and the white man replied "Never mind, come out, I want to place someone here." Witness said, "why should I come out from here when I have paid my fare?" . . . . The white man then left and brought an Indian who, witness believed, was in the employ of the railway. The Indian was told to tell plaintiff to get out of the carriage. Thereupon the Indian said, "the white man orders you to come out and you must come out." The Indian then left. Witness said to the white man, "what do you want to shift me about for. I have paid my fare and have a right to remain here." The white man became angry at this and said, "well, if you don't come out, I will knock hell out of you." The white man got into the carriage and laid hold of witness by the arm and tried to pull him out. Plaintiff said, "Let me alone and I will come out." The witness left the carriage and the white man pointed out another second class compartment and told him to go there. Plaintiff did as he was directed. The compartment he was shown into was empty. He believed some people who were playing a band were put into the carriage from which he was expelled. This white man was the District Superintendent of Railways at Newcastle. (*Shame*). To proceed, witness travelled undisturbed to Maritzberg. He fell asleep and when he awoke at Maritzberg he found a white man, a white woman and a child in the compartment with him. A white man came up to the carriage and said, "Is that your boy speaking to the white man in the compartment?" Witness's fellow-traveller replied "yes," pointing to his little boy. The other white man then said, "No, I don't mean him. I mean the damned coolie in the corner." This gentleman with the choice language was a railway official, being a shunter. The white man in the compartment replied, "Oh never mind him, leave him alone." Then the white man outside (the official) said, "I am not going to allow a coolie to be in the same compartment with white people." This man addressed plaintiff, saying "Sammy, come out." Plaintiff said, "why, I was removed at New Castle to this compartment." The white man said, "well, you must come out" and was about to enter the carriage. Witness thinking he would be handled as at New Castle said he would go out and left the compartment. The white man pointed out another second class compartment which witness entered. This was empty for a time but before leaving, a white man entered. Another white man, (the official), afterwards came up and said if you don't like to travel with that stinking coolie I will find you another carriage." (The Natal *Advertiser*, 22nd November, 1893.)

You will have noticed that the official at Maritzberg mal-treated the Indian passenger although his white fellow-passenger did not mind him. If this is not bestial treatment, I should very much like to know what is, and such occurrences take place often enough to be irritating.

It was found during the case that one of the witnesses for the defendant was coached. In answer to a question from the Bench whether the Indian passengers were treated with consideration, the witness who was one of the officials referred to replied in the affirmative. Thereupon the presiding Magistrate who tried the case is reported to have said to the witness, "Then you have a different opinion to what I have and it is a curious thing that people who are not connected with the railway observe more than you."

The Natal *Advertiser*, a European daily in Durban, made the following remarks on the case :—

It was indisputable from the evidence that the Arab had been badly treated and seeing that second class tickets are issued to Indians of this description, the plaintiff ought not to have been subjected to unnecessary annoyance and indignity. . . . . Some definite measures should be taken to minimise the danger of trouble arising between European and coloured passengers without rendering the carrying out of such measures annoying to any person whether black or white.

In the course of its remarks on the same case the *Natal Mercury* observed :—

There is throughout South Africa a tendency to treat all Indians, as coolies pure and simple, no matter whether they be educated and cleanly in their habits or not. . . On our railways we have noticed on more than one occasion that coloured passengers are not by any means treated with civility, and although it would be unreasonable to expect that the white employees of the N.G.R. should treat them with the same deference as is accorded to European passengers still we think it would not be in any way derogatory to their dignity if the officials were a little more *Suavitor in modo* when dealing with coloured travellers.

The *Cape Times*, a leading newspaper in South Africa, says :—

Natal presents the curious spectacle of a country entertaining a supreme contempt for the very class of people she can least do without. Imagination can only picture the commercial paralysis which would inevitably attend the withdrawal of the Indian population from that Colony. And yet the Indian is the most despised of creatures, he may not ride in the tram-cars, nor sit in the same compartment of a railway carriage with the Europeans, hotel-keepers refuse him food or shelter and he is denied the privilege of the public bath!

Here is the opinion of an Anglo-Indian, Mr. Drummond who is intimately connected with the Indians in Natal. He says, writing to the *Natal Mercury* :—

The majority of the people here seem to forget that they are British subjects, that their Maharani is our Queen and for that reason alone one would think that they might be spared the opprobrious term of 'coolie,' as it is here applied. In India it is only the lower class of white men who calls native a 'nigger' and treats him as if he were unworthy of any consideration or respect. In their eyes, as in the eyes of many in this colony, he is treated either as a heavy burden or a mechanical machine.....It is a common thing and a lamentable thing to hear the ignorant and the unenlightened speak of the Indian generally as the scum of the earth, etc. It is depreciation from the white man and not appreciation that they get.

I think I have adduced sufficient outside testimony to substantiate my statement that the railway officials treat the Indians as beasts. On the tramcars, the Indians are often not allowed to sit inside but are sent upstairs,' as the phrase goes. They are often made to remove from one seat to another or prevented from occupying front benches. I know an Indian officer, a Tamil gentleman, dressed in the latest European style who was made to stand on the tram-car board although there was accomodation available for him.

Quoting statistics to prove the prosperity of the Indian community is quite unnecessary. It is not denied that the Indians who go to Natal do earn a living and that in spite of the persecution.

In the Transvaal we cannot own landed property, we may not trade or reside except in specified locations, which are described by the British Agent, "as places to deposit the refuse of the town without any water except the polluted soakage in the gully between the location and the town." We may not as of right walk on the footpaths in Johannesburg and Pretoria, we may not be out after 9 P. M. We may not travel without passes. The law prevents us from travelling first or second class on the railways. We are required to pay a special registration fee of £3 to enable us to settle in the Transvaal and though we are treated as mere "chattels" and have no privileges whatever, we may be called upon to render compulsory military service, if Mr. Chamberlain disregards the Memorial which we have addressed to him on the subject. The history of the whole case as it affects the Indians in the Transvaal is very interesting and I am only sorry that for want of time I cannot deal with it now. I must, however, beg you to study it from the Green Pamphlet. I must not omit to mention that it is criminal for an Indian to buy native gold.

The Orange Free State has made "the British Indian an impossibility by simply classifying him with the Kaffir," as its chief organ puts it. It has passed a special law whereby we are prevented from trading, farming or owning property under any circumstances. If we submit to these degrading conditions we may be allowed to reside after passing through certain humiliating ceremonies. We were driven out from the State and our stores were closed causing to us a loss of £9,000. And this grievance remains absolutely without redress. The Cape Parliament has passed a Bill granting the East

London Municipality in that Colony, the power to frame Bye-Laws prohibiting Indians from walking on the foot-paths and making them live in locations. It has issued instructions to the authorities of East Gripuinland not to issue any trading licences to the Indians. The Cape Government are in communication with the Home Government with a view to induce them to sanction legislation restricting the influx of the Asiatics. The people in the Chartered territories are endeavouring to close the country against the Asiatic trader. In Zululand, a Crown Colony, we cannot own or acquire landed property in the townships of Eshowe and Nondweni. This question is now before Mr. Chamberlain for consideration. As in the Transvaal there also it is criminal for an Indian to buy native gold.

Thus we are hemmed in on all sides by restrictions. And if nothing further were to be done here and in England on our behalf, it is merely a question of time when the respectable Indian in South Africa will be absolutely extinct.

Nor is this merely a local question. It is as the London *Times* puts it, "that of the status of the British Indian outside India." "If," says the *Thunderer*, "they fail to secure that position, (that is of equal status) in South Africa, it will be difficult for them to attain it elsewhere." I have no doubt you have read in the papers that Australian Colonies have passed legislation to prevent Indians from settling in that part of the World. It will be interesting to know how the Home Government deal with that question.

The real cause of all this prejudice may be expressed in the words of the leading organ in South Africa,

namely, the *Cape Times*, when it was under the editorship of the prince of South African journalists, Mr. St. Leger.

It is the position of these merchants which is productive of no little hostility to this day. And it is in considering their position that their rivals in trade have sought to inflict upon them through the medium of the State, what looks on the face of it something very like an injustice for the benefit of self.

Continues the same organ:—

The injustice to the Indians is so glaring that one is almost ashamed of one's countrymen in wishing to have these men treated as native (*i.e.*, of South Africa,) simply because of their success in trade. The very reason that they have been so successful against the dominant race is sufficient to raise them above that degrading level.

If this was true in 1889 when the above was written, it is doubly so now, because the legislators of South Africa have shown phenomenal activity in passing measures restricting the liberty of the Queen's Indian subjects. Other objections also have been raised to our presence there, but they will not bear scrutiny and I have dealt with them in the Green Pamphlet. I venture, however, to quote, from the *Natal Advertiser*, which states one of them and prescribes a statesmanlike remedy also. And so far as the objection may be valid, we are in perfect accord with the *Advertiser's* suggestion. This paper which is under European management was at one time violently against us. Dealing with the whole question from an Imperial standpoint it concludes:—

It will, therefore, probably yet be found that the removal of the drawbacks at present incidental to the immigration of Indians into British Colonies is not to be effected so much by the adoption of an obsolete policy of exclusion as by an enlightened and progressive application of ameliorating laws to those Indians who settle in them. One of the chief objections to Indians is that they do not live in accordance with European rules. The remedy for this is to gradually raise their mode of life by compelling them to live in better dwellings and by creating among them new wants. It will probably be found easier, because, more in accord with the

great onward movements of mankind, to demand of such settlers that they shall rise to their new conditions than to endeavour to maintain the *status quo ante* by their entire exclusion.

We believe also that much of the ill-feeling is due to the want of proper knowledge in South Africa about the Indians in India. We are, therefore, endeavouring to educate public opinion in South Africa by imparting the necessary information. With regard to the legal disabilities we have tried to influence in our favour the public opinion both in England and here. As you know both the Conservatives and Liberals have supported us in England without distinction. The London *Times* has given eight leading articles to our cause in a very sympathetic spirit. This alone has raised us a step higher in the estimation of the Europeans in South Africa and has considerably affected for the better the tone of newspapers there. The British Committee of the Congress has been working for us for a very long time. Ever since he entered Parliament, Mr. Bhownaggree has been pleading our cause in season and out of season. Says one of our best sympathisers in London :—

The wrong is so serious that it has only to be known in order I hope to be remedied. I feel it my duty on all occasions and in all suitable ways to insist that the Indian subjects of the Crown should enjoy the full status of British subject througout the whole British Empire and in allied states. This is the position which you and our Indian friends in South Africa should firmly take up. In such a question compromise is impossible. For any compromise would relinquish the fundamental right of the Indian races to the complete status of British subjects—a right which they have earned by their loyalty in peace and by their services in war, a right which was solemnly guaranteed to them by the Queen's Proclamation in 1857, and which has now been explicitly recognised by Her Majesty's Government."

Says the same gentleman in another letter :—

I have great hopes that justice will, in the end, be done. You have a good cause .....You have only to take up your position strongly in order to be successful. That position is that the British Indian subjects in South Africa are alike in our own Colonies and

in independent friendly States being deprived of their status as British subjects guaranteed to them by the Sovereign and the British Parliament.

An ex-Liberal member of the House of Commons says:—

You are infamously treated by the Colonial Government and you will be so treated by the Home Government if they do not compel the Colonies to alter their policy.

A Conservative member says:—

I am quite aware that the situation is surrounded with many difficulties; but some points stand out clear and, as far as I can make out it is true to say that breaches of what in India is a civil contract are punishable in South Africa as though they were criminal offences. This is beyond doubt contrary to the principles of the Indian Code and seems to me an infringement of the privileges guaranteed to British subjects in India. Again it is perfectly evident that in the Boer republic and possibly in Natal it is the direct obvious intention of the Government to "hunt" natives of India and to compel them to carry on their business under degrading conditions. The excuses which are put forward to defend the infringements of the liberties of British subjects in the Transvaal are too flimsy to be worth a moment's attention." Yet another Conservative member says: "Your activity is praiseworthy and demands justice. I am, therefore, willing to help you as far as lies in my power."

Such is the sympathy evoked in England. Here, too, I know we have the same sympathy, but I humbly think that our cause may occupy your attention still more largely.

What is required in India has been well put by the *Moslem Chronicle* in a forcibly written leader:—

What with a strong and intelligent public opinion here and a well meaning Government the difficulties we have to contend with, are not at all commensurate with those that retard the well-being of our countrymen in that country. It is therefore quite time that all public bodies should at once turn their attention to this important subject to create an intelligent public opinion with a view to organise an agitation for the removal of the grievances under which our brethren are labouring. Indeed, these grievances have become and are day by day becoming so unbearable and offensive that the requisite agitation cannot be taken up one day too soon.

I may state our position a little more clearly. We are aware that the insults and indignities that we are subjected to at the hands of the populace cannot be directly removed by the intervention of the Home Government. We do not appeal to it for any such intervention. We bring them to the notice of the public so that the fairminded of all communities and the Press may be expressing their disapproval, materially reduce their rigour and possibly eradicate them ultimately. But we certainly do appeal and we hope not vainly to the Home Government for protection against reproduction of such ill-feeling in legislation. We certainly beseech the Home Government to disallow all the Acts of the Legislative bodies of the Colonies restricting our freedom in any shape or form. And this brings me to the last question, namely, how far can the Home Government interfere with such action on the part of the Colonies and the allied States. As for Zululand there can be no question since it is a Crown Colony directly governed from Downing Street through a Governor. It is not a self-governing or a responsibly-governed Colony as the Colonies of Natal and the Cape of Good Hope are. With regard to the last two their Constitution Act provides that Her Majesty may disallow any Act of the Local Parliament within two years even after it has become law having received the Governor's assent. That is one safeguard against oppressive measures by the Colonies. The Royal instructions to the Governor as also the Constitution Act enumerate certain Bills which cannot be assented to by the Governor without Her Majesty's previous sanction. Among such are Bills which have for their object class legislation such as the Franchise Bill or Immigration Bill, Her Majesty's intervention

is thus direct and precise. While it is true that the Home Government is slow to interfere with the Acts of the Colonial Legislatures, there are instances where it has not hesitated to put its foot down on occasions less urgent than the present one. As you are aware, the repeal of the first Franchise Bill was due to such wholesome intervention. What is more the Colonists are ever afraid of it. And as a result of the sympathy expressed in England and the sympathetic answer given by Mr Chamberlain to the Deputation that waited on him some months ago most of the papers in South Africa, at any rate in Natal have veered round considerably. As to the Transvaal there is the convention. As to the Orange Free State I can only say that it is an unfriendly act on the part of a friendly State to shut her doors against any portion of Her Majesty's subjects. And as such I humbly think it can be effectively checked.

It may not be amiss to quote a few passages from the London *Times* articles bearing on the question of intervention as well as the whole question generally:

The whole question resolves itself into this. Are Her Majesty's Indian subjects to be treated as a degraded and an outcaste race by a friendly government or are they to have the same rights and status as other British subjects enjoy? Are leading Muhammadan merchants who might sit in the Legislative Council at Bombay, to be liable to indignities and outrage in the South African Republic? We are continually telling our Indian subjects that the economic future of their country depends on their ability to spread themselves out and to develop their foreign trade. What answer can our Indian Government give them if it fails to secure to them the same protection abroad which is secured to the subjects of every other dependency of the Crown?

It is a mockery to urge our Indian fellow-subjects to embark on external commerce if the moment they leave India they lose their rights as British subjects, and can be treated by foreign governments as a degraded and an outcaste race.

In another article it says:—

The matter is eminently one for good offices and for influence, for that "friendly negotiation" which Mr. Chamberlain promises,

though he warns the deputation that it may be tedious and will certainly not be easy. As to the Cape Colony and Natal, the question is to a certain extent simplified since, of course, the Colonial Office can speak to them with greater authority.

The incident is one of those which suggests wider questions than any that directly offer themselves for official replies. We are at the centre of a world-wide Empire, at a period when locomotion is easy and is every day becoming easier, both in time and cost. Some portions of the Empire are crowded, others are comparatively empty, and the flow from the congested to the under-peopled districts is continuous What is to happen when subjects differing in colour, religion and habits from ourselves or from the natives of a particular spot emigrate to that spot for their living ? How are race prejudices and antipathies, the jealousies of trade, the fear of competition to be controlled ? The answer, of course, must be by intelligent policy at the Colonial Office.

Small as are the requirements of the Indian the steady growth of the population of India is such that a certain outward movement is inevitable, and it is a movement that will increase. It is very desirable that our white fellow-subjects in Africa should understand that there will, in all probability, be this current flowing from India, that it is perfectly within the rights of the British Indian to seek his subsistence at the Cape, and that he ought, in the common interest of the Empire to be well treated when he comes there. It is indeed to be feared that the ordinary Colonist, wherever settled, thinks much more of his immediate interests than of those of the great empire which protects him, and he has some difficulty in recognising a fellow-subject in the Hindu or the Parsee. The duty of the Colonial Office is to enlighten him and to see that fair treatment is extended to British subjects of whatever colour.

Again :—

In India the British, the Hindu and the Mussalman communities find themselves face to face with the question as to whether at the outset of the new industrial movements which have been so long and anxiously awaited, Indian traders and workers are or are not to have the same status before the law as all other British subjects enjoy. May they or may they not go freely from one British possession to another and claim the rights of British subjects in allied states or are they to be treated as outcaste races, subjected to a system of permits and passes when travelling on their ordinary business avocations, and relegated, as the Transvaal Government would relegate them to a ghetto at the permanent centres of their trade ? These are questions which applied to all Indians who seek to better their fortunes outside the limits of the Indian Empire. Mr. Chamberlain's words and the determined

attitude taken up by every section of the Indian press show that for two such questions there can be but one answer.

I shall take the liberty to give one more quotation from the same journal :—

The question with which Mr. Chamberlain was called upon to deal cannot be so easily reduced to concrete terms. On the one hand he clearly laid down the principle of the "equal rights" and equal privilege of all British subjects in regard to redress from foreign States. It would, indeed, have been impossible to deny that principle. Our Indian subjects have been fighting the battles of Great Britain over half the old world with the loyalty and courage which have won the admiration of all British men. The fighting reserve which Great Britain has in the Indian races adds greatly to her political influence and prestige and it would be a violation of the British sense of justice to use the blood and the valour of these races in war and yet to deny them the protection of the British name in the enterprise of peace. The Indian workers and traders are slowly spreading across the earth from Central Asia to the Australian Colonies and from the Straits Settlements to the Canary Islands. Wherever the Indian goes he is the same useful well-doing man, lawabiding under whatever form of Government he may find himself, frugal in his wants and industrious in his habits. But these very virtues make him a formidable competitor in the labour markets to which he resorts. Although numbering in the aggregate some hundreds of thousands, the imigrant Indian labourers and small dealers have only recently appeared in the foreign countries or British Colonies in numbers sufficient to arouse jealousy and to expose them to political injustice.

But the facts which we brought to notice in June, and which were urged on Mr. Chamberlain by a deputation of Indians last week, show that the necessity has now arisen for protecting the Indian labourer from such jealousy, and for securing to him the same rights as other British subjects enjoy.

Gentlemen, Bombay has spoken in no uncertain terms. We are yet young and inexperienced, we have a right to appeal to you, our elder and freer brethren for protection. Being under the yoke of oppression we can merely cry out in anguish. You have heard our cry. The blame will now lie on your shoulders if the yoke is not removed from our necks.

DEPUTATION TO LORD SELBORNE

Messrs. Abdul Gani (Chairman, British Indian Association), Mr. Haji Habib (Secretary, Pretoria Committee), Mr. E. S. Coovadia, Mr. P. Moonsamy Moonlight, Mr. Ayob Haeje Beg Mahomed and Mr. M. K. Gandhi formed a deputation that waited on Lord Selborne on November, 22nd, 1905. On behalf of the deputation, Mr. Gandhi presented the following statement of the position to His Excellency :—

STATEMENT

There are, besides laws affecting coloured people and therefore British Indian's the Peace Preservation Ordinance and Law 3 of 1885 as amended in 1886.

THE PEACE PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

The Peace Preservation Ordinance, as its name implies although framed to keep out of the Colony dangerous character, is being used mainly to prevent British Indians from entering the Transvaal. The working of the law has always been harsh and oppressive—and this in spite of the desire of the Chief Secretary for Permits that it should not be so. He has to receive instructions from the Colonial Office, so that the harsh working is due, not to the chief officer in charge of the Department, but to the system under which it is being worked. *(a)* There are still hundreds of refugees waiting to come. *(b)* Boys with their parents or without are required to take out permits. (c) Men with old £3 registrations coming into the country without permits are, though refugees being sent away and required to make formal application. *(d)* Even wives of Transvaal residents are expected to take out permits if they are alone, and to pay £3 registration, whether with or without their husbands. (Correspondence is now going on between the Government and the British Indian Association on the point.) *(e)* Children under sixteen, if it cannot be proved that their parents are dead, or are residents of the Transvaal, are being sent away or are refused permits, in spite of the fact that they may be supported by their relatives who are their guardian and who are residing in the Transvaal. *(f)* No non-refugee British Indians are allowed to enter the Colony, no matter what their station may be in life. (The last prohibition causes serious inconvenience to the established merchants, who, by reason thereof, are prevented from drawing upon India for confidential managers or clerks.)

In spite of the declarations of her late Majesty's ministers, and assurances of relief after the establishment of civil Govern-

ment, this law remains on the statute book, and is being fully enforced, though many laws, which were considered to be in conflict with the British constitution, were repealed as soon as British authority was proclaimed in the Transvaal. Law 3 of 1885 is insulting to British Indians, and was accepted totally under a misapprehension. It imposes the following restrictions on Indians :—(*a*) It prevents them from enjoying burger rights. (*b*) It prohibits ownership of fixed property, except in streets, wards, or locations set apart for the residence of Indians. (*c*) It contemplates compulsory segregation in locations of British Indians for purposes of sanitation. And (*d*) It imposes a levy of £3 on every Indian who may enter the Colony for purposes of trade or the like.

REFORMED ADMINISTRATION OF ORDINANCE

It is respectfully submitted, on behalf of the British Indian Association that the Peace Preservation Ordinance should be so administered that (*a*) it should facilitate the entry of all refugees without delay. (*b*) Children under sixteen should be exempt from any restriction whatsoever, if they have their parents or supporters with them. (*c*) Female relatives of British Indians should be entirely free from interference or restriction as to the rights on entry. And (*d*) a limited number of Indians, though not refugees, should on the application of resident traders who may satisfy the Permit Officer that they require the services of such men, be granted permits for residence during the period of their contract of service. (*e*) Indians with educational attainment should be allowed to enter the Colony on application.

REPEAL OF COLOUR LEGISLATION.

Both the Law of 1885 and the Peace Preservation Ordinance and all other colour legislation affecting British Indians, should be repealed so soon as possible and they should be assured as to—

(*a*) Their right to own landed property. (*b*) To live where they like, subject to the general sanitary laws of the Colony. (*c*) Exemption from any special payment. (*d*) And generally freedom from special legislation and enjoyment of civil rights and liberty in the same manner and to the same extent as the other Colonists.

SUBSTITUTES SUGGESTED

Though the British Indian Association does not share the fear of the European inhabitants that an unrestricted immigration from India will swamp the latter, as an earnest of its intention to work in harmony with them and to conciliate them, it has all along submitted that—(*a*) The Peace Preservation Ordinance should be replaced by an immigration law of a general character, on the Cape or the Natal basis, provided that the educational test recognises the great Indian languages and that power be given to the Government to grant residential permits to such men as may be required for

the wants of Indians who may be themselves already established in businesses. (b) A Dealer's Licences Law of a general character may be passed, applicable to all sections of the community, whereby the Town Councils or Local Boards could control the issue of new trade licenses, subject to appeal to the Supreme Court to review the decisions of such Councils or Local Boards. Under such a law whilst the then existing licenses would be fully protected, except when the premises licensed are not kept in a sanitary condition, all new applicants would have to be approved or by the Town Councils of the Local Boards, so that the increase of licenses would be largely dependent upon the bodies above-named.

MR. GANDHI'S ADDRESS

Before presenting the statement to Lord Selborne, Mr Gandhi addressed His Excellency as follows :—

PRELIMINARY REPRESENTATIONS

Before I deal with the statement I am to hand to your Excellency, I have been asked to mention two matters that have occurred during your recent tour through the Transvaal. Your Excellency is reported to have said at Potchefstroom that "no non-refugee British Indians would be allowed to enter the Colony until the Representative Assembly has considered the question next year." If the report is correct, it would, as I hope to show this afternoon, be a very grave injustice to the vested rights of the Indian community. At Ermelo, your Excellency is reported to have used the expression "coolie storekeepers." This expression has given very great offence to the British Indians in the Colony, but the British Indian Association has assured them that the expression has probably not been used by your Excellency, or, if it has, your Excellency is incapable of giving thereby any intentional offence to British Indian storekeepers. The use of the word "coolie" has caused a great deal of

mischief in Natal. At one time it became so serious that the then Justice, Sir Walter Wagg, had to intervene and to put down the use of that expression in connection with any but indentured Indians, it having been imported into the Court of Justice. As your Excellency may be aware, it means "labourer" or "porter." Used, therefore, in connection with traders, it is not only offensive, but a contradiction in terms.

THE PEACE PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

Coming to the statement that the British Indian Association is submitting to your Excellency, I would take first the Peace Preservation Ordinance. Soon after the Transvaal became part of the British Dominions, the services rendered during the war by the dhooly-bearers that came with Sir George White, and those rendered by the Indian Ambulance Corps in Natal, were on many people's lips. Sir George White spoke in glowing terms of the heroism of Parbhur Singh, who, perched up in a tree, never once failed to ring the gong as a notice to the inhabitants each time the Boer gun was fired from the Umbulwana Hill. General Buller's despatches, praising the work of the corps, were just out and the administration was in the hands of the military officers who knew the Indians. The first batch of refugees, therefore, who were waiting at the ports, entered the country without any difficulty, but the civilian population became alarmed, and called for the restriction of the entry of even the refugees. The result was that the country was dotted with Asiatic officers, and from that time up to-day the Indian community has known no rest; whereas aliens, in every sense of the term, as a rule, got their permits at the ports on application there and then, the Indian, even

though a refugee had to write to the supervisors of Asiatics, who had to refer the application to the Colonial Office, before permits were issued. The process took a very long time, from two to six months, and even one year and more, and then, too, the Colonial office had laid down a rule that only so many permits should be issued to British Indian refugees per week. The result of this mode of operation was that corruption became rampant, and there grew up a gang of permit-agents who simply fleeced innocent refugees; and it was a matter of notoriety that each refugee who wanted to enter the Transvaal had to spend from £15 to £30 or more. The matter came to the notice of the British Indian Association, repeated representations were made, and ultimately the Asiatic offices were wiped out. The mode of granting permits was however, unfortunately still kept up, and the Chief Secretary for Permits has been always subject to instruction from the Colonial Office. Thus the Peace Preservation Ordinance, which was intended to apply to dangerous character and political offenders, under the influence of the Colonial Office had become an Indian Immigration Restriction Law, as it remains to this day. Under the present regime, too, therefore, it is a most difficult matter for even *bona fide* refugees to get permits, and it is only in rare cases that it is possible to get them, except after a delay of months. Every one, no matter what his status may be, has to make an application on a special form, give two references, and put his thumb impression upon the form. The matter is then investigated, and the permit is granted. As if this were not enough, owing to the charges made by Mr. Loveday and his friends, the Chief Secretary for Permits received instructions to insist on European references.

This was tantamount to the denial of the right of British Indian refugees to enter the country. It would be hard to find twenty Indians who would be known to respectable Europeans by name as well as appearance. The British Indian Association had to correspond with the Government, and, in the meantime, the issue of permits was suspended, and it has been only lately realised that the insisting upon European reference was a serious injustice.

THE ENTRY OF CHILDREN

But still the difficulties apart from the necessity for European references are there. Male children under sixteen years of age are now called upon to take out permits before they can enter the Colony, so that it has been not an uncommon experience for little children of ten years of age and under to be torn away from their parents at the border towns. Why such a rule has been imposed we fail to understand.

The High Commissioner: Have you ever known a case where the parents have stated beforehand that they have children and which children have been refused permission to come in?

Mr. Gandhi: Yes; and the parents have been obliged to make affidavits before the children have been allowed to come in.

If the parents have the right to enter, so far as I am aware, every civilised country has admitted the right of minor children also to enter with them, and, in any case, children under sixteen years, if they cannot prove their parents are dead, or that their parents have been resident in the Transvaal, before the war, are not al-

lowed to enter or remain in the Colony. This is a very serious matter. As your Excellency is aware, the "joint-family" system prevails all over India. Brothers and sisters and their children live under the same roof from generation to generation, and the eldest member in the family is nominally, as well as in reality, the supporter and the bread-earner. There is, therefore, nothing unusual in Indians bringing the children of their relatives into the country, and it is submitted that it will be a very serious injustice if such children, who have hitherto been left unmolested, are either deported from the Colony or prevented from entering the Colony. The Government, again, intend to require the female relatives of resident Indians also to be registered, in the same manner as the males. The British Indian Association has sent an emphatic protest against any such measure, and has even submitted that it would be prepared to fight the question in a court of law, as, according to the advice given to it, wives of resident Indians are not required to take out registration certificates and pay £ 3.

THE ENTRY OF SPECIAL CLERKS, ETC.

No new permits are granted by the Government, no matter how necessary it may be in certain cases. We were all extremely pleased to read in the papers your Excellency's emphatic declaration that the vested interests of the Indians who are already settled in the country should not be disturbed or touched. There are merchants who have constantly to draw upon India for confidential clerks, in order to enable them to carry on their business. It is not easy to pick out reliable men from the resident population. That is the experience of merchants all over, and belonging to all communities. If therefore,

new Indians are absolutely shut out of the country u
the establishment of representative government, it will seriously interfere with these vested interests, and in any case, it is difficult to see why men of attainments and education, whether they be refugees or not, should not be able to have their permits on application. And, in spite of all these hardships, our anti-Indian friends are never tired of saying the country is flooded with British Indians who were never in the Transvaal. They have made a point of saying that every Indian who was before in the country was registered. I hardly think it is necessary for me to dilate upon this matter, as your Excellency has been told that all the facts with reference to this charge are wrong, but I may be pardoned for referring your Excellency to a case that happened in 1893. Shire and Dumat were large contractors of labour. They brought into the country at one time 800 Indian labourers. How many more they brought I do not know. The then State Attorney insisted that they should take out registration certificates and pay £ 3 each. Shire and Dumat tested the matter in the High Court, and the then Chief Justice, Kotzé, held that these men were not, in the terms of the law, called upon to pay £3, as they did not enter for "purposes of trade," and that he could not help the Government, even if the men, after the contract was over, subsequently remained in the country. That is only one instance, which cannot be gainsaid, in which hundreds of Indians remained in the country without praying £3 each. The British Indian Association has always submitted, and that from personal experience, that hundreds of Indians, who did not take out trade licences, remained in the country without ever registering themselves and paying £ 3.

BAZAARS AND LOCATIONS

Coming to Law 3 of 1885, it has been often urged that Indians, after the establishment of British Government in this country, have received relief with reference to trade licences. Nothing, however, can be farther from the truth. Before the war, we were able to trade anywhere we liked, as against tender of payment for licence money. The long arm of the British Government was then strong enough to protect us, and up to the very eve of the war, in spite of the constant threats of the then Government to prosecute British Indians who were trading, no action was taken. It is true that now, owing to the decision of the Supreme Court, Indian trade is unfettered but that is in spite of the Government. Up to the very last moment the Government declined to come to the rescue and a notice was published called the "Bazaars Notice," which stated that, after a certain date, every Indian who did not hold a licence to trade at the outbreak of war outside locations, would be expected not only to remove to locations, but to trade there also. After the notice was published locations were established in almost every town, and when every effort to get justice at the hands of the Government was exhausted, as a last resort it was decided to test the matter in a Court of Law. The whole of the Government machinery was then set in motion against us. Before the war a similar case was fought, and the British Government aided the Indians to seek an interpretation of the law, which we have now received from the present Supreme Court. After the establishment of the British Government, all these forces were against us. It is a cruel irony of fate, and there is no use disguising the fact that we have felt it most keenly, and this, I may state, as

has now transpired, in spite of the fact that the then Attorney-General told the Government that the interpretation they sought to place upon the law was bad, that, if it went to the Supreme Court, the matter would be decided in favour of British Indians. If, therefore, British Indians have not been sent to locations and are free to trade anywhere they like, and to live where they like—as I say, it is because it is notwithstanding the intentions of the Government to the contrary. In every instance, Law 3 of 1885 has been, so far as the Indians are concerned, most strictly interpreted against us, and we have not been allowed advantage of any loopholes that are left in it in our favour. For instance, British Indians are not debarred from owning landed property in "streets, wards, or locations that may be set apart" by the Government. The Government have resolutely declined to consider the words "streets and wards," and have simply clung to the world locations, and these locations, too, have been established miles away. We have pleaded hard, saying that the Government have the power to give us the right to ownership of land in streets and wards, that they should make use of that power in our favour, but the plea has been in vain. Even land which is being used for religious purposes, the Government would not transfer in the names of the trustees, as in Johannesburg, Heidelburg, Pretoria and Potchefstroom, although the mosque premises are good in every respect, from a sanitary standpoint. It is time, we therefore submit, that some relief was granted to us, while new legislation is under consideration.

CLASS LEGISLATION

As to the new legislation to replace Law 3 of 1885 the despatch drawn by Sir Arthur Lawley has caused us

a very great deal of pain. It insists on legislation affecting British Indians or Asiatics, as such. It also insists on the principle of compulsory segregation both of which are in conflict with the repeated assurances given to British Indians. Sir Arthur Lawley, I wish to say with the greatest deference, has allowed himself to be led astray by what he saw in Natal. Natal has been held up as an example of what the Transvaal would be, but the responsible politicians in Natal have always admitted that Indians have been the saving of the Colony. Sir James Hulett stated before the Native Affairs Commission that the Indian, even as a trader, was a desirable citizen, and formed a better link between the white wholesale merchant and the Native. Sir Arthur Lawley had also stated that, even if promises were made to British Indians, they were made in ignorance of the facts as they now are, and therefore it would be a greater duty to break them than to carry them out. With the greatest deference, I venture to submit that this is a wrong view to take of the promises. We are not dealing with promises that were made fifty years ago, though we undoubtedly rely upon the Proclamation of 1858 as our "Magna Charta." That proclamation has been reaffirmed more than once. Viceroy after Viceroy has stated emphatically that it was a promise acted upon. At the Conference of the Colonial Premiers, Mr. Chamberlain laid down the same doctrine and told the Premiers that no legislation affecting British Indians as such would be countenanced by Her late Majesty's Government, that it would be putting an affront quite unnecessarily on millions of the loyal subjects of the crown, and that, therefore, the legislation that was passed could only be of a general character. It was for that

reason that the first Immigration Restriction Act of Australia was vetoed. It was for the same reason that the first Natal Franchise Act was vetoed, and it was for the same reason that the Colony of Natal, after submitting a draft bill applicable to Asiatics as such, had to draft another measure. There are matters, not of years gone by, but of recent years. It cannot be said that there are to-day any new facts that have come to light to change all this. Indeed, even immediately before the war, declarations were made by Ministers that one of the reasons was to protect the rights of British Indians. Lastly, but not least, your Excellency, too, gave expression to similar sentiments on the eve of the war. Though, therefore, the manner in which Sir Arthur Lawley has approached the question is, in our humble opinion, very unjust and inconsistent with the British traditions, we, in order to show that we wish to co-operate with the white colonists, have submitted that, even though no such law existed before, there may now be an Immigration Act after the basis of the Cape or Natal, except that, as to the educational test, the great Indian languages should be recognised and that the already established British Indian merchants should have facilities afforded to them for importing temporarily men whom they may require in their businesses. That will at once do away with the fear of what has been termed an Asiatic invasion. We have also submitted that with reference to trade licenses, which have caused so much grumbling, the power should be given to the Local Boards or Town Councils to regulate the issue of any new licence subject to the control of the Supreme Court. All the existing licences should be taken out of the operation of any such statute, because they represent vested interests.

We feel that, if those two measures were passed, and Law 3 of 1885 were repealed, some measure and only some measure of justice would be done to Indians. We submit that we ought to have perfect freedom of owning landed property and of living where we like under the general municipal regulations as to sanitation and appearance of buildings, and during the time that the legislation is being formed, the Peace Preservation Ordinance should be regulated in accordance with the spirit of such regulation, and liberal interpretation should be placed upon Law 3 of 1885. It seems to me to be foreign to the nature of the British Constitution as I have been taught from my childhood, and it is difficult for my countrymen to understand that, under the British flag which protects aliens, its own subjects should be debarred from holding a foot of landed property so long as good use is made of it. Under the conditions, therefore, submitted by the Association, it ought to be possible for the Government to free the Statute Book of the Colony from legislation that necessarily insults British Indians. I do not wish to touch on such questions as footpath regulations, when we have to consider the question of bread and butter and life and death. What we want is not political power; but we do wish to live side by side with other British subjects in peace and amity, and with dignity and self-respect. We, therefore, feel that the moment His Majesty's Government decide so pass legislation differentiating between class and class, there would be an end to that freedom which we have learned to cherish as a priceless heritage of living under the British Crown.

DEPUTATION TO LORD ELGIN

The deputation to the Earl of Selborne, High Commissioner in South Africa, having failed in its efforts to obtain redress, the Indians led by Mr. Gandhi organised an agitation in England and succeeded in enlisting the sympathy of many Englishmen in the cause of the South African Indians. An influential Committee with Lord Ampthill as President, Sir M M. Bhownaggree as Executive Chairman and Mr. Ritch as Secretary, was formed to guard over Indian interests and a deputation from among the leading sympathisers of the cause of British Indians in South Africa was organised to wait on the Earl of Elgin, the Colonial Secretary. The deputation which consisted of Lord Stanley of Alderley, Mr. H. O. Ally, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, Sir Lepel Griffin, Mr. J. D. Rees, C.I.E., M.P., Sir George Birdwood, K.C.S.I., Sir Henry Cotton, K.C.S.I., M. P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, K C I E., Mr. Amir Ali, Mr. Harold Cox, M. P , and Mr. Thornton, C.S.I., waited on Lord Elgin on Thursday, November, 8, 1906, at the Colonial office. Lord Elgin began by saying that his sentiments would all be in favour of doing anything he could for the interest of British Indians Sir Lepel Griffin having introduced the Delegates in a neat little speech, Mr Gandhi, as one of the two delegates from South Africa, spoke as follows :

Both Mr. Ally and I are very much obliged to your Lordship for giving us the opportunity of placing the British Indian position before you. Supported though we are by distinguished Anglo-Indian friends and others, I feel that the task before Mr. Ally and myself is very difficult because your Lordship, in reply to the cablegram

sent to you through Lord Selborne, after the great Indian Mass Meeting in Johannesburg, was pleased to inform the British Indian Association that, although you would be pleased to give us every opportunity of stating our case, no good purpose was likely to be served, as your Lordship had approved of the principle of the Ordinance, in that it gave some measure of relief to the British Indian community, though not as much as His Majesty's Government would desire. We, who are the men on the spot, and who are affected by the Ordinance in question, have ventured to think otherwise. We have felt that this Ordinance does not give us any relief whatsoever. It is a measure which places British Indians in a far worse position than before, and makes the lot of the British Indian well-nigh intolerable. Under the Ordinance, the British Indian is assumed to be a criminal. If a stranger, not knowing the circumstances of the Transvaal, were to read the Ordinance, he would have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that an Ordinance of that nature, which carries so many penalties, and wounds the British Indian community on all sides, must only apply to thieves or a gang of robbers. I venture, therefore, to think that, although Sir Lepel Griffin has used strong language in connection with the Ordinance, he has not at all exaggerated, but every word of it is justified. At the same time I beg to state that the Ordinance, as amended, does not apply to British Indian females. The draft Ordinance undoubtedly applied to females also, but owing to the very strong protest made by the British Indian Association, and by Mr. Ally separately, as Chairman of the Hamidia Islamic Society, pointing out the great violence that would have been done to female sanctity, if I may say so, the

Ordinance was amended so as to take females out of its operation. But it applies to all adult males and even to children, in that the parents or guardians have to take out registration certificates for their children or wards, as the case may be.

It is a fundamental maxim of the British law that everyone is presumed to be innocent until he is found guilty, but the Ordinance reverses the process, brands every Indian as guilty, and leaves no room for him to prove his innocence. There is absolutely nothing proved against us, and yet every British Indian, no matter what his status is, is to be condemned as guilty, and not treated as an innocent man. My Lord, an Ordinance of this nature it is not possible for British Indians to reconcile themselves to. I do not know that such an Ordinance is applicable to free British subjects in any part of His Majesty's Dominions.

Moreover, what the Transvaal thinks to-day, the other Colonies thinks to-morrow. When Lord Milner sprang his Bazaar Notice on British Indians, the whole of South Africa rang with the idea. The term "bazaar" is a misnomer; it has been really applied to locations where trade is utterly impossible. However, a proposal was seriously made, after a Bazaar Notice by the then Mayor of Durban, Mr. Ellis Brown, that Indians should be relegated to bazaars. There is not the slightest reason why this Ordinance also, if it ever becomes law, should not be copied by the other parts of South Africa. The position to-day in Natal is that even indentured Indians are not required to carry passes as contemplated by the Asiastic Law Amendment Ordinance; nor are there any penalties attached to the non-carrying of

passes as are defined in the Ordinance under discussion. We have already shown, in our humble representation, that no relief has been granted by this Ordinance, because the remission of the £3 fee referred to by Mr. Duncan is quite illusory, because all we British Indians resident in the Transvaal, who are obliged to pay £3 under Law 3 of 1885, and those who, under Lord Selborne's promises are likely to be allowed to re-enter the Transvaal, have paid the £3 already.

The authority to issue temporary permits is also superfluous, in that the Government have already exercised the power, and there are to-day in the Transvaal several Indians in possession of temporary permits. They are liable to be expelled from the Colony on the expiry of their permits.

The relief under the Liquor-Ordinance is, British Indians feel, a wanton insult. So much was thus recognised by the local Government that they immediately assured the Indians that it was not intended for British Indians at all, but for somebody else. We have no connection with anybody else and we have always endeavoured to show that the British Indians ought to be treated as British subjects, and ought not to be included with the general body of Asiatics with respect to whom there may be a need for some restrictions which ought not to apply to British Indians as British subjects.

There remains one more sentiment, that is, in connection with the land owned by the late Aboobaker. The land should belong to the heirs by right, but under the interpretation reluctantly put upon it by the Supreme Court, that it is only individual in character, and does not

touch the community, the land cannot be transmitted to the heirs. The Ordinance is intended to rectify the error, but as I had the honour to represent the heirs, I ventured to think that even they would not consent to pay for getting this relief at the price, in the nature of the Ordinance for British Indians; and certainly the Indian community can never exchange, for the relief given to the heirs of the land of Aboobaker, an Ordinance of this nature, which requires them to pay so great a price for what is really their own. So that under the Ordinance, in that respect again, there is absolutely no relief. As I said before, we shall be under the Ordinance branded as criminals.

My Lord, the existing legislation is severe enough. I hold in my hands returns from the Court of the Magistrate at Volkerust. Over 150 successful prosecutions of Indians attempting to enter the Transvaal have taken place during the years 1905 and 1906. All these prosecutions, I venture to say, are by no means just. I venture to believe that, if these prosecutions were gone into, you would see that some of them were absolutely groundless.

So far as the question of identification is concerned, the present laws are quite enough. I produce to Your Lordship the Registration Certificate held by me, and it will show how complete it is to establish identification. The present law can hardly be called an amendment. I produce before Your Lordship a registration receipt held by my colleague, Mr. Ally, from the Transvaal Government. Your Lordship will see that it is merely a receipt for £3. The registration under the present Ordinance is of a different type. When Lord Milner wished to

enforce Law 3 of 1885, he suggested new registration. We protested against it, but on his strong advice, as a voluntary act, we allowed ourselves to be newly registered; and hence the form produced before Your Lordship. At the time the registration was undertaken, Lord Milner stated emphatically that it was a measure once for all, and that it would form a complete title to residence by those who hold such registration certificates. Is all this now to be undone?

Your Lordship is doubtless aware of the Punia case, wherein a poor Indian woman in the company of her husband, was torn away from her husband, and was ordered by the Magistrate to leave the country within seven hours. Fortunately, relief was granted in the end, as the matter was taken up in time. A boy under eleven years was also arrested and sentenced to pay a fine of £30 or to go to gaol for three months, and at the end of it to leave the country. In this case, again, the Supreme Court has been able to grant justice. The conviction was pronounced to be wholly bad, and Sir James Rose-Innes stated that the Administration would bring upon itself ridicule and contempt if such a policy was pursued. If the existing legislation is strong enough, and severe enough to thus prosecute British Indians, is it not enough to keep out of the colony British Indians who may attempt fraudulently to enter it?

It has been stated that the reason for passing the Ordinance is that there is an unauthorised influx of British Indians into the Transvaal, on a wholesale scale, and that there is an attempt, on the part of the Indian community, to introduce Indians in such a manner. The last charge has been, times without number, repudiated

by the Indian community, and the makers of the charge have been challenged to prove their statement. The first statement has also been denied.

I ought to mention one thing also; that is, the fourth resolution that was passed at the British Indian Mass Meeting. It was passed by the meeting solemnly, prayerfully, and in all humility, and the whole of that great meeting decided by that resolution that, if this Ordinance ever came to be enforced and we did not get relief, the British Indians, rather than submit to the great degradation involved in it, would go to gaol, such was the intensity of the feeling aroused by the Ordinance. We have hitherto suffered much in the Transvaal and in other parts of South Africa; but the hardship has been tolerable; we have not considered it necessary to travel 6000 miles to place the position before the Imperial Government. But the straining point has been reached by the Ordinance, and we felt that we should, in all humility, exhaust every resource, even to the extent of sending a deputation to wait on Your Lordship.

The least, therefore, that, in my humble opinion, is due to the British Indian community, is to appoint a Commission as suggested in the humble representation submitted to Your Lordship. It is a time-honoured British custom that, whenever an important principle is involved, a Commission is appointed before a step is taken. The question of Alien Immigration into the United Kingdom is a parallel case. Charges somewhat similar to the charges against the Indian community were made against the aliens who enter the United Kingdom. There was also the question of adequacy of the existing legislation, and the necessity for further

legislation. All these three points were referred to a Commission before any step was taken. I therefore venture to think that a Commission should be appointed, and the whole question thrashed out before any drastic measures are taken.

I venture therefore to hope that Your Lordship will see your way to grant this small measure of relief to the British Indian community.

BEFORE THE COURT IN 1907

Mr. Gandhi's appeal to Lord Elgin and the efforts of the British Committee in London were successful only to the extent of securing from Lord Elgin a declaration that the ordinance would be hung up until the matter had received the consideration of the Transvaal Parliament that was shortly to come into being. A constitutional Government was soon after formed in the Transvaal and the new measure received the Royal Assent and became Law The Indian Community in Transvaal, seeing that their efforts were all in vain, determined to fight and risk the consequences of disobedience in accordance with the resolution passed at a vast mass meeting of some 3,000 British Indians held at the Empire Theatre, Johannesburg.

On the 26th December, 1907, the Royal Assent to the Immigration Act was announced and simultaneously came the news that a number of the leaders of the two Asiatic communities were warned to appear before the Magistrate to show cause why, having failed to apply for registration, as required by the law, they should not be ordered to leave the Transvaal. They were directed to leave the Colony

within a given period, and failing to do so, they were sentenced to simple imprisonment for two months. Mr. Gandhi was one of those arrested and brought to trial.

In Christmas week of 1907 Mr. Gandhi received a telephone message from Mr. H. F. D. Papenfue, Acting Commissioner of Police for the Transvaal, asking him to call at Marlborough House. Upon arriving there, he was informed that the arrests had been ordered of himself and 25 others.

The following account of the proceedings in Court is taken from the "Indian Opinion"

Mr. Gandhi gave his word that all would appear before the respective magistrates at 10 A.M. next day and the Commissioner accepted this guarantee. Next morning when he attended at the B. Criminal Court he was asked by the Superintendent whether he held duly issued registration certificates under law 2 of 1907, and upon receiving replies in the negative, he was promptly arrested and charged under section 8 sub-section 2 of Act 2 of 1907, in that he was in the Transvaal without a registration certificate issued under the act. The Court was crowded to excess, and it seemed as if, at one time, the barrier would be overthrown.

Mr. D. J. Shurman prosecuted on behalf of the Crown.

Mr, Gandhi pleaded guilty.

Sup. Vernon gave evidence as to the arrest.

Mr. Gandhi asked no questions, but went into the box prepared to make a statement. He said what he was about to state was not evidence but he hoped the Court would grant him indulgence to make a short explanation

seeing that he was an officer of that Court. He wished to say why he had not submitted to this.

Mr. Jordan (Magistrate) : I don't think that has anything to do with it. The law is there, and you have disobeyed it. I do not want any political speeches made.

Mr. Gandhi ; I do not want to make any political speeches.

Mr. Jordan : The question is, have you registered or not? If you have not registered there is an end of the case. If you have any explanation to offer as regards the order I am going to make that is another story. There is the law, which has been passed by the Transvaal legislature and sanctioned by the Imperial Government. All I have to do and all I can do is to administer that law as it stands

Mr. Gandhi : I do not wish to give any evidence in extenuation and I know that legally I cannot give evidence at all.

Mr. Jordan : All I have to deal with is legal evidence. What you want to say, I suppose, is that you do not approve of the law and you conscientiously resist it.

Mr. Gandhi : That is perfectly true.

Mr. Jordan : I will take the evidence if you say you conscientiously object.

Mr. Gandhi was proceeding to state when he came to the Transvaal and the fact that he was Secretary to the British Indian Association when Mr. Jordan said he did not see how that affected the case.

Mr. Gandhi : I said that before and I simply asked the indulgence of the Court for five minutes.

Mr. Jordan : I don't think this is a case in which the Court should grant any indulgence ; you have defied the law.

Mr. Gandhi: Very well, sir, then I have nothing more to say.

The Magistrate then ordered Mr. Gandhi to leave the country in 48 hours.

On the 11th January 1908 Mr. Gandhi appeared before the Court, and he pleaded guilty to the charge of disobeying the order of the Court to leave the Colony within 48 hours.

Mr. Gandhi asked leave to make a short statement and having obtained it, he said he thought there should be distinction made between his case and those who were to follow. He had just received a message from Pretoria stating that his compatriots had been tried there and had been sentenced to three months' imprisonment with hard labour, and they had been fined a heavy amount in lieu of payment of which they would receive a further period of three months' hard labour If these men had committed an offence, he had committed a greater offence, and he asked the magistrate to impose upon him the heaviest penalty.

Mr. Jordan: You asked for the heaviest penalty which the law authorised?

Mr. Gandhi: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Jordan: I must say I do not feel inclined to accede to your request of passing the heaviest sentence which is six months' hard labour with a fine of £500. That appears to me to be totally out of proportion to the offence which you have committed. The offence practically is contempt of Court in having disobeyed the order of December, 28, 1907. This is more or less a political offence, and if it had not been for the political defiance set to the law, I should have thought it my duty to pass the lowest sentence which I am authorised by the act.

Under the circumstance, I think a fair sentence to meet the case would be two months' imprisonment without hard labour.

Mr. Gandhi was then removed in custody.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE ASSAILANTS.

As licences to trade or to hawk were refused without the production of the new registration certificates many men were sentenced to imprisonment for hawking without a licence, until the Johannesbury gaol was uncomfortably crowded. Realising that there was no sign of the passive resistance movement breaking down and impressed by the determination of the Asiatic communities, as well as the increasing pressure of public opinion not only in England and India, but also in South Africa and the Transvaal itself, General Smuts decided to try a truce, and accordingly invited negotiations from the imprisoned Indian leaders. As a result of these negotiations, General Smuts suspended the operation of the Act, and agreed to accept voluntary re-registration promising at the same time to introduce repealing legislation in the next Session of Parliament, provided that voluntary re-registration had been satisfactorily effected. True to his promise, Mr. Gandhi took to voluntary re-registration and began advising his countrymen to do so.

One morning in February, 1908, when Mr. Gandhi set out to fulfil his pledge to the Transvaal Government that he would undertake voluntary registration, he was attacked by a small section of the Passive Resisters who imagined that Mr. Gandhi was playing the coward and betraying his trust. Though bleeding profusely he refused to seek

police protection against his own countrymen and would not permit the Doctor to stitch up his face before completing the form of application for voluntary registration. That same day, though tossing with fever, he issued the following manifesto from his sick bed :—

Those who have committed the act did not know what they were doing. They thought that I was doing what was wrong. They have had their redress in the only manner they know. I, therefore, request that no steps be taken against them.

Seeing that the assault was committed by a Mahomedan or Mahomedans, 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 to-day cement the two communities indissolubly—such is my heartfelt prayer. May God grant it! . . . . The spirit of passive resistance rightly understood should make the people fear none and nothing but God—no cowardly fear, therefore, should deter the vast majority of sober-minded Indians from doing their duty. The promise of repeal of the Act, against voluntary registration, having been given, it is the sacred duty of every true Indian to help the Government and the Colony to the uttermost.

THE ISSUE AT STAKE

Undisturbed in any way by the murderous attack on him Mr. Gandhi was able to secure the voluntary re-registration of his countrymen by the middle of May, 1908 It was now time for Genl. Smuts to carry out his promise to repeal the obnoxious act. It was clear, however, Genl. Smuts was determined to depart from his promise and to "break faith." Immediate protests were made by both the British Indian and Chinese leaders to General Smuts, who, however, failed to satisfy them, constantly evading the issue. Finally he invited Mr. Gandhi to discuss the difficulty with him, and at the interview produced a Draft Bill to repeal the Act on condition that Mr. Gandhi, on behalf of the British Indian community, would consent to regard certain classes of Indians as prohibited emigrants, including even those who could pass the most severe education test of the Immigration Act. Recognising at once that General Smuts' intention was to substitute for one piece of insulting legislation an even more humiliating law, Mr. Gandhi indignantly refused to contemplate the suggestion and negotiations were abruptly broken off. The agitation was in full swing ; the jails became crowded as usual ; a deputation was sent to England to explain to the British public how General Smuts had broken faith and was playing with the liberty and the conscience of the Indian community. The following statement issued by Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Haji Habib on the 5th Nov. 1909 in London gives an account of the abortive negotiation made in England by Mr. Gandhi and the British Committee there for redressing the wrongs of the Transvaal Indians :—

The Transvaal British Indian Deputation arrived in London on the 10th day of July last. The enclosed statement of the British Indian case in that Colony was prepared immediately after the arrival in London of that Deputation, but it was not issued as delicate negotiations with a view to arriving at a quiet settlement were in progress. We have now learnt that these have proved abortive and that the position remains unchanged. It has, therefore, become necessary for us to inform the public as to how the matter stands and what the struggle of the British Indians in the Transvaal means.

The ex-Colonial Secretary of the Transvaal, during its administration as a Crown Colony, writing in a magazine in South Africa in the month of February last, thus correctly summed up the question:

"The position of the Indian leaders is that they will tolerate no law which does not put them on an equality with Europeans in regard to restriction on immigration. They are willing to see the number of Asiatics limited by administrative action..... They insist on equality in the terms of the law itself.

That is still the position.

Mr. Smuts, the present Colonial Secretary of the Transvaal, offers to repeal the Registration Law around which the struggle has been raging for the last three years, and to concede to a limited number of British Indians, *other* than former residents of the Transvaal, certificates of permanent residence. Were the object aimed at by the British Indians the admission into the Colony of a few more of their brethren, this concession would be material, but the object they have had in view in agitating for the repeal of the Law being to secure legal or theoretical equality in respect of immigration, their purpose is by the proposed maintenance of the legal disability not advanced a step. We are not aware whether the above

modification of the present law proposed by Mr. Smuts will take place irrespective of the continuance of the passive resistance at present being offered by the British Indians of the Transvaal, but we are in a position to state that the proposed concession will not satisfy passive resisters. The struggle of the Indian community of that Colony was undertaken in order to obtain the removal of the stigma cast upon the whole of India by this legislation, which imports a racial and colour bar into the Immigration Laws of a British Colony for the first time in the history of Colonial legislation. The principle so laid down that British Indians may not enter the Transvaal because they are British Indians is a radical departure from traditional policy, is un-British and intolerable, and if that principle is accepted even tacitly by British Indians, we consider that they will be untrue to themselves, to the land of their birth, and to the Empire to which they belong. Nor is it the passive resisters in the Transvaal who, in a matter of this kind, have alone to be considered. The whole of India is now awakened to a sense of the insult that the Transvaal legislation offers to her, and we feel that the people here, at the heart of the Empire, cannot remain unmoved by this departure, so unprecedented and so vital, from Imperial traditions. Mr. Smuts' proposal brings out the issue in the clearest manner possible. If we were fighting not for a principle but for loaves and fishes, he would be prepared to throw them at us in the shape of residential permits for the small number of cultured British Indians that may be required for our wants, but because we insist upon the removal of the implied racial taint from the legislation of the Colony, he is not prepared to yield an inch. He would give us the husk without the kernel. He declines to

remove the badge of inferiority, but is ready to change the present rough-looking symbol for a nicely polished one. British Indians, however, decline to be deluded. They may yield everything, occupy any position, but the badge must be removed first. We, therefore, trust that the public will not be misled by the specious concessions that are being offered, into the belief that British Indians, because they do not accept them, are unreasonable in their demands, that they are uncompromising, and that, therefore, they do not deserve the sympathy and support of a common sense and practical public. In the final reply received by us from Lord Crewe the following is the position that is taken up:

> His Lordship explained to you that Mr. Smuts was unable to accept the claim that Asiatics should be placed in a position of equality with Europeans in respect of right of entry or otherwise.

Herein lies the crux. Legal equality in respect of the right of entry, even though never a man does enter, is what British Indians have been fighting for, and according to the reports we have received from the Transvaal, is what some of them, at least, will die for. The only possible justification for holding together the different communities of the Empire under the same sovereignty is the fact of elementary equality, and it is because the Transvaal legislation cuts at the very root of this principle that British Indians have offered a stubborn resistance.

It would be contrary to fact to argue that no relief can be had in this matter because the Transvaal is a Self-Governing Colony, and because now South Africa has got its Union. The difficulty of the situation is due to a mistake committed at the centre of the Empire. The Imperial Government are party to the crime against the Imperial Constitution. They sanctioned when they need

not have, and when it was their duty not to have sanctioned the legislation in question. They are now undoubtedly most anxious to settle this troublesome matter. Lord Crewe has endeavoured to bring about a satisfactory result, but he is too late. Mr. Smuts, perhaps, very properly has reminded his Lordship of the fact that the legislation in question had received Imperial sanction, and that he should or could now be called upon to retrace his steps, because the British Indians in the Transvaal had undertaken to disregard the legislation, and to suffer the penalties of such disregard. His position as a politician and as an aspirant to high office "in a white South Africa" is unquestionable, but neither the British public nor the Indian public are interested in his position nor are they party to this crime of the Imperial Government.

We may add that, during the last four months, arrests and imprisonments have gone on unabated. The leaders of the community continue to go to prison. The severity of the prison regulations is maintained The Prison diet has been altered for the worse. Prominent medical men of Johannesburg have certified that the present dietary scale for Indian prisoners is deficient. The authorities, unlike their action during last year, have ignored the religious scruples of Mahomedan prisoners, and have refused to give facilities for observing the sacred annual fast which millions of Mahomedans scrupulously undergo from year to year Sixty passive resisters recently came out of the Pretoria gaol emaciated and weak. Their message to us is that, starved as they were, they are ready to be re-arrested as soon as the Government wish to lay their hands on them. The acting Chairman of the British Indian Association has

only just been arrested and sentenced to be imprisoned for three months with hard labour. This is his third term. He is a Mahomedan. A brave Parsee, a well-educated man, was deported to Natal. He re-entered and is now undergoing six months' imprisonment with hard labour. He is in gaol for the fifth time. A young Indian, an ex-Volunteer Sergeant, has also gone to gaol for the third time on the same terms as the Parsee. Wives of imprisoned British Indians and their children either take up baskets of fruit, hawk about and earn their living in order to support themselves, or are being supported from contributions. Mr. Smuts, when he re-embarked for South Africa, said that he had arrived at an understanding with Lord Crewe that would satisfy the large body of British Indians who were heartily sick of the agitation. His prophecy has been totally disproved by what has happened since.

THE MARRIAGE QUESTION

The £3 tax was not the only disability of South African Indians. Among the various legal disabilities to which Indians were subjected, the most galling was the one concerning the introduction of the plural wives of Asiatics into the Transvaal. The law involved great hardship on the Muslims in particular. Mr. Gandhi urged on the Minister "not for a general recognition of polygamy", but contended " that, in continuation of the practice hitherto followed, existing plural wives of domiciled residents should be allowed to enter " On this question the following correspondence between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. E. M. Gorges took place in September, 1913 In reply to Mr. Gorges' letter, Mr. Gandhi wrote on 22nd September:—

Dear Mr. Gorges,—I am much obliged to you for your letter of the 19th instant regarding the marriage question. I have not widened the original scope of my request. But I shall endeavour as clearly as possible to re-state the position.

It is submitted that authority should be taken from Parliament during its next session to legalise monogamous marriages already solemnised or hereafter to be solemnised by Indian priests among Indians belonging to non-Christian denominations. Legislation has become necessary only because the marriage clause in the new Act was hastily worded without considering the full position. Unless the relief now sought is granted soon, the status of Indian women married in South Africa is that of concubines and their children not lawful heirs of their parents. Such is, as I take it, the effect of the Searle judgment combined with the action of the Natal Master of the Supreme Court and the Gardiner judgment. I have asked for a promise of amelioration during the next session because I submit that the matter is one of urgency. With regard to polygamy, I have not asked for legal recognition, but the admission under the powers vested in the Minister of plural wives without the Government in any way recognising their legal status. The admission is to be restricted only to plural wives already married to Indians who may be found to be unquestionably domiciled in the Union. This at once restricts the scope of the Government's generosity and enables them to know *now* how many such wives will have to be admitted. I have already submitted a plan as to how this can be brought about.

In my humble opinion, the letter of the 10th August, 1911, referred to in your communication, bears the interpretation I have placed upon it. The British Indian Association raised the question of polygamy and the above-mentioned letter containing the assurance was the reply. I suppose you know that plural wives have actually been admitted by the Immigration Officers and that polygamous Unions are even registered on the Transvaal registration certificates.

As doubts have arisen as to the meaning of the term "monogamous marriage," I beg to record that the meaning that the community has placed upon it is that a marriage is monogamous if a man is married to only one woman, no matter under what religion and no matter whether such religion under given circumstances sanctions polygamy or not.

I observe that paragraph 2 of your letter seems to suggest that my reply to your last wire did not though it might have covered the other points referred to therein. I purposely refrained from touching the other points as I felt that no scope was left open for me to do so. But if General Smuts is still prepared to consider the other points, I shall be certainly prepared to make a further submission. I cannot help feeling that the unfortunate rupture has taken place on points very vital to the Indian community but of little consequence to the Government or the dominant population of the Union.

Pray always consider me to be one the least desirous to obstruct the Government and most anxious to serve it in so far as I can do so consistently with my duty to my countrymen.

To this Mr. Gorges replied that the minister after full consideration had asked him to say that it would

not be possible for him to give any assurance that legislation on the lines indicated by him would be introduced at the next session Mr. Gandhi thereupon replied on 28th September:—

Dear Mr Gorges,—I do not know that I am justified in writing this letter to you, but, as you have been personally solicitous about the non-revival of passive resistance, and as, in the course of my conversations with you, I have so often told you that I have nothing to withhold from the Government, I may as well inform you of what is now going on.

I wrote to you from Phœnix in reply to your last letter, and if you have not yet replied to my communication but intend to do so, I would suggest your sending your reply to my Johannesburg address, as I shall be here for some time at least.

The campaign has started in earnest. As you know, sixteen passive resisters, including four women, are already serving three months' imprisonment with hard labour. The resisters here were awaiting my arrival and the activity here will commence almost immediately

I cannot help saying that the points on which the struggle has re-started are such that the Government might gracefully grant them to the community. But what I would like to impress upon the Government is the gravity of the step we are about to take. I know that it is fraught with danger. I know also that, once taken, it may be difficult to control the spread of the movement beyond the limits one may set. I know also what responsibility lies on my shoulders in advising such a momentous step, but I feel that it is not possible for me to refrain from advising a step which I consider

to be necessary, to be of educational value and, in the end, to be valuable both to the Indian community and to the State. This step consists in actively, persistently and continuously asking those who are liable to pay the £3 tax to decline to do so and to suffer the penalties for non-payment, and, what is more important, in asking those who are now serving indenture and who will, therefore, be liable to pay the £3 tax on completion of their indenture to strike work until the tax is withdrawn. I feel that, in view of Lord Ampthill's declaration in the House of Lords, evidently with the approval of Mr. Gokhale, as to the definite promise made by the Government and repeated to Lord Gladstone, this advice to indentured Indians would be fully justified. That the tax has weighed most heavily upon the men I know from personal experience ; that the men resent it bitterly I also know from personal knowledge. But they have submitted to it more or less with quiet resignation, and I am loth to disturb their minds by any step that I might take or advise. Can I not even now, whilst in the midst of the struggle, appeal to General Smuts and ask him to re-consider his decision on the points already submitted and on the question of the £3 tax, and, whether this letter is favourably considered or not, may I anticipate the assurance that it will in no wise be taken to be a threat ?

(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

BEFORE THE COURT IN 1913

While Mr. Gandhi was leading a deputation to England, another deputation led by Mr. Polak came to India to press the question of the repeal of the £3 tax. Then followed an agitation in England and India in 1910-1912 which compelled attention of the authorities. Mr. Gokhale subsequently visited South Africa and made special representations to the Union Ministers on this particular question and a definite undertaking was given to him that the tax would be repealed. For a time it appeared that settlement was possible. But General Smuts again evaded and the tension became more when in 1913 a measure was introduced into the Union Parliament exempting women only from its operation, Mr. Gandhi wired to Mr. Gokhale asking whether the promise of repeal was limited to women only. Mr. Gokhale replied that it applied to all who were affected by the tax. Mr. Gandhi reminded the Union Government of the promise and asked for a definite undertaking to repeal it in 1914. The Union Government declined. It was then that Mr. Gandhi organised the great movement advising indentured Indians to suspend work till the tax was repealed. Under his lead the Indian labourers gathered in thousands and they passed mine after mine adding to their numbers. Then commenced the historic March into the Transvaal allowing themselves to be freely arrested. The Government hoping to demoralise the Indians issued a warrant to arrest Mr. Gandhi.

Mr. Gandhi, was, on the 11th November, 1913, charged on three counts, before the Resident Magistrate, Mr. J. W. Cross, of Dundee, with inducing indentured immigrants to leave the Province. The Court was crowded with Indians

and Europeans. Mr. W. Daizell-Turnbull was specially instructed by the Attorney-General to appear for the prosecution, and Mr. Advocate J. W. Godfrey appeared for Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Gandhi pleaded guilty to the charges.

Mr. Turnbull read the section and left the matter in the hands of the Magistrate.

Mr. Godfrey stated that he was under an obligation to the defendant not to plead in mitigation in any way whatsoever. The circumstances which had brought Mr. Gandhi before the Magistrate were well known to all persons, and he was only expressing the desire of the defendant when he stated that the Magistrate had a duty to perform, and that he was expected to perform that duty fearlessly, and should therefore not hesitate to impose the highest sentence upon the prisoner if he felt that the circumstances in the case justified it

Mr. Gandhi obtained the permission of the Court, and made the following statement:—

As a member of the profession, and being an old resident of Natal, he thought that, in justice to himself and the public, he should state that the counts against him were of such a nature that he took the responsibility imposed upon him, for he believed that the demonstration for which these people were taken out of the Colony was one for a worthy object. He felt that he should say that he had nothing against the employers, and regretted that in this campaign serious losses were being caused to them. He appealed to the employers also, and he felt that the tax was one which was heavily weighing down his countrymen, and should be removed. He also felt that he was in honour bound, in view of the position of things between Mr. Smuts and Professor

Gokhale, to produce a striking demonstration. He was aware of the miseries caused to the women and babes in arms. On the whole, he felt he had not gone beyond the principles and honour of the profession of which he was a member. He felt that he had only done his duty in advising his countrymen, and it was his duty to advise them again, that, until the tax were removed, to leave work and subsist upon rations obtained by charity. He was certain that without suffering it was not possible for them to get their grievance remedied.

The Magistrate finally in pronouncing sentence said :—

It was a painful duty to pass a sentence upon the conduct of a gentleman like Mr. Gandhi, upon the deliberate contravention of the law, but he had a duty to perform, and Mr. Godfrey, his counsel, had asked him fearlessly to perform that duty. The accused having pleaded guilty, he (the Magistrate) accepted that plea, and passed the following sentences :—Count 1, £20, or three months' imprisonment, with hard labour : Count 2, £20, or three months' imprisonment, with hard labour, to take effect upon the expiration of the sentence in respect to count 1 ; Count 3, £20 or three months' imprisonment, with hard labour, this to take effect upon the expiration of the sentence imposed in count 2.

Mr. Gandhi, in a clear and calm voice, said :—" I elect to go to gaol."

His counsel visited him later, and, through him, desired it to be stated that he was cheerful and confident, and sent as his message to the strikers the following :—

" No cessation of the strike without the repeal of the £3 tax. The Government, having imprisoned me, can gracefully make a declaration regarding the repeal."

THE SOLOMON COMMISSION.

While Mr. Gandhi and his compatriots were suffering in jail, his countrymen in India, under the guidance of Mr. Gokhale, continued to render all possible assistance to keep up the firm attitude of the South African Indians Money was raised in thousands for the help of the distressed in South Africa. And in December, 1913, Lord Hardinge's famous speech in Madras opened the eyes of the Imperial Government to the gravity of the situation created by the Union Government. Soon after a Royal Commission to enquire into the condition of Indians in South Africa was appointed. In view of the forthcoming Commission's enquiry, Mr. Gandhi and his colleagues were released from prison. Soon after release Mr. Gandhi made the following statement :--

We were discharged unconditionally on the 18th instant, on the recommendation of the Commission. We were not told at the time of our relief why we were being relieved. It is not true that after relief we went to Pretoria to see the Ministers. Knowing as we do the feelings of Mr. Esselen, and Colonel Wylie towards Indians, it is impossible for us not to feel strongly that the Commission has not been appointed to give us fair-play, but it is a packed body and intended to hoodwink the Government and the public both in England and in India. The Chairman's integrity and impartiality is undoubted, but Mr. Esselen and Colonel Wylie are well known and admitted generally to be amongst the strongest and most violent opponents of Indians in South Africa. Mr. Esselen has emphatically declared from the public platform on many occasions extreme anti-Asiatic views and is so intimately related politically to the Union

Ministers that he is regarded here practically as a non-official member of the Ministry. Only recently he expressed himself, privately, most offensively about the Indians to a member of the Union Parliament, named Mr. Meyler, who has publicly protested against his appointment. Colonel Wylie has been our bitterest opponent in Natal for more than twenty years. So far back as 1896 he led a mob to demonstrate against the landing of Indians who had arrived at Durban in two vessels, advocated at a public meeting the sinking of the ships with all Indians on board and commending a remark made by another speaker that he would willingly put down one month's pay for one shot at the Indians and asked how many were prepared to put down similarly a month's pay on those terms; and he has consistently been our enemy all these years Moreover, he is Colonel of the Defence Force whose acts are the subject of inquiry and he is also the Legal Adviser of many estate owners and during the present agitation he has openly said that the £ 3 tax ought not to be repealed.

The Commission is not merely judicial but also political, investigating not only the facts as to ill-treatment, but also recommending a policy for the future, and it is impossible that the Chairman will control the views of his colleagues in matters of policy. The appointment of Messrs. Esselen and Wylie to investigate our grievances and to stigmatise our protests against their appointment as an unwarranted reflection on their impartiality is to add insult to injury. Almost the entire South African Press admits the reasonableness of our suggestions as to the additional members. Ministers of religion and other European friends are working to remove the present deadlock and secure us fair-play. We would be

prepared to lead evidence before Sir William Solomon alone if it was a question merely of enquiring into the charges of flogging, acts of military and other ill-treatment, but this inquiry includes an examination of grievances also. Before our release, public meetings had been held at all Indian centres throughout South Africa protesting strongly against the personnel of the Commission and urging the appointment of Mr. Schreiner and Judge Rose-Innes to counterbalance Messrs. Esselen and Wylie. Immediately on our release, as soon as we took the situation in, we addressed a letter to the Ministry asking for these additions to the Commission. Objection has been taken to the form in which this request was put forward by us, but we are confronted with a terrible crisis and it is not easy always to weigh carefully the niceties of form at such a juncture. The Indian position has always been to insist on the community being consulted at least informally regarding matters vitally affecting it since it is voteless.

In the constitution of the present Commission, Indian sentiment not only was not consulted but was contemptuously trampled on. During the recent deadlock in connection with the European railwaymen's grievances, the men were permitted to choose their nominee by a referendum. We merely asked for informal consultation when we were released.

We found that the indignation of our countrymen was at white heat owing to floggings which had been seen with their own eyes, shooting which they believed to be unjustified and other acts of ill-treatment, and this indignation was further intensified by the harrowing accounts of prison treatment which the passive resisters including ladies who were released at this time on the expiry

of their sentences gave to the community. In all our experience of prison treatment in this country never have we been treated before with such unparalleled cruelty. Insults by warders, frequent assaults by Zulu warders, with the holding off of blankets and other necessary articles, food badly cooked by Zulus, all these necessitated a hunger strike causing immense suffering. You have to know these things to understand the frame of mind with which the community met in the public meeting on Sunday, the 21st December, to consider the position and resolve on future action.

There was but one feeling at the meeting and that was that if we had any self-respect, we must not accept the Commission unless it was modified in some manner in favour of the Indians and we must also ask for the release of all real passive resister prisoners in which terms we do not include persons rightly convicted of actual violence and we all took a solemn oath in God's name that unless these conditions were complied with, we would resume our Passive Resistance. Now this oath we mean to keep whatever happens. In this trouble we are fighting with spiritual weapons and it is not open to us to go back on our solemn declaration. Moreover, in this matter it is not as though it is the leaders that are egging the community on, on the contrary so determined is the community to keep the vow which it has solemnly taken that, if any leaders ventured to advise acceptance of the commission without any modification on the lines asked for, they would beyond all doubt be killed and I must add, justly so. I believe we are gaining ground. Several influential Europeans including some ministers of religion, recognising the justice of our stand, are working to help us and we have not yet given

up the hope that some way may be found out of the difficulty.

In all this crisis, I wish to say before concluding, two things have greatly sustained and comforted us, one is the splendid courage and staunch advocacy of our cause by His Excellency the Viceroy and the other is the hearty support which India has sent us. We shall do nothing now, till Sir Benjamin Robertson arrives and we shall receive him with all honour and trust both because you tell us we shall find in him a strong friend and also because he has been appointed by the Viceroy to whom we feel so profoundly grateful. But unless the Commission is made in some way more acceptable to us, I do not see how the renewal of Passive Resistance can be avoided. We know it will entail enormous suffering. I assure you, we do not desire it, but neither shall we shrink from it, if it must be borne.

At a meeting held under the auspices of the Natal Indian Association, Mr. Gandhi sketched his future programme. He said:—

He would have preferred to speak first in one of the Indian tongues, but in the presence of Messrs. Polak and Kallenbach, his fellow convicts, feelings of gratitude compelled him to speak first in the tongue they knew. They would notice he had changed his dress from that he had formerly adopted for the last 20 years, and he had decided on the change when he heard of the shooting of their fellow-countrymen. No matter whether the shooting was found to be justified or not, the fact was that they were shot, and those bullets shot him (Mr. Gandhi) through the heart also. He felt how glorious it would have been if one of those bullets had

struck him also, because might he not be a murderer himself, by having participated in that event by having advised Indians to strike? His conscience cleared him from this guilt of murder, but he felt he should adopt mourning for those Indians as an humble example to his fellow-countrymen. He felt that he should go into mourning at least for a period, which should be co-extensive with the end of that struggle, and that he should accept some mourning not only inwardly, but outwardly as well, as a humble example to his fellow-countrymen, so that he could tell them that it was necessary for them to show, by their conduct and outward appearance, that they were in mourning. He was not prepared himself to accept the European mourning dress for this purpose, and, with some modification in deference to the feelings of his European friends, he had adopted the dress similar to that of an indentured Indian. He asked his fellow-countrymen to adopt some sign of mourning to show to the world that they were mourning and further to adopt some inward observance also. And perhaps he might tell them what his inward mourning was—to restrict himself to one meal a day. They had been released, he continued, not on any condition, but they knew that they were released on the recommendation of a Commission appointed by the Government, in order that every facility might be given not only to them, but to the Indian community, to bring before the Commission any evidence that community might have in its possession. He thought it a right and proper thing that the Government had appointed a Commission, but he thought the Commision was open to the gravest objection from the Indian standpoint; and he was there to tender his humble advice to them that it

was impossible to accept the Commission in a form in which the Indians had no voice. They were fighting for so many grievances, and the underlying spirit of the struggle was to obtain full recognition on the part of the Government of the right of consultation in anything which appertained to Indian interests. Unless the Government was prepared to condescend to that extent, unless they were prepared to ascertain and respect the Indian sentiments, it was not possible for Indians, as loyal but manly citizens of the Empire, to render obedience to their commissions or laws which they might have passed over their heads. This was one of the serious fundamental objections. The other objection was that it was a partisan Commission; therefore the Indians wanted their own partisans on it. This they might not get, but they at least wanted impartial men, who had not expressed opinions hostile to their interests, but gentlemen who would be able to bring to the deliberations of the Commission an open, just and impartial mind. (Applause.) He considered that Mr. Esslen and Mr. Wylie, honourable gentlemen as they were, could not possibly bring open minds to bear on the inquiry, for the simple reason that they had their own human limitations and could not divest themselves of their anti-Asiatic views which they had expressed times without number. If the Government appointed the Indians' nominees, and thus honoured their sentiments, and granted a release for the prisoners now in gaol, he thought it would be possible for them to assist the Government, and therefore the Empire, and bring, perhaps, this crisis to an end without further suffering. But it might be that they might have to undergo further suffering. It might be that their sins were so great that they might

have to do still further penance. "Therefore I hope you will hold yourselves in readiness," he proceeded, "to respond to the call the Government may make by declining our just and reasonable requests, and then to again force the pace by again undergoing still greater purifying suffering, until at last the Government may order the military to riddle us also with their bullets. My friends, are you prepared for this? (Voices: "Yes.") Are you prepared to share the fate of those of our countrymen whom the cold stone is resting upon to-day? Are you prepared to do this (Cries of "Yes.") Then, if the Government does not grant our request, this is the proposition I wish to place before you this morning. That all of us, on the first day of the New Year, should be ready again to suffer battle, again to suffer imprisonment and march out. (Applause.) That is the only process of purification and will be a substantial mourning both inwardly and outwardly which will bear justification before our God. That is the advice we give to our free and indentured countrymen—to strike, and even though this may mean death to them, I am sure it will be justified." But if they accepted the quiet life, he went on, not only would the wrath of God descend upon them, but they would incur the disgrace of the whole of that portion of the European world forming the British Empire. (Applause.) He hoped that every man, woman and grown-up child would hold themselves in readiness to do this. He hoped they would not consider self, that they would not consider their salaries, trades, or even families, their own bodies in the struggle which was to his mind a struggle for human liberty, and therefore a struggle for the religion to which they might respectively belong. It was essentially a religious struggle—(hear, hear)—as any

struggle involving assertion and freedom of their conscience must be a religious struggle. He therefore hoped they would hold themselves in readiness to respond to the call and not listen to the advice of those who wavered, nor listen to those who asked them to wait, or to those who might ask them to refrain from the battle. The struggle was one involving quite a clear issue, and an incredibly simple one. "Do not listen to any one," he concluded, "but obey your own conscience and go forward without thinking. Now is the time for thinking, and having made up your minds stick to it, even unto death." (Applause.)

SHOULD INDIANS HAVE FULL CITIZEN RIGHTS?

Though Mr. Gandhi declined to participate with the Solomon commission his demands on behalf of the South African Indians were never extravagant. He realised the limitations under which they had to labour and he defined the limits of their ambition. Within those limits however he was determined to offer resistance to interference. Replying to the criticims of the "Natal Mercury" *he wrote early in January 1914* :—

Your first leader in to-day's issue of your paper invites a statement from me, which, I hope, you will permit me to make.

You imagine that a more potent reason for delaying the contemplated march is "to be found in the fact that

the mass of the local Indian community could not be relied upon to join in the resuscitation of a form of conflict which recoiled most injuriously upon the Indians themselves." There are other inferences, also, you have drawn from the delay, with which I shall not deal at present. I, however, assure you that you are wrongly informed if you consider that the mass of the local Indian community is not to be relied upon to join the march, if it has ever to be undertaken. On the contrary the difficulty to-day is even to delay it, and my co-workers and I have been obliged to send special messengers and to issue special leaflets in order to advise the people that the march must be postponed for the time being. I admit that speculation as to whether the mass of the local Indian community will or will not join the march is fruitless, because this will be, if it has to be, put to the test at no distant date. I give my own view in order that the public may not be lulled into a sense of false belief that the movement is confined to a few only among the community.

The chief reason, therefore, for trespassing upon your courtesy is to inform the South African public through your columns that whilst the great National Congress that has just closed its session at *Karachi* was fully justified in asking, and was bound to ask, for full citizen rights throughout the British Dominions for all the King's subjects, irrespective of caste, colour, or creed, and whilst they may not and ought not to be bound by local considerations, we in South Africa have repeatedly made it clear that, as sane people, we are bound to limit our ambition by local circumstances, we are bound to recognise the widespread prejudice, however unjustified it may be and, having done so, we have

declared—and I venture to re-declare through your columns—that my co-workers and I shall not be a party to any agitation which has for its object the free and unrestricted immigration of British Indians into the Union or the attainment of the political franchise in the near future. That these rights must come in time will, I suppose, be admitted by all, but when they do come they will not be obtained by forcing the pace, as passive resistance is undoubtedly calculated to do, but by otherwise educating public opinion, and by the Indian community so acquitting itself in the discharge of all the obligations that flow from citizenship of the British Empire as to have these rights given to them as a matter of course. Meanwhile, so far as my advice counts for anything, I can only suggest that the efforts of the Indian community should be concentrated upon gaining or regaining every lost civil right or every such right at present withheld from the community; and I hold that even this will not happen unless we are ready to make an effective protest against our civil destruction by means of passive resistance, and unless through our self-suffering we have demonstrated to the European public that we are a people that cherishes its honour and self-respect as dearly as any people on earth.

A TRUCE WITH THE GOVERNMENT.

The following letter from Mr. Gandhi to the Government places on record the agreement arrived at as a result of a series of interviews with the Minister at Pretoria. It was dated Pretoria, January 21, 1914 :—

Before leaving for Phœnix, I venture to express my thanks to General Smuts for the patient and kind interviews that he has been pleased to grant me during this time of overwhelming pressure. My countrymen will remember with gratitude his great consideration.

"I understand that the Minister is unable to accept (with regard to the Indian Inquiry Commission) either (1) my suggestion that a member representing Indian interests should be co-opted when questions of policy are inquired into, or (2) my suggestion that a second Commission, with Indian representation should be appointed to deal with those questions only, the present Commission in that case becoming purely judicial. I submitted a third proposal also, which, in view of the Government's decision, I need not state here. Had any of my suggestions been viewed favourably by the Government, it would have been possible for my countrymen to assist the labours of the Commission. But with regard to leading evidence before this Commission, which has a political as well as a judicial character, they have conscientious scruples, and these have taken with them a solemn and religious form. I may state briefly that these scruples were based on the strong feeling that the Indian community should have been either consulted or represented where questions of policy were concerned.

The Minister, I observe, appreciates these scruples, and regards them as honourable, but is unable to alter his decision. As, however, by granting me the recent interviews, he has been pleased to accept the principle of consultation, it enables me to advise my countrymen not to hamper the labours of the Commission by any active propaganda, and not to render the position of the Government difficult by reviving passive resistance, pending the result of the Commission and the introduction of legislation during the forthcoming session.

If I am right in my interpretation of the Government's attitude on the principle of consultation, it would be further possible for us to assist Sir Benjamin Robertson, whom the Viceroy, with gracious forethought, has deputed to give evidence before the Commission.

A word is here necessary on the question of allegations as to ill-treatment during the progress of the Indian strike in Natal. For the reasons above stated, the avenue of proving them through the Commission is closed to us. I am personally unwilling to challenge libel proceedings by publishing the authentic evidence in our possession, and would far rather refrain altogether from raking up old sores. I beg to assure the Minister that, as passive resisters, we endeavour to avoid, as far as possible, any resentment of personal wrongs. But in order that our silence may not be mistaken, may I ask the Minister to recognise our motive and reciprocate by not leading evidence of a negative character before the Commission on the allegations in question.

Suspension of passive resistance, moreover, carries with it a prayer for the release of the passive resistance prisoners now undergoing imprisonment, either in the

ordinary gaols or the mine compounds, which might have been declared as such.

Finally, it might not be out of place here to recapitulate the points on which relief has been sought. They are as follows :—

(1) Repeal of the £3 tax in such a manner that the Indians relieved will occupy virtually the same status as the indentured Indians discharged under the Natal Law, 25 of 1891

(2) The marriage question. (These two are the points, as I have verbally submitted, which require fresh legislation.)

(3) The Cape entry question. (This requires only administrative relief subject to the clear safeguards explained to the Minister)

(4) The Orange Free State question. (This requires merely a verbal alteration in the assurance already given.)

(5) An assurance that the existing laws especially affecting Indians will be administered justly, with due regard to vested rights.

I venture to suggest that Nos. 3, 4 and 5 present no special difficulty, and that the needful relief may be now given on these points as an earnest of the good intentions of the Government regarding the resident Indian population.

If the Minister, as I trust and hope, views my submission with favour, I shall be prepared to advise my countrymen in accordance with the tenour of this letter.

THE SETTLEMENT.

The passing of the Indian Relief Act in July, 1914, in the Union Houses of Parliament brought a sigh of relief to the whole Indian population both in South Africa and in India. The abolition of the £3. tax, the legislation on the marriage question and the removal of the racial bar were distinctly to the advantage of the Indians and on the lines recommended by the Commission. But there were certain other administrative matters which were not included in the Relief Bill but which were of equal importance to constitute a complete settlement. Mr. Gandhi submitted a list of reforms in the desired directions which General Smuts discussed in a letter addressed to Mr. Gandhi under date, 30th June. On the same day Mr. Gandhi sent the following reply :—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of even date herewith setting forth the substance of the interview that General Smuts was pleased, notwithstanding many other pressing calls upon his time, to grant me on Saturday last. I feel deeply grateful for the patience and courtesy which the Minister showed during the discussion of the several points submitted by me.

The passing of the Indians' Relief Bill and this correspondence finally closed the Passive Resistance struggle which commenced in the September of 1906 and which to the Indian community cost much physical suffering and pecuniary loss and to the Goverment much anxious thought and consideration.

As the Minister is aware, some of my countrymen have wished me to go further. They are dissatisfied that the trade licenses laws of the different Provinces, the Transvaal Gold Law, the Transvaal Townships Act, the Transvaal Law 3 of 1885, have not been altered so as to give them full rights of residence, trade and ownership of land. Some of them are dissatisfied that full inter-provincial migration is not permitted, and some are dissatisfied that on the marriage question the Relief Bill goes no further than it does. They have asked me that all the above matters might be included in the Passive Resistance struggle. I have been unable to comply with their wishes. Whilst, therefore, they have not been included in the programme of Passive Resistance, it will not be denied that some day or other these matters will require further and sympathetic consideration by the Government. Complete satisfaction cannot be expected until full civic rights have been conceded to the resident Indian population

I have told my countrymen that they will have to exercise patience and by all honourable means at their disposal educate public opinion so as to enable the Government of the day to go further than the present correspondence does. I shall hope that when the Europeans of South Africa fully appreciate the fact that now, as the importation of indentured labour from India is prohibited and as the Immigrants' Regulation Act of last year has in practice all but stopped further free Indian immigration and that my countrymen do not aspire to any political ambition, they, the Europeans, will see the justice and indeed the necessity of my countrymen being granted the rights I have just referred to.

Meanwhile, if the generous spirit that the Government have applied to the treatment of the problem during the past few months continues to be applied, as promised in your letter, in the administration of the existing laws, I am quite certain that the Indian community throughout the Union will be able to enjoy some measure of peace and never be a source of trouble to the Government.

FAREWELL SPEECH AT DURBAN

On the eve of their departure from South Africa Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi were the recipients of innumerable addresses from every class of South African residents, Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsees and Europeans. Mr. Gandhi replied to each one of these touching addresses in suitable terms.

On Wednesday the 18th July, 1914, Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi were entertained at a great gathering of Indian and European residents at the Town Hall, Durban, which was presided over by the Mayor (Mr. W. Holmes). Telegrams were read from the Bishop of Natal, Gen. Botha, Messrs. Smuts, Merriman, Burton, Hoskin and others. The Mayor and several speakers eulogised the services of Mr. Gandhi.

Referring to the addresses which had been presented to him, he said that, while he valued them, he valued more the love and sympathy which the addresses had expressed. He did not know that he would be able to

make adequate compensation. He did not deserve all the praise bestowed upon him. Nor did his wife claim to deserve all that had been said of her. Many an Indian woman had done greater service during the struggle than Mrs. Gandhi. He thanked the community on behalf of Mr. Kallenbach, who was another brother to him, for the addresses presented. The community had done well in recognising Mr. Kallenbach's worth. Mr. Kallenbach would tell them that he came to the struggle to gain. He considered that, by taking up their cause, he gained a great deal in the truest sense. Mr. Kallenbach had done splendid work during the strike at Newcastle and, when the time came, he cheerfully went to prison, again thinking that he was the gainer and not the loser. Proceeding, Mr. Gandhi referred to the time of his arrival in 1897 when his friend Mr. Laughton had stood by him against the mob. He also remembered with gratefulness the action of Mrs. Alexander, the wife of the late Superintendent of Police in Durban, who protected him with her umbrella from the missiles thrown by the excited crowd. Referring to Passive Resistance, he claimed that it was a weapon of the purest type. It was not the weapon of the weak. It was needed, in his opinion, far greater courage to be a Passive Resister than a physical resister. It was the courage of a Jesus, a Daniel, a Cranmer, a Latimer and a Ridley who could go calmly to suffering and death, and the courage of a Tolstoy who dared to defy the Czars of Russia, that stood out as the greatest. Mr. Gandhi said he knew the Mayor had received some telegrams stating that the Indians' Relief Bill was not satisfactory. It would be a singular thing if in this world they would be able to get anything that satisfied everybody, but in the condition of things in South Africa at the present

time, he was certain they could not have had a better measure. "I do not claim the credit for it," Mr. Gandhi remarked. "It is rather due to the women and young people like Nagappan, Narayanasamy, and Valliamah who have died for the cause and to those who quickened the conscience of South Africa. Our thanks are due also to the Union Government. General Botha showed the greatest statemanship when he said his Government would stand or fall by this measure. I followed the whole of that historic debate—historic to me, historic to my countrymen, and possibly historic to South Africa and the world." Proceeding, Mr. Gandhi said that it was well known to them how the Government had done justice, and how the Opposition had come to their assistance They had also received handsome help from both the Imperial and Indian Governments, backed by that generous Viceroy, Lord Hardings. (Cheers.) The manner in which India, led by their great and distinguished countryman, Mr. Gokhale, had responded to the cry which came from the hearts of thousands of their countrymen in South Africa, was one of the results of the Passive Resistance movement, and left, he hoped, no bitter traces or bitter memories. (Applause). "This assurance," continued Mr. Gandhi, "I wish to give. I go away with no ill-will against a single European. I have received many hard knocks in my life, but here I admit that I have received those most precious gifts from Europeans—love and sympathy." (Cheers.) This settlement, he said, had been achieved after an eight years' struggle. The Indians in South Africa had never aspired to any political ambition, and as regardes the social question, that could never arise in connection with the Indians,

"I do not hold for one moment," Mr. Gandhi exclaimed, "that East and West cannot combine. I think the day is coming when East must meet West, or West meet East, but I think the social evolution of the West to-day lies in one channel, and that of the Indian in another channel. The Indians have no wish to-day to encroach on the social institutions of the European in South Africa (Cheers) Most Indians are natural traders. There are bound to be trade jealousies and those various things that come from competition. I have never been able to find a solution of this most difficult problem, which will require the broad-mindedness and spirit of justice of the Government of South Africa to hold the balance between conflicting interests" Referring to his stay in South Africa, Mr. Gandhi said that he should retain the most sacred memories of this land. He had been fortunate in forming the happiest and most lasting friendships with both Europeans and Indians. He was now returning to India—a holy land sanctified by the austerities of the ages. In conclusion, Mr. Gandhi hoped that the same love and sympathy which had been given to him in South Africa might be extended to him, no matter in what part of the world he might be. He hoped that the settlement embodied in the Indians' Relief Bill would be carried out in a spirit of broad-mindedness and justice in the administration of the laws lately passed in connection with the affairs of the Indian community. "Then," added Mr. Gandhi, "I think there will be no fear on the part of my countrymen in their social evolution. That is one of the lessons of the settlement."

ADDRESS TO THE INDENTURED INDIANS

The following speech is the text of Mr. Gandhi's address to Indentured Indians at Verulam on the 12th July, 1914 :—

Please understand, my indentured countrymen, that it is wrong for you to consider that relief has been obtained because I or you have gone to gaol, but because you had the courage to give up your life and sacrifice yourselves and in this instance I have also to tell you that many causes led to this result. I have to specially refer to the valuable assistance rendered by the Hon. Senator Marshall Campbell. I think that your thanks and my thanks are due to him for his work in the Senate while the Bill was passing through it. The relief is of this nature ; the £ 3 tax you will not have to pay, and arrears will be remitted. It does not mean that you are free from your present indentures. You are bound to go through your present indentures faithfully and honestly, but when these finish you are just as free as any other free Indian under Act 25, 1891, and can receive the same protection as set forth in that Act. You are not bound to re-indenture or return to India. Discharge certificates will be issued to you free of charge. If you want to go to India and return therefrom you must first spend three years in Natal as free Indians. If you, being poor, want assistance to enable you to go to India, you can get it on application to the Government; but in that case you would not be allowed to return. If you want to return, fight shy of this asistance, and use your own money or borrow from your friends. If you re-indenture you come under the same law—namely, 25 of 1891. My

advice to you is: Do not re-indenture, but by all means serve your present masters under the common law of the country. Now, in the event of any occasion arising (which I hope it will not do), you will know what is necessary. * * *

Victoria County has not been as free from violence as the Newcastle District was You retaliated. I do not care whether it was under provocation or not, but you retaliated, and have used sticks and stones, and you have burnt sugar-cane. That is not passive resistance. If I had been in your midst I would have repudiated you, and allowed rather my own head to be broken than allow a single stick or stone to be used. Passive resistance is a more powerful weapon than all the sticks, stones, and gunpowder in the world. If imposed upon, you must suffer even unto death. That is passive resistance. If, therefore, I was an indentured Indian working for the Hon. Mr. Marshall Campbell, Mr. Saunders or other employer, and if I found my treatment not just, I would not go to the Protector—I would go to my master and ask for justice; and if he would not grant it I would say that I would remain there without food or drink until it was granted. I am quite sure that the stoniest heart will be melted by passive resistance. Let this sink deeply into yourselves. This is a sovereign and most effective remedy. * * *

I shall now say my farewell to Verulam and you all. The scene before me will not fade in my memory, be the distance ever so great. May God help you all in your trouble. May your own conduct be such that God may find it possible to help you.

ADDRESS TO THE TAMIL COMMUNITY

On the 15th July, 1914, at the West-End Bioscope Hall, Johannesburg, Mr. Gandhi addressed a meeting of the Tamil Community, including many ladies.

Mr. Gandhi said that he felt, in coming to meet the Tamil brothers and sisters, as if he came to meet blood relations. That was a sentiment which he had cherished now for many years, and the reason was quite simple. Of all the different sections of the Indian community, he thought that the Tamil had borne the brunt of the struggle. The largest number of deaths that Passive Resistance had taken had been from the Tamil community. They had that morning gone to the cemetery to perform the unveiling ceremony in connection with the two memorials to a dear sister and brother. Both of these had been Tamils. There was Narayansamy whose bones lay at Delagoa Bay. He had been a Tamil. The deportees had been Tamils. The last to fight and come out of gaol had been Tamils Those who were ruined hawkers were all Tamils. The majority of the Passive Resisters at Tolstoy Farm had been Tamils. On every side, Tamils had shown themselves to be most typical of the best traditions of India, and by saying that he was not exaggerating in the slightest degree. The faith, the abundant faith in God, in Truth, that the Tamils had shown, had been one of the most sustaining forces throughout those long-drawn years. The majority of women to go to gaol were Tamils. The sisters who defied the authorities to arrest them and had gone from door to door, from barracks to barracks at Newcastle, to ask the men to lay down their tools and

strike work—who were they? Again, Tamil sisters. Who matched among the women? Tamils, of course. Who lived on a pound loaf of bread and an ounce of sugar? The majority were Tamils: though there he must give their due also to those of their countrymen who were called Calcutta men. In that last struggle they also had responded nobly, but he was not able to say quite so nobly as the Tamils; but they had certainly come out almost as well as the Tamils had, but the Tamils had sustained the struggle for the last eight years and had shown of what stuff they were made from the very beginning. Here in Johannesburg they were a handful, and yet, even numerically, they would show, he thought, the largest number who had gone to gaol again and again; also if they wanted imprisonment wholesale, it came from the Tamils. So that he felt, when he came to a Tamil meeting, that he came to blood-relations. The Tamils had shown so much pluck, so much faith, so much devotion to duty and such noble simplicity, and yet had been so self-effacing. He did not even speak their language, much as he should like to be able to do so, and yet they had simply fought on. It had been a glorious, a rich experience, which he would treasure to the end of his life. How should he explain the settlement to them? They did not even want it. But if he must he could only tell them that all that they and theirs had fought for had been obtained and obtained largely through the force of character that they had shown; and yet they did not want, they had not wanted to reap the reward, except the reward that their own consciences would offer them They had fought for the Cape entry right for Colonial borns. That they had got. They had fought for the just administration of the laws. That they had

got. They had fought for the removal of the racial taint in the law with reference to the Free State. That they had got. The £3 Tax was now a matter of the past. And, with reference to the marriage question, all those dear sisters who had gone to gaol now could be called the wives of their husbands, whilst but yesterday they might have been called so out of courtesy by a friend, but were not so in the eye of the law. That was one of the things they had fought for and had got. Truth was what they had been fighting for, and Truth had conquered—not he or they. They might fight to-morrow for an unrighteous thing, and as sure as fate they would be beaten and well-beaten. Truth was unconquerable, and whenever the call to duty came he hoped they would respond. There was one thing more. They had sometimes, as every other section of the community had, jealousies amongst themselves. They had petty jealousies not in conection with the struggle, but in matters which had nothing to do with the struggle. All those petty jealousies and differences, he hoped, would go, and they would rise higher still in the estimation of themselves and of those who as all grew to know them and the depth of character which they had. They had also, as all sections of the Indian community had, not only those jealousies but sometimes many pickerings also, and petty quarrels. He felt these also should be removed especially from their midst, because they had shown themselves so fit to give themselves to the Motherland. And here, of course, it was a Tamil who had given his four sons to be trained as servants of India. He hoped Mr. and Mrs. Naidoo knew exactly what they had done. They had surrendered all right to those children or life, and they could not possibly do anything to ad-

vance their material well-being, but had always to remain servants of India. It was no joke, and yet Mr. and Mrs. Naidoo had certainly done that. He could not appeal to them too strongly that they of all sections should rid themselves of all those bickerings, petty jealousies and quarrels amongst themselves. He would also ask them whenever they chose a President or a Chairman to obey him, to follow him, and not always listen to the views of this or that man. If they did that their usefulness would be curtailed. And then too they should not worry if others and not they might reap the reward. Their reward would be all the greater if it was not of this earth; they were not fighting for material reward, and a true Passive Resister never thought of material reward. They should not worry about material prosperity, but always have higher things before them. Then indeed they would be like the eleven working in the community which could raise the community as one to look up to. The privilege was certainly theirs and time also was at their disposal, and if they make good use of that time it would be a splendid thing for the whole of South Africa, and would certainly be a splendid thing for them; and if he heard in India that all those little things to which he had drawn attention had also been got rid of by the Indian community he would indeed be rejoiced. One thing more. He had known something of Madras, and how sharp caste distinctions were there. He felt they would have come to South Africa in vain if they were to carry those caste prejudices with them. The caste system had its uses, but that was an abuse. If they carried caste distinctions, to that fatuous extent and drew those distinctions, and called one another high and low and so on, those things would be their ruin. They should remember that

they were not high caste or low caste, but all Indians, all Tamils. He said Tamils, but that was also applicable to the whole Indian community, but most to them because most was certainly expected of them.

FAREWELL SPEECH AT JOHANNESBURG

At Johannesburg Mr. Gandhi was the recipient of numerous addresses, from Hindus, Parsees, Mahomedans, Europeans and other important communities. Indeed every class of people, and every important association presented a separate address. Mr. Gandhi made a touching reply to them:.

Johannesburg was not a new place to him. He saw many friendly faces there, many who had worked with him in many struggles in Johannesburg. He had gone through much in life. A great deal of depression and sorrow had been his lot, but he had also learnt during all those years to love Johannesburg even though it was a Mining Camp. It was in Johannesburg that he had found his most precious friends. It was in Johannesburg that the foundation for the great struggle of Passive Resistance was laid in the September of 1906. It was in Johannesburg that he had found a friend, a guide, and a biographer in the late Mr. Doke. It was in Johannesburg that he had found in Mrs. Doke a loving sister, who had nursed him back to life when he had been assaulted by a countryman who had misunderstood his mission and who misunderstood what he had done. It was in Johannesburg that he had found a Kallenbach, a Polak, a Miss Schlesin, and many another who had always helped him and had

ways cheered him and his countrymen. Johannesburg therefore, had the holiest associations of all the holy associations that Mrs. Gandhi and he would carry back to India, and, as he had already said on many another platform, South Africa, next to India, would be the holiest land to him and to Mrs. Gandhi and to his children, for, in spite of all the bitternesses, it had given them those life-long companions. It was in Johannesburg again that the European Committee had been formed, when Indians were going through the darkest stage in their history, presided over them, as it still was, by Mr. Hoskin. It was last, but not least, Johannesburg that had given Valliamma, that young girl, whose picture rose before him even as he spoke, who had died in the cause of truth. Simple-minded in faith—she had not the knowledge that he had, she did not know what Passive Resistance was, she did not know what it was the community would gain, but she was simply taken up with unbounded enthusiasm for her people—went to gaol, came out of it a wreck, and within a few days died. It was Johannesburg again that produced a Nagappan and Narayansamy, two lovely youths hardly out of their teens, who also died. But both Mrs. Gandhi and he stood living before them. He and Mrs. Gandhi had worked in the lime-light; those others had worked behind the scenes not knowing where they were going, except this that what they were doing was right and proper and, if any praise was due anywhere at all, it was due to those three who died. They had had the name of Harbatsingh given to them. He (the speaker) had had the privilege of serving imprisonment with him. Harbatsingh was 75 years old. He was an ex-indentured Indian, and when he (the speaker) asked him why he had come there, that he had gone

there to seek his grave, the brave man replied, "What does it matter? I know what you are fighting for. You have not to pay the £3 tax, but my fellow ex-indentured Indians have to pay that tax, and what more glorious death could I meet?" He had met that death in the gaol at Durban. No wonder if Passive Resistance had fired and quickened the conscience of South Africa!

But, proceeded Mr. Gandhi, he concurred with Mr. Duncan in an article he wrote some years ago, when he truly analysed the struggle, and said that behind that struggle for concrete rights lay the great spirit which asked for an abstract principle, and the fight which was undertaken in 1906, although it was a fight against a particular law, was a fight undertaken in order to combat the spirit that was seen about to overshadow the whole of South Africa, and to undermine the glorious British Constitution, of which the Chairman had spoken so loftily that evening, and about which he (the speaker) shared his views. It was his knowledge, right or wrong, of the British Constitution which bound him to the Empire. Tear that Constitution to shreds and his loyalty also would be torn to shreds. Keep that Constitution intact, and they held him bound a slave to that Constitution. He had felt that the choice lay for himself and his fellow-countrymen between two courses, when this spirit was brooding over South Africa, either to sunder themselves from the British Constitution, or to fight in order that the ideals of that Constitution might be preserved—but only the ideals. Lord Ampthill had said, in a preface to Mr. Duke's book, that the theory of the British Constitution must be preserved at any cost if the British Empire was to be saved from the mistakes that all the previous Empires had made. Practice might

bend to the temporary aberration through which local circumstances might compel them to pass, it might bend before unreasoning or unreasonable prejudice, but theory once recognised could never be departed from, and this principle must be maintained at any cost. And it was that spirit which had been acknowledged now by the Union Government, and acknowledged how nobly and loftily. The words that General Smuts so often emphasised still rang in his ears. He had said, "Gandhi, this time we want no misunderstanding, we want no mental or other reservations, let all the cards be on the table, and I want you to tell me wherever you think that a particular passage or word does not read in accordance with your own reading," and it was so. That was the spirit in which he approached the negotiations. When he remembered General Smuts of a few years ago, when he told Lord Crewe that South Africa would not depart from its policy of racial distinction, that it was bound to retain that distinction, and that, therefore, the sting that lay in this Immigration Law would not be removed, many a friend, including Lord Ampthill, asked whether they could not for the time being suspend their activity. He had said "No." If they did that it would undermine his loyalty, and even though he might be the only person he would still fight on. Lord Ampthill had congratulated him, and that great nobleman had never deserted the cause even when it was at its lowest ebb, and they saw the result that day. They had not by any means to congratulate themselves on a victory gained. There was no question of a victory gained, but the question of the establishment of the principle that, so far as the Union of South Africa at least was concerned, its legislation would never contain the racial taint, would never contain

the colour disability. The practice would certainly be different. There was the Immigration Law. It recognised no racial distinctions, but in practice they had arranged, they had given a promise, that there should be no undue influx from India as to immigration. That was a concession to present prejudice. Whether it was right or wrong was not for him to discuss then. But it was the establishment of the principle which had made the struggle so important in the British Empire, and the establishment of that principle which had made those sufferings perfectly justifiable and perfectly honourable, and he thought that, when they considered the struggle from that standpoint, it was a perfectly dignified thing for any gathering to congratulate itself upon such a vindication of the principles of the British Constitution. One word of caution he wished to utter regarding the settlement. The settlement was honourable to both parties. He did not think there was any room left for misunderstanding, but whilst it was final in the sense that it closed the great struggle, it was not final in the sense that it gave to Indians all that they were entitled to. There was still the Gold Law which had many a sting in it. There was still the Licensing Laws throughout the Union, which also contained many a sting. There was still a matter which the Colonial-born Indians especially could not understand or appreciate, namely, the water-tight compartments in which they had to live; whilst there was absolutely free inter-communication and inter-migration between the Provinces for Europeans, Indians had to be cooped up in their respective Provinces. Then there was undue restraint on their trading activity. There was the prohibition as to holding landed property in the

Transvaal, which was degrading, and all these things took Indians into all kinds of undesirable channels. These restrictions would have to be removed. But for that, he thought, sufficient patience would have to be exercised. Time was now at their disposal, and how wonderfully the tone had been changed! And here he had been told in Capetown, and he believed it implicitly, the spirit of Mr. Andrews had pervaded all those statesmen and leading men whom he saw. He came and went away after a brief period, but he certainly fired those whom he saw with a sense of their duty to the Empire of which they were members. But, in any case, to whatever circumstances that healthy tone was due, it had not escaped him. He had seen it amongst European friends whom he met at Capetown; he had seen it more fully in Durban, and this time it had been his privilege to meet many Europeans who were perfect strangers even on board the train, who had come smilingly forward to congratulate him on what they had called a great victory. Everywhere he had noticed that healthy tone. He asked European friends to continue that activity, either through the European Committee or through other channels, and to give his fellow-countrymen their help and extend that fellow-feeling to them also, so that they might be able to work out their own salvation.

To his countrymen he would say that they should wait and nurse the settlement, which he considered was all that they could possibly and reasonably have expected, and that they would now live to see, with the co-operation of their European friends, that what was promised was fulfilled, that the administration of the existing laws was just, and that vested rights were

respected in the administration; that after they had nursed these things, if they cultivated European public opinion, making it possible for the Government of the day to grant a restoration of the other rights of which they had been deprived, he did not think that there need be any fear about the future. He thought that, with mutual co-operation, with mutual good-will, with due response on the part of either party, the Indian community need ever be a source of weakness to that Government or to any Government. On the contrary he had full faith in his countrymen that, if they were well-treated, they would always rise to the occasion and help the Government of the day. If they had insisted on their rights on many an occasion, he hoped that the European friends who were there would remember that they had also discharged the responsibilities which had faced them.

And now it was time for him to close his remarks and say a few words of farewell only. He did not know how he could express those words. The best years of his life had been passed in South Africa. India, as his distinguished countryman, Mr. Gokhale, had reminded him, had become a strange land to him. South Africa, he knew, but not India. He did not know what impelled him to go to India, but he did know that the parting from them all, the parting from the European friends who had helped him through thick and thin, was a heavy blow, and one he was least able to bear, yet he knew he had to part from them. He could only say farewell and ask them to give him their blessing, to pray for them that their heads might not be turned by the praise they had received, that they might still know how to do their duty to the best of their ability, that they might still

learn that first, second, and last should be the approbation of their own conscience, and that then whatever might be due to them would follow in its own time.—*From "The Souvenir of the Passive Resistance Movement in South Africa."*

FAREWELL TO SOUTH AFRICA

Just before leaving South Africa, Mr. Gandhi handed to Reuter's Agent at Capetown the following letter addressed to the Indian and European public of South Africa:—

I would like on the eve of my departure for India to say a few words to my countrymen in South Africa, and also to the European community. The kindness with which both European and Indian friends have overwhelmed me sends me to India a debtor to them. It is a debt I shall endeavour to repay by rendering in India what services I am capable of rendering there, and if in speaking about the South African Indian question I am obliged to refer to the injustices which my countrymen have received and may hereafter receive, I promise that I shall never wilfully exaggerate, and shall state the truth and nothing but the truth.

A word about the settlement, and what it means. In my humble opinion it is the Magna Charta of our liberty in this land. I give it the historic name, not because it gives us rights which we have never enjoyed and which are in themselves new or striking, but because it has come to us after eight years' strenuous suffering, that has involved the loss of material possessions and of precious

lives. I call it our Magna Charta because it marks a change in the policy of the Government towards us and establishes our right not only to be consulted in matters affecting us, but to have our reasonable wishes respected. It moreover confirms the theory of the British Constitution that there should be no legal racial inequality between different subjects of the Crown, no matter how much practice may vary according to local circumstance. Above all the settlement may well be called our Magna Charta, because it has vindicated Passive Resistance as a lawful clean weapon, and has given in Passive Resistance a new strength to the community; and I consider it an infinitely superior force to that of the vote, which history shows has often been turned against the voters themselves.

The settlement finally disposes of all the points that were the subject-matter of Passive Resistance, and in doing so it breathes the spirit of justice and fair play. If the same spirit guides the administration of the existing laws my countrymen will have comparative peace, and South Africa will hear little of Indian problem in an acute form.

Some of my countrymen have protested against it. The number of these protestants is numerically very small and in influence not of great importance. They do not object to what has been granted, but they object that it is not enough. It is impossible, therefore, to withhold sympathy from them. I have had an opportunity of speaking to them, and I have endeavoured to show to them that if we had asked for anything more it would have been a breach of submission made on behalf of the British Indians in a letter addressed to the Government by Mr. Cachalia during the latter part of last year

and we should have laid ourselves open to the charge of making new demands.

But I have also assured them that the present settlement does not preclude them from agitation (as has been made clear in my letter to the Secretary of the Interior of the 16th ultimo) for the removal of other disabilities which the community will still suffer from under the Gold Law, the Townships Act, the Law 3 of 1885 of the Transvaal and the Trade Licences Laws of Natal and the Cape. The promise made by General Smuts to administer the existing law justly and with due regard to vested rights gives the community breathing time, but these laws are in themselves defective, and can be, as they have been, turned into engines of oppression and instruments by indirect means to drive the resident Indian population from South Africa. The concession to popular prejudice in that we have reconciled ourselves to the almost total prohibition by administrative methods of a fresh influx of Indian immigrants, and to the deprivation of all political power, is, in my opinion, the utmost that could be reasonably expected from us. These two things being assured, I venture to submit that we are entitled to full rights of trade, inter-provincial migration, and ownership of landed property being restored in the not distant future. I leave South Africa in the hope that the healthy tone that pervades the European community in South Africa to-day will continue, and that it will enable Europeans to recognise the inherent justice of our submission. To my countrymen I have at various meetings that I have addressed during the past fortnight attended in several cases by thousands, said, "Nurse the settlement; see to it that the promises made are being carried out Attend to development and progress from

within. Zealously remove all causes which we may have given for the rise and growth of anti-Indian prejudice or agitation, and patiently cultivate and inform European opinion so as to enable the Government of the day and legislature to restore to us our rights." It is by mutual co-operation and goodwill that the solution of the balance of the pressing disabilities which were not made points for Passive Resistance may be obtained in the natural course, and without trouble or agitation in an acute form.

The presence of a large indentured and ex-indentured Indian population in Natal is a grave problem. Compulsory repatriation is a physical and political impossibility, voluntary repatriation by way of granting free passages and similar inducements will not—as my experience teaches me—be availed of to any appreciable extent. The only real and effective remedy for the great State to adopt is to face responsibility fairly and squarely, to do away with the remnant of the system of indenture, and to level up this part of the population and make use of it for the general welfare of the Union. Men and women who can effectively strike in large bodies, who can for a common purpose suffer untold hardships, who can, undisciplined though they are, be martyrs for days without police supervision and yet avoid doing any damage to property or person, and who can in times of need serve their King faithfully and capably, as the ambulance corps raised at the time of the late war (and which had among other classes of Indians nearly 1,500 indentured Indians) bore witness, are surely people who will, if given ordinary opportunities in life, form an honourable part of any nation.

If any class of persons have special claim to be considered, it is these indentured Indians and their children, to whom South Africa has become either a land of adoption or of birth. They did not enter the Union as ordinary free immigrants, but they came upon invitation, and indeed even after much coaxing, by agents of South African employers of this class of labour. In this letter I have endeavoured as accurately and as fairly as is in my power to set forth the Indian situation, and the extraordinary courtesy, kindness and sympathy that have been shown to me during the past month by so many European friends. The frankness and generosity with which General Smuts, in the interview, that he was pleased to grant me, approached the questions at issue, and the importance that so many distinguished members of both Houses of Parliament attached to the Imperial aspect of the problem, give me ample reason for believing that my countrymen who have made South Africa their homes will receive a fairly full measure of justice and will be enabled to remain in the Union with self-respect and dignity.

Finally, in bidding good-bye to South Africa, I would like to apologise to so many friends on whom I have not been able, through extreme pressure of work, to call personally. I once more state that though I have received many a hard knock in my long stay in this country, it has been my good fortune to receive much personal kindness and consideration from hundreds of European friends, well-wishers and sympathisers. I have formed the closest friendships, which will last for ever, for this reason and for many similar reasons, which I would love to reduce to writing but for fear of trespassing unduly upon the courtesy of the press. This

sub-continent has become to me a sacred and dear land, next only to my motherland. I leave the shores of South Africa with a heavy heart, and the distance that will now separate me from South Africa will but draw me closer to it, and its welfare will always be a matter of great concern, and the love bestowed upon me by my countrymen and the generous forbearance and kindness extended to me by the Europeans will ever remain a most cherished treasure in my memory.

RECEPTION IN ENGLAND

Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi left South Africa for London in July, 1914. On their arrival in England they were welcomed at a great gathering of British and Indian friends and admirers at the Hotel Cecil, on August 8. Letters of apology were received from the Prime Minister, the Marquis of Crewe, Earl Roberts, Lords Gladstone, Curzon, Lamington, Ampthill, Harris, the Hon Mr. Gokhale, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. The Reception was arranged by the Hon. Mr. Bhupendranath Basu, the Rt Hon. Mr. Ameer Ali and others who spoke on the occasion.

Mr. Gandhi, in returning thanks, referred to the great crisis which at the moment overshadowed the world. He hoped his young friends would "think Imperially" in the best sense of the word, and do their duty. With regard to affairs in South Africa, Mr. Gandhi paid a noble tribute to the devotion of his followers. It was to the rank and file that their victory was due. Those who had suffered and died in the strug-

gle were the real heroes. * * Mr. Gandhi regarded the settlement as the Magna Charta of the South Africa British Indians, not because of the substance but because of the spirit which brought it about There had been a change in the attitude of the people of South Africa and the settlement had been sealed by the sufferings of the Indian community. It had proved that if Indians were in earnest they were irresistible. There had been no compromise in principles. Some grievances remained unredressed but these were capable of adjustment by pressure from Downing Street, Simla, and from South Africa itself. The future rested with themselves If they proved worthy of better conditions, they would get them.

LETTER TO LORD CREWE

The following letter dated the 14th August, 1914, signed by Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Major N. P. Sinha, Dr. Jivraj N. Mehta and some fifty other Indians, was sent to the Under-Secretary of State for India :—

It was thought desirable by many of us that during the crisis that has overtaken the Empire and whilst many Englishmen, leaving their ordinary vocations in life, are responding to the Imperial call, those Indians who are residing in the United Kingdom and who can at all do so should place themselves unconditionally at the disposal of the Authorities.

With a view of ascertaining the feeling of the resident Indian population, the undersigned sent out a circular letter to as many Indians in the United King-

dom as could be approached during the thirty-eight hours that the organisers gave themselves. The response has been generous and prompt, in the opinion of the under-signed representatives of His Majesty's subjects from the Indian Empire at present residing in the different parts of the United Kingdom.

On behalf of ourselves and those whose names appear on the list appended hereto, we beg to offer our services to the authorities. We venture to trust that the Right Hon'ble the Marquess of Crewe will approve of our offer and secure its acceptance by the proper authority. We would respectfully emphasise the fact that the one dominant idea guiding us is that of rendering such humble assistance as we may be considered capable of performing, as an earnest of our desire to share the responsibilities of membership of this great Empire if we would share its privileges.

FAREWELL TO ENGLAND

When England joined the war Mr. Gandhi organised the Indian Field Ambulance Corps with the help of leading Indians in England, notably H. H. the Aga Khan. Soon after Mr. Gandhi fell ill and he was nursed back to health by the kindness of Mr. and Mrs. Roberts. Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi were again entertained at a Farewell Reception at the Westminster Palace Hotel, prior to their departure for India. Among those who took part in the function were Sir Henry Cotton, Mr. Charles Roberts, Sir K. G. Gupta. A letter of apology was read from Sir William Wedderburn. Mr. Gandhi said in the course of his reply :—

His wife and himself were returning to the motherland with their work unaccomplished and with broken

health, but he wished nevertheless, to use the language of hope. * * He had himself pleaded hard with Mr. Roberts that some place should be found for him ; but his health had not permitted and the doctors had been obdurate. He had not resigned from the corps. If in his own motherland he should be restored to strength, and hostilities were still continuing, he intended to come back, directly the summons reached him. (Cheers). As for his work in South Africa, they had been purely a matter of duty and carried no merit with them and his only aspiration on his return to his motherland was to do his duty as he found it day by day. He had been practically an exile for 25 years and his friend and master, Mr. Gokhale, had warned him not to speak of Indian questions as India was a foreign land to him. (Laughter.) But the India of his imagination was an India unrivalled in the world, an India where the most spiritual treasures were to be found: and it was his dream and hope that the connection between India and England might be a source of spiritual comfort and uplifting to the whole world,

---

RECEPTION IN BOMBAY

Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi arrived at Bombay on the 9th January, 1915. They were entertained on arrival at a great public reception over which Sir Pherozeshah Mehta presided. Replying to the toast Mr. Gandhi said in the course of his speech :—

In what he had done, he had done nothing beyond his duty and it remained to be seen how far he had succeeded in doing his duty. That was not a mere lip

expression but he asked them to believe sincerely that these were his feelings.

They had also honoured Mrs. Gandhi as the wife of the great Gandhi. He had no knowledge of the great Gandhi but he could say that she could tell them more about the sufferings of women who rushed with babies to the jail and who had now joined the majority, than he could.

In conclusion, Mr. Gandhi appealed to them to accept the services of himself and his wife, for he said they had come to render such service as God would enable them to do so. They had not come to receive big entertainments like that because they did not think they were worthy of such presents. He felt they would only spoil them if ever by such action a thought crossed their minds that they had done something to deserve such a big *tamasha* made in their honour. He, however, thanked them on behalf of his wife and himself most sincerely for the great honour done to them that afternoon and he hoped to receive the whole country in their endeavour to serve the Motherland. Hitherto, he said, they had known nothing of his failures. All the news that they had received related to his successes. Here they would now see them in the naked light, and would see their faults, and anticipating such faults and failures, he asked them to overlook them, and with that appeal, he said, they as humble servants would commence the service of their country.

RECEPTION IN MADRAS

In reply to the Welcome Address read by Mr. G. A. Natesan on behalf of the Indian South African League, at a meeting at the Victoria Public Hall, Madras, on the 21st April, 1915, with Dr. Sir Subramania Iyer in the Chair, Mr. Gándhi said :—

Mr. Chairman and Friends,—On behalf of my wife and myself I am deeply grateful for the great honour that you here in Madras, and, may I say, this Presidency, have done to us and the affection that has been lavished upon us in this great and enlightened—not benighted—Presidency.

If there is anything that we have deserved, as has been stated in this beautiful address, I can only say I lay it at the feet of my Master under whose inspiration I have been working all this time under exile in South Africa. *(Hear, hear).* In so far as the sentiments expressed in this address are merely prophetic, Sir, I accept them as a blessing and as a prayer from you and from this great meeting that both my wife and I myself may possess the power, the inclination, and the life to dedicate whatever we may develop in this sacred land of ours to the service of the Motherland. *(Cheers).* It is no wonder that we have come to Madras. As my friend, Mr. Natesan, will perhaps tell you, we have been overdue and we have neglected Madras. But we have done nothing of the kind. We know that we had a corner in your hearts and we knew that you will not misjudge us if we did not hasten to Madras before going to the other presidencies and to other towns. * * * * But, 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 Narayanasawmy, 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 Madrassis 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, the Madrasis look on a Madrassi as 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 inspired 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 my wife and I have been obliged to work in the lime-light, and you have magnified out of all proportion (*cries of 'No? no?'*) this little work we have been able to do. Believe me, my dear friends, that if you consider, whether in India or in South Africa, it is possible for us, poor mortals—the same individuals, the same stuff of which you are made—if you consider that it is possible for us to do

anything whatsoever without your assistance and without your doing the same thing that we would be prepared to do, you are lost, and we are also lost, and our services will be in vain, I do not for one moment believe that the inspiration was given by us. The inspiration was given by them to us, and we were able to be interpreters between the powers who called themselves the Governors and those men for whom redress was so necessary. We were simply links between those two parties and nothing more. It was my duty, having received the education that was given to me by my parents to interpret what was going on in our midst to those simple folk, and they rose to the occasion. They realised the might of religious force, and it was they who inspired us, and let them who have finished their work, and who have died for you and me, let them inspire you and us. We are still living and who knows whether the devil will not possess us to-morrow and we shall not forsake the post of duty before any new danger that may face us. But these three have gone for ever.

An old man of 75 from the United Provinces, Harbart Singh, has also joined the majority and died in jail in South Africa; and he deserved the crown that you would seek to impose upon us. 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 Mahomedans, 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-forces against the physical forces. (*Loud applause.*)

THE INDIAN SOUTH AFRICAN LEAGUE

At the General Meeting of the Indian South African League, held at the premises of Messrs G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras, on Friday, May 7, 1915, with Dewan Bahadur M. Audinarayana Iyah in the Chair, Mr. G.A. Natesan, one of the Joint Secretaries, presented a statement of accounts of the League and wound up by urging that the balance of the League's Fund might be handed over to Mr. Gandhi who had undertaken to look after the interests of the South Africa returned Indians and their dependents. The Resolution was unanimously passed. Mr. Gandhi in the course of his reply made a brief statement and said:—

The passive resistance struggle started with the Asiatic struggle in the Transvaal in 1906. As it went on stage after stage, it, owing to the exigencies of the case and as a matter of course, expanded and embraced the following further points, *viz.*, (1) the removal of racial disability in the Immigration Legislation of the Union of South Africa; (2) the restoration of the status of Indian wives whether married in accordance with Hindu or Mahomedan religious rites as it orginally existed before what was known in South Africa as the Searle Judgment; (3) repeal of the annual £3 tax which was payable by every ex-indentured Indian, his wife and his children—male and female—males after reaching 16 years, females after reaching 12, if they decided to settle in the province of Natal as freemen; (4) just administration of existing laws specially affecting British Indians with due regard to vested rights. All these points were completely gained under the settlement of last year, and they have been embodied so far as legislation was necessary in what was known as the Indian Relief Act and otherwise in the cor-

respondence that took place between General Smuts and himself immediately after the passing of the Act referred to. Such being the case and as the Indian South African League was formed solely for the purpose of assisting the struggle it could well dissolve itself. Mr. Gandhi referred also to the administration of the funds that were sent to him from India and other parts of the Empire. He said that, at every stage of the struggle, a complete statement of income and expenditure was published.

Mr. Gandhi then informed the meeting that there were nearly 30 passive resisters including their families in India who were to be supported. These included the widows and children of the two men who were shot in the course of the struggle. He, therefore, suggested that the small balance which was still with the Indian South African League might well be devoted to their assistance. Mr. Gandhi desired to take the opportunity to express the thanks of the South African Indians for the great and valuable assistance it had rendered to them during the most critical times of the struggle. He was not going to mention any names, but he felt it his duty to convey in person as the interpreter of the wishes of many Transvaal deportees, who were in Madras in 1909, of their heartfelt thanks to Mr. Natesan for the devotion which he displayed in looking after their interest during their exile in India. He was glad he was able to convey in person his grateful thanks to the chairman and the members of the League for the moral and material support they had rendered to their cause.

ADVICE TO SOUTH AFRICAN INDIANS

In spite of his multifarious activities in India, Mr. Gandhi seldom forgot the scene of his early labours. His South African friends and fellow-workers are always dear to him. In a communication to the Indian Opinion he wrote under date 15th December, 1917 :—

When I left South Africa, I had fully intended to write to my Indian English friends there from time to time, but I found my lot in India to be quite different from what I had expected it to be. I had hoped to be able to have comparative peace and leisure but 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. My South African friends will, I hope, forgive me for my apparent neglect of them. Let me assure them that not a day has passed but I have thought of them and their kindness. South African associations can never be effaced from my memory.

You will not now be surprised when I tell you that it was only to-day that I learnt from *Indian Opinion* to hand about the disastrous floods. During my travels I rarely read newspapers and I have time merely to glance at them whilst I am not travelling. I write this to tender my sympathy to the sufferers. My imagination enables me to draw a true picture of their sufferings. They make one thing of God and His might and the utter evanescence of this life. They ought to teach us ever to seek His protection and never to fail in the daily duty before us. In the divine account-books only our actions are noted, not what we have read or what we have spoken. These and similar reflections fill my soul for

the moment and I wish to share them with the sufferers. The deep poverty that I experience in this country deters me even from thinking of financial assistance to be sent for those who have been rendered homeless. Even one pie in this country counts. I am at this very moment living in the midst of thousands who have nothing but roasted pulse or grain flour mixed with water and salt. We here, therefore, can only send the sufferers an assurance of our heartfelt grief.

I hope that a determined movement will be set on foot to render illegal residence on flats exposed to visitations of death-dealing floods. The poor will, if they can, inhabit even such sites regardless of consequences. It is for the enlightened persons to make it impossible for them to do so.

The issues of *Indian Opinion* that acquainted me with the destruction caused by the floods gave me also the sad news of Mr. Abdul Ganie's death. Please convey my respectful condolences to the members of our friend's family Mr. Abdul Ganie's services to community can never be forgotten. His sobriety of judgment and never-failing courtesy would have done credit to anybody. His wise handling of public questions was a demonstration of the fact that services to one's country could be efficiently rendered without a knowledge of English or modern training.

I note, too, that our people in South Africa are not yet free from difficulties about trade licences and leaving certificates. My Indian experience has confirmed the opinion that there is no remedy like passive resistance against such evils. The community has to exhaust milder remedies but I hope that it will not allow the sword of passive resistance to get rusty. It is our duty

whilst the terrible war lasts to be satisfied with petitions, etc. for the desired relief but I think the Government should know that the community will not rest until the questions above mentioned are satisfactorily solved. It is but right that I should also warn the community against dangers from within. I hear from those who return from South Africa that we are by no means free of those who are engaged in illicit traffic. We who seek justice must be above suspicion, and I hope that our leaders will not rest till they have purged the community of internal defects.

RAILWAY RESTRICTIONS IN TRANSVAAL

Writing to the "Times of India" on June 2, 1918, Mr. Gandhi drew attention to the fresh disabilities imposed on Indians by the Union Government by the introduction of the railway travelling restrictions, Mr. Gandhi, while deploring the existing colour prejudices felt bound to protest against the attempt of the Union Government to give legal recognition to the anti-colour campaign. We omit the long extracts from the "Indian Opinion" and give the text of Mr. Gandhi's letter:—

SIR,—I offer no apology for seeking the hospitality of your columns for the enclosed extracts from *Indian Opinion*. They deal with the well being of over two lakhs of emigrants from India. Mr. Ahmed Mahomed Cachalia, the esteemed president of the British Indian Association of Johannesburg, has sent from that place the following cablegram regarding one of the matters referred to in the extracts:—

'Mass meeting fifth strongly protested section nineteen, railway regulations. Resolved cable supporters India. Regulations impose statutory color-bar in regard to issue of tickets, placing in and removing from compartments, occupation of places on station platforms, empowers minor officials remove without assigning reason. Please make suitable representations appropriate quarters. Community unanimous assert rights unless relief sought granted.'

Mr. Cachalia was one of the staunchest workers during the Passive Resistance campaign that raged for eight years in South Africa. During that campaign he reduced himself to poverty and accepted imprisonment for the sake of India's honour. One can, therefore, easily understand what is meant by the words 'community unanimous assert right unless relief sought granted.'

It is not a threat. It is the burning cry of distress felt by a community whose self-respect has been injured.

It is evident that the white people of South Africa have not been visibly impressed by the war which is claimed to be waged for the protection of the rights of weaker or minor nationalities. Their prejudice against colour is not restrained even by the fact that local Indians have raised a volunteer bearer corps which is gallantly serving in East Africa with the column that was taken to East Africa by General Smuts.

The problem is difficult, it is complex. Prejudices cannot be removed by legislation. They will yield only to patient toil and education. But what of the Union Government? It is now feeding the prejudice by legalising it. Indians would have been content, if the popular prejudice had been left to work itself out, care being taken to guard against violence on either side. Indians of South Africa could not complain even against a boycott on the part of the whites. It is there already. In social life they are completely ostracised. They feel the ostracism, but they silently bear it. But the situa-

tion alters when the Government steps in and gives legal recognition to the Anti-Colour Campaign. It is impossible for the Indian settlers to submit to an insulting restraint upon their movements. They will not allow booking clerks to decide as to whether they are becomingly dressed. They cannot allow a platform-inspector to restrict them to a reserved part of a platform. They will not, as if they were ticket-of-leave men, produce their certificates in order to secure railway tickets.

The pendency of the war cannot be used as an effective shield to cover fresh wrongs and insults. The plucky custodians of India's honour are doing their share in South Africa. We here are bound to help them. Meetings throughout India should inform the white inhabitants of South Africa that India resents their treatment of her sons. They should call upon the Government of India and the Imperial Government to secure effective protection for our countrymen in South Africa. I hope that Englishmen in India will not be behind hand in lending their valuable support to the movement to redress the wrong. Mr. Cachalia's cable is silent on the grievance disclosed in the second batch of extracts. It is not less serious. In its effect, it is far more deadly. But the community is hoping to right the wrong by an appeal to the highest legal tribunal in the Union. But really the question is above that tribunal. Let me state it in a sentence. A reactionary Attorney-General has obtained a ruling from the Natal Supreme Court to the effect that subjects of 'native states' are aliens and not British subjects and are, therefore, not entitled to its protection so far as appeals under a particular section of the Immigrants Restriction Act are concerned. Thus if the local courts' ruling is correct,

thousands of Indians settled in South Africa will be deprived of the security of residence in South Africa for which they fought for eight years and which they thought they had won. At least a quarter of the Indian settlers of South Africa are subjects of the Baroda and the Kathiawar states. If any law considers them as aliens, surely it has to be altered. It is an insult to the states and their subjects to treat the latter as aliens

---

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

In 1919 the Transvaal legislature passed laws restricting the then Indian traders and their successors to particular Townships. The disabilities of Indian traders multiplied and became the subject of an acute agitation and threatened to revive passive resistance. On receipt of a cable early in August, 1919, from the British Indian Association, Natal, Mr. Gandhi wrote as follows in the Indian Review :—

I have just received the following cablegram from Mr. Ibrahim Ismail Aswat, Chairman of the British Indian Association, Johannesburg :

"Bill assented 13rd June, promulgated 3rd instant. Restricts companies acquiring further fixed properties and holding bonds as prior to company law. Re-affirms Gold and Townships Acts operating on new licensees after 1st May and restricting present traders and successors to particular townships. Deputation waiting His Excellency urging withhold assent on ground class legislation. Government promised another commission during recess investigate Indian question throughout Union as concession to the detractors in Parliament. Fear further restrictive legislation. Community request you appeal Viceroy propose Royal Commission. India representing Union local Indian interests. Convened Union Indian Conference 4th August,great success. Decided united action. Many of the association pledged resist any cost.—Aswat."

The cablegram bears out what I have said in my letter to Sir George Barnes* and what I said at the recent meeting at Poona. The restrictions are clear—1. No further holding of landed property in the Transvaal ; 2. No new trade licences within the area affected by the Gold Law and the Townships Act ; 3 the present holders and their successors in title to be restricted as to trade to the townships in which they are now trading.

As I have already remarked, this means virtual ruin of the Indian settlers in the Transvaal. Their only means of livelihood to the largest number is trade, and the largest number of Indians is to be found probably within the gold area. If the Act stands, they must die out in the natural course.

* *In the course of the correspondence between Mr. Gandhi and Sir George Barnes, Mr. Gandhi wrote* :—

Do you know that the Indians of South Africa raised an ambulance corps which served under General Smuts in South Africa? Is this new law to be their reward? I ought not to bring in war services in order to secure the protection of an elementary right which considerations alike of honour and justice entitle them to. I commend to your attention the report of the Select Committee of the Union House of Assembly.

The Union Government, unmindful of their trust and equally unmindful of their written word, accepted the amendment "prohibiting the holding of mortgages by the Asiatics on property except as security for *bona fide* loan or investment and providing that any Asiatic Company which acquired fixed property after the 1st instant should dispose of the same within two years or a further period as fixed by a competent Court with a rider that in the event of failure to do so the property might be sold by an order of the Court." I am quoting from Reuter's cable dated 23rd May from Capetown. You will see this completes legalised confiscation of property rights throughout the Transvaal and virtually the trade rights within the gold area of the Indian settlers. There was no evasion of Law 3 of 1885. Indians did openly what the law permitted them to do, and they should be left free to do so. I do not wish to prolong this tail of agony. The Government of India are bound to protect the rights of the 5,000 Indian settlers in the Transvaal at any cost.

In the cablegram the word 'assent' occurs twice. It says the Bill has been assented to and it refers to a deputation that is to wait on H. E. the Governor-General of South Africa requesting him to withhold assent The second use of the word 'assent' refers probably to a clause in the Letters Patent providing for the vetoing of class legislation. The clause is undoubtedly to be used under exceptional circumstances. No one can deny that the Asiatics Act constitutes a very exceptional circumstance warranting the exercise of the Royal veto.

The most important part of the cablegram, however, is the fact that the commission promised by the Union Government is to be appointed as a "concession" to "the detractors" of Indians in the Union Parliament. Unless, therefore, the Government of India take care, there is every likelihood of the commission, like the committee of the South African Assembly proving to the British Indians a curse, instead of a blessing. It is, therefore, not unnatural that the British Indian Association urges that H. E. the Viceroy should propose a Royal Commission upon which both the Union and the Indian interests are represented. Nothing can be fairer than the proposal made by Mr. Aswat. I say so, because as a matter of right no commission is really needed to decide that Indian settlers are entitled to trade in South Africa where they like and hold landed property on the same terms as the European settlers. This is the minimum they can claim. But under the complex constitution of this great Empire, justice is and has often to be done in a round-about manner. A wise captain, instead of sailing against a head-wind, tacks and yet reaches his destination sooner than he otherwise would have. Even so. Mr. Aswat

wisely accepts the principle of a commission on a matter that is self evident, but equally wisely wants a commission that would not prove abortive and that will dare to tell the ruling race in South Africa that, as members in an Empire which has more coloured people than white, they may not treat their Indian fellow-subjects as helots. Whether the above proposal is accepted or some other is adopted by the Imperial Government, it must be made clear to them that public opinion in India will not tolerate confiscation of the primary rights of the British Indian settlers in South Africa.

INDIAN RIGHTS IN THE TRANSVAAL

From time to time trouble rose in Transvaal between the trading people among European colonists and Indians. A policy of squeezing out the Indian petty trader was prevalent throughout the colony A correspondent of the Times of India wrote to its columns in August 18, 1919, that South Africa cannot be run economically with the Indian in it and the white people cannot be expected to commit race suicide. Strangely enough even the Smutts-Gandhi agreement was pressed into issue. Mr. Gandhi wrote to "The Times of India" :—

No possible exception can be taken to the impartial manner in which your South African correspondent has given a summary of the Indian position in the Transvaal in your issue of the 18th instant. He has put as fairly as it was possible for him to do, both sides of the question.

It is not the additional 'brown burden on the top of the black one' which agitate 'the European Colonists in South Africa,' but "the crux of the whole question is, as your correspondent puts it, "that South Africa cannot be run economically with the Indian in it, and the white people who have made the country, cannot be expected to commit race suicide." This is not the problem that presents itself to the Boer living on the Veldt to whom the Indian trader is a blessing nor to the European housewife in the big towns of the Transvaal who depends solely upon the Indian vegetable vendor for the vegetables brought to her door. But the problem presents itself in the manner put by your correspondent to the petty European trader who finds in the thrifty and resourceful Indian a formidable rival, and with his vote which counts a great deal and with his influenceas a member of the ruling race he has succeeded in making his own economic problem a race problem for South Africa. In reality the problem is whether the petty trader for his selfish end is to be allowed to override every consideration of justice, fair play, imperial policy and all that goes to make a nation good and great.

In support of the gradual but certain squeezing out process, what has been called the Smuts-Gandhi agreement has been pressed into service. Now that agreement is embodied in two letters and two only of the 30th June, 1914 · the first one addressed to me on behalf of General Smuts by Mr. Gorges, Secretary for the Interior, and the second my acknowledgment of it bearing the same date, The agreement, as the letters conclusively show, is an agreement on questions which were the subject of civil—in the correspondence described as passive—resistance. The settlement stipulates only for an

extension—never a restriction—of existing rights, and as it was intended only to cover questions arising out of civil resistance it left open all the other questions. Hence the reservation in my letter of the 30th June, *viz* :—

"As the Minister is aware, some of my countrymen have wished me to go further. They are dissatisfied that trade licenses, laws of the different Provinces, the Transvaal Gold Law, the Transvaal Law 3 of 1885, have not been altered so as to give them full rights of residence, trade and ownership of land. Some of them are dissatisfied that full inter-provincial migration is not permitted, and some are dissatisfied that on the marriage question the Relief Bill goes no further than it does."

In this correspondence there is not a word about the Indian settlers not getting trade licenses or holding fixed property in the mining or any other area. And the Indians had a perfect right to apply for and get as many trade licenses as they could secure and as much fixed property as they could hold, whether through forming registered companies or through mortgages. After a strenuous fight for eight years it was not likely that I would give away any legal rights, and if I did, the community, I had the honour to represent, would naturally and quite properly have dismissed me as an unworthy, if not a traitorous, representative.

But there is a third letter, totally irrelevant considered as part of the agreement, which has been used for the curtailment of trade rights. It is my letter of the 7th July addressed to Mr. Gorges. The whole tone of it shows that it is purely a personal letter setting forth only my individual views about 'vested rights in connection with the Gold Law and Townships Amendment Act.' I

have therein stated definitely that I do not wish to restricts' the future action of my countrymen and I have simply recorded the definition of 'vested rights' I discussed with Sir Benjamin Robertson on the 4th March, 1914, saying that by " vested rights I understand the right of an Indian and his successors to live and trade in townships in which he was living and trading, no matter how often he shifts his residence or business from place to place in the same township." This is the definition on which the whole of the theory of evasion of law and breach of faith has been based. Apart from the question of irrelevance of the letter I claim that it could not be used, even if it could be admitted as part of the agreement, in the manner it has been. As I have already stated on previous occasions there was a prospect of an adverse interpretation of the Gold Law as to trade licences, and there was the tangible difficulty in getting land or leases of buildings and it was by the most strenuous efforts that Indians were able within Gold Areas to retain their foothold. I was anxious to protect the existing traders and their successors *even though the legal interpretation of the law might be adverse to the Indian claim.* The vested right, therefore, referred to in my letter of the 7th July was a right created in spite of the law. And it was this right that had to be protected in the administration of the then existing laws. Even if, therefore, my said letter can be incorporated in the agreement, by no cannon of interpretation that I know can it be said to prevent the Indians *morally* (for that is the meaning of the charge of breach of faith) from getting new trade licences in virtue of the law of the land. Indians openly and in a fair fight gained in their favour a legal decision to the effect that they could obtain trade licences against tender of the licence fee even within the

gold area. To this they were perfectly morally entitled. There cannot be any question of a legal breach. There trade rivals would long ago have made short work of any legal breach. Lastly supposing that the law was adverse to the Indian claim my definition could not be pleaded to bar any agitation for amendment of the law, for the whole of the settlement, if the nature of it was of a temporary character, and the Indians, as definitely stated in my letter of the 30th June, could not be expected to rest content until full civic rights had been conceded.' The whole of the plea, therefore, of breach of faith is, I venture to submit, an utterly dishonest and shameless piece of tactics, which ought not to be allowed to interfere with a proper adjustment of the question.

ANOTHER S. A. COMMISSION

In response to the agitation in South Africa and in India, a Commission was appointed by the Union Government to investigate the trade and other questions which caused grave irritation to the Indians; and Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State for India announced in November, 1919, the inclusion of Sir Benjamin Robertson, Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces in the Commission to represent the Government of India, Interviewed by the Associated Press, *Mr. Gandhi said on the subject of enquiry and the composition:—*

It is a matter of very great regret that Mr. Montagu's message to His Excellency the Viceroy so materially alters the position. I do, however, feel that any agitation insisting upon the appointment on the Commission of Indian representatives may damage our

case which is so overwhelmingly strong. If a representative like Mr. Sastri is appointed along with Sir Benjamin Robertson to put before the South African Government and the forthcoming Commission the Indian case, it would be the next best thing. In my opinion our effort should be to concentrate upon securing a proper reference to the Commission in the place of the very narrow one, we are led to believe, is likely to be suggested by the Union Government. The *Times of India* is really rendering a great service in moulding and consolidating public opinion on this question, irrespective of class or race. It is not enough that merely the trade question is referred to the Commission. The whole of the Law 3 of 1885 must come under review leaving aside for the time being the question of political status. Our goal must be the restoration of full trading and property rights of Indians lawfully settled in South Africa. This is what even Australia has allowed although it was Australia which led the anti-Asiatic cry. We must also guard against the Commission whittling down any of the rights already being enjoyed by the settlers. By no canon of justice or propriety can the existing rights be taken away from the Indian settlers, but if we do not take care and provide beforehand there is every danger of such a catastrophe happening. It actually happened with the Select Committee of the Union Parliament whose findings produced the new legislation we so much deplore.

Indians in the Colonies

RECIPROCITY BETWEEN INDIA AND THE DOMINIONS

At the Madras Provincial Conference held at Nellore in June, 1915, Mr. G. A. Natesan moved a resolution thanking Mr. and Mrs Gandhi for the invaluable services they had rendered to the Motherland by their heroic struggle in South Africa. Mr. Gandhi, in acknowledging the thanks of the Conference, spoke as follows:—

In so far as sentiment enters into the claims of India, with regard to the status of Indians in the Empire, it seems possible that by a measure of reciprocal treatment as between India and the Dominions this difficulty could be surmounted. Given an outlet for Indian emigrants in East Africa, it ought not to be beyond the powers of statesmanship to arrange that India should have the power to exclude white men of the working class, just as the Dominions exclude Indians. Or rather it might be arranged that the number of Indians to be admitted to any one of the white States of the Empire should bear a relative proportion to the white population of the State. As a matter of fact, if the proportion agreed on is to avoid the necessity for removing some of the Asiatics now in the Dominions, it will have to be something like twice as great as the number of the whites in India in relation to the total population. The existing white community in India, inclusive of troops,

bears the proportion of about 1 : 2,002 of the native population. In Canada there are now about 3,000 Indians in a total population of 8,000,000. A 1 : ratio 1,000 as suggested would, therefore, permit the Indian colony in Canada to be increased by about 5,000. In Australia there are rather more than 5,000 Indians, and under 5,000,000 white men at present, but the excess over the 1 : 1,000 ratio is trifling. In New Zealand, where there are about 1 : 250 Indians, this ratio is almost exactly conformed to by the existing situation. South Africa presents a difficulty since the South African Indians already exceed a proportion of one to ten of the white residents. But South Africa differs from its sister Dominions, since it is the only one which has a native population of more than negligible size. The Indian section of the composite racial problem—presented by the Union—might perhaps be adjusted somewhat by offering inducements to South African Indians to transfer themselves to East Africa. The conferring of full political rights on the small Indian communities domiciled in the Dominions would then be the only step necessary to meet every legitimate aspiration of Indians for equality of treatment and the recognition of their claims as British subjects.

INDIAN AND EUROPEAN EMIGRANTS

Mr. M. K. Gandhi, in moving the Resolution on India and the Colonies at the Bombay Congress of 1915, said:—

Mr. President and Friends,—the Resolution that stands in my name reads thus :—

" The Congress regrets that the existing laws affecting Indians in South Africa and Canada have not, in spite of the liberal and imperialistic declarations of Colonial statesmen, been justly and equitably administered, and this Congress trusts that the Self-Governing Colonies will extend to the Indian emigrants equal rights with European emigrants and that the Imperial Government will use all possible means to secure the rights which have been hitherto unjustly withheld from them, thus causing widespread dissatisfaction and discontent."

Friends,—It is an irony of fate that whilst this vast assembly will be regretting the hostile attitude that has been adopted by the Self-Governing Colonies, a Contingent of your countrymen formed in South Africa will be nearing the theatre of war in order to help the sick and the wounded, and I am in possession of facts in connection with this Contingent formed in South Africa which shows that it is composed of the middle classes which, in accordance with the *Times of India*, are going to form the future self-governing nation. Those men are drawn from ex-indentured Indians and their children, from the petty hawkers, the toilers, the traders, and yet the Colonies do not consider it necessary to alter their attitudes nor do I see the logic in altering their policy. It is the

fashion now-a-days to consider that because our humble share in not being disloyal to the Government at the present juncture, we are entitled to the rights which have been hitherto withheld from us, as if those rights were withheld because our loyalty was suspected. No, my friends, if they have been withheld from us, the reasons are different and those reasons will have to be altered. They are due, some of them to undying prejudices, to economic causes and these will have to be examined; but prejudice will have to be cut down. And what are the hardships that our countrymen are labouring under in South Africa, in Canada, and the other Self-Governing Colonies? In South Africa the Settlement of 1914 secures what the passive resisters were fighting for and nothing more, and they were fighting for the restoration of legal equality in connection with emigrants from British India and nothing more.

That legal equality has been restored, but the domestic troubles till remain and if it was not the custom unfortunately inherited for the last forty years that the predominent language in this assembly should be English, our Madras friends will have taken good care to have learnt one of the northern vernaculars, and then there are men enough in South Africa who would tell you about the difficulties that we have to go through even now in South Africa in connection with holding landed property, in connection with men who having been once domiciled in South Africa, return to South Africa, their difficulties in connection with the admission of children, their difficulties in connection with holding licenses of trade. These are, if I may so call them, bread and butter difficulties. There are other difficulties which I shall not enumerate just now. In Canada, it is not possible for these member s

of the Sikhs who are domiciled there to bring their wives and their children. (*Cries of 'shame, shame.'*) The law is the same but administration is widely unequal, so unequal that they cannot bring their wives and children, and the law or the administration still remains the same in spite of declarations about justice and what not, in view of the hostilities and in view of the splendid aid which India is said to have rendered to the Empire. How are these difficulties to be met.. I do not intend to go into details, but the Congress proposes that this difficulty can be met by an appeal to the sense of justice of the Colonial statesmen and by an appeal to the Imperial Government. I fear that the Congress can only do this, but the Resolution so far as it goes in one respect is inadequate to the occasion. Lord Hardinge, only a few months ago, made a fervent appeal to Indian publicists and to Indian public statesmen for helping him to an honourable solution which will retain the dignity of India, at the same time, not because of any trouble to the Self Governing Colonies. Lord Hardinge is still waiting for an answer, that answer is not supplied by the Congress, nor can it be by the Congress; it is to be supplied by an association of the specialists, if I may so call them. The Congress has given them the lead, and it is for these associations to frame the details in which they will have to examine the rival claims and to offer to Lord Hardinge a solution which shall be saturated with details, a solution which will satisfy the Colonial Governments as well as the Indian people and will not take away anything whatsoever from the just demands that this Resolution makes. With these words I have much pleasure in proposing this Resolution.

INDENTURED LABOUR

The following is a pronouncement made by Mr. Gandhi during the strenuous agitation made throughout India in the early part of 1917 for the complete abolition of indenture :—

There is no doubt that we are engaged in a severe struggle for the preservation of our honour, and that, if we do not take care, the promise made by Lord Hardinge, that indentured labour should soon be a thing of the past may be reduced to a nullity. The Viceregal pronouncement just made seems to set at rest one fear, that the system may be prolonged for a further period of five years, which, as Sir Ramakrishna Bhandarkar showed at Poona, would, in reality, mean ten years. We are thankful to Lord Chelmsford for his assurance. And we are thankful, too, to that good Englishman, Mr. C. F. Andrews, for the lead that he gave us in the matter. So soon as he gained the information from Fiji that five years' extension was taken by the planters of those lands as a settled fact, he forsook his sick-bed and his rest at Shanti Niketan, and sounded for us the call of duty.

But if one cloud, that threatened to destroy our hopes, seems to have disappeared, another equally dangerous looms on the horizon. The conditions of abolition, as stated by Lord Hardinge last March, are these:—

"On behalf of His Majesty's Government, he (the Secretary of State) has asked us, however, to make it clear that the existing system of recruiting must be maintained until new conditions, under which labour should be permitted to proceed to the Colonies, should have been worked out in conjunction with the Colonial Office and the Crown Colonies concerned; until pro-

per safeguards in the Colonies should have been provided; and until they should have had reasonable time to adjust themselves to the change, a period which must necessarily depend on circumstances and conditions imperfectly known at present."

Those of us who know anything of the system knew that it was well-nigh impossible to find new conditions which would be economically sound for the planters, and morally sound for us. We felt that the Government would soon find this out for themselves, and that, in view of Lord Hardinge's whole-hearted disapproval of the system, his view of the nearness of the end would coincide with our own. But now a different situation faces us. Nearly a year has gone by, and we discover that the planters of Fiji have been led to believe that they will have five years more of the system, and at the end of it new conditions may after all be a change in name but not in substance. Let Mr. Bonar Law's despatch speak for itself. Writing under date March 4, 1916, to the Acting Governor of Fiji, he says:—

"The Secretary of State for India is satisfied that it would not be possible for the Government of India to continue to defeat by a bare official majority resolutions in their Legislative Council, urging the abolition of indenture; that in his opinion, the strong and universal feeling in India on this subject makes it a question of urgency: and that he has accepted the conclusion that indentured emigration must be abolished."

He then proceeds:—

"Though, from the point of view of the Colonies concerned, the decision which the Indian Government and the Secretary of State for India have taken is to be regretted, I recognise that the final decision upon this question must rest with the Indian Government."

Thus the humanities of the question are tacitly supposed to be no concern of the Colonies.

Now mark this significant paragraph, culled from the same illuminating despatch:—

"I have, therefore, agreed to the appointment of an inter-departmental committee to consider what system should be sub-

stituted for the system of indenture should be allowed for a further period of five years, and should cease at the end of that period. . . . The Secretary of State for India is anxious that the change of system should be brought about with as little disturbance as possible to the economic interests of the Colonies, and that he has made it clear that the existing system must be maintained until a properly safeguarded system has been devised."

Mr. Andrews has been twitted for having referred to the five years' extension. Let his critics explain away Mr. Bonar Law's emphatic pronouncement published in the Fiji newspapers. What with this official statement and the Secretary of State for India's solicitude for the economic interests of the planters, our cause may easily be lost, if we are found unwatchful.

In the light of the Viceregal speech and Mr. Bonar Law's despatch, our duty seems to be clear. We must strengthen the Government's hands where necessary, and even stimulate their activity, so that this inter-departmental committee is not allowed to frustrate our hopes. It is a body wherein the influence of the Crown Colonies and the Colonial office will be preponderant. It is a body which has to find a substitute which would be acceptable to us. As I hold, it will be a vain search, if the more well-being of the labourer is to be the primary consideration. But, if the planters can have their own way, we know that they will urge an impossible substitute, and, in the event of its rejection by us, they will, in accordance with Mr. Bonar Law's despatch, claim continuance of recruiting under indenture. It must, therefore, be clearly understood that the onus of producing an acceptable substitute rests with them and not with us. They have had more than a year already. Lord Hardinge's despatch, urging total abolition, is dated the 15th October, 1915. The committee is to sit in May next. This period for finding a substitute is long enough, in all conscience. Either

Mr. Andrews' harrowing picture of the conditions of life in Fiji is true or it is untrue. We believe it to be true, and it has never been seriously attacked. And in waiting for over a year, we shall have waited almost beyond the point of endurance. Substitute or no substitute, we are entitled, for the sake of our motherland, for the sake of our own honour and reputation, and, indeed, that of the Empire, to the unconditional abolition of this last remnant of slavery. Natal stopped the system without the provision of a substitute. Mauritius has done likewise. The Johannesburg mines survived not only the shock of an abrupt termination of Chinese labour, but the withdrawal of every Chinese labourer from the country as fast as transport could be got ready.

Capital is both bold and timid. If only we shall do our duty, if only the Government of India will steel their hearts against the blandishments of the Fijian and West Indian planters, there is, no doubt, that these people will know how to save millions, without India's having to go to their rescue.

INDIAN COLONIAL EMIGRATION

The following is the full text of on article published in the "Indian Review" for September, 1917 :—

I have carefully read the resolution issued at Simla by the Government of India on the 1st instant, embodying the report of the Inter-Departmental Conference recently held in London. It will be remembered that this was the conference referred to in the Viceregal speech of last year at the opening of the sessions of the Viceregal Legislative Council. It will be remembered, too, th at

this was the Conference which Sir James Meston and Sir S.P. Sinha were to have attended but were unable to attend owing to their having returned to India before the date of the meeting of the Conference. It is stated in the report under discussion that these gentlemen were to discuss the question of emigration to certain English Colonies informally with the two Secretaries of State, *i.e.*, the Secretary of State for India and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Lord Islington, Sir A. Steel Maitland, and Messrs. Seton, Grindle, Green and Macnaughton constituted the Conference. To take the wording of the Resolution, this Conference sat "to consider the proposals for a new assisted system of emigration to British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica and Fiji." The public should, therefore, note that this assisted emigration is to be confined only to the four Crown Colonies mentioned and not to the Self-Governing Colonies of South Africa, Canada or Australia, or the Crown Colony of Mauritius. What follows will show the importance of this distinction. It is something to be thankful for that "the Government of India have not yet considered the report and reserved judgment on all the points raised in it." This is as it should be on a matter so serious as this and one which only last year fairly convulsed the whole of India and which has in one shape or another agitated the country since 1895.

The declaration too that "His Majesty's Government in agreement with the Government of India have decided that indentured emigration shall not be re-opened" is welcome as is also the one that "no free emigrants can be introduced into any Colony until all Indian emigrants already there have been released from existing indentures."

In spite, however, of so much in the report that fills one with gladness, the substantive part of it which sets forth the scheme which is to replace indentured emigration is, so far as one can judge, to say the least of it, disappointing. Stripped of all the phraseology under which the scheme has been veiled, it is nothing less than a system of indentured emigration, no doubt on a more humane basis and safeguarded with some conditions beneficial to the emigrants taking advantage of it.

The main point that should be borne in mind is that Conference sat designedly to consider a scheme of emigration not in the interests of the Indian labourer, but in those of the Colonial employer. The new system, therefore, is devised to help the Colonies concerned. India needs no outlet, at any rate for the present moment, for emigration outside the country. It is debateable whether, in any event, the four Colonies will be the most suitable for Indian colonisation. The best thing, therefore, that can happen from an Indian standpoint is that there should be no assisted emigration from India of any type whatsoever. In the absence of any such assistance, emigration will have to be entirely free and at the risk and expense of the emigrant himself. Past experience shows that, in that event, there will be very little voluntary emigration to distant Colonies. In the report assisted emigration means, to use a mild expression, stimulated emigration; and surely with the industries of India crying out for labour and with her legitimate resources yet undeveloped, it is madness to think of providing a stimulus for the stay-at-home Indian to go out of India. Neither the Government nor any voluntary agency has been found capable of protecting from ill-usage the Indian who emigrates either to

Burma or Ceylon, much less can any such protection avail in far-off Fiji or the three other Colonies. I hope that leaders of public opinion in India will, therefore, take their stand on the one impregnable rock of not wanting any emigration whatsoever to the Colonies. It might be argued that we, as a component part of the Empire, are bound to consider the wants of our partners, but this would not be a fair plea to advance so long as India stands in need of all the labour she can produce. If, therefore, India does not assist the Colonies, it is not because of want of will but it is due to want of ability. An additional reason a politician would be justified in using is that, so long as India does not in reality occupy the position of an equal partner with the Colonies, and so long as her sons continue to be regarded by Englishmen in the Colonies and English employers even nearer home to be fit only as hewers of wood and drawers of water, no scheme of emigration to the Colonies can be morally advantageous to Indian emigrants. If the badge of inferiority is always to be worn by them, they can never rise to their full status and any material advantage they will gain by emigrating can, therefore, be of no consideration.

But let us for the moment consider the new system. "The system," it is stated, "to be followed in future will be one of aided emigration and its object will be to encourage the settlement of Indians in certain Colonies after a probationary period of employment in those Colonies, to train and fit them for life and work there and at the same time, to acquire a supply of the labour essential to the well-being of the colonists themselves." So the resettlement is to be conditional on previous employment under contract and it will be seen in the course of our examina-

tion that this contract is to be just as binding as the contracts used to be under indenture. The report has the following humorous passage in it: "He will be, in no way, restricted to service under any particular employer except that for his own protection, a selected employer will be chosen for him for the first six months." This has a flavour of the old indentured system One of the evils complained of about that system was that the labourer was assigned to an employer. He was not free to choose one himself. Under the new system, the employer is to be selected for the protection of the labourer. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that the would-be labourer will never be able to feel the protection devised for him The labourer is further "to be encouraged to work for his first three years in agricultural industries, by the offer, should he do so, of numerous and important benefits subsequently as a colonist." This is another inducement to indenture, and I know enough of such schemes to be able to assure both the Government and public that these so-called inducements in the hands of clever manipulators become nothing short of methods of compulsion in respect of innocent and ignorant Indian labourers. It is due to the framers of the scheme that I should draw attention to the fact that they have avoided all criminal penalties for breach of contract. In India itself if the scheme is adopted, we are promised a revival of the much-dreaded depots and emigration agents, all no doubt, on a more respectable basis but still of the same type and capable of untold mischief.

The rest of the report is not likely to interest the public, but those who wish to study it will, I doubt not, come to the conclusion to which I have been driven, that the framers have done their best to strip the old

system of many of the abuses which had crept into it, but they have not succeeded in placing before the Indian public an acceptable scheme. I hold that it was an impossible task. The system of indenture was one of temporary slavery ; it was incapable of being amended, it should only be ended and it is to be hoped that India will never consent to its revival in any shape or form.

THE INIQUITIES OF THE INDENTURE SYSTEM

Under the auspices of the District Congress Committee in Bombay Mr. M. K. Gandhi delivered a lecture on Indentured Indian Labour before a large gathering on 30th October, 1917, at the Empire Theatre, Sir Ebrahim Rahimtullah presiding.

Mr. Gandhi said :—

The question of indentured labour was just now a topical question, because those true and real friends of India, Messrs. Andrews and Pearson, were conducting an enquiry in Fiji. The Fiji Islands absorbed the largest number of indentured Indians at the present moment. Messrs. Andrews and Pearson were not the first to interest the Indians in this question, but it was the deceased statesman Mr. Gokhale, who first impressed Indians with the importance of their duties in connection with this question. The resolution which Mr. Gokhale brought before the Council for the abolition of the indenture system was defeated by a majority though all the non-official members of the Council voted for the abolition. However much a benign and sympathetic Viceroy wished to remove this abominable system of

very serious difficulty in his way and that was the report by the two Commissioners, who were sent by Lord Hardinge, namely, Messrs. MacNeill and Chimanlal which are contained in two bulky volumes. All might not care to wade through the rather dull pages of those volumes but to him who knew what real indentured labour was, they were of great interest. They might, however, take upon trust that the report recognised that indentured labour should continue just as it was, if certain conditions were fulfilled. Those conditions, Mr. Gandhi said, were impossible of fulfilment. And the recommendations which these two great Commissioners made, showed that they really could not seriously have meant that the system of indenture which existed to-day in Fiji, Jamaica, Guiana and other colonies should be continued a minute longer than was actually necessary. The speaker here referred to the previous Commission and said that the defects which Messrs. MacNeill and Chimanlal had pointed out were patent to all. Their report contained nothing new. But there was unofficial investigation on behalf of some philanthropic body in England some forty years ago, and in that book an unvarnished tale was given, which told in graphic language what were the hardships under that system.

In this connection Mr. Gandhi quoted a statement made by the Prime Minister of Natal in which he said that the system of indenture was a most unadvisable thing and that the sooner it was terminated the better for the indentured labourer and the employer. Lord Selborne said the same thing when he was the High Commissioner in South Africa: he said that it was worse for the employer than the employed, because it was a system perilously near to slavery. Sir William Hunter

wrote a beautiful series of letters in 1895 when he first brought himself to study the system personally and compared the system of indenture, after a due investigation, to a state bordering on slavery. On one occasion he used the expression semi-slavery. Mr. Gandhi said if he erred in making these statements, he erred in Lord Selborne's company. And it was in connection with this system that these two worthy gentlemen, the Commissioners, had seen fit to report and advise the fulfilment of certain conditions which, in the very nature of the contract, were impossible of fulfilment. The conditions were that unsuitable emigrants be excluded; the proportion of females to males to be raised from 40 to 50 per cent. The speaker could not understand what they meant by unsuitable emigrants being excluded. The Commissioners themselves told them that it was not easy to find labour in India. India was not pining to send her children out as semi-slaves. Lord Sanderson stated that it was the surplus population from India that went out from dissatisfaction with the economic conditions in India. But they must remember that there were 500 recruiting licences issued in the year 1907. Could they conceive the significance of the extraordinary state of things which required one recruiter to 17 labourers? The Colonial Governments had their sub-agents in India for this indentured labour to be collected. They were paid a sum of Rs. 25 for each cooly recruited, and this sum of Rs. 25 was divided between the recruiter and the sub-agent. Mr. Gandhi thought the mental state of those recruiters must be miserable, who could send so many of their countrymen as semi-slaves. After having seen what the recruiting agents did and after having read the many gross

mis-statements they made, he was not surprised that thousands and thousands of their countrymen were becoming indentured labourers The Commissioners devoted several pages to the immorality prevailing on the estates. It was not forty women for sixty men; but the statement was made that these men did not marry these women, but kept them, and that many of these women were prostitutes. Mr. Gandhi said he would decline to send his children under such an indenture, if he was worthy of his salt, out of the country. But thousands of men and women had gone. What did they think of that in India?

The conditions were that rigorous provisions should be either expunged from the Ordinances or that the Protector should control employers. As for the regulations made to protect these labourers they could take it from him, Mr. Gandhi said, that there were a great many flaws in them and a coach and four could be easily driven through these. The aim of the rules was to make the employer supreme. Here was capital ranged against labour with artificial props for capital and not labour.

Mr. Gandhi condemned the "protector" of emigrants. They were men belonging to that very class to which employers belonged; they moved among them and was it not only natural that they should have their sympathies on the side of the employer? How was it then possible that they could do justice to the labourer against the employer? He knew many instances when magistrates had meted out justice to the indentured labourer, but it was impossible to expect such a thing from the Protectors of emigrants. The labourer was bound hand and foot to the employer. If he committed an offence against his employer he first of all had to undergo a course of im

prisonment, then the days that the labourer had spent in the jail were added to his indenture and he was taken back to his master to serve again. The Commissioners had to say nothing against these rules. There was nobody to judge the Protector of Emigrants if he gave a wrong judgment, but in the case of the magistrate he could be criticised. Again the Commissioners add that these prisoners should be put into separate jails. But the Colonial Government would be bankrupt if they built jails for hundreds of prisoners that were imprisoned. They were not able to build jails for the passive resisters. Then the Commissioners said that the labourer should be allowed to redeem his indenture by payment of a graduated redemption fee. They made a mistake in thinking him to be an independent man. He was not his own master. Mr. Gandhi said he had known of English girls well educated who were decoyed, and who were not indentured, unable to free themselves. How was it then possible for an indentured labourer to do this? Mr. Balfour compared the labourer under an indenture to a soldier. But the soldier was a responsible man and he could rise to a high position. But an indentured labourer remained a labourer. He had no privileges. His wife was also included under his disabilities, so also his son. In Natal the finger of scorn was pointed at these people. Never could an indentured Indian rise to a higher post than that of labourer. And what did the labourer bring when he returned to India? He returned a broken vessel, with some of the artificial and superficial signs of civilisation, but he left more valuable things behind him. He may bring some sovereigns also with him. They should decline to perpetuate this hateful system of indenture because it robbed them of their national self-respect.

If they could consider well over what he had said, they would try and abolish the system in a year's time and this one taint upon the nation would have gone and indentured labour would be a thing of the past. He wanted to remove the cause of the ill-treatment of the Indians in the Colonies. However protected that system may be, it still remained a state bordering upon slavery. "It would remain," said Mr. Gandhi, "a state based upon full-fledged slavery and it was a hindrance to national growth and national dignity."

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

In the course of an article criticising the Imperial Conference Resolution on Indian emigration, Mr. Gandhi wrote as follows in the Indian Review *for August, 1918:—*

The Imperial Conference Resolution * on the status of our countrymen emigrating to the Colonies, reads well on the surface, but it is highly deceptive. We need not

* *A summary of the proceedings of the Conference was cabled by the Secretary of State to the Viceroy. The following is an extract:—*

The fifteenth meeting of the Conference was held on July 25th. The first subject discussed was reciprocity of treatment between India and the Dominions. This discussion followed on the resolution passed by the Conference last year, accepting the principle of reciprocity and a further resolution passed to that effect should now be given to the last year's resolution in pursuance of which the Conference agreed as follows:—(1) It is the inherent function of the Governments of several communities of British Commonwealth including India that each should enjoy complete control in the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any other communities. (2) British citizens domiciled in any British country including India should be admitted into any other British country for visits for the purposes of pleasure or commerce including temporary resi-

consider it a great achievement that we can pass the same laws against the colonials that they may pass against us. It is like a giant telling a dwarf that the latter is free to give blow for blow. Who is to refuse permission and passports to the colonials desiring to enter India? But Indians, no matter what their attainments are, are constantly being refused permission to enter the colonies even for temporary periods. South African legislation of emigration was purged of the racial taint, by the passive resistance movement. But the administrative principles still continue and will do so, so long as India remains both in name and substance a dependency.

The agreement arrived at regarding those who are already domiciled practically re-states the terms of the settlement of 1914. If it extends to Canada and Australia it is a decided gain, for in Canada till recently there was a big agitation owing to the refusal of its Government to admit the wives and children of its Sikh settlers. I may perhaps add that the South African settlement provides

---

dency for the purpose of education. The conditions of such visits should be regulated on the principle of reciprocity as follows:— (a) The right of the Government of India recognised to enact laws which shall have the effect of subjecting British citizens domiciled in any other British country to the same conditions in visiting India as those imposed on Indians desiring to visit such country. (b) Such right of visit or temporary residence shall, in each individual case, be embodied in the passport or written permit issued by the country of domicile and subject to vie there by an officer appointed by and acting on behalf of the country to be visited. If such a country so desires such right shall not extend to the visit or temporary residents for labour purpose or to permanent settlement. (3) Indians already permanently domiciled in other British countries should be allowed to bring in their wives and minor children on condition (a) that no more than one wife and her children shall be admitted for each such Indian and (b) that each individual so admitted shall be certified by the Government of India as being the lawful wife or child of such Indian. The Conference recommends other questions covered by the memoranda presented to the Conference by the representatives of India.

for the protection of those who had plural wives before the settlement, especially if the latter had at any time entered South Africa. It may be the proper thing in a predominently Christian country to confine the legality to only one wife. But it is necessary even for that country, in the interests of humanity and for the sake of friendship for members of the same Imperial Federation to which they belong administratively, to allow the admission of plural wives and their progeny.

The above agreement still evades the question of inequality of status in other matters :—Thus the difficulty of obtaining licenses throughout South Africa, the prohibition to hold landed property in the Transvaal and the Free State and virtual prohibition within the Union itself of the entry of Indians into the Free State, the prohibition of Indian children to enter the ordinary Government schools, deprivation of Municipal franchise in the Transvaal and the Free State and practical deprivation of the Union franchise throughout South Africa, barring perhaps the Cape. The resolutions of the Imperial Conference therefore are decidely an eye-wash. There is no change of heart in the colonies and certainly no recognition of Imperial obligations regarding India. The Fijian atrocities to which Mr. Andrews has drawn pointed attention show what is possible even in the Crown Colonies which are under direct Imperial control.

Jail Experiences

These prison experiences were originally written by Mr. Gandhi in Gujarati and we are indebted to the Modern Review *for the following English version:—*

I

INSPECTION

When the different inspectors come to inspect, all the prisoners have to post themselves in a row, and take off their caps to salute them. As all of us had English caps, there was no difficulty in observing this rule. It was both legal and proper that we should take off our caps. The words of direction used were "fall in." These words had, so to speak, become our food, as we had to "fall in" four or five times a day. One of these officers, an assistant to the Chief Warder, was a little stiff-necked, and so the Indians had nicknamed him "General Smuts." Generally he was the first to come in the mornings, and again in the evenings. At half past nine the Doctor came. He was very good and kind, and unfailing in his inquiries. Each prisoner had, according to jail rules, to show all parts of his body, on the first day to the Doctor, stripping himself bare of all clothes, but he was kind enough not to enforce the same in our case. When many more Indians had come, he simply told us to report to him if any one had got itches, etc., so that he might examine him in *camera*. At half past ten or eleven, the Governor and Chief Warder came. The

former was a firm, just and quiet-natured officer. His invariable inquiries were whether we were all right, whether we wanted anything, whether we had any complaints to make. Whenever we had any such, he heard them attentively, and gave us relief, if he could. Some of these complaints and grievances I shall refer to later on. His deputy came also at times. He was kind-hearted too. But the best of them all was our Chief Warder. Himself deeply religious, he was not only kind and courteous towards us, but every prisoner sang his praises in no measured terms. He was attentive in preserving to the prisoners all their rights, he overlooked their trivial faults, and knowing in our case that we were all innocent he was particularly kind to us, and to show his kindness he often came and talked to us.

INCREASE IN OUR NUMBERS

I have said before that there were only five of us passive resisters, at first. On 14th January, Tuesday, came in Mr. Thambi Naidu, the Chief Picket, and Mr. Koin, the President of the Chinese Association. We all were pleased to receive them. On the 18th, fourteen others joined us, including Samundar Khan. He was in for two months. The rest were Madrasis, Kunamias and Gujarati Hindus. They were arrested for hawking without licences, and sentenced to pay a fine of £2, and, in default, to 14 days' imprisonment. They had bravely elected to go to jail. On the 21st, 76 others came. In this batch only Nawab Khan had two months, the rest were with a fine of £2, or, in default, 14 days' imprisonment. Most of them were Gujarati Hindus, some Kunamias and some Madrasis. On the 22nd, 35, on the 23rd, 3, on the 24th, 1, on the 25th, 2, on the 28th, 6, and in the

evening 4 more, and on the 29th, 4 Kunamias added to our numbers. So that by the 29th, there were 155 passive resisters incarcerated. On the 30th, I was removed to Pretoria, but I knew that on that day 5 or 6 others had come in.

FOOD

The question of food is of great moment to many of us, in all circumstances, but to those in prison, it is of the greatest importance. They are greatly in need of good food. The rule is that a prisoner had to rest content with jail food, he cannot procure any from outside. The same is the case with a soldier who has to submit to his regulation rations, but the difference between the two is that his friends can send other food to the soldier and he can take it, while a prisoner is prohibited from doing so. So that this prohibition about food is one of the signs of being in prison. Even in general conversation, you will find the jail-officers, saying that there could be no exercise of taste about prison diet, and no such article could be allowed therein. In a talk with the prison medical officer, I told him that it was necessary for us to have some tea, or ghee or some such thing along with bread, and, he said, you want to eat with taste, and no palatable thing could be allowed in a prison.

According to the regulations, in the first week, an Indian gets, in the morning 12 oz of "mealie pap" without sugar or ghee; at noon, 4 oz. of rice and one oz. of ghee; in the evening, from 5 days, 12 oz. of mealie pap, for 3 days, 12 oz. of boiled beans and salt. This scale has been modelled on the dietary of the Kaffirs—the only difference being that in the evening, the Kaffirs are given crushed maize corn and lard or fat, while the

Indians get rice. In the second week, and thenceforward, for two days, boiled potatoes and for two days, cabbages, or pumpkin or some such vegetable is given along with maize flour. Those who take meat are given meat with vegetables on Sundays.

The first batch of prisoners had resolved to solicit for no favours at the hands of Government, and to take whatever food was served out, if not religiously objectionable. Really speaking, the above was not a proper kind of diet for Indians, though medically, of course, it contained sufficient nutrition. Maize is the daily food of the Kaffirs, so this diet suits them, nay, they thrive on it in jail. But Indians rarely use maize-flour, rice only suits them. We are not used to eat beans alone, nor could we like vegetables as cooked by or for Kaffirs. They never clean the vegetable nor season them with any spices. Again the vegetable cooked for the Kaffirs mostly consist of the peelings left after the same have been prepared for the European convicts. For spices, nothing else besides salt is given. Sugar is never dreamt of. Thus the food question was a very difficult one for us all. Still, as we had determined that the passive resisters were neither to solicit nor ask for favours from the jail authorities, we tried to rest content with this kind of food.

In reply to his inquiries we had told the Governor that the food did not suit us, but we were determined not to ask for any favours from Government. If Government of its own accord wanted to make a change, it would be welcome, else we would go on taking the regulation diet.

But this determination could not last long. When others joined us, we thought it would be improper to

make them share this trouble with us also. Was it not sufficient that they had shared the prison with us? So we began to talk to the Governor on their behalf. We told him, we were prepared to take any kind of food, but the later batches could not do so. He thought over the matter, and said that he would allow them to cook separately, if they put it on the ground of religion, but the articles of food would be the same, it did not rest with him to make any changes in them.

In the meantime, fourteen others had joined us, and some of them elected to starve rather than take mealie pap. So I read the jail rules and found out that applications in such matters should be made to the Director of Prisons. I asked, therefore, the Governor to be permitted to apply to him, and sent a petition accordingly.

We, the undersigned prisoners, beg to state that we are all Asiatics, 18 Indians and 3 Chinese.

The 18 Indians get for their breakfast mealie pap, and the others, rice and ghee; they get beans thrice and "pap" four times. We were given potatoes on Saturdays and greens on Sundays. On religious grounds, we cannot eat meat: some are entirely prohibited from taking it, and others cannot do so because of its not being religiously slaughtered.

The Chinese get maize-corn instead of rice. All the prisoners are mostly used to European food, and they also eat bread and other flour preparations. None of us is used to mealie pap, and some of us suffer from indigestion.

Seven of us have eaten no breakfast at all; only at times, when the Chinese prisoners who got bread, out of mercy, gave them a piece or two out of their rations, have we eaten the same. When this was mentioned to the Governor, he said we were guilty of a jail offence in thus accepting bread.

In our opinion this kind of food is entirely unsuitable to us. So we have to apply that we should be given food according to the rules for European prisoners and mealie pap be left out entirely; or, in the alternative, such food should be given as would sup port us, and be in consonance with our habits and customs.

This is an urgent matter and a reply be sent by wire.

Twenty-one of us had signed the petition and while it was being despatched seventy-six more came in. They also had a dislike for the "pap," and so we added a paragraph stating that the new arrivals also objected to the diet. I requested the Governor to send it by wire. He asked his superior's permission by telephone, and allowed at once 4 oz. of bread in place of "pap." We were all very pleased, and from the 22nd, 4 oz. of bread was substituted in place of pap, morning and evening. In the evening we got 8 oz., *i.e.*, half a loaf. But this was merely a temporary arrangement. A committee was sitting on the question and we heard that they had recommended an allowance of flour, ghee and pulse; but before it could take effect, we had been released, and so nothing more happened.

In the beginning when there was only eight of us we did not cook ourselves, so we used to get uncooked rice and ill-cooked vegetables whenever the same were given, so we obtained permission to cook of ourselves. On the first day, Mr. Kadva cooked. After that Mr. Thambi Naidu and Mr. Jivan both took up the function, and in our last days they had to cook for about 150 men. They had to cook once only, excepting on vegetable days which were two in a week—when they had to do so twice Mr. Naidu took great trouble over this. I used to distribute.

From the style of the petition the reader must have noted the fact that it was presented on behalf of all Indian prisoners and not us (eight) alone. We talked with the Governor also on the same lines and he had promised to look into it for all the Asiatic prisoners. We still hope that the jail diet of the Indians would be improved.

Again the three Chinese used to get other articles instead of rice, and hence annoyance was felt, as there was an appearance of their being considered separate from and inferior to us. For this reason, I applied, on their behalf, to the Governor and to Mr. Playford, and it was ordered that they should be placed on the same level as Indians.

It is instructive to compare this dietary with that of the Europeans. They get for their morning breakfast "pap" and 8 oz. of bread; for the midday meal, bread and soup or bread and meat, or bread and meat and potatoes or vegetables; and in the evenings bread and "pap." Thus they get bread thrice in the day, and so they do not care whether they have the "pap" or not. Again they get meat or soup, in addition. Besides this they are often given tea or cocoa. This will show that both the Europeans and the native Kaffirs get food suitable to them, and it is the poor Indians alone who suffer. They had no special dietary of their own. If they were treated like Europeans in food, they the Europeans would have felt ashamed, and no one had the concern to find out what was the food of the Indian. They had thus to be ranked with the Kaffirs and silently starve. For this state of circumstances I find fault with our own people, the Passive Resisters. Some Indians got the requisite food by stealth, others put up with whatever they got, and were either ashamed to make public the story of their distress or had no thought for others. Hence the outside public remained in the dark. If we were to follow truth and agitate where we got injustice, there would be no room to undergo such inconveniences. If we were to leave self and apply ourselves to the good of others, grievances would get remedied soon. But just as it is

necessary to take steps for the redress of such complaints, so it is necessary to think of certain other things also. It is but meet for prisoners to undergo certain inconveniences. If there be no trouble, what is the good of being called a prisoner? Those who are the masters of their minds, take pleasure even in suffering, and live happily in jails. They do not lose sight of the existence of the suffering, and they should not do so, considering that there are others also suffering with them.

There is another evil habit of ours, and that is our tenacity in sticking to our manners and customs. We must do in Rome as the Romans do. We are living in South Africa and we must accustom ourselves to what is considered good food here. "Mealie pap" is a food, as good, simple and cheap as our wheat. We cannot say it is without taste, sometimes, it beats wheat even. It is my belief that out of respect for the country of our adoption, we must take food which grows in that country, if it be not unwholesome. Many "Whites" like this "pap" and eat it in the morning. It becomes palatable if milk or sugar or even ghee be taken with it. For these reasons and for the fact that we might have to go to jail again, in the future, it is advisable for every Indian to accustom himself to this preparation of maize. With this habit even when the time comes to take it merely with salt, we would not find it hard to do so. It is incumbent on us to leave off some of our habits for the good of our country. All those nations that have advanced have given up these things where there was nothing substantial to lose. The Salvation Army people attract the natives of the soil, by adopting their customs, dress, etc., if not particularly objectionable.

SICKNESS

It would have been a miracle had no one out of 150 prisoners fallen ill. The first to be taken ill was Mr. Samundar Khan. He had been brought into jail ailing and was taken to Hospital the next day. Mr. Kadva was a victim to rheumatism, and for some days he did not mind being treated by the Doctor in the prison cell itself, but eventually he had to go to the Hospital too. Two others suffered from fainting fits and were taken there. The reason was that it was very hot then, and the convicts had to remain out in the sun the whole day, and so they fell down in fits. We nursed them as best we could. Later on Mr. Nawab Khan also succumbed, and on the day of our release he had to be led out by hand. He had improved a little after the Doctor had ordered milk, etc., to be given to him. On the whole, still, it may be safely said, that the Passive Resisters fared well.

PAUCITY OF SPACE

I have stated already that our cell had space enough to accommodate only fifty-one prisoners, and the same holds good with regard to the area. Later on when instead of 51 there were 151 souls to be accommodated, great difficulty was felt. The Governor had to pitch tents outside, and many had to go there. During our last days, about a hundred had to be taken out to sleep, and back again the morning. The area space was too small for this number, and we could pass our time there with great difficulty. Added to this was our evil inborn habit of spitting everywhere, which rendered the place dirty and there was the danger of disease breaking out. Fortunately our companions were amenable to advice,

and assisted us in keeping the compound clean. Scrupulous care was exercised in inspecting the area and privies, and this saved the inmates from disease. Every one will admit that the Government was at fault in incarcerating such a large number in so narrow a space. If the room was insufficient, it was incumbent on the Government not to send so many there, and if the struggle had been prolonged, it would not have been possible for the Government to commit any more to this prison.

READING

I have already mentioned that the Governor had allowed us the use of a table, with pen, ink, etc. We had the free run of the prison library also. I had taken from there the works of Carlyle and the Bible. From the Chinese Interpreter, who used to come there, I had borrowed the Kuran-e-Sharif translated into English, speeches of Huxley, Carlyle's Lives of Burns, Johnson, and Scott, and Bacon's Essays. Of my own I had taken the Bhagavad-Gita, with Manilal Nathubhai's Annotations, several Tamil works, an Urdu Book from the Moulvi Sahib the writings of Tolstoy, Ruskin and Socrates. Many of these I read or re-read in the jail. I used to study Tamil regularly. In the morning I used to read the Gita and at noon, mostly the Koran. In the evening I taught the Bible to Mr Foretoon, who was a Chinese Christian. He wanted to learn English, and I taught it to him through the Bible.

If I had been permitted to spend out my full period I would have been able to complete my translations of a book each of Carlyle and Ruskin. I believe that as I was fully occupied in the study of the above works, I

would not have become tired even if I had got more than two months; not only that but I would have added usefully to my knowledge and studies. I would have passed a happy life, believing as I do that whoever has a taste for reading good books is able to bear loneliness in any place with great ease.

RELIGIOUS STUDY

In the West, we now see, that, as a matter of fact, the State looks after the religion of all its prisoners, and hence, we find a Church in the Johannesburg prison for its inmates, but it is provided to meet only the needs of the Whites, who alone are allowed access thereto. I asked for special permission for Mr. Foretoon and myself, but the Governor told me it was only for White Christian prisoners. Every Sunday they attend it, and preachers of different denominations give them religious lessons there.

Several missionaries come in to convert the Kaffirs also with special permission. There is no Church for them; they sit in the open. Jews also have got their preachers to look after them. It is only the Hindus and Mahomedans who are spiritually left unprovided for. There are not many Indian prisoners, it is true, but the absence of any such provision for them is hardly creditable to them. The leaders of both communities should, therefore, lay their heads together, and arrange for the religious instruction of the members of their community in jail, even if there be only one convict. The preachers, whether Hindus or Moulvis, should be pure-hearted, and they should be careful not to become thorns in the sides of the convicts.

THE END

All that was worth knowing has been stated above. Indians being placed on a level with the Kaffirs is a fact which calls for further consideration. While the White convicts get a bedstead to sleep on, a tooth-brush to clean their teeth, a towel to wipe their faces and hands, and also a handkerchief, Indians get nothing. Why this distinction?

We should never think that this is not a matter for our interference. It is these little things which either enhance our respect or degrade us. An Arabic book says that he who has no self-respect has no religion. Nations have become great by gradually enhancing their self-respect. Self-respect does not mean vanity or rashness, but a state of mind which is prepared not to let go its privileges simply out of fear or idleness. One who has really his trust in God attains to self-respect, and I firmly believe that one who has no trust in Him never knows what is right, nor does he know how to do right.

II

Every prisoner in the jail on getting up in the morning is required to fold his own bedding, and to place it in its proper place. He must finish his toilet by 6 o'clock and be ready to start out at the stroke of the hour. The work begins at 7 o'clock. It is of various kinds. The ground to be dug was very hard. It was to be worked upon with spades, and hence the work proved too hard. Again, it was a very hot day. The place we were taken to was about a mile and a half from the jail. Each one of us started very well indeed. But as one of

us was used to this kind of work, it was not long before we were quite done up. As the day advanced, the work seemed harder still. The warder was very strict. He used to cry out every now and then, "go on, go on." This made the Indians quite nervous. I saw some of them weeping. One of them had a swollen foot. All this caused me a great deal of heart-burning, and yet on every occasion, I reminded them of the duty, and asked them to perform it as well as possible, with a good heart, and without minding the words of the warder, I felt myself done up also. My hands were covered with blisters and water was oozing out of them. I could hardly bend the spade and felt the weight of it as if it was quite a maund. I prayed to God to preserve my honour, to maintain my limbs intact, and to bestow on me sufficient strength to be able to perform my allotted task. I trusted to Him and went on with my work. The warder would sometimes remonstrate with me at an occasional break required to get over the fatigue. I told him that it was unnecessary for him to remind me of my duty, and that I was prepared to go through as much of it as was possible for me to do. Just then I saw Mr. Jhinabhai faint.....While I was pouring water on Jhinabhai's head, the following occurred to me. Most of the Indians trusted my word, and submitted themselves to imprisonment. If the advice that I happened to offer them were erroneous, how much sin I would be committing in the eyes of God in tendering it to them. They underwent all sorts of hardships on account of that advice. With this thought in my mind, I heaved a deep sigh. With God as my witness, I reflected on the subject once more, and was immediately reassured that it was all right. I felt that the advice

that I tendered to them was the only advice that I could under the circumstances. In anticipation of future happiness, it was absolutely necessary that we should undergo the hardest trials and sufferings in the first instance, and that there was no reason to be grieved at the letter. This was simply a fit of fainting, but even if it was a case of death, how could I offer any other advice than what I had already done? It at once occurred to me that it was more honourable for anybody to die suffering in that manner, than to continue living a life of perpetual enslavement.

* * * *

At one time one of the warders came to me, and asked me to provide him with two of his men to clean the water-closets. I thought that I could do nothing better than clean them myself and so I offered him my services. I have no particular dislike to that kind of work. On the contrary, I am of opinion that we ought to get ourselves accustomed to it.

I was given a bed in a ward, where there were principally Kaffir patients. Here I passed the whole night in great misery and terror. I did not know then that I was to be taken the next day to another cell that was occupied by Indian prisoners. Fretting that I would be kept incarcerated with such men, I got very nervous and terror-stricken. And yet I tried my best to reconcile myself to the idea that it was my duty to undergo the sufferings that may befall me. I read from the "Bhagawad-Gita," that I had with me, certain verses suited to the occasion, and, on pondering over them, was soon reconciled to the situation. The chief reason why I got nervous was that in the same room, there were a

number of wild, murderous looking, vicious Kaffir and Chinese prisoners. I did not know their language. One of the Kaffirs began to ply me with all sorts of questions As far as I could gather, he seemed to be mocking me indecently. I did not understand what his questions were and I kept quiet. He then asked me in his broken English, "Why have they brought you here?" I gave him a very short reply and was again silent. He was followed by one of the Chinamen. He was worse than the other. He approached my bed, and looked at me intently. I kept on my silence. He then proceeded towards the above-mentioned Kaffir's bed. There they began to mock each other indecently, and expose their private parts. Both these prisoners were probably there for murder or highway robbery. How could I enjoy sleep after seeing these deadful things?

(At one time) as soon as I got seated at the water closet there to answer the call of nature, a very wild and muscular looking Kaffir turned up. He asked me to get off from the seat, and began to abuse me. I told him I would not be long when he took hold of me, and threw me outside. Fortunately, I was able to catch hold of one of the doors, and to save myself from a nasty fall. This did not make me very nervous. I simply walked away with a smiling countenance. But one or two Indian prisoners who happened to see the situation in which I was placed, could not restrain themselves from shedding tears.

III

When on the 25th February I got three months' hard labour, and once again embraced my brother Indians and my son in the Volksrust Jail, I little thought that I should have had to say much in connection with my third "pilgrimage" to the jail, but with many other human assumptions, this too proved to be false. My experience this time was unique, and what I learnt therefrom I could not have learnt after years of study. I consider these three months invaluable. I saw many vivid pictures of passive resistance, and I have become, therefore, a more confirmed resister than what I was three months ago. For all this, I have to thank the Government of this place (the Transvaal).

Several officers had betted this that I should not get less than six months. My friends—old and renowned Indians—my own son—had got six months and so I too was wishing that they might win their bets. Still I had my own misgivings, and they proved true. I got only three months, that being the maximum under the law.

After going there, I was glad to meet Messrs. Dawood Muhammad, Rustamji, Sorabiji, Pillay, Hajura Sing, Lal Bahadur Sing and other 'fighters." Excepting for about ten all others were accommodated in tents, pitched in the jail compound for sleeping, and the scene resembled a camp more than a prison. Every one liked to sleep in the tents.

We were comfortable about our meals. We used to cook ourselves as before, and so could cook as we liked. We were about 77 passive resisters in all.

Those who were taken out for work had rather a hard time of it. The road near the Magistrate's Court

had to be built, so they had to dig up stones, etc., and carry them. After that was finished they were asked to dig up grass from the school compound. But mostly they did their work cheerfully. For three days I was also thus sent out with the "shans" (gangs) to work, but in the meanwhile a wire was received that I was not to be taken outside to work. I was disheartened at this as I liked to move out, because it improved my health and exercised my body. Generally I take two meals a day, but in the Volksrust Jail, on account of this exercise I felt hungry thrice. After this turn, I was given the work of a sweeper, but this was useless, and after a time even that was taken away.

WHY I WAS MADE TO LEAVE VOLKSRUST?

On the 2nd of March I heard that I was ordered to be sent to Pretoria. I was asked to be ready at once, and my warder and I had to go to the station in pelting rain, walking on hard roads, with my luggage on my head. We left by the evening train in a third class carriage.

My removal gave rise to various surmises. Some thought that peace was near, others, that after separating me from my companions, Government intended to oppress me more, and some others, that in order to stifle discussion in the House of Commons it might be intended to give me greater liberty and convenience.

I did not like to leave Volksrust, as we passed our days and nights pleasantly there talking to one another. Messrs. Hajura Sing and Joshi always put us questions, questions which were neither useless nor trivial, as they related to science and philosophy. How would one like to leave such company and such a camp?

But if everything happened as we wished, we should not be called human beings. So I left the place quietly. Saluting Mr. Kaji on the road, the warder and I got confined in a compartment. It was very cold, and raining too for the whole night. I had my overcoat with me which I was permitted to use. I was given bread and cheese for my meals on the way, but as I had eaten before I left, I gave them to my warder.

PRETORIA JAIL: THE BEGINNING

We reached Pretoria on the 3rd, and found everything new. The jail was newly built, and the men were new. I was asked to eat but I had no inclination to do so. Mealie meal porridge was placed before me. I tasted a spoonful only and then left it untouched. My warder was surprised at it, but I told him I was not hungry, and he smiled. Then I was handed over to another warder. He said, "Gandhi, take off your cap." I did so. Then he asked, "Are you the son of Gandhi?" I said, "No, my son is undergoing six months' imprisonment at Volksrust." He then confined me in a cell. I began to walk forwards and backwards in it. He saw it from the watch-hole in the door, and exclaimed, "Gandhi, don't walk about like that. It spoils my floor." I stopped, and stood in a corner, quietly. I had nothing to read even, as I had not yet got my books. I was confined at about eight, and at ten I was taken to the Doctor. He only asked me if I had any contagious disease, and then allowed me to go. I was then interned in a small room at eleven where I passed my whole time. It seemed to be a cell made for one prisoner only. Its dimensions were about 10×7 feet. The floor was of black pitch, which the warder tried to keep shining. There was only

one small glass window, barred with iron bars, for light and air. There was electric light kept to examine the inmates at night. It was not meant for the use of the prisoners, as it was not strong enough to enable one to read. When I went and stood very near it, I could read only a large-type book. It is put out at eight, but is again put on five or six times during the night, to enable the warders to look over the prisoners, through the watch-holes.

After eleven the Deputy-Governor came and I made these requests to him! for my books, for permission to write a letter to my wife who was ill, and for a small bench to sit on. For the first, he said, he would consider for the second, I might write, and for the third, no. Afterwards I wrote out my letter in Gujarati and gave it to be posted. He endorsed on it, that I should write it in English. I said, my wife did not know English, and my letters were a great source of a comfort to her, and that I had nothing special to write in them. Still I did not get the permission, and I declined to write in English. My books were given to me in the evening.

My mid-day meal I had to take standing in my cell with closed doors. At three, I asked leave for a bath. The warder said, "All right, but you had better go there after undressing yourself." (The place was 125 feet distant from my cell). I said, if there was no special object in my doing so, I would put my clothes on the curtain there and take my bath. He allowed it, but said, "Do not delay. Even before I had cleaned my body, he shouted out," "Gandhi, have you done?" I said, "I would do so in a minute." I could rarely see the face of an Indian. In the evening I got a blanket and a coir mat to sleep on but neither pillow nor plank. Even

when answering a call of nature, I was being watched by a warder. If he did not happen to know me, he would cry out, "Sam, come out." But Sam had got the bad habit of taking his full times in such a condition, so how could he get up at once? If he were to do so, he would not be easy. Sometimes the warders and sometimes the Kaffirs would peep in, and at times would sing out, "get up." The labour given to me next day was to polish the floor and the doors. The latter were of varnished iron, and what polish could be brought on them by rubbing? I spent three hours on each door rubbing, but found them unchanged, the same as before.

FOOD

The food was in keeping with the above conditions.

. . . . . .

I knew that no ghee was given with rice in the evening, and I had thought of remedying the defect. I spoke to the Chief Warder, but he said, ghee was to be given only on Wednesdays and Sunday noons in place of meat, and if its further supply were needed, I should see the Doctor. Next day applied to see him and I was taken to him.

I requested him to order out for all Indians ghee in place of fat. The Chief Warder was present and he added that Gandhi's request was not proper. Till then many Indians had used both fat and meat, and that those who objected to fat, were given dry rice, which they ate without any objection; that the passive resisters had also done so, and when they were released, they left with added weight. The Doctor asked me what I had to say to that. I replied that I could not quite swallow the story, but speaking for myself, I should spoil my health, if I

were compelled to take rice without ghee. Then he said, "for you specially, I would order bread to be given." I said, "thank you, but I had not applied for myself alone, and I would not be able to take bread for myself alone, till ghee was ordered to be given to all others." The Doctor said, "Then you should not find fault with me, now."

I again petitioned and I came to learn that the food regulations would ultimately be made as in Natal. I criticised that also and gave the reasons why I could not for myself alone accept ghee. At last, when in all about a month and a half had elapsed, I got a reply stating that wherever there were many Indian prisoners, ghee would invariably be given. Thus it might be said that after a month and a half I broke my fast, and for the last month I was able to take rice, ghee and bread. But I took no breakfast and at noon, when pap was doled out, I hardly took ten spoonfuls, as every day it was differently prepared. But still I got good nourishment from the bread and rice, and so my health improved. I say so, because when I used to eat once only, it had broken down. I had lost all strength, and for ten days I was suffering from a severe ache in half of my forehead. My chest too had shewn symptoms of being affected.

I had told many passive resisters that, if they left jail with spoiled health, they would be considered wanting in the right spirit. We must turn our prisons into palaces so that when I found my own health getting ruined I felt apprehensive lest I should have to go out for that reason. It has to be remembered that I had not availed myself of the order for ghee made in my favour, so that there was a chance of my health getting affected, but this does not apply in the case of others, as it is open to

each individual prisoner, when he is in jail, to have some special order made in his favour, and thus preserve his health.

OTHER CHANGES

I have said that my Warder was harsh in his dealings with me. But this did not last long. When he saw that I was fighting with the Government about food, &c., but obeying his orders unreservedly, he changed his conduct and allowed me to do as I liked. This removed my difficulties about bath, latrine, &c. He became so considerate that he scarcely allowed it to be seen that he *ordered* me to do anything. The man who succeeded him was like a Pasha and he was always anxious to work after my conveniences. He said, "I love those who fight for their community, I myself am such a fighter, and I do not consider you to be a convict." He thus used to comfort me.

Again, the bench which was refused in the beginning was sent to me, by the Chief Warder himself, after some days. In the meanwhile I had received two religious books for reading from General Smuts. From this I concluded that the hardship I had to undergo were due, not to his express orders, but to the carelessness and indifference to himself and others, and also because the Indians were considered to be like Kaffirs. The only object of isolating me appeared to be to prevent my talking with others. After some trouble I got permission for the use of a note-book and pencil.

THE VISIT OF THE DIRECTOR

Before I was taken to Pretoria, Mr. Lichenstein had seen me with special permission. He had come to see on office business, but he asked me how I was, &c. I

was not willing to answer him on the point, but he pressed me. So I said, "I will not tell you all, but I will say this much, that they treat me cruelly. General Smuts by this means wants me to give in, but that would never be, as I was prepared to undergo whatever befell me, that my mind was at peace, but that you should publish, this. After coming out, I myself would do so." He communicated it to Mr. Polak, who not being able to keep it to himself in his turn spoke to others, and Mr. David Polak thereupon wrote to Lord Selborne and an inquiry was held. The warder came for that purpose and I spoke to him the very words set out above. I also pointed out the defects, which I have mentioned in the beginning. Thereupon, after ten days he sent me a plank for bed, a pillow, a night shirt and a handkerchief, which I took. In my memorial to him I had asked him to provide this convenience for all Indians. Really speaking, in this respect Indians are softer than the whites, and they cannot do without pillows.

HANDCUFFS

The opinion I had come to, in consequence of my treatment in jail in the beginning, was confirmed by what happened now. About four days after I received a witness summons in Mr. Pillay's case. So I was taken to Court. I was manacled this time, and the Warder took no time in putting on the handcuffs. I think this was done unintentionally. The Chief Warder had seen me and from him I had obtained leave to carry a book with me. He seemed to be under the impression that I was ashamed of the manacles, and so I had asked permission to carry a book, and hence he asked me to

hold the book in my hands in such a way as to conceal the handcuffs. This made me smile, as I was feeling honoured in thus being manacled. The book that I was carrying was called, "The Court of God is in Their Mind." I thought this a happy coincidence, because I thought what hardships might trouble me externally, if I were such as to make God live in my heart, what should I care for the hardships? I was thus taken on foot, handcuffed, to Court.

LESSONS OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE

Some of the above details might be considered trivial, but my main object in setting them out has been that to minor as well as important matters you can apply the principles of resistance. I calmly acquiesced in all the troubles, bodily given to me by the warder, with the result that not only was I able to remain calm and quiet, but that he himself had to remove them in the end. If I had opposed him, my strength of mind would have become weakened, and I could not have done these more important things that I had to do, and in the bargain made him my enemy.

My food difficulty also was solved at last because I resisted, and underwent suffering in the beginning.

The greatest good I derived from these sufferings was that by undergoing bodily hardships I could see my mental strength clearly increasing, and it is even now maintained. The experience of the last three months has left me more than ever prepared to undergo all such hardships with ease. I feel that God helps such conscientious objectors, and in putting them to the test, He only burdens them with such sufferings as they can bear.

WHAT I READ

The tale of my happiness or unhappiness is now at an end. Amongst the many benefits I received in these three months, one was the opportunity I got to read. At the start, I must admit, I fell into moods of despondency and thoughtfulness while reading, and was even tired of these hardships, and my mind played antics like a monkey. Such a state of mind leads many towards lunacy, but, in my case, my books saved me They made up in a large measure for the loss of the society of my Indian brethren. I always got about three hours to read.

So that I was able to go through about thirty books, and con over others, which comprised English, Hindi, Gujarathi, Sanskrit and Tamil works. Out of these, I consider Tolstoys' Emerson's and Carlyle's worth mentioning. The two former related to religion. I had borrowed the Bible from the jail Tolstoy's books are so simple and easy that any man can study and profit by them. Again he is a man who practices what he preaches, and hence his writings inspire great confidence.

Carlyle's French Revolution is written in a very effective style. It made me think that from the White Nations we could hardly learn the remedy to remove the present miseries of India, because I am of opinion that the French people have secured no special benefits by their Revolution. This was what Mazzini thought too. There is a great conflict of opinion about this, which it is hardly proper to mention here. Even there I saw some instances of passive resistance.

The Swamiji had sent me Gujarati, Hindi and Sanskrit books. Bhai Keshavram had sent *Vedasabdasankhlja* and Mr. Motilal Devan, the Upanishads. I also read the

Manusmriti, the Ramayana Sar, published in Phœnix, the *Patanjal Yog Darshana*, the *Ahnik Prakash* of Nathuramji, the *Sandhya Gutika* given by Professor Parmanand, the *Bhagavad Gita* and the works of the late Kavi Shri Rajchandra. This gave me much food for thought. The Upanishads produced in me great peacefulness. One sentence specially has struck to me. It means, "whatever thou dost, thou shouldst do the same for the good of the soul." The words are of great importance and deserve great consideration too.

But I derived the greatest satisfaction from the writings of Kavi Shri Rajchandra. In my opinion they are such as should attract universal belief and popularity. His life was as exemplary and high as Tolstoy's. I had learnt some passages from them and from the Sandhya book by heart and repeated them at night while lying awake. Every morning also for half an hour I used to think over them, and repeat what I had learnt by heart. This kept my mind in a state of cheerfulness, night and day. If disappointment or despair attacked me at times, I would think over what I had read and my heart would instantly become gladdened, and thank God. . . . I would only say, that in this world good books make up for the absence of good companions, so that all Indians, if they want to live happily in jail, should accustom themselves to reading good books.

MY TAMIL STUDIES

What the Tamils have done in the struggle no other Indian community has done. So I thought that if for no other reason than to show my sincere gratefulness to them, I should seriously read their books. So I spent the last month in attentively studying their language. The

more I studied, the more I felt its beauties. It is an interesting and sweet language, and from its construction and from what I read, I saw that the Tamils counted in their midst, in the past and even now, many intelligent, clever and wise persons. Again, if there is to be one nation in India, those who live outside the Madras Presidency, must know Tamil.

THE END

I wish that the result of the perusal of these experiences would be that he who knows not what patriotism is would learn it, and after doing so, become a passive resister, and he who is so already, would be confirmed in his attitude. I also get more and more convinced that he who does not know his true duty or religion would never know what patriotism or feeling for one's own country is.

Passive Resistance

HOW THE IDEA ORIGINATED

In answer to a question put to him by the Rev. Joseph Doke, his biographer, as to the birth and evolution of this principle so far as he was concerned, Mr. Gandhi replied as follows: —

"I remember," he said, "how one verse of a Gujarati poem, which, as a child, I learned at school, clung to me. In substance it was this:—

"If a man gives you a drink of water and you give him a drink in return, that is nothing.

Real beauty consists in doing good against evil."

"As a child, this verse had a powerful influence over me, and I tried to carry it into practice. Then came the 'Sermon on the Mount.'"

"But," said I, "surely the *Bhagavad-Gita* came first?"

"No," he replied, "of course I knew the *Bhagavad-Gita* in Sanskrit tolerably well, but I had not made its teaching in that particular a study. It was the New Testament which really awakened me to the rightness and value of Passive Resistance. When I read in the 'Sermon on the Mount' such passages as 'Resist not him that is evil but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also' and 'Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may

be sons of your Father which is in heaven.' I was simply overjoyed, and found my own opinion confirmed where I least expected it. The *Bhagavad Gita* deepened the impression, and Tolstoy's 'The Kingdom of God is Within You' gave it a permanent form."

Tolstoy, Ruskin, Thoreau and the Passive Resistance Movement in England "had proved an object lesson, not only to him but to his people, of singular force and interest." Mr Gandhi's ideal "is not so much to resist evil passively; it has its active compliment—to do good in reply to evil." In answer to Rev. Joseph Doke, he said:—

I do not like the term "passive resistance." It fails to convey all I mean. It describes a method, but gives no hint of the system of which it is only part. Real beauty, and that is my aim, is in doing good against evil. Still, I adopt the phrase because it is well-known, and easily understood, and because, at present, the great majority of my people can only grasp that idea. To me, the ideas which underlie the Gujarati hymn and the "Sermon on the Mount" should revolutionise the whole of life.

SOUL FORCE *v.* PHYSICAL FORCE

The advantages of soul-force against physical force are well pictured by Mr. Gandhi in the following words:—

Passive resistance is an all-sided sword; it can be used anyhow; it blesses him who uses it and him against whom it is used without drawing a drop of blood; it produces far-reaching results. It never rusts and cannot be

stolen. Competition between passive resisters does not exhaust them. The sword of passive resistance does not require a scabbard, and one cannot be forcibly dispossessed of it

---

THE ORIGIN OF THE MOVEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

As to how the movement originated in South Africa, here is Mr. Gandhi's statement:—

Some years ago, when I began to take an active part in the public life of Natal, the adoption of this method occurred to me as the best course to pursue, should petitions fail, but, in the then unorganised condition of our Indian community, the attempt seemed useless. Here, however, in Johannesburg, when the Asiatic Registration Act was introduced, the Indian community was so deeply stirred, and so knit together in a common determination to resist it, that the moment seemed opportune Some action they would take; it seemed to be best for the Colony, and altogether right, that their action should not take a riotous form, but that of Passive Resistance. They had no vote in Parliament, no hope of obtaining redress, no one would listen to their complaints. The Christian churches were indifferent, so I proposed this pathway of suffering, and after much discussion, it was adopted. In September, 1906, there was a large gathering of Indians in the old Empire Theatre, when the position was thoroughly faced, and, under the inspiration of deep feeling, and on the proposal of one of our leading men, they swore a solemn oath committing themselves to Passive Resistance.

THE GENESIS OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE.

In an address that Mr. Gandhi delivered before an audience of Europeans at the Germiston (Transvaal) Literary and Debating Society in 1908, he said :—

Passive resistance was a misnomer. But the expression had been accepted as it was popular, and had been for a long time used by those who carried out in practice the idea denoted by the term. The idea was more completely and better expressed by the term "soul-force." As such, it was as old as the human race. Active resistance was better expressed by the term " body force." Jesus Christ, Daniel and Socrates represented the purest form of passive resistance or soul-force. All these teachers counted their bodies as nothing in comparison to their soul Tolstoy was the best and brightest (modern) exponent of the doctrine. He not only expounded it, but lived according to it. In India, the doctrine was understood and commonly practised long before it came into vogue in Europe. It was easy to see that soul force was infinitely superior to body force. If people in order to secure redress of wrongs, resorted to soul force, much of the present suffering would be avoided. In any case the wielding of this force never caused suffering to others. So that, whenever it was misused, it only injured the users, and not those against whom it was used. Like virtue, it was its own reward. There was no such thing as failure in the use of this kind of force. " Resist not evil " meant that evil was not to be repelled by evil, but by good ; in other words, physical force was to be opposed not by its like but by soul-force. The

same idea was expressed in Indian philosophy by the expression, "freedom from injury to every living thing." The exercise of this doctrine involved physical suffering on the part of those who practised it. But it was a known fact that the sum of such suffering was greater rather than less in the world. That being so, all that was necessary for those who recognised the immeasurable power of soul force, was consciously and deliberately to accept physical suffering as their lot, and when this was done, the very suffering became a source of joy to the sufferer. It was quite plain that passsive resistance thus understood, was infinitely superior to physical force, and that it required greater courage than the latter. No transition was, therefore, possible from passive resistance to active or physical resistance. . . . . The only condition of a successful use of this force was a recognition of the existence of the soul as apart from the body, and its permanent and superior nature. And this recognition must amount to a living faith and not a mere intellectual grasp.

PASSIVE RESISTERS IN THE TOLSTOY FARM

Writing to a friend from the Tolstoy Farm, where he was living with a number of passive resisters' families, Mr. Gandhi says, touching manual labour:—

I prepare the bread that is required on the farm. The general opinion about it is that it is well made. Manilal and a few others have learnt how to prepare it. We put in no yeast and no baking power. We grind our own

wheat. We have just prepared some marmalade from the oranges grown on the farm. I have also learnt how to prepare coromel coffee. It can be given as a beverage even to babies. The passive resisters on the farm have given up the use of tea and coffee, and taken to coromel coffee prepared on the farm. It is made from wheat which is first baked in a certain way and then ground. We intend to sell our surplus production of the above three articles to the public later on. Just at present, we are working as labourers on the construction work that is going on, on the farm, and have not time to produce more of the articles above-mentioned than we need for ourselves.

A LESSON TO INDIA

Mr. Gandhi wrote these lines in reply to the Rev. Joseph Doke, his well-known biographer, who had invited him to send a message to his countrymen in India with reference to the unrest in 1909 :—

The struggle in the Transvaal is not without its interest for India. We are engaged in raising men who will give a good account of themselves in any part of the world. We have undertaken the struggle on the following assumptions :—

(1) Passive Resistance is always infinitely superior to physical force.

(2) There is no inherent barrier between European and Indian anywhere.

(3) Whatever may have been the motives of the British rulers in India, there is a desire on the part of the Nation at large to see that justice is done. It would be a

calamity to break the connection between the British people and the people of India. If we are treated as, or assert our right to be treated as, free men, whether in India or elsewhere, the connection between the British people and the people of India cannot only be mutually beneficial, but is calculated to be of enormous advantage to the world religiously, and, therefore, socially and politically. In my opinion, each Nation is the complement of the other.

Passive Resistance in connection with the Transvaal struggle I should hold justifiable on the strength of any of these propositions. It may be a slow remedy, not only for our ills in the Transvaal, but for all the political and other troubles from which our people suffer in India.

A MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS

The following message to the Congress was published in the Indian Review *for December, 1909 :—*

You have cabled me for a message to the forthcoming Congress. I do not know that I am at all competent to send any message. Simple courtesy, however, demands that I should say something in reply to your cable. At the present moment I am unable to think of anything but the task immediately before me, namely, the struggle that is going on in the Transvaal. I hope our countrymen throughout India realise that it is national in its aim, in that it has been undertaken to save India's honour. I may be wrong, but I have not hesitated publicly to remark that it is the greatest struggle of modern times, because it is the purest as well in its goal as in its

methods. Our countrymen in the Transvaal are fighting for the right of cultured Indians to enter the Transvaal in common with Europeans. In this the fighters have no personal interest to serve, nor is there any material gain to accrue to anybody after the above-mentioned right (which has for the first time in Colonial Legislation been taken away) is restored. The sons of Hindustan, who are in the Transvaal, are showing that they are capable of fighting for an ideal, pure and simple. The methods adopted in order to secure relief are also equally pure and equally simple. Violence in any shape or form is entirely eschewed. They believe that self-suffering is the only true and effective means to procure lasting reforms. They endeavour to meet and conquer hatred by love. They oppose the brute or physical force by soul force. They hold that loyalty to an earthly sovereign or an earthly constitution is subordinate to loyalty to God and His constitution. In interpreting God's constitution through their conscience they admit that they may possibly be wrong. Hence, in resisting or disregarding those man-made laws which they consider to be inconsistent with the eternal laws of God, they accept with resignation the penalties provided by the former, and trust to the working of time and to the best in human nature to make good their position. If they are wrong, they alone suffer, and the established order of things continues. In the process, over 2,500 Indians or nearly one-half of the resident Indian population, or one-fifth of the possible Indian population of the Transvaal, have suffered imprisonment, carrying with it terrible hardships. Some of them have gone to gaol again and again. Many families have been impoverished. Several merchants have accepted privation rather than surrender

their manhood. Incidentally, the Hindu-Mahomedan problem has been solved in South Africa. We realise there that the one cannot do without the other. Mahomedans, Parsees and Hindus, or taking them provincially, Bengalees, Madrasees, Punjabis, Afghanistanees, and Bombayites, have fought shoulder to shoulder.

I venture to suggest that a struggle such as this is worthy of occupying the best, if not, indeed, the exclusive attention of the Congress. If it be not impertinent I would like to distinguish between this and the other items on the programme of the Congress. The opposition to the laws or the policy with which the other items deal does not involve any material suffering : the Congress activity consists in a mental attitude without corresponding action. In the Transvaal case the law and the policy it enunciates being wrong, we disregard it, and therefore consciously and deliberately suffer material and physical injury ; action follows, and corresponds to, our mental attitude. If the view here submitted be correct, it will be allowed that in asking for the best place in the Congress programme for the Transvaal question, I have not been unreasonable. May I also suggest that in pondering over and concentrating our attention upon passive resistance such as has been described above, we would perchance find out that, for the many ills we suffer from India, passive resistance is an infailiable panacea. It is worthy of careful study, and I am sure it will be found that it is the only weapon that is suited to the genius of our people and our land, which is the nursery of the most ancient religions and has very little to learn from modern civilization—a civilization based on violence of the blackest type, largely a negation of the Divine in man, and which is rushing headlong to its own ruin.

THE GAINS OF THE PASSIVE RESISTANCE STRUGGLE

The following is an English rendering from Gujarati, originally published in the "Indian Review" for Nov. Dec., 1911:—

Very often we come across Indians who question the utility of passive resistance as carried on in this country (South Africa). They say that what our people have got as a result of the terrible sufferings in the jails and outside is some proposed modification in the Immigration Law, which they cannot understand, and which is hardly likely to be of any practical value to them. The maximum gain from the struggle, according to their view, is that thereby a few very highly-educated Indins who are least likely to be of any use to them will find it possible to enter the country. For the edification of those who hold the above view, we propose to give a short summary of the gains thereof.

That thereby the Indian community could preserve its national self-respect: according to our proverb, one who can preserve his self-respect can preserve everything else.

That thereby the Registration Act of 1907 has got to be swept off the statute book.

That thereby the whole of India became acquainted with our disabilities in this country.

That through it other nations became acquainted with our grievances and began to appreciate us better.

That by it was brought about the prohibition of Indian indentured labour to Natal by the Indian Government.

That the struggle helped to bring about some desirable modification in the Licencing Law of Natal.

That it brought about the disallowance of the Registration Law of Rhodesia which was framed on the same basis as that of the Transvaal.

That it brought about the disallowance of the most obnoxious Licensing Law of Natal. Any one who doubts this statement had better refer to the despatch of the Imperial Government disallowing the Act and the reasons for such disallowance.

That but for the struggle the other Colonies in South Africa would have passed Immigration Restriction Laws similar to the law in the Transvaal.

That but for the struggle, the Transvaal Legislature would have passed other Anti-Asiatic Law as harsh as the Immigration Restriction Law.

That the struggle brought about the repeal of the Railway Regulations which differentiated between the white and the coloured people and that they are now applicable to all equally.

That it is a matter of common knowledge that the Transvaal Registration Law of 1907 was the first of a series of Anti-Asiastic Laws that were proposed to be added to the statute book. The unanimous opposition of the Indians to this law, however, deterred the Transvaal Government from taking up the other legislation.

That it brought into existance a committee consisting of Europeans under the presidency of Mr. Hosken which could not have come into existence otherwise. This committee is likely to be useful to Indians in their future struggle.

That besides those who have already joined the committee, it has created, in a great many other Europeans, feelings of sympathy and regard for Indians.

That thereby the Indian community has gained a great deal of prestige and that those Europeans who before the struggle used to treat Indians with contempt, have been taught to show them due regard and consideration.

That the Government now feels that the strength which is in us is unconquerable.

That the majority of the Indians domiciled in the country showed themselves quite cowardly before the struggle. It has, however, given them more vigour and courage. Those who were afraid even to whisper before that time, are now boldly speaking out their minds as men.

That whereas before the struggle, there was no woman's movement in Johannesburg, now there is a class opened under Mrs. Vogle who gives her services free to the community.

That jail life which seemed so dreadful to Indians before the struggle, is no longer terrifying to them.

That although on account of the struggle, Mr. Cachalia and others have lost almost all their earthly possessions, they feel that as a consequence thereof, they have acquired much strength of mind and character which they could not have purchased with any amount of money and which nothing but the actual struggle could have infused into them.

That but for the struggle, the Indian community would have continued to remain ignorant of the fact that in the Tamil section thereof, there were men and women

who were great assets to this people, and who would do credit to any community.

That the struggle, which brought about the Transvaal Law of 1908, revived the rights of hundreds of Indians who had left the country during the great war.

That the Indian community now stands before the world fully acquitted of all charges of fraud which were levelled against them before the present settlement.

That the withdrawal of the Bill introduced in the Union Parliament exempting Europeans from the payment of the poll-tax in Natal is one of the freshest instances showing the dread the authorities have of a fresh passive resistance struggle on the part of Indians.

That the struggle made General Smuts rescind his own orders on three and the Imperial Government on two different occasions.

That before the struggle, all laws used to be framed against us independently of us and what we thought of them, but that since the struggle the authorities are obliged to take our views and feelings into their consideration and they certainly show more regard to them.

That as a consequence of the struggle, the prestige of the Indian community stands on a much higher level than ever before. Better this than the riches of the whole world.

That the community has demonstrated to the world the invulnerability of " Truth."

That by keeping its full faith in God the community has vindicated the glory of Religion. " Where there is truth and where there is religion, there alone is victory."

On bestowing more thought on the question and looking at it from its various bearings, one can find much more to say as to the fruits thereof, than what has been

stated above. The last on the list, however, is incomparably the best of them all. Such a great fight could not have been carried on successfully without fully trusting in God. He was our only prop all that time. Those who put their implicit faith in Him cannot but reach their aims. The struggle will not have been carried on in vain, if, as a result of it, we shall have learnt to put still more trust in Him.

The Champaran Enquiry

LABOUR TROUBLE IN BEHAR

For many years past the relations of landlords and tenants and the circumstances attending the cultivation of indigo in the Champaran District have not been satisfactory. In response to an insistent public demand to inquire into the conditions under which Indian labourers work in the Indigo Plantations, Mr. Gandhi arrived at Muzaffarpur on the 15th April, 1917, whence he took the midday train for Motihari. Next day he was served with a notice to quit the District " by next available train as his presence," the notice announced " will endanger the public peace and may lead to serious disturbance which may be accompanied by loss of life." Mr. Gandhi replied :—

Whith reference to the order under Sec. 144, Cr. P. C., just served upon me, I beg to state that I am sorry that you have felt called upon to issue it; and I am sorry too that the Commissioner of the Division has totally mis-interpreted my position. Out of a sense of public responsibility, I feel it to be my duty to say that I am unable to leave this district, but if it so pleases the authorities, I shall submit to the order by suffering the penalty of disobedience.

I most emphatically repudiate the Commissioner's suggestion that ' my object is likely to be agitation.' My desire is purely and simply for ' genuine search for

knowledge ' and this I shall continue to satisfy so long as I am left free.

Mr. Gandhi appeared before the Magistrate on the 18th instant and read the following statement before the Court :—

With the permission of the Court I would like to make a brief statement showing why I have taken the very serious step of seemingly disobeying the order made under S. 144 of the Cr P. C. In my humble opinion it is a question of difference of opinion between the local administration and myself. I have entered the country with motives of rendering humanitarian and national service, I have done so in response to a pressing invitation to come and help the ryots, who urge they are not being fairly treated by the indigo planters. I could not render any help without studying the problem. I have, therefore, come to study it with the assistance, if possible, of the administration and the planters. I have no other motive and I cannot believe that my coming here can in any way disturb public peace or cause loss of life. I claim to have considerable experience in such matters. The administration, however, have thought differently. I fully appreciate their difficulty, and I admit too, that they can only proceed upon the information they receive. As a law-abiding citizen, my first instinct would be as it was, to obey the order served upon me. I could not do so without doing violence to my sense of duty to those for whom I came I feel that I could just now serve them only by remaining in their midst. I could not, therefore, voluntarily retire. Amid this conflict of duty I could only throw the responsibility of removing me from them on the administration. I am fully conscious of the fact that a person, holding in the public life of

India a position such as I do, has to be most careful in setting examples. It is my firm belief that in the complex constitution under which we are living, the only safe and honourable course for a self-respecting man is, in the circumstances such as face me, to do what I have decided to do, that is, to submit without protest to the penalty of disobedience. I have ventured to make this statement not in any way in extenuation of the penalty to be awarded against me, but to show that I have disregarded the order served upon me, not for want of respect for lawful authority, but in obedience to the higher law of our being—the voice of conscience.

Under instructions from higher authorities the notice was soon withdrawn. Early in June a commission was appointed to enquire into the agrarian troubles in the Behar plantations with Mr. Gandhi himself as one of the members of the commission. In December, 1917, the Champaran Agrarian Bill based on the recommendations of the Commission was passed in the Behar Legislative Council when the Hon. Mr. Maude who moved the Bill made a frank statement of the scandals which necessitated the enquiry, thus justifying Mr. Gandhi's work on behalf of the labourers.

The Kaira Question

THE SITUATION IN KAIRA

In the year 1916-17 there was serious and widespread failure of crops in the District of Kaira in Gujarat. Under the revenue rules the ryots were entitled to full suspension of taxes if the yield was less than 4 as. in the rupee and half suspension if between 4 and 6 as. The Government granted complete suspensian to one village only out of a total of 600, half suspension to some 104 villages and issued orders to collect revenue from the rest. The ryots claimed that the Governmeut were wrong in their estimate and Mr. Gandhi and Mr. V. J. Patel who conducted an enquiry also came to the same conclusion. The Government persisted in collecting revenues as usual. Petitions and protests having been of no avail, the ryots resorted to passive resistance under the guidance of Mr. Gandhi. In the following lecture at Bombay in February, 1918, Mr. Gandhi narrated the story of the trouble in Kaira in his usually brief and lucid manner :—

I do not want to say much. I have received a letter asking me to be present at to-morrow's deputation that is going to wait on his Excellency the Governor, and I am sure I will be able to explain to him the true facts. Still I must make it clear here that the responsibility of the notice issued by the Gujarat Sabha lies on me. I was at Ahmedabad before that notice was issued, where

the matter of Kaira District was being discussed, when it was decided that the Gujarat Sabha ought to take part in the matter. I think that, as regards this notice, a mountain has been made out of a mole-hill. Everyone knew what the notice was when it was being framed. Nobody then even dreamt that Government would misinterpret it. The Sabha had with it sufficient data about the plight of the people. They came to know that Government officials were collecting taxes and the people were even selling their cattle to pay the taxes. The matter had come to such a pass, and, knowing this, the Sabha thought it better to issue a notice to console the people who braved these hardships. And the notice was the result of that information, and I have every hope that in the deputation that is going to wait on the Governor, the result of the deliberations will end in the success of the people.

COMMISSIONER'S WRATH

If the Commissioner had not been angry with us, and had talked politely with the deputation that waited on him, and had not misinstructed the Bombay Government, such a grave crisis would not have eventuated, and we would not have had the trouble of meeting here this evening. The Sabha's request was to suspend the collection of dues till the negotiations were over. But Government did not take this proper course and issued an angry Press Note. It was my firm belief— and even now I firmly believe—that the representatives of the people and Government could have joined together and taken the proper steps. I regret to have to say that Government has made a mistake. Perhaps subordinate officers of Government would say to Government that

the notice was issued not from a pure motive, but from some other ulterior motive. If Government are impressed with this erroneous belief, those who have stood by the people, I hope, will continue to stand by them to the end and will not retreat. Any responsible right-thinking man could have given them the same advice. People possess the same rights as the authorities have, and public men have every right to advise the people of their rights. The people that do not fight for their rights are like slaves (hear, hear), and such people do not deserve Home Rule. When authorities think that they can take anything from the people and can interfere, a difficult situation arises. And if such a situation arises, I must plainly say that those who have given the people the right advice, will stand by them till the end.

THE WEAPONS

I have not yet come to any conclusion, and I sincerely trust that those who understand the responsibility, will not hesitate to undergo hardships in order to secure justice. (Applause). And in such an eventuality I hope you will not beat an ignominous retreat. The first and the last principle of passive resistance is that we should not inflict hardships on others, but put up with them ourselves in order to get justice, and Government need not fear anything if we make up our mind, as we are bent on getting sheer justice from it and nothing else. To get that justice we must fight with the authorities and the people that do not so fight are but slaves. We can have only two weapons on occasions like this: Revolt or passive resistance, and my request is for the second remedy always. The right of suffering hardships and claiming justice and getting our demands is from

one's birth. Similarly we have to get justice at the hands of Government by suffering hardships. We must suffer hardships like brave men. What I have to say is, resort to the right means, and that very firmly, in order to remove the distress through which the Gujarat people are passing. It is my conviction that, if we tell the truth to the British Government, it can ultimately be convinced, and if only we are firm in our resolve, rest assured that Kaira people shall suffer wrongs no more. (Loud cheers).

THE VOW OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE

As a result of the persistent refusal of Government to recognize the serious state of affairs in Kaira and grant a suspension of revenue, a passive resistance movement was inaugurated under Mr. Gandhi's lead. At the meeting on the 22nd March, 1918, at Nadiad, Mr. Gandhi exhorted the ryots to resort to Satyagraha, and over 200 men signed the following declaration:—

Knowing that the crops of our villages are less than four annas we had requested the Government to suspend the revenue collection till the ensuing year. As however Government has not acceded to our prayer, we, the undersigned, hereby solemnly declare that we shall not pay the full or remaining revenue, but we will let the Government take such legal steps as they may think fit to collect the same and we shall gladly suffer all the consequences of our refusal to pay. We shall allow our lands to be confiscated, but we shall not, of our own accord, pay anything and thereby lose our self-respect

and prove ourselves wrong. If Government decide to suspend the second instalment of the revenue throughout the district, those amongst us who are in a position to pay, will pay the whole or the balance of the revenue as may be due. The reason why those of us who have the money to pay and still do not, is that if they do the poorer might in panic sell their things or borrow to pay and thereby suffer.

Under the circumstances we believe it is the duty of those who are able to pay to protect the poor.

STATEMENT ON THE KAIRA DISTRESS

Mr. Gandhi sent to the Press the following statement on the Kaira distress under date 28th March, 1918:—

In the District of Kaira the crops for the year 1917-18 have, by common admission, proved a partial failure. Under the Revenue rules if the crops are under four annas, the cultivators are entitled to full suspension of the Revenue assessment for the year; if the crops are under six annas, half the amount of assessment is suspended. So far as I am aware, the Government have been pleased to grant full suspension with regard to one village out of nearly 600, and half-suspension in the case of over 103 villages. It is claimed on behalf of the ryots that the suspension is not at all adequate to the actuality. The Government contend that in the vast majority of villages crops have been over six annas. The only question, therefore, at issue is, whether the crops have been under four annas or six annas, as the case may be, or over the latter figure. Government valuation is in the first instance made by the Talatis assisted by the chiefman of the villages concerned. As a rule no check

on their figures is considered necessary, for it is only during partial failure of crops that Government valuation of crops may have to be challenged. The Talatis are as a class obsequious, unscrupulous and tyrannical. The chief men are especially selected for their docility. The Talati's one aim is naturally to collect full assessment as promptly as possible. We sometimes read accounts of assiduous Talatis having been awarded 'pugrees' for making full collection. In applying to the Talatis the adjectives I have given, I wish to cast no reflections on them as men. I merely state the fact. The Talatis are not born; they are made; and rent-collectors all the world over have to cultivate a callousness without which they could not do their work to the satisfaction of their masters. It is impossible for me to reproduce the graphic description given by the ryots of the recent collectors which the Talatis chiefly are. My purpose in dealing with the Talatis is to show that the Government's valuation of the crops is derived in the first instance from the tainted source and is presumably biassed against the ryots. As against their valuation we have the universal testimony of ryots, high and low, some of whom are men of position and considerable wealth who have a reputation to lose and who have nothing to gain by exaggerations except the odium of Talatis and possibly higher officials. I wish to state at once that behind this movement there is no desire to discredit the Government, or an individual official. The movement is intended to assert the right of the people to be effectively heard in matters concerning themselves.

It is known to the public that the Hon'ble Mr. G.K. Parekh and Mr. V. J. Patel invited and assisted by the

Gujarat Sabha carried on investigations, as also Messrs. Deodhar, Joshi and Thakkar of the Servants of India Society. Their investigation was necessarily preliminary and brief and therefore confined to a few villages only. But the result of their enquiry went to show that the crops in the majority of cases was under four annas. As their investigation, not being extensive enough, was capable of being challenged, and it was challenged, I undertook a full inquiry with the assistance of over 20 capable, experienced, and impartial men of influence and status. I personally visited over 50 villages and met as many men in the villages as I could, inspected in these villages most of the fields belonging to them and after a searching cross-examination of the villagers, came to the conclusion that their crops were under four annas. I found that among the men who surrounded me, there were present those who were ready to check exaggerations and wild statements. Men knew what was at stake if they departed from the truth. As to the 'Rabi' crops and the still standing 'Kharif' crops, I was able by the evidence of my own eyes to check the statements of the agriculturists. The methods adopted by my co-workers were exactly the same. In this manner nearly four hundred villagers were examined, and with but a few exceptions, crops were found to be under four annas, and only in three cases they were found to be over six annas. The method adopted by us was, so far as the 'Kharif' crops were concerned, to ascertain the actual yield of the whole of the crops of individual villages and the possible yield of the same village in a normal year. Assuming the truth of the statements made by them, this is admittedly an absolute test, and any other method that would bring about the same result must be rejected as untrue and

unscientific; and, as I have already remarked, all probability of exaggeration was avoided in the above-named investigation. As to the standing 'Rabi' crops, there was the eye estimate and it was tested by the method above mentioned. The Government method is an eye estimate and therefore a matter largely of guess-work. It is moreover open to fundamental objections which I have endeavoured to set forth in a letter to the Collector of the District. I requested him to treat Vadthal—a well-known and ordinarily well-to-do village of the District with the railway line passing by it and which is near a trade centre—as a test case, and I suggested that if the crops were in that village proved to be under four annas, as I hold they were, it might be assumed that in the other villages less fortunately situated, crops were not likely to be more than four annas. I have added to my request a suggestion that I should be permitted to be present at the inquiry. He made the inquiry, but rejected my suggestion, and therefore it proved to be one-sided. The Collector has made an elaborate report on the crops of that village, which in my opinion I have successfully challenged. The original Government valuation, I understand, was twelve annas, the Collector's minimum valution is seven annas. If the probably wrong methods of valuation to which I have drawn attention and which have been adopted by the Collector are allowed for, the valuation according to his own reckoning would come under six annas and according to the agriculturists it would be under four annas. Both the report and my answer are too technical to be of value to the public. But I have suggested that, as both the Government and agriculturists hold themselves in the right, if the Government have any regard for

popular opinion, they should appoint an impartial committee of inquiry with the cultivators' representatives upon it, or gracefully accept the popular view. The Government have rejected both the suggestions and insist upon applying coercive measures for the collection of revenue. It may be mentioned that these measures have never been totally suspended and in many cases the ryots have paid simply under pressure. The Talatis have taken away cattle, and have returned them only after the payment of assessment. In one case, I witnessed a painful incident:—A man having his milch buffalo taken away from him, and it was only on my happening to go to the village that the buffalo was released; this buffalo was the most valuable property the man possessed and a source of daily bread for him. Scores of such cases have already happened and many more will no doubt happen hereafter if the public opinion is not ranged on the side of the people. Every means of seeking redress by prayer has been exhausted. Interviews with the Collector, the Commissioner and His Excellency have taken place. The final suggestion that was made is this:—Although in the majority of cases people are entitled to full suspension, half suspension should be granted throughout the District, except for the villages which show, by common consent, crops over six annas. Such a gracious concession may be accompanied by a declaration that the Government would expect those who have ready means voluntarily to pay up the dues, we the workers on our part undertaking to persuade such people to pay up the Government dues. This will leave only the poorest people untouched. I venture to submit that acceptance of this suggestion can only bring credit and strength to the Government. Resistance of

popular will can only produce discontent which in the case of fear-stricken peasantry such as of Kaira can only find an underground passage and thus demoralise them. The present movement is an attempt to get out of such a false position, humiliating alike for the Government and the people. And how do the Government propose to assert their position and so-called prestige? They have a 'Revenue Code' giving them unlimited powers without a right of appeal to the ryots against the decisions of the Revenue Authorities. Exercises of these powers in a case like the one before us in which the ryots are fighting for a principle and the authorities for prestige, would be a prostitution of justice, of a disavowal of all fair-play. These powers are:—

(1) Right of summary execution.

(2) Right of exacting a quarter of the assessment as punishment.

(3) Right of confiscation of land, not merely 'Rayatwari' but even 'Inami' or 'Sanadia,' and the right of keeping a man under *hajat*.

Those remedies may be applied singly or all together, and unbelievable though it may seem to the public, it may be mentioned that notices of the application of all these remedies but the last have been issued. Thus a man owning two hundred acres of land in perpetuity and valued at thousands of rupees, paying a small assessment rate, may at the will of the authority lose the whole of it, because for the sake of principle he respectfully refuses voluntarily to pay the assessment himself, and is prepared meekly but under strong protest to penalties that may be inflicted by law. Surely vindictive confiscation of property ought not to be the reward for orderly disobedience which properly handled

can only result in progress all round and in giving the Government a bold and a frank peasantry with a will of its own.

I venture to invite the press and the public to assist these cultivators of Kaira who have dared to enter up a fight for what they consider is just and right. Let the public remember this also that unprecedentally severe plague has decimated the population of Kaira. People are living outside their homes in specially prepared thatched cottages at considerable expenses to themselves. In some villages mortality has been tremendous. Prices are ruling high on which owing to the failure of crops they can but take little advantage and have to suffer all the disadvantages thereof. It is not money they want, so much as the voice of a strong, unanimous and emphatic public opinion.

REPLY TO THE COMMISSIONER.

Mr. Gandhi wrote from Nadiad under date 15th April, the following reply to the Commissioner's address to the cultivators to desist from following Mr. Gandhi's lead in regard to the vow of Passive Resistance. The Commissioner's exhortations to the agriculturists amounted to a threat detailing the consequences of non-payment of revenues. Mr. Gandhi replied as follows:—

The publication of the summary of the Commissioner's Gujarati address to the Kaira cultivators necessitates a reply in justice to the latter as also the workers.

I have before me a varbatim report of the speech. It is more direct than the summary in the laying down of the Government policy. The Commissioner's position is that the revenue authorities' decision regarding sus-

pension is final. They may and do receive and hear complaints from the ryots but the finality of their decision cannot be questioned. This is the crux of struggle. It is contended on behalf of the ryots that where there are, in matters of administrative orders, sharp differences of opinion between local officials and them the points of differences are and ought to be referred to an impartial committee of inquiry. This, it is held, constitutes the strength of the British constitution. The Commissioner has on principle rejected this position and invited a crisis. And he has made such a fetish of it that he armed himself beforehand with a letter from Lord Willingdon to the effect that even he should not interfere with the Commissioner's decision. He brings in the war to defend his position and abjures the ryots and me to desist from our cause at this time of peril to the Empire. But I venture to suggest that the Commissioner's attitude constitutes a peril far graver than the German peril, and I am serving the Empire in trying to deliver it from this peril from within. There is no mistaking the fact that India is waking up from its long sleep. The Ryots do not need to be literate to appreciate their rights and their duties. They have but to realise their invulnerable power and no Government, however strong, can stand against their will. The Kaira ryots are solving an imperial problem of the first magnitude in India. They will show that it is impossible to govern men without their consent. Once the Civil Service realises this position, it will supply to India truly *civil servants* who will be the bulwark of the people's rights. To-day the Civil Service rule is a rule of fear. The Kaira Ryot is fighting for the rule of love. It is the Commissioner who has produced the crisis. It was, as it is now, his duty to placate the people when

he saw that they held a different view. The revenue of India will be no more in danger because a Commissioner yields to the popular demands and grants concessions than the administration of justice was in danger when Mrs. Maybrick was reprieved purely in obedience to the popular will, or the Empire was in danger because a corner of a mosque in Cawnpore was replaced in obedience to the same demand. Had I hesitated to advise the people to stand firm against the Commissioner's refusal to listen to their prayer, instead of taking the open and healthy course it has taken, their discontent would have burrowed under and bred ill-will. That son is a true son of his father who rather than harbour ill-will against him, frankly but respectfully tells him all he feels and equally respectfully resists him, if he cannot truthfully obey his commands. I apply the same law to the relations between the Government and the people. There cannot be seasons when a man must suspend his conscience. But just as a wise father will quickly agree with his son and not incour his ill-will, especially if the family was in danger from without, even so a wise Government will quickly agree with the ryots rather than incur their displeasure. War cannot be permitted to give a license to the officials to exact obedience to their orders, even though the ryots may consider them to be unreasonable and unjust.

The Commissioner steels the hearts of the ryots for continuing their course by telling them that for a revenue of four lakhs of rupees he will for ever confiscate over a hundred and fifty thousand acres of land worth over three crores of rupees, and for ever declare the holders, their wives and children unworthy of holding any lands in Kaira. He considers the ryots to be misguided and

contumacious in the same breath. These are solemn words :—

"Do not be under the impression that our mamlatdars and our Talatis will realise the assessment by attaching and selling your movable property. We are not going to trouble ourselves so much. Our officers' time is valuable. Only by your bringing in the monies shall the treasuries be filled. This is no threat. You take it from me that parents never threaten their children. They only advise. But if you do not pay the dues, your lands will be confiscated. Many people say that this will not happen. But I say it will. I have no need to take a vow. I shall prove that I mean what I say. The lands of those who do not pay will be confiscated. Those who are contumacious will get no lands in future. Government do not want their names on their Records of Rights. Those who go out shall never be admitted again."

I hold that it is the sacred duty of every loyal citizen to fight unto death against such a spirit of vindictiveness and tyranny. The Commissioner has done the Ahmedabad strikers and me a cruel wrong, in saying that the strikers knowingly broke their vow. He was present at the meeting where the settlement was declared. He may hold that the strikers had broken their vow (though his speech at the meeting produced a contrary impression) but there is nothing to show that the strikers knowingly broke their vow. On the contrary it was entirely kept by their resuming their work on their getting for the first day wages demanded by them, and the final decision as to wages being referred to arbitration. The strikers had suggested arbitration which the mill-owners had rejected. Their struggle in its essence was for a thirty-five per cent. increase in their wages or such increase as an arbitration board may decide. And this is what they have got. The hit at the strikers and me is, I regret to have to say, a hit below the belt.

THE MEANING OF THE COVENANT

On the 20th April, Mr. Gandhi in company of Mrs. Gandhi, Messrs. Manu Subedar, V. J. Patel and others visited three villages, viz., *Kasar, Ajarpura and Samarkha in Anand Taluka.*

At Ajarpura which was visited by the Mamlatdar of the Taluka only two days back and where he had taken great pains to explain to the people why they should now pay up the revenue without any further delay, but where all efforts had proved fruitless, a meeting of about a thousand men and three hundred ladies was held. Here Mr. Gandhi delivered a long address. He said:—

First of all I want to talk to you a little about the Mamlatdar's visit. The Mamlatdar told you that the covenant must be observed. But he misinterpreted the meaning of the covenant. He told you that your forefathers had entered into a covenant with the Government to pay a certain assessment for the lands in their possession. Now let us see as to what kind of covenant our forefathers had entered into. Our ancient law covenant is that we should give to our king one-fourth of the grains that grow in our fields. It meant that whenever our crops failed we had to pay nothing. The present Government have changed this law and forces up to pay in money. I do not know whether it has gained thereby. Perhaps they may have. But remember well that this is our ancient law, and you have taken the vow in accordance with it. And again it is the Government law that if the crops are under four annas, the collection of revenue must be suspended till the next year. This year you sincerely believe that your crops are under four annas and there-

fore your revenue must be suspended. The Government say that it is not your right, but it is only a grace that it suspends revenue till the next year. Let me declare to you that it is no grace on the part of Government, but it is your right. And if it is a grace Government cannot show it at its sweet will."

He then pointed out that the real significance of the struggle lay in the fact that it would revive the old village republics. The key of village self-government lay in the assertion of public opinion. He then exhorted them to be fearless. He then said that *Satyagraha* must pervade through all their life.

REPLY TO KAIRA PRESS NOTE

Mr. M. K. Gandhi sent the following reply to the press note issued by the Bombay Government in the first week of May, 1918, on the situation in the Kaira District.

The Government press note on the Kaira trouble is remarkable for the sins both of omission and commission. As to the paragraph devoted to Messrs. Parekh's and Patel's investigations, I wish only to say that at the interview with His Excellency the Governor, the Commissioner challenged the accuracy of their statements. I immediately suggested the appointment of a committee of inquiry. Surely, it was the most proper thing that the Government could have done, and the whole of the unseemly executions, the removal of the cultivators' milch cattle and their ornaments, the confiscation orders, could have been avoided. Instead, as the press note says, they posted a Collector 'of long experience.' What could he do? The best of officials have to move in a vicious circle. They have to carry out the traditions of a service which

has made of prestige a fetish and which considers itself to be almost infallible, and rarely admits its mistakes.

With reference to the investigation by Mr. Devdhar and his co-workers, the press note leaves on the reader the impression that the Commissioner had responded to their suggestions. At the interview at which I was present he challenged the report they had submitted to him and said distinctly that whatever relief he granted would not be granted because of the report which he said in substance was not true so far as it contained any new things and was not new in so far as it contained any true statements.

I cannot weary the public with the tragedy in the Matar Taluka. In certain villages of the Taluka which are affected by the irrigation canals they have a double grievance: (1) the ordinary failure of crops by reason of the excessive rainfall, and (2) the total destruction of crops by reason of overflooding. In the second case, they are entitled to full remission. So far as I am aware, in many cases it has not been granted.

It is not correct to say that the Servants of India Society stopped investigation in the Thasra Taluka because there was no case for inquiry but because they deemed it unnecessary, so their report says, as I had decided to inquire into the crops of almost every village.

MR. GANDHI'S CHALLENGE NOT ACCEPTED

The press note is less than fair in calling my method of inquiry 'Utopian.' I do adhere to my contention that if the cultivators' statements may be relied upon, my method cannot but yield absolutely reliable results. Who should know better than the cultivator himself the yield of is crops? I refuse to believe that lakhs of men could

conspire to tell an untruth when there was no great gain in view, and suffering, a certainty. It is impossible for thousands of men to learn by heart figures as to the yield, —actual and probable—of over ten crops so that the total in each case would give less than a four-anna crop. I contend that my method contains automatic safeguards against deception. Moreover I had challenged the official annawari alike of *kharif* and *rabi* crops. When I did so the *rabi* crops were still standing. I had, therefore, suggested that they could cut the rabi crops and test the yield and thus find the true annawari. I had suggested this specially of Vadthal. My argument was that if the cultivators' annawari of such *rabi* crops was found to be correct and the officials' wrong, it was not improper to infer that the cultivators' valuations regarding the *kharif* crops were also right. My offer was not accepted. I may add that I had asked to be allowed to be present when the collector visited Vadthal which was taken as a test village. This request was also not acceded to.

The note is misleading inasmuch as it states that in arriving at my annawari, I have not taken into account the *rabi* crops or the cotton crops. I have taken these crops into account, I have simply questioned the logic of the official system. The reason is obvious. If out of a population of one thousand men, only two hundred men grew *rabi* crops, it would be highly unjust to the eight hundred men to force up their annawari if without the rabi crops their crops showed only four annas or under.

GROSS INACCURACIES

I am surprised at the gross inaccuracies in the paragraph devoted to the crops in Limbasi. In the first ins-

tance I was not present when the official inquiry was made, and in the second instance the wheat, which is valued at Rs. 13,445, included wheat also from two neighbouring villages so that out of the crops estimated at Rs. 13,445, three assessments had to be paid. And what are Rs. 13,445 in a population of eighteen hundred men? For the matter of that, I am prepared to admit that the Limbasi people had a rice crop which too gave them as many rupees. At the rate of forty rupees per head per year to feed a man the Limbasi people would require Rs. 72,000 for their food alone. It may interest the public to know that according to the official annawari, the Limbasi wheat alone should have been Rs. 83,021. This figure has been supplied to me by the collector. To demonstrate the recklessness with which the press note has been prepared, I may add that if the Limbasi people are to be believed, the whole of the wheat crop was on the threshing floor. According to their statements, nearly one-third was foreign wheat. The Limbasi wheat, therefore, would be under Rs. 9,000. The official annawari is ten annas. Now according to the actual yield the wheat annawari of Limbasi was 11 annas as against the official ten annas. Moreover, a maund of wheat per Vigha is required as seed and the Limbasi cultivators had 3,000 (Rs. 3 per maund equals Rs. 9,000) maunds of wheat on 1,965 Vighas, *i.e.*, the wheat crop was a trifle over the seed. Lastly, whilst the crop was under harvest, I had offered to the collector to go over to Limbasi myself and to have it weighed so that there might be no question of the accuracy or otherwise of the cultivators' statements. But the collector did not accept my offer. Therefore, I hold that the cultivators' figures must be accepted as true.

ADVOCACY OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE

Merely to show how hopelessly misleading the press note is I may state that the Gujarat Sabha did not pass a resolution advising passive resistance. Nor that it would have shirked it but I felt myself that passive resistance should not be the subject of a resolution in a Sabha, whose constitution was governed by the rule of majority and so the Gujarat Sabha's resolution left it open to individual members to follow their own bent of mind. It is true that most of the active members of the Sabha are engaged in the Kaira trouble.

I must repudiate totally the insinuation that I dissuaded payment by people who wished to pay. The figures given in the press note showing the collection in the different Talukas, if they prove anything, prove that the hand of the law has hit them hard and that the fears of the Ravanis and the Talatis have proved too strong for them. When after confiscation and sales under execution the Government show a clean bill and no arrears, will they contend that there was no case for relief or inquiry ?

I admit that the suspension is granted as a matter of grace and not as a matter of right enforceable by law, but the concession is not based on caprice, but is regulated by properly defined rules, and the Government do not contend that if the crops had been under four annas they could have withheld suspension. The sole point throughout has been the difference as to annawari. If it is true that in granting concessions the Government take into account also other circumstances, *e. g.*, in the words of the press note, the general economic situation, suspension is doubly necessary this year because of the plague and high prices. The collector told me definitely that he could not take this last into account. He could gr

suspension only under the rules which had reference only to crops and nothing else.

I think I have shown enough here to warrant a committee of inquiry and I submit that, as a matter of principle, it would be worth while granting the inquiry even if one cultivator remains with an arrear against him, because there is nothing found to attach and the Government might be reluctant to sell his lands. The people have challenged the accuracy of Talatis' figures; in some cases there are Talatis themselves ready to come forward to show that they were asked to put up the annawari found by them. But if the inquiry is now held to be unnecessary, why do the Government not grant suspension, especially when admittedly there is only a small number left to collect from and more especially when if suspension is granted well-to-do cultivators are ready to pay.

It is evident now that Government have surrendered the question of principle for which the Commissioner has stood.

VICEROY'S CALL FOR CONCORD

The Viceroy has appealed for the sinking of domestic differences. Is the appeal confined only to the ryots or may the officials also yield to the popular will when the popular demand is not immoral or unjust and thus produce contentment?

If distress means starvation, I admit that the Kaira people are not starving. But if sale of goods to pay assessment or to buy grain for food be an indication of distress there is enough of it in the district. I am prepared to show that hundreds have paid their assessment either by incurring debts or by selling their trees, cattle or other valuables. The most grievous omission

in the press note, however, is that of the fact that collections are being made in a vindictive spirit. The cultivators are being taught a lesson for their contumacy so called. They are under threat to lose their lands worth 3 crores of rupees for an assessment of 4 lakhs of rupees. In many cases a quarter of the assessment has been exacted as a penalty. Is there not in the above narrative room for a doubt that the officials may be in the wrong?

END OF THE KAIRA STRUGGLE

The following is the translation of a manifesto issued in Gujarati to the people of Kaira by Messrs. M.K. Gandhi and Vallabhbhai J. Patel :—

The struggle that the people of the District of Kaira entered upon on the 22nd of March last, has come to an end. The people took the following vow on that day :—

"Our village has had crops under four annas. We therefore requested the Government to postpone collection to the next year, but they did not do so. We the undersigned therefore solemnly declare that we shall not pay the assessment for the year whether it be wholly or in part. We shall undergo all the sufferings that may result from such refraining. We shall also allow our lands to be confiscated should they do so. But we shall not by voluntary payment allow ourselves to be regarded as liars and thus lose our self-respect. If the Government would graciously postpone for all the remaining villages collection of the balance of the revenue, we, who can afford it, would be prepared to pay up revenue whether it be in full or in part. The reason why the well-to-do amongst us would not pay is that if they do, the needy ones would out of fright sell their chattels, or incur debts and pay the revenue and thus suffer. We believe that it is the duty of the well-to-do to protect the needy against such a plight."

The meaning of this vow is that the Government suspending collection of the revenue from the poor, the well-to-do should pay the assessment due by them. The Mamlatdar of Nadiad at Uttersanda, on the 3rd of June, issued such orders, whereupon the people of Uttersanda

who could afford, were advised to pay up. Payments have already commenced there.

On the foregoing order having been passed at Uttersanda a letter was addressed to the Collector stating that if orders like the one in Uttersanda were passed everywhere the struggle would come to an end, and it would be possible to inform His Excellency the Governor on the 10th instant—the day of the sitting of the Provincial War Conference—that the domestic difference in Kaira was settled. The Collector has replied to the effect that the order like the one in Uttersanda is applicable to the whole district. Thus the peoples' prayer has at last been granted. The Collector has also stated in reply to a query about *Chothai* orders that the orders will not be enforced against those who may voluntarily pay up. Our thanks are due to the Collector for this concession.

AN END WITHOUT GRACE

We are obliged to say with sorrow that although the struggle has come to an end it is an end without grace. It lacks dignity. The above orders have not been passed either with generosity or with the heart in them. It very much looks as if the orders have been passed with the greatest reluctance. The Collector says :—

" Orders were issued to all mamlatdars on the 25th April that no pressure should be put on those unable to pay. Their attention was again drawn to these orders in a proper circular issued by me on the 22nd of May and to ensure that proper effect was given to them. The mamlatdars were advised to divide the defaulters in each village into two classes, those who could pay and those who were unable to pay on account of poverty." .

If this was so why were these orders not published to the people ? Had they known them on the 25th April what sufferings would they not have been saved from.

! expenses that were unnecessarily incurred by the Government in engaging the officials of the district in

effecting executions would have been saved. Wherever the assessment was uncollected the people lived with their lives in their hands. They have lived away from their homes to avoid attachments. They have not had even enough food. The women have suffered what they ought not to have. At times, they have been obliged to put up with insults from insolent Circle Inspectors, and to helplessly watch their milch buffaloes taken away from them. They have paid *Chothai* fines, and had they known the foregoing orders they would have been saved all the miseries. The officials knew that this relief for the poor was the crux of the struggle. The Commissioner would not even look at this difficulty. Many letters were addressed to him but he remained unbending. He said : "Individual relief cannot be granted, it is not the law." Now the Collector says : "The orders of April 25, so far as it related to putting pressure on those who were really unable to pay on account of poverty, were merely a restatement of what are publicly known to be the standing orders of Government on that subject." If this is really true the people have suffered deliberately and through sheer obstinacy ! At the time of going to Delhi Mr. Gandhi wrote to the Commissioner requesting him to grant or to issue orders to the above effect so that the good news could be given to His Excellency the Viceroy. The Commissioner gave no heed to the request.

OFFICIAL'S OBSTINACY

"We are moved by the sufferings of the people, we perceive our mistake and in order to placate the people we are now prepared to grant individual relief," the officials could have generously said all this and endeared themselves to the people but they have obstinately avoided this method (of winning them over). And even now relief has been granted in a niggardly manner, involuntarily and without admission of any mistake. It is even claimed that what has now been granted is nothing new. And hence we say that there is little grace in the settlement.

The officials have failed to be popular because of their obstinacy, because of their mistaken belief that they should never admit being in the wrong and because of their having made it a fetish that it should never be said of them that they had yielded to anything like popular agitation. It grieves us to offer this criticism. But we have permitted ourselves to do so as their friends.

A TRIBUTE TO KAIRA PEOPLE

But though the official attitude is thus unsatisfactory, our prayer has been granted and it is our duty to accept the concession with thankfulness. Now, there is only 8 per cent. of the assessment remaining unpaid. It was a point of honour with us till now to refuse payment. Conditions having materially altered it is a point of honour for a Satyagrahi to pay up the assessment. Those who can afford should pay without causing the Government the slightest trouble and thus show that, when there is no conflict between the dictates of conscience and those of man-made law they are able to compel anybody to obey the law of the land. A Satyagrahi sometimes appears momentarily to disobey laws and the constituted authority, only to prove in the end his regard for both.

In making a list of those who are unable to pay we should apply a test so rigid that no one can challenge our finding. Those whose incapacity for payment is at all in doubt should consider it their duty to pay. The final decision as to the incapacity for payment will rest with the authorities, but we believe that the judgment of the people will have its full weight.

HONOUR OF A SATYAGRAHI

By their courage the people of Kaira have drawn the attention of the whole of India. During the last six months they have had full taste of the fruits of observing

truth, fearlessnes, unity, determination and self-sacrifice. We hope that they will still further cultivate these great qualities, will move forward in the path of progress, and shed lustre on the name of the Motherland. It is our firm belief that the people of Kaira have truly served their own cause, as well as the cause of Swaraj and the Empire.

May God bless you.

THE LAST PHASE

The Satyagraha Campaign in Kaira was thus practically over. Several meetings were held, some to greet the Satyagrahis released from jail, some to celebrate the victory of the campaign and several more to do honour to Mr. Gandhi for his wise and courageous lead. At the meeting of the 27th July at Nadiad, Mr. Gandhi thus welcomed those who were released from the jail:—

We stand on the threshold of a twilight—whether morning or evening twilight we know not. One is followed by the night, the other heralds the dawn. If we want to see the dawning day after the twilight and not the mournful night, it behoves every one of us who are Home Rulers to realise the truth at this juncture, to stand for it against any odds and to preach and practise it at any cost unflinchingly. Only will the correct practice of truth entitle them to the name of Home Rulers.

It happened that some one who preceded had said in the course of his speech that he was the disciple of Mr. Pandya who, in turn, was the disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. Almost the whole of Mr. Gandhi's address was in answer to this statement. He said :—

As the fate would have it, it happens that with my longer stay and increasing familiarity in India, the unen-

viable name of "Guru" is being given me. Some do not hesitate to volunteer for others and talk of them as my disciples. But I may give them a warning. I am not insensible that this warning carries with it a sense of self-esteem, but even at the risk of being styled conceited, I would give the warning. I say that it is not within me to be anybody's "Guru." I have always and will always disclaim this title. I, who am in search of a spiritual Guru, how can I arrogate to myself the title of a Guru? I cannot even think of being anybody's political guru in the sense that I applied the term to the late Mr. Gokhale, for I am but an infant in politics. Another thing is that I would be infinitely pained to find one who calls himself my disciple going astray, or falling short of my expectations and I want to spare myself that pain. I, therefore, ask you to think a million times before you proceed to say that you are anybody's disciple. Our whole life is but an experiment and our skill lies in always keeping the grain from the chaff. I wish you all to join me in this great experiment, not as disciples but as my brothers and sisters, regarding me if you choose, as your elder brother. To be a guru I must be myself flawlessly perfect, which I can never claim to be. (Speaking of Mr. Mohanlal Pandya the Mahtma said:) The honour for the victory belongs to Mr. Pandya in a special sense. I am everywhere being regarded as one living in the Elysian heights of perfectness, as one by profession a Satyagrahi, and as standing apart from all, capable of conceiving anything and achieving anything. No one therefore ventures to emulate my example. But Mr. Mohanlal Pandya was still a novice in the trade, he began his study of Satyagraha early in the campaign and has now won his degree of the Master of Arts. His influence, therefore, told on all and he could

infect many others with his courage and love of truth. Concluding, the Mahatma said that Satyagraha had multitudinous applications and one could not call himself a real Satyagrahi unless he had realised all of them.

The meeting in Nadiad was called for the special purpose of doing honour to Mr. Gandhi. On receiving the address Mr. Gandhi spoke to this effect :—

I am grateful to you for the address of honour you have given me. But a servant of the people cannot accept honours. He is supposed to have consecrated his all to the people and I could but consecrate all that you have given me to you. One who has made "service" his religion, cannot lust for honour; the moment he does so, he is lost. I have seen that some are inspired by the lust of help while some by the lust of fame. The lust of help is sordid enough, but that of fame is even more so. The misdeeds of the latter leads a man into one more wicked than those into which the former does. I therefore beseech you that if you want really to do me honour) do not please give me a shower bath of addresses and honours. The best way to honour me is to do my behest and to carry my principles into practice. And what, forsooth, have I done in this campaign? If anything, I can only claim the cleverness that is necessary for a commander in picking out men for his campaign. I was clever enough in doing that, but there too I should not have achieved anything if you had not acquitted yourselves well. The choice of my lieutenant, I may here add, was particularly happy. I will say that, without the help of Mr. V. J. Patel, we could not have won the campaign. He had a splendid practice, he had his municipal work to do, but he renounced it all and threw himself in the campaign. But

before I close, I must give my tribute of praise to those who deserve it more than all the rest, and whose names will probably never adorn your honours list. First and foremost I place the sweeper in the Ananthashram, who has rendered me a service which is service in the highest sense of the term, and for which I can never express adequate gratefulness. Next come the children of the Ashram, who have ungrudgingly without any sense of reward served me, looked after me at all hours of the day and the night, and thus rendered a service of which vakils and barristers are incapable.

EARLIER INDIAN SPEECHES.

THE DUTIES OF BRITISH CITIZENSHIP.

The following statement made by Mr. Gandhi at the time of the troubles in the Transvaal explains his attitude towards law and legislators and enunciates the duties of true British citizenship :—

I consider myself a lover of the British Empire, a citizen (though voteless) of the Transvaal, prepared to take my full share in promoting the general well-being of the country. And I claim it to be perfectly honourable and consistent with the above profession to advise my countrymen not to submit to the Asiatic Act, as being derogatory to their manhood and offensive to their religion. And I claim, too, that the method of passive resistance adopted to combat the mischief is the clearest and safest, because, if the cause is not true, it is the resisters, and they alone, who suffer. I am perfectly aware of the danger to good government, in a country inhabited by many races unequally developed, when an honest citizen advises resistance to a law of the land. But I refuse to believe in the infallibility of legislators. I do believe that they are not always guided by generous or even just sentiments in their dealings with unrepresented classes. I venture to say that if passive resistance is generally accepted, it will once and for ever avoid the contingency of a terrible death struggle and bloodshed in the event (not impossible) of the natives being exasperated by a stupid mistake of our legislators.

It has been said that those who do not like the law may leave the country. This is all very well, spoken from a cushioned chair, but it is neither possible nor becoming for men to leave their homes because they do not subscribe to certain laws enacted against them. The Uitlanders of the Boer regime complained of harsh laws; they, too, were told that if they did not like them, they could retire from the country. Are Indians, who are fighting for their self-respect, to slink away from the country for fear of suffering imprisonment or worse? If I could help it, nothing would remove Indians from the country save brute force. It is no part of a citizen's duty to pay blind obedience to the laws imposed on him. And if my countrymen believe in God and the existence of the soul, then, while they may admit that their bodies belong to the state to be imprisoned and deported, their minds, their wills, and their souls must ever remain free like the birds of the air, and are beyond the reach of the swiftest arrow.

A PLEA FOR THE SOUL.

The following is an extract from the letter of the London correspondent of the "Amrita Bazaar Patrika" summarising an address delivered by Mr. Gandhi before the Members of the Emerson Club and of the Hampstead Branch of the Peace and Arbitration Society whilst in London.

Mr. Gandhi turned to India, and spoke with enthusiasm of Rama, the victim of the machinations of a woman, choosing fourteen years' exile rather than surrender; other Orientals were mentioned, and then, through the Doukhabors of to-day, he brought the

thoughts of the audience to the soul resistance of Indians *versus* brute force in south Africa. He insisted that it was completely a mistake to believe that Indians were incapable of lengthened resistance for a principle; in their fearlessness of suffering they were second to none in the world. Passive resistance had been called a weapon of the weak, but Mr. Gandhi maintained that it required courage higher than that of a soldier on the battlefield, which was often the impulse of the moment; for passive resistance was continuous and sustained: it meant physical suffering. Some people were inclined to think it too difficult to be carried out to-day, but those who held that idea were not moved by true courage— Again referring to Oriental teaching, Mr. Gandhi said that the teaching of the "Lord's Song" was, from the beginning, the necessity of fearlessness. He touched on the question of physical force while insisting that it was not thought of by Indians in the Transvaal. He does does not want to share in liberty for India that is gained by violence and bloodshed, and insists that no country is so capable as India for wielding soul force. Mr. Gandhi did not approve of the militant tactics of the suffragettes for the reason that they were meeting body force with body force, and not using the higher power of soul force: violence begot violence. He maintained, too, that the association of Britain and India—must be a mutual benefit, if India—eschewing violence—did not depart from her proud position of being the giver and the teacher of religion. "If the world believes in the existence of the soul." He said in conclusion, "it must be recognised that soul force is better than body force: it is the sacred principle of love which moves mountains. On us is the responsibility of living

out this sacred law ; we are not concerned with results."

Mr. Gandhi protested against the mad rush of to-day, and, instead of blessing the means by which modern science has made this mad rush possible, that is, railways, motors, telegraph, telephone, and even the coming flying machines, he declared that they were diverting man's thoughts from the main purpose of life ; bodily comfort stood before soul growth ; man had no time to-day even to know himself ; he preferred a newspaper or sport or other things rather than to be left alone with himself for thought. He claimed Ruskin as on his side in this expression of protest against the drive and hurry of modern civilisation. He did not describe this development of material science as exclusively British, but he considered that its effect in India had been baneful in many ways. He instanced the desecration of India's holy places, which he said were no longer holy, because the fatal facility of locomotion had brought to those places people whose only aim was to defraud the unsophisticated : such people, in the olden days when pilgrimages meant long and wearisome walking through jungles, crossing rivers, and encountering many dangers, had not the stamina to reach the goal. Pilgrimages in those days could only be undertaken by the cream of society, but they came to know each other ; the aim of the holy places was to make India holy. Plague and famine, which existed in pre-British days, were local then ; to-day, rapid locomotion had caused them to spread. To avoid the calamity which intense materialism must bring, Mr. Gandhi urged that India should go back to her former holiness which is not yet lost. The contact with the West has awakened her from the lethargy into which she had

sunk: the new spirit, if properly directed, would bring blesssing to both nations and to the world. If India adopted Western modern civilisation as Japan had done, there must be perpetual conflict and grasping between Briton and Indian. If, on the other hand, India's ancient civilisation can withstand this latest assault, as it has withstood so many before, and be as of old, the religious teacher, the spiritual guide, then there would be no impassable barrier between East and West. Some circumstances exist, said Mr. Gandhi, which we cannot understand; but the main purpose of life is to live rightly, think rightly, act rightly; the soul must languish when we give all our thought to the body.

ON ANARCHICAL CRIMES.

The following is the summary of an address delivered at the Students' Hall, College Square, Calcutta, in March 1915 *with the Hon. Mr. Lyon in the chair.*

Though it was the command of his Guru, the late Mr. Gokhale that Mr. Gandhi, during his stay here should keep his ears open but his mouth shut, he could not resist the temptation of addressing the meeting. It was the opinion of the speaker as well as his departed Guru that politics should not be a sealed book to the student community; for he saw no reason why student should not study and take part in politics. He went the length of saying that politics should not be divorced from religion. They would agree with him as well as their teachers, professors and the worthy Chairman that literary education is of no value, if it is not able to build up a sound character. Could it be said that the students or the public men in this country are entirely fearless?

This question engaged the speaker's serious attention although he was in exile. He understood what political dacoity or political assassination was. He had given the subject his most careful attention and he came to the conclusion that some of the students of his country were fired no doubt with zeal in their minds and with love for their motherland, but they did not know how they should love her best. He believed that some of them resorted to nefarious means, because they did not work in the fear of God but in the fear of man. He was there to tell them that if he was for sedition, he must speak out sedition and think loudly and take the consequence. If he did so, it would clear the atmosphere of any taint of hypocrisy. If the students, who are the hopes of India, nay, perhaps of the Empire, did not work in the fear of God, but in the fear of man, in the fear of the authorities—the Government whether it is represented by the British or an indigenous body, the results would prove disastrous to the country. They should always keep their minds open, regardless of what the consequence would be ; youths who have resorted to dacoities and assassinations, were misguided youths with whom they should have absolutely no connection. They should consider those persons as enemies to themselves and to their country. But he did not for a moment suggest that they should hate those people. The speaker was not a believer in Government he would not have any Government. He believes that Government is the best that governs the least. But whatever his personal views were, he must say that misguided zeal that resorts to dacoities and assassinations cannot be productive of any good. These dacoities and assassinations are absolutely a foreign growth in India.

They cannot take root here and cannot be a permanent institution here. History proves that assassinations have done no good. The religion of this country, the Hindu religion is abstention from "*himsa*," that is taking animal life. That is, he believes the guiding principle of all religions. The Hindu religion says that even the evil-doer should not be hated. It says that nobody has any right to kill even the evil doer. These assassinations are a western institution and the speaker warned his hearers against these western methods and western evils. What have they done in the western world? If the youths imitated them and believed that they could do the slightest good to India they were totally mistaken. He would not discuss what Government was best for India, whether the British Government or the Government that existed before, though he believed that there was a great deal of room for improvement in the British Government. But he would advise his young friends to be fearless, sincere and be guided by the principle of religion. If they had a programme for the country, let them place it openly before the public. The speaker concluded the address with an appeal to the young men present, to be religious and be guided by a spirit of religion and morality. If they were prepared to die, the speaker was prepared to die with them. He would be ready to accept their guidance. But if they wanted to terrorise the country, he should rise against them.

LOYALTY TO THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

At the annual gathering of the Madras Law Dinner in April 1915, *Mr. M. K. Gandhi was specially invited to propose the toast of the British Empire. The Hon'ble Mr. Corbet, the Advocate-General, in doing so referred to Mr. Gandhi as a very distinguished stranger, a stranger in the sense that they had not known him long, but one whose name they were all familiar with. Mr. Gandhi was a member of the profession, though he had not lately practised. Mr. Gandhi, he continued, was about to propose the toast of the British Empire, for the consolidation of which he had laboured strenuously, with absolute self-devotion for many years. Mr. Gandhi said :—*

During my three months' tour in India, as also in South Africa, I have been so often questioned how I, a determined opponent of modern civilization and an avowed patriot, could reconcile myself to loyalty of the British Empire of which India was such a large part ; how it was possible for me to find it consistent that India and England could work together for mutual benefit. It gives me the greatest pleasure this evening at this great and important gathering, to re-declare my loyalty to this British Empire, and my loyalty is based upon very selfish grounds. As a passive resister I discovered that a passive resister has to make good his claim to passive resistance, no matter under what circumstances 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 one 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).

ADVICE TO STUDENTS.

Mr. Gandhi delivered the following speech at the Y. M. C. A. in reply to the Madras Students' address on April 27, 1915, the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri presiding.

Mr. Chairman and Dear Friends,—Madras as well-nigh exhausted the English vocabulary in using adjectives of virtue with reference to my wife and myself, and, if I may be called upon to give an opinion as to where I have been smothered with kindness, love and attention, I would have to say: it is Madras. (Applause). But as I have said so often, I believed it of Madras. So it is no wonder to me that you are lavishing all these kindnesses with unparalleled generosity, and now the worthy president of the Servants of India Society—under which society I am going through a period of probation—has, if I may say so, capped it all. Am I worthy of these things? My answer from the innermost recesses of my heart is an emphatic "No." But I have come to India to become worthy of every adjective that you may use, and all my life will certainly be dedicated to prove worthy of them, if I am to be a worthy servant.

And so it is that you have sung that beautiful national song, on hearing which all of us sprang to our feet. The poet has lavished all the adjectives that he possibly could to describe Mother India. He describes Mother India as sweet smiling, sweet-speaking, fragrant, all-powerful, all good, truthful, land flowing with milk and honey, land having ripe fields, fruits and grains, land inhabited by a race of men of whom we have only a picture in the great Golden Age. He pictures to us a land which shall embrace in its possession the whole of the world, the whole of humanity by the might or right not of physical power but of soul-power. Can we sing that hymn ? I ask myself, "can I, by any right, spring to my feet when I listen to that song." The poet no doubt gave us a picture for our realisation, the words of which simply remain prophetic, and it is for you, the hope of India, to realise every word that the poet has said in describing this motherland of ours. To day, I feel that these adjectives are very largely misplaced in his description of the motherland, and it is for you and for me to make good the claim that the poet has advanced on behalf of his motherland.

THE REAL EDUCATION.

You, the students of Madras, as well as the students all over India—are you receiving an education which will make you worthy to realise that ideal and which will draw the best out of you, or is it an education which has become a factory for making Government employees or clerks in commercial offices ? Is the goal of the education that you are receiving that of mere employment whether in the Government departments or other departments ? If that be the goal of your Education, if that is the goal that you have set before yourselves, I

feel and I fear that the vision which the poet pictured for himself is far from being realised. As you have heard me say perhaps, or as you have read, I am and I have been a determined opponent of modern civilisation. I want you to turn your eyes to-day upon what is going on in Europe and if you have come to the conclusion that Europe is to-day groaning under the heels of the modern civilization then you and your elders will have to think twice before you can emulate that civilisation in our Motherland. But I have been told, " How can we help it, seeing that our rulers bring that culture to our Motherland." Do not make any mistake about it at all. I do not for one moment believe that it is for any rulers to bring that culture to you, unless you are prepared to accept it, and if it be that the rulers bring that culture before us I think that we have forces within ourselves to enable us to reject that culture without having to reject the rulers themselves. (Applause). I have said on many a platform that the British race is with us. I decline to go into the reasons why that race is with us, but I do believe that it is possible for India if she would but live upto the traditions of the sages of whom you have heard from our worthy president, to transmit a message through this great race, a message not of physical might, but a message of love. And then, it will be your privilege to conquer the conquerors not by shedding blood but by sheer force of spiritual predominence. When I consider what is going on to-day in India, I think it is necessary for us to say what our opinion is in connection with the political assassinations and political dacoities. I feel that these are purely a foreign importation which cannot take root in this land. But you the student world have to beware, lest mentally or

morally you give one thought of approval to this kind of terrorism. I, as a passive resister, will give you another thing very substantial for it. Terrorise yourself; search within; by all means resist tyranny wherever you find it; by all means resist encroachment upon your liberty, but not by shedding the blood of the tyrant. That is not what is taught by our religion. Our religion is based upon *ahimsa*, which in its active form is nothing but Love, love not only to your neighbours, not only to your friends but love even to those who may be your enemies.

One word more in connection with the same thing I think that if we were to practise truth, to practise *ahimsa* we must immediately see that we also pratise fearlessness. If our rulers are doing what in our opinion is wrong, and if we feel it our duty to let them hear our advice even though it may be considered sedition, I urge you to speak sedition—but at your peril, you must be prepared to suffer the consequences. And when you are ready to suffer the consequences and not hit below the belt, then I think you will have made good your right to have your advice heard even by the Government.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

I ally myself with the British Government, because I believe that it is possible for me to claim equal partnership with every subject of the British Empire. I to-day claim that equal partnership. I do not belong to a subject race. I do not call myself a member of a subject race. But there is this thing: it is not for the British Governors to give you; it is for you to take the thing. I want and I can take the thing. That I want only by discharging my obligations. Max Muller has told us,—we need not go to Max Muller to

interpret our own religion—but he says, our religion consists in four letters "D-u-t-y" and not in the five letters "R-i-g-h-t". And if you believe that all that we want can go from a letter discharge of our duty, then think always of your duty and fighting along those lines ; you will have no fear of any man, you will fear only God That is the message that my master—if I may say so, your master too—Mr. Gokhale has given to us. What is that message then ? It is in the constitution of the Servants of India Society and that is the message by which I wish to be guided in my life. The message is to spiritualise the political life and the political institutions of the country. We must immediately set about realising its practice. The students cannot be away from politics. Politics is as essential to them as religion. Politics cannot be divorced from religion. My views may not be acceptable to you, I know. All the same, I can only give you what is stirring me to my very depths. On the authority of my experiences in South Africa I claim that your countrymen who had not that modern culture but who had that strength of the Rishis of old, who have inherited the *tapascharya* performed by the Rishis, without having known a single word of English literature and without knowing anything whatsoever of the present modern culture, they were able to rise to their full height. And what has been possible for the uneducated and illiterate countrymen of ours in South Africa is ten times possible for you and for me to-day in this sacred land of ours. May that be your privilege and may that be my privilege. (Applause.)

POLITICS AND THE PEOPLE.

Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi on their way to Tranquebar arrived at Mayavaram on the 22nd May, 1915, *and they were presented with an address by the citizens of the town In the course of his reply, Mr. Gandhi said* :—

It was quite by accident that I had the great pleasure of receiving an address from my ' Panchama brethren, and there, they said that they were without convenience for drinking water, they were without convenience for living supplies, and they could not buy or hold land. It was difficult for them even to approach Courts. Probably, the last is due to their fear, but a fear certainly not due to themselves, and who is then responsible for this state of things? Do we propose to perpetuate this state of things? Is it a part of Hinduism? I do not know. I have now to learn what Hinduism really is. 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 mass 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. (Hear, hear.)

Are the Brahmins in Mayavaram equal minded towards the Pariah and will they tell me, if they are so equal minded, that others will not follow? Even if they say that they are prepared to do so but others will not follow, I shall have to disbelieve them until I have revised my notions of Hinduism. If the Brahmins themselves consider they are holding high position by

penance and austerity, then they have themselves much to learn, then they will be the people who have cursed and ruined the land.

My friend, the Chairman, has asked me the question whether it is true that I am at war with my leaders. I say that I am not at war with my leaders. I seem to be at war with my leaders because many things I have heard seem to be inconsistent with my notions of self-respect and with self respect to my Motherland. I feel that they are probably not discharging the sacred trust they have taken upon their shoulders ; but I am sure I am studying or endeavouring to take wisdom from them, but I failed to take that wisdom. It may be that I am incompetent and unfit to follow them. If so, I shall revise my ideas. Still I am in a position to say that I seem to be at war with my leaders. Whatever they do or whatever they say does not somehow or other appeal to me. The major part of what they say does not seem to be appealing to me.

I find here words of welcome in the English language. I find in the Congress programme a Resolution on Swadeshi. If you hold that you are Swadeshi and yet print these in English, then I am not Swadeshi. To me it seems that it is inconsistent. I have nothing to say against the English language. But I do say that, if you kill the vernaculars and raise the English language on the tomb of the vernaculars (hear, hear), then you are not favouring Swadeshi in the right sense of the term. If you feel that I do not know Tamil, you should pardon me, you should execuse me and teach me and ask me to learn Tamil and I having your welcome in that beautiful language. if you translate it to me, then I should think you are performing some part of the

programme. Then only I should think I am being taught Swadeshi.

I asked when we were passing through Mayavaram whether there have been any handlooms here and whether there were handloom-weavers here. I was told that there were 50 handlooms in Mayavaram. What were they engaged in? They were engaged chiefly in preparing "Sarees" for our women. Then is Swadeshi to be confined only to the women? It is to be only in their keeping? I do not find that our friends, the male population, also have their stuff prepared for them by these weavers and through their handlooms, (a voice: there are 1,000 handlooms here). There are, I understand one thousand handlooms. So much the worse for the leaders! Loud applause.) If these one thousand handlooms are kept chiefly in attending to the wants of our women, double this supply of our handlooms and you will have all your wants supplied by our own weavers and there will be no poverty in the land I ask you and ask our friend the President how far he is indebted to foreign goods for his outfit and if he can tell me that he has tried his utmost and still has failed to outfit himself or rather to fit himself out with Swadeshi clothing and therefore he has got this stuff, I shall sit at his feet and learn a lesson. What I have been able to learn to-day is that it is entirely possible for me, without any extra cost, to fit myself with Swadeshi clothing. How am I to learn through those who move or who are supposed to be movers in the Congress, the secret of the Resolution? I sit at the feet of my leaders, I sit at the feet of the Mayavaram people and let them reveal the mystery, give me the secret of the meaning, teach me how I should behave myself and tell me

whether it is a part of the National movement that should drive off those who are without dwellings, why cry for water and that I should reject the advances of those who cry for food. These are the questions which I ask my friend here. Since I am saying something against you, I doubt whether I shall still enjoy or retain the affection of the student population and whether I shall still retain the blessing of my leaders. I ask you to have a large heart and give me a little corner in it. I shall try to steal into that corner. If you would be kind enough to teach me wisdom, I shall learn wisdom in all humility and in all earnestness. I am praying for it and I am asking for it. If you cannot teach me, I again declare myself at war with my leaders. (Loud cheers.)

THE REWARD OF PUBLIC LIFE.

In reply to the citizens' address at Bangalore presented in May 1915, *Mr. Gandhi made the following speech* :—

I did not want to be dragged in the carriage. There is a meaning in that. Let us not spoil our public men by dragging them. Let them work silently. We should not encourage the thought, that one has to work, because one will be honoured similarly. Let public men feel that they will be stoned, they will be neglected and let them still love the country ; for service is its own reward. A charge has been brought against us that we as a nation are too demonstrative and lack businesslike methods. We plead guilty to the charge. Are we to copy modern activities or are we to copy the ancient civilisation which has survived so many shocks ? You and I have to act on the political platform from a spiritual side and if this is

done, we should then conquer the conquerors. The day will dawn then, when we can consider an Englishman as a fellow-citizen. (Cheers). That day will shortly come; but it my be difficult to conceive when. I have had signal opportunities of associating myself with Englishmen of character, devotion, nobility and influence. I can assure you that the present wave of activity is passing away and a new civilisation is coming shortly which will be a nobler one. India is a great dependency and Mysore is a great Native State. It must be possible for you to transmit this message to British Governors and to British statesmen; the message is "Establish a Ram Rajya in Mysore and have as your minister a Vasishta who will command obedience." (Prolonged cheers.) Then my fellow-countrymen, you can dictate terms to the conqueror. (Prolonged cheers.)

THREE SPEECHES ON GOKHALE

I. UNVEILING MR. GOKHALE'S PORTRAIT

The following is the speech delivered by Mr. Gandhi at Bangalore in unveiling a portrait of Mr. Gokhale in May, 1915.

My dear countrymen,—Before I perform this ceremony to which you have called me, I wish to say this to you that you have given me a great opportunity or rather a privilege on this great occasion. I saw in the recitation,—the beautiful recitation that was given to me,—that God is with them whose garment was dusty and tattered. My thoughts immediately went to the end of my garment; I examined and found that it is not dusty and it is not tattered; it is fairly spotless and

clean. God is not in me. There are other conditions attached; but in these conditions too I may fail; and you, my dear countrymen, may also fail; and if we do tend this well, we should not dishonour the memory of one whose portrait you have asked me to unveil this morning. I have declared myself his disciple in the political field and I have him as my *Raja Guru*; and this I claim on behalf of the Indian people. It was in 1896 that I made this declaration, and I do not regret having made the choice.

Mr. Gokhale taught me that the dream of every Indian who claims to love his country, should be not to glorify in language but to spiritualise the political life of the country and the political institutions of the country. He inspired my life and is still inspiring; and in that I wish to purify myself and spiritualise myself. I have dedicated myself to that ideal. I may fail, and to what extent I may fail, I call myself to that extent an unworthy disciple of my master.

SPIRITUALISING THE POLITICAL LIFE

What is the meaning of spiritualising the political life of the country? What is the meaning of spiritualising myself? That question has come before me often and often and to you it may seem one thing, to me it may seem another thing; it may mean different things to the different members of the Servants of India Society itself. It shows much difficulty and it shows the difficulties, of all those who want to love their country, who want to serve their country and who want to honour their country. I think the political life must be an echo of private life and that there cannot be any divorce between the two.

* * * *

I was by the side of that saintly politician to the end of his life and I found no ego in him. I ask you, members of the Social Service League, if there is no ego in you. If he wanted to shine, if he wanted to shine in the political field of his country, he did so not in order that he might gain public applause, but in order that his country may gain. He developed every particular faculty in him, not in order to win the praise of the world for himself, but in order that his country might gain. He did not seek public applause, but it was showered upon him, it was thrust upon him; he wanted that his country might gain and that was his great inspiration.

There are many things for which India is blamed, very rightly, and if you should add one more to our failures the blame will descend not only on you but also on me for having participated in to-day's functions. But I have great faith in my countrymen.

You ask me to unveil this portrait to-day, and I will do so in all sincerity and that should be the end of your life. (Loud and continued applause)

II. THE LATE MR. GOKHALE.

The following is the text of Mr. Gandhi's speech in seconding the Resolution on Mr. Gokhale at the 15th Bombay Provincial Conference held at Poona on 10th and 11th July 1915.

Mr. President, Brothers and Sisters,—Perhaps it is impudent on my part to add anything to the feeling words that have been spoken by Mrs. Ranade. The fact that she is the widow of the master's master adds solemnity to the proceedings, which I can only mar by any

remarks I may make. But, claiming as I do to be one of Mr. Gokhale's disciples, you will forgive me if I say a few words which are personal tit-bits. It was on board the *Cronprinz* some years ago that I found myself in the master's company together with a common friend, Mr. Kallenbach, a German. (Laughter.) Let me say that all Germans are not fiends; nor are all German soldiers fiends. Mr. Kallenbach is a German and a soldier, but I feel that no purer-minded person to-day walks the earth in Europe than Mr Kallenbach (Hear, hear.) He was accepted as a worthy companion by Mr. Gokhale, who used to play with him the game of coits. Mr. Gokhale had just then, during the voyage from England to Capetown, picked up that game, and he very nearly gave Mr. Kallenbach a beating in the game. (Laughter). I fancy that was a drawn game between them; and, let me add, Mr. Kallenbach, so far as I am aware, is one of the cleverest players of coits in South Africa. Just after that we had our meals at which Mr. Gokhale was talking to me with reference to the result of the game. He thought I never indulged in such sports and that I was against them. He expostulated with me in kind words and said, "Do you know why I want to enter into such competition with Europeans? I certainly want to do at least as much as they can do, for the sake of our country. (Hear, hear.) It is said, rightly or wrongly, that we are inferior people in many matters, and so far as I can do it"—and this he said in all humility—"I certainly want to show that we are at least their equals, if not their superiors." That was one incident. On board the same steamer we were engaged in a hot discussion in connection with our dear motherland, and he was mapping out 'for

me, as a father would for his child, a programme that I was to follow in India if I ever happened to see the motherland again, and in connection therewith there was one thing he said :—"We lack in India character; we want religious zeal in the political field." Shall we then follow the spirit of the master with the same thoroughness and the same religious zeal, so that we can safely teach a child politics? One of his missions in life, I think, was to inculcate the lesson that whatever we do, we should do with thoroughness. This it is not possible for us mortals to imitate in any degree of perfection. Whatever he did, he did with a religious zeal; that was the secret of his success. He did not wear his religion on his sleeves; he lived it. Whatever he touched, he purified; wherever he went, he recreated an atmosphere around him which was fragrant. When he came to South Africa he electrified the people there not only by his magnificent eloquence but by the sincerity of his character and by the religious devotion with which he worked. What was that devotion? Ailing though he was, he was awake the whole night practically when we was to have seen General Smuts; he did so in order to prepare the case for his countrymen with a thoroughness that surprised the Leader of the Boer Government. What was the result? The result was that he got the promise from the South African Government that the £3 tax would be gone in a few years, and the £3 tax is no more. (Cheers.) It is no more there to grind down so many thousands of our countrymen. Mr. Gokhale is dead, but it is possible for you and for me to make his spirit live in us and through us. (Hear, hear). We are about to pass resolutions which would

expect us, the chosen representatives, it, or may be, the self-elected representatives of the people to do certain things. Shall we discharge our trust with the master's devotion? The people we represent will base their verdict not upon our speeches but upon our actions, and how shall we act? We have a right to pass this resolution if we act in the spirit of the master.

III. GOKHALE'S SERVICES TO INDIA

In unveiling the portrait of Gokhale at the Khalikdina Hall, Karachi, on Tuesday the 29th February, 1916, *Mr. Gandhi spoke as follows* :—

In Hyderabad, Sind, also, I was asked to unveil a portrait of Mr. Gokhale; and there I put to myself and to those present a question which I put to myself and to you now. That question is: What right have I to unveil the portrait of Mr. Gokhale and what right have you to join in the ceremony? Of course to unveil a portrait or to join in it is nothing great or important in itself. But the question really involved in the ceremony is important *viz.*, are your hearts and is my heart in reality so much moved as to copy the glorious example of the great man? The function will have no real significance unless we follow in his footsteps. And if we do follow him we shall be able to achieve a great deal. Of course it is not possible for all of us to achieve what Mr. Gokhale did in the Imperial Legislative Council. But the way in which he served the Motherland, the whole-hearted devotion with which he did it day and night without ceasing—all this it is in our power to do as the great one did. And I hope that when you leave this hall you will bear in mind to follow him and thus give

expression to your regard for him. You know that the best achievement of Mr. Gokhale according to himself was the establishment of the Servants of India Society. This great institution he has left behind him; and it lies with us to support it and continue its noble work. It would be best if we could join the Society. But that will involve the question of our being fit for it. But if we are not in a position to join the Society, we can all do the next best thing *viz.* render pecuniary aid and swell the funds of the Society. A great deal of money has been collected in the Bombay Presidency to perpetuate the memory of Mr. Gokhale; but so far nothing has been done in Karachi, Hyderabad and other parts of Sind. Hence to-day on this occasion you should all make up your minds to do something in this connection. In Bombay, Rs. 30,000 have been collected for the erection of Mr. Gokhale's statue. Besides that, money has been collected for placing the Servants of India Society on a sound financial basis. For this purpose a lakh of rupees are required. That amount has not yet been collected. In fact, Rs. 75,000 has been collected and Rs. 25,000 still remains to be subscribed. Karachi and Hyderabad could easily do that and collect the balance. I do not mean to say that you should necessarily contribute that amount. You may do what your hearts move you to do; what I say is that if your hearts are really moved, you may render monetary help to the Servants of India Society. That will be the true test of your regard for Mr. Gokhale and the best way of perpetuating the memory of the great man who lived and who died for the Motherland. (Loud applause).

HINDU UNIVERSITY SPEECH.

The following is the full text of the speech delivered on Feb. 4th 1916, on the occasion of the opening of the Benares Hindu University. The speech was edited by Mr. Gandhi. "In editing the speech" he wrote, "I have merely removed some of the verbiage which in cold print would make the speech bad reading."

Friends, I wish to tender my humble apology for the long delay that took place before I am 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 accept the lectures that have been delivered here during the last two days from this category, because they were 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 that 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 varnaculars 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 I 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 to-day 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 thing 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 to-day? We should have to-day 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 past 50 years would be a heritage for the nation. (Applause). To-day even our wives are not the sharers in our best thought. Look at Professor Bose and Professor Ray and their brilliant re-searches. 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 Moslem 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 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 overawe their less fortunate brethren. Among them I have seen the students 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, an 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 these 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 I say "Oh, it is the money that has come from the agriculturists." Over 75 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, not 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 to-day 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 explaining my 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.

[At this point there was an interruption and there was a movement on the platform to leave; the speech therefore ended here abruptly.]

THE BENARES INCIDENT.

The following communication was made to the Press by Mr. M. K. Gandhi, describing the circumstances under which his speech at the opening ceremony of the Hindu University, Benares, was interrupted.

Mrs. Besant's reference in *New India* and certain other references to the Benares incident perhaps render it necessary for me to return to the subject, however disinclined I may be to do so. Mrs. Besant denies my

statement wtth reference to her whispering to the Princes. I can only say that if I can trust my eyes and my ears, I must adhere to the statement I have made. She occupied a seat on the left of the semi-circle on either side of the Maharaja of Darbhanga, who occupied the chair, and there was at least one Prince, perhaps there were two, who were sitting on her side. Whilst I was speaking, Mrs. Besant was almost behind me. When the Maharaja rose Mrs. Besant had also risen. I had ceased speaking before the Rajahs actually left the platform. I gently suggested to her that she might have refrained from interrupting, but that, if she disapproved of the speech after it was finished, she could have then dissociated herself from my sentiments. But she, with some degree of warmth, cried, "How could we sit still when you were compromising every one of us on the platform ? You ought not to have made the remarks you did." This answer of Mrs. Besant's does not quite tally with her solicitude for me, which alone, according to her version of the incident, promoted her to interrupt the speech. I suggest that if she merely meant to protect me she could have passed a note round or whispered into my ears her advice. And, again, if it was for my protection, why was it necessary for her to rise with the Princes and to leave the hall as I held she did along with them ?

So far as my remarks are concerned, I am yet unable to know what it was in my speech that seems to her to be open to such exception as to warrant her interruption. After referring to the Viceregal visit and the necessary precautions that were taken for the Viceroy's safety, I showed that an assassin's death was anything but an honorable death, and said that anarchism was opposed

to our Sastras and had no place in India. I said then where there was honourable death it would go down to history as men who died for their conviction. But when a bomb-thrower died, secretly plotting all sorts of things, what could he gain ? I then went on to state and dealt with the fallacy that, had not bomb-throwers thrown bombs, we should never have gained what we did with reference to the Partition Movement. It was at about this stage that Mrs. Besant appealed to the chair to stop me. Personally, I shall desire a publication of the whole of my speech whose trend was a sufficient warrant for showing that I could not possibly incite the students to deeds of violence. Indeed it was conceived in order to carry on a rigorous self-examination.

I began by saying that it was a humiliation for the audience and myself that I should have to speak in English. I said that English having been the medium of instruction, it had done a tremendous injury to the country, and I conceive I showed successfully that, had we received training during the past 50 years in higher thought in our own vernaculars, we should be to-day within reach of our goal. I then referred to the Self-government Resolution passed at the Congress and showed that whilst the All-India Congress Committee and the All-India Moslem League would be drawing up their paper about the future constitution, their duty was to fit themselves by their own action for self-government. And in order to show how short we fall of our duty I drew attention to the dirty condition of the labyrinth of lanes surrounding the great temple of Kasi-Viswanath and the recently erected palatial buildings without any conception as to the straightness or

the width of the streets. I then took the audience to the gorgeous scene that was enacted on the dais of laying of the foundation and suggested that if a stranger not knowing anything about Indian life had visited the scene he would have gone away under the false impression that India was one of the richest countries in the world, such was the display of jewellery worn by our noblemen. And turning to the Maharajahs and the Rajahs I humourously suggested that it was necessary for them to hold those treasures in trust for the nation before we could realise our ideals, and I cited the action of the Japanese noblemen who considered it a glorious privilege, even though there was no necessity for them, to dispossess themselves of treasures and land which were handed to them from generation to generation. I then asked the audience to consider the humiliating spectacle of the Viceroy's person having to be protected from ourselves when he was our honoured guest. And I was endeavouring to show that the blame for these precautions was also on ourselves in that they were rendered necessary because of the introduction of organised assassination in India. Thus I was endeavouring to show on the one hand how the students could usefully occupy themselves in assisting to rid society of its proved defects, and on the other, to wean themselves even in thought from methods of violence.

I claim that with twenty years' experience of public life in the course of which I have had to address on scores of occasions turbulent audiences, I have some experience of feeling the pulse of my audience. I was following closely how the speech was being taken, and I certainly did not notice that the student world was

being adversely affected. Indeed some of them came to me the following morning and told me that they perfectly understood my remarks, which had gone home. One of them, a keen debater, even subjected me to cross-examination and seemed to feel convinced by a further development of the argument such as I had advanced in the course of my speech. Indeed I have spoken now to thousands of students and others of my countrymen throghout South Africa, England and India and by precisely the arguments that I used that evening I claim to have weaned many from their approval of anarchical methods.

Finally, I observe that Mr. S. S. Setlur, of Bombay, who has written on the incident to *Hiudu* in no friendly mood towards me and who, I think, in some respects totally and unfairly has endeavoured to tear me to pieces and who was an eye-witness to the proceedings gives a version different from Mrs. Besant's. He thinks that the general impression was not that I was encouraging the anarchists but I was playing the role of an apologist for the civilian bureaucrat. The whole of Mr. Setlur's attack upon me shows that if he is right, I was certainly not guilty of any incitement to violence and that offence consisted in my reference to jewellery, etc.

In order that the fullest justice might be done both to Mrs. Besant and myself, I would make the following suggestion. She says that she does not propose to defend herself by quoting the sentence which drew the Princes away and that would be playing into the enemies' hand. According to her previous statement my speech is already in the hands of detectives, so that so far as my safety is concerned, her forbearance is not going to be of the slightest use. Would it not there-

fore be better that she should either publish a verbatim report, if she has it, or reproduce such sentiments in my speech as, in her opinion, necessitated her interruption and the Princes' withdrawal.

I will therefore conclude this statement by repeating what I have said before : that, but for Mrs. Besant's interruption, I would have concluded my speech in a few minutes and no possible misconception about my views on anarchism would have arisen.

REPLY TO KARACHI ADDRESS.

In reply to the welcome address presented by the Citizens' Association, Karachi, on February 29, 1916, Mr. Gandhi spoke in Hindi to the following effect :—

I am grateful to you all for this address and for what you have done in connection with my visit and for the trouble you have taken therefor. I have been travelling in various parts of India ; and in the course of my travels I have been struck with the fact that throughout India the hearts of the people are in a special degree drawn towards me. All brothers of Hindustan, without distinction of creed or caste, have been showing this attachment. But I feel convinced that this remarkable attachment to me is meant not for me but as a fitting tribute of admiration to all those noble brothers and sisters of ours in South Africa who underwent such immense troubles and sacrifices, including incarceration in jails, for the service of the Motherland. It is undoubtedly this consideration which leads you to be so very kind to me. It was they who won the struggle, and it was by reason of their unflinching determination to ' do or die' that so much was achieved. Hence I take

it that whatever tribute is paid to me is in reality and in truth paid to them.

In the course of my tour in India I have been particularly struck with one thing and that is the awakening of the Indian people. A new hope has filled the hearts of the people, hope that something is going to happen which will raise the Motherland to a higher status. But side by side with this spirit of hope I also had amongst my countrymen awe not only of the Government but also of heads of castes and the priestly class. As a result of this we are afraid to speak out what is in us. So long as this spirit remains, there will be and there can be, no true progress. You know that at the last session of the Congress a resolution was passed about self-government. For the attainment of that ideal you and I, all of us, must work and persevere In persuance of that resolution the committees of the Congress and the Moslem League will soon meet together; and they will decide what they think proper. But the attainment of self-government depends not on their saying or doing anything but upon what you and I do. Here in Karachi commerce is predominent and there are many big merchants. To them I wish to address a few words. It is a misapprehension to think that there is no scope in commerce for serving the mother-country If they are inspired by the spirit of truth, merchants can be immensely useful to the country. The salvation of our country, remember, is not in the hands of others but of ourselves, and more in the hands of merchants in some respects than the educated people; for I strongly feel that so long as there is no swedeshism, there can be no self-government (hear, hear,); and for the spread of swadeshism Indian

merchants are in a position to do a very great deal. The swadeshi wave passed through the country at one time. But I understand that the movement had collapsed largely because Indian merchants had palmed on foreign goods as swadeshi articles. By Indian merchants being honest and straight-forward in their business, they could achieve a great deal for the regeneration and uplift of of the country. Hence merchants should faithfully observe what Hindus call *Dharma* and Muhammadans call *Iman* in their business transactions. Then shall India be uplifted. I appeal to you that in this potent way can you be serviceable to the country. Karachi is a big and important city—the fourth important city and port in India. It possesses many big and rich merchants. I hope they will brood over this suggestion, for it rests very largely with the merchants to do lasting good or lasting harm to the country. In South Africa our merchants rendered valuable help in the struggle; and yet because some of them weakened, the struggle was prolonged somewhat. It is the duty of the educated classes to mix freely with Indian merchants and the poor classes. Then will our journey to the common and cherished goal be less irksome. (Prolonged applause.)

THE GURUKULA

The following is an account of Mr. Gandhi's speech at the anniversary of the Gurukula, as written out by himself:—

I propose to reproduce only as much of it as in my opinion is worth placing on record with additions where they may be found necessary. The speech, it may be

observed, was delivered in Hindi. After thanking Mahatmaji Munshi Ram for his great kindness to my boys to whom he gave shelter on two occasions and acted as father to them and after stating that the time for action had arrived rather than for speeches, I proceeded :—I owe a debt of gratitude to the Arya Samaj. I have often derived inspiration from its activity. I have noticed among the members of the Samaj much self-sacrifice. During my travels in India I came across many Arya Samajists who were doing excellent work for the country. I am, therefore, grateful to Mahatmaji that I am enabled to be in your midst. At the same time it is but fair to state that I am frankly a Sanatanist. For me Hinduism is all-sufficing. Every variety of belief finds protection under its ample fold. And though the Arya Samajists and the Sikhs and the Brahmo Samajists may choose to be classed differently from the Hindus, I have no doubt that at no distant future they will be all merged in Hinduism and find in it their fulness. Hinduism like every other human institution has its drawbacks and its defects. Here is ample scope for any worker to strive for reform, but there is little cause for succession.

SPIRIT OF FEARLESSNESS

Throughout my travels I have been asked about the immediate need for India. And perhaps I would not do better than repeat this afternoon the answer I have given elsewhere. In general terms a proper religious spirit is the greatest and most immediate need. But I know that this is too general an answer to satisfy anybody. And it is an answer true for all time. What, therefore, I desire to say is that owing to the religious spirit being

dormant in us, we are living in a state of perpetual fear. We fear the temporal as well as the spiritual authority. We dare not speak out our minds before our priests and our Pandits. We stand in awe of the temporal power. I am sure that in so doing we do a disservice to them and us. Neither the spiritual teachers nor our political governors could possibly desire that we should hide the truth from them. Lord Willingdon speaking to a Bombay audience has been saying recently that he had observed that we hesitated to say 'no' when we really meant it and advised his audience to cultivate a fearless spirit. Of course, fearlessness should never mean want of due respect or regard for the feelings of others. In my humble opinion fearlessness is the first thing indispensable before we could achieve anything permanent and real. This quality is unattainable without religious consciousness. Let us fear God and we shall cease to fear man. If we grasp the fact that there is a divinity within us which witnessess everything we think or do and which protects us and guides us along the true path, it is clear that we shall cease to have any other fear on the face of the earth save the fear of God. Loyalty to the Governor of governors supersedes all other loyalty and gives an intelligent basis to the latter.

MEANING OF SWADESHI

And when we have sufficiently cultivated this spirit of fearlessneess, we shall see that there is no salvation for us without true Swadeshi, not the Swadeshi which can be conveniently put off. Swadeshi for me has a deeper meaning. I would like us to apply it in our religious, political and economic life. It is not therefore merely confined to

wearing on occasions a Swadashi cloth. That we have to do for all time not out of a spirit of jealousy or revenge, but because it is a duty we owe to our dear country. We commit a breach of the Swadeshi spirit certainly if we wear foreign-made cloth but we do so also if we adopt the foreign cut. Surely the style of our dress has some correspondence with our environment. In elegance and tastefulness it is immeasurably superior to the trousers and the jacket. An Indian wearing a shirt flowing over his pyjamas with a waist coat on it without a necktie and its flaps hanging loose behind is not a very gracefull spectacle. Swadeshi in religion teaches one to measure the glorious past and re-enact it in the present generation. The pandemonium that is going on in Europe shows that modern civilization represents forces of evil and darkness whereas the ancient *i.e.*, Indian civilization, represents in its essence the divine force. Modern civilization is chiefly materialistic as ours is chiefly spiritual. Modern civilization occupies itself in the investigation of the laws of matter and employs the human ingenuity in inventing or discovering means of production and weapons of destruction ; ours is chiefly occupied in exploring spiritual laws. Our Shastras lay down unequivocally that a proper observance of truth, chastity, scrupulous regard for all life, abstention from coveting others' possessions and refusal to hoard anything but what is necessary for our daily wants is indispensable for a right life ; that without it a knowledge of the divine element is an impossibility. Our civilization tells us with daring certainty that a proper and perfect cultivation of the quality of *ahimsa* which in its active form means purest love and pity,

brings the whole world to our feet. The author of this discovery gives a wealth of illustration, which carries conviction with it.

THE DOCTRINE OF AHIMSA

Examine its result in the political life. There is no gift so valued by our Shastra as the gift of life. Consider what our relations would be with our rulers if we gave absolute security of life to them. If they could but feel that no matter what we might feel about their acts, we would hold their bodies as sacred as our own, there would immediately spring up an atmosphere of mutual trust and there would be such frankness on either side as to pave the way for an honourable and just solution of many problems that worry us to-day. It should be remembered that in practising *ahimsa* there need not be any reciprocation, though as a matter of fact in its final stages it commands reciprocation. Many of us believe, and I am one of them, that through our civilization we have a message to deliver to the world. I tender my loyalty to the British Government quite selfishly. I would like to use the British race for transmitting this mighty message of *ahimsa* to the whole world. But that can only be done when we have conquered our so-called conquerors and you, my Arya Samaj friends, are perhaps specially elected for this mission. You claim to examine our scriptures critically. You take nothing for granted and you claim not to fear to reduce your belief to practice. I do not think that there is any room for trifling with or limiting the doctrine of *ahimsa*. You dare then to reduce it to practice regardless of immediate consequences which would certainly test the strength of your convictions. You would not only have procured salvation for India, but you would

have rendered the noblest service that a man can render to humanity—a service moreover which you would rightly assert, the great Swami was born for. This Swadeshi is to be considered as a very active force to be ceaselessly employed with an ever-increasing vigilance, searching self-examination. It is not meant for the lazy, but it is essentially meant for them who would gladly lay down their lives for the sake of truth. It is possible to dilate upon several other phases of Swadeshi, but I think I have said enough to enable you to understand what I mean. I only hope that you who represent a school of reformers in India will not reject what I have said, without a thorough examination. And if my word has commended itself to you, your past record entitles me to expect you to enforce in your own lives the things of eternity about which I have ventured to speak to you this after-noon and cover the whole of India with your activity.

WORK OF THE ARYA SAMAJ

In concluding my report of the above speech, I would like to state what I did not in speaking to that great audience and it is this. I have now twice visited the Gurukula. In spite of some vital differences with my brethren of the Arya Samaj, I have a sneaking regard for them, and it, and perhaps the best result of the activity of the Arya Samaj is to be seen in the establishment and the conduct of the Gurukula. Though it depends for its vitality entirely upon the inspiring presence of Mahatmaji Munshiram, it is truly a national and self-governing and self-governed institution. It is totally independent of Government aid or patronage. Its war chest is filled not out of monies received from the privileged few, but from the poor many who make it a

point of honor from year to year to make a pilgrimage to Kangri and willingly give their mite for maintaining this National College. Here at every anniversary a huge crowd gathers and the manner in which it is handled, housed and fed evinces no mean power of organisation. But the most wonderful thing about it all is that the crowd consisting of about ten thousand men, women and children, is managed without the assistance of a single policeman and without any fuss or semblance of force, the only force that subsists between the crowd and the managers of the institution is that of love and mutual esteem. Fourteen years are nothing in the life of a big institution like this. What the collegiates who have been just turned out during the last two or three years will be able to show, remains to be seen. The public will not and cannot judge men or institutions except through the results that they show. It makes no allowance for failures It is a most exacting judge. The final appeal of the Gurukula as of all popular institutions must be to this judge Great responsibility therefore rests upon the shoulders of the students who have been discharged from the College and who have entered upon the thorny path of life. Let them beware. Meanwhile those who are wellwishers of this great experiment may derive satisfaction from the fact that we have it as an indisputable rule of life, that as the tree is so will the fruit be. The tree looks lovely enough. He who waters it is a noble soul. Why worry about what the fruit is likely to be ?

INDUSTRIAL TRAINING

As a lover of the Gurukula, I may be permitted to offer one or two suggestions to the committe and the parents. The Gurukula boys need a thorough industrial

training if they are to become self-reliant and self-supporting. It seems to me that in our country in which 85 per cent. of the population is agricultural and perhaps 10 per cent. occupied in supplying the wants of the peasantry, it must be part of the training of every youth that he has a fair pratical knowledge of agriculture and hand-weaving. He will lose nothing if he knows a proper use of tools, can saw a piece of board straight and build a wall that will not come down through a faulty handling of the plumber's line. A boy who is thus equipped will never feel helpless in battling with the world and never be in want of employment. A knowledge of the laws of hygiene and sanitation as well as the art of rearing children should also form a necessary part of the Gurukula lads. The sanitary arrangements at the fair left much to be desired. The plague of flies told its own tale. These irrepressible sanitary inspectors incessantly warned us that in point of sanitation all was not well with us. They plainly suggested that the remains of our food and excreta need to be properly buried. It seemed to me to be such a pity that a golden opportunity was being missed of giving to the annual visitors practical lessons on sanitation. But the work must begin with the boys. Then the management would have at the annual gathering three hundred practical sanitary teachers. Last but not least let the parents and the committee not spoil their lads by making them ape European dress or modern luxuries. These will hinder them in their after life and are antagonistic to Bramacharya. They have enough to fight against in the evil inclinations common to us all. Let us not make their fight more difficult by adding to their temptations.

SWADESHI

The following is an address delivered before the Missionary Conference, Madras, on the 14th February, 1916.

It was not without great diffidence that I undertook to speak to you at all. And I was hard put to it in the selection of my subject. I have chosen a very delicate and difficult subject. It is delicate because of the peculiar views I hold upon Swadeshi, and it is difficult because I have not that command of language which is necessary for giving adequate expression to my thoughts. I know that I may rely upon your indulgence for the many shortcomings you will no doubt find in my address, the more so when I tell you that there is nothing in what I am about to say that I am not either already practising or am not pre paring to practise to the best of my ability. It encour ages me to observe that last month you devoted a week to prayer in the place of an address. I have earnestly prayed that what I am about to say may bear fruit and I know that you will bless my word with a similar prayer.

After much thinking I have arrived at a definition of Swadeshi that, perhaps, best illustrates my meaning. Swadeshi is that sprit 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. And, as we do not abandon our pursuit after 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.

Let us briefly examine the three branches of Swadeshi as sketched above. Hinduism has become a conservative religion and, therefore, a mighty force because of the Swadeshi spirit underlying it. It is the most tolerant because it is non-proselytising, and it is as capable of expansion to-day as it has been found to be in the past. It has succeeded not in driving out, as I think it has been erroneously held, but in absorbing Buddhism. By reason of the Swadeshi spirit, a Hindu refuses to change his religion, not necessarily because he considers it to be the best, but because he knows that he can complement it by introducing reforms. And what I have said about Hinduism is, I suppose, true of the other great faiths of the world, only it is held that it is specially so in the case of Hinduism. But here comes the point I am labouring to reach. If there is any substance in what I have said, will not the great missionary bodies of India, to whom she owes a deep debt of gratitude for what they have done and are doing, do still better and

serve the spirit of Christianity better by dropping the goal of proselytising while continuing their philanthropic work? I hope you will not consider this to be an impertinence on my part. I make the suggestion in all sincerity and with due humility. Moreover I have some claim upon your attention. I have endeavoured to study the Bible. I consider it as part of my scriptures. The spirit of the Sermon on the Mount competes almost on equal terms with the Bhagavad Gita for the domination of my heart. I yield to no Christian in the strength of devotion with which I sing 'Lead kindly light" and several other inspired hymns of a similar nature. I have come under the influence of noted Christian missionaries belonging to different denominations. And I enjoy to this day the privilege of friendship with some of them. You will perhaps, therefore, allow that I have offered the above suggestion not as a biased Hindu, but as a humble and impartial student of religion with great leanings towards Christianity. May it not be that "Go ye unto all the world" message has been somewhat narrowly interpreted and the spirit of it missed? It will not be denied, I speak from experience, that many of the conversions are only so-called. In some cases the appeal has gone not to the heart but to the stomach. And in every case a conversion leaves a sore behind it which, I venture to think, is avoidable. Quoting again from experience, a new birth, a change of heart, is perfectly possible in every one of the great faiths. I know I am now treading upon thin ice. But I do not apologise in closing this part of my subject, for saying that the frightful outrage that is just going on in Europe, perhaps shows that the message of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Peace, had been little understood in

Europe, and that light upon it may have to be thrown from the East.

I have sought your help in religious matters, which it is yours to give in a special sense. But I make bold to seek it even in political matters. 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. As a matter of fact, in your own silent manner, you influence politics not a little. And 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 Cæsar what was Caesar's and for the rest have done much as they have liked. The vast organisation of caste answered not only 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 the caste system its wonderful power of organisation. One had but to attend the great Kumbha Mela at Hardwar last year to know how skiful that organisation must have been, which without any seeming effort was able

effectively to cater for more than a million pilgrims. Yet it is the fashion to say that we lack organising ability. This is true, I fear, to a certain extent, of those who have been nurtured in the new traditions. 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 organise 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 organised assassination on its sacred soil. It is not too late to mend. And you can help if you will, as no other body or bodies can.

And now for the last division of Swadeshi. 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 to-day 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. She need not be, she ought not to be, drawn into the vertex of mad and ruinous competition which breeds fratricide, jealousy and many other evils. But who is to stop her great millionaires from entering into the world competition? Certainly not legislation. Force of public opinion, proper education, however, can do a great deal in the desired direction. The hand-loom

industry is in a dying condition. I took special care during my wanderings last year to see as many weavers as possible, and my heart ached to find how they had lost, how families had retired from this once flourishing and honourable occupation. If we follow the Swadeshi doctrine, it would be your duty and mine to find out neighbours who can supply our wants and to teach them to supply them where they do not know how to proceed, assuming that there are neighbours who are in want of healthy occupation. Then every village of India will almost be a self-supporting and self-contained unit, exchanging only such necessary commodities with other villages where they are not locally producible. 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 Mahomedan is ready to offer pure water to drink. And yet thousands of Hindus would rather die of thirst than drink water from a Mahomedan 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 forswear foreign goods. There is a verse in the Bhagavat Gita, which, freely rendered, means, masses follow the classes. It is easy to undo the evil if the thinking portion of the

community were to take the Swadeshi vow even though it may, for a time, cause considerable inconvenience. I hate legislative interference, in any department of life. At best it is the lesser evil. But I would tolerate, welcome, indeed, plead for a stiff protective duty upon foreign goods. Natal, a British colony, protected its sugar by taxing the sugar that came from another British colony, Mauritius. England has sinned against India by forcing free trade upon her. It may have been food for her, but it has been poison for this country.

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 to 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 a needle, because these are not manufactured in India, need cause no terror. A Swadeshist will learn to do without hundreds of things which to-day 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. And we would be making for the goal even if we confined Swadeshi to a given set of articles allowing ourselves as a temporary measure to use such things as might not be procurable in the country.

There now remains for me to consider one more objection that has been raised against Swadeshi. The objectors consider it to be a most selfish doctrine without any warrant in the civilized code of morality. With them to practice Swadeshi is to revert to barbarism. I cannot

enter into a detailed analysis of the proposition. But I would urge that Swadeshi is the only doctrine consistent with the law of humility and love. It is arrogance to think of launching out to serve the whole of India when I am hardly able to serve even my own family. It were better to concentrate my effort upon the family and consider that through them I was serving the whole nation and, if you will, the whole of humanity. This is humility and it is love. The motive will determine the quality of the act. I may serve my family regardless of the sufferings I may cause to others. As for instance, I may accept an employment which enables me to extort money from people, I enrich myself thereby and then satisfy many unlawful demands of the family. Here I am neither serving the family nor the State. Or I may recognise that God has given me hands and feet only to work with for my sustenance and for that of those who may be dependent upon me. I would then at once simplify my life and that of those whom I can directly reach. In this instance I would have served the family without causing injury to anyone else. Supposing that every one followed this mode of life, we should have at once an ideal state. All will not reach that state at the same time. But those of us who, realising its truth, enforce it inpractice will clearly anticipate and accelerate the coming of that happy day. Under this plan of life, in seeming to serve India to the exclusion of every other county, I do not harm any other country. My patriotism is both exclusive and inclusive. It is exclusive in the sense that in all humility I confine my attention to the land of my birth, but it is inclusive in the sense that my service is not of a competitive or antagonistic nature. *Sic utere tuo ut alienum non la*

is not merely a legal maxim, but it is a grand doctrine of life. It is the key to a proper practice of *Ahimsa* or love. It is for you, the custodians of a great faith, to set the fashion and show, by your preaching, sanctified by practice, that patriotism based on hatred "killeth" and that patriotism based on love "giveth life."

AHIMSA

The following letter from the pen of Mr. M. K. Gandhi appeared in The Modern Review, for October, 1916.

There seems to be no historical warrant for the belief that an exaggerated practice of Ahimsa synchronised with our becoming bereft of manly virtues During the past 1,500 years we have, as a nation, given ample proof of physical courage, but we have been torn by internal dissensions and have been dominated by love of self instead of love of country. We have, that is to say, been swayed by the spirit of irreligion rather than of religion.

I do not know how far the charge of unmanliness can be made good against the Jains. I hold no brief for them. By birth I am a Vaishnavite, and was taught Ahimsa in my childhood. I have derived much religious benefit from Jain religious works as I have from scriptures of the other great faiths of the world. I owe much to the living company of the deceased philosopher, Rajachand Kavi, who was a Jain by birth. Thus, though my views on Ahimsa are a result of my study of most of the faiths of the world, they are now no longer dependent upon the authority of these works. They are a part of my life, and, if I suddenly discovered that the

religious books read by me bore a different interpretation from the one I had learnt to give them, I should still hold to the view of Ahimsa as I am about to set forth here.

Our Shastras seem to teach that a man who really practises Ahimsa in its fulness has the world at his feet; he so affects his surroundings that even the snakes and other venomous reptiles do him no harm. This is said to have been the experience of St. Francis of Assisi.

In its negative form it means not injuring any living being whether by body or mind. It may not, therefore, hurt the person of any wrong-doer, or bear any ill-will to him and so cause him mental suffering. This statement does not cover suffering caused to the wrong-doer by natural acts of mine which do not proceed from ill-will. It, therefore, does not prevent me from withdrawing from his presence a child whom he, we shall imagine, is about to strike. Indeed, the proper practice of Ahimsa *requires* me to withdraw the intended victim from the wrong-doer, if I am, in any way whatsoever, the guardian of such a child. It was, therefore, most proper for the passive resisters of South Africa to have resisted the evil that the Union Government sought to do to them. They bore no ill-will to it. They showed this by helping the Government whenever it needed their help. ***Their resistance consisted of disobedience of the orders of the Government, even to the extent of suffering death at their hands.*** Ahimsa requires deliberate self-suffering, not a deliberate injuring of the supposed wrong-doer.

In its positive form, Ahimsa means the largest love, the greatest charity. If I am a follower of Ahimsa, I

must love my enemy. I must apply the same rules to the wrong-doer who is my enemy or a stranger to me, as I would to my wrong-doing father or son. This active Ahimsa neceessarily includes truth and fearlessness. As man cannot deceive the loved one, he does not fear or frighten him or her. Gift of life is the greatest of all gifts; a man who gives it in reality, disarms all hostility. He has paved the way for an honourable understanding. And none who his himself subject to fear can bestow that gift. He must, therefore, be himself fearless. A man cannot then practice Ahimsa and be a coward at the same time. The practice of Ahimsa calls forth the greatest courage. It is the most soldierly of a soldier's virtues. General Gordon has been represented in a famous statue as bearing only a stick. This takes us far on the road to Ahimsa. But a soldier, who needs the protection of even a stick, is to that extent so much the less a soldier. He is the true soldier who knows how to die and stand his ground in the midst of a hail of bullets. Such a one was Ambarish, who stood his ground without lifting a finger though Durvasa did his worst. The Moors who were being pounded by the French gunners and who rushed to the guns' mouths with 'Allah' on their lips, showed much the same type of courage. Only theirs was the courage of desperation. Ambarisha's was due to love. Yet the Moorish valour, readiness to die, conquered the gunners. They frantically waved their hats, ceased firing, and greeted their erstwhile enemies as comrades. And so the South African passive resisters in their thousands were ready to die rather than sell their honour for a little personal ease. This was Ahimsa in its active form. It *never* barters away honour. A

helpless girl in the hands of a follower of Ahimsa finds better and surer protection than in the hands of one who is prepared to defend her only to the point to which his weapons would carry him. The tyrant, in the first instance, will have to walk to his victim over the dead body of her defender ; in the second, he has but to overpower the defender ; for it is assumed that the cannon of propriety in the second instance will be satisfied when the defender has fought to the extent of his physical valour. In the first instance, as the defender has matched his very soul against the mere body of the tyrant, the odds are that the soul in the latter will be awakened, and the girl would stand an infinitely greater chance of her honour being protected than in any other conceivable circumstance, barring of course, that of her own personal courage.

If we are unmanly to-day, we are so, not because we do not know how to strike, but because we fear to die. He is no follower of Mahavira, the apostle of Jainism, or of Buddha or of the Vedas, who, being afraid to die, takes flight before any danger, real or imaginary, all the while wishing that somebody else would remove the danger by destroying the person causing it. He is no follower of Ahimsa who does not care a straw if he kills a man by inches by deceiving him in trade, or who would protect by force of arms a few cows and make away with the butcher or who, in order to do a supposed good to his country, does not mind killing off a few officials. All these are actuated by hatred, cowardice and fear. Here the love of the cow or the country is a vague thing intended to satisfy one's vanity, or soothe a stinging conscience.

Ahimsa truly understood, is in my humble opinion a

panacea for all evils mundane and extra-mundane. We can never overdo it. Just at present we are not doing it at all. Ahimasa does not displace the practice of other virtues, but renders their practice imperatively necessary before it can be practised even in its rudiments. Mahavira and Buddha were soldiers, and so was Tolstoy. Only they saw deeper and truer into their profession, and found the secret of a true, happy honourable and godly life. Let us be joint sharers with these teachers, and this land of ours will once more be the adode of Gods.

ENCONOMIC *vs.* MORAL PROGRESS

The following is a lecture delivered by Mr. Gandhi at a meeting of the Muir Central College Economic Society, held at Allahabad, on Friday, 22nd December 1916.

Does economic progress clash with real progress? By economic progress, I take it, we mean materia advancement without limit, and by real progress we mean moral progress, which again is the same thing as progress of the permanent element in us. The subject may therefore be stated thus; Does not mora progress increase in the same proportion as materia progress? I know that this is a wider proposition than the one before us. But I venture to think that we always mean the large one even when we lay down the smaller. For we know enough of science to realize that there is no such thing as perfect rest or repose in this visible universe of ours. If, therefore, materia progress does not clash with moral progress, it mus

necessarily advance the latter. Nor can we be satisfied with the clumsy way in which sometimes those who cannot defend the large proposition put their case. They seem to be obsessed with the concrete case of thirty millions of India, stated by the late Sir William Wilson Hunter to be living on one meal a day. They say that, before we can think or talk of their moral welfare, we must satisfy their daily wants. With these they say, material progrees spells moral progress. And then is taken a sudden jump; what is true of thirty millions is true of the universe. They forget that hard cases make bad law. I need hardly say to you how ludicrously absurd this deduction would be. No one has ever suggested that grinding pauperism can lead to anything else than moral degradation. Every human being has a right to live and therefore to find the wherewithal to feed himself and where necessary to clothe and house himself. But for this very simple performance we need no assistance from economists or their laws.

'Take no thought for the morrow' is an injunction which finds an echo in almost all the religious scriptures of the world. In well-ordered society the securing of one's livelihood should be and is found to be the easiest thing in the world. Indeed, the test of orderliness in a country is not the number of millionares it owns, but the absence of starvation among its masses. The only statement that has to be examined is, whether it can be laid down as a law of universal application that material advancement means moral progress.

Now let us take a few illustrations. Rome suffered a moral fall when it attained high material affluence. So did Egypt and so perhaps most countries of which

we have any historical record. The descendants and kinsmen of the royal and divine Krishna too fell when they were rolling in riches. We do not deny to the Rockefellers and the Carnegies possession of an ordinary measure of morality but we gladly judge them indulgently. I mean that we do not even expect them to satisfy the highest standard of morality. With them material gain has not necessarily meant moral gain. In South Africa, where I had the privilege of associating with thousands of our countrymen on most intimate terms, I observed almost invariably that the greater the possession of riches, the greater was their moral turpitude. Our rich men, to say the least, did not advance the moral struggle of passive resistance as did the poor. The rich men's sense of self respect was not so much injured as that of the poorest. If I were not afraid of treading on dangerous ground, I would even come nearer home and show how that possession of riches has been a hindrance to real growth. I venture to think that the scriptures of the world are far safer and sounder treatises on laws of economics than many of the modern text-books. The question we are asking ourselves this evening is not a new one. It was addressed of Jesus two thousand years ago. St. Mark has vividly described the scene. Jesus is in his solemn mood. He is earnest. He talks of eternity. He knows the world about him. He is himself the greatest economist of his time. He succeeded in economising time and space—he transcended them. It is to him at his best that one comes running, kneels down, and asks; 'Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him: 'Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God. Thou knowest

the commandments. Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.' And he answered and said unto him : ' Master, all these have I observed from my youth.' Then Jesus beholding him loved him and said unto him : ' One thing thou lackest. Go thy way, sell whatever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shall have treasure in heaven—come, take up the cross and follow me.' And he was sad at that saying and went away grieved—for he had great possession. And Jesus looked round about and said unto his disciple : ' How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God ' And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again and said unto them, ' Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God !.' Here you have an eternal rule of life stated in the noblest words the English language is capable of producing. But the disciples nodded unbelief as we do even to this day. To him they said as we say to-day : 'But look how the law fails in practice. If we sell all and have nothing, we shall have nothing to eat. We must have money or we cannot even be reasonably moral.' So they state their case thus :—And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves : ' Who then can be saved.' And Jesus looking upon them said : 'With men it is impossible, but not with God, for with God, all things are possible.' Then Peter began to say unto him : 'Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.' And Jesus answered and said : 'Verily I say unto you there is no man

that has left house or brethren or sisters, or father or mother, or wife or children or lands for my sake and Gospel's but he shall receive one hundredfold, now in this time houses and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and land, and in the world to come, eternal life. But many that are first shall be last and the last, first.' You have here the result or reward, if you prefer the term, of following the law. I have not taken the trouble of copying similar passages from the other non-Hindu scriptures and I will not insult you by quoting, in support of the law stated by Jesus, passages from the writings and sayings of our own sages, passages even stronger, if possible, than the Biblical extracts I have drawn your attention to. Perhaps the strongest of all the testimonies in favour of the affirmative answer to the question before us are the lives of the greatest teachers of the world. Jesus, Mahomed, Buddha, Nanak, Kabir, Chaitanya, Shankara, Dayanand, Ramkrishna were men who exercised an immense influence over, and moulded the character of, thousands of men. The world is the richer for their having lived in it. And they were all men who deliberately embraced poverty as their lot.

I should not have laboured my point as I have done, if I did not believe that, in so far as we have made the modern materialistic craze our goal, so far are we going down hill in the path of progress. I hold that economic progress in the sense I have put it is antagonisict to real progress. Hence the ancient ideal has been the limitation of activities promoting wealth. This does not put an end to all material ambition. We should still have, as we have always had, in our midst people who make the pursuit of wealth their aim in life. But

we have always recognised that it is a fall from the ideal. It is a beautiful thing to know that the wealthiest among us have often felt that to have remained voluntarily poor would have been a higher state for them. That you cannot serve God and Mammon is an economic truth of the highest value. We have to make our choice. Western nations are to-day groaning under the heal of the monster god of materialism. Their moral growth has become stunted. They measure their progress in £. s. d. American wealth has become the standard. She is the envy of the other nations. I have heard many of our countrymen say that we will gain American wealth but avoid its methods. I venture to suggest that such an attempt, if it were made, is foredoomed to failure. We cannot be 'wise, temperate and furious' in a moment. I would have our leaders teach us to be morally supreme in the world. This land of ours was once, we are told, the abode of the Gods. It is not possible to conceive Gods inhabiting a land which is made hideous by the smoke and the din of mill chimneys and factories and whose roadways are traversed by rushing engines, dragging numerous cars crowded with men who know not for the most part what they are after, who are often absent-minded, and whose tempers do not improve by being uncomfortably packed like sardines in boxes and finding themselves in the midst of utter strangers, who would oust them if they could and whom they would, in their turn, oust similarly. I refer to these things because they are held to be symbolical of material progress. But they add not an atom to our happiness. This is what Wallace, the great scientist, has said as his deliberate judgment :—

In the earliest records which have come down to us from the past, we find ample indications that general ethical considerations and conceptions, the accepted standard of morality, and the conduct resulting from these, were in no degree inferior to those which prevail to-day.

In a series of chapters he then proceeds to examine the position of the English nation under the advance in wealth it has made : He says : 'This rapid growth of wealth and increase of our power over Nature put too great a strain upon our crude civilisation, on our superficial Christianity, and it was accompanied by various forms of social immorality almost as amazing and unprecedented.' He then shows how factories have risen on the corpses of men, women and children, how, as the country has rapidly advanced in riches, it has gone down in morality. He shows this by dealing with insanitation, life-destroying trades, adulteration, bribery and gambling. He shows how with the advance of wealth, justice has become immoral, deaths from alcoholism and suicide have increased, the average of premature births, and congenital defects has increased and prostitution has become an institution. He concludes his examination by these pregnant remarks :—

" The proceedings of the divorce courts show other aspects of the result of wealth and leisure, while a friend who had been a good deal in London society assured me that, both in country houses and in London, various kinds of orgies were occasionally to be met with, which would hardly have been surpassed in the period of the most dissolute emperors. Of war, too, I need say nothing. It has always been more or less chronic since the rise of the Roman Empire ; but there is now undoubtedly a disinclination for war among all civilized peoples. Yet the vast burden of armaments taken together with the most pious declarations in favour of peace, must be held to show an almost total absence of morality as a guiding principle among the governing classes."

Under the British ægis we have learnt much, but it is my firm belief that there is little to gain from Britain in intrinsic morality, that if we are not careful,

we shall introduce all the vices that she has been a prey to owing to the disease of materialism. We can profit by that connection only if we keep our civilization, and our morals straight, *i.e.*, if, instead of boasting of the glorious past, we express the ancient moral glory in our own lives and let our lives bear witness to our boast. Then we shall benefit her and ourselves. If we copy her because she provides us with rulers, both they and we shall suffer degradation. We need not be afraid of ideals or of reducing them to practice even to the uttermost. Ours will only then be a truly spiritual nation when we shall show more truth than gold, greater fearlessness than pomp of power and wealth, greater charity than love of self. If we will but clean our houses, our palaces and temples of the attributes of wealth and show in them the attributes of morality, we can offer battle to any combinations of hostile forces without having to carry the burden of a heavy militia. Let us seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousnes, and the irrevocable promise is that everything will be added unto us. These are real economics. May you and I treasure them and enforce them in our daily life.

THE MORAL BASIS OF CO-OPERATION

The following is a paper contributed to the Bombay Provincial Co-operative Conference held on 17th September, 1917.

The only claim I have on your indulgence is that some months ago I attended with Mr. Ewbank a meeting of mill-hands to whom he wanted to explain the principles of co-operation: The chawl in which

they were living, was as filthy as it well could be. Recent rains had made matters worse. And I must frankly confess that, had it not been for Mr. Ewbank's great zeal for the cause he has made his own, I should have shirked the task. But there we were, seated on a fairly worn out *charpai*, surrounded by men, women and children. Mr. Ewbank opened fire on a man who had put himself forward and who wore not a particularly innocent countenance. After he had engaged him and the other people about him in Gujarati conversation, he wanted me to speak to the people. Owing to the suspicious looks of the man who was first spoken to, I naturally pressed home the moralities of co-operation. I fancy that Mr. Ewbank rather liked the manner in which I handled the subject. Hence, I believe, his kind invitation to me to tax your patience for a few moments upon a consideration of co-operation from a moral standpoint.

My knowledge of the technicality of co-operation is next to nothing. My brother, Devadhar, has made the subject his own. Whatever he does, naturally attracts me and predisposes me to think that there must be something good in it and the handling of it must be fairly difficult Mr. Ewbank very kindly placed at my disposal some literature too on the subject. And I have had an unique opportunity of watching the effect of some co-operative effort in Champaran. I have gone through Mr. Ewbank's ten main points which are like the Commandments, and I have gone through the twelve points of Mr. Collins of Behar, which remind me of the law of the Twelve Tables. There are so-called agricultural banks in Champaran. They were to me disappointing efforts, if they were meant to be demonstrations of the success of co-operation. On the other hand, there is quiet work in

the same direction being done by Mr. Hodge, a missionary whose efforts are leaving their impress on those who come in contact with him. Mr. Hodge is a co-operative enthusiast and probably considers that the result which he sees flowing from his efforts are due to the working of co-operation. I, who was able to watch the efforts, had no hesitation in inferring that the personal equation counted for success in the one and failure in the other instance.

I am an enthusiast myself, but twenty-five years of experimenting and experience have made me a cautious and discriminating enthusiast. Workers in a cause necessarily, though quite unconciously, exaggerate its merits and often succeed in turning its very defects into advantages. In spite of my caution I consider the little institution I am conducting in Ahmedabad as the finest thing in the world. It alone gives me sufficient inspiration. Critics tell me that it represents a soulless soul-force and that its severe discipline has made it merely mechanical. I suppose both—the critics and I—are wrong. It is, at best, a humble attempt to place at the disposal of the nation a home where men and women may have scope for free and unfettered development of character, in keeping with the national genius, and, if its controllers do not take care, the discipline that is the foundation of character may frustrate the very end in view. I would venture, therefore, to warn enthusiasts in co-operation against entertaining false hopes.

With Sir Daniel Hamilton it has become a religion. On the 13th January last, he addressed the students of the Scottish Churches College and, in order to point a moral, he instanced Scotland's poverty of two hundred

years ago and showed how that great country was raised from a condition of poverty to plenty. "There were two powers, which raised her—the Scottish Church and the Scottish banks. The Church manufactured the men and the banks manufactured the money to give the men a start in life. . . . The Church disciplined the nation in the fear of God which is the beginning of wisdom and in the parish schools of the Church the children learned that the chief end of man's life was to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever. Men were trained to believe in God and in themselves, and on the trustworthy character so created the Scottish banking system was built." Sir Daniel then shows that it was possible to build up the marvellous Scottish banking system only on the character so built. So far there can only be perfect agreement with Sir Daniel, for that 'without character there is no co-operation' is a sound maxim. But he would have us go much further. He thus waxes eloquent on co-operation: "Whatever may be your day-dreams of India's future, never forget this that it is to weld India into one, and so enable her to take her rightful place in the world, that the British Government is here; and the welding hammer in the hand of the Government is the co-operative movement." In his opinion it is the panacea of all the evils that afflict India at the present moment. In its extended sense it can justify the claim on one condition which need not be mentioned here; in the limited sense in which Sir Daniel has used it, I venture to think, it is an enthusiast's exaggeration. Mark his peroration: "Credit, which is only Trust and Faith, is becoming more and more the money power of the world, and in the parchment bullet

into which is impressed the faith which removes mountains, India will find victory and peace." Here there is evident confusion of thought. The credit which is becoming the money power of the world has little moral basis and is not a synonym for Trust or Faith, which are purely moral qualities. After twenty years' experience of hundreds of men, who had dealings with banks in South Africa, the opinion I had so often heard expressed has become firmly rooted in me, that the greater the rascal the greater the credit he enjoys with his banks. The banks do not pry into his moral character : they are satisfied that he meets his overdrafts and promissory notes punctually. The credit system has encircled this beautiful globe of ours like a serpent's coil, and if we do not mind, it bids fair to crush us out of breath. I have witnessed the ruin of many a home through the system, and it has made no difference whether the credit was labelled co-operative or otherwise. The deadly coil has made possible the devastating spectacle in Europe, which we are helplessly looking on. It was perhaps never so true as it is today that, as in law so in war, the longest purse finally wins. I have ventured to give prominence to the current belief about credit system in order to emphasise the point that the co-operative movement will be a blessing to India only to the extent that it is a moral movement strictly directed by men fired with religious fervour. It follows, therefore, that co-operation should be confined to men wishing to be morally right, but failing to do so, because of grinding poverty or of the grip of the Mahajan. Facility for obtaining loans at fair rates will not make immoral men moral. But the wisdom of the Estate or philanthropists demands that they should help

on the onward path, men struggling to be good.

Too often do we believe that material prosperity means moral growth. It is necessary that a movement which is fraught with so much good to India should not degenerate into one for merely advancing cheap loans. I was therefore delighted to read the recommendation in the Report of the Committee on Co-operation in India, that "they wish clearly to express their opinion that it is to true co-operation alone, that is, to a co-operation which recognizes the moral aspect of the question that Government must look for the amelioration of the masses and not to a pseudo-co-operative edifice, however imposing, which is built in ignorance of co-operative principles." With this standard before us, we will not measure the success of the movement by the number of co-operative societies formed, but by the moral condition of the co-operators. The registrars will, in that event, ensure the moral growth of existing societies before multiplying them. And the Government will make their promotion conditional, not upon the number of societies they have registered, but the moral success of the existing institutions. This will mean tracing the course of every pie lent to the members. Those responsible for the proper conduct of co-operative societies will see to it that the money advanced does not find its way into the toddy-seller's bill or into the pockets of the keepers of gambling dens. I would excuse the rapacity of the Mahajan if it has succeeded in keeping the gambling die or toddy from the ryot's home.

A word perhaps about the Mahajan will not be out of place. Co-operation is not a new device. The ryots co-operate to drum out monkeys or birds that destroy their crops. They co-operate to use a common

thrashing floor. I have found them co-operate to protect their cattle to the extent of their devoting the best land for the grazing of their cattle. And they have been found co-operating against a particularly rapacious Mahajan. Doubts have been expressed as to the success of co-operation because of the tightness of the Mahajan's hold on the ryots. I do not share the fears. The mightiest Mahajan must, if he represent an evil force, bend before co-operation, conceived as an essentially moral movement. But my limited experience of the Mahajan of Champaran has made me revise the accepted opinion about his 'blighting influence.' I have found him to be not always relentless, not always exacting of the last pie. He sometimes serves his clients in many ways and even comes to their rescue in the hour of their distress My observation is so limited that I dare not draw any conclusions from it, but I respectfully enquire whether it is not possible to make a serious effort to draw out the good in the Mahajan and help him or induce him to throw out the evil in him. May he not be induced to join the army of co-operation, or has experience proved that he is past praying for ?

I note that the movement takes note of all indigenous industries. I beg publicly to express my gratitude to Government for helping me in my humble effort to improve the lot of the weaver. The experiment I am conducting shows that there is a vast field for work in this direction. No well-wisher of India, no patriot dare look upon the impending destruction of the hand-loom weaver with equanimity. As Dr. Mann has stated, this industry used to supply the peasant with an additional source of livelihood and an insuran c

against famine. Every Registrar who will nurse back to life this important and graceful industry will earn the gratitude of India. My humble effort consists firstly in making researches as to the possibilities of simple reforms in the orthodox hand-looms, secondly, in weaning the educated youth from the craving for Government or other services and the feeling that education renders him unfit for independent occupation and inducing him to take to weaving as a calling as honourable as that of a barrister or a doctor, and thirdly by helping those weavers who have abandoned their occupation to revert to it. I will not weary the audience with any statement on the first two parts of the experiment. The third may be allowed a few sentences as it has a direct bearing upon the subject before us. I was able to enter upon it only six months ago. Five families that had left off the calling have reverted to it and they are doing a prosperous business. The Ashram supplies them at their door with the yarn they need; its volunteers take delivery of the cloth woven, paying them cash at the market rate. The Ashram merely loses interest on the loan advanced for the yarn. It has as yet suffered no loss and is able to restrict its loss to a minimum by limiting the loan to a particular figure. All future transactions are strictly cash. We are able to command a ready sale for the cloth received. The loss of interest, therefore, on the transaction is negligible. I would like the audience to note its purely moral character from start to finish. The Ashram depends for its existence on such help as *friends* render it. We, therefore, can have no warrant for charging interest. The weavers ould not be saddled with it. Whole families that

were breaking to pieces are put together again. The use of the loan is pre-determined. And we, the middlemen, being volunteers, obtain the privilege of entering into the lives of these families, I hope, for their and our betterment. We cannot lift them without being lifted ourselves. This last relationship has not yet been developed, but we hope, at an early date, to take in hand the education too of these families and not rest satisfied till we have touched them at every point. This is not too ambitious a dream. God willing, it will be a reality some day. I have ventured to dilate upon the small experiment to illustrate what I mean by co-operation to present it to others for imitation. Let us be sure of our ideal. We shall ever fail to realize it, but we should never cease to strive for it. Then there need be no fear of " co operation of scoundrels " that Ruskin so rightly dreaded.

THIRD CLASS IN INDIAN RAILWAYS.

The following communication was made by Mr. Gandhi to the Press from Ranchi, on Sept. 25, 1917.

I have now been in India for over two years and a half after my return from South Africa. Over one quarter of that time I have passed on the Indian trains travelling third class by choice. I have travelled up north as far as Lahore, down south up to Tranquebar, and from Karachi to Calcutta. Having resorted to third class travelling, among other reasons, for the purpose of studying the conditions under which this class of passengers travel, I have naturally made as critical observations as I could. I have fairly covered the majority of railway systems during

this period. Now and then I have entered into correspondence with the management of the different railways about the defects that have come under my notice. But I think that the time has come when I should invite the press and the public to join in a crusade against a grievance which has too long remained unredressed, though much of it is capable of redress without great difficulty

On the 12th instant I booked at Bombay for Madras by the mail train and paid Rs 13-9. It was labelled to carry *22* passengers. These could only have seating accommodation. There were no bunks in this carriage whereon passengers could lie with any degree of safety or comfort. There were two nights to be passed in this train before reaching Madras. If not more than *22* passengers found their way into my carriage before we reached Poona, it was because the bolder ones kept the others at bay. With the exception of two or three insistent passengers, all had to find their sleep being seated all the time. After reaching Raichur the pressure became unbearable. The rush of passengers could not be stayed. The fighters among us found the task almost beyond them. The guards or other railway servants came in only to push in more passengers.

A defiant Memon merchant protested against this packing of passengers like sardines. In vain did he say that this was his fifth night on the train. The guard insulted him and referred him to the management at the terminus. There were during this night as many as 35 passengers in the carriage during the greater part of it. Some lay on the floor in the midst of dirt and some had to keep standing. A free fight was, at one time, avoided only by the intervention of some of the older passengers

who did not want to add to the discomfort by an exhibition of temper.

On the way passengers got for tea tannin water with filthy sugar and a whitish looking liquid miscalled milk which gave this water a muddy appearance. I can vouch for the appearance, but I cite the testimony of the passengers as to the taste.

Not during the whole of the journey was the compartment once swept or cleaned. The result was that every time you walked on the floor or rather cut your way through the passengers seated on the floor, you waded through dirt.

The closet was also not cleaned during the journey and there was no water in the water tank.

Refreshments sold to the passengers were dirty-looking, handed by dirtier hands, coming out of filthy receptacles and weighed in equally unattractive scales. These were previously sampled by millions of flies. I asked some of the passengers who went in for these dainties to give their opinion. Many of them used choice expressions as to the quality but were satisfied to state that they were helpless in the matter; they had to take things as they came.

On reaching the station I found that the ghariwala would not take me unless I paid the fare he wanted. I mildly protested and told him I would pay him the authorized fare. I had to turn passive resister before I could be taken. I simply told him he would have to pull me out of the ghari or call the policeman.

The return journey was performed in no better manner. The carriage was packed already and but for a friend's intervention I could not have been able to secure even a seat. My admission was certainly beyond the

authorised number. This compartment was constructed to carry 9 passengers but it had constantly 12 in it. At one place an important railway servant swore at a protestant, threatened to strike him and locked the door over the passengers whom he had with difficulty squeezed in. To this compartment there was a closet falsely so called. It was designed as a European closet but could hardly be used as such. There was a pipe in it but no water, and I say without fear of challenge that it was pestilentially dirty.

The compartment itself was evil looking. Dirt was lying thick upon the wood work and I do not know that it had ever seen soap or water.

The compartment had an exceptional assortment of passengers. There were three stalwart Punjabi Mahomedans, two refined Tamilians and two Mahomedan merchants who joined us later. The merchants related the bribes they had to give to procure comfort. One of the Punjabis had already travelled three nights and was weary and fatigued. But he could not stretch himself. He said he had sat the whole day at the Central Station watching passengers giving bribe to procure their tickets. Another said he had himself to pay Rs. 5 before he could get his ticket and his seat. These three men were bound for Ludhiana and had still more nights of travel in store for them.

What I have described is not exceptional but normal. I have got down at Raichur, Dhond, Sonepur, Chakradharpur, Purulia, Asansol and other junction stations and been at the 'Mosafirkhanas' attached to these stations. They are discreditable looking places where there is no order, no cleanliness but utter confusion and horrible din and noice. Passengers have no benches

or not enough to sit on. They squat on dirty floors and eat dirty food. They are permitted to throw the leavings of their food and spit where they like, sit how they like and smoke everywhere. The closets attached to these places defy description. I have not the power adequately to describe them without committing a breach of the laws of decent speech. Disinfecting powder, ashes or disinfecting fluids are unknown. The army of flies buzzing about them warns you against their use. But a third-class traveller is dumb and helpless. He does not want to complain even though to go to these places may be to court death. I know passengers who fast while they are travelling just in order to lessen the misery of their life in the trains. At Sonepur flies having failed, wasps have come forth to warn the public and the authorities, but yet to no purpose. At the Imperial Capital a certain third class booking office is a Black-Hole fit only to be destroyed.

Is it any wonder that plague has become endemic in India ? Any other result is impossible where passengers always leave some dirt where they go and take more on leaving ?

On Indian trains alone passengers smoke with impunity in all carriages irrespective of the presence of the fair sex and irrespective of the protest of non-smokers. And this, notwithstanding a bye-law which prevents a passenger from smoking without the permission of his fellows in the compartment which is not allotted to smokers.

The existence of the awful war cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the removal of this gigantic evil. War can be no warrant for tolerating dirt and overcrowding. One could understand an entire stoppage

of passenger traffic in a crisis like this, but never a continuation or accentuation of insanitation and conditions that must undermine health and morality.

Compare the lot of the first class passengers with that of the third class. In the Madras case the first class fare is over five times as much as the third class fare. Does the third class passenger get one-fifth, even one-tenth, of the comforts of his first class fellow ? It is but simple justice to claim that some relative proportion be observed between the cost and comfort.

It is a known fact that the third class traffic pays for the ever-increasing luxuries of first and second class travelling. Surely a third class passenger is entitled at least to the bare necessities of life

In neglecting the third class passengers, opportunity of giving a splendid education to millions in orderliness, sanitation, decent composite life and cultivation of simple and clean tastes is being lost. Instead of receiving an object lesson in these matters third class passengers have their sense of decency and cleanliness blunted during their travelling experience.

Among the many suggestions that can be made for dealing with the evil here described, I would respectfully include this : let the people in high places, the Viceroy, the Commander-in-Chief, the Rajas, Maharajas, the Imperial Councillors and others, who generally travel in superior classes, without previous warning, go through the experiences now and then of third class travelling. We would then soon see a remarkable change in the conditions of third class travelling and the uncomplaining millions will get some return for the fares they pay under the expectation of being carried from place to place with ordinary creature comforts.

VERNACULARS AS MEDIA OF INSTRUCTION

The following introduction was written by Mr. M. K. Gandhi to Dr. P. J. Mehta's "Self-Government Series." Pamphlet No. 1, entitled "Vernaculars as Media of Instruction in Indian Schools and Colleges."

It is to be hoped that Dr. Mehta's labour of love will receive the serious attention of English educated India. The following pages were written by him for the *Vedanta Kesari* of Madras and are now printed in their present form for circulation throughout India. The question of vernaculars as media of instruction is of national importance; neglect of the vernaculars means national suicide. One hears many protagonists of the English language being continued as the medium of instruction pointing to the fact that english Educated Indians are the sole custodians of public and patriotic work. It would be monstrous if it were not so. For the only education given in this country is through the English language. The fact, however, is that the results are not at all proportionate to the time we give to our education. We have not reacted on the masses. But I must not anticipate Dr. Mehta. He is in earnest. He writes feelingly. He has examined the pros and cons and collected a mass of evidence in support of his arguments. The latest pronouncement on the subject is that of the Viceroy. Whilst His Excellency is unable to offer a solution, he is keenly alive to the necessity of imparting instruction in our schools through the vernaculars. The Jews of Middle and Eastern Europe, who are scattered in all parts

of the world, finding it necessary to have a common tongue for mutual intercourse, have raised Yiddish to the status of a language, and have succeeded in translating into Yiddish the best books to be found in the world's literature. Even they could not satisfy the soul's yearning through the many foreign tongues of which they are masters; nor did the learned few among them wish to tax the masses of the Jewish population with having to learn a foreign language before they could realise their dignity. So they have enriched what was at one time looked upon as a mere jargon—but what the Jewish children learnt from their mothers—by taking special pains to translate into it the best thought of the world. This is a truly marvellous work. It has been done during the present generation, and Webster's Dictionary defines it as a polyglot jargon used for inter-communication by Jews from different nations.

But a Jew of Middle and Eastern Europe would feel insulted if his mother-tongue were now so described. If these Jewish scholars have succeeded, within a generation, in giving their masses a language of which they may feel proud, surely it should be an easy task for us to supply the needs of our own vernaculars which are cultured languages. South Africa teaches us the same lesson. There was a duel there between the Taal, a corrupt form of Dutch, and English. The Boer mothers and the Boer fathers were determined that they would not let their children, with whom they in their infancy talked in the Taal, be weighed down with having to receive instruction through English. The case for English here was a strong one. It had able pleaders for it. But English had to yield before Boer patriotism. It may be

observed that they rejected even the High Dutch. The school masters, therefore, who are accustomed to speak the published Dutch of Europe, are compelled to teach the easier Taal. And literature of an excellent character is at the present moment growing up in South Africa in the Taal, which was only a few years ago, the common medium of speech between simple but brave rustics. If we have lost faith in our vernaculars, it is a sign of want of faith in ourselves; it is the surest sign of decay. And no scheme of self-government, however benevolently or generously it may be bestowed upon us, will ever make us a self-governing nation, if we have no respect for the languages our mothers speak.

SOCIAL SERVICE

At the anniversary celebration of the Social Service League held in Madras on February 10, 1916, *Mr Gandhi delivered an address on "Social Service." Mrs. Whitehead presided. He said*:

I have been asked this evening to speak to you about social service. If this evening you find that I am not able to do sufficient justice to this great audience you will ascribe it to so many engagements that I hastily and unthinkingly accepted. It was my desire that I should have at least a few moments to think out what I shall have to say to you but it was not to be. However, as our Chair Lady has said, it was work we want and not speeches. I am aware that you will have lost very little, if anything at all, if you find at the end of this evening's talk that you have listened to very little.

Friends, for Social Service as for any other service

on the face of the earth, there is one condition indispensable namely, qualifications, and proper qualifications, on the part of those who want to render social service or any other service. So we shall ask ourselves this evening whether those of us who are already engaged in this kind of service and others who have aspired to render the service possess these necessary qualifications. Because you will agree with me that in social service if they can mend matters they can also spoil matters and in trying to do service however well-intentioned that service might be, if they are not qualified for that service they will be rendering not service but disservice. What are these qualifications ?

Imagine why I must repeat to you almost the qualifications that I described this morning to the students in the Young Mens' Christian Association Hall. Because they are of universal application and they are necessary for any class of work, much more so in social service at this time of the day in our national life in our dear country. It seems to me that we require truth in one hand and fearlessness in the other hand. Unless we carry the torchlight we shall not see the step in front of us and unless we carry the quality of fearlessness we shall not be able to give the message that we might want to give. Unless we have this fearlessness I feel sure that when that supreme final test comes we shall be found wanting. Then I ask you to ask yourselves whether those of you who are engaged in this service and those of you who want hereafter to be engaged in this service have these two qualities. Let me remind you also that these qualities may be trained in us in a manner detrimental to ourselves and in a manner detrimental to those with whom we may come in contact.

This is a dangerous statement almost to make, as if truth could be ever so handled, and in making that statement I would like you also to consider that truth comes not as truth but only as truth so-called. In the inimitable book *Ramayana* we find that Indrajit and Lakshman, his opponent, possessed the same qualities. But Lakshman's life was guided by principle, based upon religion while Indrajit's principle was based upon irreligion, and we find what Indarajit possessed was mere dross and what Lakshman possessed was of great assistance not only to the side on whose behalf he was fighting but he has left a treasure for us to value. What was that additional quality he possessed? So, I hold that life without religion is life without principle, that life without principle is like a ship without a rudder. Just as our ship without rudder, the helmsman plying at it, is tossed about from place to place and never reaches its destination, so will a man without the heart-grasp of religion whirl without ever reaching his destined goal. So, I suggest to every social servant that he must not run away with the idea that he will serve his whole countrymen unless he has got these two qualities duly sanctified by religion and by a life divinely guided.

After paying a glowing tribute to the Madras Social Service League for its work in certain Pariah villages in the city he went on to say :—

It is no use white-washing those needs which we know everyday stare us in the face. It is not enough that we clear out the villages which are occupied by our Pariah brethern. They are amenable to reason and persuasion. Shall we have to say that the so-called higher classes are not equally amenable to reason and to persuasion and to hygienic laws which are indispensable

in order to live a city-life. We may do many things with immunity but when we immediately transfer ourselves to crowded streets where we have hardly air to breathe, the life becomes changed, and we have to obey another set of laws which immediately come into being. Do we do that? It is no use saddling the municipality with the responsibilities for the condition in which we find not only the central parts of Madras but the central parts of every city of importance in India, and I feel no municipality in the world will be able to over-ride the habits of a class of people handed to them from generation to generation. It can be done only by such bodies as Social Service Leagues. If we pulsate with a new life, a new vision shall open before us in the near future, I think that these are the signs which will be an indication to show that we are pulsating with a new life, which is going to be a proper life, which will add dignity to our nationality and which will carry the banner of progress forward. I, therefore, suggest that it is a question of sanitary reform in these big cities, which will be a hopeless task if we expect our municipalities to do this unaided by this voluntary work. Far be it from me to absolve the municipalities from their own responsibilities. I think there is a great deal yet to be done in the municipalities. Only the other day I read with a great degree of pain a report about the proceedings of the Bombay Municipality, and the deplorable fact in it is that a large part of the time of the Municipality was devoted to talking over trifles while they neglected matters of great moment. After all, I shall say that they will be able to do very little in as much as there is a demand for their work on the people themselves.

Here Mr. Gandhi instanced two cases where the Social Service League had been of immense help to the Municipality in improving the sanitary condition of the town, by changing the habits of the people, which had become a part of their being. He observed that some officials might consider that they could force an unwilling people to do many things, but he held to that celebrated saying that it was far better that people should often remain drunkards than that they should become sober at the point of the sword.

Mr. Gandhi then recounted some of his experiences in a temple at Kasi (Benares)—the wretched lanes surrounding it, the dirt to be witnessed near the sanctuary, the disorderly crowd and the avaricious priest. These evils in the temples, he said had to be removed by Social Service Leagues. For making it possible for students to fight these conditions, the educational system had to be revolutionised. Now-a-days they were going out of their schools as utter strangers to their ancestral traditions and with fatigued brains, able to work no longer. They had to revolutionise that system.

Finally, he referred to the railway services and the conditions under which third class passengers travelled. To do social service among the passengers and instil better habits of sanitation among them, the social servants must not go to them in a foreign costume, speaking a foreign tongue. They might issue pamphlets to them or give instructive lessons, and so on.

TRUE PATRIOTISM

The following report of a conservation which an interviewer had with Mr. Gandhi contains his views on a variety of subjects of national interest:—

"We have lost" he said, "much of our self-respect, on account of being too much Europeanised. We think and speak in English. Thereby, we impoverish our vernaculars, and estrange the feelings of the masses. A knowledge of English is not essential to the service of our Motherland."

Turning to caste, he said "caste is the great power and secret of Hinduism."

Asked where he would stay, Mr. Gandhi replied: "Great pressure is brought down on me to settle in Bengal: but I have a great capital in the store of my knowledge in Guzerat and I get letters from there."

"Vernacular literature is important. I want to have a library of all books. I invite friends for financial aid to form libraries and locate them."

"Modern civilisation is a curse in Europe as also in India. War is the direct result of modern civilisation, everyone of the Powers was making preparations for war."

"Passive resistance is a great moral force, meant for the weak, also for the strong. Soul-force depends on itself. Ideals must work in practice, otherwise they are not potent. Modern civilisation is a brute force."

It is one thing to know the ideal and another thing to practise it. That will ensure greater dicipline, which means a greater service and greater service means

greater gain to Government. Passive resistance is a highly aggressive thing. The attribute of soul is restlessness ; there is room for every phase of thought.

" Money, land and women are the sources of evil and evil has to be counteracted. I need not possess land, nor a woman, nor money to satisfy my luxuries. I do not want to be unhinged merely because others are unhinged. If ideals are practised, there will be less room for mischievous activities. Public life has to be moulded."

" Every current has to change its course. There are one and a half million sadhus and if every sadhu did his duty, India could achieve much. Jagat Guru Sankaracharya does not deserve that appellation because he has no more force in him: '

Malicious material activity is no good. It finds out means to multiply one's luxuries. Intense gross modern activity should not be imposed on Indian institutions, which have to be remodelled on ideals taken from Hinduism. Virtue as understood in India is not understood in foreign lands. Dasaratha is considered a fool in foreign lands, for his having kept his promise to his wife. India says a promise is a promise. That is a good ideal. Material activity is mischievous. " Truth shall conquer in the end."

" Emigration does no good to the country from which people emigrate. Emigrants do not return better moral men. The whole thing is against Hinduism. Temples do not flourish. There are no opportunities for ceremonial functions. Priests do not come, and at times they are merely men of straw, immigrants play much mischief and corrupt society. It is not enterprise. They may earn more money easily in those parts, which

means that they do not want to toil and remain straight in the methods of earning. Immigrants are not happier and have more material wants."

Questioned about the Theosophical Society Mr. Gandhi said: "There is a good deal of good in the Theosophical Society, irrespective of individuals. It has stimulated ideas and thoughts."

THE SATYAGRHASHRAMA

This Address was delivered in the Y.M. C.A. Auditorium, Madras, on the 16th February 1916, the Hon. Rev. G. Pittendrigh, of the Madras Christian College, presiding:—

To many of the students who came here last year to converse with me, I said I was about to establish an institution—*Ashrama*—somewhere in India, and it is about that place that I am going to talk to you this morning. I feel and I have felt, during the whole of my public life, that what we need, what any nation needs, but we perhaps of all the nations of the world need just now is nothing else and nothing less than character-building. And this is the view propounded by that great patriot, Mr. Gokhale (cheers). As you know in many of his speeches, he used to say that we would get nothing, we would deserve nothing unless we had character to back what we wished for. Hence his founding of that great body, the Servants of India Society. And as you know, in the prospectus that has been issued in connection with the Society, Mr. Gokhale has deliberately stated that it was necessary to spiritualise the political life of the country. You know also that he used to say so often that our aver-

age was less than the average of so many European nations. I do not know whether that statement by him whom, with pride, I consider to be my political *Guru*, has really foundation in fact, but I do believe that there is much to be said to justify it in so far as educated India is concerned; not because we, the educated portion of the community, have blundered, but because we have been creatures of circumstances. Be that as it may, this is the maxim of life which I have accepted, namely, that no work done by any man, no matter how great he is, will really prosper unless he has religious backing. But what is religion? The question will be immediately asked. I for one, would answer: Not the religion which you will get after reading all the scriptures of the world; it is not really a grasp by the brain, but it is a heart-grasp. It is a thing which is not alien to us, but it is a thing which has to be evolved out of us. It is always within us, with some consciously so: with the others quite unconsciously. But it is there; and whether we wake up this religions instinct in us through outside assistance or by inward growth, no matter how it is done, it has got to be done if we want to do anything in the right manner and anything that is going to persist.

Our Scriptures have laid down certain rules as maxims of life and as axioms which we have to take for granted as self-demonstrated truths. The Shastras tell us that without living, according to these maxims, we are incapable even of having a reasonable perception of relgion. Believing in these implicity for all these long years and having actually endeavoured to reduce to practice these injunctions of the Shastras, I have deemed it necessary to seek the association of those

who think with me, in founding this institution. And I shall venture this morning to place before you the rules that have been drawn up and that have to be observed by every one who seeks to be a member of that *Ashram*.

Five of these are known as *Yamas* and the first and the foremost is,

THE VOW OF TRUTH.

Not truth simply as we ordinarily understand it, that as far as possible, we ought not to resort to a lie, that is to say, not truth which merely answers the saying, "Honesty is the best policy"—implying that if it is not the best policy, we may depart from it. Bot here truth as it is conceived, means that we have to rule our life by this law of Truth at any cost. And in order to satisfy the definition I have drawn upon the celebrated illustration of the life of *Prahlad*. For the sake of truth, he dared to oppose his own father, and he defended himself, not by retaliation, by paying his father back in his own coin, but in defence of Truth, as he knew it; he was prepared to die without caring to return the blows that he had received from his father or from those who were charged with his father's instructions. Not only that: he would not in any way even parry the blows: on the contrary, with a smile on his lips, he underwent the innumerable tortures to which he was subjected, with the result that, at last, Truth rose triumphant; not that Prahlad suffered the tortures because he knew that some day or other in his very life-time he would be able to demonstrate the infallibility of the Law of Truth. That fact was there; but if he had died in the midst of tortures, he would still have adhered to Truth. That is the Truth

which I would like to follow. There was an incident I noticed yesterday. It was a trifling incident, but I think these trifling incidents are like straws which show which way the wind is blowing. The incident was this : I was talking to a friend who wanted to talk to me aside, and we were engaged in a private conversation. A third friend dropped in, and he politely asked whether he was intruding. The friend to whom I was talking said : "Oh, no, there is nothing private here." I felt taken aback a little, because, as I was taken aside, I knew that so far as this friend was concerned, the conversation was private. But he immediately, out of politeness, I would call it overpoliteness, said, there was no private conversation and that he (the third friend) could join. I suggest to you that this is a departure from my definition of Truth. I think that the friend should have, in the gentlest manner possible, but still openly and frankly, said : "Yes, just now, as you properly say, you would be intruding," without giving the slightest offence to the person if he was himself a gentleman—and we are bound to consider every body to be a gentleman unless he proves to be otherwise. But I may be told that the incident, after all, proves the gentility of the nation. I think that it is over-proving the case. If we continue to say these things out of politeness, we really become a nation of hypocrites. I recall a conversation I had with an English friend. He was comparatively a stranger. He is a Principal of a College and has been in India for several years. He was comparing notes with me, and he asked me whether I would admit that we, unlike most Englishmen, would not dare to say "No" when it was "No" that we *meant*. And I must confess I immediately

said "Yes"; I agreed with that statement :—We do hesitate to say "No" frankly and boldly, when we want to pay due regard to the sentiments of the person whom we are addressing. In our *Ashrama* we make it a rule that we must say "No" when we mean "No," regardless of consequences. This then is the first rule. Then we come to the

DOCTRINE OF AHIMSA

Literally speaking, *Ahimsa* means non-killing. But to me it has a world of meaning and takes me into realms much higher, infinitely higher, than the realm to which I would go, if I merely understood by *Ahimsa* non-killing. *Ahimsa* really means that you may not offend anybody,you may not harbour an uncharitable thought even in connection with one who may consider himself to be your enemy. Pray notice the guarded nature of this thought ; I do not say "whom you consider to be your enemy", but "who may consider himself to be your enemy." For one who follows the doctrine of *Ahimsa* there is no room for an enemy ; he denies the existence of an enemy. But there are people who consider themselves to be his enemies, and he cannot help that circumstance. So, it is held that we may not harbour an evil thought even in connection with such persons. If we return blow for blow, we depart from the doctrine of *Ahimsa*. But I go further. If we resent a friend's action or the so-called enemy's action, we still fall short of this doctrine. But when I say, we should not resent, I do not say that we should acquiesce: but by resenting I mean wishing that some harm should be done to the enemy, or that he should be put out of the way, not even by any action of ours, but by the action of somebody else,

or, say, by Divine agency. If we harbour even this thought, we depart from this doctrine of *Ahimsa*. Those who join the *Ashrama* have to literally accept that meaning. That does not mean that we practise that doctrine in its entirety. Far from it. It is an ideal which we have to reach, and it is an ideal to be reached even at this very moment, if we are capable of doing so. But it is not a proposition in geometry to be learnt by heart; it is not even like solving difficult problems in higher mathematics; it is infinitely more difficult than solving those problems. Many of you have burnt the midnight oil in solving those problems. If you want to follow out this doctrine, you will have to do much more than burn the midnight oil. You will have to pass many a sleepless night, and go through many a mental torture and agony before you can reach, before you can even be within measurable distance of this goal. It is the goal and nothing less than that, you and I have to reach, if we want to understand what a religious life means. I will not say much more on this doctrine than this: that a man who believes in the efficacy of this doctrine finds in the ultimate stage, when he is about to reach the goal, the whole world at his feet,—not that he wants the whole world at his feet, but it must be so. If you express your love—*Ahimsa*—in such a manner that it impresses itself indelibly upon your so-called enemy, he must return that love. Another thought which comes out of this is that, under this rule, there is no room for organised assassinations, and there is no room for murders even openly committed, and there is no room for any violence even for the sake of your country, and even for guarding the honour of precious ones that may be under your charge. After all, that

would be a poor defence of the honour. This doctrine of *Ahimsa* tells us that we may guard the honour of those who are under our charge by delivering *ourselves* into the hands of the man who would commit the sacrilege. And that requires far greater physical and mental courage than the delivering of blows. You may have some degree of physical power,—I do not say courage—and you may use that power. But after that is expended, what happens? The other man is filled with wrath and indignation, and you have made him more angry by matching your violence against his; and when he has done you to death, the rest of his violence is delivered against your charge. But if you do not retaliate, but stand your ground, between your charge and the opponent, simply receiving the blows without retaliating, what happens? I give you my promise that the whole of the violence will be expended on you, and your charge will be left unscathed. Under this plan of life there is no conception of patriotism which justifies such wars as you witness today in Europe. Then there is

THE VOW OF CELIBACY

Those who want to perform national service, or those who want to have a glimpse of the real religious life must lead a celibate life, no matter if married or unmarried. Marriage but brings a woman closer together with the man, and they become friends in a special sense, never to be parted either in this life or in the lives that are to come. But I do not think that, in our conception of marriage, our lusts should necessarily enter. Be that as it may, this is what is placed before those who come to the *Ashrama*. I do not deal with that at any length. Then we have

THE VOW OF CONTROL OF THE PALATE

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 I am just now coming after having inspected the Victoria Hostel. I saw there not to my dismay, though it should be to my dismay; but I am used to it now, that there are so many kitchens, not kitchens that are established in order to serve caste restrictions, but kitchens that have become necessary in order that people can have the condiments, and the exact weight of the condiments, to which they are used in the respective places from which they have come. And therefore we find that for the Brahmans themselves there are different compartments and different kitchens catering for the delicate tastes of all these different groups. I suggest to you that this is simply slavery to the palate, rather than mastery over it. I may say this: unless we take our minds off from this habit, and unless we shut our eyes to the tea shops and coffee shops and all these kitchens, and unless we are satisfied with foods that are necessary for the proper maintenance of our physical health, and unless we are prepared to rid ourselves of stimulating, heating and exciting condiments that we mix with our food, we will certainly not be able to control the over-abundant, unnecessary, and exciting stimulation that we may have. If we do not do that, the result naturally is, that we abuse ourselves and we abuse even the sacred trust given to us, and we become less than animals and brutes, eating, drinking and indulging in passions we share in common with the animals; but have you ever seen a horse or a 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? Then we have

THE VOW OF NON-THIEVING.

I suggest that we are thieves in a way. If I take anything that I do not need for my own immediate use, and keep it, I thieve it from somebody else. I venture to suggest that it is the fundamental law of Nature, without exception, that Nature produces enough for our wants from day to-day, and if only everybody took enough for himself and nothing more, there would be no pauperism in this world, there would be no man dying of starvation in this world. But so long as we have got this inequality so long we are thieving. I am no socialist and I do not want to dispossess those who have got possessions: but I do say that, personally, those of us who want to see light out of darkness have to follow this rule. I do not want to dispossess anybody. I should then be departing from the rule of *Ahimsa*. If somebody else possesses more than I do, let him. But so far as my own life has to be regulated, I do say that I dare not possess anything which I do not want. In India we have got three millions of people having to be satisfied with one meal a day, and that meal consisting of a chapatti containing no fat in it, and a pinch of salt. You and I have no right to any thing that we really have until these three millions are clothed and fed better. You and I, who ought to know better, must adjust our wants, and even undergo voluntary starvation, in order that they may be nursed, fed

and clothed. Then there is the vow of non-possession which follows as a matter of course. Then I go to

THE VOW OF SWADESHI.

The vow of *Swadeshi* is a necessary vow. But you are conversant with the *Swadeshi* life and the *Swadeshi* spirit. I suggest to you we are departing from one of the sacred laws of our being when we leave our neighbour and go out somewhere else in order to satisfy our wants. If a man comes from Bombay here and offers you wares, you are not justified in supporting the Bombay merchant or trader so long as you have got a merchant at your very door, born and bred in Madras. That is my view of *Swadeshi*. In your village-barber, you are bound to support him to the exclusion of the finished barber who may come to you from Madras. If you find it necessary that your village barber should reach the attainments of the barber from Madras you may train him to that. Send him to Madras by all means, if you wish, in order that he may learn his calling. Until you do that, you are not justified in going to another barber. That is *Swadeshi*. So, when we find that there are many things that we cannot get in India, we must try to do without them. We may have to do without many things which we may consider necessary; 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 on his shoulders 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, immediately you adopt this *Swadeshi* life. We have also

THE VOW OF FEARLESSNESS.

I found, throughout my wanderings in India, that India, educated India, is seized with a paralysing fear. We may not open our lips in public; we may not declare our confirmed opinions in public: we may talk about them secretly; and we may do anything we like within the four walls of our house,—but those are not for public consumption. If we had taken a vow of silence I would have nothing to say. When we open our lips in public, we say things which we do not really believe in. I do not know whether this is not the experience of almost every public man who speaks in India. I then suggest to you that there is only one Being, if Being is the proper term to be used, whom we have to fear, and that is God. When we fear God, we shall fear no man, no matter how high-placed he may be. And if you want to follow the vow of truth in any shape or form, fearlessness is the necessary consequence. And so you find, in the *Bhagavad Gita*, fearlessness is declared as the first essential quality of a Brahmin. We fear consequence, and therefore we are afraid to tell the Truth. A man who fears God will certainly not fear any earthly consequence. Before we can aspire to the position of understanding what religion is, and before we can aspire to the position of guiding the destinies of India, do you not see that we should adopt this habit of fearlessness? Or shall we over-awe our countrymen, even as we are over-awed? We thus see how important this "fearlessness" now is. And we have also

THE VOW REGARDING THE UNTOUCHABLES.

There is an ineffaceable blot that Hinduism to-day carries with it. I have declined to believe that it has been handed to us from immemorial times. I think that

this miserable, wretched, enslaving spirit of "untouchableness" must have come to us when we were in the cycle of our lives, at our lowest ebb, and that evil has still stuck to us and it still remains with us. It is, to my mind, a curse that has come to us, and as long as that curse remains with us, so long I think we are bound to consider that every affliction that we labour under in this sacred land is a fit and proper punishment for this great and indelible crime that we are committing. That any person should be considered untouchable because of his calling passes one's comprehension; and you, the student world, who receive all this modern education, if you become a party to this crime, it were better that you received no education whatsoever.

Of course, we are labouring under a very heavy handicap. Although you may realise that there cannot be a single human being on this earth who should be considered to be untouchable, you cannot react upon your families, you cannot react upon your surroundings, because all your thought is conceived in a foreign tongue, and all your energy is devoted to that. And so we have also introduced a rule in this Ashrama: that we shall receive our

EDUCATION THROUGH THE VERNACULARS.

In Europe every cultured man learns, not only his language, but also other languages, certainly three or four. And even as they do in Europe, in order to solve the problem of language in India, we, in this Ashrama, make it a point to learn as many Indian vernaculars as we possibly can. And I assure you that the trouble of learning these languages is nothing compared to the trouble that we have to take in mastering the English language. We never master the English language: with

some exceptions it has not been possible for us to do so; we can never express ourselves as clearly as we can in our own mother tongue. How dare we rub out of our memory all the years of our infancy? But that is precisely what we do when we commence our higher life, as we call it, through the medium of a foreign tongue. This creates a breach in our life for bringing which we shall have to pay dearly and heavily. And you will see now the connection between these two things,—education and untouchableness—this persistance of the spirit of untouchableness even at this time of the day in spite of the spread of knowledge and education. Education has enabled us to see the horrible crime. But we are seized with fear also and therefore, we cannot take this doctrine to our homes. And we have got a superstitious veneration for our family traditions and for the members of our family. You say, "My parents will die if I tell them that I, at least, can no longer partake of his crime." I say that Prahlad never considered that his father would die if he pronounced the sacred syllables of the name of Vishnu. On the contrary, he made the whole of that household ring, from one corner to another, by repeating that name even in the sacred presence of his father. And so you and I may do this thing in the sacred presence of our parents. If, after receiving this rude shock, some of them expire, I think that would be no calamity. It may be that some rude shocks of the kind might have to be delivered. So long as we persist in these things which have been handed down to us for generations, these incidents may happen. But there is a higher law of Nature, and in due obedience to that higher law, my parents and myself should make that sacrifice.

AND THEN WE FOLLOW HAND-WEAVING.

You may ask: "Why should we use our hands?" and say "the manual work has got to be done by those who are illiterate. I can only occupy myself with reading literature and political essays." I think we have to realise the dignity of labour. If a barber or shoe-maker attends a college, he ought not to abandon the profession of barber or shoe-maker. I consider that a barber's profession is just as good as the profession of medicine.

Last of all, when you have conformed to these rules think that then, and not till then, you may come to

POLITICS

and dabble in them to your heart's content, and certainly you will then never go wrong. Politics, divorced of religion, has absolutely no meaning. If the student-world crowd the political platforms of this country, to my mind, it is not necessarily a healthy sign of national growth; but that does not mean that you, in your student life, ought not to study politics. Politics are a part of our being; we ought to understand our national institutions, and we ought to understand our national growth and all those things. We may do it from our infancy. So, in our *Ashrama*, every child is taught to understand the political institutions of our country, and to know how the country is vibrating with new emotions, with new aspirations, with a new life. But we want also the steady light, the infallible light, of religious faith, not a faith which merely appeals to the intelligence, but a faith which is indelibly inscribed on the heart. First, we want to realise that religious consciousness, and immediately we have done that, I think the whole department of life is open to us, and it should then be a sacred privilege o

students and everybody to partake of that whole life, so that, when they grow to manhood and when they leave their colleges, they may do so as men properly equipped to battle with life. To-day what happens is this: much of the political life is confined to student life; immediately the students leave their colleges and cease to be students, they sink into oblivion, they seek miserable employments, carrying miserable emoluments, rising no higher in their aspirations, knowing nothing of God, knowing nothing of fresh air or bright light and nothing of that real vigorous independence that comes out of obedience to these laws that I have ventured to place before you.

INDIAN MERCHANTS

Mr. Gandhi was entertained by the merchants of Broach during his visit to the city and presented with an address of welcome. Mr. Gandhi replied to the address in the following terms :—

Merchant always have the spirit of adventure, intellect and wealth, as without these qualities their business cannot go on. But now they must have the fervour of patriotism in them. Patriotism is necessary even for religion. If the spirit of patriotism is awakened through religious fervour, then that patriotism will shine out brilliantly. So it is necessary that patriotism should be roused in the mercantile community.

The merchants take more part in public affairs now-a-days than before. When merchants take to politics through patriotism, Swaraj is as good as obtained. Some of you might be wondering how we can get Swaraj. I lay my hand on my heart and say that,

when the merchant class understands the sprit of patriotism, then only can we get Swaraj quickly. Swaraj then will be quite a natural thing.

Amongst the various keys which will unlock Swaraj to us, the Swadeshi Vow is the golden one. It is in the hands of the merchants to compel the observance of the Swadeshi Vow in the country, and this is an adventure which can be popularised by the merchants. I humbly request you to undertake this adventure, and then you will see what wonders you can do.

This being so, I have to say with regret that it is the merchant class which has brought ruin to the Swadeshi practice, and the Swadeshi movement in this country. Complaints have lately risen in Bengal about the increase of rates, and one of them is against Gujarat. It is complained there that the prices of Dhotis have been abnormally increased aud Dhotis go from Gujarat. No one wants you not to earn money, but it must be earned righteously and not be ill-gotton. Merchants must earn money by fair means. Unfair means must never be used

Continuing, Mr. Gandhi said: India's strength lies with the merchant class. So much does not lie even with the army. Trade is the cause of war, and the merchant class has the key of war in their hands. Merchants raise the money and the army is raised on the strength of it. The power of England and Germany rests on thier trading class. A country's prosperity depends upon its mercantile community. I consider it as a sign of good luck that I should receive an address from the merchant class. Whenever I remember Broach, I will enquire if the merchants who have given me an address this day have righteous faith and

patriotism. If I receive a disappointing reply, I will think that merely a wave of giving addresses had come over India and that I had a share in it.

NATIONAL DRESS

Mr. Gandhi wrote the following reply to Mr. Irwin's criticism of his dress in the "Pioneer" during the Champaran enquiry.

I have hitherto successfully resisted to temptation of either answering your or Mr. Irwin's criticism of the humble work I am doing in Champaran. Nor am I going to succumb now except with regard to a matter which Mr. Irwin has thought fit to dwell upon and about which he has not even taken the trouble of being correctly informed. I refer to his remarks on my manner of dressing.

My "familiarity with the minor amenities of western civilisation" has taught me to respect my national costume, and it may interest Mr. Irwin to know that the dress I wear in Champaran is the dress I have always worn in India except that for a very short period in India I fell an easy prey in common with the rest of my countrymen to the wearing of semi-European dress in the courts and elsewhere outside Kathiawar. I appeared before the Kathiawar courts now 21 years ago in precisely the dress I wear in Champaran.

One change I have made and it is that, having taken to the occupation of weaving and agriculture and having taken the vow of Swadeshi, my clothing is now entirely hand-woven and hand-sewn and made by me or my fellow workers. Mr. Irwin's letter suggests that I appear before the ryots in a dress I have temporarily and specially

adopted in Champaran to produce an effect. The fact is that I wear the national dress because it it the most natural and the most becoming for an Indian. I believe that our copying of the European dress is a sign of our degradation, humiliation and our weakness, and that we are committing a national sin in discarding a dress which is best suited to the Indian climate and which, for its simplicity, art and cheapness, is not to be beaten on the face of the earth and which answers hygienic requirements. Had it not been for a false pride and equally false notions of prestige, Englishmen here would long ago have adopted the Indian costume. I may mention incidentally that I do not go about Champaran bare headed. I do avoid shoes for sacred reasons. But I find too that it is more natural and healthier to avoid them whenever possible.

I am sorry to inform Mr. Irwin and your readers that my esteemed friend Babu Brijakishore Prasad, the "ex-Hon. Member of Council," still remains unregenerate and retains the provincial cap and never walks barefoot and "kicks up" a terrible noise even in the house we are living in by wearing wooden sandals. He has still not the courage, inspite of most admirable contact with me, to discard his semi-anglicised dress and whenever he goes to see officials he puts his legs into the bifurcated garment and on his own admission tortures himself by cramping his feet in inelastic shoes. I cannot induce him to believe that his clients won't desert him and the courts won't punish him if he wore his more becoming and less expensive dhoti. I invite you and Mr. Irwin not to believe the "stories" that the latter hears about me and my friends, but to join me in the crusade against educated Indians abandoning their manners, habits and

customs which are not proved to be bad or harmful. Finally I venture to warn you and Mr. Irwin that you and he will ill-serve the cause both of you consider is in danger by reason of my presence in Champaran if you continue, as you have done, to base your strictures on unproved facts. I ask you to accept my assurance that I should deem myself unworthy of the friendship and confidence of hundreds of my English friends and associates—not all of them fellow-cranks—if in similar circumstances I acted towards them differently from my own countrymen.

THE HINDU-MAHOMEDAN PROBLEM.

The following is an extract from a Gujarati letter addressed by Mr. Gandhi, to a Mahomedan correspondent:

I never realise any distinction between a Hindu and a Mahomedan. To my mind, both are sons of Mother India. I know that Hindus are in a numerical majority, and that they are believed to be more advanced in knowledge and education. Accordingly, they should be glad to give way so much the more to their Mahomedan brethren. As a man of truth, I honestly believe that Hindus should yield up to the Mahomedans what the latter desire, and that they should rejoice in so doing. We can expect unity only if such mutual large-heartedness is displayed. When the Hindus and Mahomedans act towards each other as blood-brothers, then alone can there be unity, then only can we hope for the dawn of India.

GUJARAT EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

The following is the Presidential address to the Second Gujarat Educational Conference held at Broach in October 20, 1917, specially translated for the "Indian Review."

EDUCATION THROUGH THE VERNACULARS

The Gujarat Education League that has called us together has set before it three objects :

(1) To cultivate and express public opinion on matters of education.

(2) To carry on sustained agitation on educational questions.

(3) To take all practical steps for the spread of education in Gujarat.

I shall endeavour to the best of my ability to place before you my thoughts on these objects and the conclusions I have arrived at.

It must be clear enough to everybody that our first business is to consider and form an opinion about the medium of instruction. Without fixing the medium all our other efforts are likely to be fruitless. To go on educating our children without determining the medium is like an attempt to build without a foundation.

Opinion seems to be divided on the matter. One party claim that instruction ought to be imparted through the vernacular (Gujarati in this province). The other will have English as the medium. Both are guided by pure motives. Both are lovers of their country. But good intentions alone are not sufficient for reaching a goal. It is world-wide experience that good intentions

often take a man to a bad place. It is, therefore, our duty to examine on their merits the contentions of both the parties and, if possible, to arrive at a final and unanimous conclusion on this great question. That it is great no one can doubt. We cannot, therefore, give too much consideration to it.

It is, moreover, a question which affects the whole of India. But every Presidency or Province can come to an independent conclusion. It is in no way essential that, before Gujarat may move, all the other parts of India should arrive at a unanimous decision.

We shall, however, be better able to solve our difficulties by glancing at similar movements in other provinces. When the heart of Bengal, at the time of the Partition, was throbbing with the Swadeshi spirit, an attempt was made to impart all instruction through Bengali. A National College was established. Rupees poured in. But the experiment proved barren. It is my humble belief that the organisers of the movement had no faith in the experiment. The teachers fared no better. The educated class of Bengal seemed to dote upon English. It has been suggested that it is the Bengali's command over the English language that has promoted the growth of Bengali literature. Facts do not support the view. Sir Rabindranath Tagore's wonderful hold on Bengali is not due to his command of the English language. His marvellous Bengali is dependent upon his love of the mother tongue. "Gitanjali" was first written in Bengali. The great poet uses only Bengali speech in Bengal. The speech that he recently delivered in Calcutta on the present situation was in Bengali. Leading men and women of Bengal were among the audience. Some of

them told me that for an hour and a half, by a ceaseless flow of language, he kept the audience spell-bound. He has not derived his thoughts from English literature. He claims that he has received them from the atmosphere of the soil. He has drunk them from the Upanishads. The Indian sky has showered them upon him. And I understand that the position of the other Bengali writers is very similar to the poet's.

When Mahatma Munshiramji, majestic as the Himalayas, delivers his addresses in charming Hirdi, the audience composed of men, women and children listen to him and understand his message. His knowledge of English he reserves for his English friends. He does not translate English thought into Hindi.

It is said of the Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviaji, who, though a householder, has, for the sake of India, dedicated himself entirely to the country, that his English speech is silvery. His silvery eloquence compels Viceregal attention. But if his English speech is silvery, his Hindi speech shines golden like the waters of the Ganges under the sunbeams, as they descend from the Mansarovar.

These three speakers do not owe their power to their English knowledge, but to their love of the vernaculars. The services rendered by the late Swami Dayanand to Hindi owe nothing to the English language. Nor did English play any part in the contributions of Tukaram and Ramdas to Marathi literature. The English language can receive no credit for the growth in Gujarati literature from Premanand's pen as of Shamal Chat's and quite recently of Dalpatram.

The foregoing illustrations seem to afford sufficient proof that love of, and faith in, the vernaculars, rather

than a knowledge of English are necessary for their expansion.

We shall arrive at the same conclusion when we consider how languages grow. They are a reflection of the character of the people who use them. One who knows the dialects of the Zulus of South Africa knows their manners and customs. The character of a language depends upon the qualities and acts of the people. We shold unhesitatingly infer that a nation could not possess warlike, kind hearted and truthful people, if its language contained no expressions denoting these qualities. And we should fail to make that language assimilate such expressions by borrowing them from another language and forcing them into its dictionary, nor will such spurious importation make warriors of those who use that speech. You cannot get steel out of a piece of ordinary iron, but you can make effective use of rusty steel, by ridding it of its rust. We have long laboured under servility and our vernaculars abound in servile expressions. The English language is probably unrivalled in its vocabulary of nautical terms. But if an enterprising Gujarati presented Gujarat with a translation of those terms, he would add nothing to the language and we should be none the wiser for his effort. And if we took up the calling of sailors and provided ourselves with shipyards and even a navy, we should automatically have terms which would adequately express our activity in this direction. The late Rev. J. Taylor gave the same opinion in his Gujarati Grammar. He says : " One sometimes hears people asking whether Gujarati may be considered a complete or an incomplete language. There is a proverb, ' As

the king, so his subjects; as the teacher, so the pupil.' Similarly it can be said, 'As the speaker, so the language.' Shamalbhatt and other poets do not appear to have been obsessed with an idea of the incompleteness of Gujarati when they expressed their different thoughts, but they so coined new expressions and manipulated the old that their thoughts became current in the language.

"In one respect all languages are incomplete. Man's reason is limited and language fails him when he begins to talk of God and Eternity. Human reason controls human speech. It is, therefore, limited, to the extent that reason itself is limited, and in that sense all languages are incomplete. The ordinary rule regarding language is that a language takes shape in accordance with the thoughts of its wielders. If they are sensible, their language is full of sense, and it becomes nonsense when foolish people speak it. There is an English proverb, "A bad carpenter quarrels with his tools." Those who quarrel with a language are often like the bad carpenter. To those who have to deal with the English language and its literature, the Gujarati language may appear incomplete for the simple reason that translation from English into Gujarati is difficult. The fault is not in the language but in the people before whom the translation is placed. They are not used to new words, new subjects and new manipulations of their language. The speaker, therefore, is taken aback. How shall a singer sing before a deaf man? And how can a writer deliver his soul until his readers have developed a capacity for weighing the new with the old and sifting the good from the bad.

"Again some translators seem to think that Gujarat

they have imbibed with their mother's milk, and they have learnt English at school, and that they, therefore, have become mastors of two languages, and need not take up Gujarati as a study. But attainment of perfection in one's mother tongue is more difficult than effort spent in learning a foreign tongue. An examination of the works of Shamalbhatt and other poets will reveal endless effort in every line. To one indisposed to undergo mental strain, Gujarati will appear incomplete. But it will cease to so appear after a proper effort. If the worker is lazy, the language will fail him. It will yield ample results to an industrious man. It will be found to be capable even of ornamentation. Who dare be little Gujarati, a member of the Aryan family, a daughter of Sanskrit, a sister of many noble tongues? May God bless it and may there be in it to the end of time, good literature, sound knowledge and expression of true religion. And may God bless the speech and may we hear its praise from the mothers and the scholars of Gujarat."

Thus we see that it was neither the imperfection of Bengali speech, nor impropriety of the effort that was responsible for the failure of the movement in Bengal to impart instruction through Bengali. We have considered the question of incompleteness. Impropriety of the effort cannot be inferred from an examination of the movement. It may be that the workers in the cause lacked fitness or faith.

In the north, though Hindi is being developed, real effort to make it a medium seems to have been confined only to the Arya Samajists. The experiment continues in the Gurukuls

In the Presidency of Madras the movement com-

menced only a few years ago. There is greater intensity of purpose among the Telugus than among the Tamils. English has acquired such a hold of the literary class among the Tamils that they have not the energy even to conduct their proceedings in Tamil. The English language has not affected the Telugus to that extent. They therefore, make greater use of Telugu. They are not only making an attempt to make Telugu the medium of instruction ; they are heading a movement to repartition India on a linguistic basis. And though the propagation of this idea was commenced only recently, the work is being handled with so much energy that they are likely to see results within a short time. There are many rocks in their way. But the leaders of the movement have impressed me with their ability to break them down.

In the Deccan the movement goes ahead. That good soul Prof. Karve is the leader of the movement. Mr. Naik is working in the same direction. Private institutions are engaged in the experiment. Prof. Bijapurkar, has, after great labour, succeeded in reviving his experiment and we shall see it in a short time crystallised into a school. He had devised a scheme for preparing text-books. Some have been printed and some are ready for print. The teachers in that institution never betrayed want of faith in their cause. Had the institution not been closed down, so far as Marathi is concerned the question of imparting all instruction through it would have been solved.

We learn from an article in a local magazine by Rao Bahadur Hargovindas Kantawala that a movement for making Gujarati the medium of instruction has already been made in Gujarat. Prof. Gajjar and the late Diwan

Bahadur Manibhai Jushbhai initiated it. It remains for us to consider whether we shall water the seed sown by them. I feel that every moment's delay means so much harm done to us. In receiving education through English at least sixteen years are required. Many experienced teachers have given it as their opinion that the same subjects can be taught through the vernaculars in ten years' time. Thus by saving six years of their lives for thousands of our children we might save thousands of years for the nation.

The strain of receiving instruction through a foreign medium is intolerable. Our children alone can bear it, but they have to pay for it. They become unfit for bearing any other strain. For this reason our graduates are mostly without stamina, weak, devoid of energy, diseased and mere imitators. Originality, research, adventure, ceaseless effort, courage, dauntlessness and such other qualities have become atrophied. We are thus incapacitated for undertaking new enterprises, and we are unable to carry them through if we undertake any. Some who can give proof of such qualities die an untimely death. An English writer had said that the non-Europeans are the blotting-sheets of European civilisation. What ever truth there may be in this cryptic statement, it is not due to the natural unfitness of the Asiatics. It is the unfitness of the medium of instruction which is responsible for the result. The Zulus of South Africa are otherwise interprising, powerfully built and men of character. They are not hampered by child-marriages and such other defects. And yet the position of their educated class is the same as ours. With them the medium of instruction is Dutch. They easily obtain command over Dutch

as we do over English, and like us they too on completion of their education loose their energy and for the most part become imitators. Originality leaves them along with the mother-tongue. We the English-educated class are unfit to ascertain the true measure of the harm done by the unnatural system. We should get some idea of it if we realised how little we have reacted upon the masses. The outspoken views on education that our parents sometimes give vent to are thought-compelling. We dote upon our Boses and Roys. Had our people been educated through their vernaculars during the last fifty years, I am sure that the presence in our midst of a Bose or a Roy would not have filled us with astonishment.

Leaving aside for the moment the question of propriety or otherwise of the direction that Japanese energy has taken, Japanese enterprise must amaze us. The national awakening there has taken place through their national language, and so there is a freshness about every activity of theirs. They are teaching their teachers. They have falsified the blotting-sheet smile. Education has stimulated national life, and the world watches dumbstruck Japan's activities. The harm done to national life by the medium being a foreign tongue is immeasurable.

The correspondence that should exist between the school training and the character imbibed with the mother's milk and the training received through her sweet speech is absent when the school training is given through a foreign tongue. However pure may be his motives, he who thus snaps the cord that should bind the school-life and the home-life is an enemy of the nation. We are traitors to our mothers by remaining

under such a system. The harm done goes much further. A gulf has been created between the educated classes and the uneducated masses. The latter do not know us. We do not know the former. They consider us to be 'Saheblog.' They are afraid of us. They do not trust us. If such a state of things were to continue for any length of time, a time may come for Lord Curzon's charge to be true, *viz.*, that the literary classes do not represent the masses.

Fortunately the educated class seems to be waking up from its trance. They experience the difficulty of contact with the masses. How can they infect the masses with their own enthusiasm for the national cause? They cannot do so through English. They have not enough ability or none for doing so through Gujarati. They find it extremely difficult to put their thoughts into Gujarati. I often hear opinion expressed about this difficulty. Owing to the barrier thus created the flow of national life suffers impediment.

Macaulay's object in giving preference to the English language over the vernaculars was pure. He had a contempt for our literature. It affected us and we forgot ourselves and just as a pupil often outdoes the teacher so was the case with us. Macaulay thought that we would be instrumental in spreading western civilisation among the masses. His plan was that some of us would learn English, form our character and spread the new thought among the millions. (It is not necessary here to consider the soundness of this vew. We are merely examining the question of the medium.) We, on the other hand, discovered in English education a medium for obtaining wealth and we gave that use of it predominance. Some of us found in it a stimulus for our

patriotism. So the original intention went into the background, and the English language spread beyond the limit set by Macaulay. We have lost thereby.

Had we the reins of Government in our hands we would have soon detected the error. We could not have abandoned the vernaculars. The governing class has not been able to do so. Many perhaps do not know that the language of our courts is considered to be Gujarati. The Government have to have the Acts of the legislature translated in Gujarati. The official addresses delivered at Darbar gatherings are translated there and then. We see Gujarati and other vernaculars used side by side with English in currency notes. The mathematical knowledge required of the surveyors is difficult enough. But Revenue work would have been too costly, had surveyors been required to know English. Special terms have, therefore been coined for the use of surveyors. They excite pleasurable wonder. If we had a true love for our venaculars we could even now make use of some of the means at our disposal for their spread. If the pleader were to begin to make use of the Gujarati language in the courts they would save their clients much money, and the latter will gain some necessary knowledge of the laws of the land, and will begin to appreciate their rights. Interpreters' fees would be saved, and legal terms would become current in the language. It is true the pleaders will have to make some effort for the attainment of this happy result. I am sure, nay, I speak from experience, that their clients will lose nothing thereby. There is no occasion to fear that arguments advanced in Gujarati will have less weight. Collectors and other officials are expected to know Gujarati. But by our superstitious

regard for English we allow their knowledge to become rusty.

It has been argued that the use we made of English for attainment of wealth, and for stimulating patriotism was quite proper. The agument however, has no bearing on the question before us. We shall bow to those who learn English for the sake of gaining wealth or for serving the country otherwise. But we would surely not make English the medium on that account. My only object in referring to such a use of the English language was to show that it continued its abuse as a medium of instruction and thus produced an untoward result. Some contend that only English-knowing Indians have been fired with the patriotic spirit The past few months have shown us something quite different. But even if we were to admit that claim on behalf of English, we could say that the others never had an opportunity. Patriotism of the English-educated class has not proved infectious, whereas a truly patriotic spirit ought to be all-pervading.

It has been stated that the foregoing arguments, no matter how strong they may be in themselves, are impracticable. "It is a matter for sorrow that other branches of learning should suffer for the sake of English. It is certainly undesirable that we should suffer an undue mental strain in the act of gaining command over the English language. It is, however, my humble opinion that there is no escape for us from having to bear this hardship, regard being had to the fact of our relationship with the English language, and to find out a way These are not the views of an ordinary writer. They are owned by one who occupies a front rank among the Gujarati men of letters. He is a lover

of Gujarati. We are bound to pay heed to whatever Prof. Dhruva writes. Few of us have the experience he has. He has rendered great service to the cause of Gujarati literature and education. He has a perfect right to advise and to criticise. In the circumstances one like me has to pause. Again the views above expressed are shared with Prof. Dhruva by several protagonists of the English language. Prof. Dhruva has stated them in dignified language. And it is our duty to treat them with respect. My own position is still more delicate. I have been trying an experiment in national education under his advice and guidance. In that institution Gujarati is the medium of instruction. Enjoying such an intimate relation with Prof. Dhruva I hesitate to offer anything by way of criticism of his views. Fortunately, Prof. Dhruva regards both systems, the one wherein English is the medium and the other in which the mother tongue is the medium, in the nature of experiment ; he has expressed no final opinion on either. My hesitation about criticising his views is lessened on that account. It seems to me that we lay too much stress on our peculiar relationship with the English language. I know that I may not with perfect freedom deal with this subject from this platform. But it is not improper even for those who cannot handle political subjects to consider the following proposition. The English connection subsists solely for the benefit of India. On no other basis can it be defended. English statesmen themselves have admitted that the idea that one nation should rule another is intolerable, undesirable and harmful for both. This proposition is accepted as a maxim beyond challenge in quarters where it is considered from an altruistic

standpoint. If then both the rulers and the nation are satisfied that the mental calibre of the nation suffers by reason of English being the medium, the system ought to be altered without a moment's delay. It would be a demonstration of our manliness to remove obstacles however great in our path, and if this view be accepted, those like Prof. Dhruva who admit the harm done to our mental calibre do not stand in need of any other argument.

I do not consider it necessary to give any thought to the possibility of our knowledge of English suffering by reason of the vernacular occupying its place. It is my humble belief that not only is it unnecessary for all educated Indians to acquire command over English, but that it is equally unnecessary to induce a taste for acquiring such command.

Some Indians will undoubtedly have to learn English. Prof. Dhruva has examined the question with a lofty purpose only. But examining from all points we would find that it will be necessary for two classes to know English :—

(1) Those patriots who have a capacity for learning languages, who have time at their disposal and who are desirous of exploring the English literature and placing the results before the nation, or those who wish to make use of the English language for the sake of coming in touch with the rulers.

(2) Those who wish to make use of their knowledge of English for the sake of acquiring wealth.

There is not only no harm in treating English as an optional subject, and giving these two classes of candidates the best training in it, but it is even necessary to secure for them every convenience. In such a scheme

the mother-tongue will still remain the medium. Prof. Dhruva fears that if we do not receive all instruction through English, but learn it as a foreign language, it will share the fate of Persian, Sanskrit and other languages. With due respect I must say that there is a hiatus in this reasoning. Many Englishmen, although they receive their training through English possess a high knowledge of French and are able to use it fully for all their purposes. There are men in India who although they have received their training through English have acquired no mean command over French and other languages. The fact is that when English occupies its proper place and the vernaculars receive their due, our minds which are to-day imprisoned will be set free and our brains though cultivated and trained, and yet being fresh will not feel the weight of having to learn English as a language. And it is my belief that English thus learnt will be better than our English of to day And our intellects being active, we should make more effective use of our English knowledge. Weighing the pros and cons, therefore, this seems to be the way that will satisfy many ends.

When we receive our education through the mother-tongue, we should observe a different atmosphere in our homes. At present we are unable to make our wives co-partners with us. They know little of our activity. Our parents do not know what we learn. If we receive instruction through the mother-tongue we should easily make our washermen, our barbers, and our bhangis, partakers of the high knowledge we might have gained. In England one discusses high politics with barbers while having a shave. We are unable to do so even in our family circle, not because the members of the family or

the barbers are ignorant people. Their intellect is as well-trained as that of the English barber. We are able to discuss intelligently with them the events of "Mahabharata," "Ramayana" and of our holy places. For the national training flows in that direction. But we are unable to take home what we receive in our schools. We cannot reproduce before the family circle what we have learnt through the English language.

At the present moment the proceedings of our Legislative Councils are conducted in English. In many other institutions the same state of things prevails. We are, therefore, in the position of a miser who buries underground all his riches. We fare no better in our law courts. Judges often address words of wisdom The court going public is always eager to hear what the Judges have to say But they know no more than the dry decisions of the Judges. They do not even understand their counsels' addresses. Doctors receiving diplomas in Medical Colleges treat their patients no better. They are unable to give necessary instructions to their patients. They often do not know the vernacular names of the different members of the body. Their connection, therefore, with their patients, as a rule, does not travel beyond the writing of prescriptions. It is brought up as a charge against us that through our thoughtlessness we allow the water that flows from the mountain-tops during the rainy season to go to waste, and similarly treat valuable manure worth lakhs of rupees and get disease in the bargain. In the same manner being crushed under the weight of having to learn English and through want of far-sightedness we are unable to give to the nation what it should receive at our hands. There is no exaggeration in this

statement. It is an expression of the feelings that are raging within me. We shall have to pay dearly for our continuous disregard of the mother-tongue. The nation has suffered much by reason of it. It is the first duty of the learned class now to deliver the nation from the agony.

There can be no limit to the scope of a language in which Narasingh Mehta sang. Nandshanker wrote his *Karanghelo*, which has produced a race of writers like Navalram, Narmadashanker, Manilal, Malabari and others ; in which the late Raychandkavi carried on his soul-lifting discourses, which the Hindus, Mahomedans and Parsis claim to speak and can serve if they will ; which has produced a race of holy sages ; which owns among its votaries millionaires ; which has been spoken by sailors who have ventured abroad ; and in which the Barda hills still bear witness to the valourous deeds of Mulu Manek and Jodha Manek. What else can the Gujaratis achieve if they decline to receive their training through that language ? It grieves one even to have to consider the question.

In closing this subject I would invite your attention to the pamphlets published by Dr. Pranjiwandas Mehta, of which a Gujarati translation is now out. I ask you to read them. You will find therein a collection of opinions in support of the views herein expressed.

If it is deemed advisable to make the mother-tongue the media of instruction, it is necessary to examine the steps to be taken for achieving the end. I propose to recount them, without going into the argument in support :—

(1) The English-knowing Gujaratis should never, in their mutual intercourse, make use of English.

(2) Those who are competent both in English and Gujarati, should translate useful English works into Gujarati.

(3) Education Leagues should have text-books prepared.

(4) Moneyed men should establish schools in various places in which Gujarati should be the medium.

(5) Alongside of the foregoing activity, conferences and leagues should petition the Government and pray that the medium should be Gujarati in Government schools, that proceedings in the Law Courts and Councils and all public activities should be in Gujarati, that public services should be open to all, without invidious distinctions in favour of those who know English, and in accordance with the qualifications of applicants for the post for which they may apply, and that schools should be established where aspirants for public offices may receive training through Gujarati.

There is a difficulty about the foregoing suggestions. In the councils there are members who speak in Marathi, Sindhi, Gujarati and even Kanarese. This is a serious difficulty, but not insurmountable. The Telugus have already commenced a discussion of the question, and there is little doubt that a re-distribution of provinces will have to take place on a linguistic basis. Till then every member should have the right to address his remarks in Hindi or in his own vernacular. If this suggestion appears laughable, I would state in all humility that many suggestions have at first sight so appeared. As I hold the view that our progress depends upon a correct determination of the medium of instruction, my suggestion appears to me to have much substance in it. If my suggestion were adopted

the vernaculars will gain in influence, and when they acquire State recognition, they are likely to show merits beyond our imagination. * * *

THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE FOR INDIA

It behoves us to devote attention to a consideration of a national language, as we have done to that of the medium of instruction. If English is to become a national language, it ought to be treated as a compulsory subject. Can English become the national language? Some learned patriots contend that even to raise the question betrays ignorance. In their opinion English already occupies that place. His Excellency the Viceroy in his recent utterance has merely expressed a hope that English will occupy that place. His enthusiasm does not take him as far as that of the former. He Excellency believes that English will day after day command a larger place, will permeate the family circle, and at last rise to the status of a national language. A superficial consideration will support the viceregal contention. The condition of our educated classes gives one the impression that all our activities would come to a stand still if we stop the use of English. And yet deeper thought will show that English can never and ought not to become the national language of India. What is the test of a national language?

(1) For the official class it should be easy to learn.

(2) The religious, commercial and political activity throughout India should be possible in that language.

(3) It should be the speech of the majority of the inhabitants of India.

(4) For the whole of the country it should be easy to learn.

(5) In considering the question, weight ought not to be put upon momentary or shortlived conditions.

The English language does not fulfil any of the conditions above named. The first ought to have been the last, but I have purposely given it the first place, because that condition alone gives the appearance of being applicable to the English language. But upon further consideration we should find that for the officials even at the present moment it is not an easy language to learn. In our scheme of administration, it is assumed that the number of English officials will progressively decrease, so that in the end only the Viceroy and others whom one may count on one's finger-tips will be English. The majority are of Indian nationality to-day, and their number must increase.

And everyone will admit that for them English is more difficult to be learnt than any Indian language. Upon an examination of the second condition, we find that until the public at large can speak English, religious activity through that tongue is an impossibility. And a spread of English to that extent among the masses seems also impossible.

English cannot satisfy the third condition because the majority in India do not speak it.

The fourth, too, cannot be satisfied by English because it is not an easy language to learn for the whole of India.

Considering the last condition we observe that the position that English occupies to-day is momentary. The permanent condition is that there will be little necessity for English in the national affairs. It will certainly be required for imperial affairs. That, therefore, it will be an imperial language, the language of diplo-

macy, is a different question. On that purpose its knowledge is a necessity. We are not jealous of English. All that is contended for is that it ought not to be allowed to go beyond its proper sphere. And as it will be the imperial language, we shall compel our Malaviyajis, our Shastriars and our Banerjeas to learn it. And we shall feel assured that they will advertise the greatness of India in other parts of the world. But English cannot become the national language of India. To give it that place is like an attempt to introduce Esperanto. In my opinion it is unmanly even to think that English can become our national language. The attempt to introduce Esperanto merely betrays ignorance Then which is the language that satisfies all the five conditions? We shall be obliged to admit that Hindi satisfies all those conditions.

I call that language Hindi which Hindus and Mahomedans in the North speak and write, either in the Devanagari or the Urdu character. Exception has been taken to his definition. It seems to be argued that Hindi and Urdu are different languages. This is not a valid argumeut In the Northern parts of India Musalmans and Hindus speak the same language. The literate classes have created a division. The learned Hindus have Sanskritised Hindi. The Musalmans, therefore, cannot understand it. The Moslems of Lucknow have Persianised their speech and made it unintelligible to the Hindus These represent two excesses of the same language. They find no common plece in the speech of the massess. I have lived in the North. I have freely mixed with Hindus and Mahomedans, and although I have but a poor knowledge of Hindi, I have never found any difficulty in

holding communion with them. Call the language of the North what you will, Urdu or Hindi, it is the same. If you write it in the Urdu character you may know it as Urdu. Write the same thing in the Nagiri character and it is Hindi.

There, therefore, remains a difference about the script. For the time being Mahomedan children will certainly write in the Urdu character and Hindus will mostly write in the Devangari. I say mostly, because thousands of Hindus use the Urdu character and some do not even know the Nagari character. But when Hindus and Mahomedans come to regard one another without suspicion, when the causes begetting suspicion are removed, that script which has greater vitality will be more universally used and, therefore, become the national script. Meanwhile those Hindus and Mahomedans who desire to write their petitions in the Urdu character should be free to do so, and should have the right of having them accepted at the seat of National Government.

There is not another language capable of competing with Hindi in satisfying the five conditions. Bengali comes next to Hindi. But the Bengalis themselves make use of Hindi outside Bengal. No one wonders to see a Hindi-speaking man making use of Hindi, no matter where he goes. Hindu preachers and Mahomedan Moulvis deliver their religious discourses throughout India in Hindi and Urdu and even the illiterate masses follow them. Even the unlettered Gujarati going to the North attempts to use a few Hindi words, whereas a gatekeeper from the North declines to speak in Gujarati even to his employer, who has on that acoount to speak to him in broken Hindi.

I have heard Hindi spoken even in the Dravid country. It is not true to say that in Madras one can go on with English. Even there I have employed Hindi with effect. In the trains I have heard Madras passengers undoubtedly use Hindi. It is worthy of note that Mahomedans throughout India speak Urdu and they are to be found in large numbers in every Province. Thus Hindi is destined to be the national language. We have made use of it as such in times gone by. The rise of Urdu itself is due to that fact. The Mahomedan kings were unable to make Persian or Arabic the national language. They accepted the Hindi Grammer, but employed the Urdu character and Persian words in their speeches. They could not, however, carry on their intercourse with the masses through a foreign tongue. All this is not unknown to the English. Those who know anything of the sepoys know that for them military terms have had to be prepared in Hindi or Urdu.

Thus we see that Hindi alone can become the national language. It presents some difficulty in the case of the learned classes in Madras. For men from the Deccan, Gujarat, Sind and Bengal it is easy enough. In a few months they can acquire sufficient command over Hindi to enable them to carry on national intercourse in that tongue. It is not so for the Tamils. The Dravidian languages are distinct from their Sanskrit sister in structure and grammar. The only thing common to the two groups is their Sans krit vocabulary to an extent. But the difficulty is con fined to the learned class alone. We have a rig ht to appeal to their patriotic spirit and expect them to put forth sufficient effort in order to learn Hindi. For in future when Hindi has

received State recognition, it will be introduced as a compulsory language in Madras as in other Provinces, and intercourse between Madras and them will then increase. English has not permeated the Dravidian masses. Hindi, however, will take no time. The Telugus are making an effort in that direction even now. If this Conference can come to an unanimous conclusion as to a national language, it will be necessary to devise means to attain that end. Those which have been suggested in connection with media of instruction are with necessary changes applicable to this question. The activity in making Gujarati the medium of instruction will be confined to Guzarat alone, but the whole of India can take part in the movement regarding the national language. * * *

DEFECTS IN OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

We have considered the question of the media of instruction, of the national language, and of the place that English should occupy. We have now to consider whether there are any defects in the scheme of education imparted in our schools and colleges.

There is no difference of opinion in this matter. The Government and public opinion alike have condemned the present system, but there are wide differences as to what should be omitted and what should be adopted. I am not equipped for an examination of these differences. but I shall have the temerity to submit to this conference my thoughts on the modern system of education.

Education cannot be said to fall within my province. I have, therefore, some hesitation in dwelling upon it. I am myself ever prepared to put down and be impatient of those men and women who travelling outside their provinces discourse upon those for which

they are not fitted. It is but meet that a lawyer should resent the attempt of a physician to discourse upon law. Nor has a man who has no experience of educational matters any right to offer criticism thereon. It is, therefore, necessary for me to briefly mention my qualifications.

I began to think about the modern system of education 25 years ago. The training of my children and those of my brothers and sisters came into my hands. Realising the defects of the system obtaining in our schools, I began experiments on my own children. I even moved them myself. My discontent remained the same even when I went to South Africa. Circumstances compelled me to think still more deeply. For a long time I had the management of the Indian Educational Association of Natal in my hands. My boys have not received a public school training. My eldest son witnessed the vicissitudes that I have passed through. Having despaired of me, he joined the educational institutions in Ahmedabad. It has not appeared to me that he has gained much thereby. It is my belief that those whom I have kept away from public schools have lost nothing but have received good training. I have noticed defects in that training. They were inevitable. The boys began to be brought up in the initial stages of my experiments, and whilst the different links belong to the same chain that was hammered into shape from time to time, the boys had to pass through these different stages. At the time of the Passive Resistance struggle, over fifty boys were being educated under me. The constitution of the school was largely shaped by me. It was unconnected with any other institution or with the Government standard. I am conducting a

similar experiment here. A national institution has been in existence for the last five months and has received the blessings of Prof. Dhruva and other learned men of Gujarat. The ex-Professor Shah of the Gujarat College is its Principal. He has been trained under Prof. Gajjar. He has as his co-workers other lovers of Gujarati. I am chiefly responsible for the scheme of this institution. But all the teachers connected with it have approved of it and they have dedicated their lives to the work, receiving only maintenance money. Owing to circumstances beyond my control, I am unable personally to take part in the tuition, but my heart is ever in it My experiment therefore, though it is all that of an amateur, is not devoid of thought and I ask you to bear it in mind while you consider my criticism of modern education.

I have always felt that the scheme of education in India has taken no account of the family system. It was perhaps natural that, in framing it, our wants were not thought of. Macaulay treated our literaturewith contempt and considered us a superstitious people. The framers of the educational policy were mostly ignorant of our religion, some even deemed it to be irreligion. The scriptures were believed to be a bundle of superstitions, our civilisation was considered to be full of defects. We being a fallen nation, it was assumed that our organisation must be peculiarly defective and so not withstanding pure intentions a faulty structure was raised. For building a new scheme the framers naturally took count of the nearest conditions. The Governors would want the help of the lawyers, physicians, clerks. We would want the new knowledge. These ideas controlled the scheme. Text books were, therefore, prepared in utter

disregard of our social system, and according to an English proverb, the cart was put before the horse. Malabari has stated that if we want to teach our children History and Geography we must first give them a knowledge of the geography of the home. I remember that it was my lot to have to memorise the English counties. And a subject which is deeply interesting was rendered dry as dust for me. In history there was nothing to enthral my attention. It ought to be a means to fire the patriotic spirit of young lads. I found no cause for patriotism in learning history in our schools. I had to imbibe it from other books.

In the teaching of Arithmetic and kindred subjects, indigenous methods have received little or no attention. They have been almost abandoned and we have lost the cunning of our forefathers which they possessed in mental arithmetic.

The teaching of Science is dry. Pupils can make no practical use of it. Astronomy which can be taught by observing the sky is given to the pupils from text-books. I have not known a scholar being able to analyse a drop of water, after leaving school.

It is no exaggeration to say that the teaching of Hygiene is a farce. We do not know at the end of 60 years' training how to save ourselves from plague and such other diseases. It is in our opinion the greatest reflection upon our educational system that our doctors have not been able to rid the country of these diseases. I have visited hundreds of homes but have hardly seen a house in which rules of hygiene were observed. I doubt very much if our graduates know how to treat snake-bites, etc. Had our doctors been able to receive their training in medicine in their childhood, they would

not occupy the pitiable position that they do. This is a terrible result of our educational system. All the other parts of the world have been able to banish plague from their midst. Here it has found a home and thousands die before their time, and if it be pleaded that poverty is the cause, the Department of Education has to answer why there should be any poverty after 60 years of education.

We might now consider the subjects which are altogether neglected. Character should be the chief aim of education. It passes my comprehension how it can be built without religion. We shall soon find out that we are neither here nor there. It is not possible for me to dilate on this delicate subject. I have met hundreds of teachers. They have related their experiences with a sigh. This Conference has to give deep thought to it. If the scholars lost their characters they could have lost everything.

In this country 85 to 90 per cent. of the population is engaged in agricultural pursuits. We can, therefore never know too much of agriculture. But there is no place for agricultural training even in our High Schools. A catastrophe like this is possible only in India. The art of hand-weaving is fast dying. It was the agriculturist's occupation during his leisure. There is no provision for the teaching of that art in our syllabus. Our education simply produces a political class, and even a goldsmith, blacksmith or a shoemaker who is entrapped in our schools is turned out a political. We should surely desire that all should receive what is good education. But if all at the end of their education in our schools and colleges become politicals ?—

There is no provision for military training. It is

no matter of great grief to me . I have considered it a boon received by chance, but the nation wants to know the use of arms. And those who want to, should have the opportunity. The matter, however, seems to have been clean forgotton.

Music has found no place. We have lost all notion of what a tremendous effect it has on men. Had we known it, we would have strained every nerve to make our children learn the art. The Vedic chant seems to recognise its effect. Sweet music calms the fever of the soul. Often we notice disturbances in largely attended meetings. The sound of some national rhyme rising in tune from a thousand breasts can easily still such disturbances. It is no insignificant matter to have our children singing with one voice soul-stirring, vitalising national songs. That sailors and other labouring classes go through their heavy task to the tune of some rhythmic expression is an instance of the power of music. I have known English friends forgetting their cold by rolling out some of their favourite tunes. The singing of dramatic songs, anyhow, without reference to timeliness and thumping on harmoniums and concertinas harm our children. If they were to receive methodical musical training, they would not waste their time singing so called songs out of tune. Boys will abhor questionable songs even as a good musician will never sing out of tune and out of season. Music is a factor in national awakening, and it should be provided for. The opinion of Dr. Ananda Coomaraswami on this subject is worthy of study.

Gymnastics and body-training in general have had no serious attention given to them Tennis, cricket and football have replaced national games. The former,

it may be admitted, are games full of interest, but if everything western had not captivated us, we should not have abandoned equally interesting but inexpensive national games, such as *Gedidudo, Moi dandia, Khogho, Magmatli, Nadtutu, Kharopat, Navnagli, Sat tali* and so on. Our gymnastics which exercise every limb of the body and our *Kusti* grounds have almost disappeared. If anything western is worthy of being copied it is certainly the western drill An English friend rightly remarked that we did dot know how to walk. We have no notion of marching in step in large bodies. We are not trained to march noiselessly, in an orderly manner in step, in twos or fours, in directions varying from time to time. Nor need it be supposed that drilling is useful for military purposes only. It is required for many acts of benevolence, *e.g.*, there is a fire drill, there is a drill for helping the drowned to come to life, and there is a stretcher drill. Thus it is necessary to introduce in our schools national games, national gymnastics and the western drill.

Female education fares no better than male education. In framing the scheme of female education, no thought has been given to the Indian conception of relationship between husband and wife, and the place an Indian woman occupies in society.

Much of the primary education may be common to both the sexes. But beyond that there is little that is common. Nature has made the two different, and a distinction is necessary in framing a scheme of education for the two sexes. Both are equal, but the sphere of work is defined for each. Woman has the right to the queenship of the home. Man is the controller of outside management. He is the bread-winner, woman husbands the

resources of the family and distributes them. Woman is her infant's nurse, she is its maker, on her depends the child's character, she is the child's first teacher, thus she is the mother of the nation. Man is not its father. After a time the father's influence over his son begins to wane. The mother never allows it to slip away from herself. Even when we reach manhood we play like children with our mothers. We are unable to retain that relationship with our fathers. If then the vocation of the two are naturally and properly distinct, there is no occasion to arrange for an independent earning of livelihood by women in general. Where women are obliged to be telegraphists, typists and compositors, there is a break in well ordered society. A nation that has adopted such a scheme has, in my opinion, come to the end of its resources, and has begun to live on its capital.

Thus it is wrong on the one hand to keep our women in a state of ignorance and degradation. It is a sign of weakness, and it is tyrannical to impose men's work on her. After co-education for some years, a different scheme for girls is necessary. They ought to have a knowledge of the managment of the home, of regulating the life during the child-bearing period and the upbringing of children, etc. To formulate such a scheme is a difficult task. This is a new subject in the department of education. In order to explore the unbeaten track, women of character and learning and men of experience should be entrusted with the task of devising a scheme of female education. Such a committee will try to devise means for the education of our girls. But we have numerous girls who are married during girlhood. The number is increasing. These girls disappear from the education stage after marriage. I venture to copy

below the views I have expressed on this phase of female education in my preface to the first number of the Bhaginee Samaj series:

"The provision of education for unmarried girls does not solve the problem of female education. Thousands of girls at the age of 12 become victims of child-marriage and disappear from view. They become mother. So long as we have not got rid of this cruel wrong, husbands will have to become their wives' teachers. In the fitness of husbands for this task lies high hope for the nation. All endeavour for the national uplift is vain so long as instead of becoming our companions, our better halves and partners in our joys and sorrows, our wives remain our cooks and objects of our lust. Some treat their wives as if they were beasts. Some Sanskrit text and a celebrated verse of Tulsidas are responsible for this deplorable state of things. Tulsidas has said that beasts, fools, Sudras and women are fit to receive bodily punishment. I am a devotee of Tulsidas. But my worship is not blind. Either the couplet is apocryphal, or Tulsidas following the popular current has thoughtlessly written it off. With reference to Sanskrit expressions, we are haunted by the superstitious belief that everything Sanskrit is scriptural! It is our duty to purge ourselves of the superstition and uproot the habit of considering women as our inferiors. Their is another body of men who in pursuit of their passions decorate their wives from period to period during twenty-four hours even as we decorate our idols. We must shake ourselves free of this idolatry. Then at last they will be what Uma was to Shankara, Sita to Rama, Damayanti to Nala, they will be our companions, they will discourse

with us on equal terms, they will appreciate our sentiments, they will nurse them, they would by their marvellous intuitive powers understand our business worries as by magic, share them with us and give us the soothing peace of the home. Then but not till then is our regeneration possible. To attain to that lofty status through girl-schools is highly improbable for a long time. So long as we are destined to groan under the shackles of child-marriages, so long will husbands have to become teachers of their child-wives. It is not tuition in the alphabet only that is here contemplated. Step by step they have to be initiated in political and social subjects and literary training is not indispensable for imparting such knowledge to them. Husbands who aspire after the position of teachers will have to alter their conduct towards their wives. If husbands were to observe Brahmacharya so long as their wives have not reached maturity and are receiving their education under them, had we not been paralysed by inertia, we would never impose the burden of motherhood upon a girl of 12 or 15. We would shudder even to think of any such possibility.

It is well that classes are opened for married women and that lectures are given for them. Those who are engaged in this kind of activities are entitled to credit. But it appears that until husbands discharge the duty incumbent on them, we are not likely to obtain great results. Upon reflection this would appear to be a self evident truth "

Wherever we look, we observe imposing structures upon weak foundation. Those who are selected as teachers for primary schools may, for the sake of courtesy, be so called. In reality, however, it is an

abuse of terms to call such men teachers. A scholar's childhood is the most important period of life. Knowledge received during that period is never forgotten. And it is during this period that they are helped the least, and they are shoved into any so-called school.

In my opinion, if in this country, instead of devoting our pecuniary resources to ornamenting our schools and colleges beyond the capacity of this poor country, we were to devote them to imparting primary education under teachers who are well trained, upright and sobered by age, in hygienic conditions, we should in a short time have tangible results. Even if the salaries of the teachers in primary schools were doubled, we could not obtain the desired results. Paltry changes are not enough to secure important results. It is necessary to alter the framework of primary education. I know that this is a difficult subject. There are many pitfalls ahead, but its solution ought not to be beyond the power of the Gujarat Education League. It ought, perhaps, to be stated that their is no intention here of finding fault with primary school teachers individually. That they are able beyond their capacity to show us results, is a proof of the stability of our grand civilisation. If the same teachers were properly fitted and encouraged, they could show us undreamt-of results.

It is, perhaps, improper for me to say anything about the question of compulsory education. My experience is limited. I find it hard to reconcile myself to any compulsion being imposed on the nation. The thought, therefore, of putting an additional burden in the shape of cumpulsory education worries me. It appears to be more in keeping with the times to experiment in free and voluntary education. Until

we have come out of the compulsion stage as the rule of life, to make education compulsory seems to me to be fraught with many dangers. The experience gained by the Baroda Government may help us in considering this subject. The results of my examination of the Baroda system have been so far unfavourable. But no weight can be attached to them as my examination was wholly superficial. I take it for granted that the delegates assembled here, will be able to throw helpful light on the subject.

It is certain that the golden way to remove the defects enumerated by me is not through petitioning. Great changes are not suddenly made by Governments. Such enterprises are possible only by the initiative of the leaders of a nation. Under the British Constitution voluntary national effort has a recognised place. Ages will pass away before we achieve our aims, if we depended solely upon Government initiative. As in England so in India, we have to lead the way for the Government by making experiments ourselves. Those who detect short-comings in our educational system can make the Government remove them by themselves making experiments and showing the way. Numerous private institutions should be established in order to bring about such a consummation. There is one big obstacle in our path. We are enamoured of 'degrees.' The very life seems to hang upon passing an examination and obtaining a degree. It sucks the nation's life-blood. We forget that 'degrees' are required only by candidates for Government service. But Government service is not a foundation for national life. We see, moreover, that wealth can be acquired without Government service. Educated men can, by their enterprise,

acquire wealth even as illiterate men do by their cleverness. If the educated class became free from the paralysing fear of their unfitness for business, they should surely have as much capacity as the illiterate class. If, therefore, we become free from the bondage of 'degrees,' many private institutions could be carried on. No Goverment can possibly take charge of the whole of a nation's education. In America private enterprise is the predominant factor in education. In England numerous schools and colleges are conducted by private enterprise. They issue their own certificates. Herculean efforts must be made in order to put national education on a firm foundation. Money, mind, body and soul must be dedicated to it. We have not much to learn from America. But there is certainly one thing which we can copy from that country. Great educational schemes are propounded and managed by gigantic trusts. Millionaires have given off their millions to them. They support many a private school. These trusts have not only untold wealth at their disposal, but command also the services of able-bodied, patriotic and learned men, who inspect and protect national institutions and give financial assistance, where necessary. Any institution conforming to the conditions of these trusts is entitled to financial help. Through these trusts even the elderly peasant of America has brought to his door the results of the latest experiments in agriculture Gujarat is capable of supporting some such scheme. It has wealth, it has learning, and the religious instinct has not yet died out. Children are thirsting for education. If we can but initiate the desired reform, we could, by our success, command Government action. One act actually accomplished will be far more forcible than thousands of petitions.

The foregoing suggestions have involved an examination of the other two objects of the Gujarat Education League. The establishment of a trust such as I have described is a continuous agitation for the spread of education and a practical step towards it.

But to do that is like doing the only best. It could not, therefore, be easy. Both Government and millionaires can be wakened into life only by coaxing. *Tapasya* is the only means to do it. It is the first and the best step in religion. And I assume that the Gujarat Education League is an incarnation of *Tapasya*. Money will be showered upon the League when its secretaries and members are found to be embodiments of selflessness and learning. Wealth is always shy. There are reasons for such shyness. If, therefore, we want to coax wealthy men, we shall have to prove our fitness. But although we require money, it is not necessary to attach undue importance to that need. He who wishes to impart national education can, if he is not equipped for it, do so by labouring and getting the necessary training and having thus qualified himself will, sitting under the shadow of a tree, distribute knowledge freely to those who want it. He is a Brahmin, indeed, and this dharma can be practised by every one who wishes it. Both wealth and power will bow to such a one. I hope and pray to God that the Gujarat Education League will have immoveable faith in itself.

The way to Swaraj lies through education. Political leaders may wait on Mr. Montagu. The political field may not be open to this Conference. But all endeavour will be useless without true education. The field of education is a speciality of this Conference. And if we achieve success in that direction, it means success all over.

GUJARAT POLITICAL CONFERENCE

The following is an English translation of Mr. Gandhi's Presidential Address to the First Gujarat Political Conference held at Godhra, on November 3, 1917.

Brothers and Sisters, I am thankful to you all for the exalted position to which you have called me. I am but a baby of two years and a half in Indian politics. I cannot trade, here, on my experience in South Africa. I know that acceptance of the position is to a certain extent an impertinence. And yet I have been unable to resist the pressure your over-whelming affection has exerted upon me.

I am conscious of my responsibility. This Conference is the first of its kind in Gujarat. The time is most critical for the whole of India. The empire is labouring under a strain never before experienced. My views do not quite take the general course. I feel that some of them run in the opposite direction. Under the circumstances, I can hardly claim this privileged position. The president of a meeting is usually its spokesman. I cannot pretend to lay any such claim. It is your kindness that gives me such a unique opportunity of placing my thoughts before the Gujarat public. I do not see anything wrong in these views being subjected to criticism, dissent, and even emphatic protest. I would like them to be freely discussed. I will only say with regard to them that they were not formed to-day or yesterday. But they were formed years ago. I am enamoured of them, and my Indian experience of two years and a half has not altered them.

I congratulate the originators of the proposal to hold this Conference as also those friends who have reduced it to practice. It is a most important event for Gujarat. It is possible for us to make it yield most important results. This conference is in the nature of a foundation, and if it is well and truely laid, we need have no anxiety as to the superstructure. Being the first progenitor, its responsibility is great. I pray that God will bless us with wisdom and that our deliberations will benefit the people.

This is a political conference. Let us pause a moment over the word 'political.' It is, as a rule, used in a restricted sense, but I believe it is better to give it a wider meaning. If the work of such a conference were to be confined to a consideration of the relations between the rulers and the ruled, it would not only be incomplete, but we should even fail to have an adequate conception of those relations. For instance the question of Mhowra flowers is of great importance for a part of Gujarat. If it is considered merely as a question between the Government and the people, it might lead to an untoward end, or even to one never desired by us. If we considered the genesis of the law on Mhowra flowers and also appreciated our duty in the matter, we would, very probably, succeed sooner in our fight with Government than otherwise, and we would easily discover the key to successful agitation. You will more clearly perceive my interpretation of the word 'political' in the light of the views now being laid before you.

Conferences do not, as a rule, after the end of their deliberations, appear to leave behind them an executive body, and even when such a body is appointed, it is, to use the language of the late Mr. Gokhale, composed of

men who are amateurs. What is wanted in order to give effect to the resolutions of such conferences is men who would make it their business to do so. If such men come forward in great numbers, then and then only will such conferences be a credit to the country and produce lasting results. At present there is much waste of energy. It is desirable that there were many institutions of the type of the Servants of India Society. Only when men fired with the belief that service is the highest religion, come forward in great numbers, only then could we hope to see great results. Fortunately, the religious spirit still binds India, and if during the present age the service of the motherland becomes the end of religion, men and women of religion in large numbers would take part in our public life. When sages and saints take up this work, India will easily achieve her cherished aims. At all events it is incumbent on us that for the purposes of this conference we formed an executive committee whose business, it would be, to enforce its resolutions.

The sound of Swaraj pervades the Indian air. It is due to Mrs. Besant that Swaraj is on the lips of hundreds of thousands of men and women. What was unknown to men and women only two years ago, has, by her consummate tact and her indefatigable efforts, become common property for them. There cannot be the slightest doubt that her name will take the first rank in history among those who inspired us with the hope that Swaraj was attainable at no distant date. Swaraj was, and is, the goal of the Congress. The idea did not originate with her. But the credit of presenting it to us as an easily attainable goal belongs to that lady alone. For that we could hardly thank

her enough. By releasing her and her associates, Messrs. Arundale and Wadia, Government have laid us under an obligation, and at the same time acknowledged the just and reasonable nature of the agitation for Swaraj. It is desirable that Government should extend the same generosity towards our brothers, Mahomed Ali and Shaukat Ali. It is no use discussing the appositeness or otherwise of what Sir William Vincent has said about them. It is to be hoped that the Government will accede to the peoples' desire for their release and thus make them responsible for any improper result that might flow from their release. Such clemency will make them all the more grateful to the Government. The act of generosity will be incomplete so long as these brothers are not released. The grant of freedom to the brothers will gladden the peoples' hearts and endear the Government to them.

Mr. Montagu will shortly be in our midst. The work of taking signatures to the petition to be submitted to him is going on apace. The chief object of this petition is to educate the people about Swaraj. To say that a knowledge of letters is essential to obtain Swaraj betrays ignorance of history. A knowledge of letters is not necessary to inculcate among people the idea that we ought to manage our own affairs. What is essential is the grasp of such an idea. People have to desire Swaraj. Hundreds of unlettered kings have ruled kingdoms in an effective manner. To see how far such an idea exists in the minds of the people and to try to create it where it is absent, is the object of this petition. It is desirable that millions of men and women should sign it intelligently. That such a largely signed petition will have its due weight with Mr. Montagu is its natural result.

No one has the right to alter the scheme of reforms approved by the Congress and the Moslem League, and one need not, therefore, go into the merits thereof. For our present purposes, we have to understand thoroughly the scheme formulated most thoughtfully by our leaders and to faithfully do the things necessary to get it accepted and enforced.

This scheme is not Swaraj, but is a great step towards Swaraj. Some English critics tell us that we have no right to enjoy Swaraj, because the class that demands it is incapable of defending India. "Is the defence of India to rest with the English alone," they ask, "and are the reins of Government to be in the hands of the Indians? Now this is a question which excites both laughter and sorrow. It is laughable, because our English friends fancy that they are not of us, whilst our plan of Swaraj is based upon retention of the British connection. We do not expect the English settlers to leave this country. They will be our partners in Swaraj. And they need not grumble if in such a scheme the burden of the defence of the country falls on them. They are, however, hasty in assuming that we shall not do our share of defending the country. When India decides upon qualifying herself for the act of soldiering, she will attain to it in no time. We have but to harden our feelings to be able to strike. To cultivate a hardened feeling does not take ages. It grows like weeds. The question has also its tragic side, because it puts us in mind of the fact that Government have up to now debarred us from military training. Had they been so minded they would have had at their disposal to-day, from among the educated classes, an army of trained soldiers. Government have to

accept a larger measure of blame than the educated classes for the latter having taken little part in the war. Had the Government policy been shaped differently from the very commencement, they would have to-day an unconquerable army. But let no one be blamed for the present situation. At the time British rule was established, it was considered to be a wise policy for the governance of crores of men to deprive them of arms and military training. But it is never too late to mend. and both the rulers and the ruled must immediately repair the omission

In offering these views I have assumed the propriety of the current trend of thought. To me, however, it does not appear to be tending altogether in the right direction. Our agitation is based on the Western model. The Swaraj we desire is of a Western type. As a result of it, India will have to enter into competition with the Western nations. Many believe that there is no escape from it. I do not think so. I cannot forget that India is not Europe, India is not Japan, India is not China. The divine word that 'India alone is the land of Karma' (Action), the rest is the land of Bhoga (Enjoyment), is indelibly imprinted on my mind. I feel that India's mission is different from that of the others. India is fitted for the religious supremacy of the world. There is no parallel in the world for the process of purification that this country has voluntarily undergone. India is less in need of steel weapons, it has fought with divine weapons; it can still do so. Other nations have been votaries of brute force. The terrible war going on in Europe furnishes a forcible illustration of the truth. India can win all by soul-force. History supplies numerous instances to prove that brute force is as nothing

before soul-force. Poets have sung about it and Seers have described their experiences. A thirty-year old Hercules behaves like a lamb before his eighty-year old father. This is an instance of love-force. Love is Atman : it is its attribute. If we have faith enough we can wield that force over the whole world. Religion having lost its hold on us, we are without an anchor to keep us firm amidst the storm of modern civilisation, and are therefore being tossed to and fro. Enough, however, of this, for the present. I shall return to it at a later stage.

In spite of my views being as I have just described them, I do not hesitate to take part in the Swaraj movement, for India is being governed in accordance with the Western system and even the Government admit that the British Parliament presents the best type of that system. Without parliamentary government, we should be nowhere. Mrs. Besant is only too true when she says that we shall soon be facing a hunger-strike, if we do not have Home Rule. I do not want to go into statistics. The evidence of my eyes is enough for me. Poverty in India is deepening day by day. No other result is possible. A country that exports its raw produce and imports it after it has undergone manufacturing processes, a country that in spite of growing its own cotton, has to pay crores of rupees for its imported cloth, cannot be otherwise than poor. It can only be said of a poor country that its people are spend thrifts, because they ungrudgingly spend money in marriage and such other cermonies. It must be a terribly poor country that cannot afford to spend enough in carrying out improvements for stamping out epidemics like the plague. The poverty of a country must contin-

uously grow when the salaries of its highly paid officials are spent outside it. Surely it must be India's keen poverty that compels its people, during cold weather for want of woollen clothing, to burn their precious manure, in order to warm themselves. Throughout my wanderings in India I have rarely seen a buoyant face. The middle classes are groaning under the weight of awful distress. For the lowest order there is no hope. They do not know a bright day. It is a pure fiction to say that India's riches are buried under ground, or are to be found in her ornaments. What there is of such riches is of no consequence. The nation's expenditure has increased, not so its income. Government have not deliberately brought about this state of things. I believe that their intentions are pure. It is their honest opinion that the nation's prosperity is daily growing. Their faith in their Blue Books is immovable. It is only too true that statistics can be made to prove anything. The economists deduce India's prosperity from statistics. People like me who appreciate the popular way of examining figures shake their heads over bluebook statistics. If the gods were to come down and testify otherwise, I would insist on saying that I see India growing poorer.

What then would our Parliament do? When we have it, we would have a right to commit blunders and to correct them. In the early stages we are bound to make blunders. But we being children of the soil, won't lose time in setting ourselves right. We shall, therefore, soon find out remedies against poverty. Then our existence won't be dependent on Lancashire goods. Then we shall not be found spending untold riches on Imperial Delhi. It will, then, bear some

correspondence to the peasant cottage. There will be some proportion observed between that cottage and our Parliament House. *The nation to-day is in a helpless condition, it does not possess even the right to err. He who has no right to err can never go forward.* The history of the Commons is a history of blunders. Man, says an Arabian proverb, is error personified. *Freedom to err and the duty of correcting errors is one definition of Swaraj.* And such Swaraj lies in Parliament. That Parliament we need to-day. We are fitted for it to-day. We shall, therefore, get it on demand. It rests with us to define 'to-day.', Swaraj is not to be attained through an appeal to the British democracy. The English nation cannot appreciate such an appeal. Its reply will be:—"We never sought outside help to obtain Swaraj. We have received it through our own ability. You have not received it, because you are unfit. When you are fit for it, nobody can withhold it from you." How then shall we fit ourselves for it? We have to demand Swaraj from our own democracy. Our appeal must be to it. When the peasantry of India understand what Swaraj is, the demand will become irresistible. The late Sir W.W. Hunter used to say that in the British system, victory on the battlefield was the shortest cut to success. If educated India could have taken its full share in the war, I am certain that we would not only have reached our goal already but the manner of the grant would have been altogether unique. We often refer to the fact that many sepoys of Hindustan have lost their lives on the battle-fields of France and Mesopotamia. It is not possible for the educated classes to claim the credit for this event. It is not patriotism that had prompted those sepoys to go to

the battlefield. They know nothing of Swaraj. At the end of the war they will not ask for it. They have gone to demonstrate that they are faithful to the salt they eat. In asking for Swaraj, I feel that it is not possible for us to bring into account their services. The only thing we can say is that we may not be considered blameworthy for our inability to take a large active part in the prosecution of the war.

That we have been loyal at a time of stress is no test of fitness for Swaraj. Loyalty is no merit. It is a necessity of citizenship all the world over. That loyalty can be no passport to Swaraj is a self-demonstrated maxim. Our fitness lies in that we now keenly desire Swaraj, and in the conviction we have reached that bureaucracy, although it has served India with pure intentions, has had its day. And this kind of fitness is sufficient for our purpose. Without Swaraj there is now no possibility of peace in India.

But if we confine our activities for advancing Swaraj only to holding meetings, the nation is likely to suffer harm. Meetings and speeches have their own place and time. *But they cannot make a Nation.*

In a nation fired with Swaraj-zeal we shall observe an awakening in all departments of life. The first step to Swaraj lies in the Individual. The great truth, 'As with the Individual so with the Universe,' is applicable here as elsewhere. If we are ever torn by conflict from within, if we are ever going astray, and if instead of ruling our passions we allow them to rule us, Swaraj can have no meaning for us. Government of self, then, is primary education in the school of Swaraj.

Then the Family. If dissensions reign supreme in our families, if brothers fight among themselves, if joint

families, *i.e.*, families enjoying Self-government, become divided through family quarrels, and if we are unfit even for such restricted Swaraj, how can we be considered fit for the larger Swaraj ?

Now for the Caste. If caste-fellows become jealous of one another, if the castes cannot regulate their affairs in an orderly manner, if the elders want to usurp power, if the members become self-opinionated and thus show their unfitness for tribal Self-government, how can they be fit for national Self-government ?

After caste the City Life If we cannot regulate the affairs of our cities, if our streets are not kept clean, if our homes are dilapidated and if our roads are crooked, if we cannot command the services of selfless citizens for civic government, and those who are in charge of affairs are neglectful or selfish, how shall we claim larger powers ? The way to national life lies through the cities. It is, therefore, necessary to linger a little longer on civic government.

The plague has found a home in India. Cholera has been always with us. Malaria takes an annual toll of thousands. The plague has been driven out from every other part of the world. Glasgow drove it out as soon as it entered it. In Johannesburg it could appear but once. Its municipality made a great effort and stamped it out within a month, whereas we are able to produce little impression upon it. We cannot blame the Government for this state of things. In reality we cannot make our poverty answerable for it. None can interfere with us in the prosecution of any remedies that we might wish to adopt. Ahmedabad, for instance, cannot evade responsibility by pleading poverty. I fear that in respect of the plague we must

shoulder the whole responsibility. It is a matter of wonderment that when the plague is working havoc in our rural quarters, cantonments, as a rule, remain free. Reasons for such immunity are obvious. In the cantonments the atmosphere is pure, houses detached, roads are wide and clean, the sanitary habits of the residents are exceptionally sound. Whereas ours are as unhygienic as they well could be. Our closets are pestilentially dirty. Ninety per cent. of our population go barefoot, people spit anywhere, perfrom natural functions anywhere and are obliged to walk along roads and paths thus dirtied. It is no wonder that the plague has found a home in our midst.

Unless we alter the conditions of our cities, rid ourselves of dirty habits, and reform our castes, Swaraj for us can have no value.

It will not be considered out of place here to refer to the condition of the so-called untouchables. The result of considering the most useful members of society as unworthy of being even touched by us, has been that we let them clean only a part of our closets. In the name of religion we ourselves would not clean the remainder, for fear of pollution, and so, in spite of personal cleanliness, a portion of our houses remains the dirtiest in the world, with the result that we are brought up in an atmosphere which is laden with disease germs. We were safe so long as we kept to our villages. But in the cities we ever commit suicide by reason of our insanitary habits.

Where many die before their death there is every probability that people are devoid of both religion and its practice. I believe that it ought not to be beyond us to banish the plague from India, and if we could do so,

we shall have increased our fitness for Swaraj, as it could not be by agitation, no matter howsoever great. This is a question meriting the serious consideration of our Doctors and Vaidyas.

Our sacred Dakorji is our next door neighbour. I have visited that holy place. Its unholiness is limitless. I consider myself a devout Vaishnavite. I claim, therefore, a special privilege of criticising the condition of Dakorji. The insanitation of that place is so great, that one used to hygienic conditions can hardly bear to pass even twenty-four hours there. The pilgrims are permitted to pollute the tank and the streets as they choose. The keepers of the idol quarrel among themselves, and to add insult to injury, a receiver has been appointed to take charge of the jewellery and costly robes of the idol. It is our clear duty to set this wrong right. How shall we, Gujaratis, bent on attaining Swaraj, discharge ourselves in its army, if we cannot sweep our houses clean?

The inconsideration of the state of education in our cities also fills us with despondency. It is up to us to provide by private effort for the education of the masses. But our gaze is fixed upon Government, whilst our children are starving for want of education.

In the cities the drink-evil is on the increase, tea-shops are multiplying, gambling is rampant. If we cannot remedy these evils how should we attain Swaraj whose meaning is government of ourselves?

We have reached a time when we and our children are likely to be deprived of our milk-supply. Dairies in Gujarat are doing us infinite harm. They buy out practically the whole milk-supply and sell its products, butter, cheese etc., in a wider market. How can a

nation whose nourishment is chiefly derived from milk allow this important article of food to be thus exploited? How can men be heedless of the national health, and think of enriching themselves, by such an improper use of this article of diet? Milk and its products are of such paramount value to the nation that they deserve to be controlled by the municipalities. What are we doing about them?

I have just returned from the scene of Bakr-Id riots. For an insignificant cause, the two communities quarrelled, mischievous men took advantage of it, and a mere spark became a blaze. We were found to be helpless. We have been obliged to depend only upon Government assistance. This is a significant illustration of the condition I am trying to describe.

It will not be inopportune to dwell for a moment on the question of cow-protection. It is an important question. And yet it is entrusted to the so-called cow-protection societies. The protection of cows is an old custom. It has originated in the necessity of the condition of the country. Protection of its cows is incumbent upon a country, 73 per cent. of whose population lives upon agriculture, and uses only bullocks for it. In such a country even meat-eaters should abstain from beef-eating. These natural causes should be enough justification for not killing cows. But here we have to face a peculiar situation. The chief meaning of cow-protection seems to be to prevent cows from going into the hands of our Mussalman brethren, and being used as food. The governing class seem to need beef. In their behalf thousands of cows are slaughtered daily. We take no steps to prevent the slaughter. We hardly make any attempt to prevent the cruel torture of cows by certain

Hindu dairies of Calcutta, which subject them to certain indescribable practices and make them yield the last drop of milk. In Gujarat Hindu drivers use spiked sticks to goad bullocks into action. We say nothing about it. The bullocks of our cities are to be seen in a pitiable condition. Indeed, protection of the cow and her progeny is a very great problem. With us it has degenerated into a pretext for quarrelling with the Mahomedans, and we have thus contributed to a further slaughter of cows. It is not religion, but want of it, to kill a Mahomedan brother who declines to part with his cow. I feel sure that if we were to negotiate with our Mussalman brothers upon a basis of love, they will appreciate the peculiar condition of India and readily co-operate with us in the protection of cows. By courtesy and even by Satyagraha we can engage them in that mission. But in order to be able to do this, we shall have to understand the question in its true bearing. We shall have to prepare rather to die than to kill. But we shall be able to do this only when we understand the real value of the cow and have pure love for her. Many ends will be automatically served in achieving this one end. Hindus and Mahomedans will live in peace, milk and its products will be available in a pure condition and will be cheaper than now, and our bullocks will become the envy of the world. By real *tapasya* it is possible for us to stop cow slaughter whether by the English, Mahomedans or Hindus. This one act will bring Swaraj many a step nearer.

Many of the foregoing problems belong to Municipal Government. We can, therefore, clearly see that *National Government is dependent upon purity of the government of our cities.*

It will not be considered an improper statement to say that the Swadeshi movement is in an insane condition. We do not realise that Swaraj is almost wholly obtainable through Swadeshi. If we have no regard for our respective vernaculars, if we dislike our clothes, if our dress repels us, if we are ashamed to wear the sacred *Shikha*, if our food is distasteful to us, our climate is not good enough, our people uncouth and unfit for our company, our civilisation faulty and the foreign attractive, in short, if ev erything native is bad and everything foreign pleasing to us, I should not know what Swaraj can mean for us. If everything foreign is to be adopted, surely it will be necessary for us to continue long under foreign tutelage, because foreign civilisation has not permeated the masses. It seems to me that, before we can appreciate Swaraj, we should have not only love but passion, for Swadeshi. Every one of our acts should bear the Swadeshi stamp. Swaraj can only be built upon the assumption that most of what is national is on the whole sound. If the view here put forth be correct, the Swadeshi movement ought to be carried on vigorously. Every country that has carried on the Swaraj movement has fully appreciated the Swadeshi spirit. The Scotch Highlanders hold on to their kilts even at the risk of their lives. We humorously call the Highlanders the 'petticoat brigade.' But the whole world testifies to the strength that lies behind that petticoat and the Highlanders of Scotland will not abandon it, even though it is an inconvenient dress, and an easy target for the enemy. The object in developing the foregoing argument is not that we should treasure our faults, but that what is national, even though comparatively less agreeable should be adhered to, and

that what is foreign should be avoided, though it may be more agreeable than our own. That which is wanting in our civilisation can be supplied by proper effort on our part. I do hope that the Swadeshi spirit will possess every member in this assembly, and that we would carry out the Swadeshi vow in spite of great difficulties and inconvenience. Then Swaraj will be easy of attainment.

The foregoing illustrations go to show that our movement should be twofold. We may petition the Government, we may agitate in the Imperial Council for our rights, but for a real awakening of the people, internal activity is more important. There is likelihood of hypocrisy and selfishness tainting external activity. There is less danger of such a catastrophe in the internal activity. Not only will external activity, without being balanced by the internal, lack grace, but it is likely to be barren of results. It is not my contention that we have no internal activity at all, but I submit that we do not lay enough stress upon it.

One sometimes hears it said, 'Let us get the government of India in our own hands, and every thing will be all right.' There could be no greater superstition than this. No nation has thus gained its independence. The splendour of the spring is reflected in every tree, the whole earth is then filled with the freshness of youth. Similarly when the Swaraj spirit has really permeated society, a stranger suddenly come upon us will observe energy in every walk of life, he will find national servants engaged, each according to his own abilities, in a variety of public activities.

If we admit that our progress has not been what it might have been, we shall have to admit two reasons

for it. We have kept our women strangers to these activities of ours, and have thus brought about paralysis of half the national limb. The nation walks with one leg only. All its work appears to be only half or incompletely done. Moreover, the learned section having received its education, through a foreign tongue, has become enervated and it is unable to give the nation the benefit of such ability as it possesses. I need not reiterate my views on this subject, as I have elaborated them in my address delivered before the Gujarat Educational Conference. It is a wise decision, that of conducting the proceedings of this Conference in Gujarati, and I hope that all Gujaratis will adhere to the determination and resist every temptation to alter it.

The educated class, lovers of Swaraj, must freely mix with the masses. We dare not reject a single member of the community. We shall make progress only if we carry all with us. Had the educated class identified itself with the masses, Bakr-Id riots would have been an impossibility.

Before coming to the last topic, it remains for me to refer to certain events as a matter of duty and to make one or two suggestions. Every year the god of death exacts his toll from among our leaders. I do not intend to mention all such occasions of sorrow. But it is impossible to omit reference to the Grand Old Man of India. Who am I to estimate the value of the service rendered to the country by the deceased patriot ? I have only sat at his feet. I paid my respects to him when I went to London as a mere lad. I was privileged to carry with me a note of introduction to him, and from the moment of presentation I became his worshipper. Dadabhai's flawless and uninterrupted service to the

country, his impartiality, his spotless character, will always furnish India with an ideal servant of his country. May God give him peace! May He grant his family and the Nation the ability to bear the loss! It is possible for us to immortalise him, by making his character our own, by copying his manner of service and by enthroning him for ever in our hearts. May the great soul of Dadabhai watch over our deliberations!

It is our duty to express our thanks to His Excellency the Viceroy for having announced the decision of the government of India to abolish what is known as the Viramgam customs. This step should have been taken earlier. The nation was groaning under the weight of this impost. Many have lost their calling by reason of it. It has caused much suffering to many a woman. The decision has not yet been reduced to practice. It is to be hoped that it will soon be.

I have submitted through the Press my experiences about the hardships of third class railway travellers. They are, indeed, intolerable. The people of India are docile, they have received training in silent suffering. Thousands, therefore, put up with the hardships and they remain unredressed. There is merit in such suffering But it must have its limits. Submission out of weakness is unmanliness. That we tamely put up with the hardships of railway travelling is probably proof of our unmanliness. These hardships are twofold. They are due to the remissness of railway administration as also that of the travelling-public The remedies are also, therefore, twofold. Where the railway administration is to blame, complaints should be addressed to it, even in Gujarati. The matter should be ventilated in the press. Where the public are to blame, the knowing travellers

should enlighten their ignorant companions, as to their carelessness and dirty habits. Volunteers are required for this purpose. Every one can do his share, according to his ability, and the leading men might, in order to appreciate the difficulties of third class travelling, resort to it from time to time, without making themselves known, and bring their experiences to the notice of the administration. If these remedies are adopted, we should, in a short time see great changes.

An inter-departmental committee recently sat in London to consider certain measures about the supply of indentured labour to Fiji and the other sister islands. The Report of that committee has been published and the Government of India have invited the opinion of the public upon it. I need not dwell at length upon the matter as I have submitted my views already through the press. I have given it as my opinion that the recommendations of the committee, if adopted, will result in a kind of indenture. We can therefore only come to one conclusion. We can have no desire to see our labouring classes emigrating under bondage in any shape or form. There is no need for such emigration. The law of indenture should be totally abolished. It is no part of our duty to provide facilities for the Colonies.

I now reach the concluding topic. There are two methods of attaining desired end: Truthful and Truthless. In our scriptures they have been described respectively as divine and devilish. In the path of Satyagraha there is always unflinching adherence to Truth. It is never to be forsaken on any account, not even for the sake of one's country. The final triumph of Truth is always assumed for the divine method. Its

votary does not abandon it, even though at times the path seems impenetrable and beset with difficulties and dangers, and a departure however slight from that straight path may appear full of promise. His faith even then shines resplendent like the midday sun and he does not despond. With truth for sword, he needs neither steel nor gunpowder. He conquers the enemy by the force of the soul, which is Love. Its test is not to be found among friends. There is neither newness, nor merit nor yet effort in a friend loving a friend. It is tested truly when it is bestowed on the so-called enemy; it then becomes a virtue, there is effort in it, it is an act of manliness and real bravery. We can adopt this method towards the Government and doing so, we should be in a position to appreciate their beneficial activities and with greater ease correct their errors because we should draw attention to them not in anger but in Love. Love does not act through fear There can, therefore, be no weakness in its expression. A coward is incapable of exhibiting Love, it is the prerogative of the brave. Following this method we shall not look upon all Governmental activity with suspicion, we shall not ascribe bad motives to them. And our examination of their actions, being directed by Love, will be unerring and is bound, therefore, to carry conviction with them.

Love has its struggles. In the intoxication of power, man often fails to detect his mistakes. When that happens a Passive Resister does not sit still. He suffers. He disobeys the ruler's laws and orders in a civil manner, and willingly incurs hardships caused by such disobedience, [*e.g.*, imprisonment and gallows.] Thus is the soul disciplined. Here there is no waste of energy, and any untoward results of such respectful

disobedience are suffered merely by him and his companions. A Passive Resister is not at sixes and sevens with those in power but the latter willingly yield to him. *They know that they cannot effectively exercise force against the Passive Resister. Without his concurrence they cannot make him do their will. And this is the full fruition of Swaraj, because in it is complete independence.* It need not be taken for granted, that such decorous resistance is possible only in respect of civilised rulers. Even a heart of flint will melt in front of a fire kindled by the power of the soul. Even a Nero becomes a lamb when he faces Love. This is no exaggeration. It is as true as an algebraical equation. This Satyagraha is India's special weapon. It has had others but Satyagraha has commanded greater attention. It is omnipresent, and is capable of being used at all times and under all circumstances. It does not require a Congress license. He who knows its power cannot help using it. Even as the eye-lashes automatically protect the eyes, so does Satyagraha when kindled automatically protect the freedom of the Soul.

But truthlessness has opposite attributes. The terrible war going on in Europe is a case in point. Why should a nation's cause be considered right and another's wrong because it overpowers the latter by sheer brute force? The strong are often seen preying upon the weak. The wrongness of the latter's cause is not to be inferred from their defeat in a trial of brute strength, nor is the rightness of the strong to be inferred from their success in such a trial. The wielder of brute force does not scruple about the means to be used. He does not question the propriety of means, if he can somehow achieve his purpose. This is not

Dharma, it is Adharma: In Dharma, there cannot be a particle of untruth, cruelty or the taking of life. The measure of Dharma is the measure of love, kindness, truth. Heaven itself is no acceptable exchange for them. Swaraj itself is useless at the sacrifice of Truth. Sacrifice of Truth is the foundation of a nation's destruction. The believer in brute force becomes impatient and desires the death of the so-called enemy. There can be but one result of such an activity. Hatred increases. The defeated party vows vengeance, and simply bides his time. Thus does the spirit of revenge descend from father to son. It is much to be wished that India may not give predominance to the worship of brute force. If the members of this assembly will deliberately accept Satyagraha, in laying down its own programme, they will reach their goal all the easier for it. They may have to face disappointment in the initial stages. They may not see results for a time. But Satyagraha will triumph in the end. The brute-force-man like the oilman's ox moves in a circle. It is a motion, but it is not progress. Whereas the votary of Truth force ever moves forward.

A superficial critic reading the foregoing is likely to conclude that the views herein expressed are mutually destructive. On the one hand I appeal to the Government to give military training to the people. On the other I put Satyagraha on the pedestal. Surely there can be no room for the use of arms in Satyagraha, nor is there any. But military training is intended for those who do not believe in Satyagraha. That the whole of India will ever accept Satyagraha is beyond my imagination. Not to defend the weak is an entirely effeminate idea, everywhere to be rejected. In order to protect our

innocent sister from the brutal designs of a man we ought to offer ourselves a willing sacrifice and by the force of Love conquer the brute in the man. But if we have not attained that power, we would certainly use up all our bodily strength in order to frustrate those designs. The votaries of soul-force and brute-force are both soldiers. The latter, bereft of his arms, acknowledges defeat, the former does not know what defeat is. He does not depend upon the perishable body and its weapons, but he derives his strength from the unconquerable and immortal soul. The thing outside the two is not a man, for he does not recognise the Dweller within him. If he did, he would not take fright and run away from danger. Like a miser trying to save his flesh, he loses all, he does not know how to die. But the armoured soldier always has death by him as a companion. There is hope of his becoming a Passive Resister, and one has a right to hope that India, the holy land of the gods, will ever give the predominant place to the divine force, rather than to the brute force. Might is right, is a formula which, let us hope, will never find acceptance in India. Her formula is, Truth alone conquers.

Upon reflection, we find that we can employ Satyagraha even for social reform. We can rid ourselves of many defects in our social institutions. We can settle the Hindu-Mohammedan problem, and we can deal with political questions. It is well that for the sake of facilitating progress we divide our activities according to the subjects handled. But it should never be forgotton that all are inter-related. It is not true to say that neither religion nor social reform has anything to do with politics. The result obtained by bringing religion into play

in the consideration of political subjects will be different from that obtained without it. The Hindus can ill afford to neglect 56 lakhs of ignorant Sadhus in considering political matters. Our Mussalman brethren cannot lose sight of their Fakeers. In advancing political progress the condition of our widows and child marriages must have their proper place, and the purdah must tax Mussalman wit. Nor can we, Hindus and Muhammedans, in considering politics, shut our eyes to scores of questions that arise between us.

Indeed our difficulties are like the Himalayas. But we have equally powerful means at our disposal for removing them. We are children of an ancient nation. We have witnessed the burial of civilizations, those of Rome, Greece, and Egypt. Our civilization abides even as the ocean in spite of its ebbs and flows. We have all we need to keep ourselves independent. We have the mountains that kiss the sky, we have the mighty rivers. We have the matchless beauties of nature and we have handed down to us a heritage of deeds of valour. This country is the treasure-house of *tapasya*. In this country alone do people belonging to different religions live together in amity. In this country alone do all the gods receive their due measure of worship. We shall disgrace our heritage, and our connection with the British nation will be vain if in spite of such splendid equipment, by some unique effort, we do not conquer our conquerors. The English nation is full of adventure, the religious spirit guides it, it has unquenchable faith in itself, it is a nation of great soldiers, it treasures its independence, but it has given the place of honour to its commerical instinct, it has not always narrowly examined the

means adopted for seeking wealth. It worships modern civilisation. The ancient ideals have lost their hold upon it. If therefore, instead of imitating that nation, we do not forget our past, we have real regard for our civilisation, we have firm faith in its supremacy, we shall be able to make a proper use of our connection with the British nation, and make it beneficial to ourselves, to them and to the whole world. I pray to the Almighty that this assembly taking its full share of this great work may shed lustre upon itself, upon Gujarat, and upon the whole of Bharatavarsha.

ADDRESS TO SOCIAL SERVICE CONFERENCE

Mr. Gandhi delivered the following address as President of the First All-India Social Service Conference held at Calcutta on December 27, 1917.

Friends, I thank you for the honour you have conferred upon me. I was totally unprepared for the invitation to preside over the deliberations of this assembly. I do not know that I am fitted for the task. Having fixed views about the use of Hindi at national gatherings, I am always disinclined to speak in English. And I felt that the time was not ripe for me to ask to be allowed to deliver the Presidential Speech in Hindi. Moreover I have not much faith in conferences. Social Service to be effective has to be rendered without noise. It is best performed when the left hand knoweth not what the right is doing. Sir Gibbie's work told because nobody knew it. He could not be spoiled by praise or held back by blame. Would that our service were of this nature. Holding such views it was not without

considerable hesitation and misgivings that I obeyed the summons of the Reception Committee. You will, therefore, pardon me if you find in me a candid critic rather than an enthusiast carrying the conference to its goal with confidence and assurance.

It seems to me then that I cannot do better than draw attention to some branches of Social Service which we have hitherto more or less ignored.

The greatest service we can render society is to free ourselves and it from the superstitious regard we have learnt to pay to the learning of the English language. It is the medium of instruction in our schools and colleges. It is becoming the *lingua franca* of the country. Our best thoughts are expressed in it. Lord Chelmsford hopes that it will soon take the place of the mother tongue in high families. This belief in the necessity of English training has enslaved us. It has unfitted us for true national service. Were it not for force of habit, we could not fail to see that, by reason of English being the medium of instruction, our intellect has been segregated, we have been isolated from the masses, the best mind of the nation has become gagged and the masses have not received the benefit of the new ideas we have received. We have been engaged these past sixty years in memorising strange words and their pronunciation instead of assimilating facts. In the place of building upon the foundation, the training received from our parents, we have almost unlearnt it. There is no parallel to this in History. It is a national tragedy. The first and the greatest Social Service we can render is to revert to our vernaculars, to restore Hindi to its natural place as the National Language and begin carrying on all our provincial proceedings

in our respective vernaculars and national proceedings in Hindi. We ought not to rest till our schools and colleges give us instruction through the vernaculars. It ought not to be necessary even for the sake of our English friends to have to speak in English. Every English Civil and Military Officer has to know Hindi. Most English merchants learn it because they need it for their business. The day must soon come when our legislatures will debate national affairs in the vernaculars or Hindi as the case may be. Hitherto the masses have been strangers to their proceedings. The vernacular papers have tried to undo the mischief a little. But the task was beyond them. The *Patrika* reserves its biting sarcasm, the *Bengalee* its learning for ears tuned to English. In this ancient land of cultured thinkers the presence in our midst of a Tagore or a Bose or a Ray ought not to excite wonder. Yet the painful fact is that there are so few of them. You will forgive me if I have carried too long on a subject which, in your opinion, may hardly be treated as an item of Social Service. I have however taken the liberty of mentioning the matter prominently as it is my conviction that all national activity suffers materially owing to this radical defect in our system of education.

Coming to more familiar items of Social Service, the list is appalling. I shall select only those of which I have any knowledge.

Work in times of sporadic distress such as famine and floods is no doubt necessary and most praiseworthy. But it produces no permanent results. There are fields of Social Service in which there may be no renown but which may yield lasting results.

In 1914 cholera, fevers and plague together claimed

4,649,663 victims. If so many had died fighting on the battlefield during the war that is at present devastating Europe, we would have covered ourselves with glory and lovers of Swaraj would need no further argument in support of their cause. As it is, 4,639,663 have died a lingering death unmourned and their dying has brought us nōthing but discredit. A distinguished Englishman said the other day that Englishmen did all the thinking for us whilst we sat supine. He added that most Englishmen basing their opinions on their English experience presented impossible or costly remedies for the evils they investigated. There is much truth in the above statement. In other countries reformers have successfully grappled with epidemics. Here Englishmen have tried and failed. They have thought along western lines ignoring the vast differences, climatic and other, between Europe and India. Our doctors and physicians have practically done nothing. I am sure that half-a-dozen medical men of the front rank dedicating their lives to the work of eradicating the triple curse would succeed where Englishmen have failed. I venture to suggest that the way lies not through finding out cures but through finding or rather applying preventive methods. I prefer to use the participle 'applying' for I have it on the aforementioned authority that to drive out plague (and I add cholera and malaria) is absurdly simple. There is no conflict of opinion as to the preventive methods. We simply do not apply them. We have made up our minds that the masses will not adopt them. There could be no greater calumny uttered against them. If we would but stoop to conquer, they can be easily conquered. The truth is that we

expect the Government to do the work. In my opinion, in this matter, the Government cannot lead; they can follow and help if we could lead. Here, then, there is work enough for our doctors and an army of workers to help them. I note that you in Bengal are working somewhat in this direction. I may state that a small but earnest band of volunteers are at the present moment engaged in doing such work in Champaran. They are posted in different villages. There they teach the village children, they give medical aid to the sick and they give practical lessons in hygiene to the village folk by cleaning their wells and roads and showing them how to treat human excreta. Nothing can yet be predicted as to results as the experiment is in its infancy. This Conference may usefully appoint a committee of doctors who would study rural conditions on the spot and draw up a course of instructions for the guidance of workers and of the people at large.

Nothing perhaps affords such splendid facility to every worker, wholetime or otherwise, for effective service as the relief of agony through which the 3rd class railway passengers are passing. I feel keenly about this grievance not because I am in it but I have gone to it as I have felt keenly about it. This matter affects millions of our poor and middle class countrymen. This helpless toleration of every inconvenience and insult is visibly deteriorating the nation even as the cruel treatment to which we have subjected the so called depressed classes has made them indifferent to the laws of personal cleanliness and the very idea of self-respect. What else but downright degradation can await those who have to make a scramble always like mad animals for seats in a miserable compartment, who have to swear

and curse before they can speak through the window in order to get standing room, who have to wallow in dirt during their journey, who are served their food like dogs and eat it like them, who have ever to bend before those who are physically stronger than they and who being packed like sardines in compartments have to get such sleep as they can in a sitting posture for nights together. Railway servants swear at them, cheat them. On the Howrah-Lahore service our friends from Kabul fill to the brim the cup of the misery of the third class travellers. They become lords of the compartments they enter. It is not possible for any one to resist them. They swear at you on the slightest pretext, exhaust the whole of the obscene vocabulary of the Hindi language. They do not hesitate to belabour you if you retort or in any way oppose them. They usurp the best seats and insist on stretching themselves full length even in crowded compartment. No compartment is deemed too crowded for them to enter. The travellers patiently bear all their awful impertinence out of sheer helplessness They would, if they could, knock down the man who dared to swear at them as do these Kabulis. But they are physically no match for the Kabulis and every Kabuli considers himself more than a match for any number of travellers from the plains. This is not right. The effect of this terrorising on the national character cannot but be debasing. We the educated few ought to deliver the travelling public from this scourge or for ever renounce our claim to speak on its behalf or to guide it. I believe the Kabulis to be amenable to reason. They are a God-fearing people. If you know their language, you can successfully appeal to their good sense..

But they are spoilt children of nature. Cowards among us have used their undoubted physical strength for our nefarious purposes. And they have now come to think that they can treat poor people as they choose and consider themselves above the law of the land. Here is work enough for Social Service. Volunteers for this class of work can board trains and educate the people to a sense of their duty, call in guards and other officials in order to remove over-crowding, see that passengers leave and board trains without a scramble. It is clear that until the Kabulis can be patiently taught to behave themselves, they ought to have a compartment all to themselves and they ought not to be permitted to enter any other compartment. With the exception of providing additional plant, every one of the other evils attendant on railway travelling ought to be immediately redressed. It is no answer that we have suffered the wrong so long. Prescriptive rights cannot accrue to wrongs.

No less important is the problem of the depressed classes. To lift them from the position to which Hindu society has reduced them is to remove a big blot on Hinduism. The present treatment of these classes is a sin against religion and humanity.

But the work requires service of the highest order. We shall make little headway by merely thowing schools at them. We must change the attitude of the masses and orthodoxy. I have already shown that we have cut ourselves adrift from both. We do not react on them. We can do so only if we speak to them in their own language, An anglicised India cannot speak to them with effect. If we believe in Hinduism we must approach them in the Hindu fashion. We must

do *tapasya* and keep our Hinduism undefiled. Pure and enlightened orthodoxy must be matched against superstitious and ignorant orthodoxy. To restore to their proper status a fifth of our total population is a task worthy of any Social Service organisation.

The bustees of Calcutta and the chawls of Bombay badly demand the devoted services of hundreds of social workers. They send our infants to an early grave and promote vice, degradation and filth.

Apart from the fundamental evil arising out of our defective system of education I have hitherto dealt with evils calling for service among the masses. The classes perhaps demand no less attention than the masses. It is my opinion that all evils like diseases are symptoms of the same evil or disease. They appear various by being refracted through different media. The root evil is loss of true spirituality brought about through causes, I cannot examine, from this platform. We have lost the robust faith of our forefathers in the absolute efficacy of *Satya* (truth) *Ahimsa* (love) and *Brahmacharya* (Self-restraint.) We certainly believe in them to an extent. They are the best policy but we may deviate from them if our untrained reason, suggests deviation. We have not faith enough to feel that though the present outlook seems black, if we follow the dictates of truth or love or exercise self-restraint, the ultimate result must be sound. Men whose spiritual vision has become blurred mostly look to the present rather than conserve the future good. He will render the greatest social service who will reinstate us in our ancient spirituality. But humble men that we are, it is enough for us if we recognise the loss and by such ways as are open to us prepare the way

for the man who will infect us with his power and enable us to feel clearly through the heart, things we are to-day unable to perceive through our reason.

Looking then at the classes I find that our Rajahs and Maharajahs squander their resources after so called useless sport and drink. I was told the other day that the cocaine habit was sapping the nation's manhood and that like the drink habit it was on the increase and in its effect more deadly than drink. It is impossible for a social worker to blind himself to the evil. We dare not ape the West. We are a nation that has lost its prestige and its self-respect. Whilst a tenth of our population is living on the verge of starvation, we have no time for indulging ourselves. What the West may do with impunity is like in our case to prove our ruin. The evils that are corroding the higher strata of society are difficult for an ordinary worker to tackle. They have acquired a certain degree of respectability. But they ought not to be beyond the reach of this Conference.

Equally important is the question of the status of women both Hindu and Mahomedan. Are they or are they not to play their full part in the plain of regeneration alongside of their husband? They must be enfranchised. They can no longer be treated either as dolls or slaves without the social body remaining in a condition of social paralysis. And here again I would venture to suggest to the reformer that the way to women's freedom is not through education but through the change of attitude on the part of men and corresponding action. Education is necessary but it must follow the freedom. We dare not wait for literary education to restore our womanhood to its proper state. Even without

literary education our women are as cultured as any on the face of the earth. The remedy largely lies in the hands of husbands.

It makes my blood boil as I wander through the country and watch lifeless and fleshless oxen with their ribs sticking through their skins, carrying loads or ploughing our fields. To improve the breed of our cattle, to rescue them from the cruelty practised on them by their cow-worshipping masters and to save them from the slaughter house is to solve half the problem of our poverty.....We have to educate the people to a humane use of their cattle and plead with the Government to conserve the pasture land of the country. Protection of the cow is an economic necessity. It can not be brought about by force. It can only be achieved by an appeal to the finer feelings of our English friends and our Mahomedan countrymen to save the cow from the slaughter-house. This question involves the overhauling of the management of our Pinjrapoles and cow-protection societies. A proper solution of this very difficult problem means establishment of perfect concord between Hindus and Mahomedans and an end of Bakr-id riots.

I have glanced at the literature kindly furnished at my request by the several Leagues who are rendering admirable Social Service. I note that some have included in their programme many of the items mentioned by me. All the Leagues are non-sectarian and they have as their members the most distinguished men and women in the land. The possibilities for services of a far reaching character are therefore great. But if the work is to leave its impress on the nation, we must have workers who are prepared, in Mr. Gokhale's words,—

to dedicate their lives to the cause. Give me such workers and I promise they will rid the land of all the evils that afflict it.

THE PROTECTION OF THE COW.

Mr. Gandhi published the following reply in the "Statesman" of January 19, 1918 *to Mr. Irwin's attack on Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi in the columns of the same journal* :—

Mr. Irwin's latest letter published in your issue of the 12th instant compels me to court the hospitality of your columns. So long as your correspondent confined himself to matters directly affecting himself, his misrepresentations did not much matter, as the real facts were as much within the knowledge of the Government and those who are concerned with the agrarian question in Champaran, as within mine. But in the letter under notice, he has travelled outside his jurisdiction as it were, and unchivalrously attacked one of the most innocent women walking on the face of the earth (and this I say although she happens to be my wife) and has unpardonably referred to a question of the greatest moment, I mean, the cow-protection question, without taking the precaution as behoves a gentleman of ascertaining facts at first hand.

My address to the *Gau-rakshini Sabha* he could have easily obtained upon application to me. This at least was due to me as between man and man. Your correspondent accuses me of 'making a united attack on *saheb log* (their landlords) who slaughter and eat cows daily.' This pre-supposes that I was addressing a comparatively microscopic audience of the planters'

riyats. The fact is that the audience was composed chiefly of the non-raiyat class. But I had in mind a much bigger audience, and not merely the few thousand hearers before me. I spoke under a full sense of my responsibility. The question of cow-protection is, in my opinion, as large as the Empire to which Mr. Irwin and I belong. I know that he is the proud father of a young lad of 24, who has received by his gallantry the unique honour of a Colonelcy at his age. Mr. Irwin can, if he will, obtain a greater honour for himself by studying the cow question and taking his full share in its solution. He will, I promise, be then much better occupied, than when is dashing off his misrepresentations to be published in the press, and most unnecessarily preparing to bring 2,200 cases against his tenants for the sake of deriving the questionable pleasure of deeming me responsible for those cases.

I said at the meeting that the Hindus had no warrant for resenting the slaughter of cows by their Mahomedan brethren who kill them from religious conviction, so long as they themselves were a party to the killing by inches of thousands of cattle who were horribly ill-treated by their Hindu owners, to the drinking of milk drawn from cows in the inhuman dairies of Calcutta, and so long as they calmly contemplated the slaughter of thousands of cattle in the slaughter houses of India for providing beef for the European or Christian residents of India. I suggested that the first step towards procuring full protection for cows was to put their own house in order by securing absolute immunity from ill-treatment of their cattle by Hindus themselves, and then to appeal to the Europeans to abstain from beef-eating whilst resident in India, or at least to procure

beef from outside India. I added that in no case could the cow protection propaganda, if it was to be based upon religious conviction, tolerate a sacrifice of Mahomedans for the sake of saving cows, that the religious method of securing protection from Christians and Mahomedans alike was for Hindus to offer themselves a willing sacrifice of sufficient magnitude to draw out the merciful nature of Christians and Mahomedans. Rightly or wrongly worship of the cow is ingrained in the Hindu nature and I see no escape from a most bigotted and sanguinary strife over this question between Christians and Mahomedans on the one hand and Hindus on the other except in the fullest recognition and practice by the Hindus of the religion of *ahimsa*, which it is my self-imposed and humble mission in life to preach. Let the truth be faced. It must not be supposed that Hindus feel nothing about the cow-slaughter going on for the European. I know that their wrath is to-day being buried under the awe inspired by the English rule. But there is not a Hindu throughout the length and breadth of India who does not expect one day to free his land from cow-slaughter. But contrary to the genius of Hinduism as I know it, he would not mind forcing even at the point of the sword either the Christian or the Mahomedan to abandon cow-slaughter. I wish to play my humble part in preventing such a catastrophe and I thank Mr. Irwin for having provided me with an opportunity of inviting him and your readers to help me in my onerous mission. The mission may fail to prevent cow-slaughter. But there is no reason why by patient plodding and consistent practice it should not succeed in showing the folly, the stupidity and the inhumanity of committing the crime of

killing a fellow human being for the sake of saving a fellow animal.

So much on behalf of the innocent cow. A word only for my innocent wife who will never even know the wrong your correspondent has done her. If Mr. Irwin would enjoy the honour of being introduced to her he will soon find out that Mrs. Gandhi is a simple woman almost unlettered, who knows nothing of the two bazaars mentioned by him, even as I knew nothing of them until very recently and sometime after the establishment of the rival bazaar referred to by Mr. Irwin. He will then further assure himself that Mrs. Gandhi has had no hand in its establishment and is totally incapable of managing such a bazaar. Lastly he will at once learn that Mrs. Gandhi's time is occupied in cooking for and serving the teachers conducting the school established in the *dehat* in question, in distributing medical relief and in moving amongst the women of the *dehat* with a view to giving them an idea of simple hygiene. Mrs. Gandhi, I may add, has not learnt the art of making speeches or addressing letters to the press.

As to the rest of the letter, the less said the better. It is so full of palpable mis-representations that it is difficult to deal with them with sufficient self-restraint. I can only say that I am trying to the best of my ability to fulfil the obligation, I hold myself under, of promoting good-will between planters and the raiyats, and if I fail it would not be due to want of efforts on my part, but it would be largely, if not entirely, due to the mischievous propaganda Mr. Irwin is carrying on openly and some others *sub rosa* in Champaran in order to nullify the effect of the report published by the Agrarian Committee, which was brought into being not

as Mr. Irwin falsely suggests at my request but by the agitation carried on, as your files would demonstrate, by Mr. Irwin and his friends of the Anglo-Indian Association. If he is wise, he will abide by his written word, voluntarily and after full discussion and deliberation, given by him at Ranchi.

ON WOMANHOOD

The annual gathering of the Bombay Bhagini Samaj was held on Wednesday, February 20, 1918, at the Morarji Gokuldas Hall, under the presidency of Mr. M. K. Gandhi. The annual report of the Samaj having been read by the General Secretary, the President distributed prizes to the pupils of the female classes, and delivered a very informing address on the education of women, in the course of which he said :—

It is necessary to understand what we mean when we talk of the regeneration of women. It presupposes degeneration and if that is so we should further consider what led to it and how. It is our primary duty to have some very hard thinking on these points. In travelling all over India, I have come to realize that all the existing agitation is confined to an infinitesimal section of our people who are really a mere speck in the vast firmament. Crores of people of both the sexes live in absolute ignorance of this agitation. Full eighty-five per cent of the people of this country pass their innocent days in a state of total detachment from what is going on around them. These men and women ignorant as they are do their "bit" in life well and properly. Both have the same education or rather the

absence of education. Both are helping each other as they ought to do. If their lives are in any sense incomplete, the cause can be traced to the incompleteness of the lives of the remaining fifteen per cent. If my sisters of the Bhagini Samaj will make a close study of the lives of these 85 per cent of our people, it will provide them ample material for an excellent programme of work for the Samaj.

MAN MADE SOCIAL LAWS.

In the obsevations that I am going to make, I will confine myself to the 15 per cent. abovementioned and even then it would be out of place to discuss the disabilities that are common both to men and women. The point for us to consider is the regeneration of our women relatively to our men. Legislation has been mostly the handi-work of men; and man has not always been fair and discriminate in performing that self-appointed task. The largest part of our effect in promoting the regeneration of women should be directed towards removing those blemishes which are represented in our Shastras as the necessary and ingrained characteristic of women. Who will attempt this and how? In my humble opinion in order to make the attempt, we will have to produce women pure, firm and self-controlled as Sita, Damayanti and Draupadi. If we do produce them such modern sisters will receive the same homage from Hindu society as is being paid to their prototypes of yore. Their words will have the same authority as the Shastras. We will feel ashamed of the stray reflections on them in our Smritis and will soon forget them. Such revolutions have occurred in Hinduism in the past and will still take place in the future, leading to the stability of our faith. I pray to

God that this Association might soon produce such women as I have described above.

PLACE OF LITERARY EDUCATION

We have now discussed the root cause of the degeneration of our women and have considered the ideals by the realization of which the present conditions of our women can be improved. The number of women who can realize those ideals will be necessarily very few and therefore, we will now consider what ordinary women can accomplish if they would try. Their first attempt should be directed towards awakening in the minds of as many women as possible a proper sense of their present condition. I am not among those who believe that such an effort can be made through literary education only. To work on that basis would be to postpone indefinitely the accomplishment of our aims; I have experienced at every step that it is not at all necessary to wait so long. We can bring home to our women the sad realities of their present condition without in the first instance giving them any literary education. Woman is the companion of man gifted with equal mental capacities. She has the right to participate in very 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 thing 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 halfway because of the condition of our women. Much of our work does not yield

appropriate results ; our lot is like that of the penny wise and pound foolish trader who does not employ enough capital in his business.

FAULTY SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.

But although much good and useful work can be done without a knowledge of reading and writing yet it is my firm belief that you cannot always do without a knowledge thereof. It develops and sharpens one's intellect and it stimulates our power of doing good. I have never placed an unnecessarily high value on the knowledge of reading and writing. I am only attempting to assign its proper place to it. I have pointed out from time to time that there is no justification for men to deprive women or to deny to them equal rights on the ground of their illiteracy: but education is essential for enabling women to uphold these natural rights, to improve them and to spread them; again the true knowledge of self is unattainable by the millions who are without such education. Many a book is full of innocent pleasure and this will be denied to us without education. It is no exaggeration to say that a human being without education is not far removed from an animal. Education, therefore, is necessary for women as it is for men. Not that the methods of education should be identical in both cases. In the first place our state system of education is full of error and productive of harm in many respects. It should be eschewed by men and women alike. Even if it were free from its present blemishes I would not regard it as proper for women from all points of view. 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 what 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. In framing any scheme of women's education this cardinal truth must be constantly kept in mind. Man is supreme in the outward activities of a married pair and therefore it is in the fitness of things that he should have a greater knowledge thereof. On the other hand home life is entirely the sphere of woman and therefore in domestic affairs, in the upbringing and education of children, women ought to have more knowledge. Not that knowledge should be divided into watertight compartments or that some branches of knowledge should be closed to any one; but unless courses of instruction are based on a discriminating appreciation of these basic principles the fullest life of man and woman cannot be developed.

IS EDUCATION NECESSARY?

I should say a word or two as to whether English education is or is not necessary for our women. I have come to the conclusion that in the ordinary course of our lives neither our men nor our women need necessarily have any knowledge of English. True English is necessary for making a living and for active association in our political movements. I do not believe in women working for a living or undertaking commercial enterprizes. The few women who may require or desire to have English education can very easily have their way by joining the schools for men. To introduce English education in schools meant for women could only lead to prolong our helplessness. I have often read and heard people saying that the rich treasures of

English literature should be opened alike to men and women. I submit in all humility that there is some misapprehension in assuming such an attitude. No one intends to close these treasures against women while keeping them open for men. There is none on earth able to prevent you from studying the literature of the whole world if you are fond of literary tastes. But when courses of education have been framed with the needs of a particular society in view, you cannot supply the requirements of the few who have cultivated a literary taste. In asking our men and women to spend less time in the study of English than they are doing now, my object is not to deprive them of the pleasure which they are likely to derive from it, but I hold that the same pleasure can be obtained at less cost and trouble if we follow a more natural method. The world is full of many a gem of priceless beauty; but then these gems are not all of English setting. Other languages can well boast of productions of similar excellence; all these should be made available for our common people and that can only be done if our own learned men will undertake to translate them for us in our own languages.

UNSPEAKABLE SIN OF CHILD MARRIAGE.

Merely to have outlined a scheme of education as above is not to have removed the bane of child marriage from our society or to have conferred on our women an equality of rights. Let us now consider the case of our girls who disappear, so to say, from view, after marriage. They are not likely to return to our schools. Conscious of the unspeakable and unthinkable sin of the child marriage of their daughters, their mothers cannot think of educating them or of otherwise making

their dry life a cheerful one. The man who marries a young girl does not do so out of any altruistic motives but through sheer lust. Who is to rescue these girls? A proper answer to this question will also be a solution of the woman's problem. The answer is albeit difficult, but it is only one. There is of course none to champion her cause but her husband. It is useless to expect a child-wife to be able to bring round the man who has married her. The difficult work must, therefore, for the present at least be left to man. If I could, I would take a census of child wives and will find the friends as well as through moral and polite exhortations I will attempt, to bring home to them the enormity of their crime in linking their fortunes with child wives and will warn them that there is no expiation for that sin unless and until they have by education made their wives fit not only to bear children but also to bring them up properly and unless in the meantime they live a life of absolute celibacy.

QUIET AND UNOBTRUSIVE WORK NEEDED.

Thus, there are many fruitful fields of activity before the members of the Bhagini Samaj for devoting their energies to. The field for work is so vast that if resolute application is brought to bear thereon the wider movements for reform may for the present be left to themselves and great service can be done to the cause of Home Rule without so much as even a verbal reference to it. When printing presses were non-existent and scope for speech-making very limited, when one could hardly travel twenty-four miles in the course of a day instead of a thousand miles as now, we had only one agency for propagating our ideals and that was our 'Acts' ; and acts had

immense potency. We are now rushing to and fro with the velocity of air, delivering speeches, writing newspaper articles and yet we fall short of our accomplishments and the cry of despair fills the air. I, for one, am of opinion that as in old days our acts will have a more powerful influence on the public than any number of speeches and writing. It is my earnest prayer to your Association that its members should give prominence to quiet and unobtrusive work in whatever it does.

PLEA FOR HINDI

Mr. Gandhi wrote the following letter to the press under date, Indore, March 3, 1918 *soon after the conclusion of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan* :—

At the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan just closing a committee consisting of the Hon'ble Rai Bahadur Bishen Dutta Shukla, Rai Bahadur Saryoo Prasad, Babu Shiva-Prasad Gupta, Babu Purushottan Das Tandon, Babu Gauri Shanker Prasad, Pandit Venkatesha Narayan Tiwari and myself, were appointed as a speial committee to give effect to certain resolutions of the Sammelan. One of the instructions given to the committee is to find out six Tamil and Telugu youths of promise and good character who would undertake to learn Hindi with a view to ultimately becoming missionaries for the propagation of Hindi among the Tamil and the Telugu people. It has been proposed to locate them either at Allahabad or at Benares, and to teach them Hindi. Expenses of their board and lodging as well as instruction will be paid for by the committee. It is expected that the course will not take longer than a year at the most and as soon as they have attained a certain standard

of knowledge of Hindi they would be entrusted with the missionary work, that is, the work of teaching Hindi to the Tamil or the Telugu people as the case may be, for which they would get a salary to maintain themselves suitably. The Committee will guarantee such service for at least a period of three years, and will expect applicants to enter into a contract with the Committee to render the stipulated service faithfully and well for that period. The Committee expects that the services of these youths will be indefinitely prolonged and that they will be able to serve themselves as well as the country. The desire of the Committee is to offer liberal payment and expect in return absolute faithfulness and steadfastness. I trust that you agree with the Sammelan that Hindi and Hindi alone, whether in Sanskrit form or as Urdu, can become the language of intercourse between the different provinces. It is already that amongst the Muhammadans all over India, as also amongst the Hindus except in the Madras Presidency. I exclude the English educated Indians who have made English, in my humble opinion, much to the detriment of the country, the language of mutual intercourse. If we are to realise the Swaraj ideal we must find a common language that can be easily learnt and that can be understood by the vast masses. This has always been Hindi or Urdu and is so even now as I can say from personal experience. I have faith enough in the patriotism, selflessness and the sagacity of the people of the Madras Presidency to know that those who at all want to render national service or to come in touch with the other Provinces, will undergo the sacrifice, if it is one, of learing Hindi. I suggest that they should consider it a privilege to be able to learn a

language that will enable them to enter into the hearts of millions of their countrymen. The proposal set forth is a temporary make-shift. An agitation of great potency must arise in the country that would compel the educational authorities to introduce Hindi as the second language in the public schools. But it was felt by the Sammelan that no time should be lost in popularising Hindi in the Madras Presidency. Hence the above-mentioned proposal which, I hope, you will be able to commend to your readers. I may add that the Committee proposes to send Hindi teachers to the Tamil as also to the Andhra districts in order to teach Hindi free of charge to those who would care to learn it. I hope that many will take advantage of the profered tuition. Those youths who wish to apply for the training above-mentioned should do so under cover addressed to me care of Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Allahabad, before the end of April.

THE AHMEDABAD MILL HANDS

When the mill hands at Ahmedabad went on strike Mr. Gandhi was requisitioned to settle the dispute between the mill owners and the workmen. Mr. Gandhi was guiding the labourers to a successful settlement of their wages when some of them betrayed a sense of weakness and despair, and demoralisation was apprehended. At a critical stage in the crisis Mr. Gandhi and Miss Anasuyabai took the vow of fast. This extereme action on the part of Mr. Gandhi was disquieting to friends and provoked some bitter comments from the unfriendly. In the following statement issued from Nadiad under date, March 27,

1918, *Mr. Gandhi explains the circumstances which necessitated this action :—*

Perhaps I owe an explanation to the public with regard to my recent fast. Some friends consider the action to have been silly, others, cowardly and some others still worse. In my opinion I would have been untrue to my Maker and to the cause I was espousing if I had acted otherwise.

When over a month ago I reached Bombay I was told that Ahmedabad millhands had threatened a strike and violence if the bonus that was given to them during the plague was withdrawn. I was asked to intervene and I consented.

Owing to the plague the men were getting as much as 70 per cent. bonus since August last An attempt to recall that bonus had resulted in grave dissatisfaction among the labourers. When it was almost too late, the millowners offered in the place of the plague bonus and for the sake of the high prices a rise of 20 per cent. The labourers were unsatisfied. The matter was referred to arbitration, Mr. Chatfield, the Collector being the Umpire. The men in some mills however struck work. The owners thinking that they had done so without just cause withdrew from the arbitration, and declared a general lockout to be continued till the labourers were exhausted into accepting the 20 per cent. increase they had offered. Messrs. Shankerlal Banker, V. J. Patel and I the arbitrators apponted on behalf of the labourers, thought that they were to be demoralised if we did not act promptly and decisively. We, therefore, investigated the question of increase, we sought the millowners' assistance. They would not give it. Their one purpose was to organise

themselves into a combination that could fight a similar combination of their employees. One-sided technically though our investigation was, we endeavoured to examine the millowners' side, and came to the conclusion that 35 per cent. increase was fair. Before announcing the figure to the millhands we informed the employers of the result of our inquiry and told them that we would correct ourselves if they could show any error. The latter would not co-operate. They sent a reply saying as much, but they pointed out in it that the rate of increase granted by the Government as also the employers in Bombay was much less than the one contemplated by us. I felt that the addendum was beside the point, and at a huge meeting announced 35 per cent. for the millhands' acceptance. Be it noted that the plague bonus amounted to 70 per cent. of their wages and they had declared their intention of accepting not less than 50 per cent. as high prices increase. They were now called upon to accept the mean, finding the mean was quite an accident between the millowners 20 per cent. and their own 50 per cent. After some grumbling, the meeting accepted the 35 per cent. increase it always being understood, that they would recognise at the same time the principle of arbitration whenever the millowners did so. From that time forward, *i.e.*, day after day thousands of people gathered together under the shade of a tree outside the city walls, people walking long distances in many cases and solemnly repeated their determination in the name of God not to accept anything less than 35 per cent. No pecuniary assistance was given them. It is easy enough to understand that many must suffer from the pangs of starvation and that they could not, while they were without employ-

ment, get any credit. We, who were helping them, came, on the other hand to the couclusion that we would only spoil them if we collected public funds and utilised them for feeding them unless the able-bodied amongst them were ready to perform bread-labour. It was a difficult task to persuade men who had worked at machines to shoulder baskets of sand or bricks. They came, but they did so grudgingly. The millowners hardened their hearts. They were equally determined not to go beyond 20 per cent. and they appointed emissaries to persuade the men to give in. Even during the early part of the lockout, whilst we had declined to help those who would not work we had assured them that we would feed and clothe ourselves after feeding and clothing them. Twenty two days had passed by ; hunger and the Millowners' emissaries were producing their effect and Satan was whispering to the men that there was no such thing as God on earth who would help them and that vows were dodges resorted to by weaklings, One morning instead of an eager and enthusiastic crowd of 5 to 10 thou sand men with determination written on their faces, I met a body of about 2,000 men with despair written on their faces. We had just heard that millhands living in a particular chowl had declined to attend the meeting, were preparing to go to work and accept 20 per cent. increase and were taunting us (I think very properly) that it was very well for us who had motors at our disposal and plenty of food, to attend their meetings and advise staunchness even unto death. What was I to do? I held the cause to be just. I believe in God as I believe that I am writing this letter. I believe in the necessity of the performance of "one's promises" at

all costs. I knew that the men before us were God-fearing men, but that the long-drawn out lockout or strike was putting an undue strain upon them. I had the knowledge before me that during my extensive travels in India, hundreds of people were found who as readily broke their promises as they made them. I knew, too, that the best of us have but a vague and indistinct belief in soul-force and in God. I felt that it was a sacred moment for me, my faith was on the anvil, and I had no hesitation in rising and declaring to the men that a breach of their vow so solemnly taken was unendurable by me and that I would not take any food until they had the 35 per cent. increase given or until they had fallen. A meeting that was up to now unlike the former meetings totally unresponsive, worked up as if by magic. Tears trickled down the cheeks of every one of them and man after man rose up saying that they would never go to the mills unless they got the increase, and that they would go about the city and steel the hearts of those who had not attended the meeting. It was a privilege to witness the demonstration of the efficacy of truth and love. Every one immediately realised that the protecting power of God was as much with us to-day as it used to be in the days of yore. I am not sorry for the vow, but with the belief that I have, I would have been unworthy of the truth undertaken by me if I had done anything less. Before I took the vow, I knew that there were serious defects about it. For me to take such a vow in order to affect in any shape or form the decision of the millowners would be a cowardly injustice done to them, and that I would so prove myself unfit for the friendship which I had the privilege of

enjoying with some of them. I knew that I ran the risk of being misunderstood. I could not prevent my fast from affecting my decision. Their knowledge moreover put a responsibility on me which I was ill able to bear. From now I disabled myself from gaining concessions for the men which ordinarily in a struggle such as this I would be entirely justified in securing. I knew, too, that I would have to be satisfied with the minimum I could get from the millowners and with a fulfilment of the letter of the men's vow rather than its spirit and so hath it happened. I put the defects of my vow in one scale and the merits of it in the other. There are hardly any acts of human beings which are free from all taint. Mine, I know, was exceptionally tainted, but rather the ignominy of having unworthily compromised by my vow, the position and independence of the millowners, than that it should be said by posterity that 10,000 men had suddenly broken a vow which they had for over twenty days solemnly taken and repeated in the name of God. I am fully convinced that no body of men can make themselves into a nation or perform great tasks unless they become as true as steel and unless their promises come to be regarded by the world like the law of the Medes and Persians, inflexible, and unbreakable, and whatever may be the verdict of friends, so far as I can think at present, on given occasions, I should not hesitate in future to repeat the humble performance which I have taken the liberty of describing in this communication.

I cannot conclude this letter without mentioning two names of whom India has every reason to be proud. The millowners were represented by Mr. Ambalal Sarabhai who is a gentleman in every sense of the term. He is a

man of great culture and equally great abilities, He adds to these qualities a resolute will. The millhands were represented by his sister Anusuyabai. She possesses a heart of gold. She is full of pity for the poor. The mill hands adore her. Her word is law with them. I have not known a struggle fought with so little bitterness and such courtesy on either side. This happy result is principally due to the connection with it of Mr. Ambalal Sarabhai and Anusuyabai.

A LETTER TO THE VICEROY

Mr. M. K. Gandhi addressed the following letter to H. E. the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, soon after the Delhi War Conference :—

Sir, as you are aware, after careful consideration, I felt constrained to convey to Your Excellency that I could not attend the Conference for reasons stated in the letter of the 26th instant (April), but, after the interview, you were good enough to grant me, I persuaded myself to join it, if for no other cause than certainly out of my great regard for yourself. One of my reasons for abstension and perhaps the strongest, was that Lok. Tilak, Mrs. Besant and the Ali brothers, whom I regard as among the most powerful leaders of public opinion, were not invited to the Conference. I still feel that it was a grave blunder not to have asked them, and I respectfully suggest that that blunder might be possibly repaired if these leaders were invited to assist the Government by giving it the benefit of their advice at the Provincial Conferences, which, I understand, are to follow. I venture to submit that no Government can afford to disregard the leaders, who represent the large

masses of the people as these do, even though they may hold views fundamentally different. At the same time it gives me pleasure to be able to say that the views of all parties were permitted to be freely expressed at the Committees of the Conference. For my part, I purposely refrained from stating my views at the Committee at which I had the honour of serving, or at the Conference itself. I felt that I could best serve the objects of the Conference by simply tendering my support to the resolutions submitted to it, and this I have done without any reservation. I hope to translate the spoken word into action as early as the Government can see its way to accept my offer, which I am submitting simultaneously herewith in a separate letter.

I recognise that in the hour of its danger we must give, as we have decided to give ungrudging and unequivocal support to the Empire of which we aspire in the near future to be partners in the same sense as the Dominions Overseas. But it is the simple truth that our response is due to the expectation that our goal will be reached all the more speedily. On that account, even as 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, and I am sure that it is this faith which has enabled many members of the Conference to tender to the Government their full-hearted co-operation. If I could make my countrymen retrace their steps, I would make them withdraw all the Congress resolutions and not whisper "Home Rule" or "Responsible Government" during the pendency of the War. 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 this very act, would become the most favoured partner in the Empire and racial distinctions would become a thing of the past. But practically the whole of educated India has decided to take a less effective course, and it is no longer possible to say that educated India does not exercise auy influence on the masses. I have been coming into most intimate touch with the raiyats ever since my return from South Africa to India, and I wish to assure you that the desire for Home-Rule has widely penetrated them. I was present at the sessions of the last Congress and I was a party to the resolution that full Responsible Government should be granted to British India within a period to be fixed definitely by a Parliamentary Statute. I admit that it is a bold step to take, but I feel sure that nothing less than a definite vision of Home-Rule to be realised in the shortest possible time will satisfy the Indian people. I know that there are many in India who consider no sacrifice is too great in order to achieve the end, and they are wakeful enough to realise that they must be equally prepared to sacrifice themselves for the Empire in which they hope and desire to reach their final status. It follows then that we can but accelerate our journey to the goal by silently and simply devoting ourselves heart and soul to the work of delivering the Empire from the threatening danger. It will be a national suicide not to recognise this elementary truth. We must perceive that if we serve to save the Empire, we have in that very act secured Home Rule

Whilst, therefore, it is clear to me that we should

give to the Empire every available man for its defence, I fear that I cannot say the same thing about the financial assistance. My intimate intercourse with the raiyats convinces me that India has already donated to the Imperial Exchequer beyond her capacity. I know that, in making this statement, I am voicing the opinion of the majority of my countrymen.

The Conference means for me, and I believe for many of us, a definite step in the consecration of our lives to the common cause, but ours is a peculiar position. We are to day outside the partnership. Ours is a consecration based on hope of better future. I should be untrue to you and to my country if I did not clearly and unequivocally tell you what that hope is. I do not bargain for its fulfilment, but you should know that disappointment of hope means disillusion. There is one thing I may not omit. You have appealed to us to sink domestic differences. If appeal involves the toleration of tyranny and wrong-doings on the part of officials, I am powerless to respond. I shall resist organised tyranny to the uttermost. The appeal must be to the officials that they do not ill-treat a single soul, and that they consult and respect popular opinion as never before. In Champaran by resisting an age-long tyranny, I have shown the ultimate sovereinty of British justice. In Kaira a population that was cursing the Government now feels that it, and not the Government, is the power when it is prepared to suffer for the truth it represents. It is, therefore, losing its bitterness and is saying to itself that the Government must be a Government for people, for it tolerates orderly and respectful disobedience where injustice is felt. Thus Champaran aud Kaira affairs

are my direct, definite and special contribution to the War. Ask me to suspend my activities in that direction and you ask me to suspend my life. If I could popularise the use of soul-force, which is but another name for love-force in place of brute force, I know that I could present you with an India that could defy the whole world to its worst. In season and out of season, therefore, I shall discipline myself to express in my life this eternal law of suffering, and present it for acceptance to those who care, and if I take part in any other activity, the motive is two show the matchless superiority of that law.

Lastly, I would like you to ask His Majesty's Ministers to give definite assurance about Muhammadan States. I am sure you know that every Muhammadan is deeply interested in them. As a Hindu, I cannot be indifferent to their cause. Their sorrows must be our sorrows. In the most scrupulous regard for the rights of those States and for the Muslim sentiment as to the places of worship and your just and timely treatment of Indian claim to Home Rule lies the safety of the Empire. I write this, because I love the English Nation and I wish to evoke in every Indian the loyalty of Englishman.

RECRUITING FOR THE WAR

The following is the translation of Mr. M. K. Gandhi's address, delivered at a meeting in the District of Kaira in July 1918.

Sisters and Brothers of Kaira :—You have just come successful out of a glorious Satyagraha campaign. You have, during it, given such evidence of fearlessness,

tact and other virtues that I venture to advise and urge you to undertake a still greater campaign.

You have successfully demonstrated how you can resist Government with civility, and how you can retain your own respect without hurting theirs. I now place before you an opportunity of proving that you bear no hostility to Government in spite of your strenuous fight with them.

You are all Home Rulers, some of you are members of Home Rule Leagues. One *meaning of Home rule* is that we should become *partners of the Empire.* To-day we are a subject people We do not enjoy all the rights of Englishmen. We are not to-day partners of the Empire as are Canada, South Africa and Australia. We are a dependency. We want the rights of Englishmen, and we aspire to as much partners of the Empire as the Dominions overseas. We wish for the time when we may aspire to the Viceregal office. To bring such a state of things, we should have the ability to defend ourselves, that is the ability to bear arms and to use them. As long as we have to look to the Englishmen for our defence, as long as we are not free from the military, so long we cannot be regarded as equal partners with Englishmen. It, therefore, behoves us to learn the use of arms and to acquire the ability to defend ourselves. *If we want to learn the use of arms with the greatest possible despatch, it is our duty to enlist ourselves in the Army.*

There can be no friendship between the brave and the effeminate. We are regarded as a cowardly people. If we want to become free from that reproach, we should learn the use of arms.

Partnership in the Empire is our definite goal.

We should suffer to the utmost of our ability and even lay down our lives to defend the Empire. If the Empire perishes, with it perish our cherished aspirations.

WAYS AND MEANS OF SWARAJ.

The easiest and the straightest way, therefore, to win Swarajya is to participate in the defence of the Empire. It is not within our power to give much money. Moreover, it is not money that will win the war. Only an inexhaustible army can do it. That army, India can supply If the Empire wins mainly with the help of our army, it is obvious that we would secure the righst we want.

Some will say that if we do not secure those rights just now, we would be cheated of them afterwards. The power acquired in defending the Empire will be the power that can secure those rights. Rights won by making an opportunity of the Empire's weakness are likely to be lost when the Empire gains its strength. We cannot be partners of the Empire by embarrassing it. Embarrassment in its hour of crisis will not avail to secure the rights we needs must win by serving it. To distrust the statesmen of the Empire is to distrust our own strength, it is a sign of our own weakness. We should not depend for our rights on the goodness or the weakness of the statesmen. We should depend on our fitness, our strength. The Native States are helping the empire and they are getting their reward. The rich are rendering full financial assistance to Government and they are likewise getting their reward. The assistance in either case is rendered conditionally. The sepoys are rendering their services for their salt and for their livelihood. They get their livelihood, and pzeris

and honours in addition. All these classes are a part of us, but they cannot be regarded as Home rulers, their goal is not Home Rule. The help they render is not consecrated to the country.

If we seek to win Swarajya in a spirit of hostility, it is possible for the Imperial statesmen to use these three forces against us and defeat us. If we want Swarajya, it is our duty to help the Empire and we shall, undoubtedly, get the reward of their help. If our motive is honest, Government will behave honestly with us. Assuming for a moment that they will not do so, our honesty should make us confident of our success. It is not a mark of greatness to return goodness for goodness only. Greatness lies in returning good for evil.

VALID OBJECTIONS.

Government do not give us commissions in the Army ; they do not repeal the Arms Act ; they do not open schools for military training. How can we then co-operate with them ? These are valid objections. In not granting reforms in these matters, Government are making a serious blunder. The English nation has performed several acts of virtue. For these, God's grace be with it. But the heinous sin perpetrated by the English administrators in the name of that nation will undo the effect of these acts of virtue, if they do not take care betimes. If the worst happens to India, which may God forbid, and she passes into the hands of some other nation, India's piteous cry will make England hang her head in shame before the world, and curses will descend upon her for having emasculated a nation of thirty crores. I believe the statesmen of England have realised this, and they have taken the warning ; but they are unable to alter

all of a sudden the situation created by themselves. Every Englishman upon entering India is trained to despise us, to regard himself as our superior and to maintain a spirit of isolation from us. They imbibe these characteristics from their Indian atmosphere. The finer spirits try to get themselves rid of this atmosphere and endeavour to do likewise with the rank and file, but their effort does not bear immediate fruit. If there were no crisis for the Empire, we should be fighting against this domineering spirit. But to sit still at this crisis, waiting for commissions, etc., is like cutting the nose to spite the face. It may happen perchance that we may idle away our time waiting for commissions till the opportunity to help the Empire may be gone.

Even if Government desire to obstruct us in enlisting in the army and rendering other help, by refusing us commissions, or by delay in giving them, it is my firm belief that it is incumbent upon us to insist upon joining the army.

THE NEED FOR MEN.

Government at present want five lakhs of men for the army. This number they are sure to raise some way or the other. If we supply this number, we would cover ourselves with glory, we would be rendering true service and the reports that we often hear of improper recruitment will be a thing of the past. It is no small thing to have the whole work of recruiting in our hands. If the Government have no trust in us, if their intentions are not pure, they would not raise recruits through our agency.

The foregoing argument will show that by enlisting in the army we help the Empire, we qualify ourselves

for Swarajya, we learn to defend India and to a certain extent, regain our lost manhood. I admit it is because of my faith in the English nation that I can advise as I am doing. I believe that, though this nation has done India much harm, to retain connection with that nation is to our advantage. Their virtues seem to me to outweigh their vices. It is miserable to remain in subjection to that nation. The Englishmen have the great vice of depriving a subject nation of its self-respect, but they have also the virtue of treating their equals with due respect and of loyalty towards them. We have seen that they have many times helped those groaning under the tyranny of others. In partnership with them we have to give and receive a great many things to and from each other and our connection with them based on that relationship is likely to benefit the world. If such was not my faith and if I thought it desirable to become absolutely independent of that nation, I would not only not advise co-operation but would certainly advise people to rebel and by paying the penalty of the rebellion, awaken the people. We are not in a position to-day to stand on our own legs unaided and alone. I believe that our good lies in becoming and remaining equal partners of the Empire and I have seen it throughtout India that all Home Rulers are of the same belief.

APPEAL TO KAIRA AND GUJARAT.

I expect from Kaira and Gujarat not 500 or 700 recruits but thousands. If Gujarat wants to wipe herself free of the reproach of " effeminate Gujarat ", she should be prepared to contribute thousands of sepoys. These must include the educated classes, the Pattidars, the Dharalas, Vaghris and all, and I hope they will fight

side by side as comrades. Unless the educated classes or the 'elite' of the community take the lead, it is idle to expect the other classes to come forward. I believe that those from the educated classes are above the prescribed age, but are able-bodied, may enlist themselves. Their services will be utilised, if not for actual fighting, for many other purposes accessory thereto, and for treating and nursing the sepoys. I hope also that those who have grown-up sons will not hesitate to send them as recruits. To sacrifice sons in the war ought to be a cause not of pain, but of pleasure to brave men. Sacrifice of sons at the crisis will be sacrifice for Swarajya.

To you, my sisters, I request that you will not be startled by this appeal, but will accord it a hearty welcome. It contains the key to your protection and your honour.

There are 600 villages in the Kaira District. Every village has on an average a population of over 1,000. If every village gave at least twenty men the Kaira District would be able to raise an army of 12,000 men. The population of the whole district is seven lakhs and this number will then work out at 17 per cent.—a rate which is lower than the death-rate. If we are not prepared to make even this sacrifice for the Empire and Swarajya, it is no wonder if we are regarded as unworthy of it. If every village gives at least twenty men they will return from the war and be the living bulwarks of their village. If they fall on the battle-field, they will immortalise themselves, their villages and their country, and twenty fresh men will follow suit and offer themselves for national defence.

If we mean to do this, we have no time to lose. I wish the names of the fittest and the strongest in every village will be selected and sent up. I ask this of you, brothers and sisters. To explain things to you, and to clear the many questions that will arise, meetings will be held in important villages. Volunteers will also be sent out.

THE MONTAGU-CHELMSFORD SCHEME

On the publication of the "Report on Constitutional Reforms" by the Rt. Hon. Mr. E. S. Montagu and H. E. Lord Chelmsford, Mr. Gandhi wrote the following letter (dated, July 18, 1918) *to the Hon. (now the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, who had invited him to give an expression of his views on the subject for publication in the "Servant of India." Mr. Gandhi wrote* :—

After all, our standard of measurement must be the Congress-League scheme. Crude though it is, I think that we should with all the vehemence and skill, that we can command, press for the incorporation into it of the essentials of our own.

DOCTRINE OF COMPARTMENTS.

I would, therefore, for instance, ask for the rejection of the doctrine of compartments. I very much fear that the dual system in the Provinces will be fatal to the success of the experiment and as it may be only the success of the experiment that can take us to the next and I hope the final stage, we cannot be too insistent that the idea of reservation should be dropped. One cannot help noticing an unfortunate suspicion of our intentions regarding the

purely British as distinguished from the purely Indian interests. Hence, there is to be seen in the scheme elaborate reservations on behalf of these interests. I think that more than anything else it is necessary to have an honest, frank and straightforward understanding about these interests and for me personally this is of much greater importance than any legislative feat that British talent alone or a combination of British and Indian talent may be capable of performing. I would certainly, in as courteous terms as possible, but equally emphatic say that these interests will be held subservient to those of India as a whole and that therefore they are certainly in jeopardy in so far as they may be inconsistent with the general advance of India. Thus, if I had my way, I would cut down the military expenditure. I would protect local industries by heavily taxing goods that compete against products of our industries and I would reduce to a minimum the British element in our services, retaining only those that may be needed for our instruction and guidance. I do not think that they had or have any claim upon our attention, save by right of conquest. That claim must clearly go by the board as soon as we have awakened to a consciousness of our national existence and possess the strength to vindicate our right to the restoration of what we have lost. To their credit let it be said that they do not themselves advance any claim by right of conquest. One can readily join in the tribute of praise bestowed upon the Indian Civil Service for their proficiency, devotion to duty and great organising ability. So far as material reward is concerned that service has been more than handsomely paid and our gratitude otherwise can be best expressed by assimilating their virtues ourselves.

PRESENT TOP-HEAVY ADMINISTRATION.

No scheme of reform can possibly benefit India that does not recognise that the present administration is top-heavy and ruinously expensive and for me even law, order and good government would be too dearly purchased if the price to be paid for it is to be the grinding poverty of the masses. The watchword of our reform councils will have to be. not the increase of taxation for the growing needs of a growing country, but a decrease of financial burdens that are sapping the foundation itself of organic growth. If this fundamental fact is recognised, there need be no suspicion of our motives and I think I am perfectly safe in asserting that in every other respect British interests will be as secure in Indian hands as they are in their own.

INDIANS IN CIVIL SERVICE.

It follows from what I have said above that we must respectfully press for the Congress-League claim for the immediate granting to Indians of 50 per cent. of the higher posts in the Civil Service.

THE ROWLATT BILLS & SATYAGRAHA

During the debate on the Rowlatt Bills in the Imperial Legislative Council in 1919 *Mr. Gandhi toured round the country organising an effective opposition to the passing of the Bills. Despairing of the efficacy of mere Non-official opposition in the Council, Mr. Gandhi inaugurated what is known as the Satyagraha Movement as the only legitimate weapon in the hands of the people, to make their opposition felt. In this connection he published several contributions and spoke on many occasions. An attempt is made in the following pages to record them in the order of dates.*

MANIFESTO TO THE PRESS

[*In commending the Satyagraha Pledge, Mr. M. K. Gandhi wrote to the Press under date, February* 28, 1919 :—]

The step taken is probably the most momentous in the history of India. I give my assurance that it has not been hastily taken. Personally I have passed many sleepless nights over it. I have endeavoured duly to appreciate Government's position, but I have been unable to find any justification for the extraordinary Bills. I have read the Rowlatt Committee's Report. I have gone through the narrative with admiration. Its reading has driven me to conclusions just the opposite of the Committee's. I should conclude from the report that secret violence is confined to isolated and very small parts of India, and to a microscopic body of people. The existence of such men is truly a danger to

society. But the passing of the Bills, designed to affect the whole of India and its people and arming the Government with powers out of all proportion to the situation sought to be dealt with, is a greater danger. The Committee ignore the historical fact that the millions in India are by nature the gentlest on earth.

Now look at the setting of the Bills. Their introduction is accompanied by certain assurances given by the Viceroy regarding the Civil Service and the British commercial interests. Many of us are filled with the greatest misgivings about the Viceregal utterance. I frankly confess I do not understand its full scope and intention. If it means that the Civil Service and the British commercial interests are to be held superior to those of India and its political and commercial requirements, no Indian can accept the doctrine. It can but end in a fratricidal struggle within the Empire. Reforms may or may not come. The need of the moment is a proper and just understanding upon this vital issue. No tinkering with it will produce real satisfaction. Let the great Civil Service Corporation understand that it can remain in India only as its trustee and servant, not in name, but in deed, and let the British commercial houses understand that they can remain in India only to supplement her requirements, and not to destroy indigenous art, trade and manufacture, and you have two measures to replace the Rowlatt Bills.

It will be now easy to see why I consider the Bills to be an unmistakable symptom of a deep-seated disease in the governing body. It needs, therefore, to be drastically treated. Subterranean violence will be the remedy applied by impetuous, hot-headed youths who will have grown impatient of the spirit underlying the Bills and the

circumstances attending their introduction. The Bills must intensify the hatred and ill-will against the State of which the deeds of violence are undoubtedly an evidence. The Indian covenanters, by their determination to undergo every form of suffering make an irresistible appeal to the Government, towards which they bear no ill-will, and provide to the believers in the efficacy of violence, as a means of securing redress of grievances with an infallible remedy, and withal a remedy that blesses those that use it and also those against whom it is used. If the convenanters know the use of this remedy, I fear no ill from it, I have no business to doubt their ability They must ascertain whether the disease is sufficiently great to justify the strong remedy and whether all milder ones have been tried They have convinced themselves that the disease is serious enough, and that milder measures have utterly failed. The rest lies in the lap of the gods.

THE PLEDGE

Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. 1 *of* 1919, *and the Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill No. II of* 1919, *are unjust, subversive of the principle of liberty and justice, and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole aud the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these Bills becoming law until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a committee to be hereafter appointed may think fit and further affirm that in this struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property.*

SPEECH AT ALLAHABAD

[*Mr. M. K. Gandhi in his speech at Allahabad on the* 11*th. March, explained the Satyagraha Pledge as follows*:—]

It behoves every one who wishes to take the Satyagraha Pledge to seriously consider all its factors before taking it. It is necessary to understand the principles of Satyagraha, to understand the main features of the Bills known as the Rowlatt Bills and to be satisfied that they are so objectionable as to warrant the very powerful remedy of Satyagraha being applied and, finally, to be convinced of one's ability to undergo every form of bodily suffering so that the soul may be set free and be under no fear from any human being or institution. Once in it, there is no looking back.

Therefore there is no conception of defeat in Stayagrah. A Satyagrahi fights even unto death. It is thus not an easy thing for everybody to enter upon it. It therefore behoves a Stayagrahi to be tolerant of those who do not join him. In reading reports of Satyagraha meetings I often notice that ridicule is poured upon those who do not join our movement. This is entirely against the spirit of the Pledge. In Satyagraha we expect to win over our opponents by self-suffering *i.e*, by love. The process whereby we hope to reach our goal is by so conducting ourselves as gradually and in an unperceived manner to disarm all opposition. Oppo nents as a rule expect irritation, even violence from one another when both parties are equally matched. But when Satyagraha comes into play the expecta-

tion is transformed into agreeable surprise in the mind of the party towards whom Satyagraha is addressed till at last he relents and recalls the act which necessitated Satyagraha. I venture to promise that if we act up to our Pledge day after day, the atmosphere around us will be purified and those who differ from us from honest motives, as I verily believe they do, will perceive that their alarm was unjustified. The violationists wherever they may be will realise that they have in Satyagraha a far more potent instrument for achieving reform than violence whether secret or open and that it gives them enough work for their inexhaustible energy. And the Government will have no case left in defence of their measures if as a result of our activity the cult of violence is notably on the wane if it has not entirely died out. I hope therefore that at Satyagraha meetings we shall have no cries of shame, and no language betraying irritation or impatience either against the Government or our countrymen who differ from us and some of whom have for years been devoting themselves to the country's cause according to the best of their ability.

SPEECH AT BOMBAY

[*At the Bombay meeting against the Rowlatt Bills on 14th March, Mr. M. K. Gandhi's speech which was in Gujarati was read out by his secretary. The speech ran as follows* :—]

I am sorry that owing to my illness, I am unable to speak to you myself and have to have my remarks read to you. You will be glad to know that Sanyasi Shraddhanandji is gracing the audience to-day by his presence.

He is better known to us as Mahatma Munshiramji, the Governor of Gurukul. His joining our army is a source of strength to us. Many of you have perhaps been keenly following the proceedings of the Viceregal Council. Bill No. *2* is being steamrolled by means of the Official majority of the Government and in the teeth of the unanimous opposition from the Non-Official members. I deem it to be an insult to the latter, and through them to the whole of India. *Satyagraha* has become necessary as much to ensure respect for duly expressed public opinion, as to have the mischievous Bills withdrawn. Grave responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Satyagrahis though, as I have so often said, there is no such thing as defeat in Satyagraha, it does not mean that victory can be achieved without *Satyagrahis* to fight for it, *i.e.*, to suffer for it. The use of this matchless force is comparatively a novelty. It is not the same thing as Passive Resistance which has been conceived to be a weapon that can be wielded most effectively only by the strongest minded, and you may depend upon it that six hundred men and women who in this Presidency have signed the Pledge are more than enough for our purpose, if they have strong wills and invincible faith in their mission, and that is in the power of truth to conquer untruth which Satyagrahis believe the Bills represent. I use the word 'untruth' in its widest sense. We may expect often to be told—as we have been told already by Sir William Vincent—that the Government will not yield to any threat of Passive Resistance. Satyagraha is not a threat, it is a fact; and even such a mighty Government as the Government of India will have to yield if we are true to our Pledge. For the Pledge is

not a small thing. It means a change of heart. It is an attempt to introduce the religious spirit into politics. We may no longer believe in the doctrine of tit for tat : we may not meet hatred by hatred, violence by violence, evil by evil ; but we have to make a continuous and persistent effort to return good for evil. It is of no consequence that I give utterance to these sentiments. Every Satyagrahi has to live up to them. It is a difficult task, but with the help of God nothing is impossible. (Loud Cheers.)

SPEECH AT MADRAS.

[*At the meeting held at the Madras Beach on the 18th March, Mr. Gandhi, in responding to the welcome, said* :—]

You will forgive me for saying the few words that I want to say just now sitting in the chair. I am under strict medical orders not to exert myself, having got a weak heart. I am, therefore, compelled to have some assistance and to get my remarks read to you. But before I call upon Mr. Desai to read my remarks, I wish to say one word to you. Beware before you sign the Pledge. But if you do, you will see to it that you shall never undo the Pledge you have singed. May God help you and me in carrying out the Pledge.

[*Mr. Desai, after a few words of introduction, read the following message* :—]

I regret that owing to heart weakness I am unable to speak to you personally. You have no doubt attended many meetings, but those that you have been attending of late are different from the others in that at the meetings to which I have referred some immediate

tangible action, some immediate definite sacrifice has been demanded of you for the purpose of averting a serious calamity that has overtaken us in the shape of what are known as the Rowlatt Bills. One of them Bill No. I, has undergone material alterations and its further consideration has been postponed. Inspite, however, of the alteration, it is mischievous enough to demand opposition. The Second Bill has probably at this very moment been finally passed by that Council, for in reality you can hardly call the Bill as having been passed by that august body when all its non-official members unanimously and in strong language opposed it. The Bills require to be resisted not only because they are in themselves bad, but also because Government who are responsible for their introduction have seen fit practically to ignore public opinion and some of its members have made it a boast that they can so ignore that opinion. So far it is common cause between the different schools of thought in the country. I have, however, after much prayerful consideration, and after very careful examination of the Government's standpoint, pledged myself to offer Satyagraha against the Bills, and invited all men and women who think and feel with me to do likewise. Some of our countrymen, including those who are among the best of the leaders, have uttered a note of warning, and even gone so far as to say that this Satyagraha movement is against the best interests of the country. I have naturally the highest regard for them and their opinion. I have worked under some of them. I was a babe when Sir Dinshaw Wacha and Babu Surendranath Bannerji were among the accepted leaders of public opinion in India. Mr.

Sastriar is a politician who has dedicated his all to the country's cause His sincerity, his probity are all his own. He will yield to no one in the love of the country. There is a sacred and indissoluble tie binding me to him. My upbringing draws me to the signatiories of the two Manifestoes. It is not, therefore, without the grearest grief and much searching of heart that I have to place myself in opposition to their wishes. But there are times when you have to obey a call which is the highest of all, *i.e.*, the voice of conscience even though such obedience may cost many a bitter tear, nay even more, separation from friends, from family, from the state to which you may belong, from all that you have held as dear as life itself. For this obedience is the law of our being. I have no further and other defence to offer for my conduct. My regard for the signatories to the Manifesto remains undiminished, and my faith in the efficiency of Satyagraha is so great that I feel that if those who have taken the Pledge will be true to it, we shall be able to show to them that they will find when we have come to the end of this struggle that there was no cause for alarm or misgivings. There is, I know, resentment felt even by some Satyagrahis over the Manifestoes. I would warn Satyagrahis that such resentment is against the spirit of Satyagraha. I would personally welcome an honest expression of difference of opinion from any quarter and more so from friends because it puts us on our guard. There is too much recrimination, innuendo and insinuation in our public life, and if the Satyagraha movement purges it of this grave defect, as it ought to, it will be a very desirable by—product. I wish further to suggest to Satyagrahis that any resentment of the two Manifestoes would be

but a sign of weakness on our part. Every movement, and Satyagraha most of all, must depend upon its own inherent strength, but not upon the weakness or silence of its critics.

Let us, therefore, see wherein lies the strength of Satyagraha. As the name implies it is in an insistence on truth which dynamically expressed means love; and by the law of love we are required not to return hatred for hatred, violence for violonce but to return good for evil. As Shrimati Sarojini Devi told you yesterday the strength lies in a definite recognition of the true religious spirit and action corresponding to it, and when once you introduce the religious element in politics, you revolutionise the whole of your political outlook. You achieve reform then not by imposing suffering on those who resist it, but by taking the suffering upon yourselves and so in this movement we hope by the intensity of our sufferings to affect and alter the Government's resolution not to withdraw these objectionable Bills. It has, however, been suggested that the Government will leave the handful of Satyagrahis severely alone and not make martyrs of them. But there is here, in my humble opinion, bad logic and an unwarranted assumption of fact. If Satyagrahis are left alone, they have won a complete victory, because they will have succeeded in disregarding the Rowlatt Bills and even other laws of the country, and in having thus shown that a civil disobedience of a Government is held perfectly harmless. I regard the statement as an unwarranted assumption of fact, because it contemplates the restriction of the movement only to a handful of men and women. My experience of Satyagraha leads me to believe that it is such a potent force that, once set in motion, it

ever spreads till at last it becomes a dominant factor in the community in which it is brought into play, and if it so spreads, no Government can neglect it. Either it must yield to it or imprison the workers in the movement. But I have no desire to argue. As the English proverb says, the proof of the pudding lies in the eating. The movement, for better or for worse, has been launched. We shall be judged not by our words, but solely by our deeds. It is, therefore, not enough that we sign the Pledge. Our signing it is but an earnest of our determination to act up to it, and if all who sign the Pledge, act according to it, I make bold to promise that we shall bring about the withdrawal of the two Bills and neither the Government nor our critics will have a word to say against us. The cause is great, the remedy is equally great ; let us prove worthy of them both.

APPEAL TO THE VICEROY

A public meeting of the citizens of Madras was held on March 20, 1919, at the Beach opposite the Presidency College, Madras, to appeal to the Viceroy to withhold his assent to the Rowlatt Act and to convey to Mr. M. K. Gandhi their profound and respectful thanks for the trouble he had taken to visit Madras in order to strengthen the Satyagraha movement. Mr. M. K. Gandhi did not attend owing to ill-health. Mr. Desai read the following message from Mr. M. K. Gandhi.

Friends,—This afternoon I propose to deal with some of the objections that have been raised against Satyagraha. After saying that it was a matter of regret that men like myself "should have embarked on this movement," Sir Wm. Vincent, in winding up

the debate on Bill No. 2, said, "they could only hope that (the Satyagraha) would not materialise. Mr. Gandhi might exercise great self-restraint in action, but there would be other young hot-headed men who might be led into violence which could not but end in disaster. Yielding to this threat, however, would be tantamount to complete abolition of the authority of the Governor-General-in-Council." If Sir William's fear as to violence is realised, it would undoubtedly be a disaster. It is for every Satyagrahi to guard against that danger. I entertain no such fear because our creed requires us to eschew all violence and to resort to truth and self-suffering, as the only weapons in our armoury. Indeed the Satyagraha movement is, among other things, an invitation to those who belive in the efficiency of violence for redress of grievances to join our ranks and honestly to follow our methods. I have suggested elsewhere that what the Rowlatt Bills are intended to do and what I verily believe they are bound to fail in achieving is exactly what the Satyagraha movement is pre-eminently capable of achieving. By demonstrating to the party of violence the infallible power of Satyagraha and by giving them ample scope for their inexhaustible energy, we hope to wean that party from the suicidal method of violence. What can be more potent than an absolute statement, accompanied by corresponding action, presented in the clearest terms possible that violence is never necessary for the purpose of securing reforms? Sir William says that the movement has great potentialities of evil. The Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya is said to have retorted, "and also of good." I would venture to improve upon

the retort by saying, "only of good." It constitutes an attempt to revolutionize politics and to restore moral force to its original station. After all, the Government do not believe in an entire avoidance of violence *i.e.*, physical force. The message of the West, which the Government of India, I presume, represent, is succinctly put by President Wilson in his speech delivered to the Peace Conference at the time of introducing the League of Nations Covenant. "Armed force is in the background in this programme, but it is in the background, and if the moral force of the world will not suffice, physical force of the world shall." We hope to reverse the process, and by our action show that physical force is nothing compared to the moral force, and that moral force never fails It is my firm belief that this is the fundamental difference between modern civilisation and the ancient of which India, fallen though it is, I venture to claim, is a living representative. We, her educated children, seem to have lost faith in this—the grandest doctrine of life. If we could but restore that faith in the supremacy of Moral Force, we shall have made a priceless contribution to the British Empire, and we shall, without fail, obtain the reforms we desire and to which we may be entitled. Entertaining such views it is not difficult for me to answer Sir William's second fear as to the complete abolition of the authority of the Governor-General-in-Council. This movement is undoubtedly designed, effectively to prove to the Government that its authority is finally dependant upon the will of the people and not upon force of arms, especially when that will is expressed in terms of Satyagraha. To yield to a clear moral force cannot but enhance the prestige and the dignity of the yielder.

It is to such a movement that every man and woman in this great country is invited, but a movement that is intended to produce far-reaching results, and which depends, for success, on the purity and the capacity for self-suffering of those who are engaged in it, can only be joined after a searching and prayerful self-examination. I may not too often give the warning I have given at Satyagraha meetings that everyone should think a thousand times before coming to it, but having come to it he must remain in it, cost what it may. A friend came to me yesterday, and told me that he did not know that it meant all that was explained at a gathering of a few Satyagrahi friends and wanted to withdraw. I told him that he could certainly do so if he had signed without understanding the full consequences of the pledge. And I would ask everyone who did not understand the pledge as it has been explained at various meetings to copy this example. It is not numbers so much as quality that we want. Let me therefore note down the qualities required of a Satyagrahi. He must follow truth at any cost and in all circumstances. He must make a continuous effort to love his opponents. He must be prepared to go through every form of suffering, whether imposed upon him by the Government which he is civilly resisting for the time being, or only those who may differ from him. This movement is thus a process of purification and penance. Believe me that, if we go through it in the right spirit, all the fears expressed by the Government and some of our friends will be proved to be groundless and we will not only see the Rowlatt Bills withdrawn, but the country will recognise in Satyagraha a powerful and religious weapon for securing reforms and redress of legitimate grievances.

THE SATYAGRAHA DAY

Mr. M. K. Gandhi published the following under date, 23rd March, during his stay in Madras :—

Satyagraha, as I have endeavoured to explain at several meetings, is essentially a religious movement. It is a process of purification and penance. It seeks to secure reforms or redress of grievances by self-suffering. I therefore venture to suggest that the second Sunday after the publication of the Viceregal assent to Bill No. 2 of 1919 (*i.e.*, 6th April) may be observed as a day of humiliation and Prayer. As there must be an effective public demonstration in keeping with the character of the observance, I beg to advise as follows :

(i) A twenty-four hours' fast, counting from the last meal on the preceding night, should be observed by all adults, unless prevented from so doing by consideration of religion or health. The fast is not to be regarded, in any shape or form, in the nature of a hunger-strike, or as designed to put any pressure upon the Government. It is to be regarded, for all Satyagrahis, as the necessary discipline to fit them for civil disobedience contemplated in their Pledge, and for all others, as some slight token of the intensity of their wounded feelings

(ii) All work, except such as may be necessary in the public interest, should be suspended for the day. Markets and other business places should be closed. Employees who are

required to work even on Sundays may only suspend work after obtaining previous leave.

I do not hesitate to recommend these two suggestions for adoption by public servants. For though it is unquestionably the right thing for them not to take part in political discussion and gatherings, in my opinion they have an undoubted right to express, upon vital matters, their feelings in the very limited manner herein suggested.

(iii) Public meetings should be held on that day in parts of India, not excluding villages, at which resoultions praying for the withdrawal of the two measures should be passed.

If my advice is deemed worthy of acceptance, the responsibility will lie in the first instance, on the various Satyagraha Associations, for undertaking the necessary work of organisation, but all other associations will, I hope, join hands in making this demonstration a success.

SATYAGRAHA DAY IN MADRAS

Under the auspices of Madras Satyagraha Sabha, a public meeting was held at the Triplicane Beach on 30th March to explain the message of Mr. M. K. Gandhi for the observance of the Satyagraha Day :—

I am sorry that I shall not be with you for this evening's meeting, as I must take the train for Bezwada in order to keep my engagement with our Andhra friends. But before my departure, I would like to reduce to writing my impressions of the tour through the southern part of the Presidency, which I have just

completed, and to answer some criticism and some doubts that have been offered by friends.

I have visited Tanjore, Trichnopoly, Madura, Tuticorin and Negapatam ; and taking the lowest estimate, the people addressed must have been not less than thirty thousand. Those who have a right to give us warnings, to express misgivings and who have just as great a love of the Motherland as we claim to have, have feared the danger that, however well-meaning we may be, and however anxious we may be to avoid violence, the people who may join the movement under an enthusiastic impulse may not be able to exercise sufficient self-control and break out into violence, resulting in needless loss of life, and, what is more, injury to the National cause. After embarking upon the movement, I began addressing meetings at Delhi. I passed then through Lucknow, Allahabad, Bombay, and thence to Madras. My experience of all these meetings shows that the advent of Satyagraha has already altered the spirit of those who attend the Stayagraha meetings. In Lucknow, upon an innocent remark by the chairman as to the Manifesto signed by some of the members of the Imperial Legislative Council disapproving of our movement, the audience cried out 'shame, shame!' I drew their attention to the fact that Satyagrahis and those who attended Satyagraha meetings should not use such expressions and that the speeches at our meetings ought not to be punctuated with either marks of disapproval or of approval. The audience immediately understood the spirit of my remarks and never afterwards made any demonstration of their opinion. In the towns of this Presidency as elsewhere, whilst it is true that the large crowds have refrained from any noisy demonstra-

tion out of regard for my health, they have fully understood the necessity of refraining from it on the higher ground. The leaders in the movement have also fully understood the necessity for self-restraint. These experiences of mine fill me with the greatest hope for the future. I never had any apprehensions of the danger our friends feared and the various meetings I have described confirm my optimism but I would venture further to state that every precaution that is humanly possible is being and will be taken to avert any such danger. It is for that reason that our Pledge commits the signatories to a breach of those laws that may be selected for the purpose by a Committee of Satyagrahis, and I am glad that our Sind friends have understood their Pledge and obeyed the prohibition of the Hyderabad Commissioner of Police to hold their inoffensive procession, for it is no part of the present movement to break all the laws of the land the breach of which is not inconsistent with the Pledge. A Satyagrahi is nothing if not instinctively law-abiding, and it is his law-abiding nature which exacts from him implicit obedience to the highest law that is the voice of conscience which over-rides all other laws. His civil disobedience even of certain laws is only seeming disobedience. Every law gives the subject an option either to obey the primary sanction or the secondary, and I venture to suggest that the Satyagrahi by inviting the secondary sanction obeys the law. He does not act like the ordinary offender who not only commits a breach of the laws of the land whether good or bad but wishes to avoid the consequences of that breach. It will seem, therefore, that every thing that prudence may dictate has been done to avoid any untoward results. Some friends have said: "We under-

stand your breach of the Rowlatt legislation but as a Satyagrahi there is nothing for you in it to break. How can you however break the other laws which you have hitherto obeyed and which may also be good!" So far as good laws are concerned, that is, laws which lay down moral principles, the Satyagrahi may not break them and their breach is not contempleted under the Pledge. But the other laws are neither good nor bad, moral or immoral. They may be useful or may even be harmful. Those laws, one obeys for the supposed good Government of the country. Such laws are laws made for the purpose of revenue, or political laws creating statutory offences. Those laws enable the Government to continue its power. When therefore a Government goes wrong to the extent of hurting the National fibre itself, as does the Rowlatt Legislation, it becomes the right of the subject, indeed it is his duty, to withdraw his obedience to such laws to the extent it may be required in order to bend the Government to the National will. A doubt has been expressed during my tour and my friends have written to me as to the validity in terms of Satyagraha of the entrustment of the selection of the laws for breach to a Committee. For it is argued that it amounts to a surrender of one's conscience to leave such selection to others. This doubt misunderstands the Pledge. A signatory of the Pledge undertakes, so far as he is concerned, to break if necessary all the laws which it would be lawful for the Satyagrahi to break. It is not however obligatory on him to break all such laws. He can therefore perfectly conscientiously leave the selection of the laws to be broken to the judgment of those who are experts in the matter and who in their turn are necessarily subject to

the limitations imposed by the Pledge. The worst that can happen to any signatory is that the selection may not be exhaustive enough for him.

I have been told that I am diverting the attention of the country from the one and only thing that matters, namely, the forthcoming reforms. In my opinion the Rowlatt Legislation, in spite of the amendments which, as the Select Committee very properly says, does not affect its principles, blocks the way to progress and therefore to attainment of substantial reforms. To my mind the first thing needful is to claim a frank and full recognition of the principle that public opinion properly expressed shall be respected by the Government. I am no believer in the doctrine that the same power can at the same time trust and distrust, grant liberty and repress it. I have a right to interpret the coming reforms by the light that the Rowlatt Legislation throws upon them, and I make bold to promise that if we do not gather sufficient force to remove from our path this great obstacle in the shape of the Rowlatt legislation, we shall find the reforms to be a whitened sepulchre. Yet another objection to answer. Some friends have argued : " Your Satyagraha movement only accentuates the fear we have of the onrush of Bolshevism." The fact, however, is that, if anything can possibly prevent this calamity descending upon our country, it is Satyagraha. Bolshevism is the necessary result of modern materialistic civilisation. Its insensate worship of matter has given rise to a school which has been brought up to look upon materialistic advancement as the goal and which has lost all touch with the final things of life. Self-indulgence is the Bolshevic creed, self-restraint is the Satyagraha creed. If I can but induce the

Nation to accept Satyagraha if only as a predominant factor in life, whether social or political, we need have no fear of the Bolshevic propaganda. In asking the Nation to accept Satyagraha, I am asking for the introduction in reality of nothing new. I have coined a new word for an ancient law that has hitherto mainly governed our lives, and I do prophesy that if we disobey the law of the final supremacy of the spirit over matter, of liberty and love over brute force, in a few years time we shall have Bolshevism rampant in this land which was once so holy.

MESSAGE TO SATYAGRAHIS

On April 3, 1919, *Mr. M. K. Gandhi sent the following message from Bombay to Mr S. Kasturiranga Iyengar, Editor of the* Hindu, *Madras* :—

Just arrived; having missed connection at Secunderabad.

Regarding the meeting at Delhi, I hope that the Delhi Tragedy will make Satyagrahis steel their hearts and the waverers to reconsider their position. I have no shadow of doubt that. by remaining true to the Pledge, we shall not only secure the withdrawal of the Rowlatt Legislation, but we shall kill the spirit of terrorism lying behind.

I hope the speeches on Sunday, the 6th April, will be free from anger or unworthy passion. The cause is too great and sacred to be damaged by exhibition of passion. We have no right to cry out against sufferings self-invited. Undoubtedly there should be no coercion for the suspension of business or for fast.

THE DELHI INCIDENT

Mr. M. K. Gandhi sent the following letter to the Press from Bombay under date 4th April, 1919 :—

It is alleged against the Delhi people assembled at the Delhi Railway Station (1) that some of them were trying to coerce sweetmeat sellers into closing their stalls ; (2) that some were forcibly preventing people from plying tramcars and other vehicles ; (3) that some of them threw brickbats ; (4) that the whole crowd that marched to the Station demanded the release of men who were said to be coercers and who were for that reason arrested at the instance of the Railway authorities ; (5) that the crowd declined to disperse when the Magistrate gave orders to disperse. I have read Sanyasi Swami Shradhanandji's account of the tragedy. I am bound to accept it as true, unless it is authoritatively proved to be otherwise and his account seems to me to deny the allegations, 1, 2 and 3. But assuming the truth of all allegations it does appear to me that the local authorities in Delhi have made use of a Nasmyth hammer to crush a fly. On their action, however, in firing on the crowd, I shall seek another opportunity of saying more. My purpose in writing this letter is merely to issue a note of warning to all Satyagrahis. I would, therefore, like to observe that the conduct described in the allegations 1 to 4, if true, would be inconsistent with the Satyagraha Pledge. The conduct described in allegations can be consistent with the Pledge, but if he allegation is true, the conduct was premature, because the Committee contemplated in the Pledge, has not

decided upon the disobedience of orders that may be issued by the Magistrates under the Riot Act. I am anxious to make it as clear as I can that in this movement no pressure can be put upon people who do not wish to accept our suggestions and advice, the movement being essentially one to secure the greatest freedom for all Satyagrahis, cannot forcibly demand release of those who might be arrested, whether justly or unjustly. The essence of the Pledge is to invite imprisonment and until the Committee decides upon the breach of the Riot Act, it is the duty of Satyagrahis to obey, without making the slightest ado, Magisterial orders to disperse, etc., and thus to demonstrate their law-abiding nature. I hope that the next Sunday at Satyagraha meetings, all speeches will be free from passion, anger or resentment. The movement depends for its success entirely upon perfect self-possession, self-restraint, absolute adherence to truth and unlimited capacity for self-suffering Before closing this letter, I would add that, in opposing the Rowlatt Legislation, Satyagrahis are resisting the spirit of terrorism which lies behind it and of which it is a most glaring symptom. The Delhi tragedy imposes an added responsibility upon Satyagrahis of steeling their hearts and going on with their struggle until the Rowlatt Legislation is withdrawn.

MESSAGE TO MADRAS SATYAGRAHIS

The following message from Mr. M. K. Gandhi was read at the great meeting in Madras held on the Satyagraha Day on 6th April:—

I do hope that the Presidency that produced beautiful Valliamma, Nagappan, Narayanaswami and so many

others of your Presidency with whom I was privileged to work in South Africa will not quail in the presence of sacrifice demanded of us all. I am convinced that reforms will be of no avail, unless our would-be partners respect us. And we know that they only respect those who are capable of sacrificing for ideals, as themselves. See how unstintingly they poured out treasure and blood during the War. Ours is a nobler cause and out means infinitely superior, in that we refrain from shedding blood, other than our own.

MESSAGE TO THE BOMBAY CITIZENS

At the Satyagraha Demonstrations in Bombay on 6th April, Mr. M. K. Gandhi referred to the Delhi incident and pointed out :—

We have two authoritative versions of the episode. One was Swami Shradhanandji's stating the peoples' version, and the other was Government's, justifying the action of the local authorities. The two did not tally; they differed as to some main particulars. An impartial observer will regard both as partial statements. I beg of the popular party to assume for purposes of criticism the truth of the official narrative, but there are remarkable gaps in it amounting to the evasion of charges made against the local authorities by Sanyasi Shradhanandji. His statement was the first in the field, and he was on the scene immediately after the shooting incident near the Railway Station. If the Government have sought the co-operation of the National Leaders to regulate the crowd, there would not have been any need for the display or use of military force. Even if the official version was correct, there was no justification to

fire on the innocent people. The people were entirely unarmed, and at the worst what would they have done? In any other place but India, the Police would have been deemed sufficient to meet an emergency of the Delhi type, armed with nothing more than batons He related how in 1917. at Durban, a mob of 6,000 Europeans bent upon lynching an innocent victim threatened the destruction of property worth £ 20, 000, including the lives of nearly twenty men, women and children, and a dozen Police, though they would have been justified in calling Military aid, contended with the crowd themselves and succeeded in peacefully dispersing it. The Delhi crowd had no such intention of hurting any body. It threatened to do nothing except, as alleged. it refused to disperse The authorities could have peacefully regulated the crowd; nstead they followed the customary practice of calling the Military on the slightest pretext. He did not want to labour on the point. It was enough the crowd hurt nobody and were neither overawed nor infuriated. It was a remarkable incident that the people were sufficiently firm and self-possessed to hold a mass meeting of 40,000 after the shooting incidents, and it coverd the Delhi people with glory. He has always emphasised that the people who took part in the struggle against the Rowlatt Act will be self-possessed and peaceful, but he has never said that the people will not have to suffer. Mr. Gandhi further said that to the satyagra-his such suffering must be welcome. The sterner they were the better. They have undertaken to suffer unto death. Sanyasi Shradhanandji has wired saying that 4 Mahommadans and 5 Hindus have so far died, and that about 20 people were missing and 13 persons were in

the hospital, being badly wounded. For Satyagrahis it was not a bad beginning. No country had ever risen, no nation had ever been made without sacrifice, and we were trying an experiment of building up ourselves by self-sacrifice without resorting to violence in any shape or form. That was a Satyagrahi. From Satyagraha standpoint the people's case in Delhi was weak, in that the crowd refused to disperse when asked to do so, and demanded the release of the two arrested men. Both acts were wrong. It was arrest and imprisonment they sought for by resorting to civil disobedience. In this movement it was open to Satyagrahis to disobey only those laws which are selected by the Committee contemplated in the Pledge. Before being able to offer effective civil disobedience, we must acquire habits of discipline, self-control and qualities of leadership and obedience. Till these qualities were developed and till the spirit of Satyagraha has permeated large bodies of men and women, Mr. Gandhi said he had advised that only such laws as can be individually disobeyed should be selected for disobedience, as, while disobeying certain selected laws, it was incumbent on the people to show their law-abiding character by respecting all the other laws.

DISTRIBUTION OF PROHIBITED LITERATURE

The Satyagraha Committee advised that, for the time being, laws regarding prohibited literature and registration of Newspapers may be civilly disobeyed. Accordingly Mr. Gandhi, President, and Secretaries of the Satyagraha Sabha, Bombay, issued on April 7, the following notice to organise, regulate and control the sale of these publications :—

Satyagrahis should receive copies of prohibited literature for distribution. A limited number of copies can be had from the Secretaries of the Satyagraha Sabha. Satyagrahis should, so far as possible, write their names and addresses as sellers so that they may be traced easily when wanted by the Government for prosecution. Naturally there can be no question of secret sale of this literature. At the same time, there should be no forwardness either in distributing it. It is open to Satvagrahis to form small groups of men and women to whom they may read this class of literature. The object in selecting prohibited literature is not merely to commit a civil breach of the law regarding it but it is also to supply people with clean literature of a high moral value. It is expected that the Government will confiscate such. Satyagrahis have to be as independent of finance as possible. When therefore copies are confiscated, Satyagrahis are requested to make copies of prohibited literature themselves or by securing the assistance of willing friends and to make use of it until it is confiscated by giving readings to the people from it. It

is stated that such readings would amount to dissemination of prohibited literature. When whole copies are exhausted by dissemination or confiscation, Satyagrahis may continue civil disobedience by writing out and distributing extracts from accessible books.

CIRCULATING UNREGISTERED NEWSPAPERS

Regarding the civil breach of the law governing the publication of newspapers, the idea is to publish in every Satyagraha centre a written newspaper without registering it. It need not occupy more than one side of half a foolscap. When such a newspaper is edited, it will be found how difficult it is to fill up half a sheet. It is a well known fact that a vast majority of newspapers contain much padding. Further, it cannot be denied that newspaper articles written under the terror of the very strict newspaper law have a double meaning. A Satyagrahi for whom punishments provided by law have lost all terror can give only in an unregistered newspaper his thoughts and opinion unhampered by any other consideration than that of his own conscience. His newspaper, therefore, if otherwise well edited, can become a most powerful vehicle for transmitting pure ideas in a concise manner, and there need be no fear of inability to circulate a hand-written newspaper, for it will be the duty of those who may receive the first copies to recopy till at last the process of multiplication is made to cover if necessary the whole of the masses of India and it must not be forgotten that we have in India the tradition of imparting instruction by oral teaching.

MESSAGE AFTER ARREST

Mr. Gandhi was arrested at Kosi on his way to Delhi on the morning of the 10th April and served with an order not to enter the Punjab and the District of Delhi and to restrict himself to the Bombay Presidency. The officer serving the order treated him most politely, assuring him it would be his most painful duty to arrest him, if he elected to disobey, but that there would be no ill-will between them. Mr. Gandhi smilingly said that he must elect to disobey as it was his duty, and that the officer ought also to do what was his duty. Mr. Gandhi then dictated the following message to Mr. Desai, his Secretary, laying special emphasis on his oral message that none shall resent his arrest or do anything tainted with untruth or violence which is sure to draw the sacred cause. The message reads :—

To my countrymen. It is a matter of the highest satisfaction to me, as I hope to you, that I have received an order from the Punjab Government not to enter that Province and another from the Delhi Government not to enter Delhi, while an order of the Government of India has been served on me immediately after which restricts me to Bombay. I had no hesitation in saying to the officer, who served the order on me, that I was bound in virtue of the pledge to disregard it, which I have done, and I shall presently find myself a free man, my body being taken by them in their custody. It was galling to me to remain free whilst the Rowlatt Legislation disfigured the Statute Book. My arrest makes me free. It now remains for you to do your duty

which is clearly stated in the Satyagraha Pledge. Follow it, and you will find it will be your *Kamadhenu*. I hope there will be no resentment about my arrest. I have received what I was seeking either withdrawal of the Rowlatt Legislation or imprisonment. A departure from truth by a hair's breadth, or violence committed against anybody, whether Englishman or Indian, will surely damn the great cause the Satyagrahis are handling. I hope the Hindu-Muslim unity, which seems now to have taken firm hold of the people, will become a reality and I feel convinced that it will only be a reality if the suggestions I have ventured to make in my communication to the Press are carried out. The responsibility of the Hindus in the matter is greater than that of Muhammadans, they being in a minority and I hope they will discharge their responsibility in the manner worthy of their country. I have also made certain suggestions regarding the proposal of the Swadeshi vow. Now I commend them to your serious attention and you will find that, as your ideas of Satyagraha become natured, the Hindu-Muslim unity is but part of Satyagraha. Finally it is my firm belief that we shall obtain salvation only through suffering and not by reforms dropping on us from England, no matter how unstintingly they might be granted. The English are a great Nation, but the weaker also go to the wall if they come in contact with them. When they are themselves courageous they have borne untold sufferings and they only respond to courage and sufferings and partnership with them is only possible after we have developed an indomitable courage and a faculty for unlimited suffering. There is a fundamental difference between their civilisation

and ours. They believe in the doctrine of violence or brute force as the final arbiter. My reading of our civilisation is that we are expected to believe in Soul Force or Moral Force as the final arbiter and this is Satyagraha. We are groaning under sufferings which we would avoid if we could, because we have swerved from the path laid down for us by our ancient civilisation. I hope that the Hindus, Muhammadans, Sikhs, Parsis, Christians, Jews and all who are born in India or who made India their land of adoption will fully participate in these National observances and I hope too that women will take therein as full a share as the men.

THE "SATYAGRAHI"

The unregistered newspaper, the "Satyagrahi", which Mr. Gandhi as Editor brought out in Bombay on the 7th April in defiance of the Press Act, was only a small sheet of paper sold for one pice. It stated among other things: "The editor is liable at any moment to be arrested, and it is impossible to ensure the continuity of publication until India is in a happy position of supplying editors enough to take the place of those who are arrested. It is not our intention to break for all time the laws governing the publication of newspapers. This paper will, therefore, exist so long only as the Rowlatt Legislation is not withdrawn." It also contained the following instruction to Satyagrahis:—

We are now in a position to expect to be arrested at any moment. It is, therefore, necessary to bear in mind that, if any one is arrested, he should, without causing any difficulty, allow himself to be arrested, and, if sum-

moned to appear before a Court, he should do so. No defence should be offered and no pleaders engaged in the matter. If a fine is imposed with the alternative of imprisonment, the imprisonment should be accepted. If only fine is imposed, it ought not to be paid; but his property, if he has any, should be allowed to be sold. There should be no demonstration of grief or otherwise made by the remaining Stayagrahis by reason of the arrest and imprisonment of their comrade. It cannot be too often repeated that we court imprisonment, and we may not complain of it, when we actually receive it. When once imprisoned, it is our duty to conform to all prison regulations, as prison reform is no part of our campaign at the present moment. A Satyagrahi may not resort to surreptitious practices. All that the Satyagrahis do, can only and must be done openly.

SATYAGRAHA AND DURAGRAHA.

Mr. Gandhi arrived in Bombay, on the afternoon of the 11th April, having been prevented from entering the Provinces of Punjab and Delhi. An order was soon after served on him requiring him to confine his activities within the limits of the Bombay Presidency. Having heard of the riots and the consequent bloodshed in different places, he caused the following message to be read at all the meetings that evening:—

I have not been able to understand the cause of so much excitement and disturbance that followed my detention. It is not Satyagraha. It is worse than Duragraha. Those who join Satyagraha demonstrations were bound one and all to refrain at all hazard

from violence, not to throw stones or in any way whatever to injure anybody.

But in Bombay, we have been throwing stones. We have obstructed tramcars by putting obstacles in the way. This is not Satyagraha. We have demanded the release of about 50 men who had been arrested for deeds of violence. Our duty is chiefly to get ourselves arrested. It is breach of religious duty to endeavour to secure the release of those who have committed deeds of violence. We are not, therefore, justified on any grounds whatever in demanding the release of those who have been arrested. I have been asked whether a Satyagrahi is responsible for the results that follow from that movement. I have replied that they are. I therefore suggest that if we cannot conduct this movement without the slightest violence from our side, the movement might have to be abandoned or it may be necessary to give it a different and still more restricted shape. It may be necessary to go even further. The time may come for me to offer Satyagraha against ourselves. I would not deem it a disgrace that we die. I shall be pained to hear of the death of a Satyagrahi, but I shall consider it to be the proper sacrifice given for the sake of struggle. But if those who are not Satyagrahis who shall not have joined the movement, who are even against the movement, received any injury at all, every Satyagrahi will be responsible for that sinful injury. My responsibility will be a million times heavier. I have embarked upon the struggle with a due sense of responsibility.

I have just heard that some English gentlemen have been injured. Some may even have died from such injuries. If so, it would be a great blot on Satyagraha.

For me, Englishmen too, are our brethren We can have nothing against them and for me, since such as I have described, are simply unbearable, but I know how to offer Satyagraha against ourselves. As against ourselves, what kind of Satyagraha can I offer? I do not see what penance I can offer excepting that it is for me to fast and if need be, by so doing, to give up this body and thus prove the truth of Satyagraha. I appeal to you to peacefully disperse and to refrain from acts that may, in any way, bring disgrace upon the people of Bombay.

SPEECH AT AHMEDABAD.

The following is the full text of the speech of Mr. Gandhi delivered at a meeting of the citizens of Ahmedabad held at his Ashram, Sabarmati, on Monday, the 14th April, 1919 :—

Brothers.—I mean to address myself mainly to you. Brothers, the events that have happened in course of the last few days have been most disgraceful to Ahmedabad, and as all these things have happened in my name, I am ashamed of them, and those who have been responsible for them have thereby not honoured me but disgraced me. A rapier run through my body could hardly have pained me more. I have said times without number that Satyagraha admits of no violence, no pillage, no incendiarism ; and still in the name of Satyagraha we burnt down buildings, forcibly captured weapons, extorted money, stopped trains, cut off telegraph wires, killed innocent people and plundered shops and private houses. If deeds such as these could save me from the prison house or the scaffold, I should

not like to be so saved. I do wish to say in all earnestness that violence has not secured my discharge. A most brutal rumour was set afloat that Anasuya Bai was arrested. The crowds were infuriated all the more, and disturbance increased. You have thereby disgraced Anasuya Bai and, under the cloak of her arrest, heinous deeds have been done.

These deeds have not benefited the people in any way. They have done nothing but harm. The buildings burnt down were public property and they will naturally be rebuilt at our expense. The loss due to the shops remaining closed is also our loss. The terrorism prevailing in the city due to Martial Law is also the result of this violence. It has been said that many innocent lives have been lost as a result of the operation of Martial Law. If this is a fact, then for that too, the deeds described above are responsible. It will thus be seen that the events that have happened have done nothing but harm to us. Moreover they have most seriously damaged the Satyagraha movement. Had an entirely peaceful agitation followed my arrest, the Rowlatt Act would have been out or on the point of being out of the Statute Book today. It should not be a matter for surprise if the withdrawal of the Act is now delayed. When I was released on Friday my plan was to start for Delhi again on Saturday to seek re-arrest, and that would have been an accession of strength to the movement. Now, instead of going to Delhi, it remains to me to offer Satyagraha against our own people, and as it is my determination to offer Satyagraha even unto death for securing the withdrawal of the Rowlatt legislation, I think the occasion has arrived when I should offer Satyagraha against our-

selves for the violence that has occurred. And I shall do so at the sacrifice of my body, so long as we do not keep perfect peace and cease from violence to person and property. How can I seek imprisonment unless I have absolute confidence that we shall no longer be guilty of such errors! Those desirous of joining the Satyagraha movement or of helping it must entirely abstain from violence. They may not resort to violence even on my being rearrested or on some such events happening. Englishmen and women have been compelled to leave their homes and confine themselves to places of protection in Shahi Bag, because their trust in our harmlessness has received a rude shock. A little thinking should convince us that this is a matter of humiliation for us all. The sooner this state of things stops the better for us. They are our brethren and it is our duty to inspire them with the belief that their persons are as sacred to us as our own and this is what we call *Abhayadan*, the first requisite of true religion. Satyagraha without this is *Duragraha*.

There are two distinct duties now before us. One is that we should firmly resolve upon refraining from all violence, and the other is that we should repent and do penance for our sins. So long as we don't repent and do not realise our errors and make an open confession of them, we shall not truly change our course. The first step is that those of us who have captured weapons should surrender them. To show that we are really penitent we will contribute each of us not less than eight annas towards helping the families of those who have been killed by our acts. Though no amount of money contribution can altogether undo the results of the furious deeds of the past few days, our

contribution will be a slight token of our repentence. I hope and pray that no one will evade this contribution on the plea that he has had no part in those wicked acts. For if such as those who were no party to these deeds had all courageously and bravely gone forward to put down the lawlessness, the mob would have been checked in their career and would have immediately realised the wickedness of their doings. I venture to say that, if instead of giving money to the mob out of fear, we had rushed out to protect buildings and to save the innocent without fear of death, we could have succeeded in so doing. Unless we have this sort of courage, mischief makers will always try to intimidate us into participating in their misdeeds. Fear of death makes us devoid both of valour and religion. For want of valour is want of religious faith. And having done little to stop the violence we have been all participators in the sins that have been committed. And we ought, therefore, to contribute our mite as a mark of our repentence. Each group can collect its own contributions and send them on to me through its collectors. I would also advise, if it is possible for you, to observe a twenty-four hour's fast in slight expiation of these sins. This fast should be observed in private and there is no need for crowds to go to the bathing ghats.

I have thus far drawn attention to what appears to be your duty. I must now consider my own. My responsibility is a million times greater than yours. I have placed Satyagraha before people for their acceptance, and I have lived in your midst for four years. I have also given some contribution to the special service of Ahmedabad. Its citizens are not quite unfamiliar with my views.

It is alleged that I have without proper consideration persuaded thousands to join the movement. That allegation is, I admit, true to a certain extent, but to a certain extent only. It is open to anybody to say that but for the Satyagraha campaign, there would not have been this violence. For this, I have already done a penance, to my mind an unendurable one namely, that I have had to postpone my visit to Delhi to seek rearrest and I have also been obliged to suggest a temporary restriction of Satyagraha to a limited field. This has been more painful to me than a wound but this penance is not enough, and I have, therefore, decided to fast for three days, *i.e.*, 72 hours. I hope my fast will pain no one. I believe a seventy-two hours' fast is easier for me than a twenty-four hours' fast for you. And I have imposed on me a discipline which I can bear. If you really feel pity for the suffering that will be caused to me, I request that that pity should always restrain you from ever again being party to the criminal acts of which I have complained. Take it from me that we are not going to win Swarajya or benefit our country in the least by violence and terrorism. I am of opinion that if we have to wade through violence to obtain Swarajya and if a redress of grievances were to be only possible by means of ill will for and slaughter of English men, I, for one, would do without that Swarajya and without a redress of those grievances. For me life would not be worth living if Ahmedabad continues to countenance violence in the name of truth. The poet has called Gujarat the "Garvi" (Great and Glorious) Gujarat. The Ahmedabad, its capital, is the residence of many religious Hindus and Muhammadans. Deeds of public violence in a city like this is like an

ocean being on fire. Who can quench that fire? I can only offer myself as a sacrifice to be burnt in that fire, and I therefore ask you all to help in the attainment of the result that I desire out of my fast. May the love that lured you into unworthy acts awaken you to a sense of the reality, and if that love does continue to animate you, beware that I may not have to fast myself to death.

It seems that the deeds I have complained of have been done in an organised manner. There seems to be a definite design about them, and I am sure that there must be some educated and clever man or men behind them. They may be educated, but their education has not enlightened them. You have been misled into doing these deeds by such people I advise you never to be so misguided, and I would ask them seriously to reconsider their views. To them and you I commend my book "Hind Swarajya" which, as I understand, may be printed and published without infringing the law thereby.

Among the mill-hands, the spinners have been on strike for some days. I advise them to resume work immediately and to ask for increase if they want any, only after resuming work, and in a reasonable manner. To resort to the use of force to get any increase is suicidal. I would specially advise all mill-hands to altogether eschew violence. It is their interest to do so and I remind them of the promises made to Anasuya Bai and me that they would ever refrain from violence. I hope that all will now resume work.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF THE MOVEMENT.

The following speech advising temporary suspension of the Satyagraha movement was made by Mr. Gandhi at Bombay on the 18th April :—

It is not without sorrow I feel compelled to advise the temporary suspension of civil disobedience. I give this advice not because I have less faith now in its efficacy but because I have, if possible, greater faith than before. It is my perception of the law of *Satyagraha* which impels me to suggest the suspension. I am sorry when I embarked upon a mass movement, I underrated the forces of evil and I must now pause and consider how best to meet the situation. But whilst doing so, I wish to say that from a careful examination of the tragedy at Ahmedabad and Viramgaum, I am convinced that *Satyagraha* had nothing to do with the violence of the mob and that many swarmed round the banner of mischief raised by the mob largely because of their affection for Anasuya Bai and myself. Had the Government in an unwise manner not prevented me from entering Delhi and so compelled me to disobey their orders, I feel certain that Ahmedabad and Viramgaum would have remained free from the horrors of the last week. In other words *Satyagraha* has neither been the cause nor the occasion of the upheaval. If anything, the presence of *Satyagraha* has acted as a check ever so slight upon the perviously existing lawless elements.

As regards events in the Punjab, it is admitted that they are unconnected with the *Satyagraha* movement. In the course of the *Satyagraha* struggle in South Africa several thousands of intentured Indians had struck work. This was *Satyagraha* strike and, therefore, entirely peaceful and voluntary. Whilst the strike was going on, a strike of European miners, railway employees, etc., was declared. Overtures were made to me to make common cause with the European strikers. As a *Satyagrahi* I did not require a moment's consideration to decline to do so. I went further, and for fear of our strike being classed with the

strike of the Europeans in which methods of violence and use of arms found a prominent place ours was suspended and *Satyagraha* from that moment came to be recognised by the Europeans of South Africa as an honourable and honest movement; in the words of General Smuts, a constitutional movement. I can do no less at the present critical moment. I would be untrue to *Satyagraha* if I allowed it by any action of mine to be used as an occasion for feeding violence, for embittering relations between the English and the Indians. Our *Satyagraha* must, therefore, now consist in ceaselessly helping the authorities in all the ways available to us as *Satyagrahis* to restore order and to curb lawlessness. We can turn the tragedies going on before us to good account if we could but succeed in gaining the adherence of the masses to the fundamental principles of *Satyagraha*. *Satyagraha* is like a banian tree with innumerable branches. Civil disobedience is one such branch. *Satya* (truth) and *Ahimsa* (non-violence) together make the parent trunk from which all innumerable branches shoot out. We have found by bitter experience that whilst in an atmosphere of lawlessness civil disobedience found ready acceptance, *Satya* (truth) and *Ahimsa* (non-violence) from which alone civil disobedience can worthily spring, have commanded little or no respect. Ours then is a herculian task, but we may not shirk it. We must fearlessly spread the doctrine of *Satya* and *ahimsa* and then and not till then, shall we be able to undertake mass *Satyagraha*. My attitude towards the Rowlatt legislation remains unchanged. Indeed, I do feel that the Rowlatt legislation is one of the many causes of the present unrest. But in a surcharged atmosphere I must refrain from examining these causes. The main and only purpose of this letter is to advise all *Satyagrahis* to temporarily suspend civil disobedience, to give Government effective co-operation in restoring order and by preaching and practice to gain adherence to the fundamental principles mentioned above.

NON-CO-OPERATION.

THE PUNJAB & KHILAFAT WRONGS

[In a public letter dated the 21st July, 1919, Mr. Gandhi announced that in response to the warnings conveyed to him by the Government of India and H. E. the Governor of Bombay that the resumption of civil disobedience was likely to be attended with serious consequences to public security and in response to the urgent pressure brought on him by Moderate leaders all over the country and some extremist colleagues, he decided not to resume civil resistence fearing a recrudescence of mob violence. But though further resistence was suspended, the course of events inevitably fed the rancour of the people. The disturbances which began in March at Delhi had spread to Lahore and Amritsar by the 10th April, where Martial Law was proclaimed on the 15th. Three other districts subsequently came under the military regime. The tragedy of Jullianwallah Bagh where an unarmed and defenceless crowd were ruthlessly massacred by General Dyer rankled in the minds of the people as an unwarrantable barbarity. Slowly again the cruelties and indignities of the Martial law regime with its crawling orders and thundering sentences for trivial offences, eked out and fed the flames of popular indignation. Meanwhile another specific grievance was added to the already long list. Nearly a year had elapsed since the declaration of Armistice in November 1918 and the treaty with Turkey was yet in the making. British opinion was supposed to be inimical to Turkey and the anxiety of Indian Muslims increased with the delay in the settlement. It was widely feared that the Allies wanted to deal a heavy blow on the suzerainty of the Sultan over Muslim peoples. The dismemberment of the Empire of the Khalifa is a thing unthinkable to the Muslim world. An Indian Khilafat movement was set on foot in which, somewhat to the embarrassment of many, Mr. Gandhi, who was already leading India in the Rowlatt and Punjab agitations, plunged with all the ardour of conviction. Thus the Punjab wrongs and the Khilafat question were the mainstay of a great agitation under the lead of

Mr. Gandhi, assisted by the Congress, the Muslim League, the Khilafat Conference and their many subsidiary organisations all over the country. But the peculiarity of Mr. Gandhi's lead was in his methods which were altogether novel in the history of agitations here or elsewhere. We shall have many occasions to refer to the Non-co-operation movement and his innumerable speeches thereon, but webgin with the cardinal features in Mr. Gandhi's programme, which are fasting, prayer and hartals; Writing on October 4, 1919 in his *Young India*, Mr. Gandhi observed :—]

In spite of the Herculean efforts made by the Punjab Government to crush the spirit of the people, prayer and fasting and *hartal* are institutions as old as the hills and cannot be stopped. Two illuminating abstracts from the bulky volumes published by the Government and containing a record of sentences inflicted by Martial Law Commissions and Summary Courts show although dimly what has happened during the past few months to the people of the Punjab. The leading cases examined by me have shaken my faith in the justice of these sentences. The sentence of stripes is beyond recall as are the 18 death sentences. Who will answer for them if they are proved to have been unjustly pronounced?

But sentences or no sentences, the spirit of the people is unbreakable. The Moslem Conference of Lucknow has proclaimed Friday, the 17th instant, as a day of fasting and prayer. The preliminaries will be presently arranged. The day is to be called the Khalifate day. Mr. Andrews' letter shows clearly what the Khalifate question is and how just is the case of the Muhamedans. He agrees with the suggestion I have ventured to make, *viz.* that, if justice cannot be obtained for Turkey, Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford must resign. But better than resignation, better than protests are the prayers of the just. I therefore welcome the Lucknow resolution. Prayer expresses the soul's

longing and fasting sets the soul free for efficacious prayer. In my opinion a national fast and national prayer should be accompanied by suspension of business. I therefore without hesitation advise suspension of business provided it is carried out with calmness and dignity and provided it is entirely voluntary. Those who are required for necessary work such as hospital, sanitation, off-loading of steamers etc., should not be entitled to suspend work. And I suggest that on this day of fast there are no processions, no meetings. People should remain indoors and devote themselves entirely to prayer.

It goes without saying that it is the bounden duty of the Hindus and other religious denominations to associate themselves with their Muhamedan brethren. It is the surest and simplest method of bringing about the Hindu-Muhamedan unity. It is the privilege of friendship to extend the hand of fellowship and adversity is the crucible in which friendship is tested. Let millions of Hindus show to the Muhomedans that they are one with them in sorrow.

I would respectfully urge the Government to make common cause with the people and encourage and regulate this peaceful exhibition of their feelings. Let the people not think that Government will put any obstacles directly or indirectly in their way.

I would urge the modern generation not to regard fasting and prayer with scepticism or distrust. The greatest teachers of the world have derived extraordinary powers for the good of humanity and attained clarity of vision through fasting and prayer. Much of this discipline runs to waste, because instead of being a matter of the heart, it is often resorted to for stage effect. I would therefore warn the bodies of this movement against any such suicidal manoeu-

vring. Let them have a living faith in what they urge or let them drop it. We are now beginning to attract millions of our countrymen. We shall deserve their curses if we consciously lead them astray. Whether Hindus or Muhamedans, we have all got the religious spirit in us. Let it not be undermined by our playing at religion.

THE AMRITSAR APPEALS.

[Before the end of the year, Indian opinion was greatly exasperated by the evidence of General Dyer and other Martial Law administrators before the Hunter Committee which began the enquiry about the end of October. The evidence of the Military officers shocked the sentiments of the public which were horrified by the revelations of cruelty and heartlessness. When the Congress met at Amritsar, the scene of the tragedy, feeling ran high and the President, Pandit Motilal Nehru, drew up a lengthy indictment against the Government. Just before the day of the session the political prisoners were released as the effect of a Royal Proclamation and Mr. Gandhi exercised a sobering influence over the Congress and even moved a resolution condemning mob excesses though under provocation. But soon after the Congress, when he found that the fate of the other prisoners was decreed by the Privy Council's dismissal of their appeals without further trial, he wrote to the press earnestly urging justice for the victims of Martial Law :—]

So these appeals have been dismissed in spite of the advocacy of the best counsel that were obtainable. The Privy Council has confirmed lawless procedure. I must confess that the judgment does not come upon me quite as a surprise though the remarks of the judges as Sir Simon was developing as arguments on behalf of the appellants, led one to expect a favourable verdict. My opinion based upon a study of political cases is that the judgments even of the highest Tribunals are not unaffected by subtle political

considerations. The most elaborate precautions taken to procure a purely judicial mind must break down at critical moments. The Privy Council cannot be free from the limitations of all human institutions which are good enough only for normal conditions. The consequences of a decision favourable to the people would have exposed the Indian Government to indescribable discredit from which it would have been difficult to free itself for a generation.

Its political significance can be gauged from the fact that, as soon as the news was received in Lahore all the preparations that were made to accord a fitting welcome to Lala Lajpat Rai were immediately cancelled and the capital of the Punjab was reported to be in deep mourning. Deeper discredit, therefore, now attaches to the Government by reason of the judgment, because rightly or wrongly the popular opinion will be that there is no justice under the British constitution when large political or racial considerations are involved.

There is only one way to avoid the catastrophe. The human and especially the Indian mind quickly responds to generosity. I hope that, without the necessity of an agitation or petitions, the Punjab Government or the Central Government will immediately cancel the death sentences and if at all possible, simultaneously set the appellants free.

This is required by two considerations, each equally important. The first is that of restoring public confidence which I have already mentioned. The second is fulfilment of the Royal Proclamation to the letter. That great political document orders the release of all the political offenders who may not by their release prove a danger to society. No one can possibly suggest that the twenty-one appellants will, if they are set free, in any shape or form constitute a

danger to society. They never had committed any crimes before. Most of them were regarded as respectable and orderly citizens. They were not known to belong to any revolutionary society. If they committed any crimes at all, they were committed only under the impulse of the moment and under what to them was grave provocation. Moreover, the public believe that the majority of the convictions by the Martial Law Tribunals were unsupported by any good evidence. I, therefore, hope that the Government, which have so far been doing well in discharging political offenders even when they were caught in the act, will not hesitate to release these appellants, and thus earn the good will of the whole of India. It is an act of generosity done in the hour of triumph which is the most effective. And in the popular opinion this dismissal of the appeal has been regarded as a triumph for the Government.

I would respectfully plead with the Punjab friends not to lose heart. We must calmly prepare ourselves for the worst. If the convictions are good, if the men convicted have been guilty of murders or incitements to murder, why should they escape punishment? If they have not committed these crimes as we believe most at least have not, why should we escape the usual fate of all who are trying to rise a step higher? Why should we fear the sacrifice if we would rise? No nations have ever risen without sacrifice and sacrifice can only be spoken of in connection with innocence and not with crime.

THE KHILAFAT QUESTION.

[In the first week of March, 1920, Mr. Gandhi issued the following manifesto regarding the Khilafat question. In this manifesto Mr. Gandhi enunciated the duty of the Muslims, as indeed of all India in case the agitation should fail to secure the redress of the Khilafat wrong.]

The Khalifat question has now become a question of questions. It has become an imperial question of the first magnitude.

The great prelates of England and the Mohammedan leaders combined have brought the question to the force. The prelates threw down the challenge. The Muslim leaders have taken it up.

I trust the Hindus will realise that the Khilafat question overshadows the Reforms and everything else.

If the Muslim claim was unjust, apart from the Muslim scriptures, one might hesitate to support it merely on scriptural authority. But when a just claim is supported by scriptures it becomes irresistible.

Briefly put the claim is that the Turks should retain European Turkey subject to full guarantees for the protection of non-Muslim races under the Turkish Empire and that the Sultan should control the Holy places of Islam and should have suzerainty over Jazirat-ul-Aras i.e., Arabia as defined by the Moslem savants, subject to self-governing rights being given to the Arabs if they so desire. This was what was promised by Mr. Lloyd George and this was what Lord Hardinge had contemplated. The Mohammedan soldiers would not have fought to deprive Turkey of her possessions. To deprive the Khalif of this suzerainty is to reduce the Khilafat to a nullity.

To restore to Turkey, subject to necessary guarantees, what was hers before war, is a Christian solution. To wrest any of her possessions from her for the sake of punishing her is a gunpowder solution. The Allies or England in the hour of her triumph must be scrupulously just. To reduce the Turks to impotence would be not only unjust, it would be a breach of solemn declarations and promises. It is to be wished that the Viceroy will take his courage in both his hands and place himself at the head of the Khilafat agitation as Lord Hardinge did at the time of the South African "Passive Resistance" struggle and thus like his predecessor give a clear and emphatic direction to an agitation which under impulsive or faulty leadership may lead to disastrous consequences.

But the situation rests more with us, Hindus and Mohammedans, than with the Viceroy and still more with the Moslem leaders than with the Hindus or the Viceroy.

There are signs already of impatience on the part of Muslim friends and impatience may any day be reduced to madness and the latter must inevitably lead to violence. And I wish I could persuade everyone to see that violence is suicide.

Supposing the Muslim demands are not granted by the Allies or say England? I see nothing but hope in Mr. Montagu's brave defence of the Muslim position and Mr. Lloyd George's interpretation of his own declaration. True, the latter is halting but he can secure full justice under it. But we must suppose the worst and expect and strive for the best. How to strive is the question.

What we may not do is clear enough.

(1) There should be no violence in thought, speech or deed.

(2) Therefore there should be no boycott of British goods by way of revenge or punishment. Boycott in my opinion is a form of violence. Moreover even if it were desirable it is totally impracticable.

(3) There should be no rest till the minimum is achieved.

(4) There should be no mixing up of other questions with the Khilafat, e. g., the Egyptian question.

Let us see what must be done:—

(1) The cessation of business on the 19th instant and expression of the minimun demands by means of one single resolution.

This is a necessary first step provided that the "hartal" is absolutely voluntary and the employees are not asked to leave their work unless they receive permission from their employers. I would strongly urge that the mill-hands should be left untouched. The further proviso is that there should be no violence accompanying the "hartal." I have often been told that the C. I. D's sometimes provoke violence. I do not believe in it as a great charge. But even if it be true, our discipline should make it impossible. Our success depends solely on our ability to control, guide and discipline the masses.

Now a word as to what may be done, if the demands are not granted. The barbarous method is warfare open or secret. This must be ruled out if only because it is impracticable. If I could but persuade everyone that it is always bad, we should gain all lawful ends much quicker. The power that an individual or a nation forswearing violence generates, is a power that is irresistible. But my argument to-day against violence is based upon pure expediency.

Non-co-peration is therefore the only remedy left open to us. It is the clearest remedy as it is the most effective,

when it 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 sentiments. England cannot expect a meek submission by us to an unjust usurpation of rights which to Mussalmans means matters of life and death. We may, therefore, begin at the top as also the bottom. Those who are holding offices of honour or emoluments ought to give them up. Those who belong to the menial services under the Government should do likewise. Non-co-operation does not apply to service under private individuals. I cannot approve of the threat of ostracism against those who do not adopt the remedy of Non-co-operation. It is only a voluntary withdrawal which is effective. For, voluntary withdrawal alone is a test of popular feeling and dissatisfaction. Advice to the soldier to refuse to serve is premature. It is the last, not the first step, We should be entitled to take that step when the Viceroy, the Secretary of State and the Premier desert us. Moreover, every step in withdrawing co-operation has to be taken with the greatest deliberation. We must proceed slowly so as to ensure the retention of self-control under the fiercest heat.

Many look upon the Calcutta resolutions with the deepest alarm. They scent in them a preparation for violence. I do not look upon them in that light, though I do not approve of the tone of some of them. I have already mentioned those whose subject matter I dislike.

"Can Hindus accept all the resolutions?" is the question addressed by some. I can only speak for myself. I will co-operate whole-heartedly with the Muslim friends in the prosecution of their just demand so long as they act with sufficient restraint and so long as I feel sure that they do not wish to resort to or countenance violence. I should

cease to co-operate and advice every Hindu and for that matter every one else to cease to co-operate, the moment there was violence actually done, advised or countenanced. I would, therefore, urge upon all speakers the exercise of the greatest restraint under the greatest provocation. There is certainty of victory if firmness is combined with gentleness. The cause is doomed if anger, hatred, ill-will, recklessness, and finally violence are to reign supreme. I shall resist them all my life even if I should alone. My goal is friendship with the world and I can combine the greatest love with the greatest opposition to wrong.

WHY I HAVE JOINED THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT.

[Mr. Gandhi's wholehearted espousal of the Khilafat cause was the subject of considerable discussion in the early stages of the movement. In answer to numerous letters from his countrymen and from abroad, Mr. Gandhi explained in an article in his *Young India*, of April 28, 1920, the reason why he joined the Khilafat movement:—]

An esteemed South African friend who is at present living in England has written to me a letter from which I make the following excerpts :—

" You will doubtless remember having met me in South Africa at the time when the Rev. J. J. Doke was assisting you in your campaign there and I subsequently returned to England deeply impressed with the rightness of your attitude in that country. During the months before war I wrote and lectured and spoke on your behalf in several places which I do not regret. Since returning from military service, however, I have noticed from the papers that you appear to be adopting a more militant attitude.....I notice a report in the *Times* that you are assisting and countenancing a union between the Hindus and Moslems with a view of embarrass

ing England and the Allied Powers in the matter of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire or the ejection of the Turkish Government from Constantinople. Knowing as I do your sense of justice and your humane instincts I feel that I am entitled, in view of the humble part that I have taken to promote your interests on this side, to ask you whether this latter report is correct. I cannot, believe that you have wrongly countenanced a movement to place the cruel and unjust despotism of the Stamboul Government above the interests of humanity, for if any country has crippled these interests in the East it has surely been Turkey. I am personally familiar with the conditions in Syria and Armenia and I can only suppose that if the report which the *Times* has published is correct, you have thrown to one side, your moral responsibilities and allied yourself with one of the prevailing anarchies. However, until I hear that this is not your attitude, I cannot prejudice my mind. Perhaps you will do me the favour of sending me a reply."

I have sent a reply to the writer. But as the views expressed in the quotation are likely to be shared by many of my English friends and as I do not wish, if I can possibly help it, to forefeit their friendship or their esteem, I shall endeavour to state my position as clearly as I can on the Khilafat question. The letter shows what risk public men run through irresponsible journalism. I have not seen the *Times* report referred to by my friend. But it is evident that the report has made the writer to suspect my alliance with "the prevailing anarchies" and to think that I have "thrown to one side" my "moral responsibilities."

It is just my sense of moral responsibilities which has made me take up the Khilafat question and to identify myself entirely with the Mahomedans. It is perfectly true that I am assisting and countenancing the union between Hindus and Muslims, but certainly not with "a view of embarrassing England and the Allied Powers in the matter of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire." It is contrary to my creed to embarrass governments or anybody else.

This does not however mean that certain acts of mine may not result in embarrassment. But I should not hold myself responsible for having caused embarrassment when I resist the wrong of a wrong-doer by refusing assistance in his wrong-doing. On the Khilafat question I refuse to be party to a broken pledge. Mr. Lloyd George's solemn declaration is practically the whole of the case for Indian Mahomedans and when that case is fortified by scriptural authority it becomes unanswerable. Moreover, it is incorrect to say that I have "allied myself to one of the prevailing anarchies" or that I have "wrongly countenanced the movement to place the cruel and unjust despotism of the Stamboul Government above the interests of humanity." In the whole of the Mahomedan demand there is no insistance on the retention of the so-called unjust despotism of the Stamboul Government; on the contrary the Mahomedans have accepted the principle of taking full guarantees from that Government for the protection of non-Muslim minorities. I do not know how far the condition of Armenia and Syria may be considered as anarchy, and how far the Turkish Government may be held responsible for it. I much suspect that the reports from these quarters are much exaggerated and that the European powers are themselves in a measure responsible for what misrule there may be in Armenia and Syria. But I am in no way interested in supporting Turkish or any other anarchy. The Allied Powers can easily prevent it by means other than that of ending Turkish rule or dismembering and weakening the Ottoman Empire. The Allied Powers are not dealing with a new situation. If Turkey was to be partitioned, the position should have been made clear at the commencement of the war. There would then have been no question of a broken pledge. As it is, no Indian

Mahomedan has any regard for the promises of British Ministers. In his opinion, the cry against Turkey is that of Christianity *vs.* Islam with England as the leader in the cry. The latest cablegram from Mr. Mahomed Ali strengthens the impression, for he says that unlike as in England his deputation is receiving much support from the French Government and the people.

Thus, if it is true, as I hold it is true that the Indian Mussalmans have a cause that is just and is supported by scriptural authority, then for the Hindus not to support them to the utmost would be a cowardly breach of brotherhood and they would forfeit all claim to consideration from their Mahomedan countrymen. As a public-server, therefore, I would be unworthy of the position I claim, if I did not support Indian Mussalmans in their struggle to maintain the Khilafat in accordance with their religious belief. I believe that in supporting them I am rendering a service to the Empire, because by assisting my Mahomedan countrymen to give a disciplined expression to their sentiment, it becomes possible to make the agitation thoroughly orderly and even successful.

CONGRESS REPORT ON THE PUNJAB DISORDERS.

[The Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Sub-Committee of the Congress in Nov. 1919 to enquire into the Punjab disorders together with the evidence taken by them was published in May 1920. The Report was signed by M. K. Gandhi, C. R. Das, Abbas Tyabji and M.R. Jayakar who had examined over 1,700 cases and selected about 650 statements for publication. The inclusion of Mr. Gandhi's name among the Commissioners was accepted by all as a guarantee for accuracy. The report bears the impress of Mr

Gandhi's hands and though it was the joint production of all the Commissioners it was at once conceded that Mr.Gandhi's share alike in the examination and sifting of evidence and in drawing the conclusions was considerable. As Mr. Gandhi has stood by the findings of his committee we may here reproduce the more important portions of the Report.]

We have been obliged in places to use strong language, but we have used every adjective with due deliberation. If anything, we have understated the case against the Punjab Government. We recognise we have not right to expect an impossible standard of correctness from the Government. In times of excitement and difficulty, any officer is prone to make mistakes in spite of best intentions. We recognise, too, that when the country is on the eve of important changes being introduced in the administration, and the Sovereign has made an appeal to officials and the people for co-operation, we should say nothing that may be calculated to retard progress.

But we feel that it is not possible to ignore the acts of atrocious injustice on a wholesale scale by responsible officers, as it would not be possible, no matter how bright the future might be, to ignore criminal acts of the people. In our opinion, it is more necessary now than ever before, that official wrong should be purged as well as the peoples. The task of working the reforms and making India realise her goal in the quickest time possible would well nigh be impossible if both the people and the officials did not approach it with clean hands and clean minds. If, therefore, we recommend that the officials who have erred should be brought to justice, we do so, not in a vindictive spirit, but in order that the administration of the country may become purified of corruption and injustice. Whilst therefore, we believe that the mob excesses in Amritsar and elsewhere

were wrong and deserving of condemnation, we are equally sure the popular misdeeds have been more than punished by the action of the authorities.

We believe, had Mr. Gandhi not been arrested whilst he he was on his way to Delhi and the Punjab and had Kitchlew and Satyapal not been arrested and deported, innocent English lives would have been saved and valuable property, including Christian churches, not destroyed. These two acts of the Punjab Government were uncalled for and served like matches applied to material rendered inflammable by previous processes.

In examining in detail the events in different districts of the Punjab, we have refrained from saying anything regarding the Government of India. It is impossible, however, to ignore or slur over the inaction, if not active participations of the Central Government in official action. The Viceroy never took the trouble to examine the people's case. He ignored the telegrams and letters from individuals and public bodies. He endorsed the action of the Punjab Government without enquiry, and clothed the officials with indemnityin indecent haste. He never went to the Punjab to make a personal enquiry, even after the occurrences. He ought to have known, at least in May, everything that various official witnesses have admitted, and yet he failed to inform the public or the Imperial Government of the full nature of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre or the subsequent acts done under Martial law. He became a party to preventing even a noble and well-known English Christian of unimpeachable veracity, in the person of Mr. Andrews, from proceeding to the Punjab whilst he was on his way, not to inflame passions, but simply to find out the truth. He allowed Mr. Thompson, Chief Secretary, Punjab Government, to indulge in distortion of facts and to insult Pundit Madan

Mohan Malaviya whose statements made in the Council have almost all now been proved to be true out of the mouths of official witnesses themselves. He expressed such a callous indifference to popular feelings and betrayed such criminal want of imagination that he would not postpone death sentences pronounced by the Martial Law tribunal, except after he was forced to do so by the Secretary of State for India. He seems to have closed his heart against further light by shutting out questions by a responsible member of the Council like Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya. He would not visit the Punjab for local inquiry. We refrain from criticising his attitude over the Rowlatt agitation. But a sense of public safety forbids us to ignore His Excellency's inability to appreciate and deal with the situation in April. Whilst, therefore, we do not think His Excellency has wilfully neglected the interests of those who were entrusted to his charge by His Majesty, we regret to say that H. E. Lord Chelmsford has proved himself incapable of holding the high office to which he was called, and we are of opinion that His Excellency should be re-called.

We summarise below our other conclusions:—

The people of the Punjab were incensed against Sir M. O'Dwyer's administration by reason of his studied contempt and distrust of the educated classes, and by the reason of the cruel and compulsory methods adopted during the war for obtaining recruits and monetary contributions and by his suppression of public opinion, by gagging the local press and shutting out Nationalist newspapers from outside the Punjab.

The Rowlatt agitation disturbed the public mind and shocked confidence in the goodwill of the Government. This was shared by the Punjab in a fuller measure, perhaps, than elsewhere, because of the use made by Sir Michael

O'Dwyer of the Defence of India Act for purposes of stifling public movements.

The Satyagraha movement and hartal, which was designed as a precursor of it, whilst they vitalised the whole country into activity, saved it from more awful and more widespread calamities by restraining violent tendencies and passions of the people.

The Rowlatt agitation was not conceived in an anti-British spirit and the Satyagraha movement was conceived and conducted in a spirit entirely free from ill-will and violence. There was no conspiracy to overthrow the Government in the Punjab.

The arrest and internment of Mr. Gandhi and the arrests and deportations of Kitchlew and Satyapal were unjustifiable and were the only direct cause of the hysterical popular excitement.

Mob violence, which began at Amritsar, was directly due to the firing at the Railway overbridge and the sight of dead and wounded, at a time when the excitement had reached white heat.

Whatever the cause of provocation, the mobe excesses are deeply to be regretted and condemned.

So far as the facts are publicly known, no reasobable cause has been shown to justify the introduction of martial law.

In each case martial law was proclaimed after order had been completely restored.

Even if it be held that the introduction of martial law was a State necessity, it was unduly prolonged.

Most of the measures taken under martial law in all the five districts were unnecessary, cruel, oppressive and in utter disregard of the feelings of the people affected by them.

In Lahore, Akalgrah, Ramnagar, Gujerat, Jaillalpur, Jattan, Lyallpur and Sheikhupura, there were no mob excesses worthy of the name.

The Jallianwalla Bagh massacre was calculated piece of inhumanity towards utterly innocent and unarmed men including children, and unparralleled for its ferocity in the history of modern British administration.

Martial law tribunals and summary courts were made the means of harassing innocent people and resulted in an abortion of justice on a wide scale, and under the name of justice caused moral and material suffering to hundreds of men and women.

The crawling order and other fancy punishments were unworthy of a civilized administration, and were symptomatic of the moral degradation of their inventors.

The imposition of indemnity and of punitive police at various places, notwithstanding the exemplary and vindictive punishments meted out through nearly two long months to innocent men and the exaction of fines and illegal impositions, were uncalled for, unjust and added injury.

The corruption and bribery that took place during martial law form a separate chapter of grievance which could have been easily avoided under a sympathetic administration.

The measures necessary for redressing the wrong done to the people for the purification of the administration and for preventing repetition in future of official lawlessness are —(a) The repeal of the Rowlatt Act, (b) Relieving Sir Michael O'Dwyer of any responsible office under the crown (c) Relieving General Dyer, Colonel Johnson, Colonel O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Sri Ram Sud and Malik Sahib Khan of any position of responsibility under the Crown (b) Local inquiry into the corrupt practices of minor officials, whose

names have been mentioned in the statements published by us and their dismissal, on proof of their guilt. (e) Recall of the Viceroy, (f) Refund of fines collected from the people who were convicted by special tribunals and summary courts, remission of all indemnity imposed on the cities affected and refund thereof where it has already been collected, and the removal of punitive police.

It is our deliberate opinion that Sir Michæl O'Dwyer, General Dyer, Colonel Johnson, Colonel O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Sri Ram Sud and Malik Sahib Khan have been guilty of such illegalities that they deserve to be impeached, but we purposely refrain from advising any such course, because we believe India can only gain by waiving this right. Future purity will be sufficiently guaranteed by the dismissal of the officials concerned.

We believe Colonel Macræ and Captain Doveton have failed equally with Colonel O'Brien and others to carry out their trust, but we have purposely refrained from advising any public action against them, as, unlike others mentioned by us, these two officers were inexperienced and their brutality was not so studied and calculated as that of experienced officers.

THE PUNJAB DISORDER: A PERSONAL STATEMENT.

[The Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-Committee of the Indian National Congress contains a special note on Satyagraha from the pen of Mr. M. K. Gandhi. The Commissioners discuss how far Satyagraha was responsible for violent excesses in the Punjab. Mr. Gandhi, as the pioneer and the supreme exponent of the movement, here expounds the methods and the efficacy of "The Law of Love" as the governing law of life, as much

in the home as in the broader and more complex relations of national and international affairs :—]

For the past thirty years I have been preaching and practising Satyagraha. The principles of "Satyagraha," as I know it to-day, constitute a gradual evolution.

The term 'Satyagraha' was coined by me in South Africa to express the force that the Indians there used for full eight years, and it was coined in order to distinguish it from the movement, then going on in the United Kingdom and South Africa under the name of Passive Resistance.

Its root meaning is 'holding on to truth'; hence, Truth-force I have also called it Love-force or Soul-force. In the application of "Satyagraha" I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For what appears to be truth to the one may appear to be error to the other. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of truth not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but one's own self.

"Satyagraha" differs from Passive Resistance as the North Pole from the South. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end ; whereas the former has been conceived as a weapon of the strongest and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form.

When Daniel disregarded the laws of the Medes and Persians which offended his conscience and meekly suffered the punishment for his disobedience, he offered 'Satyagraha' in its purest form. Socrates would not refrain from preaching what he knew to be the truth to the Athenian youth, and bravely suffered the punishment of death. He

was, in this case, a 'Satyagrahi.' Prahlad disregarded the orders of his father because he considered them to be repugnant to his conscience. He uncomplainingly and cheerfully bore the tortures to which he was subjected at the instance of his father. Mirabai, who is said to have offended her husband by following her own conscience, was content to live in separation from him and bore with quiet dignity and resignation all the injuries that are said to have been done to her in order to bend her to her husband's will. Both Prahlad and Mirabai practised "Satyagraha." It must be remembered, that neither Daniel nor Socrates, neither Prahlad nor Mirabai had any ill-will to-wards their prosecutors. Daniel and Socrates are regarded as having been model citizens of the States to which they belonged, Prahlad a model son, Mirabai a model wife.

This doctrine of 'Satyagraha' is not new ; it is merely an extension of the rule of domestic life to the political. Family disputes and differences are generally settled according to the law of love. The injured member has so much regard for the others that he suffers injury for the sake of his principles without retaliating and without being angry with those who differ from him. And as repression of anger, self-suffering are difficult processes, he does not dignify trifles into principles, but, in all non-essentials, readily agrees with the rest of the family, and thus contrives to gain the maximum of peace for himself without disturbing that of the others. Thus his action, whether he resists or resigns, is always calculated to promote the common welfare of the family. It is this law of love which, silently but surely, governs the family for the most part throughout the civilized world.

I feel that nations cannot be one in reality nor can their activities be conducive to the common good of the

whole humanity, unless there is this definite recognition and acceptance of the law of the family in national and international affairs, in other words, on the political platform. Nations can be called civilized, only to the extent that they obey this law.

This law of love is nothing but a law of truth. Without truth there is no love ; without truth it may be affection, as for one's country to the injury of others ; or infatuation, as of a young man for a girl ; or love may be unreasoning and blind, as of ignorant parents for their children. Love transcends all animality and is never partial. 'Satyagraha' has, therefore, been described as a coin, on whose face you read love and on the reverse you read truth. It is a coin current everywhere and has indefinable value.

' Satyagraha' is self-dependent. It does not require the assent of the opponent before it can be brought into play. Indeed it shines out most when the opponent resists. It is, therefore, irresistible. A 'Satyagrahi' does not know what defeat is, for he fights for truth without being exhausted. Death in the fight is a deliverance, and prison, a gateway to liberty.

It is called also soul-force, because a definite recognition of the soul within is a necessity, if a ' Satyagrahi' is to believe that death does not mean cessation of the struggle, but a culmination. The body is merely a vehicle for self-expression ; and he gladly gives up the body, when its existence is an obstruction in the way of the opponent seeing the truth, for which the ' Satyagrahi' stands. He gives up the body in the certain faith that, if anything would change his opponent's view, a willing sacrifice of his body must do so. And with the knowledge that the soul survives the body, he is not impatient to see the triumph of truth in the present body. Indeed, victory lies in the

ability to die in the attempt to make the opponent see the truth which the 'Satyagrahi' for the time being expresses.

And as a 'Satyagrahi' never injures his opponent and always appeals, either to his reason by gentle argument, or his heart by the sacrifice of self, 'Satyagraha' is twice blessed, it blesses him who practises it, and him against whom it is practised.

It has, however, been objected that 'Satyagraha,' as we conceive it, can be practised only by a select few. My experience proves the contrary. Once its simple principles—adherence to truth and insistence upon it by self-suffering—are understood, anybody can practise it. It is as difficult or as easy to practise as any other virtue. It is as little necessary for its practice that everyone should understand the whole philosophy of it, as it is for the practice of total abstinence.

After all, no one disputes the necessity of insisting on truth as one sees it. And it is easy enough to understand that it is vulgar to attempt to compel the opponent to its acceptance by using brute force; it is discreditable to submit to error because argument has failed to convince, and that the only true and honourable course is not to submit to it even at the cost of one's life. Then only can the world be purged of error, if it ever can be altogether. There can be no compromise with error where it hurts the vital being.

But, on the political field, the struggle on behalf of the people mostly consists in opposing error in the shape of unjust laws. When you have failed to bring the error home to the lawgiver by way of petitions and the like, the only remedy open to you, if you do not wish to submit to it, is to compel him to retrace his steps by suffering in your own person, *i.e.*, that is by inviting the penalty for the

breach of the law. Hence, ' Satyagraha' largely appears to the public as civil disobedience or civil resistance. It is civil in the sense that it is not criminal.

The criminal, *i e.* the ordinary law-breaker bre aks the law surreptitiously and tries to void the penalty ; not so the civil resister. He ever obeys the laws of the State to which he belongs, not out of fear of the sanctions, but because he considers them to be good for the welfare of society. But there come occasions, generally rare, when he considers certain laws to be so unjust as to render obedience to them a dishonour, he then openly and civilly br eaks them and quietly suffers the penalty for their breach And in order to register his protest against the action of the lawgiver, it is open to him to withdraw his co-operation from the State by disobeying such other laws whose breach does not invole moral turpitude. In my opinion, the beauty and efficacy of ' Satyagraha' are so great and the doctrine so simple that it can be preached even to children. It was preached by me to thousands of men, women and children, commonly callled indentured Indians, with excellent results.

ROWLATT BILLS.

When the Rowlatt Bills were published I felt that they were so restrictive of human liberty that they must be resisted to the utmost. I observed, too, that the opposition to them was universal among Indians. I submit that no State, however despotic, has the right to enact laws wh i ch are repuguant to the whole body of the people, much less a government guided by constitutional usage and precedent, such as the Indian Government. I felt, too, that the oncoming agitation needed a definite direction if it was neither to collapse nor to run into violent channels.

I ventured therefore to present Satyagraha to the country, emphasising its civil resistance aspect. And as it is

purely an inward and purifying tonic I suggested the observance of fast, prayer and suspension of all work for one day, April 6. There was a magnificent response throughout the length and breadth of India, even in little villages, although there was no organisation and no great previous preparation. The idea was given to the public as soon as it was conceived. On April 6 there was no violence used by the people and no collision with the police worth naming. The hartal was purely voluntary and spontaneous.

THE "ARREST."

The observance of April 6 was to be followed by civil disobedience. For that purpose the Committee of the Satyagraha Sabha had selected certain laws for disobedience. And we commenced the distribution of prohibited literature of a perfectly healthy type, *e.g.*, a pamphlet written by me on Home Rule, a translation of Ruskin's "Unto this Last," and "Defence and Death of Socrates."

But there is no doubt that April 6 found India vitalised as never before. The people who were fear-stricken ceased to fear authority. Moreover, hitherto, the masses had lain inert. The leaders had not really acted upon them. They were undisciplined. They had found a new force, but they did not know what it was and how to use it.

At Delhi the leaders found it difficult to restrain the very large number of people who had remained unmoved before. At Amritsar Mr. Satyapal was anxious that I should go there and show to the people the peaceful nature of Satyagraha. Swami Shraddhanandji from Delhi and Dr. Satyapal from Amritsar wrote to me asking me to go to their respective places for pacifying the people and for explaining to them the nature of Satyagraha. I had never been to Amritsar, and for that matter to the Punjab, before. These two messages were seen by the authorities and they

knew that I was invited to both the places for peaceful purposes.

I left Bombay for Delhi and the Punjab on April 8 and had telegraphed to Dr. Satyapal, whom I had never met before, to meet me at Delhi. But after passing Muttra I was served with an order prohibiting me from entering the province of Delhi. I felt that I was bound to disregard this order, and I proceeded on my journey. At Palwal I was served with an order prohibiting me from entering the Punjab and confine me to the Bombay Presidency. And I was arrested by a party of police and taken off the train at that station. The Superintendent of the Police who arrested me acted with every courtesy. I was taken to Muttra by the first available train and thence by goods train early in the morning to Siwai Madhupur, where I joined the Bombay mail from Peshawar and was taken charge of by Superintendent Bowring. I was discharged at Bombay on April 10.

But the people at Ahmedabad and Viramgaum and in Gujerat generally had heard of my arrest. They became furious, shops were closed, crowds gathered, and murder, arson, pillage, wire-cutting, and attempt at derailment followed.

HOW TO WORK NON-CO-OPERATION.

[Mr. Gandhi wrote the following article in *Young India*, May, 5, 1920:—]

Perhaps the best way of answering the fears and criticism as to non-co-operation is to elaborate more fully the scheme of non-co-operation. The critics seem to imagine that the organisers propose to give effect to the whole scheme at once. The fact however is that the organisers

have fixed definite, progressive four stages. The first is the giving up of titles and resignation of honorary posts. If there is no response or if the response received is not effective, recourse will be had to the second stage. The second stage involves much previous arrangement. Certainly not a single servant will be called out unless he is either capable of supporting himself and his dependants or the Khilafat Committee is able to bear the burden. All the classes of servants will not be called out at once and never will any pressure be put upon a single servant to withdraw himself from the Government service. Nor will a single private employee be touched for the simple reason that the movement is not anti-English. It is not even anti-Government. Co-operation is to be withdrawn because the people must not be party to a wrong—a broken pledge—a violation of a deep religious sentiment. Naturally, the movement will receive a check, if there is any undue influence brought to bear upon any Government servant or if any violence is used or countenanced by any member of the Khilafat Committee. The second stage must be entirely successful, if the response is at all on an adequate scale. For no Government —much less the Indian Government—can subsist if the people cease to serve it. The withdrawal therefore of the police and the military—the third stage—is a distant goal. The organisers however wanted to be fair, open and above suspicion. They did not want to keep back from their Government or the public a single step they had in contemplation even as a remote contigency. The fourth *i. e.* suspension of taxes is still more remote. The organisers recognise that suspension of general taxation is fraught with the greatest danger. It is likely to bring sensitive classes in conflict with the police. They are therefore not likely to embark upon it, unless they can do so with the

assurance that there will be no violence offered by the people.

I admit, as I have already done, that non-co-operation is not unattended with risk, but the risk of supineness in the face of a grave issue is infinitely greater than the danger of violence ensuing from organizing non-co-operation. To do nothing is to invite violence for a certainty.

It is easy enough to pass resolutions or write articles condemning non-co-operation. But it is no easy task to restrain the fury of a people incensed by a deep sense of wrong. I urge those who talk or work against non-co-operation to descend from their chairs and go down to the people, learn their feelings and write, if they have the heart, against non-co-operation. They will find, as I have found, that the only way to avoid violence is to enable them to give such expression to their feelings as to compel redress. I have found nothing save non-co-operation. It is logical and harmless. It is the inherent right of a subject to refuse to assist a Government that will not listen to him.

Non-co-operation as a voluntary movement can only succeed, if the feeling is genuine and strong enough to make people suffer to the utmost. If the religious sentiment of the Mahomedans is deeply hurt and if the Hindus entertain neighbourly regard towards their Muslim brethren, they will both count no cost too great for achieving the end. Non-co-operation will not only be an effective remedy, but will also be an effective test of the sincerity of the Muslim claim and the Hindu profession of friendship.

There is however one formidable argument urged by friends against my joining the Khilafat movement. They say that it ill becomes me, a friend of the English and an admirer of the British constitution, to join hands with those who are to-day filled with nothing but illwill against the

English. I am sorry to have to confess that the ordinary Mohamedan entertains to-day no affection for Englishmen. He considers, not without some cause, that they have not played the game. But if I am friendly towards Englishmen, I am no less so towards my countrymen, the Mohomedans. And as such they have a greater claim upon my attention than Englishmen. My personal religion however enables me to serve my countrymen without hurting Englishmen or for that matter anybody else. What I am not prepared to do to my blood brother I would not do to an Englishmen. I would not injure him to gain a kingdom. But I would withdraw co-operation from him if it became necessary, as I had withdrawn from my own brother (now deceased) when it became necessary. I serve the Empire by refusing to partake in its wrong. William Stead offered public prayers for British reverses at the time of the Boer war because he considered that the nation to which he belonged was engaged in an unrighteours war. The present Prime Minister risked his life in opposing that war and did everything he could to obstruct his own Government in its prosecution. And to-day if I have thrown in my lot with the Mohomedans a large number of whom bear no friendly feelings towards the British, I have done so frankly as a friend of the British and with the object of gaining justice and of thereby showing the capacity of the British constitution to respond to every honest determination when it is coupled with suffering. I hope by my 'alliance' with the Mohomedans to achieve a three-fold end—to obtain justice in the face of odds with the method of Satyagraha and to show its efficacy over all other methods, to secure Muhomedan friendship for the Hindus and thereby internal peace also, and last but not least to transform ill-will into affection for the British and their constitution which in spite of its imperfections has

weathered many a storm. I may fail in achieving any of the ends. I can but attempt. God alone can grant success. It will not be denied that the ends are all worthy. I invite Hindus and Englishmen to join me in a full-hearted manner in shouldering the burden the Mahomedans of India are carrying. Their is admittedly a just fight. The Viceroy, the Secretary of State, the Maharaja of Bikaner and Lord Sinha have testified to it. Time has arrived to make good the testimony. People with a just cause are never satisfied with a mere protest. They have been known to die for it. Are a high-spirited people, the Mahomedans, expected to do less?

OPEN LETTER TO LORD CHELMSFORD.

[The Turkish Peace Treaty was handed to the Ottoman Delegation on the 11th May 1920 at Paris and the terms of that treaty were published in India on the 14th with a message from H. E. the Viceroy to the Muslim people of India. According to the proposals Turkey was to be dismembered and Constantinople alone was saved for the Sultan to whom only a fringe of territory was conceded for the defence of his Capital. The actual terms were a total violation of the promises (Lloyd George's pledge) not to deprive Turkey "of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace." In reply to the Viceroy's massage of sympathy, Mr. Gandhi invited His Excellency to lead the agitation:—]

Your Excellency, As one who has enjoyed a certain measure of your Excellency's confidence and as one who claims to be a devoted well-wisher of the British Empire, I owe it to your Excellency, and through your Excellency to His Majesty's ministers, to explain my connection with and my conduct in the Khilafat question.

At the very earliest stage of the war, even while I was in London organising the Indian Volunteer Ambulance

Corps, I began to interest myself in the Khilafat question. I perceived how deeply moved the Mussalman world in London was, when Turkey decided to throw in her lot with Germany. On my arrival in January of 1915 I found the same anxiousness and earnestness among the Mussalmans with whom I came in contact. Their anxiety became intense when the information about the secret treaties leaked out. Distrust of British intentions filled their minds and despair took possession of them. Even at that moment I advised my Mussalman friends not to give way to despair but to express their fears and their hopes in a disciplined manner. It will be admitted that the whole of the Mussalman India has behaved in a singularly restrained manner during the past five years and that the leaders have been able to keep the turbulent sections of their community under complete control.

MOSLEMS SHOCKED.

The peace terms and your Excellency's defence of them have given the Mussalmans of India a shock from which it will be difficult for them to recover. The terms violate the ministerial pledges and utterly disregard Mussalman sentiment. I consider that, as a staunch Hindu wishing to live on terms of the closest friendship with my Mussalman countrymen, I should be an unworthy son of India if I did not stand by them in their hour of trial. In my humble opinion, their cause is just. They claim that Turkey must not be punished, if their sentiment is to be respected. Muslim soldiers did not fight to inflict punishment on their own Khalifa or to deprive him of his territories. The Mussalman attitude has been consistent throughout these five years.

My duty to the Empire to which I owe my loyalty requires me to resist the cruel violence that has been done

to the Mussalman sentiment so far as I am aware. Mussalman and Hindus have, as a whole, lost faith in British justice and honour. The report of the majority of the Hunter Committee, your Excellency's despatch thereon and Mr. Montagu's reply have only aggravated the distrust.

THE ONLY COURSE.

In these circumstances the only course open to one like me is either in despair to sever all connection with British rule or, if I still retained faith in the inherent superiority of the British constitution to all others at present in vogue, to adopt such means as will rectify the wrong done and thus restore confidence. I have not lost faith in such superiority and I am not without hope that somehow or other justice will yet be rendered, if we show the requisite capacity for suffering. Indeed my conception of that constitution is that it helps only those who are ready to help themselves. I don't believe that it protects the weak. It gives free scope to the strong to maintain their strength and develop it. The weak under it go to the wall.

It is then,because I believe in the British constitution,that I have advised my Mussalman friends to withdraw their support from your Excellency's Government and the Hindus to join them should the peace terms not be revised in accordance with the solemen pledges of ministers and the Muslim sentiment.Three courses were open to the Mahommedans in order to mark their emphatic disapproval of the utter injustice to which His Majesty's ministers have become a party, if they have not actually been the prime perpetrators of it. They are:

1. To resort to violence.
2. To advise emigration on a wholesale scale.
3. Not to be a party to the injustice by ceasing to co-operate with the Government.

NON-CO-OPERATION.

Your Excellency must be aware that there was a time when the boldest, though also the most thoughtless among the Mussalmans favoured violence and that Hijrat (emigration) has not yet ceased to be the battle-cry. I venture to claim that I have succeeded by patient reasoning in weaning the party of violence from its ways. I confees that I did not—I did not attempt to—succeed in weaning them violence on moral grounds but purely on utilitarian grounds. The result for the time being at any rate has however been to stop violence. The school of Hijrat has received a check if it has not stopped its activity entirely. I hold that no repression could have prevented a violent erruption, if the people had not presented to them a form of direct action involving considerable sacrifice and ensuring success if such direct action was largely taken up by the public. Non-co-operation was the only dignified and constitutional form of such direct action. For it is the right recognised from times immemorial of the subject to refuse to assist a ruler who misrules.

At the same time I admit that non-co-operation practised by the mass of people is attended with grave risks. But in a crisis such as has overtaken the Mussalmans of India, no step that is unattended with large risks can possibly bring about the desired change. Not to run some risks will be to court much greater risks, if not virtual destruction of law and order.

But there is yet an escape from non-co-operation. The Mussalman representation has requested your Excellency to lead the agitation yourself as did your distinguished predecessor at the time of the South African trouble. But if you cannot see your way to do so, non-co-operation becomes a dire necessity. I hope your Excellency will give those who

have accepted my advice and myself the credit for being actuated by nothing less than a stern sense of duty.

I have the honour to remain,
Your Excellency's obdt. servant,
(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

Laburnum Road,
Gamdevi, Bombay.
22nd June 1920.

POLITICAL FREEMASONRY.

[The Report of the Hunter Committee together with the Government of India's Despatch was published on the 3rd May, 1920, and the Secretary of State's reply followed on the 26th. As was expected the Indian members of the Committee submitted a separate Report, the Hon. Mr. Shafi writing a strong dissenting minute to the Government of India's despatch. Mr. Montagu in his Despatch comdemned the severity of the martial law administration and the excesses of Gen Dyer's action at Jullianwallah Bagh and laid down in unmistakable terms the principle which ought to govern the policy of His Majesty's Government in similar cases in the future. Mr. Gandhi, disappointed at and stung by the injustice of the Government threw out the challenge that "a scandal of this magnitude cannot be tolerated by the nation, if it is to preserve its self-respect and become a free partner in the Empire." He wrote in *Young India*, dated the 9th June, 1920:—]

Freemasonry is a secret brotherhood which has, more by its secret and iron rules than by its service to humanity, obtained a hold upon some of the best minds. Similarly there seems to be some secret code of conduct governing the official class in India before which the flower of the great British nation fall prostrate and unconsciously become instruments of injustice which as private individuals they would be ashamed of perpetrating. In no other way is it possible for one to understand the majority report of the Hunter Committee, the despatch of the Government of

India and the reply thereto of the Secretary of State for India. In spite of the energetic protests of a section of the Press to the personnel of the committee, it might be said that on the whole the public were prepared to trust it especially as it contained three Indian members who could fairly be claimed to be independent. The first rude shock to this confidence was delivered by the refusal of Lord Hunter's Committee to accept the very moderate and reasonable demand of the Congress Committe that the imprisoned Punjab leaders might be be allowed to appear before it to instruct counsel. Any doubt that might have been left in the mind of any person has been dispelled by the report of the majority of that committee. The result has justified the attitude of the Congress Commitee. The evidence collected by it shows what Lord Hunter's Committee purposely denied itself.

The minority report stands out like an oasis in a desert. The Indian members deserve the congratulation of their countrymen for having dared to do their duty in the face of heavy odds. I wish that they had refused to associate themselves even in a modified manner with the condemnation of the civil disobedience form of Satyagraha. The defiant spirit of the Delhi mob on the 30th March, 1919, can hardly be used for condemning a great spiritual movement which is admittedly and manifestly intended to restrain the violent tendencies of mobs and to replace criminal lawlessness by civil disobedience of authority, when it has forfeited all title to respect. On the 30th March civil disobedience had not even been started. Almost every great popular demonstration has been hitherto attended all the world over by a certain amount of lawlessness. The demonstration of 30th March and 6th April could have been held under any other aegis as under that of Satyagrah. I

hold that, without the advent of the spirit of civility and orderliness, the disobedience would have taken a much more violent form than it did even at Delhi. It was only the wonderfully quick acceptance by the people of the principle of Satyagrah that effectively checked the spread of violence throughout the length and breadth of India. And even to-day it is not the memory of the black barbarity of General Dyer that is keeping the undoubted restlessness among the people from breaking forth into violence. The hold that Satyagrah has gained on the people—it may be even against their will—is curbing the forces of disorder and violence. But I must not detain the reader on a defence of Satyagrah against unjust attacks. If it has gained a foothold in India, it will survive much fiercer attacks than the one made by the majority of the Hunter Committee and somewhat supported by the minority. Had the majority report been defective only in this direction and correct in every other there would have been nothing but praise for it. After all Satyagrah is a new experiment in political field. And a hasty attributing to it of any popular disorder would have been pardonable.

The universally pronounced adverse judgment upon the report and the despatches rests upon far more painful revelations. Look at the manifestly laboured defence of every official act of inhumanity except where condemnation could not be avoided through the impudent admissions made by the actors themselves; look at the special pleading introduced to defend General Dyer even against himself; look at the vain glorification of Sir Michael O'Dwyer although it was his spirit that actuated every act of criminality on the part of the subordinates; look at the deliberate refusal to examine his wild career before the events of April. His acts were an open book of which the committee ought to

have taken judicial notice. Instead of accepting everything that the officials had to say, the Committee's obvious duty was to tax itself to find out the real cause of the disorders. It ought to have gone out of its way to search out the inwardness of the events. Instead of patiently going behind the hard crust of official documents, the Commitee allowed itself to be guided with criminal laziness by mere official evidence. The report and the despatches, in my humble opinion, constitute an attempt to condone official lawlessness. The cautious and half-hearted condemnation pronounced upon General Dyer's massacre and the notorious crawling order only deepens the disappointment of the reader as he goes through page after page of thinly disguised official whitewash. I need, however, scarcely attempt any elaborate exmamination of the report or the despatches which have been so justly censured by the whole national press whether of the moderate or the extremist hue. The point to consider is how to break down this secret—be the secrecy ever so unconscious—conspiracy to uphold official iniquity. A scandal of this magnitude cannot be tolerated by the nation, if it is to preserve its self-respect and become a free partner in the Empire. The All-India Congress Committee has resolved upon convening a special session of the Congress for the purpose of considering, among other things, the situation arising from the report. In my opinion the time has arrived when we must cease to rely upon mere petition to Parliament for effective action. Petitions will have value, when the nation has behind it the power to enforce its will. What power then have we? When we are firmly of opinion that grave wrong has been done us and when after an appeal to the highest authority we fail to secure redress, there must be some power available to us for undoing the wrong. It is true that in the

vast majority of cases it is the duty of a subject to submit to wrongs on failure of the usual procedure, so long as they do not affect his vital being. But every nation and every individual has the right and it is their duty, to rise against an intolerable wrong. I do not believe in armed risings. They are a remedy worse than the disease sought to be cured. They are a token of the spirit of revenge and impatience and anger. The method of violence cannot do good in the long run. Witness the effect of the armed rising of the allied powers against Germany. Have they not become even like the Germans, as the latter have been depicted to us by them?

We have a better method. Unlike that of violence it certainly involves the exercise of restraint and patience; but it requires also resoluteness of will. This method is to refuse to be party to the wrong. No tyrant has ever yet succeeded in his purpose without carrying the victim with him, it may be, as it often is, by force. Most people choose rather to yield to the will of the tyrant than to suffer for the consequence of retiscence. Hence does terrorism form part of the stock-in-trade of the tyrant. But we have instances in history where terrorism has failed to impose the terrorist's will upon his victim. India has the choice before her now. If then the acts of the Punjab Government be an insufferable wrong, if the report of Lord Hunter's Commitee and the two despatches be a greater wrong by reason of their grievous condonation of these acts, it is clear that we must refuse to submit to this official violence, Appeal the Parliament by all means if necessay but if the Parliament fails us and if we are worthy to call ourselves a nation, we must refuse to uphold the Government by withdrawing co-operation from it.

COURTS AND SCHOOLS

[Even before the special Congres Mr. Gandhi had enunciated his scheme of non-co-operation and begun his agitation in the press and platform urging his conntrymen to follow the various terms in his programme. In the *Young India*, in August 1920, Mr. Gandhi laid special stress on the need for boycotting courts and schools. He wrote:—]

The Non-Co-operation Committee has included, in the first stage, boycott of law-courts by lawyers and of Government schools and colleges by parents or scholars as the case may be. I know that it is only my reputation as a worker and fighter, which has saved me from an open charge of lunacy for having given the advice about boycott of courts and schools.

I venture however to claim some method about my madness. It does not require much reflection to see that it is through courts that a government establishes its authority and it is through schools that it manufactures clerks and other employees. They are both healthy institutions when the government in charge of them is on the whole just. They are death-traps when the government is unjust.

First as to Lawyers.

No newspaper has combated my views on non-co-operation with so much pertinacity and ability as the Allahabad *Leader*. It has ridiculed my views on lawyers expressed in my booklet, Indian Home Rule,' written by me in 1908. I adhere to the views then expressed. And if I find time I hope to elaborate them in these columns. But I refrain from so doing for the time being as my special views have nothing to do with my advice on the necessity of lawyers suspending practice. I submit that national non-co-operation requires suspension of their practice by lawyers. Perhaps

no one co-operates with a government more than lawyers through its law-courts. Lawyers interpret laws to the people and thus support authority. It is for that reason that they are styled officers of the court. They may be called honorary office holdhers. It is said that it is the lawyers who have put up the most stubborn fight against the Government. This is no doubt partly true. But that does not undo the mischief that is inherent in the profession. So when the nation wishes to paralyse the Government, that profession, if it wishes to help the nation to bend the Government to its will, must suspend practice. But say the critics, the Government will be too pleased, if the pleaders and barristers fell into the trap laid by me. I do not believe it. What is true in ordinary times is not true in extraordinary times. In normal times the Government may resent fierce criticism of their manners and methods by lawyers, but in the face of fierce action they would be loath to part with a single lawyer's support through his practice in the courts.

Moreover, in my scheme, suspension does not mean stagnation. The lawyers are not to suspend practice and enjoy rest. They will be expected to induce their clients to boycott Courts. They will improvise arbitration-boards in order to settle disputes. A nation, that is bent on forcing justice from an unwilling government, has little time for engaging in mutual quarrels. This truth the lawyers will be expected to bring home to their cilents. The readers may not know that many of the most noted lawyers of England suspended their work during the late war. The lawyers, then, upon temporarily leaving their profession, became whole-time workers instead of being workers only during their recreation hours. Real politics are not a game. The late Mr. Gokhale used to deplore that we had not gone beyond treating politics as a pastime. We have no notion as to

how much the country has lost by reason of amateurs having managed its battles with the serious-minded, trained and wholetime-working bureaucracy.

The critics then argue that the lawyers will starve, if they leave their profession. This cannot be said of the profession. They do at times suspend work for visiting Europe or otherwise. Of those who live from hand to mouth, if they are honest men, each local Khilafat Committee can pay them an honorarium against full time service.

Lastly, for Mahomedan lawyers, it has been suggested that, if they stop their practice, Hindus will take it up. I am hoping Hindus will at least show the negative courage of not touching their Muslim brethren's clients, even if they do not suspend their own practice. But I am sure no religiously minded Musulman will be found to say that they can carry on the fight only if the Hindu stand side by side with them in sacrifice. If the Hindus do as they must, it will be to their honour and for the common good of both. But the Musulmans must go forward whether the Hindus join them or not. If it is a matter of life and death with them, they must not count the cost. No cost is too heavy for the preservation of one's honour, especially religious honour. Only they will sacrifice who cannot abstain. Forced sacrifice is no sacrifice. It will not last. A movement lacks sincerity when it is supported by unwilling workers under pressure. The Khilafat movement will become an irresistible force when every Musalman treats the peace terms as an individual wrong. No man waits for others' help or sacrifice in matters of private personal wrong. He seeks help no doubt, but his battle against the wrong goes on whether he gains help or not. If he has justice on his side, the divine law is that he does get help. God is the help of the helpless. When the Pandava brothers were unable to help Draupadi.

God came to the rescue and saved her honour. The Prophet was helped by God when he seemed to be forsaken by men.

NOW FOR THE SCHOOLS.

I feel that if we have not the courage to suspend the education of our children, we do not deserve to win the battle.

The first stage includes renunciation of honours or favours. As a matter of fact no government bestows favours without taking more than the favours are worth. It would be a bad and extravagant government which threw away its favours. In a government broad-based upon a people's will, we give our lives to secure a trinket which is a symbol of service. Under an unjust government which defies a people's will, rich *Jagirs* become a sign of servitude and dishonour. Thus considered, the schools must be given up without a moment's thought.

For me the whole scheme of non-co-operation is, among other things, a test of the intensity and extent of our feeling. Are we genuine? Are we prepared to suffer? It has been said that we may not expect much response from title-holders, for they have never taken part in national affairs and have bought their honours at too great a price easily to sacrifice them. I make a present of the argument to the objectors, and ask, what about the parents of school-children and the grown up college-students? They have no such intimate connection with the Government as the title-holders. Do they or do they not feel enough to enable them to sacrifice the schooling?

But I contend that there is no sacrifice involved in emptying the schools. We must be specially unfit for non-co-operation if we are so helpless as to be unble to manage our own education in total independence of the Government.

Every village should manage the education of its own children. I would not depend upon Government aid. If there is a real awakening the schooling need not be interrupted for a single day. The very school-masters who are now conducting Government schools, if they are good enough to resign their office, could take charge of national schools and teach our children the things they need, and not make of the majority of them indifferent clerks. I do look to the Aligarh College to give the lead in this matter. The moral effect created by the emptying of our Madrassas will be tremendous. I doubt not that the Hindu parents and scholars would not fail to copy their Musulman brethren.

Indeed what could be grander education than that the parents and scholars should put religious sentiment before a knowledge of letters?. If therefore no arrangement could be immediately made for the literary instruction of youths who might be withdrawn, it would be most profitable training for them to be able to work as volunteers for the cause which may necessitate their withdrawal from Government schools. For as in the case of the lawyers, so in the case of boys, my notion of withdrawal does not mean an idolent life. The withdrawing boys will, each according to his worth, be expected to take their share in the agitation.

SPEECH AT MADRAS.

[Addressing a huge concourse of people of all classes numbering over 50,000, assembled on the Beach opposite to the Presidency College, Madras, on the 12th August, 1920, Mr. Gandhi outlined his Non-Co-operation scheme and sketched the programme of work before the country. He said :—]

Mr. Chairman and Friends,—Like last year, I have to ask your forgiveness that I should have to speak being seated. Whilst my voice has become stronger than it was

last year, my body is still weak; and if I were to attempt to speak to you standing, I could not hold on for very many minutes before the whole frame would shake. I hope, therefore, that you will grant me permission to speak seated. I have sat here to address you on a most important question, probably a question whose importance we have not measured up to now.

LOKAMAYNA TILAK.

But before I approach that question on this dear old beach of Madras, you will expect me—you will want me—to offer my tribute to the great departed, Lokamanya Tilak Maharaj (Loud and prolonged cheers). I would ask this great assembly to listen to me in silence. I have come to make an appeal to your hearts and to your reason and I could not do so unless you were prepared to listen to whatever I have to say in absolute silence. I wish to offer my tribute to the departed patriot and I think that I cannot do better than say that his death, as his life, has poured new vigour into the country. If you were present as I was present at that great funeral procession, you would realise with me the meaning of my words. Mr. Tilak lived for his country. The inspiration of his life was freedom for his country which he called Swaraj: the inspiration of his death-bed was also freedom for his country. And it was that which gave him such marvellous hold upon his countrymen; it was that which commanded the adoration not of a few chosen Indians belonging to the upper strata of society but of millions of his countrymen. His life was one long sustained piece of self-sacrifice. He began that life of discipline and self-sacrifice in 1879 and he continued that life up to the end of his day, and that was the secret of his hold upon his country. He not only knew what he

wanted for his country but also how to live for his country and how to die for his country. I hope then that whatever I say this evening to this vast mass of people, will bear fruit in that same sacrifice for which the life of Lokamanya Tilak Maharaj stands. His life, if it teaches us anything whatsoever, teaches one supreme lesson : that if we want to do anything whatsoever for our country, we can do so not by speeches, however grand, eloquent and convincing they may be, but only by sacrifice at the back of every word and at the back of every act of our life. I have come to ask everyone of you whether you are ready and willing to give sufficiently for your country's sake, for your country's honour and for religion. I have boundless faith in you, the citizens of Madras, and the people of this great presidency, a faith which I began to cultivate in the year 1893 when I first made acquaintance with the Tamil labourers in South Africa ; and I hope that, in these hours of our trial, this province will not be second to any other in India, and that it will lead in this spirit of self-sacrifice and will translate every word into action.

Need for Non-Co-operation

What is this non-co-operation, about which you have heard much, and why do we want to offer this non-co-operation ? I wish to go for the time being into the why. There are two things before this country : the first and the foremost is the Khilafat question. On this the heart of the Mussalmans of India has become lascerated. British pledges given after the greatest deliberation by the Prime Minister of England in the name of the English nation, have been dragged into the mire. The promises given to Moslem India on the strength of which the consideration that was excepted by the British nation was exacted, have

been broken, and the great religion of Islam has been placed in danger. The Mussalmans hold—and I venture to think they rightly hold—that, so long as British promises remain unfulfilled, so long is it impossible for them to tender whole-hearted fealty and loyalty to the British connection; and if it is to be a choice for a devout Mussalman between loyalty to the British connection and loyalty to his Code and Prophet, he will not require a second to make his choice,—and he has declared his choice. The Mussalmans say frankly, openly and honourably to the whole world that, if the British Ministers and the British nation do not fulfil the pledges given to them and do not wish to regard with respect the sentiments of 70 millions of the inhabitants of India who profess the faith of Islam, it will be impossible for them to retain Islamic loylaty. It is a question, then, for the rest of the Indian population to consider whether they want to perform a neighbourly duty by their Mussalman countrymen, and if they do, they have an opportunity of a lifetime which will not occur for another hundred years, to show their good-will, fellowship and friendship and to prove what they have been saying for all these long years that the Mussalman is the brother of the Hindu. If the Hindu regards that before the connection with the British nation comes his natural connection with his Moslem brother, then I say to you that, if you find that the Moslem claim is just, that it is based upon real sentiment, and that at its background is this great religious feeling, you cannot do othewise than help the Mussalmans through and through, so long as their cause remains just and the means for attaining the end remains equally just, honourable and free from harm to India. These are the plain conditions which the Indian Musalmans have accepted

and it was when they saw that they could accept the profer red aid of the Hindus, that they could always justify the cause and the means before the whole world, that they decided to accept the proferred hand of fellowship. It is then for Hindus and Mahamadans to offer a united front to the whole of the Christaian powers of Europe and tell them that weak as India is. India has still got the capacity of preserving her self-respect, she still knows how to die for her religion and for her self-respect.

That is the Khilafat in a nut-shell; but you have also got the Punjab. The Punjab has wounded the heart of India as no other question has for the past century. I do not exclude from my calculation the Mutiny of 1857. Whatever hardships India had to suffer during the Mutiny, the insult that was attempted to be offered to her during the passage of the Rowlatt legislation and that which was offered after its passage were unparalled in Indian history. It is because you want justice from the British nation in connection with the Punjab atrocities you have to devise ways and means as to how you can get this justice. The House of Commons, the House of Lords, Mr. Montagu, the Viceroy of India, every one of them knows what the feeling of India is on this Khilafat question and on that of the Punjab; the debates in both the Houses of parliament, the action of Mr. Montagu and that of the Viceroy have demonstrated to you completely that they are not willing to give the justice which is India's due and which she demands. I suggest that our leaders have got to find a way out of this great difficulty and unless we have made ourselves even with the British rulers in India and unless we have gained a measure of self-respect at the hands of the British rulers in India, no connection, and no friendly intercourse is possible between them and ourselves. I,

therefore, venture to suggest this beautiful unanswerable method of non-co-operation.

Is it Unconstitutional

I have been told that non-co-operation is unconstitutional. I venture to deny that it is unconstitutional. On the contrary, I hold that non-co-operation is a just and religious doctrine ; it is the inherent right of every human being and it is perfectly constitutional. A great lover of the British Empire has said that under the British constitution even a successful rebellion is perfectly constitutional and he quotes historical instances, which I cannot deny, in support of his claim. I do not claim any constitutionality for a rebellion successful or otherwise, so long as that rebellion means in the ordinary sense of the term, what it does mean, namely, wresting justice by violent means. On the contrary, I have said it repeatedly to my countrymen that violence, whatever end it may serve in Europe, will never serve us in India. My brother and friend Shaukat Ali believes in methods of violence ; and if it was in his power to draw the sword against the British Empire, I know that he has got the courage of a man and he has got also the wisdom to see that he should offer that battle to the British Empire. But because he recognises as a true soldier that means of violence are not open to India, he sides with me accepting my humble assistance and pledges his word that so long as I am with him and so long as he believes in the doctrine, so long will he not harbour even the idea of violence against any single Englishman or any single man on earth. I am here to tell you that he has been as true as his word and has kept it religiously. I am here to bear witness that he has been following out this plan of non-violent non-co-operation to the very letter and I am asking India to follow this non-violent non-co-operation. I tell

you that there is not a better soldier living in our ranks in British India than Shaukat Ali. When the time for the drawing of the sword comes, if it ever comes, you will find him drawing that sword and you will find me retiring to the jungles of Hindustan. As soon as India accepts the doctrine of the sword, my life as an Indian is finished. It is because I believe in a mission special to India and it is because I believe that the ancients of India, after centuries of experience have found out that the true thing for any human being on earth is not justice based on violence but justice based on sacrifice of self, justice based on Yagna and Kurbani,—I cling to that doctrine and I shall cling to it for ever,—it is for that reason I tell you that whilst my friend believes also in the doctrine of violence and has adopted the doctrine of non-violence as a weapon of the weak, I believe in the doctrine of non-violence as a weapon of the strongest. I believe that a man is the strongest soldier for daring to die unarmed with his breast bare before the enemy. So much for the non-violent part of non-co-operation. I therefore, venture to suggest to my learned countrymen that, so long as the doctrine of non-co-operation remains non-violent, so long there is nothing un-constitutional in the doctrine.

I ask further, is it unconstitutional for me to say to the British Government 'I refuse to serve you?' Is it unconstitutional for our worthy chairman to return with every respect all the titles that he has ever held from the Government? Is it unconstitutional for any parent to withdraw his children from a Government or aided school? Is it unconstitutional for a lawyer to say 'I shall no longer support the arm of the law so long as that arm of law is used not to raise me but to debase me?' Is it unconstitutional for a civil servant or for a judge to say, 'I refuse to

serve a Government which does not wish to respect the wishes of the whole people ?' I ask, is it unconstitutional for a policeman or for a soldier to tender his resignation when he knows that he is called to serve a Government which traduces its own countrymen ? Is it unconstitutional for me to go to the ' krishan,' to the agriculturist, and say to him ' it is not wise for you to pay any taxes, if these taxes are used by the Government not to raise you but to weaken you ?' I hold and I venture to submit, that there is nothing unconstitutional in it. What is more, I have done every one of these things in my life and nobody has questioned the constitutional character of it. I was in Kaira working in the midst of 7 lakhs of agriculturists. They had all suspended the payment of taxes and the whole of India was at one with me. Nobody considered that it was unconstitutional. I submit that in the whole plan of non-co-operation, there is nothing unconstitutional. But I do venture to suggest that it will be highly unconstitutional in the midst of this unconstitutional Government,—in the midst of a nation which has built up its magnificent constitution,—for the people of India to become weak and to crawl on their belly—it will be highly unconstitutional for the people of India to pocket every insult that is offered to them ; it is highly unconstitutional for the 70 millions of Mohamadans of India to submit to a violent wrong done to their religion ; it is highly unconstitutional for the whole of India to sit still and co-operate with an unjust Government which has trodden under its feet the honour of the Punjab, I say to my countrymen so long as you have a sense of honour and so long as you wish to remain the descendants and defenders of the noble traditions that have been handed to you for generations after generations, it is unconstitutional for you not to non-co-operate and un-

constitutional for you to co-operate with a Government which has became so unjust as our Government has become. I am not anti-English; I am not anti-British; I am not anti-any Government; but I am anti-untruth—anti-humbug and anti-injustice. So long as the Government spells injustice, it may regard me as its enemy, implacable enemy. I had hoped at the Congress at Amritsar—I am speaking God's truth before you—when I pleaded on bended kneess before some of you for co-operation with the Government, I had full hope that the British Ministers who are wise as a rule, would placate the Mussalman sentiment, that they would do full justice in the matter of the Punjab atrocities; and therefore, I said :—let us return good-will to the hand of fellowship that has been extended to us, which I then believed was extended to us through the Royal Proclamation. It was on that account that I pleaded for co-operation. But to-day that faith having gone and obliterated by the acts of the British Ministers, I am here to plead not for futile obstruction in the Legislative Council but for real substantial non-co-operation which would paralyse the mightiest Government on earth. That is what I stand for to-day. Until we have wrung Justice, and until we having wrung our self-respect from unwilling hands and from unwilling pens there can be no-co-operation. Our Shastras say and I say so with the greatest deference to all the greatest religious preceptors of India but without fear of contradiction, that our Shastras teach us that there shall be no-co-operation between injustice, and justice, between an unjust man and a justice-loving man, between truth and untruth. Co-operation is a duty only so long as Government protects your honour, and non-co-operation is an equal duty when the Government, instead of protecting,

robs you of your honour. That is the doctrine of non-co-operation.

NON-CO-OPERATION & THE SPECIAL CONGRESS

I have been told that I should have waited for the declaration of the special Congress which is the mouthpiece of the whole nation. I know that it is the mouthpiece of the whole nation. If it was for me, individual Gandhi, to wait, I would have waited for eternity. But I had in my hands a sacred trust. I was advising my Mussalman countrymen and for the time being I hold their honour in my hands. I dare not ask them to wait for any verdict but the verdict of their own Conscience. Do you suppose that Mussalmans can eat their own words, can withdraw from the honourable position they have taken up? If perchance—and God forbid that it should happen—the Special Congress decides against them, I would still advise my countrymen, the Mussalmans to stand single handed and fight rather than yield to the attempted dishonour to their religion. It is therefore given to the Mussalmans to go to the Congress on bended knees and plead for support. But support, or no support, it was not possible for them to wait for the Congress to give them the lead. They had to choose between futile violence, drawing of the naked sword and peaceful non-violent but effective non-co-operation, and they have made their choice. I venture further to say to you that if there is any body of men who feel as I do, the sacred character of non-co-operation, it is for you and me not to wait for the Congress but to act and to make it impossible for the Congress to give any other verdict. After all what is the Congress? The Congress is the collected voice of individuals who form it, and if the individuals go to the Congress with a united voice, that will be the verdict you will gain from the Congress. But if we go to the Congress with no opinion because

we have none or because we are afraid to express it, then naturally we await the verdict of the Congress. To those who are unable to make up their mind I say, by all means wait. But for those who have seen the clear light as they see the lights in front of them, for them, to wait is a sin. The Congress does not expect you to wait but it expects you to act so that the Congress can guage properly the national feeling. So much for the Congress.

Boycott of the Councils.

Among the details of non-co-operation I have placed in the foremost rank the boycott of the councils. Friends have quarrelled with me for the use of the word boycott, because I have disapproved—as I disapprove even now—boycott of British goods or any goods for that matter. But there, boycott has its own meaning and here boycott has its own meaning. I not only do not disapprove but approve of the boycott of the the councils that are going to be formed next year. And why do I do it? The people—the masses,—require from us, the leaders, a clear lead. They do not want any equivocation from us. The suggestion that we should seek election and then refuse to take the oath of allegiance, would only make the nation distrust the leaders. It is not a clear lead to the nation. So I say to you, my countrymen, not to fall into this trap. We shall sell our country by adopting the method of seeking election and then not taking the oath of allegiance. We may find it difficult, and I frankly confess to you that I have not that trust in so many Indians making that declaration and standing by it. To-day I suggest to those who honestly hold the view—*viz*, that we should seek election and then refuse to take the oath of allegiance—I suggest to them that they will fall into a trap which they are preparing for themselves and for the nation. That is my view. I hold

that if we want to give the nation the clearest possible lead, and if we want not to play with this great nation, we must make it clear to this nation that we cannot take any favours, no matter, how great they may be, so long as those favours are accompanied by an injustice, a double wrong done to India not yet redressed. The first indispensable thing before we can receive any favours from them is that they should redress this double wrong. There is a Greek proverb which used to say "Beware of the Greeks but especially beware of them when they bring gifts to you." To-day from those ministers who are bent upon perpetuating the wrong to Islam and to the Punjab I say we cannot accept gifts but we should be doubly careful lest we may not fall into the trap that they may have devised. I therefore suggest that we must not coquet with the council and must not have anything whatsoever to do with them. I am told that if we, who represent the national sentiment, do not seek election, the Moderates who do not represent that sentiment will. I do not agree. I do not know what the Moderates represent and I do not know what the Nationalists represent. I know that there are good sheep and black sheep amongst the Moderates. I know that there are good sheep and black sheep amongst the Nationalists. I know that many Moderates hold honestly the view that it is a sin to resort to non-co-operation. I respectfully agree to differ from them. I do say to them also that they will fall into a trap which they will have devised if they seek election. But that does not affect my situation. If I feel in my heart of hearts that I ought not to go to the councils, I ought at least to abide by this decision and it does not matter if ninety-nine other countrymen seek election. That is the only way in which public work can be done, and public opinion can be built. That is the only way in

which reforms can be achieved and religion can be conserved. If it is a question of religious honour, whether I am one or among many I must stand upon my doctrine. Even if I should die in the attempt, it is worth dying for, than that I should live and deny my own doctrine. I suggest that it will be wrong on the part of any one to seek election to these Councils. If once we feel that we cannot co-operate with this Government, we have to commence from the top. We are the natural leaders of the people and we have acquired the right and the power to go to the nation and speak to it with the voice of non-co-operation. I therefore do suggest that it is inconsistent with non-co-operation to seek election to the Councils on any terms whatsoever.

Lawyers and Non-co-operation

I have suggested another difficult matter, *viz.*, that the lawyers should suspend their practice. How should I do otherwise knowing so well how the Government had always been able to retain this power through the instrumentality of lawyers. It is perfectly true that it is the lawyers of to-day who are leading us, who are fighting the country's battles, but when it comes to a matter of action against the Government, when it comes to a matter of paralysing the activity of the Government I know that the Government always looks to the lawyers, however fine fighters they may have been, to preserve their dignity and their self-respect. I therefore suggest to my lawyer friends that it is their duty to suspend their practice and to show to the Government that they will no longer retain their offices, because lawyers are considered to be honorary officers of the courts and therefore subject to their disciplinary jurisdiction. They must no longer retain these honorary offices if they want to withdraw co-operation

from Government. But what will happen to law and order? We shall evolve law and order through the instrumentality of these very lawyers. We shall promote arbitration courts and dispence justice, pure, simple, home-made justice, swadeshi justice, to our countrymen. That is what suspension of practice means.

PARENTS AND NON-CO-OPERATION.

I have suggested yet another difficulty—to withdraw our children from the Government schools and to ask collegiate students to withdraw from the College and to empty Government aided schools. How could I do otherwise? I want to guage the national sentiment. I want to know whether the Mohmedans feel deeply. If they feel deeply they will understand in the twinkling of an eye, that it is not right for them to receive schooling from a Government in which they have lost all faith; and which they do not trust at all. How can I, if I do not want to help this Government, receive any help from that Government. I think that the schools and colleges are factories for making clerks and Government servants. I would not help this great factory for manufacturing clerks and servants if I want to withdraw co-operation from that Government. Look at it from any point of view you like. It is not possible for you to send your children to the schools and still believe in the doctrine of non-co-peration..

THE DUTY OF TITLE HOLDERS.

I have gone further. I have suggested that our title holders should give up their titles. How can they hold on to the titles and honours bestowed by this Government? They were at one time badges of honour when we believed that national honour was safe in their hands. But now they are no longer badges of honour but badges of dishonour and disgrace when we really believe that we cannot

get justice from this Government. Every title holder holds his titles and honours as trustee for the nation and in this first step in the withdrawal of co-operation from the Government they should surrender their titles without a moment's cosideration. I suggest to my Mahomedan countrymen that, if they fail in this primary duty they will certainly fail in non-co-operation unless the masses themselves reject the classes and take up non-co-operation in their own hands and are able to fight that battle even as the men of the French Revolution were able to take the reins of Government in their own hands leaving aside the leaders and marched to the banner of victory. I want no revolution. I want ordered progress. I want no disordered order. I want no chaos. I want real order to be evolved out of this chaos which is misrepresented to me as order. If it is order established by a tyrant in order to get hold of the tyrannical reins of Government I say that it is no order for me but it is disorder. I want to evolve justice out of this injustice. Therefore I suggest to you the passive non-co-operation. If we would only realise the secret of this peaceful and infallible doctrine you will know and you will find that you will not want to use even an angry word when they lift the sword at you and you will not want even to lift your little finger, let alone a stick or a sword.

A Service to the Empire.

You may consider that I have spoken these words in anger because I have considered the ways of this Government immoral, unjust, debasing and untruthful. I use these adjectives with the greatest deliberation. I have used them for my own true brother with whom I was engaged in a battle of non-co-operation for full 13 years and although the ashes cover the remains of my brother I tell

you that I used to tell him that he was unjust when his plans were based upon immoral foundation. I used to tell him that he did not stand for truth. There was no anger in me. I told him this home truth because I loved him. In the same manner, I tell the British people that I love them, and that I want their association but I want that association on conditions well defined. I want my self-respect and I want my absolute equality with them. If I cannot gain that equality from the British people I do not want that British connection. If I have to let the British people go and import temporary disorder and dislocation of national business, I will favour that disorder and dislocation than that I should have injustice from the hands of a great nation such as the British nation. You will find that by the time the whole chapter is closed that the successors of Mr. Montagu will give me the credit for having rendered the most distinguished service that I have yet rendered to the Empire, in having offered this non-co-operation and in having suggested the boycott, not of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, but of boycott of a visit engineered by the Government in order to tighten its hold on the national neck. I will not allow it even if I stand alone, if I cannot persuade this nation not to welcome that visit but will boycott that visit with all the power at my command. It is for that reason I stand before you and implore you to offer this religious battle, but it is not a battle offered to you by a visionary or a saint. I deny being a visionary. I do not accept the claim of saintliness. I am of the earth, earthy, a common gardener man as much as any one of you, probably much more than you are. I am prone to as many weaknesses as you are. But I have seen the world. I have lived in the world with my eyes open. I have gone through the most fiery ordeals that

have fallen to the lot of man. I have gone through this discipline. I have understood the secret of my own sacred Hinduism, I have learnt the lesson that non-co-operation is the duty not merely of the saint but it is the duty of every ordinary citizen, who not knowing much, not caring to know much, but wants to perform his ordinary household functions. The people of Europe teach even their masses, the poor people, the doctrine of the sword. But the Rishis of India, those who have held the traditions of India, have preached to the masses of India the doctrine, not of the sword, not of violence but of suffering, of self-suffering. And unless you and I are prepared to go through this primary lesson, we are not ready even to offer the sword and that is the lesson my brother Shaukat Ali has imbibed to teach and that is why he to-day accepts my advice tendered to him in all prayerfulness and in all humility and says 'long live non-co-operation.' Please remember that even in England the little children were withdrawn from the schools; and colleges in Cambridge and Oxford were closed. Lawyers had left their desks and were fighting in the trenches. I do not present to you the trenches but I do ask you to go through the sacrifice that the men, women and the brave lads of England went through. Remember that you are offering battle to a nation which is saturated with the spirit of sacrifice whenever the occasion arises. Remember that the little band of Boers offered stubborn resistance to a mighty nation. But their lawyers had left their desks. Their mothers had withdrawn their children from the schools and colleges and the children had become the volunteers of the nation. I have seen them with these naked eyes of mine. I am asking my countrymen in India to follow no other gospel than the gospel of selfsacrifice which precedes every

battle. Whether you belong to the school of violence or non-violence you will still have to go through the fire of sacrifice, and of discipline. May God grant you, may God grant our leaders, the wisdom, the courage and the true knowledge to lead the nation to its cherished goal. May God grant the people of India the right path, the true vision and the ability and the courage to follow this path, difficult and yet easy, of sacrifice.

SPEECH AT THE SPECIAL CONGRESS.

[After a prolonged tour round the country addressing large masses of people on the non-co-operation programme, Mr. Gandhi reached Calcutta in the first week of September to attend the Special Congress on the 4th to which the country had been looking forward for a difinite lead on the two issues viz., the Punjab and the Khilafat. Already Mr. Gandhi had prepared the large mass of those likely to attend the session, to vote for his programme. But the leaders in different provinces were by no means convinced of the soundness of Mr. Gandhi's scheme. Lala Lajput Rai, the President of the Session and Mr. C. R. Das who subsequently became ardent followers of Mr. Gandhi, stood out against his programme and assisted by Mr. B. C. Pal, opposed Mr. Gandhi. But Mr. Gandhi carried the day and his lead was followed in the Moslem League and the Khilafat Conference as well. The resolution ran as follows :—

"In view of the fact that on the Khilafat question both the Indian and imperial Governments have signally failed in their duty towards the Mussalmans of India, and the Prime Minister has deliberately broken his pledged word given to them and that it is the duty of every non-Moslem Indian in every legitimate manner to assist his Mussulman brother in this attempt to remove the religious calamity that has overtaken him :

And in view of the fact that in the matter of the events of the April of 1919 both the said Governments have grossly neglected or failed to protect the innocent people of the Punjab and punish officers guilty of unsoldierly and barbarous behaviou

towards them and have exonerated Sir Michael O'Dwyer who proved himself directly or indirectly responsible for the most of the official crimes and callous to the sufferings of the people placed under his administration, and that the debate in the House of Lords betrayed a woeful lack of sympathy with the people of India and showed virtual support of the systematic terrorism and frightfulness adopted in the Punjab and that the latest Viceregal pronouncement is proof of entire absence of repentance in the matters of the Khilafat and the Punjab :

This Congress is of opinion that there can be no contentment in India without redress of the two aforementioned wrongs and that the only effectual means to vindicate national honour and to prevent a repetition of similar wrongs in future is the establishment of Swarajya. This Congress is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent non-co-operation until the said wrongs are righted and Swarajya is established.

And inasmuch as a beginning should be made by the classes who have hitherto moulded and represented opinion and inasmuch as Government consolidates its power through titles and honours bestowed on the people, through schools controlled by it, its law courts and its legislative councils, and inasmuch as it is desirable in the prosecution of the movement to take the minimum risk and to call for the least sacrifice compatible with the attainment of the desired object, this Congress earnestly advises—

(*a*) Surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in local bodies;

(*b*) refusal to attend Government Levees, Durbars, and other official and semi-official functions held by Government officials or in their honour;

(c) gradual withdrawal of children from Schools and Colleges owned, aided or controlled by Government and in place of such schools and colleges establishment of National Schools and Colleges in the various Provinces ;

(*d*) gradual boycott of British Courts by lawyers and litigants and establishment of private arbitration courts by their aid for the settlement of private disputes,

(*e*) refusal on the part of the military, clerical and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service in Mesopotamia ;

(*f*) withdrawal by candidates of their candidature for election to the Reformed Councils and refusal on the part of the voters to vote for any candidate who may, despite the Congress advice, offer himself for election ;

(*g*) The boycott of foreign goods;

And inasmuch as non-co-operation has been conceived as a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice without which no nation can make real progress, and inasmuch as an opportunity should be given in the very first stage of non-co-operation to every man woman and child, for such discipline and self-sacrifice, this Congress advises adoption of Swadeshi in piecegoods on a vast scale, and inasmuch as the existing mills of India with indigenous capital and control do not manufacture sufficient yarn and sufficient cloth for the requirements of the nation, and are not likely to do so for a long time to come, this Congress advises immediate timulation of further manufacture on a large scale by means of reviving hand-spinning in every home and handweaving on the part of the millions of weavers who have abandoned their ancient and honourable calling for want of encouragement."

[In moving their resolution Mr. Gandhi said :]

I am aware, more than aware, of the grave responsibility that rests on my shoulders in being privileged to move this resolution before this great assembly. I am aware that my difficulties, as also yours, increase if you are able to adopt this resolution. I am also aware that the adoption of any resolution will mark a definite change in the policy which the country has hitherto adopted for the vindication of the rights that belong to it, and its honour. I am aware that a large number of our leaders who have given the time and attention to the affairs of my motherland, which I have not been able to give, are ranged against me. They think it a duty to resist the policy of revolution-

ising the Gove rnment policy at any cost. Knowing this I stand before ycu in fear of Gcd and a sense of duty to put this before you for your hearty acceptance.

I ask you to dismiss me, for the time being, from your consideration. I have been charged of saintliness and a desire for dictatorship. I venture to say that I do not stand before you either as a saint or a candidate for dictatorship. I stand before you to present to you the results of my many years' practical experience in non-co-operation. I deny the charge that it is a new thing in the country. It has been accepted at hundreds of meetings attended by thousands of men, and has been placed in working order since the first of Aug ust by the Mussalmans, and many of the things in the programme are being enforced in a more or less intense form. I ask you again to dismiss personalities in the consideration of this important question, and bring to bear patie nt and calm judgment on it. But a mere acceptance of the resolution does not end the work. Every individual has to enforce the items of the resolution in so far as they apply to him. I beseech you to give me a patient hearing. I ask you neither to clap nor to hiss. I do not mind them so far as I am concerned, but clapping hinders the flow of thought, clapping and hissing hinder the process of correspon dence between a speaker and his audience. You will not h iss out of the stage any single speaker. For non-co-oper ation is a measure of discipline and sacrifice and it demands patience and respect for opposite views. And unless we were able to evolve a spirit of mutual toleration for diametrically opposite views, non-co-operation is an impossibility. Non-co-operation in an angry atmosphere is an impossibility. I have learnt through bitter experience the one supreme lesson to conserve my anger, and as heat conserved is transmuted into energy, even so our anger

controlled can be transmuted into a power which can move the world. To those who have been attending the Congress, as brothers in arms, I ask what can be better discipline than that which we should exercise between ourselves.

I have been told that I have been doing nothing but wreckage and that by bringing forward the resolution, I am breaking up the political life of the country. The Congress is not a party organisation. It ought to provide a platform for all shades of opinions, and a minority need not leave this organisation, but may look forward to translate itself into a majority, in course of time, if its opinion commended itself to the country. Only let no man in the name of the Congress advocate a policy with has been condemned by the Congress. And if you condemn my policy, I shall not go away from the Congress, but shall plead with them to convert the minority into a majority.

There are no two opinions as to the wrong done to the Khilafat. Mussalmans cannot remain as honourable men and follow their Prophet if they do not vindicate their honour at any cost. The Punjab has been cruelly, brutally treated, and inasmuch as one man in the Punjab was made to crawl on his belly, the whole of India crawled on her belly, and if we are worthy sons and daughters of India, we should be pledged to remove these wrongs. It is in order to remove these wrongs that the country is agitating itself. But we have not been able to bend the Government to our will. We cannot rest satisfied with a mere expression of angry feeling. You could not have heard a more passionate denunciation of the Punjab wrongs than in the pages of the Presidential address. If the Congress cannot wring justice from unwilling hands, how can it vindicate its existence and its honour? How can it do so if it cannot enforce clear

repentence, before receiving a single gift, however rich, from those blood-stained hands.

I have therefore placed before you my scheme of non-co-operation to achieve this end and want you to reject any other scheme, unless you have deliberately come to the conclusion that it is a better scheme than mine. If there is a sufficient response to my scheme, I make bold to reiterate my statement that you can gain Swarajya in the course of a year. Not the passing of the resolution will bring Swarajya but the enforcement of the resolution from day to-day in a progressive manner, due regard being had to the conditions in the country. There is another remedy before the country and that is drawing of the sword. If that was possible India would not have listened to the gospel of non-co-operation. I want to suggest to you that, even if you want to arrest injustice by methods of violence, discipline and self-sacrifice are necessary. I have not known of a war gained by a rabble, but I have known of wars gained by disciplined armies and if you want to give battle to the British Government and to the combined power of Europe, we must train ourselves in discipline and self-sacrifice. I confess I have become inpatient. I have seen that we deserve Swarajya to-day, but we have not got the spirit of national sacrifice. We have evolved this spirit in domestic affairs, and I have come to ask you to extend it to other affairs. I have been travelling from one end to the other of the country to see whether the country has evolved the national spirit, whether at the altar of the nation it is ready to dedicate its riches, children, its all, if it is ready to make the initiatory sacrifice. Is the country ready? Are the title holders ready to surrender their titles? Are parents ready to sacrifice the literary education of their children for the sake of the country? The schools and colleges are really a factory for

turning out clerks for Government. If the parents are not ready for the sacrifice, if title-holders not ready, Swarajya is very nearly an impossibility. No nation being under another nation can accept gifts and kicks at the responsibility attaching to those gifts, imposed by the conquering nation. Immediately the conquered country realised instinctively that any gift which might come to it is not for the benefit of the conquered, but for the benefit of the conqueror, that moment it should reject every form of voluntary assistance to him. These are the fundamental essentials of success in the struggle for the independence for the country, whether within the Empire or without the Empire. I hold a real substantial unity between Hindus and Mussalmans infinitely superior to the British connection and if I had to make a choice between that unity and the British connection I would have the first and reject the other. If I had to choose between the honour of the Punjab, anarchy, neglect of education, shutting out of all legislative activity, and British connection, I would choose the honour of the Punjab and all it meant, even anarchy, shutting out of all schools etc, without slightest hesitation.

If you have the same feeling burning in you as in me for the honour of Islam and the Punjab, then you will unreservedly accept my resolution.

I now come to the burning topic *viz.* the boycott of the councils. Sharpest differences of opinion existed regarding this and if the house has to divide on it, it must divide on one issue *viz.* whether Swarajya has to be gained through the councils or without the councils. If we utterly distrust the British Government and we know that they are utterly unrepentant, how can you believe that the councils will lead to Swarajya and not tighten the British hold on India?

I now come to Swadeshi. The boycott of foreign goods is included in the resolution. You have got here, I confess, an anomaly for which I am not originally responsible. But I have consented to it. I will not go into the history of how it found a place into the resolution, of which the essence is discipline and self-sacrifice. Swadeshi means permanent boycott of foreign goods. It is therefore a matter of redundancy. But I have taken it in, because I could not reject it as a matter of conscience. I know, however, it is a physical impossibility. So long as we have to rely on the pins and needles—figurative and literal both—we cannot bring about a complete boycott of foreign goods. I do not hesitate to say this clause mars the musical harmony, if I may claim it without vanity, of the programme. I feel that those words do mar the symmetry of the programme. But I am not here for symmetry of the programme as for its workability.

I again ask you not to be influenced by personality. Reject out of your consideration any service that I have done. Two things only I claim. Laborious industry, great thought behind any programme, and unflinching determination to bring it about. You may take only those things from me, and bring them to bear on any programme that you adopt.

SWARAJ IN ONE YEAR.

[Since the Special Congress at Calcutta, Mr. Gandhi constantly referred to the possibility of obtaining Swaraj in one year. The period was extended to the end of Dec. 1921 and Mr. Gandhi, in his writings and speeches during this period, spoke and wrote with the fervour of faith. Even in the last week of December he never showed any wavering of faith. In reply to his critics who could not believe in the practicability of achieving Swaraj inside the year, Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* in October, 1920 :]

Much laughter has been indulged in at my expense for having told the Congress audience at Calcutta that, if there was sufficient response to my programme of Non-Co-operation, Swaraj would be attained in one year. Some have ignored my condition and laughed because of the impossibility of getting Swaraj anyhow within one year. Others have spelt the " if " in capitals and suggested that if " ifs " were permissible in argument, any absurdity could be proved to be a possibility. My proposition, however, is based on a mathematical calculation. And I venture to say that true Swaraj is a practical impossibility without due fulfilment of my conditions. Swaraj means a state such that we can maintain our separate existence without the presence of the English. If it is to be a partnership, it must be a partnership at will. There can be no Swaraj without our feeling and being the equals of Englishmen. To-day we feel that we are dependent upon them for our internal and external security, for an armed peace between the Hindus and the Mussulmans, for our education and for the supply of daily wants, nay, even for the settlement of our religious squabbles. The Rajahs are dependent upon the British for their powers and the millionaires for their millions. The British know our helplessness and Sir Thomas Holland cracks jokes quite legitimately at the expense of Non-Co-op erationists. To get Swaraj then is to get rid of our helplessness. The problem is no doubt stupendous, even as it is for the fabled lion who, having been brought up in the company of goats, found it impossible to feel that he was a lion. As Tolstoy used to put it, mankind often laboured under hypnotism. Under its spell continuously we feel the feeling of helplessness. The British themselves cannot be expected to help us out of it. On the contrary, they din into our ears that we shall be fit to govern ourselves only by slow educative processes. The *Times* suggested that, if we boy cott the

councils, we shall lose the opportunity of a training in Swaraj. I have no doubt that there are many who believe what the *Times* says. It even resorts to falsehood. It audaciously says that Lord Milner's Mission listened to the Egyptians only when they were ready to lift the boycott of the Egyptian Council. For me the only training in Swaraj we need is the ability to defend ourselves against the whole world and to live our natural life in perfect freedom even though it may be full of defects. Good government is no substitute for self-government. The Afghans have a bad government, but it is self-government. I envy them. The Japanese learnt the art through a sea of blood. And if we to-day had the power to drive out the English by superior brute force, we would be counted their superiors. and in spite of our inexperience in debating at the Council table or in holding executive offices, we would be held fit to govern ourselves. For brute force is the only test the West has hitherto recognised. The Germans were defeated not because they were necessarily in the wrong, but because the Allied Powers were found to possess greater brute strength. In the end, therefore, India must either learn the art of war which the British will not teach her, or she must follow her own way of discipline and self-sacrifice through Non-Co-operation. It is as amazing as it is humiliating that less than one hundred thousand white men should be able to rule three hundred and fifteen million Indians. They do so somewhat undoubtedly by force but more by securing our co-operation in a thousand ways and making us more and more helpless and dependent on them as time goes forward. Let us not mistake reformed councils, more law courts and even governorships for real freedom or power. They are but subtler methods of emasculation. The British cannot rule us by mere force. And so they resort to all means, honourable and dishonourable, in order to retain their hold

on India. They want India's billions and they want India's man-power for their imperialistic greed. If we refuse to supply them with men and money, we achieve our goal, namely, Swaraj, equality, manliness.

The cup of our humiliation was filled during the closing scenes in the Viceregal Council. Mr. Shastri could not move his resolution on the Punjab. The Indian victims of Jallianwala received Rs. 1250, the English victims of mob frenzy received lacs. The officials who were guilty of crimes against those whose servants they were, were reprimanded. And the councillors were satisfied. If India were powerful, India would not have stood this addition of insult to her injury.

I do not blame the British. If we were weak in numbers, as they are, we too would perhaps have resorted to the same methods as they are now employing. Terrorism and deception are weapons not of the strong but of the weak. The British are weak in numbers, we are weak in spite of our numbers. The result is that each is dragging the other down. It is common experience that Englishmen lose in character after residence in India and that Indians lose in courage and manliness by contact with Englishmen. This process of weakening is good neither for us, two nations, nor for the world.

But if we Indians take care of ourselves, the English and the rest of the world would take care of themselves. Our contribution to the world's progress must therefore consist in setting our own house in order.

Training in arms for the present is out of the question. I go a step further and believe that India has a better mission for the world. It is within her power to show that she can achieve her destiny by pure self-sacrifice, *i.e.*, self-purification. This can be done only by Non-Co-operation

And Non-Co-operation is possible only when those who commenced to co-operate begin the process of withdrawal. If we can but free ourselves from the threefold Maya of Government-controlled schools, Government law courts and legislative councils, and truly control our own education, regulate our disputes, and be indifferent to their legislation, we are ready to govern ourselves, and we are only then ready to ask the Government servants, whether civil or military, to resign, and the taxpayers to suspend payment of taxes.

And is it such an impracticable proposition to expect parents to withdraw their children from schools and colleges and establish their own institutions, or to ask lawyers to suspend their practice and devote their whole time and attention to national service against payment, where necessary, of their maintenance or to ask candidates for councils not to enter councils and lend their passive or active assistance to the legislative machinery through which all control is excercised.The movement of Non-Co-operation is nothing but an attempt to isolate the brute force of the British from all the trappings under which it is hidden and to show that brute force by itself cannot for one single moment hold India.

But I frankly confess that, until the three conditions mentioned by me are fulfilled, there is no Swaraj. We may not go on taking our college degrees, taking thousands of rupees monthly from clients for cases which can be finished in five minutes, and taking the keenest delight in wasting the national time on the council floor, and still expect to gain national self-respect.

The last, though not the least, important part of the Maya still remains to be considered. That is Swadeshi. Had we not abandoned Swadeshi, we need not have been in the present fallen state. If we would get rid of the economic

slavery, we must manufacture our own cloth and at the present moment only by hand-spinning and hand-weaving.

All this means discipline, self-denial, self-sacrifice, organising ability, confidence, and courage. If we show this in one year among the classes that to-day count, and make public opinion, we certainly gain Swaraj within one year. If I am told that even we who lead have not these qualities in us, there certainly will never be Swaraj for India but then we shall have no right to blame the English for what they are doing. Our salvation and its time are solely dependent upon us.

TO EVERY ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA.

[Mr. Gandhi wrote the following two open letters in the pages of his *Young India*. Like every one of his articles, they were widely reproduced in the press. The letters deal with all the topics connected with the Non-Co-operation movement. The first was written in October 1920 and the second in July 1921:]

I

Dear Friend,

I wish that every Englishman will see this appeal and give thoughtful attention to it.

Let me introduce myself to you. In my humble opinion, no Indian has co-operated with the British Government more than I have for an unbroken period of twenty-nine years of public life in the face of circumstances that might well have turned any other man into a rebel. I ask you to believe me when I tell you that my co-operation was not based on the fear of the punishments provided by your laws or any other selfish motives. It was free and voluntary co-operation based on the belief that the sum total of the British Government was for the benefit of India, I put my

life in peril four times for the sake of the Empire,—at the time of the Boer war when I was in charge of the Ambulance corps whose work was mentioned in General Buller's despatches, at the time of the Zulu revolt in Natal when I was in charge of a similar corps, at the time of the commencement of the late war when I raised an Ambulance corps and as a result of the strenuous training had a severe attack of pleurisy, and lastly, in fulfilment of my promise to Lord Chelmsford at the War Conference in Delhi, I threw myself in such an active recruiting campaign in Kaira District involving long and trying marches, that I had an attack of dysentery which proved almost fatal. I did all this in the full belief that acts such as mine must gain for my country an equal status in the Empire. So last December I pleaded hard for a trustful co-operation. I fully believed that Mr.Lloyd George would redeem his promise to the Mussalmans and that the revelations of the of the official atrocities in the Punjab would secure full reparation for the Punjabis. But the treachery of Mr. Lloyd George and its appreciation by you, and the condonation of the Punjab atrocities have completely shattered my faith in the good intentions of the Government and the nation which is supporting it.

But though my faith in your good intentions is gone, I recognise your bravery and I know that what you will not yield to justice and reason, you will gladly yield to bravery.

See what this Empire means to India:—

Exploitation of India's resources for the benefit of Great Britain,

An ever-increasing military expenditure, and a civil service the most expensive in the world,

Extravagant working of every department in utter disregard of India's poverty,

Disarmament and consequent emasculation of a whole nation lest an armed nation might imperil the lives of a handful of you in our midst,

Traffic in intoxicating liquors and drugs for the purpose of sustaining a top heavy administration,

Progressively representative legislation in order to suppress an evergrowing agitation seeking to give expression to a nation's agony.

Degrading treatment of Indians residing in your dominions, and

You have shown total disregard of our feelings by glorifying the Punjab administration and flouting the Mussalman sentiment.

I know you would not mind if we could fight and wrest the sceptre from your hands. You know that we are powerless to do that, for you have ensured our incapacity to fight in open and honourable battle. Bravery on the battlefield is thus impossible for us. Bravery of the soul still remains open to us. I know you will respond to that also. I am engaged in evoking that bravery. Non-co-operation means nothing less than training in self-sacrifice. Why should we co-operate with you when we know that by your administration of this great country we are being daily enslaved in an increasing degree. This response of the people to my appeal is not due to my personality. I would like you to dismiss me, and for that matter the Ali Brothers too, from your consideration. My personality will fail to evoke any response to anti-Muslim cry if I were foolish enough to raise it, as the magic name of the Ali Brothers would fail to inspire the Mussalmans with enthusiasm if they were madly to raise in anti-Hindu cry. People flock in their thousands to listen to us because we to-day represent voice of a nation groaning under iron heels. The Ali Brothers were your friends as I was, and still am. My religion

forbids me to bear any ill-will towards you. I would not raise my hand against you even if I had the power. I expect to conquer you only by my suffering. The Ali Brothers will certainly draw the sword, if they could, in defence of their religion and their country. But they and I have made common cause with the people of India in their attempt to voice their feelings and to find a remedy for their distress.

You are in search of a remedy to suppress this rising ebullition of national feeling. I venture to suggest to you that the only way to suppress it is to remove the causes. You have yet the power. You can repent of the wrongs done to Indians. You can compel Mr. Lloyd George to redeem his promises. I assure you he has kept many escape doors. You can compel the Viceroy to retire in favour of a better one, you can revise your ideas about Sir Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer. You can compel the Government to summon a conference of the recognised leaders of the people, duly elected by them and representing all shades of opinion so as to devise means for granting *Swaraj* in accordance with the wishes of the people of India.

But this you cannot do unless you consider every Indian to be in reality your equal and brother. I ask for no patronage, I merely point out to you, as a friend, an honourable solution of a grave problem. The other solution, namely repression, is open to you. I prophesy that it will fail. It has begun already. The Government has already imprisoned two brave men of Panipat for holding and expressing their opinions freely. Another is on his trial in Lahore for having expressed similar opinions. One in the Oudh District is already imprisoned. Another awaits judgment. You should know what is going on in your midst. Our propaganda is being carried on in anticipation of repression. I invite you respectfully to choose the better way

and make common cause with the people of India whose salt you are eating. To seek to thwart their aspirations is disloyalty to the country.

I am,
Your faithful friend,
M. K. GANDHI.

II

Dear friend,—This is the second time I venture to address you. I know, that most of you detest Non-Co-operation. But I would invite you to isolate two of my activities from the rest, if you can give me credit for honesty.

I cannot prove my honesty, if you do not feel it. Some of my Indian friends charge me with camouflage, when I say we need not hate Englishmen, whilst we may hate the system they have established. I am trying to show them, that one may detest the wickedness of a brother without hating him. Jesus denounced the wickedness of the Scribes and the Pharisees, but he did not hate them. He did not enunciate this law of love for the man and hate for the evil in him for himself only, but he taught the doctrine for universal practice. Indeed, I find it in all the scriptures of the world.

I claim to be a fairly accurate student of human nature and vivisector of my own failings. I have discovered, that man is superior to the system he propounds. And so I feel, that you as an individual are infinitely better than the system you have evolved as a corporation. Each one of my countrymen in Amritsar on that fateful 10th of April was better than the crowd of which he was a member. He, as a man, would have declined to kill those innocent English bank managers. But in that crowd, many a man forgot himself. Hence it is, that an Englishman in office

is different from an Englishman outside. Similarly an Englishman in India is different from an Englishman in England. Here in India, you belong to a system that is vile beyond description. It is possible, therefore, for me to condemn the system in the strongest terms, without considering you to be bad and without imputing bad motives to every Englishman. You are as much slaves of the system as we are. I want you, therefore, to reciprocate, and not impute to me motives which you cannot read in the written word. I give you the whole of my motive when I tell you, that I am impatient to end or mend a system, which has made India subservient to a handful of you and which has made Englishmen feel secure only in the shadow of the forts and the guns that obtrude themselves on one's notice in India. It is a degrading spectacle for you and for us. Our corporate life is based on mutual distrust and fear. This, you will admit, is unmanly. A system that is responsible for such a state of things, is necessarily satanic. You should be able to live in India as an integral part of its people and not always as foreign exploiters. One thousand Indian lives against one English life is a doctrine of dark despair, and yet believe me, it was enunciated in 1919 by the highest of you in the land.

I almost feel tempted to invite you to join me in destroying a system that has dragged both you and us down. But I feel I cannot as yet do so. We have not shown ourselves earnest, self-sacrificing and self-restrained enough for that consummation.

But I do ask you to help us in the boycott of foreign cloth and in the anti-drink campaign.

The Lancashire cloth, as English historians have shown, was forced upon India, and her own world-famed manufactures were deliberately and systematically ruined. India is, therefore, at the mercy not only of Lancashire but

also of Japan, France, and America. Just see what this has meant to India. We send out of India every year sixty crores (more or less) of rupees for cloth. We grow enough cotton for our own cloth. Is it not madness to send cotton outside India, and have it manufactured into cloth there and shipped to us? Was it right to reduce India to such a helpless state?

A hundred and fifty years ago, we manufactured all our cloth. Our women spun fine yarn in their own cottages, and supplemented the earnings of their husbands. The village weavers wove that yarn. It was an indispensable part of national economy in a vast agricultural country like ours. It enabled us in a most natural manner to utilise our leisure. To-day our women have lost the cunning of their hands, and the enforced idleness of millions has impoverished the land. Many weavers have become sweepers. Some have taken to the profession of hired soldiers. Half the race of artistic weavers has died out, and the other half is weaving imported foreign yarn for want of finer hand-spun yarn.

You will perhaps now understand what boycott of foreign cloth means to India. It is not devised as a punishment. If the Government were to-day to redress the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and consent to India attaining immediate Swaraj, the boycott movement must still continue. Swaraj means at least the power to conserve Indian industries that are vital to the economic existence of the nation, and to prohibit such imports as may interfere with such existence. Agriculture and hand-spinning are the two lungs of the national body. They must be protected against consumption at any cost,

This matter does not admit of any waiting. The interests of the foreign manufacturers and the Indian importers cannot be considered, when the whole nation is

starving for want of a large productive occupation ancillary to agriculture.

You will not mistake this for a movement of general boycott of foreign goods. India does not wish to shut herself out of international commerce. Things other than cloth which can be better made outside India, she must gratefully receive upon terms advantageous to the contracting parties. Nothing can be forced upon her. But I do not wish to peep into the future. I am certainly hoping that before long it would be possible for India to co-operate with England on equal terms. Then will be the time for examining trade relations. For the time being, I bespeak your help in bringing about a boycott of foreign cloth.

Of similar and equal importance is the campaign against drink. The liquor shops are an insufferable curse imposed upon society. There never was so much awakening among the people as now, upon this question. I admit that here, it is the Indian ministers who can help more than you can. But I would like you to speak out your mind clearly on the question. Under every system of government total prohibition, so far as I can see, will be insisted upon by the nation. You can assist the growth of the ever-rising agitation by throwing in the weight of your influence on the side of the nation.

I am,
Your faithful friend,
M. K. Gandhi.

THE CREED OF THE CONGRESS

[Mr. Gandhi, in moving his resolution on the creed of the Congress at the Nagpur session in December 1920, said :]

The resolution which I have the honour to move is as follows: "The object of the Indian National Congress is the attainment of Swarajya by the people of India by all legitimate and peaceful means."

There are only two kinds of objections, so far as I understand, that will be advanced from this platform. One is that we may not to-day think of dissolving the British connection. What I say is that it is derogatory to national dignity to think of the permanence of British connection at any cost. We are labouring under a grievous wrong, which it is the personal duty of every Indian to get redressed. This British Government not only refuses to redress the wrong, but it refuses to acknowledge its mistake and so long as it retains its attitude, it is not possible for us to say all that we want to be or all that we want to get, retaining British connection. No matter what difficulties be in our path, we must make the clearest possible declaration to the world and to the whole of India, that we may not possibly have British connection, if the British people will not do this elementary justice. I do not, for one moment, suggest that we want to end the connection at all costs, unconditionally. If the British connection is for the advancement of india, we do not want to destroy it. But if it is inconsistent with our national self-respect then it is our bounden duty to destroy it. There is room in this resolution for both—those who believe that, by retaining British connection, we can purify ourselves and purify British

people, and those who have no belief. As for instance, take the extreme case of Mr. Andrews. He says all hope for India is gone for keeping the British connection. He says there must be complete severance—complete independence. There is room enough in this creed for a man like Mr. Andrews also. Take another illustration, a man like myself or my brother Shaukat Ali. There is certainly no room for us, if we have eternally to subscribe to the doctrine, whether these wrongs are redressed or not, we shall have to evolve ourselves within the British Empire: there is no room for me in that creed. Therefore this creed is elastic enough to take in both shades of opinions and the British people will have to beware that, if they do not want to do justice, it will be the bounden duty of every Indian to destroy the Empire.

I want just now to wind up my remarks with a personal appeal, drawing your attention to an object lesson that was presented in the Bengal camp yesterday. If you want Swaraj, you have got a demonstration of how to get Swaraj. There was a little bit of skirmish, a little bit of squabble, and a little bit of difference in the Bengal camp, as there will always be differences so long as the world lasts. I have known differences between husband and wife, because I am still a husband ; I have noticed differences between parents and children, because I am still a father of four boys, and they are all strong enough to destroy their father so far as bodily struggle is concerned; I possess that varied experience of husband and parent ; I know that we shall always have squabbles, we shall always have differences but the lesson that I want to draw your attention to is that I had the honour and privilege of addressing both the parties. They gave me their undivided attention and what is more they showed their attachment, their affection and their fellowship

for me by accepting the humble advice that I had the honour of tendering to them, and I told them I am not here to distribute justice that can be awarded only through our worthy president. But I ask you not to go to the president, you need not worry him. If you are strong, if you are brave, if you are intent upon getting Swaraj, and if you really want to revise the creed, then you will bottle up your rage, you will bottle up all the feelings of injustice that may rankle in your hearts and forget these things here under this very roof and I told them to forget their differences, to forget the wrongs. I don't want to tell you or go into the history of that incident. Probably most of you know. I simply want to invite your attention to the fact. I don't say they have settled up their differences. I hope they have, but I do know that they undertook to forget the differences. They undertook not to worry the President, they undertook not to make any demonstration here or in the Subjects Committee. All honour to those who listened to that advice.

I only wanted my Bengali friends and all the other friends who have come to this great assembly with a fixed determination to seek nothing but the settlement of their country, to seek nothing but the advancement of their respective rights, to seek nothing but the conservation of the national honour. I appeal to every one of you to copy the example set by those who felt aggrieved and who felt that their heads were broken. I know, before we have done with this great battle on which we have embarked at the special sessions of the Congress, we have to go probably, possibly through a sea of blood, but let it not be said of us or any one of us that we are guilty of shedding blood, but let it be said by generations yet to be born that we suffered, that we shed not somebody's blood but our own, and so

I have no hesitation in saying that I do not want to show much sympathy for those who had their heads broken or who were said to be even in danger of losing their lives. What does it matter ? It is much better to die at the hands, at least, of our own countrymen. What is there to revenge ourselves about or upon. So I ask everyone of you that, if at any time there is blood-boiling within you against some fellow countrymen of yours, even though he may be in the employ of Government, even though he may be in the Secret Service, you will take care not to be offended and not to return blow for blow. Understand that the very moment you return the blow from the detective, your cause is lost. This is your non-violent campaign. And so I ask everyone of you not to retaliate but to bottle up all your rage, to dismiss your rage from you and you will rise graver men: I am here to congratulate those who have restrained themselves from going to the President and bringing the dispute before him.

Therefore I appeal to those who feel aggrieved to feel that they have done the right thing in forgetting it and if they have not forgotten I ask them to try to forget the thing ; and that is the object lesson to which I wanted to draw your attention if you want to carry this resolution. Do not carry this resolution only by an acclamation for this resolution, but I want you to accompany the carrying out of this resolution with a faith and resolve which nothing on earth can move. That you are intent upon getting Swaraj at the earliest possible moment and that you are intent upon getting Swaraj by means that are legitimate, that are honourable and by means that are non-violent, that are paceful, you have resolved upon, so far you can say to day. We cannot give battle to this Government by means of steel, but we can give battle by exercising, what

I have so often called, "soul force" and soul force is not the prerogative of one man or a Sanyasi or even a so-called saint. Soul force is the prerogative of every human being, female or male, and therefore I ask my countrymen, if they want to accept this resolution, to accept it with that firm determination and to understand that it is inaugurated under such good and favourable auspices as I have described to you.

In my humble opinion, the Congress will have done the rightest thing, if it unanimously adopts this resolution. May God grant that you will pass this resolution unanimously may God grant that you will also have the courage and the ability to carry out the resolution and that within one year.

APPEAL TO YOUNG BENGAL.

[Soon after the Congress, Mr. Gandhi and the Ali Brothers made an extensive tour of the country appealing to the students to give up their schools and colleges and join the ranks of non-co-operators. At Aligarh and Benares great efforts were made to call away the students from the Muslim and Hindu Universities, if they could not nationalise them. They were not quite successful though a few joined the Congress, but in Bengal, at the instance of Messrs. C. R. Das and Jitendralal Banerjea, a large number of students flocked to their standard and deserted the schools. It was such appeals as the following that enthused the youth of Bengal who created a profound sensation by throwing themselves in their thousands at the steps of the Calcutta University Hall, that the few who did attend the examination had to do so by walking over their bodies. Mr. Gandhi later reproved such obstructive methods but he wrote this appeal early in January 1921:—]

Dear Young Friends:

I have just read an account of your response to the nation's call. It does credit to you and to Bengal. I had

expected no less. I certainly expect still more. Bengal has great intelligence. It has a greater heart, it has more than its share of the spiritual heritage for which our country is specially noted. You have more imagination, more faith, and more emotion than the rest of India. You have falsified the calumny of cowardice on more occasions than one. There is, therefore, no reason why Bengal should not lead now as it has done before now.

You have taken the step, you will not recede. You had ample time to think. You have paused, you have considered. You held the Congress that delivered to the nation the message of Non-Co-operation *i.e.* of self-purification, self-sacrifice, courage, and hope. The Nagpur Congress ratified, clarified, and amplified the first declaration. It was redelivered in the midst of strife, doubt, and disunion. It was redelivered in the midst of joy, acclamation, and practically perfect unanimity. It was open to you to refuse, or to hesitate or to respond. You have chosen the better, though, from a wordly wise stand point, less cautious way. You dare not go back without hurting yourselves and the cause.

But for the evil spell that the existing system of government and, most of all, this western education has cast upon us, the question will not be considered as open to argument. Can the brave Arabs retain their independence and yet be schooled under the aegis of those who would hold them under bondage? They will laugh at a person who dared to ask them to go to schools that may be established by their invaders. Is the case different or if it is different, is it not stronger in our case when we are called upon to give up schools conducted under the aegis of a government which, rightly or wrongly, we seek to bend to our will or destroy?

We cannot get *Swaraj* if not one class in the country is prepared to work and sacrifice for it. The Government will yield not to the logic of words. It knows no logic but that of brave and true deeds.

Bravery of the sword they know. And they have made themselves proof against its use by us. Many of them will welcome violence on our part. They are unconquerable in the art of meeting and suppressing violence. We propose, therefore, to sterilize their power of inflicing violence by our non-violence. Violence dies when it ceases to evoke response from its object. Non-violence is the corner-stone of the edifice of Non-Co-operation. You will, therefore. not be hasty or over-zealous in your dealings with those who may not see eye to eye with you. Intolerance is a species of violence and therefore against our creed. Non-violent Non-Co-operation is an object lesson in democracy. The moment we are able to ensure non-violence, even under circumstances the most provoking that moment we have achieved our end, because that is the moment when we can offer complete Non-Co-operation.

I ask you not to be frightened at the proposition just stated. People do not move in arithmetical progression, not even in geometrical progression. They have been known to perish in a day: they have been known to rise in a day. Is it such a difficult thing for India to realise that thirty crores of human beings have but to feel their strength and they can be free without having to use it? As we had not regained national consciousness, the rulers have hitherto played us against one another. We have to refuse to do so, and we are masters, not they.

Non-Co-operation deals first with those sensitive classes upon whom the government has acted so successfully and who have been lured into the trap consciously or unconsciously as the schoolgoing youths have been.

When we come to think about it, the sacrifice required is infinitesimal for individuals because the whole is distributed among so many of us. For what is your sacrifice? To suspend your literary studies for one year or till Swaraj is established. If I could infect the whole of the student world with my faith, I know that suspension of studies need not extend even to a year.

And in the place of your suspended studies I would urge you to study the methods of bringing about Swaraj as quietly as possible even within the year of grace. I present you with the SPINNING WHEEL and suggest to you that on it depends India's economic salvation.

But you are at liberty to reject it if you wish and go to the college that has been promised to you by Mr. Das. Most of your fellow-students in the National College at Gujarat have undertaken to give at least four hours to spinning everyday. It is no sacrifice to learn a beautiful art and to be able to clothe the naked at the same time.

You have done your duty by withdrawing from Government colleges, I have only showed you the easiest and the most profitable way of devoting the time at your disposal.

May God give you strength and courage to sustain you in your determination.

Your well-wisher,

M. K. Gandhi.

OPEN LETTER TO THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.

[Mr. Gandhi addressed the following open letter to H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught in the first week of February 1921 :—]

«Sir,—Your Royal Highness must have heard a great deal about Non Co-operation, Non-Co-operationists, and their methods and incidentally of me, its humble author. I fear that the information given Your Royal Highness must have been in its nature one-sided. I owe it to you, to my friends and myself that I should place before you what I conceive to be the scope of Non-Co-operation, as followed not only by me, but my closest associates, such as Messrs. Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali.

For me it is no joy and pleasure to be actively associated in the boycott of Your Royal Highness' visit. I have tendered loyal, voluntary assistance to Government for an unbroken period of nearly 30 years in the full belief that through that lay the path of freedom for my country. It was therefore, no slight thing for me to suggest to my countrymen that we should take no part in welcoming Your Royal Highness. Not one among us has anything against you as an English gentlemen. We hold your person as sacred as that of a dearest friend. I do not know any of my friends who would not guard it with his life if he found it in danger.

We are not at war with individual Englishmen. We seek not to destroy English life. We do desire to destroy the system that has emasculated our country in body, mind and soul. We are determined to battle with all our might against that in English nature which has made O'Dwyerism

and Dyerism possible in the Punjab and has resulted in a wanton affront upon Islam, a faith professed by seven crores of your countrymen. We consider it inconsistent with our self-respect any longer to brook the spirit of superiority and dominance which has systematically ignored and disregarded the sentiments of thirty crores of innocent people of India on many a vital matter. It is humiliating to us. It cannot be a matter of pride to you that thirty crores of Indians should live day in and day out in fear of their lives from one hundred thousand Englishmen and, therefore, be under subjection to them.

Your Royal Highness has come, not to end the system I described, but to sustain it by upholding its prestige. Your first pronouncement was a laudation of Lord Willingdon. I have the privilege of knowing him. I believe him to be an honest, amiable gentleman, who will not willingly hurt even a fly, but he certainly failed as a ruler. He allowed himself to be guided by those whose interest it was to support their power. He is not reading the mind of the Dravidian province. Here in Bengal you are issuing a certificate of merit to a Governor who is again from all I have heard an estimable gentleman, but he knows nothing of the heart of Bengal and its yearnings. Bengal is not Calcutta, Fort William and the palaces of Calcutta represent an insolent exploitation of the unmurmuring and highly cultured peasantry of this fair province.

The Non-Co-operationists have come to the conclusion that they must not be deceived by the reforms that tinker with the problem of India's distress and humiliation, nor must they be impatient and angry. We must not in our impatient anger resort to stupid violence. We freely admit that we must take our due share of blame for the existing

state. It is not so much British guns that are responsible for our subjection as our voluntary co-operation.

Our non-participation in a hearty welcome to Your Royal Highness is thus in no sense a demonstration against your high personage, but it is against the system you come to uphold. I know individual Englishmen cannot, even if they will, alter the English nature all of a sudden. If we would be the equals of Englishmen we must cast off fear. We must learn to be self-reliant and independent of schools, courts, protection and patronage of a Government we seek to end if it will not mend.

Hence this non-violent Non-Co-operation. I know we have not all yet become non-violent in speech and deed, but the results so far achieved have, I assure Your Royal Highness, been amazing. The people have understood the secret and value of non-violence as they have never done before. He who will may see that this is a religious, purifying movement. We are leaving off drink. We are trying to rid India of the curse of untouchability. We are trying to throw off foreign tinsel splendour and by reverting to the spinning wheel reviving the ancient and poetic simplicity of life. We hope thereby to sterilize the existing harmful institutions.

I ask Your Royal Highness as an Englishman to study this movement and its possibilities for the Empire and the world. We are at war with nothing that is good in the world. In protecting Islam in the manner we are, we are protecting all religions; in protecting the honour of India, we are protecting the honour of humanity. For our means are hurtful to none. We desire to live on terms of friendship with Englishmen, but that friendship must be friendship of equals both in theory and in practice, and we must continue to non-co-operate, i. e., to purify ourselves till the

goal is achieved. I ask Your Royal Highness, and through you every Englishman, to appreciate the view-point of Non-Co-operation.

I beg to remain,
Your Royal Highness' faithful servant,
M. K. Gandhi.

THE NEED FOR HUMILITY.*

The spirit of non-violence necessarily leads to humility. Non-violence means reliance on God, the Rock of Ages. If we would seek His aid, we must approach Him with a humble and a contrite heart. Non-co-operationists may not trade upon their amazing success to the Congress. We must act, even as the mango tree which droops as it bears fruit. Its grandeur lies in its majestic lowliness. But one hears of non-co-operationists being insolent and intolerant in their behaviour towards those who differfrom them. I know that they will lose all their majesty and glory, if they betray any inflation. Whilst we may not be dissatisfied with the progress made so far, we have little to our credit to make us feel proud. We have to sacrifice much more than we have done to justify pride, much less elation. Thousands, who flocked to the Congress pandal, have undoubtedly given their intelligent assent to the doctrine but few have followed it out in practice. Leaving aside the pleaders, how many parents have withdrawn their children from schools? How many of those who registered their vote in favour of non-co-operation have taken to hand-spinning or discarded the use of all foreign cloth?

Non-co-operation is not a movement of brag, bluster, or bluff. It is a test of our sincerity. It requires solid and silent self-sacrifice. It challenges our honesty and our capacity for national work. It is a movement that aims at translating ideas into action. And the more we do, the more we find that much more must be *done* than we had

* *Young India*, February, 1921.

expected. And this thought of our imperfection must make us humble.

A non-co-operationist strives to compel attention and to set an example not by his violence but by his unobtrusive humility. He allows his solid action to speak for his creed. His strength lies in his reliance upon the correctness of his position. And the conviction of it grows most in his opponent when he least interposes his speech between his action and his opponent. Speech, specially when it is hearty, betrays want of confidence and it makes one's opponent sceptical about the reality of the act itself. Humility therefore is the key to quick success. I hope that every non-co-operationist will recognise the necessity of being humble and self-restrained. It is because so little is really required to be done and because all of that little depends entirely upon ourselves that I have ventured the belief that Swaraj is attainable in less than one year.

STRIKES.*

Strikes are the order of the day. They are a symptom of the existing unrest. All kinds of vague ideas are floating in the air. A vague hope inspires all, and great will be the dis-appointment if that vague hope does not take definite shape. The labour world in India, as elsewhere, is at the mercy of those who set up as advisers and guides. The latter are not always scrupulous, and not always wise even when they are scrupulous. The labourers are dissatisfied with their lot. They have every reason for dissatisfaction. They are being taught, and justly, to regard themselves as being chiefly instrumental in enrich-

* *Young India*, February, 1921.

ing their employers. And so it requires little effort to make them lay down their tools. The political situation too is beginning to affect the labourers of India. And there are not wanting labour leaders who consider that strikes may be engineered for political purposes.

In my opinion, it will be a most serious mistake to make use of labour strikes for such a purpose. I don't deny that such strikes can serve political ends. But they do not fall within the plan of non-violent Non-co-operation. It does not require much effort of the intellect to perceive that it is a most dangerous thing to make political use of labour until labourers understand the political condition of the country and are prepared to work for the common good. This is hardly to be expected of them all of a sudden and until they have bettered their own condition so as to enable them to keep body and soul together in a decent manner. The greatest political contribution, therefore, that labourers can make is to improve their own condition, to become better informed, to insist on their rights, and even to demand proper use by their employers of the manufactures in which they have had such an important hand. The proper evolution, therefore, would be for the labourers to raise themselves to the status of part proprietors. Strikes, therefore, for the present should only take place for the direct betterment of the labourers' lot, and, when they have acquired the spirit of patriotism for the regulation of prices of the manufactures.

The conditions of a successful strike are simple. And when they are fulfilled a strike need never fail.

(1) The cause of the strike must be just.

(2) There should be practical unanimity among the strikers.

(3) There should be no violence used against non-strikers.

(4) Strikers should be able to maintain themselves during the strike period without falling back upon Union funds and should therefore occupy themselves in some useful and productive temporary occupation.

(5) A strike is no remedy when there is enough other labour to replace strikers. In that case in the event of unjust treatment or inadequate wages or the like, resignation is the remedy.

(6) Successful strikes have taken place even when all the above conditions have not been fulfilled, but that merely proves that the employees were weak and had a guilty conscience. We often make terrible mistakes by copying bad examples. The safest thing is not to copy examples of which we have rarely complete knowledge but to follow the conditions which we know and recognise to be essential for success.

It is the duty of every well wisher of the country, if we are to attain Swaraj during the year, not to precipitate any action that may even by a day retard the fulfilment of the great national purpose.

British Press, Madras.

THE MALEGAON INCIDENT.

[*Writing in* Young India *Mr. Gandhi deplored the misbehaviour of Non-Co-operators who took part in the fray in Malegaon in the first week of May* 1921.]

If the facts reported in the press are substantially correct, Malegaon Non-Co-operators have been false to their creed, their faith, and their country. They have put back the hands of the clock of progress. Non-violence is the rock on which the whole structure of Non-Co-operation is built. Take that away and every act of renunciation comes to naught, as artificial fruit is no more than a showy nothing. The murder of the men who were evidently doing their duty was, if the report is correct, deliberate. It was a cowardly attack. Certain men wilfully broke the law, and invited punishment.

There could be no justification for resentment of such imprisonment. Those who commit violence of the Malegaon type are the real co-operators with the Government. The latter will gladly lose a few officers if thereby they could kill Non-Co-operation. A few more such murders and we shall forfeit the sympathy of the masses. I am convinced that the people will not tolerate violence on our part. They are by nature peaceful and they have welcomed Non-Co-operation because it is deliberately non-violent.

What must we do then? We must ceaselessly preach against violence alike in public and in private. We must not show any sympathy to the evil-doers. We must advise the men who have taken part in the

murders to surrender themselves if they are at all repentant. The workers must be doubly careful in their talks. They must cease to talk of the evil of the Government and the officials, whether European or Indian. Bluster must give place to the work of building up put before the nation by the Congress. We must be patient if there is no response to the demand for men, money and munitions. All police orders must be strictly obeyed. There should be no processions or hartals when known workers are prosecuted or imprisoned. If we welcome imprisonments of innocent men, as we must, we ought to cultivate innocence and congratulate ourselves when we are punished for holding opinions, or for doing things that we consider it our duty to do *i.e.*, for spinning, or collecting funds, or getting names for the Congress register. There should be no civil disobedience. We have undertaken to stand the gravest provocation and remain non-violent. Let us be careful lest the hour of our triumph be, by our folly, the hour of our defeat and humiliation.

[*Reverting to the same subject in a subsequent issue of his paper, Mr. Gandhi wrote* :—]

I observe that there is a tendency to minimise the guilt of the Non-Co-operators at Malegaon. No amount of provocation by the Sub-Inspector could possibly justify retaliation by the Non-Co-operators. I am not examining the case from the legal standpoint. I am concerned only with the Non-Co-operator's. He is bound under his oath not to retaliate even under the gravest provocation.

[***But what should Non-Co-operators do in the event that any of its leaders were arrested? Should hartals***

and other demonstrations follow as a matter of course? Mr. Gandhi was explicit :—]

I would ask the public who are interested in the Khilafat or Swaraj, religiously to refrain from all demonstrations over the arrest or imprisonment of even their dearest leaders. I would hold it no honour to me for the public to proclaim a hartal or hold meetings if I was arrested or Maulana Shaukat Ali for that matter. I would welcome and expect in any such event a complete immediate boycott of all foreign cloth, a more energetic adoption of the spinning wheel, a more vigorous collection on behalf of the Tilak Swaraj Fund and a flooding of Congress offices for registration as members. I would certainly expect the emptying of Government schools and colleges and more suspensions of practice by lawyers. Killing officers and burning buildings will not only retard the advent of Swaraj and the righting of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs, but are likely to lead to utter demoralisation of the nation. We must therefore scrupulously avoid all occasions which would excite the passions of the mob and lead them into undesirable or criminal conduct.

THE SIMLA VISIT

[*Soon after Lord Reading arrived in India, an interview was arranged by Pandit Malaviya between the new Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi. The interview, which lasted many hours, took place at Simla in May* 1921. *Much speculation was rife as to the result of the interview and Mr. Gandhi explained the circumstances and the results of the interview in an article in* Young India *under the title "The Simla Visit."*

Many are asking why I waited upon His Excellency the Viceroy. Some inquire why the author of Non-Co-operation should seek to see the Viceroy. All want to know the result of the interview. I like the rigorous scrutiny of the Non-Co-operators, who more than Caesar's wife must be above suspicion. Non-Co-operation is self-reliance. We want to establish Swaraj, not obtain it from others. Then why approach a Viceroy? This is all good, so far as it goes. And I should be a bad representative of our cause, if I went to anybody to ask for Swaraj. I have had the hardihood to say that Swaraj could not be granted even by God. We would have to earn it ourselves. Swaraj from its very nature is not in the giving of anybody.

But we want the world with us in our battle for freedom, we want the good-will of every body. Our cause, we claim, is based upon pure justice. There are certain things we want Englishmen to surrender. All these things need mutual discussion and mutual understanding. Non-Co-operation is the most potent instrument for creating world opinion in our favour. So long as we protested and co-operated, the world did not understand us. The erst while lion of Bengal in his early days used to relate the story of Englishmen, who asked him how many broken heads there were in India, if things were really so bad, as now represented them to be. That was the way John Bull understood best. The other question the world has undoubtedly been asking is: If things are really so bad, why do we co-operate with the Government in so pauperising and humiliating us? Now the world understands our attitude, no, matter how weakly we may enforce it in practice. The world is now curious to know what ails

us. The Viceroy represents a big world. His Excellency wanted to know why I, with whom co-operation was an article of faith, had Non-Co-operated There must be something wrong with the Government or me.

And so His Excellency mentioned to Pandit Malaviyaji and to Mr. Andrews that he would like to see me and hear my views. I went to see the Panditji because he was anxious to meet me. I hold him in such high regard that I would not think even if he was well and I could help it, of letting him come to me. As it was, he was too weak to travel to me. It was my duty to go to him. And when I heard the purport of his conversation with His Excellency, I did not require any persuasion to prompt me to ask for an appointment if His Excellency wished to hear my views. I have devoted so much space to the reason for my seeking an appointment, for I wanted to make clear the limits and the meaning of Non-Co-operation.

It is directed not against men but against measures. It is not directed against the Governors, but against the system they administer. The roots of Non-Co-operation lie not in hatred but in justice, if not in love. Gladstone used to draw a sharp distinction between bad actions and bad men. He was accused of discourtesy for using some very strong expressions about the arts of his opponents. He put up the defence that he would have failed in his duty if he had not characterised their actions as they deserved to be, but he did not therefore mean to convey that his opponents deserved the epithets he had used about their acts. As a youth, when I heard this defence, I could not appreciate it. Now with years of experience and use, I understand how true it was. I have found some of the truest of my friends capable of

indefensible acts. For me there are few truer men than V. S. Srinivas Shastriar, but his actions confound me. I do not think he loves me less because he believes that I am leading India down to the abyss.

And so I hope, this great movement of Non-Co-operation has made it clear to thousands, as it has to me, that whilst we may attack measures and systems, we may not, must not, attack men. Imperfect ourselves, we must be tender towards others and be slow to impute motives.

I therefore gladly seized the opportunity of waiting upon His Excellency and of assuring him that ours was a religious movement designed to purge Indian political life of corruption, deceit, terrorism and the incubus of white superiority.

The reader must not be too curious. He must not believe the so-called 'reports' in the press. The veil must remain drawn over the details of the conversation between the Viceroy and myself. But I may assure him that I explained, as fully as I knew how the three claims—the Khilafat, the Punjab, and Swaraj, and gave him the genesis of Non-Co-operation His Excellency heard me patiently, courteously and attentively. He appeared to me be anxious to do only the right thing. We had a full discussion of the burning topics as between man and man. We discussed the question of non-violence, and it appeared to me to be common cause between us. Of that I may have to write more fully later.

But beyond saying that we were able to understand each other; I am unable to say that there was more in the interwiew. Some may think with me that a mutual understanding is in itself no small gain. Then, in that sense, the interview was a distinct success.

But at the end of all the long discusions, I am more than ever convinced that our salvation rests solely upon our own effort. His Excellency can only help or hinder I am sanguine enough to think that he will help.

We must redouble our efforts to go through our programme. It is clearly as follows : (1) Removal of untouchability, (2) removal of the drink curse, (3) ceaseless introduction of the spinning wheel and the ceaseless production of Khaddar leading to an almost complete boycott of foreign cloth, (4) registration of Congress members, and (5) collection of Tilak Swaraj Fund.

No fierce propaganda is necessary for solidifying Hindu-Muslim unity and producing a still more non-violent atmosphere.

I have put untouchability in the forefront because I observe a certain remissness about it. Hindu Non-Co-operators may not be indifferent about it. We may be able to right the Khilafat wrong but we can never reach Swaraj, with the poison of untouchability corroding the Hindu part of the national body. Swaraj is a meaningless term, if we desire to keep a fifth of India under perpetual subjection, and deliberately deny to them the fruits of national culture. We are seeking the aid of God in this great purification movement, but we deny to the most deserving among His creatures the rights of humanity. Inhuman ourslves, we may not plead before the Throne for deliverance from the inhumanity of others.

I put drink second, as I feel that God has sent the movement to us unsought. The greatest storm rages round it. The drink movement is fraught with the

greatest danger of violence. But so long as this Government persists in keeping the drink shops open, so long must we persist in sleeplessly warning our erring countrymen against polluting their lips with drink.

The third place is assigned to the spining wheel though for me it is equally important with the first two. If we produce an effective boycott of foreign cloth during this year we shall have shown cohesion, effort, concentration, earnestness, a spirit of nationality that must enable us to establish Swaraj.

Membership of the Congress is essential for the immense organisation required for dotting the country with the spinning wheels and for the manufacture and distribution of Khaddar and for dispelling the fear that membership of the Congress may be regarded as a crime by the Government.

The fifth item, the Tilak Swaraj Fund perpetuates the memory of the soul of Swaraj, and supplies us with the sinews of war.

We are under promise to ourselves to collect one crore rupees, register one crore members and introduce twenty lacs of spinning wheels in our homes by the 30th June. We shall postpone the attainment of our goal, if we fail to carry out the programme evolved at a largely attended meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, and arrived at after full consideration and debate.

THE ALI BROTHERS' APOLOGY.

[*After the Gandhi-Reading interview, the Ali Brothers issued a statement at the instance of Mr. Gandhi—a statement in which they regretted their occasional lapse into excessive language and promised to refrain from writing or speaking in any manner likely to provoke violence. This "definite result of the interview" was claimed as a victory for the Government. Others claimed that it was a victory for Mr. Gandhi who explained that it was no apology or undertaking to the Government but a reassertion of the principle of non-violence to which the Ali Brothers had subscribed. It was a statement to the public irrespective of what the Government might or might not do with them. In answer to criticisms against his advice to the Brothers, Mr. Gandhi stoutly defended his action, and praised the Brothers' attitude. He wrote in* Young India *of June* 15, 1921 :—]

The Ali Brothers' apology still continues to tax people's minds. I continue to receive letters expostulating with me for having gone to the Viceroy at all. Some consider that I have bungled the whole affair, others blame the Brothers for having for once weakened, and that in deference to me. I know that in a short while the storm will blow over. For, in spite of all I have heard and read, I feel that I did the right thing in responding to the Viceroy's wish to know my views. It would have been wrong on my part to have waited for a formal written invitation from His Excellency. I feel, too, that I gave the best

advice possible in the interests of Islam and India, when I asked the Brothers to make the statement issued by them. The Ali Brothers have showed humility and courage of a high order in making the statement. They have shown that they are capable of sacrificing their pride and their all for the sake of their faith and country. They have served the cause by making the statement, as they would have injured it by declining to make it.

In spite of all that conviction in me, I am not surprised at the remonstrances I am receiving. They but show that the methods now being pursued are new, that the country will not surrender a title of its just demands, and for their satisfaction, it wishes to rely purely upon its own strength.

I give below the relevant parts of the strongest argument in condemnation of my advice and its acceptance by the Brothers. The letter, moreover, is written by one of the greatest among the Non-Co-operators. It is not written for publication at all. But I know the writer will not mind my sharing it with the reader. For I have no doubt that he represents the sentiments of several thoughtful Non-Co-operators. It is my humble duty to discuss the issues arising from the incident, and the implications of Non-Co-operation. It is only by patient reasoning, that I hope to be able to demonstrate the truth, the beauty and the reasonableness of Non-Co-operation. Here then are the extracts :—

"The statement of the Brothers, taken by itself and read without reference to what has preceded and followed it, is a manly enough document. If in the heat of the moment they have said things which, they now find, may reasonably be taken to have a tendency

to incite to violence, they have, in publishing their regret, taken the only honourable course open to public men of their position. I should also have been prepared to justify the undertaking they have given for the future, had that undertaking been addressed to those of their co-workers, who, unlike themselves, do not believe in the cult of violence in any circumstances whatever. But the general words 'public assurance and promise to all who may require it' cannot in the circumstances leave any one in a doubt as to the particular party, who did require such 'assurance and promise' and at whose bidding it was given. The Viceroy's speech has now made it perfectly clear, and we have the indisputable fact that the leader of the N.-C.-O. movement has been treating with the Government, and has secured the suspension of the prosecution of the Brothers, by inducing them to give a public apology and an undertaking.

"In this view of the case,—and I fail to see what other view is possible—very serious questions affecting the whole movement arise for consideration. Indeed it seems to me that the whole principle of Non-Co-operation has been given away.

"I am not one of those who fight shy of the very name of Government, nor of those who look upon an eventual settlement with the Government as the only means of obtaining redress of our wrongs and establishing Swaraj. I believe in what you have constantly taught, *viz*, that the achievement of Swaraj rests entirely and solely with us. At the same time, I do not nor so far as I am aware, do you, exclude the possibility of a settlement with the Government under proper conditions. Such settlement, however, can only relate to

principles, and can have mothing to do with the convenience or safety of individuals. In a body of co-workers, you cannot make distinctions between man and man, and the humblest of them is entitled to the same ptotection at the hands of the leaders as the most prominent. Scores, if not hundreds of our men have willingly gone to gaol for using language far less strong than that indulged by the Brothers. Some at least of these could easily have been saved by giving a similar apology and undertaking, and yet it never occurred to any one to advise them to do so. On the contrary, their action was applauded by the leaders and the whole of the Non-Co-operationist press. The case, which more forcibly than any other comes to my mind at the moment, is that of Hamid Ahmad, who has recently been sentenced at Allahabad to transportation for life and forfeitnre of property. Is there any reason why this man should not be saved? I find Maulana Muhammad Ali pays him a high tribute in his Bombay speech of the 30th May. What consolation this tribute will bring to Hamid Ahmad from a man similary situated who has saved himself by an apology and an undertaking, I cannot say. Then there are so many others rotting in gaol who have committed no offence, and a great many more already picked out for the same fate Is it enough for us to send them our good wishes from the safe positions we ourselves enjoy?

"The Viceroy in his speech has made it clear, that the only definite result of the several interviews you had with him, is the apology and the undertaking from the Brothers. You have also made it quite clear in your subsequent speeches, that our campaign is to go on unabated. It seems that no point involving any

principle has been settled, except what needed no negotiating on either side, *viz.*, that there is to be no incitement to violence, I do not say that in this state of things there should have been no treating with the Government, though much can be said in support of that view When it was found that the game had to be played out, it would have been quite legitimate for two such honorable adversaries as yourself and Lord Reading to agree to the rules of the game, so as to avoid foul play on either side. These rules would of course apply to all who took part in the game, and not to certain favoured individuals only. The most essential thing was to agree upon the weapons to be used. While certain local Governments profess to meet propaganda by propaganda, they are really using repression of the worst type. Many other similar points would, in my opinion, be proper subjects of discussion, even when no agreement could be arrived at on the main issue.

"I hope you will not misunderstand me. I yield to none in my admiration of the sacrifices made by the Brothers, and consider it a high privilege to have their personal friendship. What has been preying upon my mind for some time past is, that we, who are directly responsible for many of our workers going to gaol and suffering other hardships, are ourselves practically immune. For example, the Government could not possibly have devised any form of punishment, which would cause some of us more pain and mental suffering, than sending innocent boys to gaol for distributing leaflets, while the author remained free. I think the time has come, when the leaders should welcome the opportunity to suffer, and stoutly decline all offers of escape. It is

in this view of the case that I have taken exception to the action of the Ali Brothers. Personally I love them."

The letter breathes nobility and courage. And those very qualities have led to a misapprehension of the situation. The unfortunate utterance of the Viceroy is responsible for the misunderstanding.

The apology of the Brothers is not made to the Government. It is addressed and tendered to friends, who drew their attention to their speeches. It was certainly not given 'at the bidding of the Viceroy.' I betray no confidence, when I say that it was not even suggested by him. As soon as I saw the speeches, I stated, in order to prove the *bona fides* of the Brothers and the entirely non-violent character of the Movement, that I would invite them to make a statement. There was no question of bargaining for their freedom. Having had my attention drawn to their speeches, I could not possibly allow them to go to gaol (if I could prevent it) *on the ground of proved incitement to violence.* I have given the same advice to all the accused, and told them that if their speeches were violent, they should certainly express regret. A Non-Co-operator could not do otherwise. Had the Brothers been charged before a Court of Law, I would have advised them to apologise to the Court for some of the passages in their speeches, which, in my opinion, were capable of being interpreted to mean incitement to violence. It is not enough for a Non-Co-operator not to mean violence; it is necessary that his speech must not be capable of a contrary interpretation by reasonable men. We must be above suspicion. The success of the movement depends upon its retaining its absolute purity,

I therefore suggest to the writer and to those who may think like him, that the whole principle of Non-Co-operation has not only been given away as the writer contends, but its non-violent character has been completely vindicated by the Brothers' apology, and the case therefore greatly strengthened.

What, however, is galling to the writer, is that whilst the Brothers have remained free, the lesser lights are in prison for having spoken less strongly than they.

That very fact shows the real character of Non-Co-operation. A Non-Co-operator may not bargain for personal safety. It was open to me to bargain for the liberty of the others. *Then* I would have given away the whole case for Non-Co-operation. I did not bargain even for the Brothers' liberty. I stated in the clearest possible terms, that no matter what the Government did, it would be my duty on meeting the Brothers to advise them to make the statement to save their honour.

We must 'play the game,' whether the Government reciprocate or not. Indeed, I for one do not *expect* the Government to pay the game. It was, when I came to the conclusion that there was no honour about the Government, that I non co-operated. Lord Reading may wish, does wish to do right and justice. But he will not be permitted to. If the Government were honorable, they would have set free all the prisoners, as soon as they decided not to prosecute the Ali Brothers. If the Government were honorable, they would not have caught youths and put them in prison, whilst they left Pandit Motilal Nehru, the arch-offender, free. If the Government were honorable, they would not countenance bogus Leagues of Peace. If the Government were honourable, they

would have long ago repented for their heinous deeds, even as we have for every crime committed by our people in Amritsar, Kasur, Viramgam, Ahmedabad, and recently in Malegaon. I entertain no false hopes or misgivings about the Government. If the Government were to-morrow to arrest the Ali Brothers, I would still justify the apology. The have acted on the square, and we must all do likewise. Indeed, inasmuch as the Government are still arresting people for disaffection, they are arresting the Ali Brothors.

The writer is, again, not taking a oorrect view of Non-Co-operation in thinking that Non-Co-operators, who are in gaol, are less fortunate than we who are outside. For me, solitary confinement in a prison cell, without any breach on my part of the code of Non-Co-operation, or private or public morals, will be freedom. For me, the whole of India is a prison, even as the master's house is to his slave; a slave to be free must continuously rise against his slavery, and be locked up in his master's cell for his rebellion. The cell-door is the door to freedom. I feel no pity for those who are suffering hardships in the gaols of the Government. Innocence under an evil Government must ever rejoice on the scaffold. It was the easiest thing for the Brothers to have rejected my advice, and embraced the opportunity of joining their comrades in the gaols. I may inform the reader that, when during the last stage of the South African struggle, I was arrested, my wife and all friends heaved a sigh of relief. It was in the prisons of South Africa, that I had leisure and peace from strife and struggle.

It is perhaps now clear, why the Non-Co-operation prisoners may not make any statement to *gain their freedom.*

VIOLENCE AND NON-VIOLENCE.

[*At the time of the Moplah outbreak in August* 1921, *Mr. Gandhi was in Assam. Within a week of the outbreak, Mr. Gandhi wrote as follows to the* Young India *under the heading,* "*The Two Incompatibles.*"

Violence and non-violence are two incompatible forces destructive of each other. Non-violence for its success therefore needs an entirely non-violent atmosphere. The Moplah outbreak has disturbed the atmosphere, as nothing else has since the inauguration of Non-Co-operation. I am writing this at Sylhet on the 29th August. By the time it is in print, much more information will have reached the public. I have only a hazy notion of what has happened. I have seen only three issues of daily papers containing the Associated Press messages. One cannot help noting the careful editing these messages have undergone. But it is clear that Moplahs have succeeded in taking half-a-dozen lives and have given already a few hundred. Malabar is under martial law. The reprisals on the part of the Government are still to follow. The braver the insurgents, the sterner the punishment. Such is the law of Governments. And I would not have minded the loss of ten times as many lives as the Moplahs must have lost, if only they had remained strictly non-violent. They would then have brought Swaraj nearest. It is any day worth all the price we can pay in our own lives. For the Moplahs it would have meant too the immediate redress of the Khilafat wrong. God wants the purest sacrifice. Our blood must not contain the germs of

anger or hate. It it not a sacrifice freely given that exacts a price. The Moplahs have demanded a price. The sacrifice has lost much of its nobility. Now it will be said, that the Moplahs have received well-merited punishment.

There would have been no martial law if only the Moplahs had died. And if there had been, it would have been thrice welcome. It would have ended the system of Government which is decimating the land.

Of course now-a-days it is the fashion to make Non-Co-operation responsible for every affliction, whether it is a famine, a coolie exodus or a Moplah rising. It is the finest tribute that can be paid to the universality of Non-Co-operation. But nothing has been produced by the Madras Government in support of the charge.

Our own duty is clear. Non-Co-operators must wash their hands clean of all complicity. We must not betray any mental or secret approval of the Moplahs. We must see clearly, that it would be dishonourable for us to show any approval of the violence. We must search for no extenuating circumstance. We have chosen a rigid standard for ourselves and by that we must abide. We have undertaken to do no violence even under the most provoking circumstances. Indeed we anticipate the gravest provocation as our final test. The misguided Moplahs have therefore rendered a distinct disservice to the sacred cause of Islam and Swaraj.

We may plead, as indeed we must, if we have acted honestly, that in spite of our efforts we have not been able to bring under check and discipline all the turbulent sections of the community. The choice for the

people lies between the gentle and self-imposed rule of non-violence and Non-Co-operation, and the iron rule of the Government. The latter is now demonstrating its power and ability to counteract all the forces of violence by its superior and trained violence. We have no answer, if we cannot show that we have greater influence over the people. We must be able quite clearly to see for ourselves and show to the people, that display of force by us against that of the Government is like a child attempting with a straw to stop the current.

I am painfully aware of the fact, that we have not as a people yet arrived at the settled conviction that India cannot attain immediate Swaraj except through complete non-violence. We do not even see that Hindu Muslim unity must vanish under the strain of violence. What is at the back of our mutual distrust, if it is not the fear of each other's violence? And Swaraj without real heart-unity is an inconceivable proposition.

What is it that hinders attainmeat of Swaraj, if it is not fear of violence? Are we not deterred simply through that fear, from taking all our steps at once? Can we not, if we can be sure of non-violence, issue to-day an ultimatum to the Government either to co-operate with us or to go? Do not the Moderates keep aloof, mainly because they distrust our ability to create a non-violent atmosphere? Their timidity will derive nurture from the Moplah outbreak.

What then must we do? Certainly not feel despondent. We must go forward with greater zeal, greater hope, because of greater faith in our means. We must persevere in the process of conversion of the most ignorant of our countrymen to the doctrine of non-

violence as an indispensable means as well for redressing the Khilafat wrong as for attaining Swaraj.

The Moplahs are among the bravest in the land. They are God-fearing. Their bravery must be transformed into purest gold. I feel sure, that once they realise the necessity of non-violence for the defence of the faith for which they have hitherto taken life, they will follow it without flinching. Here is the testimony given to Moplah valour by the writer in in the "Imperial Gazetteer of India": "The one constant element is a desperate fanaticism; surrender is unknown; the martyrs are consecrated before they go out and hymned after death!" Such courage is worthy of a better treatment. The Government dealt with it by passing, years ago, a special act against them. It has already set its machinery in motion for the present trouble. The Moplahs will no doubt die cheerfully. I wonder if it is possible for us to transmute their courage into the noble courage of non-violence. It may be impossible to achieve the miracle through human effort. But God is noted for His miracles. Many consider that attainment of Swaraj this year, if it is realised, must be counted a miracle. It has got to be preceded by a miraculous conversion of India, not excluding its bravest sons, to the doctrine of non-violence at least, in its restricted scope, *i.e.*, as an indispensable condition for securing India's freedom.

APPEAL TO THE WOMEN OF INDIA.

[*The following appeal addressed to the women of India appeared in* Young India *of August* 11, 1921.]

Dear Sisters,

The All-India Congress Committee has come to a momentous decision in fixing the 30th September next as the final date for completing the boycott of foreign cloth begun by the sacrificial fire lit on the 31st July in Bombay in memory of Lokamanya Tilak. I was accorded the privilege of setting fire to the huge pile containing costly saris and other dresses which you have hitherto considered fine and beautiful. I feel that it was right and wise on the part of the sisters who gave their costly clothing. Its destruction was the most economical use you could have made of it, even as destruction of plague-infected articles is their most economical and best use. It was a necessary surgical operation designed to avert more serious complaints in the body politic.

The women of India have during the past twelve months worked wonders on behalf of the motherland. You have silently worked away as angels of mercy. You have parted with your cash and your fine jewellery. You have wandered from house to house to make collections. Some of you have even assisted in picketing. Some of you who were used to fine dresses of variegated colours and had a number of changes during the day, have now adopted the white and spotless but heavy Khadi sadi reminding one of a woman's innate purity. You have done all this for the sake of India, for the

sake of the Khilafat, for the sake of the Punjab. There is no guilt about your word or work. Yours is the purest sacrifice untainted by anger or hate. Let me confess to you that your spontaneous and loving response all over India has convinced me that God is with us. No other proof of our struggle being one of self-purification is needed than that lacs of India's women are actively helping it.

Having given much, more is now required of you. Men bore the principal share of the subscriptions to the Tilak Swaraj Fund. But completion of the Swadeshi programme is possible only if you give the largest share. Boycott is impossible, *unless you will surrender the whole of your foreign clothing*. So long as the taste persists, so long is complete renunciation impossible. And boycott means complete renunciation. We must be prepared to be satisfied with such cloth as India can produce, even as we are thankfully content with such children as God gives us. I have not known a mother throwing away her baby even though it may appear ugly to an outsider. So should it be with the patriotic women of India about Indian manufactures. And for you only handspun and handwoven can be regarded as Indian manufactures. During the transition stage you can only get coarse Khadi in abundance. You may add all the art to it that your taste allows or requires. And if you will be satisfied with coarse Khadi for a few months, India need not despair of seeing a revival of the fine rich and coloured garments of old which were once the envy and the despair of the world. I assure you that a six months' course of self-denial will show you that what we to-day regard as artistic is only falsely so, and that true art

takes note not merely of form but also of what lies behind. *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 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 at the present moment.

And not only is the use of Khadi necessary for the success of the Swadeshi programme but it is imperative for every one of you to spin during your leisure hours. I have suggested to boys and men also that they should spin. Thousands of them, I know, are spinning daily. But 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 home demand but also for foreign lands. They spun not merely coarse-counts but the finest that the world has ever spun. No machine has yet reached the fineness of the yarn spun by our ancestors. If then we are to cope with the demand for Khadi during the two months and afterwards, you must form spinning clubs, institute spinning competitions and flood the Indian market with handspun yarn. For this purpose some of you have to become experts in spinning, carding and adjusting the spinning-wheels. This means ceaseless toil. You will not look upon spinning as a means of livelihood. For the middle class it should supplement the income of the family, and for very poor women, it is undoubtedly a means of livelihood. The spinning-wheel should be as it was the widows' loving companion. But for you who will read this

appeal, it is presented as a duty, as *Dharma*. If all the well-to-do women of India were to spin a certain quantity daily, they would make yarn cheap and bring about much more quickly than otherwise the required fineness.

The economic and the 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 and used to foreign fineries which they would find it difficult in after life to discard. The next few weeks will show of what stuff the women of India are made. I have not the shadow of a doubt as to your choice. The destiny of India is far safer in your hands than in the hands of a Government that has so exploited India's resources that she has lost faith in herself. At every one of women's meetings, I have asked for your blessings for the national effort, and I have done so in the belief that you are pure, simple and godly enough to give them with effect. You can ensure the fruitfulness of your blessings by giving up your foreign cloth and during your spare hours ceaselessly spinning for the nation.

I remain,
Your devoted brother,
M. K. GANDHI.

THE ARREST OF THE ALI BROTHERS.

APPEAL TO THE MUSSALMANS OF INDIA.

[*The Ali Brothers were arrested by order of the Bombay Government in the third week of September* 1921. *Mr. Gandhi addressed the following open letter to the Mussalmans of India through the columns of* Young India.]

Dear Countrymen:—Whilst the arrest of Moulanas Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali has touched every Indian heart, I know what it has meant to you. The brave brothers are staunch lovers of their country, but they are Mussalmans first and everything else after, and it must be so with every religiously minded man. The Brothers have, for years past, represented all that is best and noblest in Islam. No two Mussalmans have done more than they to raise the status of Islam in India. They have promoted the cause of the Khilafat as no two other Mussalmans of India have. For they have been true and they dared to tell what they felt even in their internment in Chindwara. Their long internment did not demoralise or weaken them. They came out just as brave as they went in.

And since their discharge from internment they have shown themselves true nationalists and you have taken pride in their being so.

The Brothers have, by their simplicity, humility and inexhaustible energy, fired the imagination of the masses as no other Mussalman has.

All these qualities have endeared them to you. You regard them as your ideal men. You are, therefore

sorry for their separation from you. Many, besides you, miss their genial faces. For me they had become inseparable. I seem to be without my arms. For anything connected with Mussalmans, Shaukat Ali was my guide and friend. He never once misled me. His judgment was sound and unerring in most cases. With the Brothers among us, I felt safe about Hindu-Muslim unity whose work they understood as few of us have.

But whilst we all miss them, we must not give way to grief or dejection. We must learn, each one of us, to stand alone. God only is our infallible and eternal Guide.

To be dejected is not only not to have known the Brothers, but it is, if I may venture to say so, not to know what religion is.

For do we not learn in all religions that the spirit of the dear ones abides with us even when they physically leave us. Not only is the spirit of the Brothers with us, but they are serving better by their suffering than if they were in our midst giving us some of their courage, hope and energy. The secret of non-violence and non-co-operation lies in our realising that it is through suffering that we are to attain our goal. What is the renunciation of titles, councils, law courts and schools, but a measure, very slight indeed, of suffering. That preliminary renunciation is a prelude to the larger suffering—the hardships of a gaol life and even the final consummation on the gallows—if need be. The more we suffer and the more of us suffer, the nearer we are to our cherished goal.

The earlier and the more clearly we recognise that it is not big meetings and demonstrations that would

give us victory but quiet suffering, the earlier and more certain will be our victory.

I have made your cause my own because I believe it to be just. Khilafat, I have understood from your best men, is an ideal. You are not fighting to sustain any wrong or even misrule. You are backing the Turks because they represent the gentlemen of Europe, and because the European, and especially the English, prejudice against them is not because the Turks are worse than others as men, but because they are Mussalmans and will not assimilate the modern spirit of exploitation of weaker people and their lands. In fighting for the Turks you are fighting to raise the dignity and the purity of your own faith.

You have, naturally, therefore, chosen pure methods to attain your end. It cannot be denied that both Mussalmans and Hindus have lost much in moral stamina. Both of us have become poor representatives of our respective faiths. Instead of each one of us becoming a true child of God, we expect others to live our religion and even to die for us. But we have now chosen a method that compels us to turn, each one of us, our face towards God. Non-co-operation presumes that our opponent with whom we non-co-operate resorts to methods which are as questionable as the purpose he seeks to fulfil by such methods. We shall, therefore, find favour in the sight of God only by choosing methods which are different in kind from those of our opponents. This is a big claim we have made for ourselves, and we can attain success, within the short time appointed by us, only if our methods are in reality radically different from those of the Government. Hence, the foundation of our movement rests on complete

non-violence whereas violence is the final refuge of the Government. And as no energy can be created without resistance, our non-resistance to Government violence must bring the latter to a standstill. But our non-violence, to be true, must be in word, thought and deed. It makes no difference that with you non-violence is an expedience. Whilst it lasts, you cannot consistently, with your pledge, harbour designs of violence. On the contrary, we must have implicit faith in our programme of non-violence which presupposes perfect accord between thought, word and deed. I would like every Mussalman to realise, whilst the occasion for anger is the greatest, that by non-violence alone can we gain complete victory even during this year.

Nor is non-violence a visionary programme. Just imagine what the united resolve of seven crores of Mussalmans (not to count the Hindus) must mean. Should we not have succeeded already, if all the titled men had given up their titles, all the lawyers had suspended their practice and all the schoolboys had left their schools and all had boycotted Councils? But we must recognise that with many of us, flesh has proved too weak. Seven crores are called Mussalmans and twenty two crores are called Hindus, but only a few are true Mussalmans or true Hindus. Therefore, if we have not gained our purpose, the cause lies within us. And if ours is, as we claim it is, a religious struggle, we dare not become impatient, save with ourselves, not even against one another.

The Brothers, I am satisfied, are as innocent as I claim I am of incitement to violence. Theirs, therefore, is a spotless offering. They have done all in their power for Islam and their country. Now, if the Khila-

fat or the Punjab wrongs are not redressed and Swaraj is not established during this year, the fault will be yours and mine. We must remain non-violent but we must not be passive. We must repeat the formula of the Brothers regarding the duty of soldiers and invite imprisonment. We need not think that the struggle cannot go on without even the best of us. If it cannot, we are neither fit for Swaraj nor for redressing the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. We must declare from a thousand platforms that it is sinful for any Mussalman or Hindu to serve the existing Government whether as soldier or in any capacity whatsover.

Above all we must concentrate on complete boycott of foreign cloth whether British, Japanese American of French, or any other, and begin, if we have not already done so, to introduce spinning-wheels and handlooms in our own homes and manufacture all the cloth we need. This will be at once a test of our belief ou nonviolence for our country's freedom and for saving the Khilafat. It will be a test also of Hindu-Muslim unity, and it will be a universal test of our faith in our own programme. I repeat my conviction that we can achieve our full purpose, within one month, of a compuete boycott of foreign cloth. For we are then in a position, having confidence in our ability to control forces of violence, to offer civil disobedience, if it is at all found necessary.

I can, therefore, find no balm for the deep wounds inflicted upon you by the Government other than non-violence translated into action by boycott of fereign cloth and mrnufacture of cloth in our own homes.

I am,
Your friend and comrade,
M. K. GANDHI.

MANIFESTO ON FREEDOM OF OPINION.

[*The Government of Bombay in a* communique *dated the 15th September* 1921, *explained their reasons for prosecuting the Ali Brothers. Mr. Gandhi, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Messrs. Motilal Nehru, N. C. Kelkar, S. E. Stokes, Lajpat Rai, Ajmal Khan and about* 50 *others issued the following manifesto on 4th October* :—]

In view of the prosecution of the Ali Brothers and others for the reasons stated in the Government of Bombay communique, dated the 15th September, 1921, we, the undersigned, speaking in our individual capacity, desire to state that it is the inherent right of every one to express his opinion without restraint about the propriety of citizens offering their services to, or remaining in the employ of the Government, whether in the Civil or the Military department.

We, the undersigned, state it as our opinion that it is contrary to national dignity for any Indian to serve as a civilian, and more especially as a soldier, under a system of Government which has brought about India's economic, moral and political degradation and which has used the soldiers and the police for repressing national aspirations, as for instance at the time of the Rowlatt Act agitation, and which has used the soldiers for crushing the liberty of the Arabs, the Egyptians, the Turks, and other nations who have done no harm to India.

We are also of opinion that it is the duty of every Indian soldier and civilian to sever his connection with the Government and find some other means of livelihood

THE GREAT SENTINEL.

REPLY TO RABINDRANATH TAGORE.

[*In the October* (1921) *number of the* Modern Review, *Rabindranath Tagore wrote an article "The Call of Truth" criticising some features of the non-co-operation movement. Mr. Gandhi replied to the criticism in the* Young India *of the 13th October.*]

The Bard of Shantiniketan has contributed to the *Modern Review* a brilliant essay on the present movement. It is a series of word pictures which he alone can paint. It is an eloquent protest against authority, slave mentality or whatever description one gives of blind acceptance of a passing mania whether out of fear or hope. It is a welcome and wholesome reminder to all workers, that we must not be impatient, we must not impose authority, no matter how great. The Poet tells us summarily to reject anything and everything that does not appeal to our reason or heart. If we would gain Swaraj, we must stand for Truth as we know it at any cost. A reformer who is enraged because his message is not accepted must retire to the forest to learn how to watch, wait and pray. With all this one must heartily agree, and the Poet deserves the thanks of his countrymen for standing up for Truth and Reason. There is no doubt that our last state will be worse than our first, if we surrender our reason into somebody's keeping. And I would feel extremely sorry to discover, that the country had unthinkingly and blindly followed all I had said or done. I am quite conscious

of the fact that blind surrender to love is often more mischievous than a forced surrender to the lash of the tyrant. There is hope for the slave of the brute, none for that of love. Love is needed to strengthen the weak, love becomes tyrannical when it exacts obedience from an unbeliever. To mutter a "mantra" without knowing its value is unmanly. It is good, therefore, that the Poet has invited all who are slavishly mimicking the call of the "charkha" boldly to declare their revolt. His essay serves as a warning to us all who in our impatience are betrayed into intolerance or even violence against those who differ from us: I regard the Poet as a sentinel warning us against the approach of enemies called Bigotry, Lethargy, Intolerance, Ignorance, Inertia and other members of that brood.

But whilst I agree with all that the Poet has said as to the necessity of watchfulness lest we cease to think, I must not be understood to endorse the proposition that there is any such blind obedience on a large scale in the country to-day. I have again and again appealed to reason, and let me assure him that, if happily the country has come to believe in the spinning-wheel as the giver of plenty, it has done so after laborious thinking, after great hesitation. I am not sure, that even now educated India has assimilated the truth underlying the "charka." He must not mistake the surface dirt for the substance underneath. Let him go deeper and see for himself, whether the "charka" has been accepted from blind faith or from reasoned necessity.

I do indeed ask the Poet and the sage to spin the wheel as a sacrament. When there is war, the poet lays down the lyre, the lawyer his law reports, the school boy his books. The Poet will sing the true note

after the war is over, the lawyer will have occasion to go to his law books when people have time to fight among themselves. When a house is on fire, all the inmates go out, and each one takes up a bucket to quench the fire. When all about me are dying for want of food, the only occupation permissible to me is to feed the hungry. It is my conviction that India is a house on fire, because its manhood is being daily scorched, it is dying of hunger because it has no work to buy food with. Khulna is starving not because the people cannot work but because they have no work. The Ceded Districts are passing successively through a fourth famine. Orissa is a land suffering from chronic famines. Our cities are not India. India lives in her seven and a half lacs of villages, and the cities live upon the villages. They do not bring their wealth from other countries. The city people are brokers and commission agents for the big houses of Europe, America and Japan. The cities have co-operated with the latter in the bleeding process that has gone on for the past two hundred years. It is my belief, based on experience, that India is daily growing poorer. The circulation about her feet and legs has almost stopped. And if we do not take care, she will collapse altogether.

To a people famishing and idle, the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food as wages. God created man to work for his food, and said that those who ate without work were thieves. Eighty per cent. of India are compulsorily thieves half the year. Is it any wonder, if India has become one vast prison ? Hunger is the argument that is driving India to the spinning wheel. The call of the spinning wheel is the noblest of all, because it is

the call of love. And love is Swaraj. The spinning wheel will 'curb the mind' when time spent on necessary physical labour can be said to do so. We must think of the millions who are to-day less than animals, who are almost in a dying state. The spinning wheel is the reviving draught for millions of our dying countrymen and countrywomen. '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 course of every pice that finds its way into your pocket, and you will realise the truth of what I write. Swaraj has no meaning for the millions if they do not know how to employ their enforced idleness. The attainment of this Swaraj is possible within a short time, and it is so possible only by the revival of the spinning wheel.

I do want growth, I do want self-determination, I do want freedom, but I want all these for the soul. I doubt if the steel age is an advance upon the flint age. I am indifferent. It is the evolution of the soul to which the intellect and all our faculties have to be devoted. I have no difficulty in imagining the possibility of a man armoured after the modern style making some lasting and new discovery for mankind, but I have less difficulty in imagining the possibility of a man having nothing but a bit of flint and a nail for lighting his path or his match-lock ever singing new hymns of praise and delivering to an aching world a message of peace and goodwill upon earth. A plea for the spinning wheel is a plea for recognising the dignity of labour

I claim that in losing the spinning wheel we lost our left lung. We are, therefore, suffering from galloping consumption. The restoration of the wheel arrests

the progress of the fell disease. There are certain things which all must do in all climes. The spinning wheel is the thing which all must turn in the Indian clime for the transition stage at any rate and the vast majority must for all time.

It was our love of foreign cloth that ousted the wheel from its position of dignity. Therefore I consider it a sin to wear foreign cloth. I must confess that I do not draw a sharp or any distinction between economics and ethics. Economics that hurt the moral well-being of an individual or a nation are immoral and therefore sinful. Thus the economics that permit one country to prey upon another are immoral. It is sinful to buy and use articles made by sweated labour. It is sinful to eat American wheat and let my neighbour, the grain dealer, starve for want of custom. Similarly it is sinful for me to wear the latest finery of Regent Street, when I know that if I had but worn the things woven by the neighbouring spinners and weavers, that would have clothed me, and fed and clothed them. On the knowledge of my sin bursting upon me, I must consign the foreign garments to the flames and thus purify myself, and thenceforth rest content with the rough "Khadi" made by my neighbours. On knowing that my neighbours may not, having given up the occupation, take kindly to the spinning wheel, I must take it up myself and thus make it popular.

I venture to suggest to the Poet, that the clothes I ask him to burn must be and are his. If they had to his knowledge belonged to the poor or the ill-clad, he would long ago have restored to the poor what was theirs. In burning my foreign clothes I burn my shame. I must refuse to insult the naked by giving them clothes

they do not need, instead of giving them work which they sorely need. I will not commit the sin of becoming their patron, but on learning that I had assisted in impoverishing them, I would give them a privileged position and give them neither crumbs nor cast off clothing, but the best of my food and clothes and associate myself with them in work.

Nor is the scheme of Non-co-operation or Swadeshi an exclusive doctrine. My modesty has prevented me from declaring from the house top that the message of Non-Co-operation, non-violence and Swadeshi is a message to the world. It must fall flat, if it does not bear fruit in the soil where it has been delivered. At the present moment India has nothing to share with the world save her degradation, pauperism and plagues. Is it her ancient Shastras that we should send to the world? Well, they are printed in many editions, and an incredulous and idolatrous world refuses to look at them, because we, the heirs and custodians, do not live them. Before therefore I can think of sharing with the world, I must possess. Our non-co-operation is neither with the English nor with the West. Our non-co-operation is with the system the English have established, with the material civilisation and its attendant greed and exploitation of the weak. Our non-co-operation is a retirement within ourselves. Our non-co-operation is a refusal to co-operate with the English administrators on their own terms. We say to them, 'Come and co-operate with us on our terms, and it will be well for us, for you and the world.' We must refuse to be lifted off our feet. A drowning man cannot save others. In order to be fit to save others we must try to save ourselves. Indian national

lism is not exclusive, nor aggressive, nor destructive. It is health-giving, religious and therefore humanitarian. India must learn to live before she can aspire to die for humanity. The mice which helplessly find themselves between the cat's teeth acquire no merit from their enforced sacrifice. True to his poetical 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 early in the 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 veins new blood had flown during the previous night. But I have had 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.

HONOUR THE PRINCE

[It was announced that H. R. H. the Prince of wales was to arrive in India in November 17 and great preparations were made by Government to give the Royal visitor a fitting reception. Writing in *Young India* of October 27, Mr. Gandhi urged his countrymen to boycott the Prince's visit. With no illwill against the Prince as man, The people were asked to dissociate themselves from all functious and festivities arranged in his honour by the Government. Mr. Gandhi wrote :—]

The reader must not be surprised at the title of this writing. Supposing that the Prince was a blood brother in a high place, supposing that he was to be exploited by neighbours for their own base ends, supposing further that he was in the hands of my neighbours, that my voice could not effectively reach him and that he was being brought to my village by the said neighbours, would I not honour him best by dissociating myself from all the ceremonial that might be arranged in his 'honour' in the process of exploitation and by letting him know by every means at my disposal that he was being exploited? Would I not be a traitor to him if I did not warn him against entering the trap prepared for him by my neighbours?

I have no manner of doubt that the Prince's visit is being exploited for advertising the 'benign' British rule in India. It is a crime against us if His Royal Highness is being brought for personal pleasure and sport when India is seething with discontent, when the masses are saturated with disaffection towards the system under which they are governed, when famine is raging in Khulna and the Ceded Districts and when an armed

conflict is raging in Malabar: it is a crime against India to spend millions of rupees on a mere show when millions of men are living in a state of chronic starvation. Eight lacs of rupees have been voted away by the Bombay Council alone for the pageant.

The visit is being heralded by repression in the land. In Sindh over fifty six non-co-operators are in gaol. Some of the bravest of Musalmans are being tried for holding certain opinions. Nineteen Bengal workers have been just imprisoned including Mr. Sen Gupta, the leading Barrister of the place. A Musalman Pir and three other selflessworkers are already in gaol for a similiar 'crime'. Several leaders of Karnatak are also imprisoned, and now its chief man is on trial for saying what I have said repeatedly in these columns and what Congressmen have been saying all over during the past twelve months. Several leaders of the Central Provinces have been similarly deprived of their liberty. A most popular doctor, Dr Paranjpye, a man universally respected for his selflessness, is suffering rigorous imprisonment like a common felon. I have by no means exhausted the list of imprisonments of non-co-operators. Whether they are a test of real crime or an answer to growing disaffection, the Prince's visit is, to say the least, most inopportune. There is no doubt that the people do not want His Royal Highness to visit India at the present juncture. They have expressed their opinion in no uncertain terms. They have declared that Bombay should observe *Hartal* on the day of his landing at Bombay. It is a clear imposition upon the people to bring the Prince in the teeth of their opposition.

What are we to do in the circumstances? We must organise a complete boycott of all functions held in the Prince's honour. We must religiously refrain from attending charities, fetes or fireworks organised for the purpose. We must refuse to illuminate or to send our children to see the organised illuminations. To this end we must publish leaflets by the million and distribute them amongst the people telling them what their duty in the matter is and it would be true honour done to the Prince if Bombay on the day of his landing wears the appearance of a deserted city.

But we must isolate the Prince from the person. We have no ill-will against the Prince as man. He probably knows nothing of the feeling in India, he probably knows nothing about repression. Equally probably he is ignorant of the fact that the Punjab wound is still bleeding, that the treachery towards India in the matter of the Khilafat is still rankling in every Indian breast, and that on the Government's own admission the reformed councils contain members who, though nominally elected, do not in any sense represent even the few lacs who are on the electoral rolls. To do or to attempt to do any harm to the person of the Prince would be not only cruel and inhuman, but it would be on our part a piece of treachery towards ourselves and him, for we have voluntarily pledged ourselves to be and remain non-violent. Any injury or insult to the Prince by us will be a greater wrong done by us to Islam and India than any the English have done. They know no better. We can lay no such claim to ignorance, we have with our eyes open and before God and man promised not to hurt a single individual in any way connected with the system we are straining

every nerve to destroy. It must therefore be our duty to take every precaution to protect his person as our own from all harm.

In spite of all our effort, we know that there will be some who would want to take part in the vorious functions from fear or hope or choice. They have as much right to do what they like as we have to do what we like. That is the test of the freedom we wish to have and enjoy. Let us, whilst we are being subjected by an insolent bureaucracy to a severe irritation,exercise the greatest restraint. And if we can exhibit our firm resolve to have nothing to do with it by dissociating ourselves from its pageant at the same time that we shcw forbearance towards those who differ from us, we would advance our cause in a most effective manner.

THE BOMBAY RIOTS.

I. THE STATEMENT.

[*H. R. H. the Prince of Wales arrived in Bombay on the 17th November. Non-Co-operators all over the country had organised what are known as 'hartals,' closing of shops and suspending all work, and boycotting the Prince. In Bombay such activities resulted in a great riot in which all parties suffered owing to the hooliganism of the mischievous elements in the mob who violated Mr. Gandhi's injunctions to be nonviolent and brought about a terrible riot. Mr. Gandhi was then in Bombay and after witnessing the scene of the tragedy, wrote some of the most stirring letters which, coupled*

with the exertions of men of all parties, restored peace in the city. The following is the text of Mr. Gandhi's first statement :]

The reputation of Bombay, the hope of my dreams, was being stained yesterday even whilst in my simplicity I was congratulating her citizens upon their non-violence in the face of grave provocation. For the volunteers with their Captain were arrested during the previous night for pasting posters under authority on private property. The posters advised the people to boycott the welcome to the Prince. They were destroyed. The Swaraj Sabha's office was mysteriously entered into and the unused posters, so far as I am aware not declared unlawful, were also removed. The Prince's visit itself and the circumstances attending the ceremonials arranged and the public money wasted for the manufacture of a welcome to His Royal Highness constituted an unbearable provocation. And yet Bombay has remained self-restrained. This, I thought, was a matter for congratulation. The burning of the pile of foreign cloth was an eloquent counter demonstration to the interested official demonstration. Little did I know that, at the very time that the Prince was passing through the decorated route and the pile of foreign cloth was burning in another part of the city, the mill-hands were in criminal disobedience of the wishes of their masters emptying them, first one and then the others, by force, that a swelling mob was molesting the peaceful passengers in the tramcars and holding up the tram traffic, that it was forcibly depriving those that were wearing foreign caps of their head-dresses and pelting inoffensive Europeans. As the day went up, the fury of the mob, now intoxicated with its initial

success, rose also. They burnt tramcars and a motor, smashed liquor shops and burnt two.

DETAILS OF OUTBREAK.

I heard of the outbreak at about one o'clock. I motored with some friends to the area of disturbances and heard the most painful and the most humliating story of molestation of Parsi sisters. Some few were assaulted and even had their saris torn from them. No one among a crowd of over fifteen hundred who had surrounded my car, denied the charge as a Parsi with hot rage and quivering lips was with the greatest deliberation narrating the story. An elderly Parsi gentleman said : "Please save us from the mob rule."

This news of the rough handling of Parsi sisters pierced me like a dart. I felt that my sisters or daughters had been hurt by a violent mob. Yes, some Parsis had joined the welcome. They had a right to hold their own view, free of molestation. There can be no coercion in Swaraj. The Moplah fanatic who forcibly converts a Hindu believes that he is acquiring religious merit A Non-Co-operator or his associate who uses coercion has no apology whatsoever for his criminality.

As I reached the two tanks I found, too, a liquor shop smashed and two policemen badly wounded and lying unconscious on cots without anybody caring for them. I alighted. Immediately the crowd surrounded me and yelled "Mahatma Gandhiki-jai". That sound usually grates on my ears, but it has grated never so much as it did yesterday, when the crowd, unmindful of the two sick brethren, choked me with the shout at the top of their voices. I rebuked them and they were silent. Water was brought for the two wounded men, I requested two of my companions and

some from the crowd to take the dying policemen to the Hospital.

I proceeded then to the scene, a little further up, where I saw a fire rising. There were two tram cars which were burnt by the crowd. On returning I witnessed a burning motor car. I appealed to the crowd to disperse, told them that they had damaged the cause of the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. I returned sick at heart and in a chastened mood.

At about 5 a few brave Hindu young men came to report that in Bhindi Bazar the crowd was molesting every passer-by who had a foreign cap on and even seriously beating him if he refused to give up his cap. A brave old Parsi who defied the crowd and would not give up his pugree was badly handled. Moulana Azad Sobhani and I went to Bhindi Bazar and reasoned with the crowd. We told them that they were denying their religion by hurting innocent men. The crowd made a show of dispersing. The police were there, but they were exceedingly restrained. We went further on and retracing our steps found to our horror a liquor shop on fire; even the fire brigade was obstructed in its work. Thanks to the efforts of Pandit Nekiram Kharan and others, the inmates of the shop were able to come out.

NATURE OF THE CROWD.

The crowd did not consist of hooligans only or boys. It was not an unintelligent crowd. They were not all mill-hands. It was essentially a mixed crowd, unprepared and unwilling to listen to anybody. For the moment it had lost its head and it was not a crowd, but several crowds numbering in all less than twenty thousand. It was bent upon mischief and destruction.

I heard that there was firing resulting in deaths and that in the Anglo-Indian quarters every one who passed with khadder on came in for hard beating if he did not put off his khadder cap or shirt. I heard that many were seriously injured. I am writing this in the midst of six Hindu and Musalman workers who have just come in with broken heads and bleeding and one with a broken nasal bone and another lacerated wounds and in danger of losing his life. They went to Parel led by Maulana Azad Sobhani and Moazzam Ali to pacify the mill hands, who, it was reported, were holding up the tram cars there. The workers, however, were enabled to proceed to their destination. They returned with their bleedings to speak for themselves.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Thus the hope of reviving mass civil disobedience has once more been dashed, in my opinion, to pieces. The atmosphere for mass civil disobedience is absent. It is not enough that such an atmoshere is to be found in Bardoli and therefore it may go on side by side with the violence in Bombay. This is impossible. Neither Bardoli nor Bombay can be treated as separate, unconnected units. They are parts of one great indivisible whole. It was possible to isolate Malabar; it was also possible to disregard Malegaon. But it is not possible to ignore Bombay. Non-Co-operators cannot escape liability. It is true that Non-Co operators were ceaselessly remonstrating everywhere with the people at considerable risk to themselves to arrest or stop the mischief and that they are responsible for saving many precious lives. But that is not enough for launching out on civil disobedience or to discharge them from liability for the violence that has taken place. We claim to have esta-

blished a peaceful atmosphere, *i.e.*, to have attained by our non-violence sufficient control over the people to keep their violence under check. We have failed when we ought to have succeeded, for yesterday was a day of our trial. We were under our pledge bound to protect the person of the Prince from any harm or insult and we broke that pledge inasmuch as any one of us insulted or injured a single European or any other who took part in the welcome to the Prince. They were as much entitled to take part in the welcome as we were to refrain.

Nor can I shirk my own personal responsibility. I am more instrumental than any other in bringing into being the spirit of revolt. I find myself not fully capable of controlling and disciplining that spirit. I must do penance for it. For me the struggle is essentially religious. I believe in fasting and prayer and I propose henceforth to observe every Monday a 24 hour's fast till Swaraj is obtained.

The Working Committee will have to devote its attention to the situation and consider in the light thereof, whether mass civil disobedience can be at all encouraged, until we have obtained complete control over the masses. I have personally come deliberately to the conclusion that mass civil disobedience cannot be started for the present. I confess my inability to conduct a campaign of Civil disobedience to a successful issue unless a completely non-violent spirit is generated among the people.

I am sorry for the conclusion. It is a humiliating confession of my incapacity, but I know that I shall appear more pleasing to my Maker by being what I am instead of appearing to be what I am not. If I can have

nothing to do with the organised violence of the Government, I can have less to do with the unorganised violence of the people. I would prefer to be cursed between the two

---

II.—MESSAGE TO THE CITIZENS OF BOMBAY.

Shocked at the riot and bloodshed that he witnessed in Bombay, Mr. Gandhi issued the following appeal to the men and women of Bombay on the morning of the 19th November.

Men and Women of Bombay,—It is not possible to describe the agony I have suffered during the past two days. I am writing this now at 3-30 A.M. in perfect peace. After 2 hours of prayer and meditation I have found it. I must refuse to eat or drink anything but water, till the Hindus and Mahomedans of Bombay have made peace with the Parsis, Christians and Jews and till Non-Co-operators have made peace with co-operators. The Swaraj that I have witnessed during the last two days has stunk in my nostrils. Hindu-Muslim unity had been a menace to the handful of Parsis, Christians and Jews. The non-violence of the Non-Co-operators has been worse than violence of co-operators. For with non-violence on our lips we have terrorised those who have differed from us and in so doing we have denied our God. There is only one God for us all whether we find him through Koran, Bible, Zend Avesta, Talmud or Gita, and he is the God of Truth and Love.

I have no interest in living save for this faith in me. I cannot hate the Englishman or anyone else. I have spoken and written much against his institutions, especially the one he has set up in India. I shall

continue to do so if I live; but we must not mistake my condemnation of the system for the man. My religion required me to love him as I love myself. I would deny God if I did not attempt to prove it at this critical moment. And the Parsis—I have meant every word I have said about them. Hindus and Mussalmans would be unworthy of freedom if they do not defend them and their honour with their lives. They have only recently proved their liberality and friendship. Mussalmans are specially beholden to them, for Parsis have, compared to their numbers, given more than they themselves to the Khilafat funds. I cannot face again the appealing eyes of Parsi men and women that I saw on the 17th inst., as I passed through them, unless Hindus and Mussalmans have expressed full and free repentance, nor can I face Mr. Andrews when he returns from East Africa, if we have done no reparation to Indian-born Christians whom we are bound to protect as our own brothers and sisters. We may not think of what they in self-defence or by way of reprisals have done to some of us. You can see quite clearly that I must do the utmost reparation to this handful of men and women, who have been the victims of forces that have come into being largely through my instrumentality. I invite every Hindu and Mussalman to do likewise, but I do not want anyone to fast, which is only good when it comes in answer to prayer and as a felt yearning of the soul. I invite every Hindu and Mussalman to retire to his home and ask God for forgiveness and to befriend the injured communities from the bottom of their hearts. I invite my fellow workers not to waste a word of sympathy on me. I need or deserve none. But I invite them to make

ceaseless effort to regain control over the turbulent elements. This is a terribly true struggle. There is no room for sham or humbug in it. Before we can make any further progress without struggle we must cleanse our hearts.

One special word to my Mussalman brothers. I have approached Khilafat as a sacred cause. I have striven for Hindu-Muslim unity because India cannot live free without it, and because we would both deny God if we considered one another as natural enemies. I have thrown myself into the arms of the Ali brothers, because I believe them to be true and God-fearing men. The Mussalmans have to my knowledge played a leading part during the two days of carnage. It has deeply hurt me. I ask every Mussalman worker to rise to his full height to realise his duty to his faith and see that the carnage stops. May God bless everyone of us with wisdom and courage to do the right at any cost!

I am, Your Servant, *M. K. Gandhi.*

III. APPEAL TO THE HOOLIGANS OF BOMBAY.

[*Mr. Gandhi issued another appeal, this time to the Hooligans of Bombay who brought about the terrible scenes of murder. The following is the full text of the appeal which was circulated broadcast in all vernaculars on Nov. 21.*]

To Hooligans of Bombay.—The most terrible mistake I have made is that I thought non-co-operators had acquired influence over you, and that you had understood the relative value of political wisdom of non-violence though not the moral necessity of it. I had thought that you had sufficiently understood the interests of your country not to meddle with the movement to its detri-

ment and that, therefore, you would have wisdom enough not to give way to your worst passions, but it cuts me to the quick to find that you have used mass awakening for your own lust for plunder, rapine and even indulging in your worst animal appetite. Whether you call yourself a Hindu, Mahomedan, Parsi, Christian or Jew, you have certainly failed to consider even your own religious interests. Some of my friends would, I know, accuse me of ignorance of human nature. If I believed the charge, I would plead guilty and retire from human assemblies and return only after acquiring knowledge of human nature, but I know that I had no difficulty in controlling even Indian hooligans in South Africa. I was able because I had succeeded in approaching them through co-workers where I had no personal contact with them. In your case, I see we have failed to reach you. I do not believe you to be incapaple of responding to the noble call of religion and country. See what you have done. Hindu-Mussalman hooligans have violated the sanctity of Parsi temples, and they have exposed their own to similar risk from the wrath of Parsi hooligans. Because some Parsis have chosen to partake in the welcome to the Prince, Hindu and Mussalman hooligans have roughly handled every Parsi they have met. The result has been that Parsi hooligans are less to blame. Hindu and Mussalman hooligans have rudely, roughly and insolently removed foreign clothes worn by some Parsis and Christians, forgetting that not all Hindus and all Mussalmans, nor by any means even a majority of them have religiously discarded the use of foreign clothes. Parsi and Christian hooligans are, therefore, interfering with Hindu and Mussalman wearers of Khaddar.

Thus, we are all moving in a vicious circle and the country suffers. I write this not to blame, but to warn you and to confess that we have grievously neglected you. I am doing penance in one way, other workers are doing in another way. Messrs. Azad Sobhani, Jaykar, Jamnadas, Mitha, Sathe, Moazam Ali and many others have been risking their lives in bringing under control this unfortunate ebullition. Srimati Sarojini Naidu has fearlessly gone in your midst to reason with you, and to appeal to you. Our work in your midst has only just begun. Will you not give us a chance by stopping the mad process of retaliation? Hindus and Mussalmans should be ashamed to take reprisals against the Parsis or Christians. The latter must know it to be suicidal to battle against the Hindu and Mussalman ferocity by brute strength. The result is they must seek assistance of an alien Government, *i.e.*, sell their freedom. Surely the best course for them is to realise their nationality and believe that reasoning Hindus and Mussalmans must and will protect the interests of the minorities before their own. Anyway, the problem before Bombay is to ensure absolute protection of the minorities and acquisition of control over the rowdy element, and I shall trust that you, hooligans of Bombay, will now restrain your hand and give a chance to the workers who are desirous of serving you. May God help you.—I am, your friend, *M. K. Gandhi.*

IV.—APPEAL TO HIS CO-WORKERS.

[*Late on the 22nd evening, Mr. Gandhi issued the following manifesto to his co-workers :—*]

Comrades,—The past few days had been a fiery ordeal for me, and God is to be thanked that some of us had not been found wanting. The broken heads before me and the dead bodies of which I have heard from an unimpeachable authority, are sufficient evidence of the fact. Workers have lost their limbs, or their lives, or have suffered bruises in the act of preserving peace, of weaning mad countrymen from their wrath. These deaths and injuries show that, in spite of the error of many of our countrymen, some of us are prepared to die for the attainment of our goal. If all of us had imbibed the spirit of non-violence, or if some had, and others had remained passive, no blood need have been spilt, but it was not to be. Some must, therefore, voluntarily give their blood in order that a bloodless atmosphere may be created, so long as there are people weak enough to seek the aid of those who have superior skill or means for doing it. And that is why the Parsis and Christians sought and received assistance of the Government, so that the Government openly took sides and armed and aided the latter in retaliatory madness and criminally neglected to protect a single life among those who, though undoubtedly guilty in the first instance, were victims of unparadonable wrath of the Parsis, Christians and Jews. The Government have thus appeared in their nakedness as party doing violence not merely to preserve the peace but to sustain aggressive

violence of its injured supporters. The police and military looked on with callous indifference, whilst the Christians in their justifiable indignation deprived innocent men of their white cap, and hammered those who would not surrender them, or whilst the Parsis assaulted or shot not in self-defence, but because the victims happened to be Hindus or Mussalmans, or non-co-operators. I can excuse the aggrieved Parsis or Christians, but can find no excuse for the military and police for taking sides. So the task before the workers is to take the blow from the Government, and our erring countrymen. This is the only way open to us of sterilizing the forces of violence. The way to immediate swaraj lies through our gaining control over the forces of violence, and that not by greater violence, but by moral influence. We must see as clearly as daylight that it is impossible for us to be trained and armed for violence if active enugh for displacing the existing Government.

Some people imagine that after all we would not have better advertised our indignation against the welcome to the Prince of Wales than by letting loose the mob frenzy on the fateful 17th. The reasoning betrays at once ignorance and weakness—ignorance of the fact that our goal was not injury to the welcome, and weakness because we still hanker after advertising our strength to others instead of being satisfied with the conciousness of its possession.

I wish I could convince everyone that we have materially retarded our progress to our triple goal. But all is not lost if the workers realise and act up to their responsibility. We must secure the full co-operation of the rowdies of Bombay. We must know

the millhands. They must either work for Goverment or for us *i.e.*, for violence or against it. There is no middle way. They must not interfere with us. Either they must be amenable to our love or helplessly submit it to the bayonet. They must not seek shelter under the banner of non-violence for the purpose of doing violence. And in order to carry our message to them we must reach every millhand individually and let him understand and appreciate the struggle.

Similarly we must reach the rowdy elements, befriend them and help them to understand the religious character of the struggle. We must neither neglect them nor pander to them. We must become true servants. The peace that we are aiming at is not a patched up peace. We must have fair guarantees of its continuance without the aid of Government, and sometimes, even in spite of its activity to the contrary. There must be a heart union between the Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsis, Christians and Jews. The three latter communities may and will distrust the other two. The recent occurrences must strenghthen that distrust. We must go out of our way to conquer their distrust. We must not molest them if they do not become non-co-operators, or do not adopt swadeshi or white khaddar cap, which has become its symbol. We must not be irritated against them even if they side with the Government on every occasion. We have to make them ours by loving service.

This is the necessity of the situation. The alternative is a civil war and a civil war with a third party consolidating itself by siding now with one and then with the other, must be held an impossibility for the near future. And what is true of smaller communities is also true of co-operators. We must not be impatient

with or intolerant to them. We are bound to recognise their freedom to co-operate with the Government if we claim freedom to non-co-operate. What would we have felt if we are in a minority, and co-operators being a majority, had used violence against us. Non-co-operation and non-violence is the most expeditious method known in the world of winning our opponents. And our struggle consists in winning our opponents, including the Englishmen, over to our side. We can only do so by being free from ill-will against the weakest or strongest of them, and that we can only do by being prepared to die for truth within us and not by killing those who do not see the truth we enunciate. I am your grateful comrade.—*M. K. Gandhi.*"

V. PEACE AT LAST

[*Mr. Gandhi broke his fast in the midst of a gathering of co-operators, non-co-operators, Hindus, Musalmans, Christians and Parsis. There were speeches of goodwill by a representative of each community. The members of the Working Committee were also present. Mr. Gandhi made a statement in Gujarati before breaking his fast. The following is its translation* :—]

Friends,

It delights my heart to see Hindus, Musalmans, Parsis and Christians met together in this little assembly. I hope that our frugal fruit-repast of this morning will be a sign of our permanent friendship. Though a born optimist, I am not in the habit of building castles in the air. This meeting therefore cannot deceive me. We shall be able to realize the hope of permanent friendship between all communities,

only if we who have assembled together will incessantly strive to build it up. I am breaking my fast upon the strength of your assurances. I have not been unmindful of the affection with which innumerable friends have surrounded me during these four days. I shall ever remain grateful to them. Being drawn by them I am plunging into this stormy ocean out of the haven of peace in which I have been during these few days. I assure you that, in spite of the tales of misery that have been poured into my ears, I have enjoyed peace because of a hungry stomach I know that I cannot enjoy it after breaking the fast. I am too human not to be touched by the sorrows of others, and when I find no remedy for alleviating them, my human nature so agitates me that I pine to embrace death like a long-lost dear friend. Therefore I warn all the friends here that if real peace is not established in Bombay and if disturbances break out again and if as a result they find me driven to a still severer ordeal, they must not be surprised or troubled. If they have any doubt about peace having been established, if each community has still bitterness of feeling and suspicion and if we are all not prepared to forget and forgive past wrongs, I would much rather that they did not press me to break the fast. Such a restraint I would regard as a test of true friendship.

I venture to saddle special responsibility upon Hindus and Musalmans. The majority of them are non-co-operators. Non-violence is the creed they have accepted for the time being. They have the strength of numbers. They can stand in spite of the opposition of the smaller communities without Government aid. If, therefore, they will remain friendly and charitable towards the smaller communities, all will be well. I will

beseech the Parsis, the Christians and the Jews to bear in mind the new awakening in India. They will see many-coloured waters in the ocean of Hindu and Musalman humanity. They will see dirty waters on the shore. I would ask them to bear with their Hindu or Musalman neighbours who may misbehave with them and immediately report to the Hindu and Musalman leaders through their own leaders with a view to getting justice. Indeed I am hoping that as a result of the unfortunate discord a Mahajan will come into being for the disposal of all inter-racial disputes.

The value of this assembly in my opinion consists in the fact that worshippers of the same one God we are enabled to partake of this harmless repast together in spite of our differences of opinion. We have not assembled with the object to-day of reducing such differences, certainly not of surrendering a single principle we may hold dear, but we have met in order to demonstrate that we can remain true to our principles and yet also remain free from ill-will towards one another

May God bless our effort.

VI.—THE MORAL ISSUE.

[*Mr. Gandhi, writing in* Young India *of Dec. 24, pointed out the lesson of the tragedy and wrote on the moral issue before the country.*]

As soon as we lose the moral basis, we cease to be religious. There is no such thing as religion overriding morality. Man for instance cannot be untruthful, cruel or incontinent and claim to have God on his side. In Bombay the sympathisers of non-co-operation lost their

moral balance. They were enraged against the Parsis and the Christians who took part in the welcome to the Prince and sought to 'teach them a lesson'. They invited reprisals and got them. It became after the 17th a game of seesaw in which no one really gained and everybody lost.

Swaraj does not lie that way. India does not want Bolshevism. The people are too peaceful to stand anarchy. They will bow the knee to any one who restores so-called order. Let us recognise the Indian phychology. We need not stop to inquire whether such hankering after peace is a virtue or a vice. The average Musalman of India is quite different from the average Musalman of the other parts of the world. His Indian associations have made him more docile than his co-religionists outside India. He will not stand tangible insecurity of life and property for any length of time. The Hindu is, proverbially, almost contemptibly mild. The Parsi and the Christian love peace more than strife. Indeed we have almost made religion subservient to peace. This mentality is at once our weakness and our strength.

Let us nurse the better, the religious part of of this mentality of ours. 'Let there be no compulsion in religion.' Is it not religion with us to observe Swadeshi and therefore wear *Khadi*? But if the religion of others does not require them to adopt Swadeshi, we may not compel them. We broke the universal law restated in the Quran. And the law does not mean that there may be compulsion in other matters. The verse means that, if it is bad to use compulsion in religion about which we have definite convictions, it is worse to resort to it in matters of less moment..

We can only therefore argue and reason with our opponents. The extreme to which we may go is non-violent non-co-operation with them even as with the Government. But we may not non-co-operate with them in private life, for we do not non-co-operate with the men composing the Goverment. We are non co-operating with the system they administer. We decline to render official service to Sir George Lloyd the Governor, we dare not withold social service from Sir George Lloyd, the Englishman.

The mischief, I am sorry to say, began among the Hindus and the Musalmans themselves. There was social persecution, there was coercion. I must confess that I did not always condemn it as strongly as I might have. I might have dissociated myself from the movement when it became at all general. We soon mended our ways, we became more tolerant but the subtle coercion was there. I passed it by as I thought it would die a natural death. I saw in Bombay that it had not. It assumed a virulent form on the 17th.

We damaged the Khilafat cause and with it that of the Punjab and Swaraj. We must retrace our steps and scrupulously insure minorities against the least molestation. If the Christian wishes to wear the European hat and unmentionables, he must be free to do so. If a Parsi wishes to stick to his *Fenta*, he has every right to do so. If they both see their safety in associating themselves with the Government, we may only wean them from their error by appealing to their reason, not by breaking their heads. The greater the coercion we use, the greater the security we give to the Government, if only because the latter has more effective weapons of coercion than we have. For us to resort

to greater corcion than the Government will be to make India more slave than she is now.

Swaraj is freedom for every one, the smallest among us, to do as he likes without any physical internerence with his liberty. Non-violent non-co-operation is the method whereby we cultivate the freest public opinion and get it enforced. When there is complete freedom of opinion, that of the majority must prevail. If we are in a minority, we can prove worthy of our religion by remaining true to it in the fact of coercion. The Prophet submitted to the coercion of the majority and remained true to his faith. And when he found himself in a majority he declared to his followers that there should be no compulsion in religion. Let us not again either by verbal or physical violence depart from the injunction, and by our own folly further cut back the hands of the clock of progress.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.

[*Though the author of the Civil Disobedience movement in India, Mr. Gandhi was always alive to its dangers. He therefore insisted that his conditions should be fulfilled in toto before any Taluka could embark on a compaign of Civil Disobedience. He was always very cautious in permitting Civil Disobedience as will be seen from the following article in* Young India. *He restrained at a certain stage, the majority of the Congress Committee from a rushing and perilous programme.*]

Civil disobedience was on the lips of every one of the members of the All-India Congress Committee. Not having really over tried it, every one appeared to be enamoured of it from a mistaken belief in it as a

soverign remedy for present day ills. I feel sure that it can be made such if we can produce the necessary atmosphere for it. For individuals there always is that atmosphere except when their civil disobedience is certain to lead to bloodshed. I discovered this exception during the Satyagraha days. But even so a call may come which one dare not neglect, cost it what it may. I can clearly see that time is coming to me when I must refuse obedience to every single State-made-law even though there may be a certainty of bloodshed. When neglect of the call means a denial of God, civil disobedience becomes a peremptory duty.

Mass civil disobedience stands on a different footing. It can only be tried in a calm atmosphere. It must be the calmness of strength not weakness, knowledge not ignorance. Individual civil disobedience may be and often is vicarious. Mass civil disobedience may be and often is selfish in the sense that individuals expect personal gain from their disobedience. Thus in South Africa, Kallenbach and Polak offered vicarious civil disobedience. They had nothing to gain. Thousands offered it because they expected personal gain also in the shape say of the removal of the annual poll-tax levied upon ex-indentured men and their wives and grown up children. It is sufficient in mass civil disobedience if the resisters understand the working of the doctrine.

It was in a practically uninhabited tract of country that I was arrested in South Africa when I was marching into prohibited area with over two to three thousand men and some women. The company included several Pathans and others who were able bodied men. It was the greatest testimony of merit the Government

of South Africa gave to the movement. They know that we were as harmless as we were determined. It was easy enough for that body of men to cut to pieces those who arrested me. It would have not only been a most cowardly thing to do, but it would have been a treacherous breach of their own pledge, and it would have meant ruin to the struggle for freedom and the forcible deportation of every Indian from South Africa. But the men were no rabble. They were disciplined soldiers and all the better for being unarmed. Though I was to inform them, they did not disperse, nor did they turn back. They marched on to their destination till they were every one of them arrested and imprisoned. So far as I am aware, this was one instance of discipline and non-violence for which there is no parallel in history. Without such restraint I see no hope of successful mass civil disobedience here.

We must dismiss the idea of overawing the Government by huge demonstrations every time some one is arrested. On the contrary we must treat arrest as the normal condition of the life of a non-co operator. For we must seek arrest and imprisonment as a soldier who goes to a battle to seek death. We expect to bear down the opposition of the Government by courting and not by avoiding imprisonment even though it be by showing our supposed readiness to be arrested and imprisoned. Civil disobedience then emphatically means our desire to surrender to a single unarmed policeman. Our triumph consists in thousands being led to the prisons like lambs to the slaughter house. If the lambs of the world had been willingly led they had long ago saved themselves from the butcher's knife.

Our triumph consists again in being imprisoned for no wrong whatever. The greater our innocence, the greater our strength and the swifter our victory.

As it is, this Government is cowardly. We are afraid of imprisonment. The Government takes advantage of our fear of gaols. If only our men and women welcome gaols as health-resorts, we will cease to worry about the dear ones put in gaols which our countrymen in South Africa need to nickname, His Majesty's Hotels.

We have too long been mentally disobedient to the laws of the State and have too often surreptiously evaded them, to be fired all of a sudden for civil disobedience. Disobedience to be civil has to be open and non-violent.

Complete civil disobedience is a state of peaceful rebellion—a refusal to obey every single State-made law. It is certainly more dangerous than an armed rebellion. For it can never be down if the civil resisters are prepared to face extreme hardship. It is based upon an implicit belief in the absolute efficacy of innocent suffering. By noiselessly going to prison a civil resister ensures a calm atmosphere. The wrongdoer wearies of wrong-doing in the absence of resistance. All pleasure is lost when the victim betrays no resistance. A full grasp of the conditions of successful civil resistance is necessary at least on the part of the representatives of the people before we can launch out on an enterprise of such magnitude. The quickest remedies are always fraught with the greatest danger and require the utmost skill in handling them. It is my firm conviction that if we bring about a successful boycott of foreign cloth we shall have produced an atmosphere that would enable us to inaugurate civil disobedience on a scale that no Government can resist. I would therefore

urge patience and determined concentration on Swadeshi upon those who are impatient to embark on mass civil disobedience.

THE MOPLAH OUTBREAK.

[*Mr. Gandhi addressed the following appeal to the Liberals on Nov. 27* :—]

Friends,—We are so preoccupied with our affairs that the events in Malabar hardly attract the attention they deserve. The ending of the trouble has become a matter of great urgency. It is one of simple humanity. Be the Moplahs ever so bad, they deserve to be treated as human beings. Their wives and children demand our sympathy. Nor are they all bad and yet there can be no doubt that many innocent men must have been adjudged guilty. Forcible conversions are terrible but Moplah bravery must command admiration. These Malabaris are not fighting for the love of it. They are fighting for what they consider as religion and in a manner they consider themselves religious. A vast majority of them have nothing personal to gain by continuing their defiance. Their sin is not of deliberation but of ignorance. If we permit the extermination of such brave people, it will be remembered against us and will be accounted as Indian cowardice.

I make bold to say that, had Mr. Yakub Hassan been allowed to go to Malabar, had I not been warned against entering Malabar, had Mussamans of real interest been invited to go, the long-drawn-out-agony could have been obviated, but it is not yet too late. The sword has been tried for three months and it has failed to answer its purpose. It has not bent the proud

Moplah nor has it saved Hindus from his depredation and lust, the sword has merely prevented the Moplas from overrunning the whole of Madras Presidency. It has exhibited no protective power. I am sure you will not plead incapacity. It is true that police and military are not transferred subjects, but you cannot escape moral responsibility. You are supporting the policy of Government regarding Malabar.

Nor, I hope, will you retort by blaming the Non-Co operators. They cannot admit any responsibility for the trouble at all, unless all agitation is to be held blameworthy. I admit, however, that non-co-operators were not able to reach their message to the Moplah homes. That would be reason for more, not less agitation, but I have not taken my pen to argue away the Non-Co-operator's blame.

I ask you to consider the broad humanities of the question, compel the Government to suspend hostilities, issue promise of freedom for past depredations upon the undertaking to surrender and to permit Non Co-operators to enter Malabar to persuade Moplahs to surrender.

I know the last suggestion means giving of importance to Non-Co-operators. Surely you do not doubt their number. As to their influence, if you do, you should find other means of dealing with the trouble than that of extermination. I am merely concerned with the termination of the shameful inhumanity proceeding in Malabar with both Liberals and Non-Co-operators as helpless witnesses. I have chosen to address this letter not to the Government but to you, because the Government could not have taken the inhuman course of destruction without your moral support. I beseech you to give heed to my prayer as of a dear friend.

REPLY TO LORD RONALDSHAY

[The hartal organised by non-co-operators in connection with the Prince's visit was more or less successful in many places. It was alleged that by intimidation and otherwise, the hartal in Calcutta on the day of the Prince's landing in Bombay was phenomenally complete. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce and the Anglo-Indian press took an alarmist view of the situation and expressed grave indignation against the passivity of the Government. With a view to suppress the activity of the Congress in this direction Government resuscitated partII of the Criminal Law Amendment Act which was then literally under a sentence of death. When volunteering was declared unlawful Congress leaders took up the challenge and called on the people to disobey the order and seek imprisonment in their thousands. Men like Messrs C. R Das in Calcutta and Motilal Nehru in Allahabad openly defied the order and canvassed volunteers in total disregard of legal consequences. They sought imprisonment and called on their countrymen to follow them to prison. The situation was grave. It was then that Pandit Madan Mohan Malavya, Sir P. C. Ray and others thought that the time had come when they should step into the breach and try to bring about a reconciliation between Government and non-co-operators. With this view Pandit Madan Mohan and others interviewed leading non-co-operators and those in authority. Lord Ronaldshay, in his speech at the Legislative Council referred to the gravity of the situation and defined the firm attitude of Government. Replying to His Excellency, Mr. Gandhi made the following statement on the 21st December, 1921.]

I have read Lord Ronaldshay's speech in the Bengal Legislative Council. Whilst I appreciate the note of conciliation about it, I cannot help saying that it is most misleading. I do not want to criticise those parts of the speech which lend themselves to criticism. I simply want to say that the present situation is entirely his own and the Viceroy's doing. In spite of my

strong desire to avoid suspecting the Government of India and the Local Government of a wish to precipitate a conflict with the people, up to now all that I have heard and read leads me to the conclusion that my suspicion is justified. Whilst I do not wish to deny the existence of some sort of pressure, even intimidation on the part of individuals, I do wish emphatically to deny that in connection with the phenomenal *hartal* on the 17th November in Calcutta, there was any intimidation, organised or initiated by or on behalf of the Local Congress or the Khilafat Committes. On the contrary, I am certain that the influence exerted by both these bodies was in the direction of avoiding all intimidation. Moral pressure there certainly was and will always be in all big movements, but it must be clear to the simplest understanding that a complete *hartal* such as Calcutta witnessed on the 17th November would be an impossibility by mere intimidation. But assume that there was intimidation. Was there any reason for disbanding Volunteer Corps, prohibiting public meetings and enforcing laws which are under promise of repeal? Why has no attempt been made to prove a single case of intimidation? It grieves me to have to say the Governor of Bengal has brought in the discovery of sword or sword-sticks in one place in Calcutta to discredit large public organisations. Who intimidated the people into observing a complete *hartal* in Allahabad after all the leaders were arrested and in spite of the reported undue official pressure that was exercised upon shop-keepers and gharivallas at that place? Again His Lordship says, "If we are to assume that this development means there is genuine desire to bring about improvement there must be a favourable atmosphere. In other

words, it will be generally agreed that there must be an essential preliminary to any possible conference. If responsible leaders of non-co-operation now come forward with definite assurance that this is the correct interpretation I should then say we were in sight of such a change of circumstances as would justify Government in reconsidering the position. But words must be backed by deeds. If I were satisfied only that there was general desire for the conference and that responsible non-co-operation leaders were prepared to take action, then I should be prepared to recommend my Government to take steps in consonance with the altered situation." This is highly misleading. If wherever words "non-co-operation leaders" occur, the word "Government" were put in and if the whole of the statement came from a non-co-operator it would represent the correct situation. Non co-operators have really to do nothing, for they have precipitated nothing. They are over-cautious. The disturbance in Bombay was allowed to override their keen desire to take up aggressive Civil Disobedince but in the present circumstances the phrase "Civil Disobedience" is really a misnomer. What non-co-operators are doing to-day, I claim, every co-operator would do to-morrow under similar circumtances. When the Government of India or the Local Governments attempt to make our political existence or agitation, no matter how peaceful, an utter impossibility, may we not resist such attempt by every lawful means at our disposal? I cannot immagine anything more lawful or more natural than that we should continue our volunteer orgaisations purging them of every tendency to become violent and continue also to hold public meetings taking the consequences of such

a step. Is it no proof of the law abiding instinct of hundreds of young men and old men that they have meekly, without offering any defence and without complaining, accepted imprisonment for having dared to exercise their elementary rights in the face of Government persecution? And so it is the Government which is to prove its genuine desire for a conference and an ultimate settlement. It is the Government which has to arrest the fatal course along which repression is taking it. It is the Government that is to prove to non-co-operators its *bona fides* before it can expect them to take part in any conference. When the Government does that, it will find that there is an absolutely peaceful atmosphere. Non-co-operation, when the Government is not resisting anything except violence, is a most harmless thing. There is really nothing for us to suspend. We cannot be expected, until there is actual settlement or guarantee of settlement, to ask schoolboys to return to Government schools or lawyers to resume practice or public men to become candidates for the Coucils or title-holders to ask for return of titles. In the nature of things, it is therefore clear that non-co-opeators have to do nothing. Speaking personally I can certainly say that if there is is a genuine desire for a conference, I would be the last person to advise precipitating aggressive Civil Disobe-Sience, which certainly it is my intention to do immediately I am entirely satisfied that the people have understood the secret of non-violence ; and let me say the last ten days' events have shown that the people seem clearly to understand its inestimable value. If then the Government recognises that non-co-operators mean business and intend to suffer limitlessly for the attainment of their goal, let the Government uncondi-

tionally retrace its steps, cancel the notifications about disbandment of volunteer organisations and prohibition of public meetings and release all those men in the different provinces who have been arrested and sentenced for so-called Civil Disobedience or for any other purpose given under the definition of non-co-operation but excluding acts of violence, actual or intended. Let the Government come down with a heavy hand on every act of violence or incitement to it, but we must claim the right for all time of expressing our opinions freely and educating public opinion by every legitimate and non-violent means. It is therefore the Government who have really to undo the grave wrong they have perpetrated and they can have the conference they wish in a favourable atmosphere. Let me also say that so far as I am concerned, I want no conference to consider the ways and means of dealing with non-co-operation. The only conference that can at all avail at this stage is a conference called to deal with the causes of the present discontent, namely, the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and Swaraj. Any conference again which can usefully sit at the present stage must be a conference that is really representative and not a conference to which only those whom the Government desire are invited.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

[*A Deputation headed by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya waited on His Excellency the Viceroy at Calcutta on December 21 and requested His Excellency to call a Round Table Conference of representatives of people of all shades of opinion with a view to bring about a final settlement. Lord Reading replied at some length and defined the attitude of the Government. He regretted that "it is impossible even to consider the convening of a conference if agitation in open and avowed defiance of law is meanwhile to be continued." Mr. Gandhi's refusal to call off the hartal in connection with H.R.H. the Prince of Wales' visit to Calcutta on December 24, apparently stiffened the attitude of the Government. Interviewed by the Associated Press, Mr. Gandhi made the following statement regarding the Viceroy's reply to the Deputation* :—]

I must confess that I have read the Viceregal utterance with deep pain. I was totally unprepared for what I must respectfully call his mischievous misrepresentation of the attitude of the Congress and the Khilafat organisations in connection with the visit of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. Every resolution passed by either organisation and every speaker has laid the greatest stress upon the fact that there was no question of showing the slightest ill-will against the Prince or exposing him to any affront. The boycott was purely a question of principle and directed against what we have held to be unscrupulous methods of bureaucracy. I have always held, as I hold even now,

that the Prince has been brought to India in order to strengthen the hold of the Civil Service corporation which has brought India into a state of abject pauperism and political serfdom. If I am proved to be wrong in my supposition that the visit has that sinister meaning, I shall gladly apologise.

It is equally unfortunate for the Viceroy to say that the boycott of the welcome means an affront to the British people. His Excellency does not realise what grievous wrong he is doing to his own people by confusing them with the British administrators in India. Does he wish India to infer that the British administrators here represent the British people and that agitation directed against their methods is an agitation against the British people? And if such is the Viceregal contention and if to conduct a vigorous and effective agitation against the methods of bureaucracy and to describe them in their true colours is an affront to the British people, then I am afraid I must plead guilty. But then I must also say in all humility, the Viceroy has entirely misread and misunderstood the great national awakening that is taking place in India. I repeat for the thousandth time that it is not hostile to any nation or any body of men but it is deliberately aimed at the system under which Government of India is being to-day conducted, and I promise that no threats and no enforcement of threats by the Viceroy or any body of men will strangle that agitation or send to rest that awakening.

I have said in my reply to Lord Ronaldshay's speech that we have not taken the offensive. We are not the aggressors, we have not got to stop any single

activity. It is the Government that is to stop its aggravatingly offensive activity aimed not at violence but a lawful, disciplined, stern but absoluely non-violent agitation. It is for the Government of India and for it alone to bring about a peaceful atmosphere, if it so desires. It has hurled a bomb shell in the midst of material rendered inflammable by its own action and wonders that the material is still not inflammable enough to explode. The immediate issue is not now the redress of the three wrongs ; the immediate issue is the right of holding public meetings and the right of forming associations for peaceful purpose. And in vindicating this right we are fighting the battle not merely on behalf of non-co-operators but we are fighting the battle for all schools of politics. It is the condition of any organic growth, and I see in the Viceregal pronouncement an insistence upon submission to a contrary doctrine which an erstwhile exponent of the law of liberty has seen fit to lay down upon finding himself in an atmosphere where there is little regard for law and order on the part of those very men who are supposed to be custodians of law and order. I have only to point to the unprovoked assaults being committed not in isolated cases, not in one place, but in Bengal, in the Punjab, in Delhi and in the United Provinces. I have no doubt that as repression goes on in its mad career, the reign of terrorism will ever take the whole of this unhappy land. But whether the campaign is conducted on civilised or uncivilised lines, so far as I can see, there is only one way open to non-co operators, indeed I contend, even to the people of India. On this question of the right of holding public meetings and forming associations there can be no yielding. We

have burnt our boats and we must sail onward till that primary right of human beings is vindicated.

Let me make my own position clear. I am most anxious for a settlement. I want a Round Table Conference. I want our position to be clearly known by everybody who wants to understand it. I impose no conditions but when conditions are imposed upon me prior to the holding of a conference, I must be allowed to examine those conditions, and if I find that they are suicidal, I must be excused if I don't accept them. The amount of tension that is created can be regulated solely by the Government of India, for the offensive has been taken by that Government.

THE AHMEDABAD CONGRESS SPEECH.

The Ahmedabad Congress of December, 1921, was above all a Gandhi Session. The President-elect, Mr. C. R. Das, was in prison and so were many other leaders besides. Hakim Ajmal Khan was elected to take the chair and the proceedings were all in Hindi and Gujarati. Mr. Gandhi was invested with full dictatorial powers by the Congress and the central resolution of the session, which he moved, ran as follows:

"*This Congress, whilst requiring the ordinary machinery to remain intact and to be utilised in the ordinary manner whenever feasible, hereby appoints, until further instructions, Mahatma Gandhi as the sole executive authority of the Congress and invests him with the full power to convene a special session of the Congress or of the All-India Congress Committee or the Working Committee and also with the power to appoint a successor in emergency.*

"*This Congress hereby confers upon the said successor and all subsequent successors appointed in turn by their predecessors, all his aforesaid powers, provided that nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to authorise Mahatma Gandhi or any of the aforesaid successors to conclude any terms of peace with the Goverment of India or the British Government without the previous sanction of the All-India Congress Committee, to be finally ratified by the Congress specially convened for the purpose, and provided also that the present creed of the Congress shall in no case* be *altered* by *Mahatma Gandhi or his successor except with the leave of the Congress first obtained.*" *The following is the full text of Mr. Gandhi's speech* :—]

I shall hope, if I can at all avoid it, not to take even the 30 minutes that Hakim Sahib has allotted to me. And I do not propose, if I can help it to take all that time, because I feel that the resolution explains itself. If at the end of 15 months' incessant activity, you, the delegates assembled in this Congress do not know your own minds, I am positive that I cannot possibly carry conviction to you even in a two hours' speech and, what is more, if I could carry conviction to you to-day because of my speech, I am afraid I would lose all faith in my countrymen, because it would demonstrate their incapacity to observe things and events, it would demonstrate their incapacity to think coherently, because I submit there is absolutely nothing new in this resolution that we have not been doing all this time, that we have not been thinking all this time. There is absolutety nothing new in this resolution which is at all startling. Those of you who have followed the proceedings from month to month of the Working

Committee of the All-India Congress Committee for two months or for three months and have studied the resolutions can but come to one conclusion that this resolution is absolutely the natural result of the national activities during the past 15 months. And if you have at all followed the course, the downward course, that the repression policy of the Government has been taking, you can only come to the conclusion that the Subjects Committee has come to through this resolution, that the only answer that a self-respecting nation can return to the Viceregal pronouncements and to the repression that is overtaking this land is the course mapped out in this resolution.

I am not going to take the time of our English knowing friends over the religious subtleties of the pledge that the volunteers have to take. I wish to confine my remark on that subject to Hindustani. But I want this assembly to understand the bearing of this resolution. This resolution means that we have grown the stage of helplessness and dependence upon anybody. This resolution means that the nation through its representatives is determined to have its own way without the assistance of any single human being on earth, except from God above (applause). This resolution, whilst it shows the indomitable courage and the determination of the nation to vindicate its rights and to be able to stare the world in the face, also says in all humility to the Government, "No matter what you do, no matter how you repress us, we shall one day wring the reluctant repentence from you and we warn you to think betime, take care what you are doing and see that you do not make 300 millions of India your eternal enemy."

This resolution, if the Government sincerely wants an open door, leaves the door wide open for the Government. If Moderate friends wish to rally round the standard of the Khilafat, round the standard of the liberties of the Punjab and therefore of India, if this Government is sincerely anxious to do justice and nothing but justice, if Lord Reading has really come to India to do justice and nothing less—and we want nothing more—if he is really anixous to do all those things, then I inform him from this platform, with God as my witness, with all the earnestness that I can command that he has got an open door in this resolution if he means well, but the door is closed in his face if he means ill. There is every chance for him to hold a Round Table Conference, but it must be a real Conference. If he wants a Conference at a table where only equals are to sit and where there is not to be a single beggar, then there is an open door and that door will always remain open no, matter how many people go to their graves, no matter what wild career this repression is to go through. So far as I am concerned, and if I can take the nation with me, I inform him, again that the door will always remain wide open.

There is nothing in this resolution which any one who has modesty and humility need be ashamed of. This resolution is not an arrogant challenge to any body, but this is a challenge to an authority that is enthroned on arrogance. It is a challenge to the authority which disregards the considered opinion of millions of thinking human beings. It is an humble challenge and an irrevocable challenge to authority which, in order to save itself, wants to crush freedom of opinion, freedom of forming associations, the two lungs

that are absolutely necessary for a man to breathe the oxygen of liberty. And if there is any authority in this country that wants to crub the freedom of speech and freedom of association. I want to be able to say, in your name, from this platform, that that authority will perish and that authority will have to repent before an India that is steeled with high courage, noble purpose and determination till every man and woman who chose to call themselves Indians are blotted out of the earth. It combines courage and humility. God only knows, if I could possibly have advised you to go to the Round Table Conference, if I could possibly have advised you not to undertake this resolution of civil disobedience, I would have done so. I am a man of peace. I believe in peace. But I do not want peace at any price. I do not want the peace that you find in stone. I do not want the peace that you find in grain. But I do want that peace which you find embedded in the human breast, which is exposed to the arrows of a whole world but which is protected from all harm by the Almighty Power of the Almighty God.

I do not want to take any more time of the delegates, I do not want to say a word more. I do not want to insult your intelligence by saying a word more in connexion with this resolution in English.

THE INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTION.

[*Mr. Hasrat Mohani, President of the Moslem League, opposed Mr. Gandhi's resolution in the Congress and brought in various amendments which sought to lay down the object of the Congress as the attainment of complete independence, free from all foreign control. Mr. Gandhi opposed all the amendments and spoke as follows in defence of his own resolution* :—]

Friends, I have said only a few words (in Hindi) in connecxion with the proposition of Mr. Hasrat Mohani. All I want to say to you in English is that proposition and the manner, the levity, with which that proposition has been taken up by so many of you, or some of you, I hope, has grieved me. It has grieved me, because it shows a lack of responsibility. As responsible men and women we should go back to the ways of Nagpur and Calcutta and we should remember what we did only an hour ago. An hour ago we passed a resolution which actually contemplates a final settlement of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and transference of the power from the hands of the bureaucracy into the hands of the people by certain definite means. Are you going to rub the whole of that condition from the mind by raising a false issue and by throwing a bombshell in the midst of the Indian atmosphere. I hope that those of you who have voted for the previous resolution will think fifty times before taking up this resolution and voting for it with levity. We shall be charged by the thinking portion of the world that we did not know really where we are. Let

us not be charged with that and let us understand our limitations. Let Hindus and Mussalmans have absolute indissoluble unity. Who is here who can say to-day with confidence, "Yes, Hindu-Muslim unity has become and has become an indissoluble factor of Indian nationalism." Who is here who can tell me that the Parsees and the Sikhs and the Christians and the Jews and the untouchables, about whom you heard this afternoon, who is here, I ask, who will tell me that those very people will not rise against any such idea ?

Think, therefore, fifty times before you take a step which will redound not to your credit, not to your advantage, but which may cause irreparable injury. Let us first of all gather up our strength, let us first of all sound our own depths, but let us not go into waters whose depths we do not know and this proposition of Mr. Hasrat Mohani lands you to a depth unfathomable. I ask you in all confidence that you will reject that proposition if you believe in the proposition that you passed only an hour ago. The proposition now before you robs away the whole of the effect of the proposition that you passed a moment ago. Are creeds such simple things like clothes which a man can change at will and put on at will ? Creeds are such for which people live for ages and ages. Are you going to change your creed which, with all deliberations and after great debates in Nagpur you accepted. There was no limitation of one year when you accepted that creed. It is an extensive creed. It takes in all the weakest and the strongest and you will deny yourselves the privilege of clothing the weakest among yourselves with protection if you accept this limited creed of Maulana Hasrat Mohani, which does not admit the weakest of your brethren. I therefore ask you in all confidence to reject this proposition.

THE BOMBAY CONFERENCE.

[*A conference of representatives of various shades of political opinion convened by Pandit Malaviya, Mr. Jinnah, and others assembled at Bombay on the 14th January, 1922, with Sir C. Sankaran Nair, in the Chair. On the second day Sir Sankaran withdrew and Sir M. Visveswarya took up his place. Over two-hundred leading men from different provinces attended. Mr. Gandhi was present throughout and though he refused to be officially connected with the resolutions he took part in the debates and helped the conference in framing the resolutions which were also ratified by the Congress Working Committee. The following account of the Conference by Mr. Gandhi himself is taken from 'Young India' of January, 1919.*]

The Conferences was both a success and a failure. It was a success in that it showed an earnest desire on the part of those who attended to secure a peaceful solution of the present trouble, and in that it brought under one roof people possessing divergent views. It was a failure in that, though certain resolutions have been adopted, the Conference did not leave on my mind the impression that those who assembled together as a whole realised the gravity of the real issue. The mind of the Conference seemed to be centred more on a Round Table Conference than upon asserting the popular right of free speech, free association and free press which are more than a round table conference. I had expected on the part of the independents to declare their firm attitude that no matter how much they might differ

regarding the method of Non-Co-operation, the freedom of the people was a common heritage and that the assertion of that right was three-fourths of Swaraj ; that therefore they would defend that right even with civil disobedience, if need be.

However, as the attention of the Conference could not be rivetted on that point but on a Round Table Conference, the discussion turned upon the essentials of such a conference.

My own position was clear. I would attend any conference as an individual, without any conditions. My purpose as a reformer is to convert people to the view I hold to be right and therefore to see everybody who would care to listen to me. But when I was asked to mention the conditions necessary for an atmosphere favourable for a successful conference, I had to press some certain conditions. And I must own that the Resolutions Committee approached my viewpoint with the greatest sympathy and showed every anxiety to accommodate me. But side by side with this, I observed an admirable disposition on its part to consider the Government's difficulties. Indeed the Government's case could not have been better presented, if it had been directly and officially represented in the Conference.

The result was a compromise. The withdrawal of notification and the discharge of prisoners coming under the notifications and of the *fatwa* prisoners, *i.e.*, the Ali Brothers and others who have been convicted in respect of the *fatwas* regarding military service, was common cause. The Committee saw the force of the suggestions that the distress warrants should be discharged, the fines imposed upon the Press, etc., should be refunded and that the prisoners convicted for non-

violent or otherwise innocent activities under cover of the ordinary laws should be discharged upon the proof of their non-violence. For this purpose I had suggested the committee appointed by the conference. But on the Resolutions Committee showing that it would be difficult for the Government to accept such an uncontrolled recommendation, I agreed to the principle of arbitration now imported in the resolution. The second compromise is regarding picketing. My suggestion was that in the event of the round table conference being decided upon, Non-Co-operation activities of a hostile nature should be suspended and that all picketing except *bona fide* peaceful picketing should also be suspended, pending result of the conference. As the implications of hostile activities appeared to me to be too dangerous to be acceptable, I hastily withdrew my own wording and gladly threw over even *bona fide* peaceful picketing, much though I regretted it. I felt that the friends interested in liquor picketing for the sake of temperance would not mind the temporary sacrifice.

I agreed too to advise the Working Committee to postpone general mass civil disobedience contemplated by the Congress to the 31st instant in order to enable the Committee and the Conference to enter into negotiations with the Government. This, I felt, was essential to show our *bona fides*. We could not take up new offensives whilst negotiations for a conference were being conducted by responsible men. I further undertook to advise the Committee, in the event of the proposed conference coming off, to stop all *harals* pending the conference. This I hold to be inevitable. *Harals* are a demonstration against bureaucracy. We cannot

continue them, if we are conferring with them for peace. Workers will bear in mind that as yet no activity of the Congress stops save general civil disobedience. On the contrary, enlistment of volunteers and Swadeshi propaganda must continue without abatement. Liquor shop picketing may continue where it is absolutely peaceful. It should certainly continue where notices unnecessarily prohibiting picketing have been issued. So may picketing continue regarding schools or foreign cloth shops. But whilst all our activities should be zealously continued, there should be the greatest restraint exercised and every trace of violence or discourtesy avoided. When restraint and courtesy are added to strength, the latter becomes irresistible. Civil disobedience being an indefeasible right, the preparations for it will continue even if the conference comes off. And the preparations for civil disobedience consist in :—

1. the enlistment of volunteers,
2. the propaganda of Swadeshi,
3. the removal of untouchability,
4. the training in non-violence in word, deed and thought,
5. unity between diverse creeds and classes.

I hear that many are enrolled as volunteers in various parts of India, although they do not wear *Khadi*, do not believe in complete non-violence, or, if they are Hindus, do not believe in untouchability as a crime against humanity. I cannot too often warn the people that every deviation from our own rules retards our progress. It is the quality of our work which will place God and not quantity. Not all the lip Mussulmans and the lip Hindus will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Islam

is no stronger than the best Mussulman. Thousandsof nominal followers of Hinduism believe their faith and discredit it. One true and perfect follower of Hinduism is enough to protect it for all time and against the whole world. Similarly, one true and perfect Non-Co-operator is any day better than a million Non-Co-operators so called. The best preparation for civil disobedience is to cultivate civility, that is truth and non-violence, amongst ourselves and our surroundings.

In order that all may approach the round table conference with perfect knowledge of the Congress demands, I laid all our cards on the table and reiterated the claims regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj. Let me repeat them here:

(1) So far as I can write from memory, full restoration to the Turks of Constantinople, Adrianople, Anatolia including Symrna and Thrace. Complete withdrawal of non-Muslim influence from Arabia, Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria and therefore withdrawal of British troops whether English or Indian from these territories.

(2) Full enforcement of the report of the Congress Sub-committee and therefore the stopping of the pensions of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, General Dyer and other officers named in the report for dismissal.

(3) Swaraj means, in the event of the foregoing demands being granted, full dominion status. The scheme of such Swaraj should be framed by representatives duly elected in terms of the Congress constitution. That means four anna franchise. Every Indian adult, male or female, paying four annas and signing the Congress creed, will be entitled to be placed on the electoral roll. These electors would elect delegates who

would frame the Swaraj constitution. This shall be given effect to without any change by the British Parliament.

If the Congress programme is so cut and dried, where is the necessity for a conference?—asks the critic. I hold that there is and there always will be.

The method of execution of the demands has to be considered. The Government may have a reasonable and a convincing answer on the claims. The Congressmen have fixed their minimum, but the fixing of the minimum means no more than confidence in the justice of one's cause. It further means that there is no room for bargaining. There can, therefore, be no appeal to one's weakness or incapacity. The appeal can only be addressed to reason. If the Viceroy summons the conference it means either that he recognises the justice of the claims or hopes to satisfy the Congressmen, among others, of the injustice thereof. He must be confident of the justice of his proposals for a rejection or reduction of the claim. That is my meaning of a meeting of equals who eliminate the idea of force, and instantly shift their ground as they appreciate the injustice of their position. I assure His Excellency the Viceroy and everybody concerned that the Congressmen or Non-Co-operators are as reasonable beings as may be found on earth or in India. They have every incentive to be so for theirs is the duty of suffering as a result of rejection of any just offer.

I have heard it urged that on the Khilafat the Imperial Government is powerless. I should like to be convinced of this. In that case and if the Imperial Government make common cause with the Mussulmans of India, I should be quite satisfied and take the chance

with the Imperial Government's genuine assistance of convincing the other powers of the justice of the Khilafat claim. And even when the claim is admitted much requires to be discussed regarding the execution.

Similarly regarding the Punjab. The principle being granted, the details have to be settled. Legal difficulties have been urged about stopping the pensions to the dismissed officials. The reader may not know that Maulana Shaukat Ali's pension (I suppose he occupied the same status as Sir Michael O'Dwyer) was stopped without any inquiry or previous notice to him. I believe that service regulations do provide for removing officers and officials from the pensions list on proof of gross neglect of duty or disloyal service. Anyway, let the Government prove a case for refusal to grant the Punjab demand save the plea of the past services of these officials. I must refuse to weigh their service to the Empire against their disservice to India, assuming the possibility of two such things co-existing.

Swaraj scheme is undoubtedly a matter on which there will be as many minds as there are men and women. And it is eminently a thing to be debated in a conference. But here again there must be a clean mind and no mental reservations. India's freedom must be the supreme interest in every body's mind. There should be no obstruction such as the preoccupation of the British elector or the indifference of the House of Commons or the hostility of the House of Lords. No lover of India can possibly take into account these extraneous matters. The only question to consider will be is India ready for what she wants? Or does she ask like a child for food she has no stomach

for? That can be determined not by outsiders but by Indians themselves.

From that standpoint, I do consider the idea of the conference for devising a scheme of full Swaraj premature. India has not yet incontestably proved her strength. Her suffering is great indeed, but nothing and not prolonged enough for the object in view. She has to go through greater discipline. I was punctiliously careful not to make Non-Co-operators party to the conference resolutions, because we are still so weak. When India has evolved disciplined strength. I would knock myself at the Viceregal door for a conference, and I know that the Viceroy will gladly embrace the opportunity whether he be an eminent lawyer or a distinguished militarist. I do not approach directly because I am conscious of our weakness. But being humble I make it clear through Moderate or other friends that I would miss not a single opportunity of having honest conferences or consultations. And so I have not hesitated to advise Non-Co-operators thankfully to meet the Independents and place our services at their disposal to make such use of them as they may deem fit. And if the Viceroy or a party desires a conference, it would be foolish for Non-Co-operators not to respond. The case of Non-Co-operators depends for success on cultivation of public opinion and public support. They have no other force to back them. If they forfeit public opinion they have lost the voice of God for the time being.

For the manner of preparing the scheme too I have simply suggested what appears to me to be a most feasible method. The All-India Congress Committee has not considered it nor has the Working

Committee. The adoption of the Congress franchise is my own suggestion. But what I have laid down as the guiding principle is really unassailable. The scheme of Swaraj is that scheme which popular representatives frame. What happens then to the experts in administration and others who may not be popularly elected? In my opinion, they also should attend and have the vote even, but they must necessarily be in a minority. They must expect to influence the majority by a constant appeal to the logic of facts. Given mutual trust and mutual respect, a round table conference cannot but result in a satisfactory and honourable peace.

The abrupt withdrawal of Sir Sankaran Nair was an unfortunate incident. In my opinion, he had nothing to do with my, or later, with Mr. Jinah's opinions. As Speaker, especially, he was exempt from any implied or express identification with anybody's views. I cannot help feeling that Sir Sankaran erred in the conception of his duty as speaker. But as we progress towards democracy, we must be prepared even for such erroneous exercise of independence. I congratulate Sir Sankaran Nair upon his boldly exercising his independence, which I have not hesitated to call cussedness in private conversation and upon the independence of the Committee in not suffering a nervous collapse but quietly electing Sir Visveswarya and voting thanks to the retiring Speaker for the services rendered.

LETTER TO H. E. THE VICEROY.

THE INAUGURATION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN BARDOLI.

[*While negotiations were going on between the representatives of the Malaviya Conference and H. E. the Viceroy, Mr. Gandhi addressed the following open letter to Lord Reading. The letter was in effect an ultimatum and the efforts of the Conference ended in failure.*]

To His Excellency the Viceroy, Delhi.

Sir,

Bardoli is a small Tehsil in the Surat District in the Bombay Presidency, having a population of about 87,000 all told.

On the 29th ultimo, it decided under the Presidency of Mr. Vithalbhai Patel to embark on Mass Civil Disobedience, having proved its fitness for it in terms of the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee which met at Delhi during the first week of November last. But as I am, perhaps, chiefly responsible for Bardoli's decision, I owe it to your Excellency and the public to explain the situation under which the decision has been taken.

It was intended under the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee before referred too to make Bardoli the first unit for Mass Civil Disobedience in order to mark the national revolt against the Government for its consistently criminal refusal to appreciate India's resolve regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj.

Then followed the unfortunate and regrettable riots on the 17th November last in Bombay resulting in the postponement of the step contemplated by Bardoli.

Meantime repression of a virulent type has taken place with the concurrence of the Government of India, in Bengal, Assam, the United Provinces, the Punjab, the Province of Delhi and in a way in Bihar and Orissa and elsewhere. I know that you have objected to the use of the word "repression" for describing the action of the authorities in these Provinces. In my opinion, when an action is taken which is in excess of the requirements of the situation, it is undoubtedly repression. The looting of property, assaults on innocent people, brutal treatment of the prisoners in jails, including flogging, can in no sense be described as legal, civilized or in any way necessary. This official lawlessness cannot be described by any other term but lawless repression.

Intimidation by Non-Co-operators or their sympathisers to a certain extent in connection with hartals and picketing may be admitted, but in no case can it be held to justify the wholesale suppression of peaceful volunteering or equally peaceful public meetings under a distorted use of an extraordinary law which was passed in order to deal with activities which were manifestly violent both in intention and action, nor is it possible to designate as otherwise than repression action taken against innocent people under what has appeared to many of us as an illegal use of the ordinary law nor again can the administrative interference with the liberty of the Press under a law that is under promise of repeal be regarded as anything but repression.

The immediate task before the country, therefore,

is to rescue from paralysis freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of Press.

In the present mood of the Government of India and in the present unprepared state of the country in respect of complete control of the forces of violence, Non-Co-operators were unwilling to have anything to do with the Malaviya Conference whose object was to induce. Your Excellency to convene a Round Table Conference. But as I was anxious to avoid all avoidable suffering, I had no hesitation in advising the Working Committee of the Congress to accept the recommendations of that Conference.

Although, in my opinion, the terms were quite in keeping with your own requirements, as I understood them through your Calcutta speech and otherwise, you have summarily rejected the proposal.

In the circumstances, there is nothing before the country but to adopt some non-violent method for the enforcement of its demands, including the elementary rights of free speech, free association and free Press. In my humble opinion, the recent events are a clear departure from the civilized policy laid down by Your Excellency at the time of the generous, manly and unconditional apology of the Ali Brothers, *viz.*, that the Government of India should not interfere with the activities of Non-Co-operation so long as they remained non-violent in word and deed. Had the Government policy remained neutral and allowed public opinion to ripen and have its full effect, it would have been possible to advise postponement of the adoption of Civil Disobedience of an aggressive type till the Congress had acquired fuller control over the forces of violence

in the country and enforced greater discipline among the millions of its adherents. But the lawless repression (in a way unparalleled in the history of this unfortunate country) has made immediate adoption of mass Civil Disobedience, an imperative duty. The Working Committee of the Congress has restricted it only to certain areas to be selected by me from time to time and at present it is confined only to Bardoli. I may under said authority give my consent at once in respect of a group of 100 villages in Guntur in the Madras Presidency, provided they can strictly conform to the conditions of non-violence, unity among different classes, the adoption and manufacture of handspun Khaddar and untouchability.

But before the people of Bardoli actually commence mass Civil Disobedience, I would respectfully urge you as the head of the Government of India finally to revise your policy and set free all the Non-Co-operating prisoners who are convicted or under trial for non-violent activities and declare in clear terms the policy of absolute non-interference with all non-violent activities in the country whether they be regarding the redress of the Khilafat or the Punjab wrongs or Swaraj or any other purpose and even though they fall within the repressive sections of the Penal Code or the Criminal Procedure Code or other repressive laws, subject always to the condition of non-violence. I would further urge you to free the Press from all administrative control and restore all the fines and forfeitures recently imposed. In thus urging I am asking Your Excellency to do what is to-day being done in every country which is deemed to be under civilized Government. If you can see your way to make the necessary declaration within seven

days of the date of publication of this manifesto, I shall be prepared to advise postponement of Civil Disobedience of an aggressive character till the imprisoned workers, have after their discharge reviewed the whole situation and considered the position *de novo*. If the Government make the requested declaration, I shall regard it as an honest desire on its part to give effect to public opinion and shall, therefore, have no hesitation in advising the country to be engaged in further moulding the public opinion without violent retraint from either side and trust to its working to secure the fulfilment of its unalterable demands. Aggressive Civil Disobedience in that case will be taken up only when the Government departs from its policy of strictest neutrality or refuses to yield to the clearly expressed opinion of the vast majority of the people of India.

REPLY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

[The Government of India in a Communique published on the 6th February in reply to Mr. Gandhi's letter, repudiated his assertions and urged that the issue before the country was no longer between this or that programme of political advance, but between lawlessness with all its consequences on the one hand and the maintenance of those principles which lie at the root of all civilised Governments. Mr. Gandhi in a further rejoinder issued on the very next day pointed out that the choice before the people was mass civil disobedience with all its undoubted dangers and lawless repression of the lawful activities of the people. The following is the full text of Mr. Gandhi's rejoinder.]

I have very carefully read the Government's reply to my letter. I confess that I was totally unprepared for such an evasion of the realities of the case as the reply betrays.

I will take the very first repudiation. The reply says they (the Govt.) emphatically repudiate the statement that they have embarked on a policy of lawless repression and also the suggestion that the present campaign of civil disobedience has been forced on the Non-Co-operation party in order to secure the elementary rights of free association, free speech and free press. Even a cursory glance at my letter would show that whilst civil disobedience was authorised by the All-India Congress Committe meeting held on the 4th November at Delhi, it had not commenced. I have made it clear in my letter that the contemplated mass civil disobedience was indefinitely postponed on account of the regrettable events of the 17th November in Bombay. That decision was duly published and it is within the knowledge of the Government as also the public that herculean efforts were being made to combat the still lingering violent tendency amongst the people. It is also within the knowledge of the Government and the public that a special form of pledge was devised to be signed by volunteers with the deliberate purpose of keeping out all but men of proved character. The primary object of these volunteers' associations was to inculcate amongst the masses the lessons of non-violence and to keep the peace at all Non-Co-operation functions. Unfortunately the Government of India lost its head completely over the Bombay events and, perhaps, still more over the very complete hartal on the same date at Calcutta. I do not wish to deny that there might have been some intimidation practiced in Calcutta, but it was not, I venture to submit, the fact of intimidation, but the irritation caused by the completeness of the hartal that maddened the Government

of India as also the Government of Bengal. Repression there was even before that time, but nothing was said or done in connection with it. But the repression that came in the wake of the notifications proclaiming the Criminal Law Amendment Act for the purpose of dealing with volunteers' associations and the Seditions Meetings Act for the purpose of dealing with public meetings held by Non-Co-opertors, came upon the Non-Co-operation community as a bombshell.

I repeat, then, that these notifications and the arrests of Deshbandu Chittaranjan Das and Maulana Abul Kalam Asid in Bengal, the arrest of Pandit Motilal Nehru and his co-workers in the U. P. and of Lala Lajput Rai and his party in the Punjab made it absolutely necessary to take up, not yet aggressive civil disobedience, but only defensive civil disobedience, otherwise described as passive resistance. Even Sir Hormusji Wadia was obliged to declare that, if the Bombay Government followed the precedents set by the Governments of Bengal, U. P. and the Punjab, he would be bound to resist such notifications, that is, to enrol himself as a volunteer or to attend public meetings in defiance of Government order to the contrary. It is thus clear that a case has been completely made out for civil disobedience, unless the Government revised its policy which has resulted in the stopping of public meetings, public associations and the Non-Co-operation press in many parts of India.

Now for the statement that the Government have embarked on a policy of lawless repression instead of an ample expression of regret and apology for the barbarous deeds that have been committed by officers in the name of law and order. I regret to find in the Government

reply a categorical denial of any lawless repression. In this connection I urge the public and Government carefully to consider the following facts whose substance is beyond challenge :- (1) official shooting at Entally in Calcutta and the callous treatment even of a corpse (2) The admitted brutality of the civil guards(3) The forcible dispersal of a meeting at Dacca and the dragging of innocent men by their legs although they had given no offence or cause whatsoever (4) Similar treatment of volunteers in Aligarh (5) The conclusive (in my opinion) findings of the committee presided over by Dr. Gokhul Chand about the brutal and uncalled for assaults upon volunteers and the public in Lahore (6) The wicked and inhuman treatment of volunteers and the public at Jullundur (7) The shooting of a boy at Dehra Dun and the cruelly forcible dispersal of a public meeting of that place (8) The looting admitted by the Bihar Government of villages by an officer and his company without any permission whatsoever, from any one, but, as stated by Non-co-operators, at the invitation of a planter, assaults upon volunteers and the burning of Khaddar and papers belonging to the Congress at Sonepur (9) The midnight searches and arrests in the Congress and Khilafat offices.

I have merely given a sample of the many infallible proofs of official lawlessness and barbarism. I have mentioned not even a tithe of what is happening all over the country. I wish to state, without fear of successful contradiction, that the scale on which this lawlessness had gone on in so many provinces of India puts into shade the inhumanities that were practised in the Punjab, if we except the crawling order and the

massacre at Jallianwallabagh. It is my certain conviction that the massacre at Jallianwallabagh was a clean transaction compared to the unclean transactions described above, and the pity of it is that, because people are not shot or butchered, the tortures through which hundreds of inoffensive men have gone through do not produce a sufficient effect to turn everybody's face against this Government.

But as if this warfare against innocence was not enough the reins are being tightened in the jails. We know nothing of what is happening to-day in Karachi jail, to a solitary prisoner in the Sabarmati jail and to a batch in the Benares jail, all of whom are as innocent as I claim to be myself. Their crime consists in their constituting themselves the trustees of national honour and dignity. I am hoping that these proud and defiant spirits will not be sent into submission masquerading in the official garb. I deny the right of the authorities to insist on high-souled men appearing before them almost naked or paying any obsequeous respect to them by way of salaming with open palms brought together, or reciting to the intonation of "Sarkar ike-Jai". No god-fearing man will do the latter even if he has to be kept standing in his stock for days and nights, as a Bengal schoolmaster is reported to have been for the sake of the dignity of human nature.

I trust that Lord Reading and his draftsmen do not know the facts that I have adduced or are being carried away by their belief in the infallibility of their employees. I refuse to believe in the statements which the public regards as God's truth. If there is the slightest exaggeration in the statements that I have made, I shall as publicly withdraw them and apologise

for them as I am making them now, but, as it is, I undertake to prove the substance of every one of these charges if not the very letter and much more of them, before any impartial tribunal of men or women unconnected with the Government. I invite Pandit Malaviyaji and those who are performing the thankless task of securing a round table conference to form an impartial commission to investigate these charges by which I stand or fall.

It is the physical and brutal ill-treatment of humanity which has made many of my co-workers and myself impatient of life itself and in the face of these things I don't wish to take public time by dealing in detail what I mean by abuse of the common law of the country but I cannot help correcting the mis-impression which is likely to be created in connection with the Bombay disorders, disgraceful and deplorable as they were. Let it be remembered that, of the persons who lost their lives, over 45 were Non-Co operators or their sympathisers, the hooligans, and of the 400 wounded, to be absolutely on the safe side, over 350 were also derived from the same class. I do not complain; the Co-operators, the Non-Co-operators and the friendly hooligans got what they deserved: they began the violence and they reaped the reward. Let it also not be forgotten that, with all deference to the Bombay Government, it was Non-Co-operators, ably assisted by Independents and Co-operators, who brought peace out of that chaos of the two days following the fateful 17th.

I must totally deny the imputation that the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act was confined to associations the majority of the members of which

had habitually indulged in violence and intimidation. The prisons of India to-day hold some of the most inoffensive men and hardly any who are convicted under the law. Abundant proof can be produced in support of this statement as also of the statement of the fact that almost wherever meetings have been broken up, there was actually no risk of violence.

The Government of India deny that the Viceroy has laid down upon the apology of the Ali Brothers the civilised policy of non interference with the non-violent activities of Non-Co-operators. I am extremely sorry for this repudiation. The very part of the communique reproduced in the reply is in my opinion sufficient proof that the Government did not intend to interfere with such activities. The Government did not wish to be inferred that speeches promoting disaffection of a less violent character were not an offence against the law. I have never stated that breach of any law was not to be an offence against it, but I have stated, as I repeat now, that it was not the intention of the Government then to prosecute for non-violent activities although they might amount to a technical breach of the law.

As to the conditions of the conference the Government reply evidently omits to mention the two words "and otherwise" after the words "Calcutta speech" in my letter. I repeat that the terms "I would gather from the Calcutta speech and otherwise" were nearly the same that were mentioned in the resolutions of the Malaviya Conference. What are called the unlawful activities of the N. C. O. party, being a reply to the notifications of the Government, would have ceased automatically with the withdrawal of those notifica-

tions, because the formation of volunteer corps and public meetings would not be unlawful activities after the withdrawal of the offending notification. Even while the negotiations were going on in Calcutta, the discharge of Fatwa prisoners was asked for and I can only repeat what I have said elsewhere that, if it is disloyal to say that military service under the existing system of Government is a sin against God and humanity, I fear that such disloyalty must continue.

The Government communique does me a cruel wrong imputing to me a desire that the proposed round table conference should be called merely to register my decrees. I did state, in order to avoid any misunderstanding the Congress demands, as I felt I was in duty bound, in as clear terms as possible. No Congressman could approach any conference without making his position clear. I accepted the ordinary courtesy of not considering me or any Congressmen to be impervious to reason or argument. It is open to anybody to convince me that the demands of the Congress regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj are wrong or unreasonable and I would certainly retrace my steps and, so far as I am concerned, rectify the wrong. The Government of India know that such has been always my attitude.

The communique, strangely enough, says that the demands set forth in my manifesto are even larger than those of the Working Committee. I claim that they fall far below the demands of the Working Committee, for what I now ask against the total suspension of Civil Disobedience of an aggressive character is merely the stoppage of ruthless repression, the release of prisoners convicted under it and a clear declaration of

policy. The demands of the Working Committee included a round table conference. In my manifesto I have not asked for a Round Table Conference at all. It is true that this wanting of a Round Table Conference does not proceed from any expediency, but it is a confession of present weakness. I freely recognise that, unless India becomes saturated with the spirit of non-violence and generates disciplined strength that can only come from non-violence, she cannot enforce her demands and it is for that reason that I now consider that the first thing for the people to do is to secure a reversal of this mad repression and then to concentrate upon more complete organisation and more construction. And here again the communique does me an injustice by merely stating that Civil Disobedience of an aggressive character will be postponed until the opportunity is given to the imprisoned leaders of reviewing the whole situation after their discharge and by conveniently omitting to mention the following conclusion of my letter. "If the Government make the requested declaration I shall regard it as an honest desire on its part to give effect to public opinion and shall therefore have no hesitation in advising the country to be engaged in further moulding public opinion without violent restraint from either side and trust to its working to secure the fulfilment of its unalterable demands. Aggressive Civil Disobedience in that case will be taken up only when the Government departs from its policy of strictest neutrality or refuse to yield to the clearly expressed opinion of the vast majority of the people of India."

I venture to claim extreme reasonableness and moderation for the above presentation of the case. The alternative before the people, therefore, is

not, as the communique concludes, between "lawlessness with all its disastrous consequences on the one hand and on the other the maintenance of those principles which lie at the root of all civilised Governments' Mass Civil Disobedience, it adds, is fraught with such danger to the State that it must be met with "sterness and severity". The choice before the people is mass civil disobedience with all its undoubted dangers and lawless repression of the lawful activities of the poeple. I hold that it is impossible for any body of self-respecting men for fear of unknown dangers to sit still and do nothing effective when looting of property and assaulting of innocent men are going on all over the country in the name of law and order.

THE CRIME OF CHAURI CHAURA.

[While Mr. Gandhi was about to inaugurate Mass Civil Disobedience in Bardoli, there occurred a terrible tragedy at Chauri Chaura on the 14th February when an infuriated-mob, including some volunteers also, attacked the *thana*, burnt down the building and beat to death no less than twenty two policemen. Some constables and chaukidars were literally burnt to death and the whole place was under mobocracy. Mr. Gandhi took this occurence as a third warning to suspend civil disobedience and the Bardoli programme was accordingly given up. On the 11th the Working Committee met at Bardoli and resolved to suspend all offensive action including even picketing and processions. The country was to confine itself to the constructive programme of Khaddar manufacture The Working Committee advised the stoppage of all activities designed to court imprisonment. Commenting on the tragedy of Chauri Chaura and the Bardoli decisions, Mr. Gandhi wrote in *Young India* of February 6th, 1922 :]

God has been abundantly kind to me. He has warned me the third time that there is not as yet in India that truthful and non-violent atmosphere which

and which alone can justify mass disobedience which can be at all described as civil which means gentle, truthful, humble, knowing, wilful yet loving, never criminal and hateful.

He warned me in 1919 when the Rowlatt Act agitation was started. Ahmedabad, Viramgam, and Kheda erred; Amritsar and Kasur erred. I retraced my steps, called it a Himalayan miscalculation, humbled myself before God and man, and stopped not merely mass civil disobedience but even my own which I knew was intended to be civil and non-violent.

The next time it was through the events of Bombay that God gave a terrific warning. He made me eyewitness of the deeds of the Bombay mob on the 17th November. The mob acted in the interest of non-co-operation. I announced my intention to stop the mass civil disobedience which was to be immediately started in Bardoli. The humiliation was greater than in 1919. But it did me good. I am sure that the nation gained by the stopping. India stood for truth and non-violence by the suspension,

But the bitterest humiliation was still to come. Madras did give the warning, but I heeded it not. But God spoke clearly through Chauri Chaura. I understand that the constables who were so brutally hacked to death had given much provocation. They had even gone back upon the word just given by the Inspector that they would not be molested, but when the procession had passed the stragglers were interfered with and abused by the constables. The former cried out for help. The mob returned. The constables opened fire. The little ammunition they had was exhausted and they retired to the Thana for safety. The mob, my informant

tells me, therefore set fire to the Thana. The self-imprisoned constables had to come out for dear life and as they did so, they were backed to pieces and the mangled remains were thrown into the raging flames.

It is claimed that no non-co-operation volunteer had a hand in the brutality and that the mob had not only the immediate provocation but they had also general knowledge of the high-handed tyranny of the police in that district. No provocation can possibly justify the brutal murder of men who had been rendered defenceless and who had virtually thrown themselves on the mercy of the mob. And when Indian claims to be non-violent and hopes to mount the throne of liberty through non-violent means, mob-violence even in answer to grave provocation is a bad augury. Suppose the 'non-violent' disobedience of Bardoli was permitted by God to succeed, the Government had abdicated in favour of the victors of Bardoli, who would control the unruly element that must be expected to perpetrate inhumanity upon due provocation? Non-violent attainment of self-Government presupposes a non-violent control over the violent elements in the country. Non-violent non-co-operators can only succeed when they have succeeded in attaining control over the hooligans of India, in other words, when the latter also have learnt patriotically or religiously to refrain from their violent activities, at least whilst the campaign of non-co-operation is going on. The tragedy at Chaura, therefore, roused me thoroughly.

'But what about your manifesto to the Viceroy and your rejoinder to his reply?' spoke the voice of Satan. It was the bitterest cup of humiliation to drink. "Surely it is cowardly to withdraw the next day after

pompous threat to the Government and promises to the people of Bardoli' Thus Satan's invitation was to deny Truth and therefore Religion, to deny God Himself. I put my doubts and troubles before the Working Committee and other associates whom I found near me. They did not all agree with me at first. Some of them probably do not even now agree with me. But never has a man been blessed, perhaps, with colleagues and associates so considerate and forgiving as I have. They understood my difficulty and patiently followed my argument. The result is before the public in the shape of the resolutions of the Working Committee. The drastic reversal of practically the whole of the aggressive programme may be politically unsound and unwise, but there is no doubt that it is religiously sound, and I venture to assure the doubters that the country will have gained by my humiliation and confession of error.

The only virtue I want to claim is Truth and Non-violence. I lay no claim to superhuman powers. I want none. I wear the same corruptible flesh that the weakest of my fellow beings wears and am therefore as liable to err as any. My services have many limitations, but God has up to now blessed them in spite of the imperfections.

For confession of error is like a broom that sweeps away dirt and leaves the surface cleaner than before, I feel stronger for my confession. And the cause must prosper for the retracing. Never has man reached his destination by persistence in deviation from the straight path.

It has been urged that Chauri Chaura cannot affect Bardoli. There is danger, it is argued, only if Bardoli is weak enough to be swayed by Chauri Chaura and is

betrayed into violence. I have no doubt whatsoever on that account. The people of Bardoli are in my opinion the most peaceful in India. But Bardoli is but a speck on the map of India. Its effort cannot succeed unless there is perfect co-operation from the other parts. Bardoli's disobedience will be civil only when the other parts of India remain non-violent. Just as the addition of a grain of arsenic to a pot of milk renders it unfit as food so will the civility of Bardoli prove unacceptable by the addition of the deadly poison from Chauri Chaura. The latter represents India as much as Bardoli.

Chauri Chaura is after all an aggravated symptom. I have never imagined that there has been no violence, mental or physical, in the places where repression is going on. Only I have believed, I still believe and the pages of *Young India* amply prove, that the repression is out of all proportion to the insignificant popular violence in the areas of repression. The determined holding of meetings in prohibited areas I do not call violence. The violence I am referring to is the throwing of brickbats or intimidation and coercion practised in stray cases. As a matter of fact in civil disobedience there should be no excitement. Civil disobedience is a preparation for mute suffering. Its effect is marvellous though unperceived and gentle. But I regarded certain amount of excitement as inevitable, certain amount of unintended violence even pardonable, *i.e.*, I did not consider civil disobedience impossible in somewhat imperfect conditions. Under perfect conditions disobedience when civil is hardly felt. But the present movement is admittedly a dangerous experiment under fairly adverse conditions.

The tragedy of Chauri Chaura is really the index

finger. It shows the way India may easily go, if drastic precautions be not taken. If we are not to evolve violence out of non-violence, it is quite clear that we must hastily retrace our steps and re-establish an atmosphere of peace, re-arrange our programme and not think of starting mass civil disobedience until we are sure of peace being started and in spite of Government provocation. We must be sure of unauthorised portions not starting mass civil disobedience.

As it is, the Congress organisation is still imperfect and its instructions are still perfunctorily carried out. We have not established Congress Committees in every one of the villages. Where we have, they are not perfectly amenable to our instructions. We have not probably more than one crore of members on the roll. We are in the middle of February, yet not many have paid the annual four annas subscription for the current year. Volunteers are indifferently enrolled. They do not conform to all the conditions of their pledge. They do not even wear hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar*. All the Hindu volunteers have not yet purged themselves of the sin of untouchability. All are not free from the taint of violence. Not by their imprisonment are we going to win Swaraj or serve the holy cause of the Khilafat or attain the ability to stop payment to faithless servants. Some of us err in spite of ourselves. But some others among us sin wilfully. They join volunteer corps well knowing that they are not and do not intend to remain non-violent. We are thus untruthful even as we hold the Government to be untruthful. We dare not enter the kingdom of Liberty with mere lip homage to Truth and Non-violence.

Suspension of mass civil disobedience and subsidence of excitement are necessary for further progress, indeed, indispensable to prevent further retrogression. I hope, therefore, that by suspension every Congress man or woman will not only feel disappointed but he or she will feel relieved of the burden of unreality and of national sin.

Let the opponent glory in our humiliation or so called defeat. It is better to be charged with cowardice and weakness than to be guilty of our oath and sin against God. It is million times better to *appear* untrue before the world than to *be* untrue to ourselves.

And so, for me the suspension of mass civil disobedience and other minor activities that were calculated to keep up excitement is not enough penance for my having been the instrument, howsoever involuntary, of the brutal violence by the people at Chauri Chaura.

I must undergo personal cleansing. I must become a fitter instrument able to register the slightest variation in the moral atmosphere about me. My prayers must have much deeper truth and humility about them than they evidence. And for me there is nothing so helpful and cleansing as a fast accompanied by the necessary mental co-operation.

I know that the mental attitude is everything. Just as a prayer may be merely a mechanical intonation as of a bird, so may a fast be a mere mechanical torture of the flesh. Such mechanical contrivances are valueless for the purpose intended. Again just as a mechanical chant may result in the modulation of voice, a mechnical fast may result in purifying the body. Neither will touch the soul within.

But a fast undertaken for fuller self-expression, for

attainment of the spirit's supremacy over the flesh, is a most powerful factor in one's evolution. After deep consideration, therefore, I am imposing on myself a five days' continuous fast permitting myself water. It commenced on Sunday evening, it ends on Friday evening. This is the least I must do.

I have taken into consideration the All-India Congress Committee meeting in front of me. I have in mind the anxious pain even the days' fast will cause many friends ; but I can no longer postpone the penance nor lessen it.

I urge co-workers not to copy my example. The motive in their case will be lacking. They are not the originators of civil disobedience. I am in the unhappy position of a surgeon proved skilless to deal with an admittedly dangerous case. I must either abdicate or acquire greater skill. Whilst the personal penance is not only necessary bnt obligatory on me, the exemplary self-restraint prescribed by the Working Committee is surely sufficient penance for every one else. It is no small penance and if sincerely carried out, it can become infinitely more real and better than fasting. What can be richer and more fruitful than a greater fulfilment of the vow of non-violence in thought, word, and deed or the spread of that spirit ? It will be more than food for me during the week to observe that comrades are all silently and without idle discussion engaged in fulfilling the constructive programme sketched by the Working Committee, in enlisting Congress members after making sure that they understand the Congress creed of truth and non-violence for the attainment of Swaraj, in daily and religiously spinning for a fixed time, in introducing the wheel of prosperity and freedom in

every home, in visiting 'untouchable' homes and finding out their wants, in inducing national schools to receive 'untouchable' children, in organising social service specially designed to find a common platform for every variety of man and woman, and in visiting the homes which the drink curse is desolating, in establishing real *Panchayats* and in organising national schools on a proper footing. The workers will be better engaged in these activities than in fasting. I hope, therefore, that no one will join me in fasting, either through false sympathy or an ignorant conception of the spiritual value of fasting.

All fasting and all penance must as far as possible be secret. But my fasting is both a penance and a punishment, and a punishment has to be public. It is penance for me and punishment for those whom I try to serve, for whom I love to live and would equally love to die. They have unintentionally sinned against the laws of the Congress though they were sympathisers if not actually connected with it, Probably they hacked the constables their countrymen and fellow beings with my name on their lips. The only way love punishes is by suffering. I cannot even wish them to be arrested. But I would let them know that I would suffer for their breach of the Congress creed. I would advise those who feel guilty and repentant to hand themselves voluntarily to the Government for punishment and make a clean confession. I hope that the workers in the Gorakhpur district will leave no stone unturned to find out the evil doers and urge them to deliver themselves into custody. But whether the murderers accept my advice or not, I would like them to know that they have seriously interfered

with Swaraj operations, that in being the cause of the postponement of the movement in Bardoli, they have injured the very cause they probably intended to serve. I would like them to know, too, that this movement is not a cloak or a preparation for violence. I would, at any rate, suffer every humiliation, every torture, absolute ostracism and death itself to prevent the movement from becoming violent or a precursor of violence. I make my penance public also because I am now denying myself the opportunity of sharing their lot with the prisoners. The immediate issue has again shifted, we can no longer press for the withdrawal of notification, or discharge of prisoners. They and we must suffer for the crime of Chauri Chaura. The incident proves, whether we wish it or no, the unity of life. All, including even the administrators, must suffer. Chauri Chaura must stiffen the Government, must still further corrupt the police, and the reprisals that will follow must further demoralise the people. The suspension and he penance will take us back to the position we occupied before the tragedy. By strict discipline and purification we regain the moral confidence required for demanding the withdrawal of notifications and the discharge of prisoners.

If we learn the full lesson of the tragedy, we can turn the curse into a blessing. By becoming truthful and non-violent, both in spirit and deed, and by making the swadeshi *i.e.*, the *khaddar* programme complete, we can establish full Swaraj and redress the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs without a single person having to offer civil disobedience.

IN DEFENCE OF THE BARDOLI DECISIONS.

[The suspension of masss civil disobedience in Bardoli, which was recommended by the Working Committee at the instance of Mr. Gandhi, was resented by some of his colleagues and followers. In reply to correspondants who attacked him, he wrote as follows in *Young India* of February, 23rd.]

A friend from Lahore without giving his name sends me the following thundering note :—

" On Tuesday the 14th I read the *Tribune* and the resolutions therein, passed at the emergency meeting of the All-India Congress Working Committee. On Monday when I came from my office I heard a flying rumour that Mahatmaji had postponed the date of the mass civil disobedience, but at that time I thought the news devoid of foundation. After a short time a friend of mine hawked me at my house and we went to bazaar. His face was somewhat sadder than usual. I enquired of him the reason of his sadness. He said he was utterly disgusted and so gave up the idea of following this movement. Mahatmaji was going to give up the lead of this movement and at the same time he had advised all the Provincial Congress Committees not to enrol any more volunteers. No picketing propaganda should be undertaken as long as the special session of the All-India Congress Committee had not confirmed what to do further.

"The people are of this opinion that you have turned your face and become fickle-minded. They will co-operate with the Government without any hesitation and join the ceremony of His Royal Highness the

Prince of Wales. Some say that they will not observe *hartal* and will accord a hearty reception at Lahore.

"Some merchants are under the impression that you have removed all the restrictions from all liquor shops and *videshi* cloth.

"Truly speaking, each and every one in Lahore city is holding meeting in the bazaar as well as in the house, and you will forgive me if I will say boldly that they are condemning the action of the All-India Congress Committee.

"I now for my sake ask you these questions.

"(1) Will you now give up the lead of this movement? If so, why?

"(2) Will you be good enough to let me know why you have given such instructions to all Provincial Congress Committees? Have you given an opportunity to Pandit Malaviya for a Round Table Conference for a settlement, or has Pandit Malaviya agreed to embrace your movement in case the Government has not turned true to its words?

"(3) Grant a compromise is arranged and the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are redressed and in the case of Swaraj the Government may only extend the reforms, will you be satisfied with that or continue your activities till you have got the full dominion status?

"(4) Suppose no decision is arrived at. Will Panlit Malaviya and all others who are connected with this conference come to your side or will their fate remain in the balance just as now?

"(5) In case no decision is arrived at, will you give up the idea of civil disobedience, if there is danger of violence.

"(6) Is your intention now to disband the present volunteer corps and enlist those who know spinning and wear handspun and handwoven *khaddar* ?

"(7) Suppose violence has made appearance when you have started your mass civil disobedience, what will you do at that time ? Will you stop your activities at the very moment ?"

There is much more criticism in this letter than I have reproduced. The writer tells me that the people are so disgusted that they now threaten to become co-operators and are of opinion that I have sold Lala Lajpat Rai, the Deshabandhu Chitta Ranjan Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, the Ali Brothers and others, and tells me that if I give up the leadership there are thousands who will leave this world by committing suicide. I may assure the citienzs of Lahore in particular and Punjabis in general that I do not believe what is said of them. I used to receive such letters even during the Martial Law days because of the suspension of civil disobedience, but I discounted all the news and on my reaching the Punjab in October, I found that I was right in my analysis of the Punjab mind and I discovered that there was no one to challenge the propriety of my act. I feel still more confident of the correctness of the decision of the Working Committee, but if it is found that the country repudiates my action I shall not mind it. I can but do my duty. A leader is useless when he acts against the promptings of his own conscience, surrounded as he must be by people holding all kinds of views. He will drift like an anchorless ship if he has not the inner voice to hold him firm and guide him. Above all, I can easily put up with the denial of the world, but any denial by me of my God is unthinkable, and if I did not give at this

critical period of the struggle the advice that I have, I would be denying both God and Truth. The telegrams and letters I am receiving from all parts of the country thanking me for my decision—telegrams from both non-co-operators and co-operators—confirm my belief that the country appreciates the decision and that the Lahore writer has given undue prominence to some heated bazaar talk which was bound to take place after the Bardoli decision which all of a sudden disturbed all previous calculations. I can understand the effect of the first shock, but I am also sure that when the people begin to analyse the implications of non-violence, they will come to no other conclusion than that of the Working Committee.

And now for the questions of the correspondent :

(1) I am not likely to give up the lead of the movement unless I have a clear indication that the people want me to. One method of giving that indication is an adverse vote of the Working Committe or the All-India Congress Committee.

(2) I assure the public that *Pandit Malaviyaji had absolutely no hand in shaping my decision.* I have often yielded to Panditji, and it is always a pleasure for me to yield to him whenever I can and always painful to differ from one who has an unrivalled record of public service and who is sacrifice personified. But so far as the decision of suspension is concerned, I arrived at it on my reading the detailed report of the Chauri Chaura tragedy in the *Chronicle.* It was in Bardoli that telegrams were sent convening the Working Committee meeting and it was in Bardoli that I sent a letter to the members of the Working Committee advising them of my desire to suspend civil disobedience. I went

thereafter to Bombay at the instance of Panditji who together with the other friends of the Malaviya Conference undoubtedly wished to plead with me for a suspension and who were agreeably surprised when I told them that so far as I was concerned, my mind was made up, but that had kept it open so that I could discuss the point thoroughly with the members of the Working Committee. The suspension has no reference to a round table conference or to any settlement. In my opinion, a round table conference is bound to prove fruitless. It requires a much stronger Viceroy than Lord Reading has proved to be to perceive the situation in the country and then to describe it correctly. I certainly feel that Pandit Malaviyaji has already come into the movement. It is not possible for him to keep away from the Congress or from danger, but the Bardoli decision was arrived at purely on its merits and I could not have been shaken from the original purpose had I not been unnerved by the Chauri Chaura tragedy which was the last straw.

(3) Nothing short of a full Dominion status is likely to satisfy me personally and nothing short of complete severance will satisfy me if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs remain unredressed, but the exact form does not depend upon me. I have no clear-cut scheme. It has to be evolved by the people's representatives.

(4) At the present moment there is no question of a settlement. Therefore, the question as to what Panditji and all others will do is premature if not irrelevant. But assuming that Panditji holds any conference and that its resolutions are ignored by the Government, Panditji and others will act as all self-respecting men do in such circumstances.

(5) I can never give up the *idea* of civil disobe-

dience, no matter what danger there is of violence, but I shall certainly give up the idea of *starting* mass civil disobedience so long as there is a certain danger of violence. Individual civil disobedience stands on a different footing.

(6) There is no question of disbanding anyVolunteer Corps, but the names of those who do not conform to the Congress pledge have certainly to be removed from the list if we are to be honest.

(7) If we have understood the essential parts of non-violence, we can but come to one conclusion, that any eruption of widespread violence—and I call the Chauri Chaura tragedy widespread for the purpose—automatically stops mass civil disobedience. That many other parts of the country have nobly responded to the spirit of non-violence is good, but it is not good enough to continue mass civil disobedience even as a most *peaceful* meeting is disturbed if one man obstructs or commits violence. Mass civil disobedience for becoming successful requires a non-violent environment. The reason for restricting it to one single small area is to prevent violence elsewhere. It, therefore, means that mass civil disobediece in a particular area is possible when the other areas passively co-operate by remaining non-violent.

THE DELHI RESOLUTIONS.

[The All-India Congress Committee met at Delhi on the 25th February and passed resolutions with important modifications on the Bardoli decisions of the Working Committee. Mr. Gandhi explains in the following article in *Young India* of March 2,1922, how the Bardoli programme came to be modified.]

The session just past of the All-India Congress Committee was in some respects more memorable than the Congress. There is so much under-current of violence, both conscious and unconscious, that I was actually and literally praying for a disastrous defeat. I have always been in a minority. The reader does not know that in South Africa I started with practical unanimity, reached a minority of sixty-four and even sixteen and went up again to a huge majority. The best and the most solid work was done in the wilderness of minority.

[The following resolution was passed on the 25th February at the session of the All-India Congress Committee held at Delhi:—

The All-India Congress Committee having carefully considered the resolutions passed by the Working Committee at its meeting held at Bardoli on the 11th and 12th instant, confirms the said resolutions with the modifications noted therein and further resolves that individual Civil Disobedience whether of a defensive or aggressive character may be commenced in respect of particular places or particular laws at the instance of and upon permission being granted therefor by the respective Provincial Committee; provided that such Civil Disobedience shall not be permitted unless all the conditions laid down by the Congress or the All-India Congress Committee or the Working Committee are strictly fulfilled.

Reports having been received from various quarters that

I know that the only thing that the Government dread is this huge majority I seem to command. They little know that I dread it even more than they. I have become literally sick of the adoration of the unthinking multitude. I would feel certain of my ground, if I was spat upon by them. Then there would be no need for confession of Himalayan and other miscalculations, no retracing, no re-arranging.

But it was not to be.

---

picketing regarding foreign cloth is as necessary as liquor-picketing, the All-India Congress Committee authorises such picketing of a *bona fide* character on the same terms as liquor-picketing mentioned in the Bardoli resolutions.

The All-India Congress Committee wishes it to be understood that the resolutions of the Working Committee do no mean any abandonment of the original Congress programme of non-co-operation or permanent abandonment of Mass Civil Disobedience but considers that an atmosphere of necessary mass non violence can be established by the workers concentrating upon th constructive programme framed by the Working Committee at Bardoli.

The All-India Congress Committee holds Civil Disobedience to be the right and duty of the people to be exercised and performed whenever the State opposes the declared will of the people.

Note :—Individual Civil Disobedience is disobedience of orders or laws by a single individual or an ascertained number or group of individuals. Therefore a prohibited public meeting where admission is regulated by tickets and to which no unauthorised admission is allowed, is an instance of Individual Civil Disobedience, whereas a prohibited meeting to which the general public is admitted without any restriction is an instance of Mass Civil Disobedience. Such Civil Disobedience is defensive when a prohibited public meeting is held for conducting a normal activity although it may result in arrest. It would be aggressive if it is held not for any normal activity but merely for the purpose of courting arrest and imprisonment.

A friend warned me against exploiting my dictator ship. He little knew that I had never once used it, if only because the legal occasion had not yet arisen for its use. The 'dictatorship' accrues to me only when the ordinary Congress machinery is rendered unworkable by the Government.

Far from my consciously or unconsciously exploiting my 'dictatorship', I have begun to wonder if I am not unconsciously allowing myself to be 'exploited'. I confess that I have a dread of it such as I never had before. My only safety lies in my shamelessness. I have warned my friends of the Committee that I am incorrigible. I shall continue to confess blunders each time the people commit them. The only tyrant I accept in this world is the 'still small voice' within. And even though I have to face the prospect of a minority of one, I humbly believe I have the courage to be in such a hopeless minority. That to me is the only truthful position.

But I am a sadder and I hope a wiser man to-day. I see that our non-violence is skin-deep. We are burning with indignation. The Government is feeding it by its insensate acts. It seems almost as if the Government wants to see this land covered with murder, arson and rapine, in order to be able once more to claim exclusive ability to put them down.

This non-violence therefore seems to be due merely to our helplessness. It almost appears as if we are nursing in our bosoms the desire to take revenge the first time we get the opportunity.

Can true voluntary non-violence come out of this seeming forced non-violence of the weak? Is it not a futile experiment I am conducting? What if, when the

fury bursts, not a man, woman or child is safe and every man's hand is raised against his fellow being? Of what avail is it then if I fast myself to death in the event of such a catastrophe coming to pass?

What is the alternative? To lie and say that what I know to be evil, is good? To say that true and voluntary co-operation will come out of false and forced co-operation is to say that light will result from darkness.

Co-operation with the Government is as much a weakness and a sin as alliance with suspended violence.

The difficulty is almost insurmountable. Hence with the growing knowledge of the fact that this non-violence is merely superficial, I must continually make mistakes and retrace, even as a man wading his way through a tractless forest must continually stop, retrace, stumble, be hurt and even bleed.

I was prepared for a certain amount of depression, dis-appointment and resentment, but I confess I was totally unprepared for the hurricane of opposition. It became clear to me that the workers were in no mood to do any serious work of construction. The constructive programme lent no enchantment. They were not a social reform association. They could not wrest power from the Government by such humdrum reform work. They wanted to deliver 'non-violent' blows! All this appeared so thoroughly unreal. They would not stop to think that even if they could defeat the Government by a childish display of rage, they could not conduct the Government of the country for a single day without serious and laborious organisation and construction.

We must not go to gaol, as Mahomed Ali would

say, 'on a false issue'. It is not *any* imprisonment that will lead to Swaraj. It is not *every* disobedience that will fire us with the spirit of obedience and discipline. Jails are no gate-way to liberty for the confirmed criminal. They are temples of liberty only for those who are innocence personified. The execution of Socrates made immortality a living reality for us,—not so the execution of countless murderers. There is no warrant for supposing that we can steal Swaraj by the imprisonment of thousands of nominally non-violent men with hatred, ill-will and violence raging in their breasts.

It would be otherwise if we were fighting with arms, giving and receiving blow for blow. The imprisonment of those who may be caught intimidating, assaulting and murdering will certainly embarrass the Government and when they are tired, they would as elsewhere yield. But such is not our fight to-day. Let us be truthful. If it is through 'show of force' that we wish to gain Swaraj, let us drop non-violence and offer such violence as we may. It would be a manly, honest and sober attitude an attitude the world has been used to for ages past. No one can then accuse us of the terrible charge of hypocricy.

But the majority will not listen to me in spite of all my warnings and passionate plea for rejecting my resolution, if they did not believe in non-violence as indispensable for the attainmentof our goal. They accepted it without a single material change. I would ask them therefore to realise their responsibility. They are now bound not to rush to civil disobedience but to settle down to the quiet work of construction. I would urge them to be indifferent to the clamour for immediate action

The immediate action is not courting imprisonment, nor even free speech and free association or free pen, but self-purification, introspection, quiet organisation. We have lost our foothold. If we do not take care, we are likely to be drowned in the waters whose depth we do not know.

It is no use thinking of the prisoners. When I heard of Chauri Chaura I sacrificed them as the first penitential act. They have gone to jail to be released only by the strength of the people, indeed the hope was the Swaraj Parliament's first act would be to open the prison gates God had decreed otherwise. We who are outside have tried and failed. The prisoners can now only gain by serving the full term of their imprisonment. Those who went under false pretences, or under any mis-apprehension or under mistaken understanding of the movement can come out by apologising and by petitioning. The movement will be all the stronger for the purging. The stoutest hearts will rejoice in the opportunity of unexpectedly greater suffering. Though thousands of Russians have 'rotted' in the Russian prisons for years and years, that unhappy people are not yet free. Liberty is a jilt most difficult to woo and please. We have shown the power of suffering. But we have not suffered enough. If the people in general keep passively non-violent and if only a few are actively, honestly and knowingly non-violent in intent, word and deed, we can reach the goal in quickest time with the least suffering. But we shall indefinitely postpone the attainment, if we send to prison men who harbour violence in their breasts.

Therefore the duty of the majority in their respective provinces is to face taunts, insults and if need be

depletion in their ranks but determinedly to pursue their goal without swerving an inch. The authorities mistaking our suspension for weakness may resort to still greater oppresson. We should submit to it. We should even abandon defensive civil disobedience and concentrate all our energy on the tasteless but health-giving economic and social reform. We should bend down on our knees and assure the moderates that they need fear no harm from us. We should assure the Zamindars that we have no ill-will against them.

The average Englishman is haughty, he does not understand us, he considers himself to be a superior being. He thinks that he is born to rule us. He relies upon his forts or his gun to protect himself. He despises u-. He wants to compel co-operation *i.e.*, slavery. Even him we have to conquer, not by bending the knee, but remaining aloof from him, but at the sametime not hating him nor hurting him. It is cowardly to molest him. If we simply refuse to regard ourselves as his slaves and pay homage to him, we have done our duty. A mouse can only shun the cat. He cannot treat with her till she has filed the points of her claws and teeth. At the same time we must show every attention to those few Englishmen who are trying to cure themselves and fellow Englishmen of the disease of race superiority.

The minority has different ideals It does not believe in the programme. Is it not right and patriotic for them to form a new party and a new organisation ? They will then truly educate the country. Those who do not believe in the creed should surely retire from the Congress. Even a national organisation must have a creed. One, for instance, who does not believe in

Swaraj has no place in the Congress. I submit that even so has one who does not believe in 'peaceful and legitimate means' no place in the Congress. A Congressman may not believe in non-co-operation and still remain in it but he cannot believe in violence and untruth and still be a Congressman. I was therefore deeply hurt when I found opposition to the note in the resolution about the creed and still more when I found opposition to my paraphrase of the two adjectives 'peaceful' and 'legitimate' into 'non-violent' and 'truthful' respectively. I had reasons for the paraphrase. I was seriously told that the creed did not insist upon non-violence and truth as the indispensable means for the attainment of Swaraj. I agreed to remove the paraphrase in order to avoid a painful discussion but I felt that truth was stabbed.

I am sure that those who raised this opposition are as patriotic as I claim to be, they are as eager for Swaraj as every other Congressman. But I do say that the patriotic spirit demands their loyal and strict adherence to non-violence and truth and that if they do not believe in them they should retire from the Congress organisation.

Is it not national economy to let all the ideals be sharply defined and to work independently of one another? That then which is most popular will win the day. If we are going to evolve the real spirit of democracy, we shall not do so by obstruction but by abstention.

The session of the All-India Congress Committee was a forcible demonstration of the fact that *we* are retarding the country's progress towards Swaraj and not the Government. Every mistake of the Government helps. Every neglect of duty on our part hinders.

REPLY TO CRITICS.

If the Bardoli decisions offended a few zealous followers of Mr. Gandhi, the Delhi resolutions were condemned by a large section of the public. Congressmen were uncomfortable at the sudden and incessant changes of programme. Doubts as to the validity of the principles of non-violence were openly discussed, some adhering to it as a mere policy and as policy, liable to change. To these Mr. Gandhi replied:—]

I am sorry that I find a nervous fear among some Hindus and Mahomedans that I am undermining their faith and that I am even doing irreparable harm to India by my uncompromising preaching of non-violence. They seem almost to imply that violence is their creed. I touch a tender spot if I talk about extreme non-violence in their presence. They confound me with texts from the Mahabharata and the Koran eulogising or permitting violence. Of the Mahabharata I can write without restraint, but the most devout Mahomedan will not, I hope, deny me the privilege of understanding the message of the Prophet. I make bold to say that violence is the creed of no religion and that whereas non-violence in most cases is obligatory in all, violence is merely permissible in some cases. But I have not put before India the final form of non-violence. The non-violence that I have preached from Congress platforms is non-violence as a policy. But even policies require honest adherence in thought, word and deed. If I believe that honesty is the best policy, surely whilst I so believe, I must be honest in thought, word and deed; otherwise I become an imposter. Non-violence being a policy means that it can upon due

notice be given up when it proves unsucceseful or ineffective. But simple morality demands that whilst a particular policy is pursued, it must be pursued with all one's heart. It is simple policy to march along a certain route, but the soldier who marches with an unsteady step along that route is liable to be summarily dismissed. I become therefore incredulous when people talk to me sceptically about non-violence or are seized with fright at the very mention of the word non-violence. If they do not believe in the expedient of non-violence, they must denounce it but not claim to believe in the expedient when their heart resists it. How disastrous it would be if, not believing in violence even as an expedient, I joined, say, a violence party and approached a gun with a perturbed heart! The reader will believe me when I say that I have the capacity for killing a fly. But I do not believe in killing even flies. Now suppose I joined an expedition for fly-killing as an expedient. Will I not be expected before being permitted to join the expedition to use all the available engines of destruction whilst I remained in the army of fly killers? If those who are in the Congress and the Khilafat Committees will perceive this simple truth, we shall certainly either finish the struggle this year to a successful end or be so sick of non-violence as to give up the pretention and set about devising some other programme.

I hold that Swami Shraddhanandji has been needlessly criticised for the proposition he intended to move. His argument is absolutely honest. He thinks that we as a body do not really believe in non-violence even as a policy. Therefore we shall never fulfil the programme of non-violence. Therefore, he says, let us

go to the Councils and get what crumbs we may. He was trying to show the unreality of the position of those who believe in the policy with their lips whereas they are looking forward to violence for final deliverance. I do say that if Congressmen do not fully *believe* in the policy, they are doing an injury to the country by pretending to follow it. If violence is to be the basis of future Government, the Councillors are undoubtedly the wisest. For it is through the Councils that by the same devices by which the present administrators rule us, the Councilors hope to seize power from the former's hands. I have little doubt that those who nurse violence in their bosoms will find no benefit from the lip profession of non-violence. I urge, therefore, with all the vehemence at my command that those who do not believe in non-violence should secede from the Congress and from non-co-operation and prepare to seek election or re-join law courts or Government colleges as the case may be. Let there be no manner of doubt hat Swaraj established by non-violent means will be different in kind from the Swaraj that can be established by armed rebellion. Police and punishments there will be even under such Swaraj. But there would be no room for brutalities such as we witness to-day both on the part of the people and the Government. And those, whether they call themselves Hindus or Mussulmans, who do not fully believe in the policy of non-violence, should abandon both non-co-operation and non-violence.

For me, I am positive that neither in the Koran nor in the Mahabharata there is any sanction for and approval of the triumph of violence. Though there is repulsion enough in Nature, she *lives* by attraction.

Mutual love enables Nature to persist Man does not live by destruction. Self-love compels regard for others. Nations cohere because there is mutual regard among the individuals composing them. Some day we must extend the national law to the universe, even as we have extended the family law to form nations—a larger family. God has ordained that India should be such a nation. For so far as reason can perceive, India cannot become free by armed rebellion for generations. India can become free by refraining from national violence. India has now become tired of rule based upon violence. That to me is the message of the plains. The people of the plains do not know what it is to put up an organised armed fight. And they must become free, for they want freedom. They have realised that power seized by violence will only result in their greater grinding.

Such at any rate is the reasoning that has given birth to the *policy*, not the *dharma*, of non-violence. And even as a Mussulman or a Hindu believing in violence applies the creed of non-violence in his family, so are both called upon without question to apply the policy of non-violence in their mutual relation and in their relation to other races and classes not excluding Englishmen. Those who do not believe in this policy and do not wish to live up to it in full, retard the movement by remaining in it.

It is thus clear what I would like the Provincial organisations to do. They must not for the present disobey the Government orders so far as it is at all possible. They must not, before they have searched their hearts, take forward action but bring about an absolutely calm atmosphere. No imprisonment courted

in anger has availed us anything. I agree with the Mussulman view which is also the Hindu view that there is no imprisonment for the sake of it. All imprisonment to be useful has to be courted for religion or country and that by men and women clad in *khaddar* and without anger or violence in their hearts. If the provinces have no such men and women, they should not embark on civil disobedience at all.

Hence it is that the constructive programme has been framed. It will steady and calm us. It will wake our organising spirit, it will make us industrious, it will render us fit for Swaraj, it will cool our blood. We shall be spat upon, laughed at, sworn at, may be even kicked and cursed. We must put up with it all inasmuch as we have harboured anger in our breasts even though we have been under the pledge of non-violence I must frankly state that unless we can retrieve our steps deliberately, cultivate non-violence and manufacture *khaddar*, we cannot render effective help to the Khilafat, we cannot get redress of the Punjab wrong, nor can we attain Swaraj. My leadership is perfectly useless if I cannot convince co-workers and the public of the absolute and immediate necessity of vigorously prosecuting the constructive programme.

We must know whether we can got a crore men and women in all India who believe in the attainment of Swaraj by peaceful *i. e*, non-violent and legitimate *i. e*. truthful means.

We must get money for the prosecution of Swadeshi and we will know how many people there are in India who are willing honestly to pay one rupee out of every hundred of their past year's income to the Tilak

Memorial Swaraj Fund. This subscription the Committee expects from Congressmen and sympathisers.

We must spend money like water in introducing the spinning wheel in every home, in the manufacture and the distribution of *khaddar* wherever required.

Surely we have long neglected the 'untouchable' brother. He has slaved for us too long. We must now serve him.

Our liquor picketing has done some good but not substantial. Not till we pierce the home of the drunkard shall we make any real advance. We must know why he drinks ; but we can substitute for it. We must have a census of all the drunkards of India.

Social Service Department has been looked at with the utmost contempt. If the non-co-operation movement is not malicious, that department is a necessity. We want to render alike to friend and foe service in times of distress. We are thereby able to keep our relations sweet with all inspite of our political aloofness.

Social service and temperance reform were laughed at as part of the struggle for Swaraj. It was a painful exhibition of ignorance of the essentials of Swaraj. I claim that human mind or human society is not divided into water-tight compartments called social, political and religious. All act and react upon one another. What is more, the vast majority of Hindus and Mussulmans have joined the struggle believing it to be religious. The masses have come in because they want to save the Khilafat and the cow. Deprive the Mussalman of the hope of helping the Khilafat and he will shun the Congress ; tell the Hindu he cannot save the cow if he joins the Congress, he will to a man leave it. To

laugh at moral reform and social service is to laugh at Swaraj, the Khilafat and the Punjab.

Even the organisation of schools was laughed at. Let us see what it means. We have demolished the prestige of Government schools. It was perhaps necessary in 1920 to do the picketing and certainly not to mind the boys being neglected, but it would be criminal any longer to picket Government schools or to neglect National institutions. We can now only draw more boys and girls by putting existing National schools on a better footing. They have the advantage of being in institutions where they breathe free air and where they are not shadowed. But the advantage of scientific training in carding, hand-spinning and hand-weaving and of having intellectual training in keeping with the requirements of the country must be added. We shall show by successful experiment the superiority of training in National schools and colleges.

Even the *Panchayats* came in for ridicule. Little did the critics realise that the masses in many parts of India had ceased to resort to law courts. If we do not organise honest *Panchayats*, they will certainly go back to the existing law courts.

Nor is a single step devoid of vast political results. Adequate manufacture and universal use of *khaddar* means a permanent boycott of foreign cloth and automatic distribution of sixty crores of rupees annually among the poor people. Permanent disappearance of the drink and the opium evils mean an annual saving of seventeen crores to the people and a diminution of that revenue for the Government. Constructive effort for the untouchables means the addition to the Congress ranks of six crores of men and women who will for

ever be bound to the Congress. Social Service Department, if it becomes a live thing, will restore the strained relations that exist to-day among co-operators (whether Indian or English) and non-co-operators. To work the full constructive programme therefore is to achieve all we want. To fail in fulfilling the programme is to postpone all possibitity of effective civil disobedience.

Several Mussulman friends have said, "Your programme is good for Swaraj but it is too slow to be good enough for saving the Khilafat. The Khilafat question will be solved in a few months and whatever can be done must be done now." Let us examine the question. The cause of the Khilafat, thank God, is safe in the hands of Gazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha. He has retrieved the prestige of the Khilafat as no Mussalman of modern times has done. India has in my opinion helped not much by her money though that has meant something, but by Hindu-Muslim unity and by telling the Government in the plainest terms possible that India will have nothing to do with the Government and will declare complete independence if England persists in her anti-Turk policy and exploits India's resources against the Turks. The greater the strength in that declaration the greater becomes the prestige of Islam and the greater the power of Mustafa Kamal Pasha. Some people think that mere temporary enbarrassment of the Government by a few thousand men, irrespective of qualification, going to jail, will make the Government yield to our wishes. Let us not underrate the power of the Government. I am sure that the Government does possess as yet the power to crush the spirit of violence. And it is nothing but

violence to go to jail anyhow. It is the suffering of the pure and God-fearing which will tell, not the bluster of the rabble. The purer India becomes, the stronger she becomes. Purity is the only weapon of the weak in body. The strong in body in their insolence often mobilise their 'hard fibre' and seek to usurp the very function of the Almighty. But when that 'hard fibre' comes in contact not with its like but with the exact opposite, it has nothing to work against. A solid body can only move on and against another solid body. You cannot build castles in the air. Therefore, the impatient Mussalmans must see the obvious truth that the little disorganised bluster of the rabble, whether it expresses itself by going to jail or by burning buildings or by making noisy demonstrations, will be no match for the organised insolence of the 'hard fibre' of the 'most determined people in the world'. This terrific insolence can only be met by the utter humility of the pure and the meek. God helps the helpless, not those who believe they can do something. Every page of the Koran teaches me, a non-Muslim, this supreme lesson. Every *sura* of Koran begins in the name of God the Compassionate and the Merciful. Let us therefore be strong in soul though weak in body.

If the Mussalmans believe in the policy of non-violence, they must give it a fair trial and they will not have given it any trial at all if they harbour anger *i.e.* violence in their breasts.

As it is, by our bluster, by intimidation, by show of force, by violent picketing, we shall estrange more men than intimidate into co-operation with us. And how can we dare seek co-operation by compulsion when we have refused to be coerced into co-operation with the

Government ? Must we not observe the same law that we expect others to observe towards us ?

If the Treaty of Sevres is not revised to our satisfaction, it is not finished The virtue lies in India's determination not to be satisfied with anything less than her demands. After all Mustafa Kamal may insist upon the settlement of the Juzurut-ul-Arab. We must continue the fight so long as it is not returned intact to the Mussulmans. If the Mussalmans consider that they can gain their end by force of arms, let them secede from the non-violent alliance by all means. But if they know that they cannot, let them carry it out in thought, word and deed and they will find that there is no surer or quicker remedy for assuaging their grief and redressing the Khilafat wrong.

Some friends argue that in order to continue the struggle, the people need some stimulant. No person or nation can be kept alive merely upon stimulants. We have had much too much of it latterly. And the antidote now is a depressant. If therefore depression follows the cessation of all aggressive activities and people forsake us, it would not only not hinder our cause but help it. Then we shall not have to shoulder the responsibility for a Chauri Chaura. Then we could go forward with a steady step without any danger of having to look back. If however we can survive the depression and keep the people with us, we shall have positive proof that the people have caught the message of non-violence and that the people are as capable of doing constructive work as they have shown themselves capable of doing destructive work.

Whatever the result, the present excitement must be abated at any cost.

I have carefully read Mr. Kelkar's article in the "*Mahratta*" criticising the Bardoli resolutions. I acknowledge the gentle and considerate manner with which he has handled me. I wish I could persuade him and many who think like Mr. Kelkar that what he calls a somersault was an inevitable operation. Consistency is a desirable quality, but it becomes a 'hobgoblin' when it refuses to see facts. I have known dispositions of armies changed from hour to hour. Once during the Zulu revolt we were all asleep. We had definite orders for the morrow. But suddenly at about midnight we were awakened and ordered to retire behind bags of grain which served as protecting walls because the enemy was reported to be creeping up the hill on which we had encamped. In another hour it was understood that it was a false alarm and we were permitted to retire to our tents. All the 'somersaults' were necessary changes. Remedies vary with the variation in diagnosis. The same physician one day detects malaria and gives a large dose of quinine, detects typhoid the next and stops all medicine and orders careful nursing and fasting, later detects consumption and orders change and solid food. Is the physician capricious or cautious and honest?

Without being untruthful and indifferent if not stupid, I could not do what Mr. Kelkar suggests I should have done at the time of the Bombay Conference. It would have been untruthful to have yielded to the Moderate friends beyond what was conceded, as the Indian sky appeared to me to be clear blue and promised to remain so. My diagnosis may be blamed, but not my

decision based on the then diagnosis, nor could I possibly conceal the demands especially in the teeth of the Viceregal declaration at Calcutta that nothing was to be expected in the matters of the Khilafat and the Punjab and that as the reforms had only just been granted no advance was to be expected. I would have been unfair to the Viceroy as also to the Moderate friends if I had not said that our demands were emphatic and clear cut. To have then suspended mass civil disobedience would have been a weakness. But Chauri Chaura darkened the horizon and I discovered a new diagnosis. It would have been idiotic on my part not to have declared in the clearest possible language that the patient required a drastic change of treatment. Not to have suspended after Chauri Chaura would have been unpardonable weakness. I assure the reader that Bardoli's unpreparedness had nothing to do with the decision. For Bardoli in my opinion was quite able to give battle. I have stated several times in the column of *Young India* and *Nava Jivan* that I considered Bardoli to be quite ready for the fray.

The fact is that the critics do not realise the implications of civil disobedience. They seem unconsciously to ignore the potent adjective 'civil.'

The more I think of the Bardoli decision and the more I rehearse the debates and the talks at Delhi, the more convinced I am of the correctness of the decision and of the necessity of Provinces stopping all offensive activities for the time being even at the risk of being considered weak and forfeiting popular applause and support.

A correspondent from Lahore writes under date, 3rd March :—

"So far as the facts about 'Bardoli decision' have come to light, it appears the decision was arrived at either under the influence of Pundit Malaviya or under some far fetched notions of non-violence In the former case the act is most unworthy, and in the latter it is most unwise. Is not the ideal of the Congress Swaraj and not Non-violence? People have imbibed non-violence generally, which surely must do for the Congress purpose. How the breaches like those at Bombay and Gorakhpur can make the engine come to a standstill I cannot understand. And if M. Paul Richard is true as to your aspirations of a World Leader through non-violence even at the cost of Indian interest, it is surely unbecoming and, excuse me to say, dishonest

"And have you realised the effects of this sudden standstill? Mr. Montagu's threat comes for that, Lord Reading and his Government are harder to us than even before. It had almost yielded. As to the public, there is a general distrust prevailing among the classes and the masses. Surely it is difficult to make men play things of the hour and their disgust and disappointment show how the fight was carried on in right earnest. Don't you perceive that it is a shock and that two such shocks must enervate the combatants altogether?

"Besides, I have heard the responsible Mussalmans talk of withdrawing co-operation even from the Hindus. The fight is religious with them. It is the 'Jehad', I should say. God's Command and the Prophet's is no joke to start and to stop the 'Jehad' at will. If the Hindus should retire, they say they must devise their own course. Will you take care to ease one heart that feels uneasy on this account?"

It is impossible to withhold sympathy from the

writer. His letter is typical of the attitude I saw reflected in Delhi. I have already given the assurance that Pundit Malaviyaji had nothing to do with the Bardoli decision. Nor have any 'far-fetched notions of non-violence' anything to do with it. The correspondent's letter is the best justification for it To me the Bardoli decision is the logical outcome of the national pledge of limited non-violence. I entirely endorse the opinion that Swaraj is the nation's goal,not non-violence. It is true that my goal is as much Swaraj as non-violonce, because I hold Swaraj for the masses to be unattainable save through non-violence. But have I not repeatedly said in these columns that I would have India become free even by violence rather than that she should remain in bondage ? In slavery she is a helpless partner in the violence of the slave-holder. It is however true that I could not take part in a violent attempt at deliverance if only because I do not believe in the possibility of success by violence. I cannot pull the trigger against my worst enemy. If I succeed in convincing the world of the supremacy of the law of non-violence and the futility of violence for the progress of mankind, the correspondent will find that India will have automatically gained her end. But I freely confess my utter inability to do so without first convincing India that she can be free only by non-violent and truthful means and no other.

I must further confess that what Mr. Montagu or Lord Reading would think of the decision did not concern me and therefore their threats do not perturb or affect me. Nor should they affect any non-co-operator. He burnt his boats when he embarked upon his mission. But this I know that if

India becomes non-violent in intent, word and deed, even the hearts of Mr. Montagu and Lord Reading will be changed. As it is, marvellous though our progress has been in non-violent action, our hearts and our speech have not become non-violent. Mr. Montagu and Lord Reading do not believe in the sincerity of our profession nor in the possibility of sincere workers succeeding in creating a truly non-violent atmosphere. What is therefore required is more and yet more non-violence "in intent, word and deed."

As for the people, I have little doubt that they will survive the purifying shock. I regard the present depression as a prelude to steady progress. But should it prove otherwise, the truth of the Bardoli decision cannot be denied. It stands independent of public approval. God *is*, even though the whole world deny Him. Truth *stands*, even if there be no public support. It is self-sustained.

I should be sorry, indeed, if responsible Mussalmans will not see the obvious corollaries of non-violence. In my opinion the fight is as religious with Hindus as with Mussalmans. I agree that ours is a spiritual 'Jehad.' But a 'Jehad, has, like all other wars, its strict restrictions and limitations. The Hindus and Mussalmans sail in the same boat. The dissatisfaction is common to both and it is open to both to dissolve partnership with each other. Either or both may also depose me from generalship. It is purely a partnership at will. Finally I assure the correspondent that when I find that I cannot carry conviction home to the people, I shall withdraw from the command myself.

I invite the reader to study the leading article of the week on non-violence. The article became fairly

long even with a discussion of the main principles. I did not therefore discuss the important side issues in it but reserved them for the Notes.

Such for instance are the questions :—

(1) When can even individual civil disobedience be resumed ?

(2) What kind of violence will stop civil disobedience ?

(3) Is there room for self-defence in the limited conception of non-violence ?

(4) Supposing the Mussalmans or the Hindus secede, can a non-violent campaign be carried on by one community alone ?

(5) Supposing Hindus and Mussalmans both reject me, what would become of my preaching ?

I shall take the questions seriatim. Civil disobedience, even individual civil disobedience—requires a tranquil atmosphere. It must not be commenced till the workers have assimilated the spirit of non-violence and have procured a certificate of merit from the co-operators whether English or Indian, *i.e.*, till they have really ceased to think ill of them. The surest test will be when our meetings are purged of intolerance and our writings of bitterness. Another necessary test will be our serious handling of the constructive programme. If we cannot settle down to it, to me it will be proof positive of our disbelief in the capacity of non-violence to achieve the purpose.

It is not every kind of violence that will stop civil disobedience. I should not be dismayed by family feuds even though they may be sanguinary. Nor will the violence of robbers baffle me though they would be to me an indication of the absence of general purifica-

tion. It is political violence which *must* stop civil disobedience. Chauri Chaura was an instance of political violence. It arose from a political demonstration which we should have avoided if we were not capable of conducting it absolutely peacefully. I did not allow Malabar and Malegaon to interrupt our course, because the Moplahs were a special people and they had not come under the influence of non-violence to any appreciable extent. Malegaon is more difficult, but there is clear evidence that the chief non-co-operators had tried their best to prevent the murders. Nor was mass civil disobedience imminent at the time. It could not interrupt individual civil disobedience elsewhere.

The non-co-operator's pledge does not exclude the right of private self-defence. Non-co-operators are under prohibition as to political violence. Those, therefore, with whom non-co-operation is not their final creed, are certainly free to defend themselves or their dependents and wards against their assailants. But they may not defend themselves against the police acting in discharge of their duties whether assumed or authorised. Thus there was no right of self-defence under the pledge against Collectors who have, I hold, illegally belaboured volunteers.

If one of the big communities secede from the compact of non-violence, I admit that it is most difficult, though certainly not impossible, for one party only to carry on the struggle. That party will need to have an invulnerable faith in the policy of non-violence. But if one community does realise that India cannot gain Swaraj for generations through violent means, it can, by its consistently non-violent *i.e.*, loving conduct, bring round all the opposing parties to its side.

If both the parties reject me, I should keep my peace just as ever and most decidedly carry on my propaganda of non-violence. I should then not be restricted as I am now. Then I should be enforcing my creed as to-day I seem to be enforcing only the policy.

A DIVINE WARNING *

If a person commits a mistake for the first time he is excused ; only the generous public forgives in him the repetition of the error. But if he is responsible even on a third occasion for the same mistake, the public leaves him severely alone. If a man is deceived once or twice, he is thought a simpleton but if is ever being deceived, he is rightly condemned a fool. Mass Civil Disobedience at Bardoli has passed off as a dream. God thought it fit in His supreme wisdom to dispose of my plans just at the moment when I thought that Mass Civil Disobedience could be commenced. There is nothing strange in this. In the Ramayana we see that Rama was banished to the wild forests when all was ready for his coronation. That has a lesson for us. We understand the true meaning of Swaraj only when we readily recognise the unreality of things which we had all along thought to be too true. It seems to me that the attempt made to win Swaraj is Swaraj itself. The faster we run towards it, the longer seems to be the distance to be traversed. The same is the case with all ideals. When one goes in pursuit of truth, he finds that it is always eluding his grasp because he sees now and then that what he once thought too true is no more than a fond illusion. The righteous man is always humble. He recognises

* From the *Navjivan*, January 1922.

his shortcomings day by day. A Brahmachari who seeks true Brahmacharyam, feels too often that the longing after wordly pleasures is still in him, making the attainment of his ideal almost impossible. He who seeks "Moksha" or deliverance experiences a similar feeling. All this explains the great "Nathi." The sages who retired for *tapas* to the mountains and forests found themselves confronted with the "Nathi." Some of the Maharishis had probably a glimpse of the truth.

SWARAJ IS THE ATTEMPT TO WIN IT.

I am now convinced more firmly than ever that Swaraj lies in our efforts to win it. Ahmedabad and Viramgaum committed excesses. So too did Amristar and Kasur. Satyagraha was then postponed because of those mob excesses. Last November I was eye-witness to the horrid outbreak at Bombay. Then too Mass Civil Disobedience was postponed. But the bitterest cup of humiliation was yet to come. Chauri Chaura taught me the most valuable lesson. I do not know how much more is still in store for me. Now if people grow impatient and consider me a fool, it will not be their fault. Why should I meddle in their affairs, if I had not the capacity to understand their true nature ? I could not sit with folded arms allowing things to drift. I could not but make open confession of error when any occurred. I would prefer being deposed from leadership, to paying lip-homage to truth and allowing the spirit within me to get corrupt by the overpowering weakness of the flesh. "If the Rana gets angry the people will give me shelter, but no one can protect me from God's wrath " is the strain of Mirabai's song and this has a moral for the world.

We shall not court God's disfavour. We must pay heed to His warnings. If we had persisted in Mass Civil Disobedience at Bardoli, in spite of Gorakhpur, there would have resulted immense harm to the public cause. We would have thrown aside truth and peace. The first condition to Mass Civil Disobedience at Bardoli was perfect peace in the other parts of the country. Bardoli would have sinned if it had proceeded with the campaign in violation of our solemn pledge.

KEEP ABOVE REPROACH.

We need not feel impatient if some people ask whether such perfect peace is at all attainable. Those who argue in this strain, wish the abandonment of Satyagraha and civility. We have to keep above the *reproach of uncivility*. We should constitute ourselves the trustees of India's honour and it is incombent on us to see that no unrighteous or uncivil action is done under cover of righteous or civil pretences. Bardoli kept peace and I maintained it. Both Bardoli and myself have done some service to the people. I think that by recanting my error, I have proved the fitness of a true servant. I am sure that the people will not lose strength but rise all the better for this confession. It is very true that God alone has rescued us from shame. I must have learnt a lesson from Madras but I did not. If a favourite of God does not take note of His warning by means of ordinary indications, the All-Merciful warns him by flare of trumpets and beat of drums and if he does not wake up even then He makes him realise the truth by thunder-storm. We have by doing the right thing put an end to imminent danger.

We had to retrace our steps and we did it in all humility.

A man who strays from his path has to retrace his steps and arrive at the same place from where he missed the way. We were taking the downward path after the Working Committee passed the resolution on Civil Disobedience but now we are climbing up.

How Love Punishes.

But a mere recantation was not enough for me. More severe penance had to be undergone. I was seized with an immense mental pain, the moment I heard of the Gorakpur tragedy. Bodily punishment was indispensable to me. A fast of five days will not suffice to make up for all my errors. I wished a fast of fourteen days, but friends persuaded me to limit it to five. The debtor who pays his full debt in time saves himself from future ruin. There must be no advertising of these prayaschittas. But there is a reason for my making it public. The fast is a penance for me and punishment for the culprits of Chouri Chaura. Love can only punish by suffering. I warn the public by making my fast known to them. I have no other option. If any Non-Co-operator deceives me—I take the whole of India to be a Non-Co-operating body· let him take away my body. I still believe that India wants my bodily existence. I warn the people by torturing my physical frame not to cheat me. If India wills it let her get rid of me by abandoning non-violence. But as long as she accepts my services she must remain non-violent and truthful. If the people will not heed this warning, I am determined to prolong this fast of five days into one of fifty and thus put an end to my life at the end of it.

INDIA IS AND MUST BE NON-VIOLENT.

I am writing this on the third day of my fast. My heart tells me that Hindus, Mussulmans, Sikhs, Jews, Christians, Parsis and others can attain Swaraj, serve the Khilafat and redress the Punjab wrong only by truth and non-violence. If we abandon them we cannot help others, not even Ghasi Mustapha Kemal Pasha If two unequals compete the weaker must either be killed or subdued. Even a *gnani* cannot change his nature at once. If the world were to act according to its true nature what can force do ? I am repeating the same old truth that India cannot attain Swaraj by physical force. Even to entertain a hope that physical force will succeed amounts to violence. India is by Nature non-violent. Knowingly or unknowingly she is intent on Non-Co-operation by means wholly non-violent and truthful. Nobody imitated the people of Ahmedabad and Viramgaum and none will imitate the mad people of Chauri-Chaura. Though violence is not in India's nature it has become a disease Mustapha Kemal Pasha is using the sword, because the Truks are trained to violence and have been fighting for the last so many centuries. But India has been non-violent for thousands of years. We need not here discuss which nation adopted the right course. There is room for both violence and non-violence in this wide world even as the soul and body find room in life.

Now we must get Swaraj by the easiest and the shortest method. India cannot change her nature in a moment. I am firmly of opinion that it will take some *yugas* to make India free by the sword. If the Indian Mussulmans will adopt Mustapha Kemal Pasha's methods, I am sure they will corrupt Islam. There is

more room for non-violence in Islam. Self-restraint occupies a higher position than anger and violence. India has been adhering to truth and Ahimsa for centuries. India's slavery should be preferred to her attaining freedom by abandoning truth and non-violence. Man cannot run to both the poles at the same time. We now see that Western methods are violent whereas it is proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Eastern method is non-violent and righteous. England has now become the central point of Europe. India has been the centre of all civil stations for centuries. Yet the world believes that England wields power and that India is still only a slave. Our attempt to-day is to get rid of slave mentality. If India succeeds in the attempt, it can only be by means of her ancient truth and non-violence. There is no country in the world which is inferior to India in physical prowess. Even little Afghanistan can subdue her. With whose help then does India wish to fight against England? Is it with the help of Japan or Afghanistan? India will then have to accept serfdom under any one who will help her in the fight. Therefore, if India wants to become free, she can only do so with God's help. God loves those who are truthful and non-violent. Hence the divine warning from Gorakhpur. It teaches us to get back, and to be more firm in non-violence if we wish to have our cherished desires accomplished.

ON THE EVE OF ARREST.

"IF I AM ARRESTED."

[For months past the rumour of Mr. Gandhi's inpending arrest was in the air. Expecting the inevitable Mr. Gandhi had more than once written his final message. But in the first week of March the rumour became more widespread and intense. The stiffening of public opinion in England and Mr. Montagu's threatening speech in defence of his Indian policy in the Commons, revealed the fact that the Secretary of State had already sanctioned Mr. Gandhi's prosecution. Chauri Chaura and the Delhi decisions were presumably the immediate cause of Government's action on Mr. Gandhi. Realising that his arrest would not long be deferred, Mr. Gandhi wrote the following message in the *Young India* of March 9 :]

The rumour has been revived that my arrest is imminent. It is said to be regarded as a mistake by some officials that I was not arrested when I was to be, *i.e.*, on the 11th or 12th of February and that the Bardoli decision ought not to have been allowed to affect the Government's programme. It is said, too, that it is now no longer possible for the Government to withstand the ever rising agitation in London for my arrest and deportation. I myself cannot see how the Government can avoid arresting me if they want a permanent abandonment of civil disobedience whether individual or mass.

I advised the Working Committee to suspend mass civil disobedience at Bardoli because that disobedience would not have been civil, and if I am now advising all provincial workers to suspend even individual civil

disobedience, it is because I know that any disobedience at the present stage will be not civil but criminal. A tranquil atmosphere is an indispensable condition of civil disobedience. It is humiliating for me to discover that there is a spirit of violence abroad and that the Government of the United Provinces has been obliged to enlist additional police for avoiding a repetition of Chauri Chaura. I do not say that all that is claimed to have happened, has happened but it is impossible to ignore all the testimony that is given in proof of the growing spirit of violence in some parts of those provinces. In spite of my political differences with Pundit Hridayanath Kunzru, I regard him to be above wilful perversion of truth. I consider him to be one of the most capable among public workers. He is not a man to be easily carried away. When, therefore, he gives an opinion upon anything, it immediately arrests my attention. Making due allowance for the colouring of his judgment by reason of his pro-Government attitude, I am unable to dismiss his report of the Chauri Chaura tragedy as unworthy of consideration. Nor is it possible to ignore letters received from Zamindars and others informing me of the violent temperament and ignorant lawlessness in the United Provinces. I have before me the Bareilly report signed by the Congress Secretary. Whilst the authorities behaved like madmen and forgot themselves in their fit of anger, we are not, if that report is to be believed, without fault. The volunteer procession was not a civil demonstration. It was insisted upon in spite of a sharp division of opinion in our own ranks. Though the crowds that gathered were not violent, the spirit of the demonstration was undoubtedly violent. It was an impotent show of force wholly

unnecessary for our purpose and hardly a preclude to civil disobedience. That the authorities could have handled the procession in a better spirit, that they ought not to have interfered with the Swaraj flag, that they ought not to have objected to the seizure of the Town Hall which was town property as Congress offices in view of the fact that it had been so used for some months with the permission of the Town Council, is all very true. But we have ceased to give credit to the authorities for common or reasonable sense. On the contrary, we have set ourselves against them because we expect nothing but unreason and violence from them, and knowing that the authorities would act no better than they did, we should have refrained from all the previous irritating demonstrations. That the U. P. Government are making a mountain out of a mole hill, that they are discounting their own provocation and the provocation given by the murdered men at Chauri Chaura is nothing new. All that I am concerned with is that it is not possible for us to claim that we have given them no handle whatsoever. It is therefore as a penance that civil disobedience has been suspended. But if the atmosphere clears up, if the people realise the full value of the adjective 'civil' and become in reality non-violent both in spirit and in deed, and if I find that the Government still do not yield to the people's will, I shall certainly be the first person to advocate individual or mass civil disobedience as the case may be. There is no escape from that duty without the people wishing to surrender their birthright.

I doubt the sincerity of Englishmen who are born fighters when they declaim against civil disobedience as if it was a diabolical crime to be punished with

exemplary severity. If they have glorified armed rebellions and resorted to them on due occasions, why are many of them up in arms against the very idea of civil resistance? I can understand their saying that the attainment of a non-violent atmosphere is a virtual impossibility in India. I do not believe it, but I can appreciate such an objection. What however is beyond my comprehension is the dead set made against the very theory of civil disobedience as if it was something immoral. To expect me to give up the preaching of civil disobedience is to ask me to give up preaching peace which would be tantamount to asking me to commit suicide.

I have now been told that the Government are compassing the destruction of the three weeklies which I am conducting, *viz.*, *Young India*, *Gujarati Nava Jivan* and *Hindi Nava Jivan*. I hope that the rumour has no foundation. I claim that these three journals are insistently preaching nothing but peace and goodwill. Extraordinary care is taken to give nothing but truth as I find it, to the readers. Every inadvertent inacuracy is admitted and corrected. The circulation of all the weeklies is daily growing. The conductors are voluntary workers, in some cases taking no salary whatsoever and in the others receiving mere maintenence money. Profits are all returned to the subscribers in some shape or other, or are utilised for some constructive public activity or other. I cannot say that I shall not feel a pang if these journals cease to exist. But it is the easiest thing for the Government to put them out. The publishers and printers are all friends and co-workers. My compact with them is that the moment Government asks for security, that moment the newspapers must stop.

I am conducting them upon the assumption that whatever view the Government may take of my activities, they at least give me credit for preaching through these newspapers nothing but the purest non-voilence and truth according to my light.

I hope, however, that whether the Government arrest me or whether they stop by direct or indirect means the publication of the three journals, the public will remain unmoved It is a matter of no pride or pleasure to me but one of humiliation that the Government refrain from arresting me for fear of an outbreak of universal violence and awful slaughter that any such outbreak must involve. It would be a sad commentary upon my preaching of, and upon the Congress and Khilafat pledge of, non-violence, if my incarceration was to be a signal for a storm all over the country. Surely, it would be a demonstration of India's unreadiness for a peaceful rebellion. It would be a triumph for the bureaucracy, and it would be almost a final proof of the correctness of the position taken up by the Moderate friends, viz, that India can never be prepared for non violent disobedience. I hope therefore that the Congress and Khilafat workers will strain every nerve and show that all the fears entertained by the Government and their supporters were totally wrong. I promise that such act of self-restraint will take us many a mile towards our triple goal.

There should therefore be no *hartals*, no noisy demonstrations, no processions. I would regard the observance of perfect peace on my arrest as a mark of high honour paid to me by my countrymen. What I would love to see, however, is the constructive work of the Congress going on with clockwork regularity and

the speed of the Punjab express. I would love to see people who have hitherto kept back, voluntarily discarding all their foreign cloth and making a bonfire of it. Let them fulfil the whole of the constructive programme framed at Bardoli, and they will not only release me and other prisoners, but they will also inaugurate Swaraj and secure redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. Let them remember the four pillars of Swaraj : Non-violence, Hindu-Moslem-Sikh-Parsi-Christian-Jew unity, total removal of untouchability and manufacture of hand-spun and hand-woven *Khaddar* completely displacing foreign cloth.

I do not know that my removal from their midst will not be a benefit to the people. In the first instance the superstition about the possession of supernatural powers by me will be demolished. Secondly, the belief that people have accepted the non co-operation programme only under my influence and that they have no independent faith in it will be disproved. Thirdly, our capacity for Swaraj will be proved by our ability to conduct our activities in spite of the withdrawal even of the originator of the current programme. Fourthly and selfishly, it will give me a quiet and physical rest, which perhaps I deserve.

MESSAGE TO CO-WORKERS.

[In the course of a letter addressed to the General Secretary of the Congress a couple of days before his arrest, Mr. Gandhi wrote as follows .—]

You ask me for my future programme. I have just sent you a telegram as follows :—

" In Ahmedabad till Saturday; Surat Sunday; Monday; Bardoli Tuesday."

But that is ' Government willing, ' for I have persistent rumours being thrust upon me that my leave is now more than overdue, and I am also told that I shall be relieved of my burdens inside of 7 days. Subject, therefore, to that happy contingency, you have the foregoing programme. If I am arrested, I look to you and all who are out to keep absolute peace. It will be the best honour that the country can do me. Nothing would pain me more, in whatever jail I may find myself, than to be informed by my custodians that a single head has been broken by or on behalf of non-co-operators, a single man had been insulted or a single building damaged. If the people or the workers have at all understood my message, they will keep exemplary peace. I would certainly be delighted if in the night following my arrest, there was throughout the length and breadth of India, a bonfire of all foreign cloth voluntarily surrendered by the people without the slightest compulsion having been exercised, and a fixed determination to use nothing but khaddar, and till then in the glorious weather of India to wear nothing but a piece of loin-cloth, and in the case

of Mussulmans, the minimum required by religious obligation. I would certainly love to be told that there was a phenomenal demand for spinning wheels and that all workers who did not know hand-spinning had commenced it in right earnest. The more I think over our future programme, and the more news I get about the spirit of violence that has silently but surely crept into our ranks, the more convinced I am that even individual civil disobedience would be wrong. It would be much better to be forsaken by everybody and to be doing the right thing than to be doing the wrong thing for the sake of boasting a large following. Whether we are few or whether we are many, so long as we believe in the programme of non-violence there is no absolution from the full constructive programme. Enforce it to-day, and the whole country is ready for mass civil disobedience to-morrow. Fail in the effort, and you are not ready even for individual civil disobedience. Nor is the matter difficult. If all the members of the All-India Congress Committee and Provincial Congress Committees are convinced of the correctness of the premises I have laid down, it can be done. The pity of it is that they are not so convinced. A policy is a temporary creed liable to be changed, but while it holds good it has got to be pursued with apostolic zeal.

MESSAGE TO KERALA.

[The following message to Kerala was dictated by Mr. Gandhi an hour and a half before his arrest. It was addressed to Mr. U. Gopala Menon, Editor of "Naveena Keralam".]

The only message that I can send in the midst of overwhelming work is for both Hindus and Moplahs to realise their future responsibility, not to brood over the past. How to reach the Moplahs as also the class of Hindus whom you would want to reach through your newspaper is more than I can say, but I know that Hindus should cease to be cowardly. The Moplahs should cease to be cruel. In other words, each party should become truly religious. According to the Sastras Hinduism is certainly not the creed of cowards. Equally certainly, Islam is not the creed of the cruel. The only way the terrible problem before you can be solved is by a few picked-Hindus and Mussulmans working away in perfect unison and with faith in their mission. They ought not to be baffled by absence of results in the initial stages, and if you can get together from among your readers a number of such men and women your paper will have served a noble purpose.

AFTER THE ARREST

THE ARREST.

Mr. Gandhi was arrested at the Satyagraha Ashram Ahmedabad on Friday the 10th March, for certain articles published in his *Young India*. On the 11th noon Messrs. Gandhi and Sankarlal Banker the publisher were placed before Mr. Brown, Assistant Magistrate, the Court being held in the Divisional Commissioner's Office at Sahibah. The prosecution was conducted by Rao Bahadur Girdharilal, Public Prosecutor. The Superintendent of Police, Ahmedabad, the first witness, produced the Bombay Goverment's authority to lodge a complaint for four articles published in *Young India*, dated the 15th June, 1921, entitled "Disaffection a Virtue", dated the 29th September, "Tampering with Loyalty" dated the 15th December, "The Puzzle and Its Solution" and dated the 23rd February 1922, "Shaking the Manes." Two formal police witnesses were then produced. The accused declined to cross-examine the witnesses

MR. GANDHI'S STATEMENT.

Mr. M. K. Gandhi, 53, farmer and weaver by profession, residing at Satyagraha Ashram, Sabarmati, said:

I simply wish to state that when the proper time comes I shall plead guilty so far as disaffection towards the Government is concerned. It is quite true that I am the Editor of *Young India* and that the articles read in my presence were written by me and the proprietors and publishers had permitted me to control the whole policy of the paper.

The case then having been committed to the Sessions Mr. Gandhi was taken to the Sabarmati Jail where he was detained till the hearing which was to come off on March 18.

THE MESSAGE OF THE CHARKA.

[Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, who saw Mr. Gandhi in jail on Saturday the 11th March brought the following message to Bombay from him:—]

I do not want Bombay to mourn over the arrest of one of its mute Secretaries and myself but to rejoice over our rest. Whilst I would like an automatic response to all the items of Non-Co-operation, I would like Bombay to concentrate upon the "charka and khaddar." The monied men of Bombay can buy all the handspun and handwoven 'khaddar' that could be manufactured throughout India...The Women of Bombay,if they really mean to do their share of work, should religiously spin for a certain time everyday for the sake of the country. I wish that no one will think of following us to jail. It would be criminal to court imprisonment till a complete non-violent atmosphere is attained. One test of such atmosphere will be for us to put the Englishmen and Moderates at ease. This can be done only if we have good-will towards them in spite of our differences.

LETTER TO HAKIM AJMAL KHAN

[The following letter was addressed by Mr. Gandhi to Hakim Ajmal Khan from the Sabarmaty Jail, dated the 12th March, 1922.]

My dear Hakimji,

Since my arrest this is the first letter I have commenced to write after having ascertained that under the Jail Rules I am entitled to write as many letters as I like as an under-trial prisoner. Of course you know that Mr. Shankerlal Banker is with me. I am happy that he is with me. Every one knows how near he has come to me—naturally, therefore, both of us are glad that we have been arrested together.

I write this to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Working Committee and, therefore, leader of both Hindus and Mussulmans or better still, of all India.

I write to you also as one of the foremost leaders of Mussulmans, but above all I write this to you as an esteemed friend. I have had the privilege of knowing you since 1915. Our daily growing association has enabled me to seize your friendship as a treasure. A staunch Mussulman, you have shown in your own life what Hindu-Muslim unity means.

We all now realise, as we have never before realised that without that unity we cannot attain our freedom, and I make bold to say that without that unity the Mussulmans of India cannot render the Khilafat all the aid they wish. Divided, we must ever remain slaves. This unity, therefore, cannot be a mere policy to be discarded when it does not suit us. We

can discard it only when we are tired of Swaraj. Hindu-Muslim unity must be our creed to last for all time and under all circumstances.

Nor must that unity be a menace to the minorities —the Parsees, the Christians, the Jews or the powerful Sikhs. If we seek to crush any of them, we shall some day want to fight each other.

I have been drawn so close to you chiefly because I know that you believe in Hindu-Muslim unity in the full sense of the term.

This unity in my opinion is unattainable without our adopting non-violence as a firm policy. I call it a policy because it is limited to the preservation of that unity. But it follows that thirty crores of Hindus and Mussulmans, united not for a time but for all time, can defy all the powers of the world and should consider it a cowardly act to resort to violence in their dealings with the English administrators. We have hitherto feared them and their guns in our simplicity. The moment we realise our combined strength, we shall consider it unmanly to fear them and, therefore, ever to think of striking them. Hence am I anxious and impatient to persuade my countrymen to feel non-violent, not out of our weakness but out of our strength. But you and I know that we have not yet evolved the non-violence of the strong and we have not done so, because the Hindu-Muslim union has not gone much beyond the stage of policy. There is still too much mutual distrust and consequent fear. I am not disappointed. The progress we have made in that direction is indeed phenomenal. We seem to have covered in eighteen months' time the work of a generation. But infinitely more is necessary.

Neither the classes nor the masses feel instinctively that our union is as necessary as the breath of our nostrils.

For this consummation we must, it seems to me, rely more upon quality than quantity. Given a sufficient number of Hindus and Mussulmans with almost a fanatical faith in everlasting friendship between the Hindu and the Mussulmans of India, we shall not be long before the unity permeates the masses. A few of us must first clearly understand that we can make no headway without accepting non-violence in thought, word and deed for the full realisation of our political ambition. I would, therefore, beseech you and the members of the Working Committee and the All-India Congress Committee to see that our ranks contain no workers who do not fully realise the essential truth I have endeavoured to place before you. A living faith cannot be manufactured by the rule of majority.

To me the visible symbol of All-India unity and, therefore, of the acceptance of non-violence as an indispensable means for the realisation of our political ambition is undoubtedly the Charka, i.e., *khaddar*. Only those who believe in cultivating a non-violent spirit and eternal friendship between Hindus and Mussulmans will daily and religiously spin. Universal hand-spinning and the universal manufacture and use of hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* will be a substantial, if not absolute, proof of the real unity and non-violence. And it will be a recognition of a living kinship with the dumb masses. Nothing can possibly unify and revivify India as the acceptance by All-India of the spinning wheel as a daily sacrament and the *khaddar* wear as a privilege and a duty.

Whilst, therefore, I am anxious that more title-holders should give up their titles, lawyers law-courts, scholars the Government schools or colleges, the Councillors the Councils and the soldiers and the civilians, their posts, I would urge the nation to restrict its activity in this direction only to the consolidation of the results already achieved and to trust its strength to command further abstentions from association with a system we are seeking to mend or end.

Moreover, the workers are too few. I would not waste a single worker to day on destructive work when we have such an enormous amount of constructive work. But perhaps the most conclusive argument against devoting further time to destructive propaganda is the fact that the spirit of intolerance which is a form of violence has never been so rampant as now. Co-operators are estranged from us; they fear us. They say that we are establishing a worse bureaucracy than the existing one. We must remove every cause for such anxiety. We must go out of our way to win them to our side. We must make Englishmen safe from all harm from our side. I should not have to labour the point, if it was clear to every one as it is to you and to me that our pledge of non-violence implies utter humility and goodwill even towards our bitterest opponent. This necessary spirit will be automatically realised, if only India will devote her sole attention to the work of construction suggested by me.

I flatter myself with the belief that my imprisonment is quite enough for a long time to come. I believe in all humility that I have no ill-will against any one. Some of my friends would not have to be as non-violent as I am. But we contemplated the imprisonment of the

most innocent. If I may be allowed that claim, it is clear that I should not be followed to prison by anybody at all. We do want to paralyse the Government considered as a system, not however, by intimidation but by the irresistible pressure of our innocence. In my opinion it would be intimidation to fill the jails anyhow And why should more innocent men seek imprisonment till one considered to be the most innocent has been found inadequate for the purpose.

My caution against further courting of imprisonment does not mean that we are now to shirk imprisonment. If the Government will take away every non-violent non-co-operator, I should welcome it. Only it should not be because of our civil disobedience, defensive or aggressive. Nor, I hope, will the country fret over those who are in jail. It will do them and the country good to serve the full term of their imprisonment. They can be fitly discharged before their time only by an act of the Swaraj Parliament. And I entertain an absolute conviction that universal adoption of *khaddar* is Swaraj.

I have refrained from mentioning untouchability. I am sure every good Hindu believes that it has got to go. Its removal is as necessary as the realisation of Hindu Muslim unity.

I have placed before you a programme which is in my opinion the quickest and the best. No impatient Khilafatist can devise a better. May God give you health and wisdom to guide the country to her destined goal.

I am, Yours Sincerely, (Sd) M. K. Gandhi.

LETTER TO SRIMATI URMILA DEVI

[The following letter was addressed to Srimati Urmila Devi, Nari Karma Mandir, Calcutta, from the Sabarmati Jail, under date the 18th instant.]

My dear sister,

You have neglected me entirely. But I know that you have done so to save my time.

I want you to devote the whole of your time to nothing but charka and khaddar. It is the only visible symbol of peace, All-India Unity and our oneness with the masses including the socalled untouchables.

Please show this to Basanti Devi and Deshabandhu. I hope he is well and strong. Prisoners cannot afford to be ill.

You know of course that Shankerlal Banker is with me.

With love to you all.

INTERVIEW IN JAIL.

[The *Bombay Chronicle* of March 14 published the following notes of an interview with Mr. Gandhi supplied by the Associated Press, Mr. Gordhandas I. Patel the Joint Honorary Secretary of the Millowners Association and a Member of the Ahmedabad Mills Tilak Swaraj Fund, in his private capacity, put a few queries to Mr. Gandhi.]

N. C. O. MOVEMENT.

Q.—In case you are convicted will the Non-Co-operation movement be adversely affected?

A.—The words "In case" are inappropriate. The more harsh the punishment, the more strong will the Non-Co-operation movement be. This is my firm conviction.

Q.—After your conviction if Government resort to rigorous repressive measures, can any district or tahsil embark upon mass civil disobedience?

A.—Certainly not. It is my emphatic advice that whatever repressive measures Government may adopt the people should in no circumstances indulge in any movement of mass civil disobedience.

Q —What should be the next move of the nation now?

A.—The first and foremost duty of the nation is to keep perfect non-violence. Mutual ill-will and feelings of hatred among the different sections of people have taken such a strong root that constant effort to eradicate them is absolutely essential and the Non-Co-operators should take the lead, because their number is considerable. There is a considerable lack of toleration, courtesy and forbearance amongst Non-Co operators and it is my firm belief that is the sole reason why our victory is delayed and that I regard the "charkha" as the most potent weapon to secure the required peace, courtesy etc. Hence I would only advice that the people should become immediately occupied with the "charka" and khaddar prepared therefrom. No sooner could we effect a complete boycott of foreign cloth and the use of hand-spun and handwoven "khaddar" than Swaraj is in hand and in consequence whereof, the doors of the jail would be automatically laid open and my companions and myself would be able to be out. I anxiously await such an auspicious occasion.

Q.—What is your opinion in regard to the remarks made by Sir William Vincent against the Ali Brothers ?

A.—There is nothing new in it. The Brothers have given out in the clearest terms what they believed to be true. This is considered to be their greatest fault and I too am committing similar faults. For the same reason I regard them both as my real brothers.

MR. MONTAGU'S RESIGNATION.

Q.—Will India suffer any harm in consequence of Mr. Montagu's resignation ?

A.—I certainly do not believe that there will be any harm. But Mr. Montagu certainly deserves credit for what he has done.

Q.—Is there any logical connection between the political conditions of England and India as present ?

A.—There certainly is such a connection. If the programme which I have laid down for India is carried through, it will produce a very salutary effect not only on the political situation of England but on that of the whole world.

Q.—What do you think of the coming Paris Conference ?

A.—At present, I have no high expectation from that, as it is my firm belief that as long as India does not show completely the miracle of " charkha " the problem of Khilafat will not be properly solved.

Q.—What are your instructions regarding the harmonious relations between the mill-hands and the capitalists of the place, in your absence ?

A.—Repose full confidence in Anusuya Bahen.

Q.—What message do you send to the people of Ahmedabad ?

A.—The people of Ahmedabad should take to " Khaddar ", preserve perfect unity and support the current movement.

LETTER TO MOULANA ABDUL BARI.

[The following letter was written by Mr. Gandhi from the Ahmedabad jail soon after his arrest.]

Dear Maulana Sahib.

Just now I am enjoying myself in my house of freedom. Hakimji and other friends are here. I feel your absence, but that does not much worry me since we had ample discussion at Ajmer. I know that you will certainly, steadily stick to those principles that formed the subject of our talk. I will earnestly request you to avoid making any speeches in the public. Personally after deep thought I have come to the conclusion that if there is anything that can serve an effective and visible symbol of the Hindu-Muslim unity, it is the adoption of charka and pure khaddar dress prepared from hand-spun yarn by the rank and file of both the communities. Only universal acceptance of this cult can supply us with a common idea and afford a common basis of action.

The use of khaddar cannot become universal until both the communities take to it. The universal adoption of charka and khaddar therefore would awaken India. It will also be a proof of our capacity to satisfy all our needs. Ever since the commencement of our present struggle we have been feeling the necessity of boycotting foreign cloth. I venture to suggest that when khaddar comes universally in use, the boycott of foreign cloth will automatically follow. Speaking for myself, charka and khaddar have a special religious significance to me because they

are a symbol of kinship between the members of both the communities with the hunger and disease-stricken poor. It is by virtue of the fact that our movement can to-day be described as moral and economic as well as political. So long as we cannot achieve this little thing, I feel certain success is impossible. Again the khaddar movement can succeed only when we recognise non-violence as an essential condition for the attainment of Swaraj and Khilafat both. Therefore the khaddar programme is the only effective and successful programme that I can place before the country at present. I was so glad when you told me that you would begin to spin regularly when I be arrested. I can only say that every man, woman and child ought to spin as a religious duty till a complete and permanent boycott of foreign cloth is effected, the Khilafat and Punjab wrongs satisfactorily redressed and the Swaraj attained. May I entreat you to use all your influence for popularising Charkha among your Muslim brethren.

MESSAGE TO THE PARSIS.

[Mr. Gandhi addressed the following message to the Parsees from the Sabarmati Jail through Mr. B.F. Bharucha :—]

How can I forget to write to you ? Please tell my Parsee sisters and brothers never to lose faith in this movement. It is impossible for me to give up my confidence in them. There is no other programme before me than that of khadi and charkha, charkha and khadi. Hand-spun yarn must be as current among us as are small coins. To attain this object we can put on no other cloth than hand-spun and hand-woven khad

So long as India is not able to do this much Civil Disobedience will be futile, Swaraj cannot be attained, and Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are impossible to be righted. If this conviction is driven home to you, keep on turning out yarn and using khaddar. Be expert spinners.

Bande Mataram from Mohandas.

TRUTH OF THE SPINNING WHEEL.

[The following letter was addressed by Mr. Gandhi to a devoted friend]

Sabarmati Jail, 17th March 1922.

My Dear Child,

Well, I hope you were all happy over the news of my arrest. It has given me great joy, because it came just when I had purified myself by the Bardoli penance and was merely concentrating upon no experiment, but the proud work of khaddar manufacture, i.e. hand-spinning. I would like you to see the truth of the spinning wheel. It and it alone is the visible outward expression of the inner feeling for humanity. If we feel for the starving masses of India, we must introduce the spinning-wheel into their homes. We must, therefore, become experts and in order to make them realise the necessity of it we must spin daily as a sacrement. If you have understood the secret of the spinning-wheel, if you realise what is a symbol of love of mankind, you will engage in no other outward activity. If many people do not follow you, you have more leisure for spinning, carding or weaving.

With love to you all. Bapu.

LETTER TO MR. ANDREWS.

[The following letter was addressed by Mr. Gandhi to Mr. C. F. Andrews from Sabarmati Jail, in answer to a letter expressing deep regret that on account of the railway strike, he was not able to leave his work and go to him before the trial was ever :—]

Sabarmati Jail, March 17.

"My dear Charlie, I have just got your letter. You were quite right in not leaving your work. You should certainly go to Gurudev, and be with him as long as he needs you. I would certainly like your going to the Ashram (Sabarmati), and staying there a while, when you are free. But I would not expect you to see me in jail; I am as happy as a bird! My ideal of a jail life—especially that of a civil resister,—is to be cut off entirely from all connection with the outside world. To be allowed a visitor is a privilege—a civil resister may neither seek, nor receive, a privilege. The religious value of jail discipline is enhanced by renouncing privileges. The forthcoming imprisonment will be to me more a religious than a political advantage. If it is a sacrifice, I want it to be the purest.

With love, Yours, Mohan.

THE GREAT TRIAL.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE COURT

[The trial of Mr. Gandhi and Shankarlal Banker took place at the Government circuit House Ahmedabad, on Saturday the 18th March 1922 before Mr. C. N. Broomsfield, I. C. S. District and Sessions Judge, Ahmedabad. The trial opened at 12 noon, the Honorable Sir J. T. Strangman, Advocate General, Bombay, conducting the prosecution. The accused were undefended.

The charges having been read out, the Judge called upon the accused to plead to the charge. He asked Mr. Gandhi whether he pleaded guilty or claimed to be tried.

Mr. Gandhi : " I plead guilty to all the charges. I observe that the King's name has been omitted from the charges and it has been properly omitted."

The Judge Mr. Banker do you plead guilty or do you claim to be tried?"

Mr. Banker :—" I plead guilty."

The advocate general then began to urge the trial. His argument over, the Court asked Mr. Gandhi :

" Mr. Gandhi do you wish to make a statement on the question of sentence ?"

Mr. Gandhi : " I would like to make a statement."

Court . " Could you give it to me in writing to put it on record ?"

Mr. Gandhi : " I shall give it as soon as I finish reading it."]

ORAL STATEMENT.

[Before reading his written statement, Mr. Gandhi spoke a few words as introductory remarks to the whole statement. He said :]

Before I read this statement, I would like to state that I entirely endorse the learned Advocate-General's remarks in connection with my humble self. I think

that he was entirely fair to me in all the statements that he has made, because it is very true and I have no desire whatsoever to conceal from this Court the fact that to preach disaffection towards the existing system of Government has become almost a passion with me. And the learned Advocate-General is also entirely in the right when he says that my preaching of disaffection did not commence with my connection with "Young India" but that it commenced much earlier, and in the statement that I am about to read it will be my painful duty to admit before this Court that it commenced much earlier than the period stated by the Advocate-General. It is the most painful duty with me but I have to discharge that duty knowing the responsibility that rested upon my shoulders.

And I wish to endorse all the blame that the Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders in connection with the Bombay occurrences, Madras occurrences and the Chouri Choura occurrences. Thinking over these things deeply, and sleeping over them night after night and examining my heart I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible for me to dissociate myself from the diabolical crimes of Chouri Choura or the mad outrages of Bombay. He is quite right when he says that as a man of responsibility, a man having received a fair share of education, having had a fair share of experience of this world, I should know the consequences of every one of my acts. I knew them. I knew that I was playing with fire. I ran the risk and if I was set free I would still do the same. I would be failing in my duty if I do not do so. I have felt it this morning that I would have failed in my duty if I did not say all what I said here just now. I wanted to avoid

violence. Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is the last article of my faith. But I had to make my choice. I had either to submit to a system which I considered has done an irreparable harm to my country or incur the risk of the mad fury of my people bursting forth when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it; and I am, therefore here, to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty. I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, Mr. Judge, is, as I am just going to say in my statement, either to resign your post or inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and law you are assisting to administer are good for the people. I do not expect that kind of conversion. But by the time I have finished with my statement you will, perhaps, have a glimpse of what is raging within my breast to run this maddest risk which a sane man can run.

WRITTEN STATEMENT.

The following is the full text of the written statement which Mr. Gandhi made before the court.

I owe it perhaps to the Indian public and to the public in England to placate which this prosecution is mainly taken up that I should explain why from a staunch loyalist and co-operator I have become an uncompromising disaffectionist and Non-Co-operator. To the court too I should say why I plead guilty to the

charge of promoting disaffection towards the Government established by law in India.

My public life began in 1893 in South Africa in troubled weather. My first contact with British authority in that country was not of a happy character. I discovered that as a man and an Indian I had no rights. On the contrary I discovered that I had no rights as a man because I was an Indian.

But I was not baffled. I thought that this treatment of Indians was an excrescence upon a system that was intrinsically and mainly good. I gave the Government my voluntary and hearty co-operation, criticising it fully where I felt it was faulty but never wishing its destruction.

Consequently when the existence of the Empire was threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge, I offered my services to it, raised a volunteer ambulance corps and served at several actions that took place for the relief of Ladysmith. Similarly in 1906 at the time of the Zulu revolt I raised a stretcher-bearer party and served till the end of the 'rebellion'. On both these occasions I received medals and was even mentioned in despatches. For my work in South Africa I was given by Lord Hardinge a Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal. When the war broke out in 1914 between England and Germany I raised a volunteer ambulance corps in London consisting of the then resident Indians in London, chiefly students. Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be valuable. Lastly in India when a special appeal was made at the War Conference in Delhi in 1917 by Lord Chelmsford for recruits, I struggled at the cost of my health to raise a corps in Kheda and the response was being made when the hostilities ceased and

orders were received that no more recruits were wanted. In all these efforts at service I was actuated by the belief that it was possible by such services to gain a status of full equality in the Empire for my countrymen.

The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt Act, a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom. I felt called upon to lead an intensive agitation against it. Then followed the Punjab horrors beginning with the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and culminating in crawling orders, public floggings and other indescribable humiliations. I discovered too that the plighted word of the Prime Minister to the Mussulmans of India regarding the integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam was not likely to be fulfilled. But in spite of the foreboding and the grave warnings of friends, at the Amritsar Congress in 1919, I fought for co-operation and working the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his promise to the Indian Mussulmans, that the Punjab wound would be healed and that the reforms inadequate and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new era of hope in the life of India.

But all that hope was shattered. The Khilafat promise was not to be redeemed. The Punjab crime was white-washed and most culprits went not only unpunished but remained in service and some continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue, and in some cases were even rewarded. I saw too that not only did the reforms not mark a change of heart, but they were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging her servitude.

I came reluctantly to the conclusion that the

British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before, politically and economically. A disarmed India has no power of resistance against any aggressor if she wanted to engage in an armed conflict with him. So much is this the case that some of our best men consider that India must take generations before she can achieve the Dominion status. She has become so poor that she has little power of resisting famines. Before the British advent, India spun and wove in her millions of cottages just the supplement she needed for adding to her meagre agricultural resources. The cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman processes as described by English witnesses. Little do town-dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of Indians are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do they realise that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence 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 law itself in this country has been used to serve the foreign expoliter. My unbiassed examination of the Punjab Martial Law cases has led me to believe that at least ninety-five per cent. of convictions were wholly bad. My

experience of political cases in India leads me to the conclusion that in nine out of every ten the condemned men were totally innocent. Their crime consisted in love of their country. In ninety-nine cases out of hundred, justice has been denied to Indians as against Europeans in the Courts of India. This is not an exaggerated picture. It is the experience of almost every Indian who has had anything to do with such cases. In my opinion the administration of the law is thus prostituted consciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiter.

The greatest misfortune is that Englishmen and their Indian associates in the administration of the country do not know that they are engaged in the crime I have attempted to describe. I am satisfied that many English and Indian officials honestly believe that they are administering one of the best systems devised in the world and that India is making steady though slow progress. They do not know that a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organised display of force on the one hand and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation or self-defence on the other have emasculated the people and induced in them the habit of simulation. This awful habit has added to the ignorance and the self-deception of the administrators. Section 124-A under which I am happily charged is perhaps the prince among the political sections of the Indian Penal Code designed to suppress the liberty of the citizen. Affection cannot be manufactured or regulated by law. If one has no affection for a person or thing one should be free to give the fullest expression to his disaffection so long as he does not contemplate, promote or incite to violence.

But the section under which Mr. Banker and I are charged is one under which mere promotion of disaffection is a crime. I have studied some of the cases tried under it, and I know that some of the most loved of India's patriots have been convicted under it. I consider it a privilege therefore, to be charged under it. I have endeavoured to give in their briefest outline the reasons for my disaffection. I have no personal ill-will against any single administrator, much less can I have any disaffection towards the King's person. But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected towards a Government which in its totality has done more harm to India than any previous system. India is less manly under the British rule than she ever was before. Holding such a belief, I consider it to be a sin to have affection for the system. And it has been a precious privilege for me to be able to write what I have in the various articles tendered in evidence against me.

In fact I believe that I have rendered a service to India and England by showing in Non-Co-operation the way out of the unnatural state in which both are living. In my humble opinion, non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. But in the past, non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evildoer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent non-co-operation only multiplies evil and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is deliberate crime and what

appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge and the Assessors, is either to resign your posts and thus dissociate yourselves from evil if you feel that the law you are called upon to administer is an evil and that in reality I am innocent, or to inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and the law you are assisting to administer are good for the people of this country and that my activity is therefore injurious to the public weal.

THE JUDGMENT.

[*After Mr. Gandhi had made his statement Mr. Broomfield the Sessions Judge, pronounced the following judgment:*]

Mr. Gandhi, you have made my task easy one way by pleading guilty to the charge. Nevertheless, what remains namely, the determination of a just sentence is perhaps as difficult a proposition as a judge in this country could have to face. The law is no respector of persons. Nevertheless, it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to have to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that in the eyes of millions of your countrymen you are a great patriot and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and even saintly life. I have to deal with you in one character only. It is not my duty and I do not presume to judge or criticise you in any other character. It is my duty to judge you as a man subject to the law who has by his own admission broken the law and committed, what to an ordinary man must appear to be, grave offences against the State. I do not forget that you have consistently preached against violence and that you have on many occasions, as I am willing to believe, done much to prevent violence. But having regard to the nature of political teaching and the nature of many of those to whom it was addressed how you could have continued to believe that violence would not be the inevitable consequence, it passes my capacity to understand. There are probably few people in India who do not sincerely regret that you should have made it impossible for any Government to leave you at liberty. But it is so. I am trying to balance what is due to you against what appears to me to be necessary in the interest of the public, and I propose in passing sentence to follow the precedent of a case in many respects similar to this case that was decided some twelve years ago. I mean the case against Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak under the same section. The

sentence that was passed upon him as it finally stood was a sentence of simple imprisonment for six years. You will not consider it unreasonable I think, that you should be classed with Mr. Tilak. That is a sentence of two years' simple imprisonment on each count of the charge, six years in all which I feel it my duty to pass upon you ; and I should like to say in doing so that if the course of events in India should make it possible for the Government to reduce the period and release you no one will be better pleased than I.

MR. GANDHI'S REPLY.

[*After the Judge had pronounced sentence, Mr. Gandhi said:*] I would say one word since you have done me the honour of recalling the trial of the late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak. I just want to say that I consider it to be the proudest privilege and honour to be associated with his name. So far as the sentence itself is concerned I certainly consider that it is as light as any judge would inflict on me and so far as the whole proceedings are concerned I must say that I could not have expected greater courtesy.

MESSAGE TO THE COUNTRY.

[*After sentence and before he left the court Mr. Gandhi asked the General Secretary of the Congress who was near him to convey to the country the following message:*]

"I am delighted that heavenly peace reigned supreme throughout the country during the last six days. If it continues to the end of the chapter, it is bound to be brief and illuminating."

JAIL LIFE IN INDIA

THE MEANING OF THE IMPRISONMENTS.*

[We have in the early part of the book given Mr. Gandhi's jail experiences in South Africa. From time to time in the columns of *Young India* Mr. Gandhi referred to the treatment of prisoners in Indian jails and as non-co-operators sought imprisonment in their hundreds in the closing week of 1921, Mr Gandhi had occasion to refer again and again to jail discipline and the way that non-co-operators should conduct themselves within the prison walls The following articles and notes were written for the guidance of his followers and much interest centres on the essay on the "Model Prisoner" in view of the fact that Mr. Gandhi himself is undergoing his prison experience in India It was characteristic of Mr Gandhi too that when Devadas his youngest son and Mr C. Rajagopalachari visited him in the Erravada jail he told them that his prison life should not be made the subject of discussion in the press. Having courted imprisonment he would not complain of the treatment, but quietly and cheerfully bear the sufferings in the true spirit of the Satyagrahi. It was in this spirit too that he wrote to his friend Mr. Andrews that his ideal of a prison life was to be completely cut off from the world during the period of incarceration.]

HUNGER STRIKE.

I cannot sufficiently warn non-co-operation prisoners against the danger of hastily embarking upon hunger strikes in their prisons. It cannot be justified as a means for removing irksome gaol restrictions. For a gaol is nothing if it does not impose upon us restrictions which we will not submit to in ordinary life. A hunger strike would be justified when inhumanity is practised, food issued which offends one's religious sense or which

* *Young India*, Nov. 8, 1921.

is unfit for human consumption. It would be rejected when it is offered in an insulting manner. In other words it should be rejected when acceptance would prove us to be slaves of hunger.

WHY SUFFER.

Let there be no mistake about the meaning of these imprisonments. They are not courted with the object of embarrassing the Government, though as a matter of fact they do. They are courted for the sake of discipline and suffering. They are courted because we consider it to be wrong to be free under a Government we hold to be wholly bad. No stone should be left unturned by us to make the Government realise that we are in no way amenable to its control. And no Government has yet tolerated such open defiance however respectful it may be. It might safely therefore be said that if we are yet outside the prison walls, the cause lies as much with us as with the Government. We are moving cautiously in our corporate capacity. We are still voluntarily obeying many of its laws. There was, for instance nothing to prevent me from disregarding the Madras Government's order and courting arrest, but I avoided it. There is nothing to prevent me save my prudence or weakness from going without permission into the barracks and being arrested for trespass. I certainly believe the barracks to be the nation's property and not of a Government which I no longer recognise as representative of the people. Thus there is an apparent inconsistency between the statement on the one hand that it is painful to remain outside the the prison walls under a bad Government and this deliberate avoidance on the other hand of arrest upon

grounds which are not strictly moral but largely expedient. We thus avoid imprisonment, because first we think that the nation is not ready for complete civil revolt, secondly we think that the atmosphere of voluntary obedience and non-violence has not been firmly established, and thirdly we have not done any constructive corporate work to inspire self-confidence. We therefore refrain from offering civil disobedience amounting to peaceful rebellion, but court imprisonment merely in the ordinary pursuit of our programme and in defence of complete freedom of opinion and action short of revolt.

Thus it is clear that our remaining outside the gaols of a bad government has to be justified upon very exceptional grounds, and that our Swaraj is attained when we are in gaol or when we have bent the Government to our will. Whether therefore the Government feel embarrassed or happy over our incarceration, the only safe and honourable place for us is the prison. And if this position be accepted, it follows that when imprisonment comes to us in the ordinary discharge of our duty, we must feel happy because we feel stronger, because we pay the price of due preformance of duty. And if exhibition of real strength is the best propaganda, we must believe that, every imprisonment strengthens the people and thus brings Swaraj nearer.

SOMETHING STRIKING.

But friends whisper into my ears, we must do something striking when the prince comes. Certainly not for the sake of impressing him, certainly not for the sake of demonstration. But I would use the occasion of his imposed visit for stimulating us into greater activity. That would constitute the most glorious

impression upon the Prince and the world, because we would have made an impression upon ourselves. The shortest way to Swaraj lies through self-impression, self-expression and self-reliance, both corporate and individual. I would certainly love the idea of filling the gaols before the Prince arrives, but I see no way to it except after very vigorous Swadeshi. There is great progress undoubtedly in that direction, but there is not revolutionary or lightning speed. Arithmetical progression will not answer, geometrical progression is absolutely necessary. It is not enough for us to be washed by the Swadeshi spirit, we must be flooded with it. Then thousands of us involuntarily, as if by a common impulse, will march forward to civil disobedience. To-day we are obliged very rightly to measure every step for want of confidence. Indeed I do not even feel sure that thousands of us are ready to suffer imprisonment, or that we have so far understood the message of non-violence as never to be ruffled or goaded into violence.

A REST CURE.

And prisons have lost their terror for the people. Hardly a non-co-operator save in one or two cases has betrayed the slightest hesitation to go to gaol. On the contrary the majority have regarded it as a rest cure. Given an atmosphere of non-violence, — a prime necessity, disappearance of fear of gaol and greater activity by reasons of imprisonments, and we have an ideal state for the establishment of Swaraj.

THE LOGICAL RESULT.

The logical result of all this reasoning is that we must quickly organise ourselves for courting arrests wholesale, and that not rudely, roughly or blusteringly,

certainly never violently, but peacefully quietly, courteously, humbly, prayerfully, and courageously. By the end of December every worker must find himself in gaol unless he is specially required in the interest of the struggle not to make the attempt. Let it be remembered, that in civil disobedience we precipitate arrests and therefore may keep few outside the attempt.

REQUISITE CONDITIONS

Those only can take up civil disobedience, who believe in willing obedience even to irksome laws imposed by the state so long as they do not hurt their conscience or religion, and are prepared equally willingly to suffer the penalty of civil disobedience. Disobedience to be civil has to be absolutely non-violent. The underlying principle being the winning over of the opponent by suffering, *i.e.*, love.

WORK IN GAOLS.*

An esteemed friend asked me whether now that the Government have provided an opportunity for hundreds to find themselves imprisoned and as thousands are responding, will it not be better for the prisoners to refuse to do any work in the gaols at all? I am afraid that suggestion comes from a misapprehension of the moral position. We are not out to abolish gaols as an institution. Even under Swaraj we would have our gaols. Our civil disobedience therefore must not be carried beyond the point of breaking the unmoral laws of the country. Breach of the laws to be civil assumes

* *Young India*, Dec. 15, 1921.

the strictest and willing obedience to the gaol discipline because disobedience of a particular rule assumes a willing acceptance of the sanction provided for its breach. And immediately a person quarrels both with the rule and the sanction for its breach, he ceases to be civil and lends himself to the precipitation of chaos and anarchy. A civil resister is, if one may be permitted such a claim for him, a philanthropist and a friend of the state. An anarchist is an enemy of the state and is therefore a misanthrope. I have permitted myself to use the language of war because the so called constitutional method has become so utterly ineffective. But I hold the opinion firmly that civil disobedience is the purest type of constitutional agitation. Of course it becomes degrading and despicable if its civil, *i.e.*, non-violent character is a mere camouflage. If the honesty of non-violence be admitted, there is no warrant for condemnation even of the fiercest disobedience because of the likelihood of its leading to violence. No big or swift movement can be carried on without bold risks and life will not be worth living if it is not attended with large risks. Does not the history of the world show that there would have been no Romance in life if there had been no risks? It is the clearest proof of a degenerate atmosphere that one finds respectable people, leaders of society raising their hands in horror and indignation at the slightest approach of danger or upon an outbreak of any violent commotion. We do want to drive out the beast in man, but we do not want on that account to emasculate him. And in the process of finding his own status, the beast in him is bound now and again to put up his ugly appearance. As I have often stated in these pages what strikes me down is not

the sight of blood under every conceivable circumstance. It is blood spilt by the non-co-operator or his supporters in breach of his declared pledge, which paralyses me as I know it ought to paralyse every honest non co-operator.

Therefore to revert to the original argument, as civil resisters we are bound to guard against universal indiscipline. Gaol discipline must be submitted to until gaol Government itself becomes or is felt to be corrupt and immoral. But deprivation of comfort, imposition of restriction and such other inconveniences do not make gaol Government corrupt. It becomes that when prisoners are humiliated or treated with inhumanity as when they are kept in filthy dens or are given food unfit for human consumption. Indeed, I hope that the conduct of non-co-operators in the gaol will be strictly correct, dignified and yet submissive. We must not regard gaolers and warders as our enemies but as fellow human beings not utterly devoid of the human touch. Our gentlemanly behaviour is bound to disarm all suspicion or bitterness. I know that this path of discipline on the one hand and fierce defiance on the other is a very difficult path, but there is no royal road to Swaraj. The country has deliberately chosen the narrow and the straight path. Like a straight line it is the shortest distance. But even as you require a steady and experienced hand to draw a straight line, so are steadiness of discipline and firmness of purpose absolutely necessary if we are to walk along the chosen path with an unerring step.

I am painfully conscious of the fact that it is not going to be a bed of roses for any of the civil resisters. And my head reels and the heart throbs when I recall

the lives of Motilal Nehru and C. R. Das in their palatial rooms surrounded by numerous willing attendants and by every comfort and convenience that money can buy and when I think of what is in store for them inside the cold unattractive prison walls where they will have to listen to the clanking of the prisoner's chains in the place of the sweet music of their drawing rooms. But I steel my heart with the thought that it is the sacrifice of just such heroes that will usher in Swaraj. The noblest of South Africans, Canadians Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans have had to undergo much greater sacrifices than we have mapped out for ourselves.

A MODEL PRISONER.*

Should non-co-operators shout Bande Mataram inside jail against jail discipline which may excite ordinary prisoners to violence, should non co-operators go on hunger strike for the improvement of food or other conveniences, should they strike work inside jails on *hartal* days and other days? Are non-co-operators entitled to break rules of jail discipline unless they affect their conscience? Such is the text of a telegram I received from a non-co operator friend in Calcutta. From another part of India when a friend, again a non-co-operator, heard of the indiscipline of non-co-operator prisoners, he asked me to write on the necessity of observing jail discipline. As against this I know prisoners who are scrupulously observing in a becoming spirit all the discipline imposed upon them.

It is necessary, when thousands are going to jail, to understand exactly the position a non-co-operator

Young India, Dec. 29, 1921.

prisoner can take up consistently with his pledge of non-violence. Non-co-operation when its limitations are not recognised, becomes a licence instead of being a duty and therefore becomes a crime. The dividing line between right and wrong is often so thin as to become indistinguishable. But it is a line that is breakable and unmistakable.

What is then the difference between those who find themselves in jails for being in the right and those who are there for being in the wrong? Both wear often the same dress, eat the same food and are subject outwardly to the same discipline. But whilst the latter submit to discipline most unwillingly and would commit a breach of it secretly, and even openly if they could, the former will willingly and to the best of their ability conform to the jail discipline and prove worthier and more serviceable to their cause than when they are outside. We have observed that the most distinguished among the prisoners are of greater service inside the jails than outside. The coefficient of service is raised to the extent of the strictness with which jail discipline is observed.

Let it be remembered that we are not seeking to destroy jails as such. I fear that we shall have to maintain jails even under Swaraj. It will go hard with us, if we let the real criminals understand that they will be set free or be very much better treated when Swaraj is established. Even in reformatories by which I would like to replace every jail under Swaraj discipline will be exacted. Therefore we really retard the advent of Swaraj if we encourage indiscipline. Indeed the swift programme of Swaraj has been conceived on the supposition that we being a cultured people are capable

of evolving high discipline within a short time.

Indeed whilst on the one hand civil disobedience authorises disobedience of unjust laws or un moral laws of a state which one seeks to overthrow, it requires meek and willing submission to the penalty of disobedience and therefore cheerful acceptance of the jail discipline and its attendant hardships.

It is now therefore clear that a civil resister's resistance ceases and his obedience as resumed as soon as he is under confinement. In confinement he claims no privileges because of the civility of his disobedience. Inside the jail by his exemplary conduct he reforms even the criminals surrounding him, he softens the hearts of jailors and others in authority. Such meek behaviour springing from strength and knowledge ultimately dissolves the tyranny of the tyrant. It is for this reason that I claim that voluntary suffering is the quickest and the best remedy for the removal of abuses and injustices

It is now manifest that shouts of Bande Mataram or any other in breach of jail discipline are unlawful for a non-co-operator to indulge in. It is equally unlawful for him to commit a stealthy breach of jail regulations. A non co-operator will do nothing to demoralise his fellow prisoners. The only occasion when he can openly disobey jail regulations or hunger-strike is when an attempt is made to humiliate him or when the warders themselves break, as they often do, the rules for the comfort of prisoners or when food that is unfit for human consumption is issued as it often is. A case for civil disobedience also arises when there is interference with any obligatory religious practice.

PRINTED AT THE INDIA PRINTING WORKS, MADRAS.

Miscellaneous

A CONFESSION OF FAITH

[*The following is an extract from a letter addressed by Mr. Gandhi to a friend in India in 1909* :—]

(1) There is no impassable barrier between East and West.

(2) There is no such thing as Western or European civilization, but there is a modern civilization which is purely material.

(3) The people of Europe, before they were touched by modern civilization, had much in common with the people of the East ; anyhow the people of India, and even to-day Europeans who are not touched by modern civilization, are far better able to mix with Indians than the offspring of that civilization.

(4) It is not the British people who are ruling India, but it is modern civilization, through its railways, telegraph, telephone, and almost every invention which has been claimed to be a triumph of civilization.

(5) Bombay, Calcutta, and the other chief cities of India are the real plague spots.

(6) If British rule were replaced to-morrow by Indian rule based on modern methods, India would be no better, except that she would be able then to retain some of the money that is drained away to England ; but then India would only become a second or fifth nation of Europe or America.

(7) East and West can only really meet when the West has thrown overboard modern civilization, almost in its entirety. They can also seemingly meet when East has also adopted modern civilization, but that meeting would be an armed truce, even as it is between, say, Germany and England, both of which nations are living in the Hall of Death in order to avoid being devoured the one by the other.

(8) It is simply impertinence for any man or any body of men to begin or to contemplate reform of the whole world. To attempt to do so by means of highly artificial and speedy locomotion, is to attempt the impossible.

(9) Increase of material comforts, it may be generally laid down, does not in any way whatsoever conduce to moral growth.

(10) Medical science is the concentrated essence of black magic. Quackery is infinitely preferable to what passes for high medical skill.

(11) Hospitals are the instruments that the Devil has been using for his own purpose, in order to keep his hold on his kingdom. They perpetuate vice, misery and degradation and real slavery. I was entirely off the track when I considered that I should receive a medical training. It would be sinful for me in any way whatsoever to take part in the abominations that go on in the hospitals. If there were no hospitals for venereal diseases, or even for consumptives, we should have less consumption, and less sexual vice amongst us.

(12) India's salvation consists in unlearning what she has learnt during the past fifty years. The railways, telegraphs, hospitals, lawyers, doctors, and such like have all to go, and the so-called upper classes have to learn to live consciously and religiously and deliberately the

simple peasant life, knowing it to be a life giving true happiness.

(13) India should wear no machine-made clothing whether it comes out of European mills or Indian mills.

(14) England can help India to do this and then she will have justified her hold on India. There seems to be many in England to day who think likewise.

(15) There was true wisdom in the sages of old having so regulated society as to limit the material condition of the people: the rude plough of perhaps five thousand years ago is the plough of the husbandman to-day. Therein lies salvation. People live long under such conditions, in comparative peace much greater than Europe has enjoyed after having taken up modern activity, and I feel that every enlightened man, certainly every Englishman, may, if he chooses, learn this truth and act according to it.

It is the true spirit of passive resistance that has brought me to the above almost definite conclusions. As a passive resister, I am unconcerned whether such a gigantic reformation, shall I call it, can be brought about among people who find their satisfaction from the present mad rush. If I realize the truth of it, I should rejoice in following it, and therefore I could not wait until the whole body of people had commenced. All of us who think likewise have to take the necessary step, and the rest, if we are in the right, must follow. The theory is there: our practice will have to approach it as much as possible. Living in the midst of the rush, we may not be able to shake ourselves free from all taint. Everytime I get into a railway car or use a motor-bus, I know that I am doing violence to my sense of what is right. I do not fear the logical result on that basis. The visiting of

England is bad, and any communication between South Africa and India by means of ocean-grey-hounds is also bad and so on. You and I can, and may outgrow these things in our present bodies, but the chief thing is to put our theory right. You will be seeing there all sorts and conditions of men. I, therefore, feel that I should no longer withhold from you what I call the progressive step I have taken mentally. If you agree with me, then it will be your duty to tell the revolutionaries and everybody else that the freedom they want, or they think they want, is not to be obtained by killing people or doing violence, but by setting themselves right and by becoming and remaining truly Indian. Then the British rulers will be servants and not masters. They will be trustees, and not tyrants, and they will live in perfect peace with the whole of the inhabitants of India. The future, therefore, lies not with the British race, but with the Indians themselves, and if they have sufficient self-abnegation and abstemiousness, they can make themselves free this very moment, and when we have arrived in India at the simplicity which is still ours largely and which was ours entirely until a few years ago, it will still be possible for the best Indians and the best Europeans to see one another throughout the length and breadth of India and act as the leaven. When there was no rapid locomotion, teachers and preachers went on foot, from one end of the country to the other, braving all dangers, not for recruiting their health (though all that followed from their tramps), but for the sake of humanity. Then were Benares and other places of pilgrimage the holy cities, whereas to-day they are an abomination.

You will recollect you used to rate me for talking to my children in Gujarati. I now feel more and more con-

vinced that I was absolutely right in refusing to talk to them in English. Fancy a Gujarati writing to another Gujarati in English, which, as you would properly say, he mispronounces, and writes ungrammatically. I should certainly never commit the ludicrous blunders in writing Gujarati that I do in writing or speaking English. I think that when I speak in English to an Indian or a foreigner, I in a measure unlearn the language. If I want to learn it well, and if I want to attune my ear to it, I can only do so by talking to an Englishman and by listening to an Englishman speaking.

PASSIVE RESISTERS IN THE TOLSTOY FARM

[*Writing to a friend from the Tolstoy Farm, where he was living with a number of passive resisters' families, Mr. Gandhi says touching manual labour* :—]

I prepare the bread that is required on the farm. The general opinion about it is that it is well made. Manilal and a few others have learnt how to prepare it. We put in no yeast and no baking powder. We grind our own wheat. We have just prepared some marmalade from the oranges grown on the farm. I have also learnt how to prepare coromel coffee. It can be given as a beverage even to babies. The passive resisters on the farm have given up the use of tea and coffee, and taken to coromel coffee prepared on the farm. It is made from wheat which is first baked in a certain way and then ground. We intend to sell our surplus production of the above three articles to the public later on. Just at present, we are working as labourers on the construction work that is going on on

the farm, and have not time to produce more of the articles above-mentioned than we need for ourselves.

THE RATIONALE OF SUFFERING

[*Mr. Gandhi has explained the philosophy of Passive Resistance and the need for suffering in the following terms* :—]

The one view is why one should go to jail and there submit himself to all personal restraints, a place where he would have to dress himself in the coarse and ugly prison garb of a felon and to live upon non-nutritious and semi-starvation diet, where he is sometimes kicked about by jail officials, and made to do every kind of work whether he liked it or not, where he has to carry out the behests of a warder who is no better than his household servant, where he is not allowed to receive the visits of his friends and relatives and is prohibited from writing to them, where he is denied almost the bare necessities of life and is sometimes obliged to sleep in the same cell that is occupied by actual thieves and robbers. The question is why one should undergo such trials and sufferings. Better is death than life under such conditions. Far better to pay up the fine than to be thus incarcerated. May God spare his creatures from such sufferings in jail. Such thoughts make one really a coward, and being in constant dread of a jail life, deter him from undertaking to perform services in the interests of his country which might otherwise prove very valuable.

The other view is that it would be the height of one's good fortune to be in jail in the interests and good name

of one's country and religion. There, there is very little of that misery which he has usually to undergo in daily life. There, he has to carry out the orders of one warder only, whereas in daily life he is obliged to carry out the behests of a great many more. In the jail, he has no anxiety to earn his daily bread and to prepare his meals. The Government sees to all that. It also looks after his health for which he has to pay nothing. He gets enough works to exercise his body. He is freed from all his vicious habits. His soul is thus free. He has plenty of time at his disposal to pray to God. His body is restrained, but not his soul. He learns to be more regular in his habits. Those who keep his body in restraint, look after it. Taking this view of jail life, he feels himself quite a free being. If any misfortune comes to him or any wicked warder happens to use any violence towards him, he learns to appreciate and exercise patience, and is pleased to have an opportunity of keeping control over himself. Those who think this way are sure to be convinced that even jail life can be attended with blessings. It solely rests with individuals and their mental attitude to make it one of blessing or otherwise. I trust, however, that the readers of this my second experience of life in the Transvaal jail will be convinced that the real road to ultimate happiness lies in going to jail and undergoing sufferings and privations there in the interest of one's country and religion.

Placed in a similar position for refusing his poll-tax, the American citizen, Thoreau, expressed similar thoughts in 1849. Seeing the walls of the cell in which he was confined, made of solid stone two or three feet thick, and the door of wood and iron a foot thick, he said to himself thus :—

"I saw that, if there was a wall of stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through before they could get to be as free as I was. I did not feel for a moment confined, and the walls seemed a great waste of stone and mortar. I felt as if I alone of all my townsmen had paid my tax. They plainly did not know how to treat me, but behaved like persons who are underbred. In every threat and in every compliment there was a blunder; for they thought that my chief desire was to stand the other side of the stone-wall. I could not but smile to see how industriously they locked the door on my meditations, which followed them out again without let or hindrance, and they were nearly all that was dangerous. As they could not reach me, they had resolved to punish my body; just as boys if they cannot come to some person against whom they have a spite, will abuse his dog. I saw that the State was half-witted, that it was timid as a lone woman with her silver spoons, and that it did not know its friends from its foes, and I lost all my remaining respect for it and pitied it."

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE

[*Mr. Gandhi contributed the following paper to the Golden Number of the* "Indian Opinion" *in 1914*:—]

I shall be at least far away from Phœnix if not actually in the Motherland, when this commemoration issue is published. I would, however, leave behind me my innermost thoughts upon that which has made this special issue necessary. Without passive resistance there would have been no richly illustrated and important special issue of *Indian Opinion* which has, for the last eleven years, in unpretentious and humble manner, endeavoured to serve my countrymen and South Africa, a period causing the most critical stage that they will, perhaps, ever have to pass through. It marks the rise and growth of passive resistance which has attracted world-wide attention.

The term does not fit the activity of the Indian community during the past eight years. Its equivalent in the vernacular, rendered into English, means truth-force. I think Tolstoy called it also Soul-Force or love-force, and so it is. Carried out to its utmost limit, this force is independent of pecuniary or other material assistance; certainly, even in its elementary form, of physical force or violence. Indeed, violence is the negation of this great spiritual force, which can only be cultivated or wielded by those who will entirely eschew violence. It is a force that may be used by individuals as well as by communities. It may be used as well in political as in domestic affairs. Its universal applicability is a demonstration of its permanence and invincibility. It can be used alike by men, women and children. It is totally untrue to say that it is a force to be used only by the weak so long as they are not capable of meeting violence by violence. This superstition arises from the incompleteness of the English expression. It is impossible for those who consider themselves to be weak to apply this force. Only those who realise that there is something in man which is superior to the brute nature in him, and that the latter always yields to it, can effectively be passive resisters. This force is to violence and, therefore, to all tyranny, all injustice, what light is to darkness. In politics, its use is based upon the immutable maxim that government of the people is possible only so long as they consent either consciously or unconsciously to be governed. We did not want to be governed by the Asiatic Act of 1907 of the Transvaal and it had to go before this mighty force. Two courses were open to us—to use violence when we were called upon to submit to the Act, or to suffer the penalties

prescribed under the Act, and thus to draw out and exhibit the force of the soul within us for a period long enough to appeal to the sympathetic chord in the governors or the law-makers. We have taken long to achieve what we set about striving for. That was because our passive resistance was not of the most complete type. All passive resisters do not understand the full value of the force, nor have we men who always from conviction refrain from violence. The use of this force requires the adoption of poverty, in the sense that we must be indifferent whether we have the wherewithal to feed or clothe ourselves. During the past struggle, all Passive Resisters, if any at all, were not prepared to go that length. Some again were only passive resisters, so-called. They came without any conviction, often with mixed motives, less often with impure motives. Some even, whilst engaged in the struggle, would gladly have resorted to violence but for most vigilant supervision. Thus it was that the struggle became prolonged ; for the exercise of the purest soul-force, in its perfect form, brings about instantaneous relief. For this exercise, prolonged training of the individual soul is an absolute necessity, so that a perfect passive resister has to be almost, if not entirely, a perfect man. We cannot all suddenly become such men, but, if my proposition is correct—as I know it to be correct,—the greater the spirit of passive resistance in us, the better men we will become. Its use, therefore, is, I think, indisputable, and it is a force which, if it became universal, would revolutionise social ideals and do away with despotisms and the ever-growing militarism under which the nations of the West are groaning and are being almost crushed to death,—that militarism which promises to overwhelm even the nations of the

East. If the past struggle has produced even a few Indians who would dedicate themselves to the task of becoming passive resisters as nearly perfect as possible, they would not only have served themselves in the truest sense of the term, they would also have served humanity at large. Thus viewed, passive resistance is the noblest and the best education. It should come, not after the ordinary education in letters of children, but it should precede it. It will not be denied that a child, before it begins to write its alphabet and to gain worldly knowledge, should know what the soul is, what truth is, what love is, what powers are latent in the soul. It should be an essential of real education that a child should learn that, in the struggle of life, it can easily conquer hate by love, untruth by truth, violence by self-suffering. It was because I felt the forces of this truth, that, during the later part of the struggle, I endeavoured, as much as I could, to train the children at Tolstoy Farm and then at Phœnix along these lines, and one of the reasons for my departure to India is still further to realise, as I already do in part, my own imperfection as a Passive Resister, and then to try to perfect myself, for I believe that it is in India that the nearest approach to perfection is most possible.

ON SOUL FORCE AND INDIAN POLITICS

[*The following is a translation of the original in Gujarati published during the agitation against the internment of Mrs. Besant and her two colleagues in June, 1917*:—]

The English expression 'Passive Resistance' hardly denotes the force about which I propose to write. But Satyagraha, *i. e.*, Truth-force, correctly conveys the

meaning. Truth-force is soul-force, and is the opposite of the force of arms. The former is a purely religious instrument; its conscious use is, therefore, possible only in men religiously inclined. Prahlad, Mirabai and others were Passive Resisters (in the sense in which the expression is here used). At the time of the Moroccan War, the French guns were playing upon the Arabs of Morocco. The latter believed that they were fighting for their religion. They defied death and with 'Allah' on their lips rushed into the cannon's mouth. There was no room left here for them to deal death. The French gunners declined to work their guns against these Arabs. They threw up their hats in the air, rushed forward and with shouts of cheer embraced these brave Arabs. This is an illustration of "Passive Resistance" and its victory. The Arabs were not consciously "Passive Resisters." They prepared to face death in a fit of frenzy. The spirit of love was absent in them. A "Passive Resister" has no spirit of envy in him. It is not Anger that bids him court Death. But it is by reason of his ability to suffer that he refuses to surrender to the so-called enemy or the tyrant. Thus a "Passive Resister" has need to have courage, forgiveness and love. Imam Hussain and his little band refused to yield to what to them appeared to be an unjust order. They knew at the time that Death alone would be their lot. If they yielded to it, they felt that their manhood and their religion would be in jeopardy. They, therefore, welcomed the embrace of Death. Imam Hussain preferred the slaughter in his arms of his son and nephew, for him and them to suffer from thirst, rather than submit to what to him appeared to be an unjust order. It is my belief that the rise of Islam has been due not to

the sword, but to the self-immolation alone of the Fakeers of Islam. There is little to boast of in the ability to wield the sword. When the striker finds out his mistake, he understands the sinfulness of his act which now becomes murder and has to repent of his folly. Whereas he who courts death even though he might have done so in error, for him it is still a victory. 'Passive Resistance' is the Religion of Ahimsa. It is, therefore, everywhere and always a duty and is desirable. Violence is Himsa and has been discarded in all religions. Even the devotees of methods of violence impose elaborate restrictions upon their use. 'Passive Resistance' admits of no such limits. It is limited only by the insufficiency of the Passive Resister's strength to suffer.

No one else but a "Passive Resister" can answer the question whether his "Passive Resistance" is lawful or otherwise. The public can only judge after the "Passive Resister" has begun his work. He cannot be deterred by public displeasure. His operations are not founded upon Arithmetical Formulæ. He may be considered a clever politician or a thoughtful man who commences his so-called Passive Resistance only after having weighed chances of success and failure. But he is by no means a "Passive Resister." The former acts because he must.

Both Soul-force and force of Arms are from times immemorial. Both have received their due meed of praise in the accepted religious literature. They respectively represent Forces of Good and Evil. The Indian belief is that there was in this land a time when the forces of Good were predominant. That state still remains our ideal. Europe furnishes a forcible illustration of predominance of the Forces of Evil.

Either of these is preferable to rank cowardice. Neither Swaraj nor an awakening among us is possible without resort to one or the other. "Swaraj" is no Swaraj which is gained without Action. Such Swaraj could make no impression on the people. No Awakening is possible without the people at large realising their power. In spite of protestations by leaders and efforts by the Government, if they and we do not give "Passive Resistance" due predominance, methods of violence will automatically gain strength. They are like weeds; they grow anyhow in any soil. For a cultivation of "Passive Resistance" endeavour and courage form the necessary manure; and as weeds, if they are not rooted out, overwhelm a crop, even so will violence grow like weeds, if the ground is not kept clean by self-sacrifice for the growth of "Passive Resistance" and violence that may have already taken root be not dealt with by loving hands. By the method of "Passive Resistance" we can wean from the error of their ways the youths who have become impatient of and angered by what to them appears to be the Governmental Zoolum, and we can strengthen the forces of good by enlisting in favour of "Passive Resistance" their heroism, their courage and their power of endurance.

Therefore, the sooner the spirit of "Passive Resistance" pervades the atmosphere, the better it is. It will bless both the Raj and the Raiyat. A Passive Resister never wants to embarrass a Government or anybody else. He does not act thoughtlessly, he is never insolent. He therefore shuns boycott, but takes the Swadeshi vow as a part of his religion and never wavers in practising it. Fearing God alone, he is afraid of no other power. Fear of kings can never make him forsake the path of duty.

In view of the foregoing, it is hardly necessary for me to say that it is our duty to make use of "Passive Resistance" in order to procure the release of Mrs. Besant and her comrades. It is beside the point whether one approves of all or any of her acts. I certainly disapprove of some of her acts. But in my humble opinion, the Government have grievously erred in interning them, and it is an act of injustice. I know that the Government think otherwise. It is possible that the public are in error in desiring their release. The Government have acted upon their belief. How are the public to make an effective demonstration of their wounded feelings? Petitions and the like are a remedy for endurable grievances. For the unendurable "Passive Resistance" alone is the remedy. Only those who consider the wrong to be unendurable will, when the feeling possesses them, dedicate themselves body and soul to the release of Mrs. Besant. Such self-surrender is the most effective demonstration of a people's desire. And before it the mightiest power must bend. Such is my unalterable faith in the efficacy of soul-force. People may restrain the supreme demonstration in view of Mr. Montagu's impending visit. Such self-imposed restraint will be a token of their sense of justice and their faith in the Government. But, if the interned are not released before his arrival, it will be our duty to take up the matchless force I have endeavoured to describe. Its use will be a true measure for the Government of the pain felt by us; our intention cannot be to irritate or harrass them; in my opinion, adoption of Satyagraha will be a service to the Government.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF LABOUR

[*In response to the invitation of the Madras Central Labour Board during his visit to Madras in 1920, Mr. Gandhi addressed a monster meeting of the labourers at the Beach opposite the High Court on the question of the "Rights and Duties of Labour." Mr. B. P. Wadia presided on the occasion. Mr. Gandhi said* :—]

Mr. Chairman and Friends,—It gives me very great pleasure to renew your acquaintance a second time. I think I told you last year, when I had the privilege of addressing some of you, that I considered myself a fellow-labourer like you. Perhaps you are labourers not by choice but by some compulsion. But I entertain such a high regard for labour. I entertain great respect for the dignity of labour that I have thrown in my lot with the labourers and for many, many years now I have lived in their midst like them labouring with my hands and with my feet. In labouring with your bodies you are simply following the law of your being, and there is not the slightest reason for you to feel dissatisfied with your lot. On the contrary, I would ask you to regard yourselves as trustees for the nation for which you are labouring. A nation may do without its millionaires and without its capitalists, but a nation can never do without its labour. But there is one fundamental distinction between your labour and my labour. You are labouring for some one else. But I consider that I am labouring for myself. Then I am my own master. And in a natural state we should all find ourselves our own masters. But such a state of things

cannot be reached in a day. It therefore becomes a very serious question for you to consider how you are to conduct yourselves as labourers serving others. Just as there is no shame in being a labourer for one's self, so also is there no shame in labouring for others.

But it becomes necessary to find out the true relationship between master and servant. What are your duties and what are your rights? It is simple to understand that your right is to receive higher wages for your labour. And it is equally simple to know that your duty is to work to the best of your ability for the wages you receive. And it is my universal experience that as a rule labour discharges its obligations more effectively and more conscientiously than the master who has corresponding obligations towards the labourers. It therefore becomes necessary for labour to find out how far labour can impose its will on the masters. If we find that we are not adequately paid or housed, how are we to receive enough wages, and good accommodation? Who is to determine the standard of wages and the standard of comfort required by the labourers. The best way, no doubt, is that you labourers understand your own rights, understand the method of enforcing your rights and enforce them. But for that you require a little previous training—education. You have been brought to a central point from the various parts of the country and find yourselves congregated together. But you find that you are not getting enough, you are not properly housed. I therefore venture to suggest to Mr. Wadia and those who are leading you and advising you that their first business is to guide you not by giving you a knowledge of letters but of human affairs and human relations. I make this suggestion respectfully and in all humility

because my survey of labour in India is so far as I have been able to undertake it and my long experience of conditions of labour in South Africa lead me to the conclusion that in a large majority of cases leaders consider that they have to give labour the knowledge of the 3 R's. That undoubtedly is a necessity of the case. But it is to be preceded by a proper knowledge of your own rights and the way of enforcing them. And in conducting many a strike I have found that it is possible to give this fundamental education to the labourers within a few days.

And that brings me to the subject of strikes. Strikers are now in the air to-day throughout the world and on the slightest pretext labour goes in for strikes. My own experience of the last six months is that many strikes have done harm to labour rather than good. I have studied so far as I can the strikes in Bombay, a strike at Tata Iron Works, and the celebrated strike of the railway labourers in the Punjab. There was a failure in all these strikes. Labour was not able to make good its points to the fullest extent. What was the reason? Labour was badly led. I want you to distinguish between two classes of leaders. You have leaders derived from yourselves and they are in their turn advised and led by those who are not themselves labourers, but who are in sympathy or expected to be in sympathy with labour. Unless there is perfect correspondence between these three, there is bound to be a failure. In all these four strikes that perfect correspondence was lacking. There is another substantial reason which I discovered. Labourers look to pecuniary support from their unions for their maintenance. No labour can prolong a strike indefinitely so long as labour depends on the resources of its unions and no strike can absolutely succeed which cannot be

indefinitely prolonged. In all the strikes that I have ever conducted I have laid down one indispensable rule that labourers must find their own support. And therein lies the secret of success and therein consists your education. You should be able to perceive that, if you are able to serve one master and command a particular wage, your labour must be worthy and fit to receive that wage anywhere else. Strikers therefore cannot expect to be idlers and succeed. Your attempts must be just. And there should be no pressure exerted upon those whom you call "black legs." Any force of this kind exerted against your own fellow-labourers is bound to react upon yourselves. And I think your advisers will tell you that these three conditions being fulfilled no strike need fail. But they at once demonstrate to you the necessity of thinking a hundred times before undertaking a strike. So much for your rights and the method of enforcing them But as labour becomes organised strikes must be few and far between. And as your mental and collective development progresses, you will find that the principle of arbitration replaces the principle of strikes and the time has now arrived when we should reach this state.

I would now venture to say a few words in connection with your national responsibility. Just as you have to understand obligations amongst ourselves with reference to your own masters, so also is it necessary to understand your obligations to the nation to which you belong. Then your primary education is complete. If you sufficiently realise the dignity of labour, you will realise that you have a duty to discharge by your country. You must therefore find out the affairs of your country in the best manner you can. You must

find out without having to wait for a cart load of books. Who are your Governors and what are your relations with them? What they do to you and what you can do to them? In my humble opinion, it is not possible for you to live your religion fully, until you undertake to understand these things and my task this afternoon is finished if I have stimulated your desire after a knowledge of the affairs of your country. And I hope you will not rest contented until you have found out through your advisers and leaders the true affairs of this country. I wish you all the prosperity that you may desire and I hope that you will discharge yourselves as good citizens of this country (loud applause).

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SWORD*

In this age of the rule of brute force, it is almost impossible for anyone to believe that anyone else could possibly reject the law of the final supremacy of brute force. And so I receive anonymous letters advising me that I must not interfere with the progress of non-co-operation even though popular violence may break out. Others come to me and assuming that secretly I must be plotting violence, inquire when the happy moment for declaring open violence is to arrive. They assure me that the English will never yield to anything but violence secret or open. Yet others, I am informed, believe that I am the most rascally person living in India because I never give out my real intention and that they have not a shadow of doubt that I believe in violence just as much as most people do.

---

* From *Young India*, August 11, 1920.

Such being the hold that the doctrine of the sword has on the majority of mankind, and as success of non-co-operation depends principally on the absence of violence during its pendency and as my views in this matter affect the conduct of a large number of people, I am anxious to state them as clearly as possible.

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 defended 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 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 English men 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 mighty wave of strength in us, which would make it impossible for a Dyer and a Frank Johnson to heap affront upon 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 Satyagrah and its off-

shoots, 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 the 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 the realisation of her strength. We seem to need it because we seem to think that we are but a lump of flesh. I want India 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 Ravan 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 practial man, I do not wait till India recognises the practicabi-

lity 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 she 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 service of India through the religion of non-violence which I believe to be the root of Hinduism.

Meanwhile I urge those who distrust me, not to disturb the even working of the struggle that has just commenced by inciting to violence in the belief that I

want violence. I detest secrecy as a sin. Let them give non-violent non-co-operation a trial and they will find that I had no mental reservation whatsoever.

THE GUJARAT NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

[*The following is an English version of Mr. Gandhi's address on the occasion of the inauguration of the Guzerat National University*:—]

I have been responsible for many important deeds during my life-time. I have regretted for some while I have been proud of others. But I can say without the least exaggeration that the work in hand this moment can be compared with none. I take this to be the most important not because the country is going to ruins, as some say, along that path, but I feel myself unequal to the task. This is not what courtesy makes me speak but it is what my conscience tells me. I would not have made this preface had I known that this comes simply as an educational problem. It is not merely to impart learning that this institution is started but it is also meant to enable students to solve the bread problem. That makes me enter into comparisons. I feel reeling as it were when I begin comparing this institution with the Guzerat College and other Colleges. To me this appears great, though some of you may differ. Bricks and mortar may be playing an important part in your comparisons and I acknowledge the superiority of the Guzerat College in these respects. All along the way I have been thinking of something which can enable me to make you set aside these standards of judgment. I have not been able to

find that something out and hence I find myself in straits wherein I had never before fallen knowingly or unknowingly. I shall not be able to convince you of things that I feel. How can I convince you that this work is great notwithstanding the deficiencies lying therein? But I have that faith and can only wish that God foster such faith in you.

PRINCIPALSHIP

Not an inch of the land is ours, everything belongs to the Government, even our body. It is doubtful whether we are masters of our own souls. In such a tragic state how can we wait for good building and learned men? I would gladly offer the principalship to a man, who though a man of little parts can convince me that we have lost our souls and our country, its valour and splendour. I do not know whether you would accept him as such. And so Mr. Gidwani is here. He is a man with high academic qualifications and bright University degrees. But these have not dazzled me. I would like you to change your standards of judgments and make character the test in your new valuations.

But here we have a holy place and that is brought about by coming together of good men from Maharashtra, Sind and Guzerat.

STERLING CHARACTER

I would first request the ladies and gentlemen present here to bless the movement and wish it success not by mere words but by deed, by sending their sons and daughters to the institution. India has ever helped such institutions financially, progress is never stayed on account of lack of financial support. But I do believe that it is stayed for lack of men, teachers and organisers.

It is only a bad workman that quarrels with his tools and the truest is he who gives the best with what he has. I would tell the principal and the professors that only one principle needs guide them here. They are to teach lessons of freedom not by their scholarship but by their sterling character. They are to meet the warring devilish forces of the Government with their divine peaceful forces. We have to nurse the seed of freedom into a full-grown tree of Swaraj. May God justify my faith in you! I know that I have not the scholarship which is expected in a Chancellor of a University. But I have my faith which has moved me to accept it. I am prepared to live and die for this work; and I accept this high office only because I know that the same feelings actuate you.

Duty of Parents

Now I turn to the students. I consider it a sin to blame them, because they are one mirror in which the present situation is so faithfully reflected. They are simple things and easy to read. If they lack in virtue the fault is not theirs, but it is that of the parents, teachers and the king. How do I find fault with the king? "Yatha-praja Tatha Raja" (as are the subjects, so is the king) is equally true as "Yatha Raja Tatha Praja" (as is the king so are the subjects) for a king is a king so long as his authority is respected. People are at fault and their drawbacks are mirrored in the students, and hence we must try to reform parents, teachers and kings. Every home is a university and the parents are the teachers. The parents in India have at present foregone this sacred duty. We have not been able to estimate foreign culture at its proper value. How can we expect India to rise with that borrowed culture?

We inaugurate this University not as an educational institution but as a national one. We inaugurate it to inculcate character and courage in students : and our fitness for Swaraj will be rated by this our success.

STUDENTS' RESPONSIBILITIES

This is not the time for words but for deeds, and I have called upon you to contribute your quota to the national sacrifice. Now I address myself to the students. I do not regard them as mere students exempt from any responsibility. I regard the students who have joined this institution as examples to others and hence fulfilling the conditions of teachers to some extent. The Maha-vidyalaya is founded on them; without them it would have been an impossibility. They share its responsibility and unless they realise this, all the efforts of the teachers will not bear fruits expected of them. They are to fully realise when they have left their colleges and joined this. May God pour into them the strength to discharge their duties during this grim struggle, however long it lasts.

BIRTHPLACE OF "N. C. O."

This strength of conviction and not the strength in number would make this institution a success and an ideal to the rest of India. It shall be so not because of the wealth of Guzerat or its learning but because it is the birthplace of Non-Co-operation. The ground was first prepared in Guzerat and the seed sown. It is Guzerat that has suffered the birth-pangs and it is Guzerat that has reared up the movement. It is not vanity that speaks in me. I do not mean to say that I am the author of all this. I have simply been a Rishi, a Seer, if a Bania like myself can be one I have simply given

the idea and it is worked out by my colleagues. Their faith is of a superior type. I have seen it by experience as directly as I see the trees opposite that India is to rise by non-violent Non-Co-operation, and even the gods cannot convince me otherwise. But my colleagues have realised this by imagination, by reasoning, by faith. Individual experience is not the only factor in an action. Faith and imagination do play their part.

My colleagues have grounded the weapon, and its effect cannot be fully realised at this moment as it will be six months hence. But its corporate symbol is this Mahavidyalaya. The chancellor, the teachers and the students form the component parts of the symbol. I am an autumnal leaf on the tree that might fall off at any moment, the teachers are the young sprouts that would last longer but fall off at their proper time but you, the students, are the branches that would put forth new leaves to replace the old ones. I request the students to have the same faith in teachers as they have in me. But if you find them lack in vitality, I would ask you to burn them in your fire of righteousness. Such is my prayer to God and that is my blessing to the students.

In conclusion, I pray to God and I wish you to join me in the prayer that this Mahavidyalaya help us to win the freedom that would turn not only this country but the world into a heaven.

INDIAN MEDICINE

[*Mr. Gandhi, in opening the Tibbi College at Delhi, in the second week of February, 1921, said* :—]

In order to avoid any misinterpretation of my views on medicine, I would crave your indulgence for a few moments over a very brief exposition of them. I have said in a book that is much criticised at the present moment that the present practice of medicine is the concentrated essence of black magic. I believe that a multiplicity of hospitals is no test of civilisation. It is rather a symptom of decay even as a multiplicity of *Pinjrapoles* is a symptom of the indifference to the welfare of their cattle by the people in whose midst they are brought into being. I hope, therefore, that this College will be concerned chiefly with the prevention of diseases rather than their cure. The science of sanitation is infinitely more ennobling, though more difficult of execution, than the science of healing. I regard the present system as black magic because it tempts people to put an undue importance on the body and practically ignores the spirit within. I would urge the students and professors of the College to investigate the laws governing the health of the spirit and they will find that they will yield startling results even with reference to the cure of the body. The present science of medicine is divorced from religion. No man who attends to his daily *Namaj* or his *Gayatri* in the proper spirit need get ill. A clean spirit must build a clean body. I am convinced that the main rules of religious conduct conserve both the spirit and the body. Let me hope and pray that this College

will witness a definite attempt on the part of the physicians to bring about a reunion between the body and the soul. Modern medical science having ignored the condition of the permanent element in the human system in diagnosing diseases has ignored the limitation that should naturally exist regarding the field of its activity. In trying to cure a body of its disease it has totally disregarded the claims of sub-human creation. Man instead of being lord and therefore protector of the lower animal kingdom, has become its tyrant and the science of medicine has been probably his chief instruments for tyranny. Vivisection in my opinion is the blackest of all the blackest crimes that man is at present committing against God and His fair creation. We should be able to refuse to live if the price of living be the torture of sentient beings. It all becomes us to invoke the blessings in our daily prayers of God, the Compassionate, if we in turn will not practice elementary compassion towards our fellow-creatures. Would to God that this College founded by one of the best of Indian physicians will bear in mind the limitations that God, in my humble opinion, has set upon our activity. Having said this much I would like to pay my humble tribute to the spirit of research that fires the modern scientist. My quarrel is not against that spirit, my complaint is against the direction that the spirit has taken. It has chiefly concerned itself with the exploration of law and methods conducing to the merely material advancement of its clientele. But I have nothing but praise for the zeal, industry and sacrifice that have animated the modern scientists in their pursuit after truth. I regret to have to record my opinion based on considerable experience that our Hakims and Vaids do not exhibit that spirit in

any mentionable degree,—they follow without question formulas, they carry on little investigation. The condition of indigenous medicine is truly deplorable. Not having kept abreast of modern research their profession has fallen largely into disrepute. I am hoping that this College will try to remedy this grave defect and restore Ayurvedic and Unani medical science to its pristine glory. I am glad, therefore, that this institution has its western wing. Is it too much to hope that a union of the three systems will result in a harmonious blending and in purging each of its special defects. Lastly, I shall hope this College will set its face absolutely against all quackery, Western or Eastern, refuse to recognise any but sterling worth and that it will inculcate among the students the belief that the profession of medicine is not intended for earning fees but for alleviating pain and suffering. With the prayer that God may bless the labours of its founder and organisers, I formally declare the Tibbi College open.

HINDUSTANI AND ENGLISH*

I have ventured to advise every student to devote this year of our trial to the manufacture of yarn and learning Hindustani. I am thankful to the Calcutta students that they have taken kindly to the suggestion. Bengal and Madras are the two provinces that are cut off from the rest of India for want of a knowledge of Hindustani on their part, Bengal, because of its prejudice against learning any other language of India,

* From *Young India*, February, 1921.

and Madras, because of the difficulty of the Dravidians about picking up Hindustani. An average Bengali can really learn Hindustani in two months if he gave it three hours per day and a Dravidian in six months at the same rate. Neither a Bengali nor a Dravidian can hope to achieve the same result with English in the same time. A knowledge of English opens up intercourse only with comparatively few English-knowing Indians; whereas a passable knowledge of Hindustani enables us to hold intercourse with the largest number of our countrymen. I do hope the Bengalis and the Dravidians will come to the next Congress with a workable knowledge of Hindustani. Our great assembly cannot be a real object lesson to the masses unless it speaks to them in a language which the largest number can understand. I appreciate the difficulty with the Dravidians, but nothing is difficult before their industrious love for the Motherland.

THE PLACE OF ENGLISH

Alongside of my suggestion about Hindustani has been the advice that the students should, during the transition period from inferiority to equality—from foreign domination to Swaraj, from helplessness to self-help—suspend their study of English. If we wish to attain Swaraj before the next Congress, we must believe in the possibility, we must do all that were capable of doing for its advancement, and one must do nothing that would not advance it or would actually retard it. Now adding to our knowledge of English cannot accelerate our progress towards our goal and it can conceivably retard it. The latter calamity is a reality in many cases, for there are many who believe that we cannot acquire the spirit of freedom without the music of the

English words ringing in our ears and sounding through our lips. This is an infatuation. If it were the truth, Swaraj would be as distant as the Greek Kalends. English is a language of international commerce, it is the language of diplomacy, and it contains many a rich literary treasure, it gives us an introduction to Western thought and culture. For a few of us, therefore, a knowledge of English is necessary. They can carry on the departments of national commerce and international diplomacy, and for giving to the nation the best of Western literature, thought and science. That would be the legitimate use of English. Whereas to-day English has usurped the dearest place in our hearts and dethroned our mother-tongues. It is an unnatural place due to our unequal relations with Englishmen. The highest development of the Indian mind must be possible without a knowledge of English. It is doing violence to the manhood and specially the womanhood of India to encourage our boys and girls to think that an entry into the best society is impossible without a knowledge of English. It is too humiliating a thought to be bearable. To get rid of the infatuation for English is one of the essentials of Swaraj.

SOCIAL BOYCOTT*

Non-Co-operation being a movement of purification is bringing to the surface all our weaknesses as also excesses of even our strong points. Social boycott is an age-old institution. It is coeval with caste. It is the

---

* From *Young India*, February, 1921.

one terrible sanction, exercised with great effect. It is based upon the notion that a community is not bound to extend its hospitality or service to an ex-communicated. It answered when every village was a self-contained unit, and the occasions of re-calcitrancy were rare. But when opinion is divided, as it is to-day, on the merits of Non-Co-operation, when its new application is having a trial, a summary use of social boycott in order to bend a minority to the will of the majority is a species of unpardonable violence. If persisted in, such boycott is bound to destroy the movement. Social boycott is applicable and effective when it is not felt as a punishment and accepted by the object of boycott as a measure of discipline. Moreover, social boycott to be admissible in a campaign of non-violence must never savour of inhumanity. It must be civilised. It must cause pain to the party using it, if it causes inconvenience to its object. Thus, depriving a man of the services of a medical man, as is reported to have been done in Jhansi, is an act of inhumanity tantamount in the moral code to an attempt to murder. I see no difference in murdering a man and withdrawing medical aid from a man who is on the point of dying. Even the laws of war, I apprehend, require the giving of medical relief to the enemy in need of it. To deprive a man of the use of an only village-well is notice to him to quit that village. Surely, Non-Co-operators have acquired no right to use that extreme pressure against those who do not see eye to 'eye' with them. Impatience and intolerance will surely kill this great religious movement. We may not make people pure by compulsion. Much less may we compel them by violence to respect our opinion. It is utterly against the spirit of the democracy we want to cultivate.

There are no doubt serious difficulties in our way. The temptation to resort to social boycott is irresistible when a defendant, who submits to private arbitration, refuses to abide by its award. Yet it is easy to see that the application of social boycott is more than likely to arrest the splendid movement to settle disputes by arbitration which, apart from its use as weapon in the armoury of Non-Co-operation, is a movement fraught with great good to the country. People will take time before they accommodate themselves to private arbitration Its very simplicity and inexpensiveness will repel many people even as plates jaded by spicy foods are repelled by simple combinations. All awards will not always be above suspicion. We must therefore rely upon the intrinsic merits of the movement and the correctness of awards to make itself felt.

It is much to be desired if we can bring about a complete *voluntary* boycott of law courts. That one event can bring Swaraj. But it was never expected that we would reach completion in any single item of Non-Co-operation. Public opinion has been so far developed as to recognise the Courts as signs not of our liberty but of our slavery It has made it practically impossible for lawyers to practise their profession and be called popular leaders.

Non-Co-operation has greatly demolished the prestige of Law Courts and to that extent, of the Government. The disintegrating process is slowly but surely going on. Its velocity will suffer diminution if violent methods are adopted to hasten it. This government of ours is armed to the teeth to meet and check forces of violence. It possesses nothing to check the mighty forces of non-violence. How can a handful of Englishmen resist a

voluntary expression of opinion accompanied by the voluntary self-denial of thirty crores of people?

I hope, therefore, that Non-Co-operation workers will beware of the snares of social boycott. But the alternative to social boycott is certainly not social intercourse. A man who defies strong, clear public opinion on a vital matter is not entitled to social amenities and privileges. We may not take part in his social functions such as marriage feasts, we may not receive gifts from him. But we dare not deny social service. The latter is a duty. Attendance at dinner parties and the like is a privilege which it is optional to withhold or extend. But it would be wisdom to err on the right side and to exercise the weapon even in the limited sense described by me on rare and well-defined occasions. And in every case the user of the weapon will use it at his own risk. The use of it is not as yet in any form a duty. No one is entitled to its use if there is any danger of hurting the movement.

"NEITHER A SAINT NOR A POLITICIAN*"

A kind friend has sent me the following cutting from the April number of the "East and West:"—

'Mr. Gandhi has the reputation of a saint but it seems that the politician in him often dominates his decisions. He has been making great use of *hartals* and there can be no gainsaying that under his direction *harta* is becoming a powerful political weapon for uniting the educated and the uneducated on a single question of the

* From *Young India.*

day. The *hartal* is not without its disadvantages. It is teaching direct action, and direct action however potent does not work for unity. Is Mr. Gandhi quite sure that he is serving the highest behests of *ahimsa*, harmlessness? His proposal to commemorate the shootings at Jallianwala Bagh is not likely to promote concord. It is a tragic incident into which our Government was betrayed; but is the memory of its bitterness worth retaining? Can we not commemorate the event by raising a temple of peace, to help the widows and orphans, to bless the souls of those who died without knowing why? The world is full of politicians and pettifoggers who, in the name of patriotism, poison the inner sweetness of man and, as a result, we have wars and feuds and such shameless slaughter as turned Jallianwala Bagh into a shamble. Shall we not now try for a larger symbiosis such as Buddha and Christ preached and bring the world to breathe and prosper together? Mr. Gandhi seemed destined to be the apostle of such a movement, but circumstances are forcing him to seek the way of raising resistances and group unities. He may yet take up the larger mission of uniting the world.'

I have given the whole of the quotation. As a rule I do not notice criticism of me or my methods except when thereby I acknowledge a mistake or enforce still further the principles criticised. I have a double reason for noticing the extract. For, not only do I hope further to elucidate the principles I hold dear, but I want to show my regard for the author of the criticism whom I know and whom I have admired for many years for the singular beauty of his character. The critic regrets to see in me a politician, whereas he expected me to be a saint. Now I think that the word "saint" should be

ruled out of present life. It is too sacred a word to be lightly applied to anybody, much less to one like myself who claims only to be a humble searcher after truth, knows his limitations, makes mistakes, never hesitates to admit them when he makes them and frankly confesses that he, like a scientist, is making experiments about some of the eternal 'varities' of life, but cannot even claim to be a scientist because he can show no tangible proof of scientific accuracy in his methods or such tangible results of his experiments as modern science demands. But though by disclaiming sainthood I disappoint the critic's expectations, I would have him give up his regrets by answering him that the politician in me has never dominated a single decision of mine, and if I seem to take part in politics, it is only because politics encircle us to-day like the coil of a snake from which one cannot get out, no matter how much one tries. I wish therefore to wrestle with the snake, as I have been doing with more or less success consciously since 1894, unconsciously, as I have now discovered, ever since reaching years of discretion. Quite selfishly, as I wish to live in peace in the midst of a bellowing storm howling round me. I have been experimenting with myself and friends by introducing religion into politics. Let me explain 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 never purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless until it has found itself, known its Maker and appreciat-

ed the true correspondence between the Maker and itself.

It was in that religious spirit that I came upon *hartal*. I wanted to show that it is not a knowledge of letters that would give India consciousness of herself, or that would find the educated together. The *hartal* illuminated the whole of India as if by magic on the 6th of April, 1919. And had it not been for the interruption of the 10th of April brought about by Satan whispering fear into the ears of a government conscious of its own wrong and inciting to anger a people that were prepared for it by utter distrust of the Government, India would have risen to an unimaginable height. The *hartal* had not only been taken up by the great masses of people in a truly religious spirit but it was intended to be a prelude to a series of direct actions.

But my critic deplores direct action. For, he says, "it does not work for unity." I join issue with him Never has anything been done on this earth without direct action. I rejected the word "passive resistance," because of its insufficiency and its being interrupted as a weapon of the weak. It was direct action in South Africa which told and told so effectively that it converted General Smuts to sanity. He was in 1906 the most relentless opponent of Indian aspirations. In 1914 he took pride in doing tardy justice by removing from the Statute Book of the Union a disgraceful measure which, in 1909 he had told Lord Morley, would be never removed, for he then said South Africa would never tolerate repeal of a measure which was twice passed by the Transvaal Legislature. But what is more, direct action sustained for eight years left behind it not only no bitterness, but the very Indians who put up such a stubborn

fight against General Smuts, ranged themselves round his banner in 1915 and fought under him in East Africa. It was direct action in Champaran which removed an age-long grievance. A meek submission when one is chafing under a disability or a grievance which one would gladly see removed, not only does not make for unity, but makes the weak party acid, angry and prepares him for an opportunity to explode. By allying myself with the weak party, by teaching him direct, firm, but harmless action, I make him feel strong and capable of defying the physical might. He feels braced for the struggle regains confidence in himself, and knowing that the remedy lies with himself, ceases to harbour the spirit of revenge and yearns to be satisfied with a redress of the wrong he is seeking to remedy.

It is working along the same line that I have ventured to suggest a memorial about Jallianwala Bagh. The writer in *East and West* has ascribed to me a proposal which has never once crossed my mind. He thinks that I want "to commemorate the shooting at Jallianwala Bagh." Nothing can be further from my thought than to perpetuate the memory of a black deed. I daresay that, before we have come to our own, we shall have a repetition of the tragedy and I will prepare the nation for it by treasuring the memory of the innocent dead. The widows and the orphans have been and are being helped but we cannot "bless the souls of those who died without knowing why," if we will not acquire the ground which has been hallowed by innocent blood and there erect a suitable memorial for them. It is not to serve, if I can help it, as a reminder of foul deed but it shall serve as an encouragement to the nation that it is better to die helpless and unarmed and as victims

rather than as tyrants, I would have the future generations remember that we who witnessed the innocent dying did not ungratefully refuse to cherish their memory. As Mrs. Jinnah truly remarked when she gave her mite to the fund, the memorial would at least give us an excuse for living. After all it will be the spirit in which the memorial is erected that will decide its character.

What was the larger "symbiosis" that Buddha and Christ preached? Buddha fearlessly carried the war into the enemy's camp and brought down on its knees an arrogant priesthood. Christ drove out the money changer from the temple of Jerusalem and drew down curse from Heaven upon the hypocrites and the pharisees. Both were for intensely direct action. But even as Buddha and Christ chastised, they showed unmistakable gentleness and love behind every act of theirs. They would not raise a finger against their enemies, but would gladly surrender themselves rather than the truth for which they lived. Buddha would have died resisting the priesthood, if the majesty of his love had not proved to be equal to the task of bending the priesthood. Christ died on the cross with a crown of thorns on his head defying the might of a whole empire. And if I raise resistances of a non-violent character, I simply and humbly follow in the foot-steps of the great teachers named by my critic.

Lastly, the writer of the paragraph quarrels with my grouping unities and would have me take up "the larger mission for uniting the world". I once told him under a common roof that I was probably more cosmopolitan than he. I abide by that expression.

let off the backs of our neighbours, the world would be quite alright without any further help from us. And if we can only serve our immediate neighbours by ceasing to prey upon them, the circle of unities thus grouped in the right fashion will ever grow in circumference till at last it is conterminus with that of the whole world. More than that it is not given to any man to try or achieve. *Yatha Pinde tatha Brahamande* is as true to-day as ages ago when it was first uttered by an unknown Rishi.

HINDU-MOSLEM UNITY*

Cow Protection

Everybody knows that without unity between Hindus and Mussulmans, no certain progress can be made by the nation. There is no doubt that the cement binding the two is yet loose and wet. There is still mutual distrust. The leaders have come to recognise that India can make no advance without both feeling the need of trust and common action. But though there is a vast change among the masses, it is still not permanent quantity. The Mussulman masses do not still recognise the same necessity for Swaraj as the Hindus do. The Mussulmans do not flock to public meetings in the same numbers as the Hindus. This process cannot be forced. Sufficient time has not passed for the national interest to be awakened among the Mussulmans. Indeed it is a marvel, that whereas but a year ago the Mussulmans as a body hardly took any interest in Congress affairs, all

* From *Young India*, July 28, 1921.

over India, thousands have registered themselves as members. This in itself is an immense gain.

But much more yet remains to be done. It is essentially the work of the Hindus. Wherever the Mussulmans are still found to be apathetic, they should be invited to come in. One often hears from Hindu quarters the complaint that Mussulmans do not join the Congress organisation or do not pay to the Swaraj Fund. The natural question is, have they been invited? In every district Hindus must make special efforts to draw out their Mussulman neighbours. There will never be real equality so long as one feels inferior or superior to the other. There is no room for patronage among equals. Mussulmans must not feel the lack of education or numbers where they are in a minority. Deficiency in education must be corrected by taking education. To be in a minority is often a blessing. Superiority in numbers has frequently proved a hindrance. It is character that counts in the end. But I have not commenced this article to lay down counsels of perfection, or to state the course of conduct in the distant future.

My main purpose is to think of the immediate task lying before us. Bakr-Id will be soon upon us. What are we to do to frustrate the attempts that will then by made to foment quarrels between us—Hindus and Mussulmans? Though the situation has improved considerably in Bihar, it is not yet free from anxiety. Over-zealous and impatient Hindus are trying to force matters. They lend themselves an easy prey to the machinations of mischief-makers not always prompted by the Government side. Protection of the cow is the nearest to the Hindu heart.

We are therefore apt to lose our heads over it, and thus be unconsciously instrumental in doing an injury to the very cause we seek to espouse. Let us recognise that our Mussulman brethren have made great efforts to save the cow for the sake of their Hindu brethren. It would be a grave mistake to underrate them. But immediately we become assertive, we make all effort on their part nugatory. We have throughout all these many years put up with cow-slaughter either without a murmur or under ineffective and violent protest. We have never tried to deserve self-imposed restraint on the part of our Mussulman countrymen by going out of our way to cultivate friendly relations with them. We have more or less gratuitously assumed the impossibility of the task.

But we are now making a deliberate and conscious attempt in standing by their side in the hour of their need. Let us not spoil the good effect by making our free offering a matter of bargain. Friendship can never be a contract. It is a status carrying no consideration with it. Service is a duty, and duty is a debt which it is a sin not to discharge. If we would prove our friendship, we must help our brethren whether they save the cow or not. We throw the responsibility for their conduct towards us on their own shoulders. We dare not dictate it to them as consideration for our help. Such help will be hired service, which the Mussulmans cannot be blamed if they summarily reject. I hope, therefore, that the Hindus of Bihar and indeed all the parts of India will realise the importance of observing the strictest forbearance no matter what the Mussulmans do on Bakr-Id. We must leave them to take what course they choose. What Hakim Ajmal Khanji did in one hour at Amritsar, Hindus could not have done by years of effort. The cows

that Messrs. Chotani and Khatri saved last Bakr-Id day, the Hindu millionaires of Bombay could not have saved if they had given the whole of their fortunes. The greater the pressure put upon the Mussulmans, the greater must be the slaughter of the cow. We must leave them to their own sense of honour and duty. And we shall have done the greatest service to the cow.

The way to save the cow is not to kill or quarrel with the Mussulman. The way to save the cow is to die in the act of saving the Khilafat without mentioning the cow. Cow protection is a process of purification. It is *tapasya*, *i.e.*, self-suffering. When we suffer voluntarily and therefore without expectation of reward, the cry of suffering (one might say) literally ascends to heaven, and God above hears it and responds. That is the path of religion, and it has answered even if one man has adopted it *in its entirety*. I make bold to assert without fear of contradiction, that it is not Hinduism to kill a fellow-man even to save the cow. Hinduism requires its votaries to immolate themselves for the sake of their religion, *i.e.*, for the sake of saving the cow. The question is how many Hindus are ready without bargaining with the Mussulmans to die for them and for their religion? If the Hindus can answer it in the religious spirit, they will not only have secured Mussulman friendship for eternity, but they will have saved the cow for all time from the Mussulmans. Let us not swear even by the greatest among them. They can but help. They cannot undertake to change the hearts of millions of men who have hitherto given no thought to the feeling of their Hindu neighbours when they slaughter the cow. But God Almighty can in a moment change them and move them to pity. Prayer accompanied by adequate

suffering is a prayer of the heart. That alone counts with God. To my Mussulman friends I would say but one word. They must not be irritated by the acts of irresponsible or ignorant but fanatical Hindus. He who exercises restraint under provocation wins the battle. Let them know and feel sure that responsible Hindus are not on their side in their trial n any bargaining spirit. They are helping because they know that the Khilafat is a just cause, and that to help them in a good cause is to serve India, for they are even as blood-brothers, born of the same mother—Bharata Mata.

UNTOUCHABILITY

[*Mr. Gandhi presided at the Suppressed Classes Conference held at Ahmedabad on the 13th and 14th May, 1921. In the course of his speech on the occasion, he narrated a fragment of his personal history. He said* :—]

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 aquainted 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 accidently

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 Mussulman 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 Porebander, where I made my first acquaintance with Sanskrit. I was not yet put to an English school, and my brother and I were placed in charge of a Brahman, who taught us *Ram Raksha* and *Vishnu Punjar*. 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 *Ramaraksha* 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 *Ramaraksha* 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 *Ramaraksha*, 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 Maharaja 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 who is regarded now-a-days as an untouchable took Rama across the Ganges in his boat, countenance the idea of any human beings being 'untouchables' 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 crystallised as a conviction in me at the age of twelve, but I do say that I did then regard untouchability as a sin. I narrate 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 *Bhagwat* 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 Mussulmans caught the sinful contagion from us, and in S. Africa, in E. Africa and in Canada the Mussulmans no less than Hindus came to be regarded as Pariahs. All this evil has resulted from the sin of untouchability.

GOKHALE, TILAK AND MEHTA*

A strange anonymous letter has been received by me, admiring me for having taken up a cause that was dearest to Lokamanya's heart, and telling me that his spirit was residing in me and that I must prove a worthy follower of his. The letter, moreover, admonishes me not to lose heart in the prosecution of the Swaraj programme, and finishes off by accusing me of imposture

---

* From *Young India*, July 13, 1921.

in claiming to be politically a disciple of Gokhale. I wish correspondents will throw off the slavish habit of writing anonymously. We, who are developing the Swaraj spirit, must cultivate the courage of fearlessly speaking out our mind. The subject-matter of the letter, however, being of public importance, demands a reply. I cannot claim the honour of being a follower of the late Lokamanya. I admire him like millions of his countrymen for his indomitable will, his vast learning, his love of country, and, above all, the purity of his private life and great sacrifice. Of all the men of modern times, he captivated most the imagination of his people. He breathed into us the spirit of Swaraj No one perhaps realised the evil of the existing system of Government as Mr. Tilak did. And in all humility I claim to deliver his message to the country as truly as the best of his disciples. But I am conscious that my method is not Mr. Tilak's methods and that is why I have still difficulty with some of the Maharashtra leaders. But I sincerely think that Mr. Tilak did not disbelieve in my method. I enjoyed the privilege of his confidence. And his last word to me in the presence of several friends was, just a fortnight before his death, that mine was an excellent method if the people could be persuaded to take to it. But he said he had doubts. I know no other method. I can only hope that when the final test comes, the country will be proved to have assimilated the method of non-violent non-co-operation. Nor am I unaware of my other limitations. I can lay no claim to scholarship. I have not his powers of organisation, I have no compact disciplined party to lead, and, having been an exile for twenty-three years, I cannot claim the experience that the Lokamanya had of India.

Two things we had in common to the fullest measure—love of country and the steadly pursuit of Swaraj. I can, therefore, assure the anonymous writer, that yielding to none in my reverence for the memory of the deceased, I will march side by side with the foremost of the Lokamanya's disciples in the pursuit of Swaraj. I know that the only offering acceptable to him is the quickest attainment of Swaraj by India. That and nothing else can give his spirit peace.

Discipleship, however, is a sacred personal matter. I fell at Dadabhai's feet in 1888, but he seemed to be too far away from me. I could be as son to him, not disciple. A disciple is more than a son. Discipleship is a second birth. It is a voluntary surrender. In 1896 I met almost all the known leaders of India in connection with my South African mission. Justice Ranade awed me. I could hardly talk in his presence. Badruddin Tayabji fathered me, and asked me to be guided by Ranade and Pherozeshah. The latter became a patron. His will had to be law. 'You must address a public meeting on the 26th September, and you must be punctual.' I obeyed. On the 25th evening I was to wait on him. I did.

'Have you written out your speech?' he inquired.

'No, Sir.'

'That won't do, young man. Can you write it out to-night?'

'Munshi, you must go to Mr. Gandhi and receive the manuscript from him. It must be printed over-night and you must send me a copy.' Turning to me, he added, 'Gandhi, you must not write a long speech, you do not know Bombay audiences cannot stand long addresses.' I

The lion of Bombay taught me to take orders. He did not make me his disciple. He did not even try.

I went thence to Poona. I was an utter stranger. My host first took me to Mr. Tilak. I met him surrounded by his companions. He listened, and said, 'We must arrange a meeting for you. But perhaps you do not know, that we have unfortunately two parties. You must give us a non-party man as chairman. Will you see Dr. Bhandarkar?' I consented and retired. I have no firm impression of Mr. Tilak, except to recall that he shook off my nervousness by his affectionate familiarity. I went thence, I think, to Gokhale, and then to Dr. Bhandarkar. The latter greeted me, as a teacher of his pupil.

'You seem to be an earnest and enthusiastic young man. Many people do not come to see me at this the hottest part of the day. I never now-a-days attend public meetings. But you have recited such a pathetic story that I must make an exception in your favour.'

I worshipped the venerable doctor with his wise face. But I could not find for him a place on that little throne. It was still unoccupied. I had many heroes but no king.

It was different with Gokhale, I cannot say why. I met him at his quarters on the college ground. It was like meeting an old friend, or better still, a mother after a long separation. His gentle face put me at ease in a moment. His minute inquiries about myself and my doings in South Africa at once enshrined him in my heart. And as I parted from him, I said to myself, 'You are my man'. And from that moment Gokhale never lost sight of me. In 1901 on my second return from South Africa, we came closer still. He simply 'took me in hand,' and began to fashion me. He was concerned

about how I spoke, dressed, walked and ate. My mother was not more solicitous about me than Gokhale. There was, so far as I am aware, no reserve between us. It was really a case of love at first sight, and it stood the severest strain in 1913. He seemed to me all I wanted as a political worker—pure as crystal, gentle as a lamb, brave as a lion and chivalrous to a fault. It does not matter to me that he may not have been any of these things. It was enough for me, that I could discover no fault in him to cavil at. He was and remains for me the most perfect man on the political field. Not therefore, that we had no differences. We differed even in 1901 in our views on social customs, *e. g.*, widow re-marriage. We discovered differences in our estimate of western civilization. He frankly differed from me in my extreme views on non-violence. But these differences mattered neither to him nor to me. Nothing could put us asunder. It were blasphemous to conjecture what would have happened if he were alive to-day. I know that I would have been working under him. I have made this confession, because the anonymous letter hurt me, when it accused me of imposture about my political discipleship. Had I been remiss in my acknowledgment to him who is now dumb? I thought, I must declare my faithfulness to Gokhale, especially when I seemed to be living in a camp which the Indian world calls opposite.

THE FEAR OF DEATH *

I have been collecting description of Swaraj. One of these would be Swaraj is the abandonment of the fear of death. A nation which allows itself to be influenced by the fear of death cannot attain Swaraj and cannot retain it if somehow attained.

English people carry their lives in their pockets. Arabs and Pathans consider death as nothing more than an ordinary ailment, they never weep when a relation dies. Boer women are perfectly innocent of this fear. In the Boer war, thousands of young Boer women became widowed. They never cared. It did not matter in the least if the husband or the son was lost, it was enough, and more than enough, that the country's honour was safe. What booted the husband if the country was enslaved? It was infinitely better to bury a son's mortal remains and to cherish his immortal memory than to bring him up as a serf. Thus did the Boer women steel their hearts and cheerfully give up their darlings to the angle of Death.

The people I have mentioned kill and get killed. But what of those who do not kill but are only ready to die themselves? Such people become the objects of a world's adoration. They are the salt of the earth.

The English and the Germans fought one another; they killed and got killed. The result is that animosities have increased. There is no end of unrest, and the present condition of Europe is pitiful. There is more of deceit, and each is anxious to circumvent the rest.

---

* Translated from the *Gujarati Navajivan, Oct., 1921.*

But fearlessness which we are cultivating is of a nobler and purer order and it is therefore that we hope to achieve a signal victory within a very short time.

When we attain Swaraj many of us will have given up the fear of death or else we shall not have attained Swaraj. Till now mostly young boys have died in the cause. Those who died in Aligarh were all below twenty-one. No one knew who they were. If Government resort to firing now I am hoping that some men of the first rank will have the opportunity of offering up the supreme sacrifice.

Why should we be upset when children or young men or old men die? Not a moment passes when some one is not born or is not dead in this world. We should feel the stupidity of rejoicing in a birth and lamenting a death. Those who believe in the soul—and what Hindu, Mussulman or Parsi is there who does not?—know that the soul never dies. The souls of the living as well as of the dead are all one. The eternal processes of creation and destruction are going on ceaselessly. There is nothing in it for which we might give ourselves up to joy or sorrow. Even if we extend the idea of relationship only to our countrymen and take all the births in the country as taking place in our own family, how many births shall we celebrate? If we weep for all the deaths in our country the tears in our eyes would never dry. This train of thought should help us to get rid of all fear of death.

India, they say, is a nation of philosophers; and we have not been unwilling to appropriate the compliment. Still hardly any other nation becomes so helpless in the face of death as we do. And in India again no other community perhaps betray so much of this helplessness as the Hindus. A single birth is enough for us to be

besides ourselves with ludicrous joyfulness. A death makes us indulge in orgies of loud lamentation which condemn the neighbourhood to sleeplessness for the night. If we wish to attain Swaraj, and if having attained it we wish to make it something to be proud of we perfectly renounce this unseemly sight.

And what is imprisonment to the man who is fearless of death itself? If the reader will bestow a little thought upon the matter, he will find that if Swaraj is delayed, it is delayed because we are not prepared calmly to meet death and inconveniences less than death.

As larger and larger numbers of innocent men come out to welcome death, their sacrifice will become the potent instrument for the salvation of all others; and there will be a minimum of suffering. Suffering cheerfully endured ceases to be suffering and is transmuted into an ineffable joy. The man who flies from suffering is the victim of endless tribulation before it had come to him, and is half dead when it does come. But one who is cheerfully ready for anything and everything that comes, escapes all pain, his cheerfulness acts as an anæsthetic.

I have been led to write about this subject because we have got to envisage even death if we will have Swaraj this very year. One who is previously prepared often escapes accident and this may well be the case with us. It is my firm conviction that Swadeshi constitutes this preparation. When once Swadeshi is a success neither this Government nor any one else will feel the necessity of putting us to any further test.

Still it is best not to neglect any contingency whatever. Possession of power makes men blind and deaf, they cannot see things which are under their very nose,

and cannot hear things which invade their ears. There is thus no knowing what this power-intoxicated Government may not do. So it seemed to me that patriotic men ought to be prepared for death, imprisonment and similar eventualities.

The brave meet death with a smile on their lips, but they are circumspect all the same. There is no room for foolhardiness in this non-violent war. We do not propose to go to gaol or to die by an immoral act. We must mount the gallows while resisting the oppressive laws of this Government.

HINDUISM*

In dealing with the problem of untouchability during the Madras tour, I have asserted my claim to being a Sanatani Hindu with greater emphasis than hitherto, and yet there are things which are commonly done in the name of Hinduism, which I disregard. I have no desire to be called a Sanatani Hindu or any other if I am not such. And I have certainly no desire to steal in a reform or an abuse under cover of a great faith.

It is therefore necessary for me once for all distinctly to give my meaning of Sanatani Hinduism. The word Sanatana I use in its natural sense.

I call myself a Santani Hindu, because—

(1) I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas and all that goes by the name Hindu scriptures, and therefore in *avataras* and re-birth,

---

* From *Young India*, Oct. 12, 1921.

(2) I believe in the *Varnashrama Dharma*, in a sense in my opinion, strictly Vedic but not in its present popular and crude sense.

(3) I believe in the protection of the cow in its much larger sense than the popular.

(4) I do not disbelieve in idol-worship.

The reader will note that I have purposely refrained from using the word divine origin in reference to the Vedas or any other scriptures. For I do not believe in the exclusive divinity of the Vedas. I believe the Bible, the Koran, and the Zend Avesta to be as much divinely inspired as the Vedas. My belief in the Hindu scriptures does not require me to accept every word and every verse as divinely inspired. Nor do I claim to have any first-hand knowledge of these wonderful books. But I do claim to know and feel the truths of the essential teaching of the scriptures. I decline to be bound by any interpretation, however learned it may be, if it is repugnant to reason or moral sense. I do most emphatically repudiate the claim (if they advance any such) of the present Shankaracharyas and Shastris to give a correct interpretation of the Hindu scriptures. On the contrary, I believe that our present knowledge of these books is in a most chaotic state. I believe implicitly in the Hindu aphorism, that no one truly knows the Shastras who has not attained perfection in Innocence (*Ahimsa*), Truth (*Satya*) and Self-control (*Brahmacharya*) and who has not renounced all acquisition or possession of wealth. I believe in the institution of Gurus, but in this age millions must go without a Guru, because it is a rare thing to find a combination of perfect purity and perfect learning. But one need not despair of ever knowing the truth of one's religion, because the fundamentals of

Hinduism as of every great religion are unchangeable, and easily understood. Every Hindu believes in God and his oneness, in rebirth and salvation. But that which distinguishes Hinduism from every other religion is its cow protection, more than its *Varnashram*, is, in my opinion, inherent in human nature, and Hinduism has simply reduced it to a science. It does attach to birth. A man cannot change his *varna* by choice. Not to abide by one's *varna* is to disregard the law of heredity. The division, however, into innumerable castes is an unwarranted liberty taken with the doctrine. The four divisions are all-sufficing.

I do not believe that inter-dining or even inter-marriage necessarily deprives a man of his status that his birth has given him. The four divisions define a man's calling, they do not restrict or regulate social intercourse. The divisions define duties, they confer no privileges. It is, I hold, against the genius of Hinduism to arrogate to oneself a higher status or assign to another a lower. All are born to serve God's creation, a Brahman 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 Brahman for instance is absolved from bodily labour or the duty of protecting himself and others. His birth makes a Brahman predominantly a man of knowledge, the fittest by heredity and training to impart it to others. There is nothing, again, to prevent the Shudra from acquiring all the knowledge he wishes. Only, he will best serve with his body and need not envy others their special qualities for service. But a Brahman who claims superiority by right of knowledge falls and has no knowledge. And so with the others who pride

themselves upon their special qualities. *Varnashrama* is self-restraint and conservation and economy of energy.

Though, therefore, *Varnashrama* is not affected by inter-dining or inter-marriage. Hinduism does most emphatically discourage inter-dining and inter-marriage between divisions. Hinduism reached the highest limit of self-restraint. It is undoubtedly a religion of renunciation of the flesh so that the spirit may be set free. It is no part of a Hindu's duty to dine with his son. And by restricting his choice of a bride to a particular group, he exercises rare self-restraint. Hinduism does not regard a marriage state as by any means essential for salvation. Marriage is a 'fall' even as birth is a 'fall.' Salvation is freedom from birth and hence death also. Prohibition against inter-marriage and inter-dining is essential for a rapid evolution of the soul. But this self-denial is no test of *varna*. A Brahman may remain a Brahman, though he may dine with his Shudra brother, if he has not left off his duty of service by knowledge. It follows from what I have said above, that restraint in matters of marriage and dining is not based upon notions of superiority. A Hindu who refuses to dine with another from a sense of superiority misrepresents his *Dharma*.

Unfortunately to-day Hinduism seems to consist merely in eating and not eating. Once I horrified a pious Hindu by taking toast at a Mussulman's house. I saw that he was pained to see me pouring milk into a cup handed by a Mussulman friend, but his anguish knew no bounds when he saw me taking toast at the Mussulman's hands. Hinduism is in danger of losing its substance if it resolves itself into a matter of elaborate rules as to what and with whom to eat. Abstemiousness from

intoxicating drinks and drugs, and from all kinds of foods, especially 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 and with everybody but living in the fear of God is nearer his freedom than a man religiously abstaining from meat and many other things, but blaspheming God in every one of his acts.

The central fact of Hinduism, however, is cow-protection. Cow-protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomena in human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realise his identity with all that lives. Why the cow was selected for apotheosis, is obvious to me. The cow was in India the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. The cow is a poem of pity. One reads pity in the gentle animal. She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb creation of God. The ancient seer, whoever he was, began with the cow. The appeal of the lower order of creation is all the more forcible because it is speechless. Cow-protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow.

The way to protect is to die for her. It is a denial of Hinduism and *Ahimsa* to kill a human being to protect a cow. Hindus are enjoined to protect the cow by their *tapasya*, by self-purification, by self-sacrifice. The present day cow-protection has degenerated into perpetual feud with the Mussulmans, whereas cow-protection means conquering the Mussulmans by our love. A Mussulman friend sent me some time ago a book detailing the

inhumanities practised by us on the cow and her progeny. How we bleed her to take the last drop of milk from her, how we starve her to emaciation, how we ill-treat the calves, how we deprive them of their portion of milk, how cruelly we treat the ox on, how we castrate them, how we beat them, how we overload them. If they had speech they would bear witness to our crimes against them which would stagger the world. By every act of cruelty to our cattle, we disown God and Hinduism. I do not know that the condition of the cattle in any other part of the world is as bad as in unhappy India. We may not blame the Englishman for this. We may not plead poverty in our defence. Criminal negligence is the only cause of the miserable condition of our cattle Our *Panjrapoles*, though they are an answer to our instinct of mercy, are a clumsy demonstration of its execution. Instead of being model dairy farms and great profitable national institutions, they are merely depots for receiving decrepit cattle.

Hindus will be judged not by their *tilaks*, not by the correct chanting of *mantras*, not by their pilgrimages, not by their most punctilious observance of caste rules but by their ability to protect the cow. Whilst professing the religion of cow-protection, we have enslaved the cow and her progeny, and have become slaves ourselves.

It will now be understood why I consider myself a Sanatani Hindu. I yield to none in my regard for the cow. I have made the Khilafat cause my own, because I see that through its preservation full protection can be secured for the cow. I do not ask my Mussulman friends to save the cow in consideration of my service. My prayer ascends daily to God Almighty, that my service of a cause I hold to be just may appear so pleasing to

him, that he may change the hearts of the Mussulmans, and fill them with pity for their Hindu neighbours and make them save the animal the latter hold dear as life itself.

I can no more describe my feeling for Hinduism than for my own wife. She moves me as no other woman in the world can. Not that she has no faults. I daresay she has many more than I see myself. But the feeling of an indissoluble bond is there. Even so I feel for and about Hinduism with all its faults and limitations. Nothing relates me so much as the music of the Gita or the Ramayana by Tulasidas, the only two books in Hinduism I may be said to know. When I fancied I was taking my last breath, the Gita was my solace. I know the vice that is going on to-day in all the great Hindu shrines, but I love them in spite of their unspeakable failings. There is an interest which I take in them and which I take in no other. I am a reformer through and through. But my zeal never takes me to the rejection of any of the essential things of Hinduism. I have said I do not disbelieve in idol worship. An idol does not excite any feeling of veneration in me. But I think that idol worship is part of human nature. We hanker after symbolism. Why should one be more composed in a church than elsewere ? Images are an aid to worship. No Hindu considers an image to be God. I do not consider idol worship a sin.

It is clear from the foregoing that Hinduism is not an exclusive religion. In it there is room for the worship of all the prophets of the world. It is not a missionary religion in the ordinary sense of the term. It has no doubt absorbed many tribes in its fold, but this absorption has been of an evolutionary imperceptible character.

Hinduism tells everyone to worship God according to his own faith or *Dharma*, and so it lives at peace with all the religions.

That being my conception of Hinduism, I have never been able to reconcile myself to untouchability. I have always regarded it as an excrescence. It is true that it has been handed down to us from generations, but so are many evil practices even to this day. I should be ashamed to think that dedication of girls to virtual prostitution was a part of Hinduism. Yet it is practised by Hindus in many parts of India. I consider it positive irreligion to sacrifice goats to Kali and do not consider it a part of Hinduism. Hinduism is a growth of ages. The very name, Hinduism, was given to the religion of the people of Hindusthan by foreigners. There was no doubt at one time sacrifice of animals was offered in the name of religion. But it is not religion, much less is it Hindu religion.

And so also it seems to me, that when cow-protection became an article of faith with our ancestors, those who persisted in eating beef were excommunicated. The civil strife must have been fierce. Social boycott was applied not only to the recalcitrants, but their sins were visited upon their children also. The practice which had probably its origin in good intentions hardened into usage, and even verses crept in our sacred books giving the practice a permanence wholly undeserved and still less justified. Whether my theory is correct or not, untouchability is repugnant to reason and to the instinct of mercy, pity or love. A religion that establishes the worship of the cow cannot possibly countenance or warrant a cruel and inhuman boycott of human beings. And I should be content to be torn to pieces rather than dis-

own the suppressed classes. Hindus will certainly never deserve freedom, nor get it if they allow their noble religion to be disgraced by the retention of the taint of untouchability. And as I love Hinduism dearer than life itself, the taint has become for me an intolerable burden. Let us not deny God by denying to a fifth of our race the right of association on an equal footing.

NATIONAL EDUCATION *

So many strange things have been said about my views on national education, that it would perhaps not be out of place to formulate them before the public.

In my opinion the existing system of education is defective, apart from its association with an utterly unjust Government, in three most important matters:

(1) It is based upon foreign culture to the almost entire exclusion of indigenous one.

(2) It ignores the culture of the heart and the hand, and confines itself simply to the head.

(3) Real education is impossible through a foreign medium.

Let us examine the three defects. Almost from the commencement, the text-books deal, not with things the boys and the girls have always to deal with in their homes, but things to which they are perfect strangers. It is not through the text-books, that a lad learns what is right and what is wrong in the home life. He is never taught to have any pride in his surroundings. The higher he goes, the farther he is removed from his home, so that at the end of his education he becomes estranged from his surroundings. He feels no poetry about the home life. The village scenes are all a sealed book to

* From *Young India*.

him. His own civilization is presented to him as imbecile, barbarous, superstitious and useless for all practical purposes. His education is calculated to wean him from his traditional culture. And if the mass of educated youths are not entirely denationalised, it is because the ancient culture is too deeply embedded in them to be altogether uprooted even by an education adverse to its growth. If I had my way, I would certainly destroy the majority of the present text-books and cause to be written text-books which have a bearing on and correspondence with the home life, so that a boy, as he learns, may react upon his immediate surroundings.

Secondly, whatever may be true of other countries, in India at any rate, where more than eighty per cent. of the population is agricultural and another ten per cent. industrial, it is a crime to make education merely literary and to unfit boys and girls for manual work in after-life. Indeed I hold that as the larger part of our time is devoted to labour for earning our bread, our children must, from their infancy, be taught the dignity of such labour. Our children should not be so taught as to despise labour. There is no reason why a peasant's son after having gone to a school should become useless, as he does become, as an agricultural labourer. It is a sad thing that our schoolboys look upon manual labour with disfavour, if not contempt. Moreover, in India, if we expect, as we must, every boy and girl of school-going age to attend public schools, we have not the means to finance education in accordance with the existing style, nor are millions of parents able to pay the fees that are at present imposed. Education to be universal must therefore be free. I fancy that even under an ideal system

of Government we shall not be able to devote two thousand million rupees which we should require for finding education for all the children of school-going age. It follows, therefore, that our children must be made to pay in 'labour' partly or wholly for the cost of all the education they receive. Such universal labour to be profitable can only be (to my thinking) hand-spinning and hand-weaving. But for the purposes of my proposition, it is immaterial whether we have spinning or any other form of labour, so long as it can be turned to account. Only, it will be found upon examination, that on a practical, profitable and extensive scale there is no occupation other than the processes connected with cloth production which can be introduced in our schools throughout India.

The introduction of manual training will serve a double purpose in a poor country like ours. It will pay for the education of our children and teach them an occupation on which they can fall back in after-life, if they choose, for earning a living. Such a system must make our children self-reliant. Nothing will demoralise the nation so much as that we should learn to despise labour.

One word only as to the education of the heart. I do not believe that this can be imparted through books. It can only be done through the living touch of the teacher. And who are the teachers in the primary and even secondary schools? Are they men and women of faith and character? Have they themselves received the education of the heart? Are they even expected to take care of the permanent element in the boys and girls placed under their charge? Is not the method of engaging teachers for lower schools an effective bar against character? Do the teachers get even a living age? And

we know that the teachers of primary school are not selected for their patriotism. They only come who cannot find any other employment.

Finally, the medium of instruction. My views on this point are too well known to need re-stating. The foreign medium has caused brain-fag, put an undue strain upon the nerve of our children, made them crammers and imitators, unfitted them for original work and thought, and disabled them for filtrating their learning to the family or the masses. The foreign medium has made our children practically foreigners in their own land. So to save ourselves from this perilous danger we should put a stop to educating our boys and girls through a foreign medium and require all the teachers and professors on pain of dismissal to introduce the change forthwith. I would not wait for the preparation of text-books. They will follow the change. It is an evil that needs a summary remedy.

My uncompromising opposition to the foreign medium has resulted in an unwarranted charge being levelled against me of being hostile to foreign culture or the learning of the English language. No reader of *Young India* could have missed the statement often made by me in those pages that I regard English as the language of international commerce and diplomacy, and therefore consider its knowledge, on the part of some of us as essential. As it contains some of the richest treasures of thought and literature, I would certainly encourage its careful study among those who have linguistic talents and expect them to translate those treasures for the nation in its vernaculars.

Nothing can be farther from my thought than that we should become exclusive or erect barriers. But I do

respectfully contend that an appreciation of other cultures can fitly follow, never precede, an appreciation and assimilation of our own. 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 deprecate its value. We have almost ceased to live it. An academic grasp without practice behind it is like an enbalmed corpse, perhaps lovely to look at but nothing to inspire or ennoble. My religion forbids me to belittle or disregard other cultures, as it insists under pain of civil suicide upon imbibing and living my own.

FROM SATYAGRAHA TO NON-CO-OPERATION*

It is often my lot to answer knotty questions on all sorts of topics arising out of this great movement of national purification. A company of collegiate non co-operators asked me to define for them the terms which I have used as heading for this note. And even at this late day, I was seriously asked whether Satyagrah did not at times warrant resistance by violence, as for instance in the case of a sister whose virtue might be in danger from a desperado. I ventured to suggest that it was the completest defence without irritation, without being ruffled, to interpose oneself between the victim and the victimizer, and to face death. I added that this (for the assailant) novel method of defence would, in all probability, exhaust his passion and he will no longer want to ravish an innocent woman, but would want to flee from her presence for very shame, and that, if he did not, the act of personal bravery on the part of her brother would steel her heart for putting up an equally brave defence and resisting the

* *From Young India.*

lust of man turned brute for the while. And I thought I clinched my argument by saying that if, in spite of all the defence, the unexpected happened, and the physical force of the tyrant overpowered his victim, the disgrace would not be that of the woman but of her assailant and that both she and her brother, who died in the attempt to defend her virtue, would stand well before the Throne of Judgment. I do not warrant that my argument convinced my listener or that it would convince the reader. The world I know will go on as before. But it is well at this moment of self-examination to understand and appreciate the implications of the powerful movement of non-violence. All religions have emphasised the highest ideal, but all have more or less permitted departures as so many concessions to human weaknesses.

I now proceed to summarise the explanation I gave of the various terms. It is beyond my capacity to give accurate and terse definitions.

Satyagrah, then, is literally holding on to Truth and it means, therefore, Truth-force. Truth is soul or spirit. It is, therefore, known as soul-force. It excludes the use of violence because man is not capable of knowing the absolute truth and, therefore, not competent to punish. The word was coined in South Africa to distinguish the non-violent resistance of the Indians of South Africa from the contemporary 'passive resistance' of the suffragettes and others. It is not conceived as a weapon of the weak.

Passive resistance is used in the orthodox English sense and covers the suffragette movement as well as the resistance of the Non-conformists. Passive resistance has been conceived and is regarded as a weapon of the weak. Whilst it avoids violence, being

non open to the weak, it does not exclude its use if, in the opinion of a passive resister, the occasion demands it. However, it has always been distinguished from armed resistance and its application was at one time confined to Christian martyrs.

Civil Disobedience is civil breach of unmoral statutory enactments. The expression was, so far as I am aware, coined by Thoreau to signify his own resistance to the laws of a slave state. He has left a masterly treatise on the duty of Civil Disobedience. But Thoreau was not perhaps an out and out champion of non-violence. Probably, also, Thoreau limited his breach of statutory laws to the revenue law, *i.e.*, payment of taxes. Whereas the term Civil-Disobedience as practised in 1919 covered a breach of any statutory and unmoral law. It signified the resister's outlawry in a civil, *i.e.*, non-violent manner. He invoked the sanctions of the law and cheerfully suffered imprisonment. It is a branch of Satyagrah.

Non-co operation predominantly implies withdrawing of co-operation from the State that in the non-co-operator's view has become corrupt and excludes Civil-Disobedience of the fierce type described above. By its very nature, Non-co-operation is even open to children of understanding and can be safely practised by the masses. Civil-Disobedience pre-supposes the habit of willing obedience to laws without fear of their sanctions. It can therefore be practised only as a last resort and by a select few in the first instance at any rate. Non co-operation, too, like Civil-Disobedience is a branch of Satyagrah which includes all non-violent resistance for the vindication of Truth.

INTROSPECTION*

Correspondents have written to me in pathetic language asking me not to commit suicide in January, should Swaraj be not attained by then and should I find myself outside the prison walls. I find that language but inadequately expresses one's thought especially when the thought itself is confused or incomplete. My writing in the *Navajivan* was, I fancied, clear enough. But I observe that its translation has been misunderstood by many. The original too has not escaped the tragedy that has overtaken the translation.

One great reason for the misunderstanding lies in my being considered almost a perfect man. Friends who know my partiality for the Bhagavad-gita have thrown relevant verses at me, and shown how my threat to commit suicide contradicts the teachings which I am attempting to live. All these mentors of mine seem to forget, that I am but a seeker after Truth. I claim to have found the way to it. I claim to be making a ceaseless effort to find it. But I admit that I have not yet found it. To find Truth completely is to realise oneself and one's destiny, *i.e.*, to become perfect. I am painfully conscious of my imperfections, and therein lies all the strength I possess, because it is a rare thing for a man to know his own limitations.

If I was a perfect man, I own I should not feel the miseries of my neighbours as I do. As a perfect man I should take note of them, prescribe a remedy and compel adoption by the force of unchallengeable Truth in me. But as yet I only see as through a glass darkly

---

* From *Young India*,

and therefore have to carry conviction by slow and laborious processes, and then too not always with success. That being so, I would be less than human if with all my knowledge of avoidable misery pervading the land and of the sight of mere skeletons under the very shadow of the Lord of the Universe, I did not feel with and for all the suffering but dumb millions of India. The hope of a steady decline in that misery sustains me; but suppose that with all my sensitiveness to sufferings, to pleasure and pain, cold and heat and with all my endeavour to carry the healing message of the spinning wheel to the heart, I have reached only the ear and never pierced the heart, suppose further that at the end of the year I find that the people are as sceptical as they are to-day about the present possibility of attainment of Swaraj by means of the peaceful revolution of the wheel. Suppose further, that I find that all the excitement during the past twelve months and more has been only an excitement and a stimulation but no settled belief in the programme, and lastly suppose that the message of peace has not penetrated the hearts of Englishmen, should I not doubt my *tapasya* and feel my unworthiness for leading the struggle? As a true man, what should I do? Should I not kneel down in all humility before my Maker and ask Him to take away this useless body and make me a fitter instrument of service?

Swaraj does consist in the change of government and its real control by the people, but that would be merely the form. The substance that I am hankering after is a definite acceptance of the means and therefore a real change of heart on the part of the people. I am certain that it does not require ages for Hindus

to discard the error of untouchability, for Hindus and Mussalmans to shed enmity and accept heart friendship as an eternal factor of national life, for all to adopt the *Charkha* as the only universal means of attaining India's economic salvation, and finally for all to believe that India's freedom lies only through non-violence and no other method. Definite, intelligent and free adoption by the nation of this programme I hold as the attainment of the substance. The symbol, the transfer of power, is sure to follow, even as the seed truly laid must develop into a tree.

The reader will thus perceive, that what I accidentally stated to friends for the first time in Poona and then repeated to others was but a confession of my imperfections and an expression of my feeling of unworthiness for the great cause which for the time being I seem to be leading. I have enunciated no doctrine of despair. On the contrary I have felt never so sanguine as I do at the time of writing that we will gain the substance during this year. I have stated at the same time as a practical idealist, that I should no more feel worthy to lead a cause which I might feel myself diffident of handling. The doctrine of labouring without attachment as much a relentless pursuit of truth as a retracing after discovery of error and a renunciation of leadership without a pang after discovery of unworthiness. I have but shadowed forth my intense longing to lose myself in the Eternal and become merely a lump of clay in the Potter's divine hands so that my service may become more certain because uninterrupted by the baser self in me.

THE SPINNING WHEEL

[*On February 15th, 1922, Mr. Gandhi addressed the following letter to Sir Daniel Hamilton from Bardoli.*]

Mr. Hodge writes to me to say that you would like to have an hour's chat with me, and he has suggested that I should open the ground which I gladly do. I will not take up your time by trying to interest you in any other activity of mine except the spinning wheel Of all my outward activities, I do believe that of the spinning wheel is the most permanent and the most beneficial. I have abundant proof now to support my statement that the spinning wheel will save the problem of economic distress in millions of India's homes, and it constitutes an effective insurance against famines.

You know the great Scientist, Dr. P. C. Ray, but you may not know that he has also become an enthusiast on behalf of the spinning wheel. India does not need to be industrialized in the modern sense of the term. It has 7,50,000 villages scattered over a vast area 1,900 miles long, 1,500 miles broad. The people are rooted to the soil, and the vast majority are living a hand-to-mouth life. Whatever may be said to the contrary, having travelled throughout the length and breadth of the land with eyes open, having mixed with millions, there can be no doubt that pauperism is growing. There is no doubt also that the millions are living in enforced idleness for at least 4 months in the year. Agriculture does not need revolutionary changes. The Indian peasant requires a supplementary industry. The most natural is the introduction of the spinning wheel, not the hand-

loom. The latter cannot be introduced in every home, whereas the former can, and it used to be so even a century ago. It was driven out not by economic pressure but by force deliberately used as can be proved from authentic records. The restoration, therefore, of the spinning wheel solves the economic problem of India at a stroke. I know that you are a lover of India, and that you are deeply interested in the economic and moral uplift of my country. I know too that you have great influence. I would like to enlist it on behalf of the spinning wheel. It is the most effective force for introducing successful Co-operative Societies Without honest co-operation of the millions, the enterprise can never be successful, and as it is already proving a means of weaning thousands of women from a life of shame, it is as moral an instrument as it is economic.

I hope you will not allow yourself to be prejudiced by anything you might have heard about my strange views about machinery. I have nothing to say against the development of any other industry in India by means of machinery, but I do say that to supply India with cloth either manufactured outside or inside through gigantic Mills is an economic blunder of the first magnitude just as it would be to supply cheap bread through huge bakeries established in the chief centres in India and to destroy the family stove.

LOVE, NOT HATE

[*In a sense "Love, not hate" is the essence of Mr. Gandhi's teaching ; and the following article written on receipt of a telegram announcing the arrest of Pandit Motilal Nehru and others at Allahabad on December 8, contains the pith of Mr. Gandhi's political philosophy and methods. As such the book may fittingly end with this chapter. "The arrest," says Mr. Gandhi, "positively filled me with joy. I thanked God for it."*]

But my joy was greater for the thought, that what I had feared would not happen before the end of the year because of the sin of Bombay was now happening by reason of the innocent suffering of the greatest and the best in the land. These arrests of the totally innocent is real Swaraj. Now there is no shame in the Ali Brothers and their companions remaining in gaol. India has not been found undeserving of their immolation.

But my joy, which I hope thousands share with me, is conditional upon perfect peace being observed whilst our leaders are one after another taken away from us. *Victory is complete if non-violence reigns supreme in spite of the arrests; disastrous defeat is a certainty if we cannot control all the elements so as to ensure peace.* We are out to be killed without killing. We have stipulated to go to prison without feeling angry or injured. We must not quarrel with the condition of our own creating.

On the contrary our non-violence teaches us to love our enemies. By non-violent non-co-operation we seek to conquer the wrath of the English administrators and their supporters. We must love them and pray to God

that they might have wisdom to see what appears to us to be their error. It must be the prayer of the strong and not of the weak. In our strength must we humble ourselves before our Maker.

In the moment of our trial and our triumph let me declare my faith. I believe in loving my enemies. I believe in non-violence as the only remedy open to the Hindus, Mussulmans, Sikhs, Parsis, Christians and Jews of India. I believe in the power of suffering to melt the stoniest heart. The brunt of the battle must fall on the first three. The last named three are afraid of the combination of the first three. We must by our honest conduct demonstrate to them that they are our kinsmen. We must by our conduct demonstrate to every Englishman that he is as safe in the remotest corner of India as he professes to feel behind the machine gun.

Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism and Judaism, in fact religion is on its trial. Either we believe in God and His righteousness or we do not. My association with the noblest of Mussulmans has taught me to see that Islam has spread not by the power of the sword but by the prayerful love of an unbroken line of its saints and fakirs. Warrant there is in Islam for drawing the sword; but the conditions laid down are so strict that they are not capable of being fulfilled by everybody. Where is the unerring general to order Jehad? Where is the suffering, the love and the purification that must precede the very idea of drawing the sword? Hindus are at least as much bound by similar restrictions as the Mussulmans of India. The Sikhs have their recent proud history to warn them against the use of force. We are too imperfect,

too impure and too selfish as yet to resort to an armed conflict in the cause of God as Shaukat Ali would say, 'Will a purified India ever need to draw the sword?' And it was the definite process of purification we commenced last year at Calcutta.

What must we then do? Surely remain non-violent and yet strong enough to offer as many willing victims as the Government may require for imprisonment. Our work must continue with clock-work regularity. Each province must elect its own succession of leaders. Lalaji has set a brilliant example by making all the necessary arrangements. The chairman and the secretary must be given in each province emergency powers. The executive committees must be the smallest possible. Every Congressman must be a volunteer.

Whilst we must not avoid arrest we must not provoke it by giving unnecessary offence.

We must vigorously prosecute the Swadeshi campaign till we are fully organised for the manufacture of all the hand-spun *Khadi* we require and have brought about a complete boycott of foreign cloth.

We must hold the Congress at any cost in spite of the arrest of every one of the leaders unless the Government dissolve it by force. And if we are neither cowed down nor provoked to violence but are able to continue national work, we have certainly attained Swaraj. For no power on earth can stop the onward march of a peaceful, determined and godly people.

APPENDIX I

I. MR. GANDHI'S RELIGION

The following account of Mr. Gandhi's religious views from the pen of the late Rev. Joseph Doke brings out clearly the essentials of Hinduism as conceived by Mr. Gandhi:—

Mr. Gandhi's religious views, and his place in the theological world, have naturally been a subject of much discussion here. A few days ago I was told that "he is a Buddhist." Not long since a newspaper described him as "a Christian Muhammadan," an extraordinary mixture indeed. Others imagine that he worships idols, and would be quite prepared to find a shrine in his office, or discover the trunk of Ganpatty projecting from among his books. Not a few believed him to be a Theosophist. I question whether any system of religion can absolutely hold him. His views are too closely allied to Christianity to be entirely Hindu; and too deeply saturated with Hinduism to be called Christian, while his sympathies are so wide and catholic, that one would imagine "he has reached a point where the formulæ of sects are meaningless."

One night, when the house was still, we argued out the matter into the morning, and these are the results.

His conviction is that old Hinduism, the Hinduism of the earliest records, was a pure faith, free from idolatry; that the spiritual faith of India has been corrupted by materialism, and because of this she has lost her place in the van of the nations; that, through the ages God, pervading all, has manifested Himself in different forms, becoming incarnate, for purposes of salvation, with the object of leading men back into the right path. The *Gita* makes Krishna say;—

"When religion decays and when irreligion prevails, then I manifest myself. For the protection of the good, for the destruction of evil, for the firm establishment of the dharma I am born again and again."

"But," said I, "has Christianity any essential place in your theology?" "It is part of it," he said, "Jesus Christ is a bright revelation; that he is to me," I replied. "Not in the sense you mean," he said frankly, "I cannot set him on a solitary throne because I believe God has been incarnate again and again."

To him, a religion is an intensely practical thing. It underlies all action. The argument so frequently used against the Passive Resistance campaign, that "it is simply a political affair, with

moral elements in it but giving no relation to religion," is to him a contradiction in terms. Politics, morals, commerce, all that has to do with conscience must be religion.

Naturally, his imagination is profoundly stirred by the "Sermon on the Mount," and the idea of self-renunciation pictured there, as well as in the *Bhagavad Gita* and *The Light of Asia* wins his complete assent. Self-mastery, self-surrender, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, are, in his conception of life, stepping-stones to the ultimate goal of all—the goal of Buddha, the goal as he interprets it, of John the Evangelist—absolute absorption of redeemed Man in God.

I question whether any religious creed would be large enough to express his views, or any Church system ample enough to shut him in. Jew and Christian, Hindu, Muhammadan, Parsi, Buddhist and Confucian, all have their places in his heart as children of the same Father. "Are you then a Theosophist?" I asked. "No," he said emphatically, "*I am not a Theosophist.* There is much in Theosophy that attracts me, but I have never been able to subscribe to the creed of Theosophists"

This breadth of sympathy is, indeed, one note of the Passive Resistance movement. It has bound together all sections of the Indian community. It would be impossible to determine which religious section has done most for its interests. Mr. Cachalia, Mr. Dawad Muhammad and Mr. Bawazeer are followers of Islam; Mr. Parsee Rustomjee and Mr. Sorabji are Zoroastrians; Mr. G.P. Vyas and Mr. Thambi Naidoo are Hindu leaders. All have suffered imprisonment, and all have rendered unstinted service, while common suffering has drawn these and other helpers into a brotherhood of sympathy in which differences of creed are forgotten.

An incident of last August will illustrate this statement. When "the old offender," Mr Thambi Naidoo, the Tamil leader, was sent to prison for the third time, to do "hard labour" for a fortnight, Mr. Gandhi suggested that we should visit the sick wife together. I assented gladly. On our way we were joined by the Moulvie and the Imam of the Mosque, together with the Jewish gentleman. It was a curious assembly which gathered to comfort the little Hindu woman in her home—two Muhammadans, a Hindu, a Jew and a Christian. And there she stood, her eldest boy supporting her and the tears trickling between her fingers. She was within a few days of the sufferings of motherhood. After we had bent together in prayer, the Moulvie spoke a few words of comfort in Urdu, and we each followed, saying what we could in our own way to give her cheer. It was one of the many glimpses which we have lately had of that divine love, which mocks at boundaries of creed, and limits of race or colour. It was a vision of Mr. Gandhi's ideal.

Owing, chiefly to his sense of the sacredness of life, and of his views of health, *vegetarianism is with him a religious principle.*

The battle was fought out in childhood under his mother's influence. But since that time abstinence from all animal food has become a matter of strong conviction with him, and he preaches it zealously. When, in these Transvaal prisons, the authorities persisted in cooking the crushed mealies of the prisoners in animal fat, his followers preferred to starve rather than touch it.

It is also part of his creed to live simply. *He believes that all luxury is wrong.* He teaches that a great deal of sickness, and most of the sins of our day, may be traced to this source. To hold in the flesh with a strong hand, to crucify it, to bring the needs of his own life, Thoreau and Tolstoi-like, within the narrowest limits, are positive delights to him, only to be rivalled by the joy of guiding other lives into the same path.

I write this in the house in which he usually lives when in Johannesburg. Yonder is the open stove—there is the rolled-up mattress on which he sleeps. It would be difficult to imagine a life less open to the assaults of pride or sloth than the life lived here. Everything that can minister to the flesh is adjured. Of all men, Mr. Gandhi reminds one of "*Purun Dass,*" of whom Kipling writes:—"He had used his wealth and his power for what he knew both to be worth, had taken honour when it came in his way; he had seen men and cities far and near, and men and cities had stood up and honoured him. Now he would let these things go, as a man drops the cloak he needs no longer." This is a graphic picture of our friend. He simply does what he believes to be his duty, accepts every experience that ensues with calmness, takes honour if it comes, without pride; and then, "lets it go as a man drops the cloak he needs no longer," should duty bring dishonour. In the position of "Purun Bhagat," he would do easily what the Bhagat did, and no one, even now, would be surprised to see him go forth at some call which no one else can hear, his crutch under this arm, his begging bowl in his hand, an antelope skin flung around him, and a smile of deep content on his lips.

> "That man alone is wise
> Who keeps the mastery of himself."

Mr. Gandhi is not a Christian in any orthodox sense. Perhaps orthodox Christianity has itself to blame for this. There is little inducement in these Colonies for an Indian to recognise the Loveliness of Christ under the disguise in which Christianity clothes the Lord. What interest has the Christian Church in Johannesburg shown in these thousands from India and China, who for years have been resident in our midst? Practically none. Are they encouraged to believe that they, too, are souls for whom Christ died? By no means. Here and there individual efforts have been made, and some few Indians attend Christian places of worship, but for the most part they have been left severely alone, while the few men, who have tried to show that thre is still a heart of love in the Church of Christ, and have dared to speak a word on behalf of

a suffering people, have been subjected to all manner of abuse, and have been made to suffer with them. It is this discrepancy between a beautiful creed and our treatment of the Indian at the door, which repels the man who thinks.

We have failed, too, I believe, to realise the inwardness of this Passive Resistance movement; and the apparent indifference of the Churches has been deeply felt by these men. In reality, it is not a trade dispute, nor is it a political move; these are incidents of the struggle. It is a sign of the awakening of the Asiatics to a sense of their manhood, the token that they do not mean to play a servile or degraded part in our Society; it is their claim, put forward in suffering, to be treated by Christians in a Christian way. This is the wonderful vision which Government and Churches alike have failed to see.

Meanwhile, although, to my thinking, the seeker has not yet reached the goal, that wonderful experience of Christ which is the glory of the Christian faith, enriching the wealthiest life, and giving new power to the strong, I cannot forget what the Master himself said:—"Not everyone who saith unto me, Lord, shall enter the Kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven." (*From Rev. Doke's Gandhi*).

II. THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF SATYAGRAHASRAMA

OBJECT

The object of this home is to learn how to serve the motherland and to serve it.

DIVISIONS

This home is divided into three classes ;—Managers, Candidates and Students,

(1) MANAGERS

Managers believe that, in order to learn how to serve the country, the following observances should be enforced in their own lives, and they have been doing so for some time.

1. THE VOW OF TRUTH

It is not enough that one ordinarily does not resort to untruth ; one ought to know that no deception may be practised even for the good of the country, that Truth may require opposition to one's parents and elders. Consider the example of Prahlad.

2. THE VOW OF AHIMSA (NON-KILLING)

It is not enough not to take the life of any living being. The follower of this Vow may not hurt even those whom he believes to be unjust; he may not be angry with them, he must love them: thus he would oppose the tyranny whether of parents, governments or others, but will never hurt the tyrant. The follower of Truth and Ahimsa will conquer the tyrant by love, he will not carry out the tyrant's will but he will suffer punishment even unto death for disobeying his will until the tyrant himself is conquered.

3. THE VOW OF CELIBACY

It is well nigh impossible to observe the foregoing two Vows unless celibacy is also observed: for this vow it is not enough that one does not look upon another woman with a lustful eye, he has so to control his animal passions that they will not be moved even in thought: if he is married he will not have a carnal mind regarding his wife but considering her as his life-long friend, will establish with her the relationship of perfect purity.

---

* A translation of the Gujarati draft constitution.

4. CONTROL OF THE PALATE

Until one has overcome the pleasures of the palate it is difficult to observe the foregoing Vows, more especially that of celibacy. Control of the Palate is therefore treated as a separate observance. One desirous of serving the country will believe that eating is necessary only for sustaining the body, he will, therefore, daily regulate and purify his diet and will either gradually or immediately in accordance with his ability leave off such foods as may tend to stimulate animal passions or are otherwise unnecessary.

5. THE VOW OF NON-STEALING

It is not enough not to steal what is commonly considered as other men's property. It is theft if we use articles which we do not really need. Nature provides from day to day just enough and no more for our daily needs.

6. THE VOW OF NON-POSSESSION

It is not enough not to possess and keep much, but it is necessary not to keep anything which may not be absolutely necessary for our bodily wants: thus if one can do without chairs, one should do so. The follower of this vow will, therefore, by constantly thinking thereover, simplify his life.

SUBSIDIARY OBSERVANCES

Two observances are reduced from the foregoing.

1. SWADESHI

It is inconsistent with Truth to use articles about which or about whose makers there is a possibility of deception. Therefore, for instance, a votary of Truth will not use articles manufactured in the mills of Manchester, Germany or India, for he does not know that there is no deception about them. Moreover labourers suffer much in the mills. Use of fire in the mills causes enormous destruction of life besides killing labourers before their time. Foreign goods and goods made by means of complicated machinery are, therefore, tabooed to a votary of Ahimsa. Further reflection will show that use of such goods will involve a breach of the vows of non-stealing and non-possession. We wear foreign goods in preference to simple goods made in our own hand looms because custom attributes greater beauty to them. Artificial beautifying of the body is a hindrance to a Brahmachari; he will, therefore, avoid the use of any but the simplest goods. Therefore the vow of Swadeshi requires the use of simple and simply made clothing to the exclusion of even buttons, foreign cuts, etc., and so will Swadeshi be applied to every department of life.

2. FEARLESSNESS

He who is acted upon by fear can hardly follow Truth or Ahimsa. Managers will, therefore, endeavour to be free from

the fear of kings, people, caste, families, thieves, robbers, ferocious animals such as tigers and even death. A truly fearless man will defend himself against others by truth-force or soul-force.

VERNACULARS

It is the belief of the managers that no nation can make real progress by abandoning its own languages; they will, therefore, train themselves through the medium of their respective vernaculars and as they desire to be on terms of intimacy with their brethren from all parts of India, they will learn the chief Indian languages, and as Sanskrit is the key to all the Indian languages, they will learn that also.

HAND LABOUR

Managers believe that body labour is a duty imposed by nature upon mankind. We may, therefore, resort to bodily labour alone for our sustenance and use our mental and spiritual powers for the common good only, and as the largest percentage in the world lives upon agriculture, managers will devote some part of their time to working on the land: and when such is not possible, perform some other bodily labour.

HAND LOOMS

Managers believe that one of the chief causes of poverty in the land is the virtual disappearance of cotton-spinning wheels and hand looms. They will, therefore, make a great effort to revive this industry by working upon hand looms themselves.

POLITICS

Politics, economic progress, etc., are not considered to be independent branches of learning but that they are all rooted in religion. An effort will, therefore, be made to learn Politics, Economics, Social Reform, etc., in a religious spirit, and work in connection with these matters will be taken up by the managers with energy and devotion.

(2) CANDIDATES

Those who are desirous of following out the foregoing programme but are not able immediately to take the necessary vows may be admitted as candidates. It is obligatory upon them to conform to the observances referred to above, though they do not take the vows, whilst they are in the Ashram and they will occupy the status of managers, when they are able to take the necessary vows.

(3) STUDENTS

1. Any children whether boys or girls from four years and upwards may be admitted.

2. Parents will have to surrender all control over their children.

3. Children may not be permitted to visit their parents until the whole course of study is finished.

4. Students will be taught to observe all the vows observable by the managers.

5. They will be taught principles of religion, agriculture, hand loom weaving and literature.

6. Literary knowledge will be imparted through the respective vernaculars of the students and will include History, Geography, Mathematics, Economics, etc., learning of Sanskrit, Hindi and at least one Dravidian Vernacular is obligatory.

7. English will be taught as a second language.

8. They will be taught Urdu, Bengali, Tamil, Telugu and Devanagiri characters.

9. Managers believe that the whole course will be completed in ten years. Upon reaching the age of majority, students will be given the option of taking the vows referred to in section 1 or retire from the Ashram, if its programme has not commended itself to them.

10. This option they will exercise when no longer they will require the assistance of their parents or other guardians.

11. Every endeavour will be made to teach the students from the very beginning not to have the fear, "what shall I do for my maintenance if and when I become an independent man."

12. Grown up persons also may be admitted as students.

13. As a rule the simplest and the same style of clothing will be worn by all.

14. Food will be simple. Chillies will be excluded altogether and no condiments will be used generally except salt, pepper and turmeric. Milk and its products being a hindrance to a celebate life and milk being often a cause of tuberculosis, and having the same stimulating qualities as meat will be most sparingly used if at all. Food will be served thrice. In it dried and fresh fruits will be liberally used. All in the Ashram will be taught principles of Hygiene.

15. There will be no vacation in this Ashram and no holidays as a rule, but during 1½ days per week the ordinary routine will be altered and students will have leisure to attend to their private personal work.

16. During 3 months in the year those whose health permits will be enabled to travel mostly on foot in the different parts of India.

17. No fees will be charged either against students or candidates but parents or members themselves will be expected to contribute as much as they can towards the expenses of the Ashram.

MISCELLANEOUS

The management will be controlled solely by the managers. The chief manager will control all admissions. The expenses of conducting the Ashram are being met from moneys already received by the chief manager and being received from friends who are more or less believers in this Ashram. The Ashram is situated in 2 houses on the banks of the Sabarmati, Ahmedabad. It is expected that in a few months about 100 acres of ground will be acquired for locating the Ashram thereon.

NOTICE

Visitors are requested during their stay at the Ashram to observe as nearly as possible the rules of the Ashram. Every endeavour will be made to make them comfortable; but they will confer upon the management a favour if they will bring with them their bedding and eating utensils. Those parents who intend sending their children to the Ashram are advised to visit the Ashram. No children will be admitted without being thoroughly examined as to their mental and moral condition.

III. THE MEMORIAL TO MR. MONTAGU

The Gujarat Sabha of Ahmedabad under the direction of Mr. M.K. Gandhi devised an excellent idea of presenting a monster petition to the Right Hon'ble Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, and H. E. the Viceroy in 1917, supporting the Congress-League Scheme of Self-Government for India. The idea was taken up by the leading political organizations in India. The following is the English translation of the Gujarati petition :—

To the Rt. Hon. Mr. E. S. Montagu, Secretary of State for India.

The petition of the British Subjects of Gujarat humbly sheweth,—

(1) The petitioners have considered and understood the Swaraj scheme prepared by the Council of the All-India Moslem League and the All-India Congress Committee and unanimously adopted last year by the Indian National Congress and the All-India Moslem League.

(2) The petitioners approve of the scheme.

(3) In the humble opinion of the petitioners, the reforms proposed in the aforementioned scheme are absolutely necessary in the interests of India and the Empire.

(4) It is further the petitioners' belief that without such reforms India will not witness the era of true contentment.

For these reasons the petitioners respectfully pray that you will be pleased to give full consideration to and accept the reform proposals and thus render successful your visit taken at great inconvenience and fulfil the national hope.

And for this act of kindness, the petitioners shall, for ever, remain grateful.

RULES FOR VOLUNTEERS

Mr. Gandhi also devised the following rules for the Volunteers to obtain signature :—

1. In taking signatures to the petition, first it must be ascertained whether the person signing correctly understands the scheme described in the petition or not.

2. In order to make people understand the scheme, it should be read out to the inhabitants of the place, called together by a notification prepared by the Sabha. If, in such reading, the people raise any new question, which cannot be answered out of the

Foreword, then the Volunteer should not decide the point himself but should refer it to the Chief of his own Circle; and the questioner should not be allowed to sign so long as he has not been satisfied.

3. It should be clearly kept in mind that no kind of pressure is to be used on any inhabitant of any place.

4. Care should be taken that Government servants, as also people who are unable to understand, do not sign by oversight.

5. Signatures should not be taken from young people, who appear to be under the age of eighteen.

6. Signatures should not be taken from school-going students whatever their age may be.

7. There is no objection in taking signatures from any man or woman if the Volunteer is convinced that he or she can understand the matter.

8. A man or woman who is unable to read or write, should be made to put his or her cross and an authentication of it by a well-known person of the place should be placed opposite the cross.

9. It should be kept in mind that each signature is to be taken on two forms.

10. The papers should be preserved without being soiled or crumbled.

11. The papers which are not signed should at once be sent to the Head Office; and a report should at once be sent to the Head Office from the place where a meeting has been held or some attempt made.

12. The Volunteer has no authority to make any speech on any subject outside the scope of petition or on any subject relating to but not included in the Foreword.

13. First the inhabitants of a place should be called together and the Foreword read out to them and their signatures taken. After that as many houses as can be practicable should be visited and the signatures of the rest of the men and women taken. But these should be taken only after the Foreword has been explained.

14. If while visiting places or calling together people, the police or any other officials object, the Volunteer should politely reply that so long as the Head Office does not direct the cessation of work he would have to continue his work. If in doing this, he is arrested by the police, he should allow himself to be arrested, but he should not resist the police. And if such a thing happens, he should at once send a detailed report to the Head Office. If people themselves hesitate to gather together through the fear of the police or for any other cause, the Volunteer should give up that place and should at once give information of such an occurrence to the Head Office.

IV THE SWADESHI VOW

The following are translations of Mr. M. K. Gandhi's two articles on Swadeshi contributed to vernacular papers on the day previous to that which was fixed for taking that vow in Bombay. The English versions originally appeared in the "Bombay Chronicle".

I

Although the desire for Swadeshi animating a large number of people at the present moment is worthy of all praise, it seems to me that they have not fully realised the difficulty in the way of its observance. Vows are always taken only in respect of matters otherwise difficult of accomplishment. When after a series of efforts we fail in doing certain things, by taking a vow to do them we draw a cordon round ourselves, from which we may never be free and thus we avoid failures. Anything less than such inflexible determination cannot be called a vow. It is not a pledge or vow when we say we shall so far as possible do certain acts. If by saying that we shall, so far as we can only use Swadeshi articles, we can be deemed to have taken the Swadeshi vow, then from the Viceroy down to the labouring man very few people would be found who could not be considered to have taken the pledge, but we want to go outside this circle and aim at a much higher goal. And there is as much difference between the act contemplated by us and the acts above described as there is between a right angle and all other angles. And if we decide to take the Swadeshi vow in this spirit it is clear that it is well nigh impossible to take an all-comprehensive vow.

After having given deep consideration to the matter for a number of years, it is sufficiently demonstrated to me that we can take the full Swadeshi vow only in respect of our clothing, whether made of cotton, silk or wool. Even in observing this vow we shall have to face many difficulties in the initial stages and that is only proper. By patronising foreign cloth we have committed a deep sin. We have abandoned an occupation which, in point of importance, is second only to agriculture, and we are face to face with a total disruption of a calling to which Kabir was born and which he adorned. One meaning of the Swadeshi vow suggested by me is that in taking it we desire to do penance for our sins, that we desire to resuscitate the almost lost art of hand-weaving, and that we are determined to save our Hindustan crores of rupees which go out of it annually in exchange for the cloth we receive. Such high results cannot be attained without difficulties; there must be obstacles in the way. Things easily obtained are practically of no value, but,

however difficult of observance that pledge may be, some day or other there is no escape from it, if we want our country to rise to its full height. And we shall then accomplish the vow when we shall deem it a religious duty to use only that cloth which is entirely produced in the country and refrain from using any another.

A HASTY GENERALISATION

Friends tell me that at the present moment we have not enough Swadeshi cloth to supply our wants and that the existing mills are too few for the purpose. This appears to me to be a hasty generalisation. We can hardly expect such good fortune as to have thirty crores of covenanters for Swadeshi. A hardened optimist dare not expect more than a few lakhs and I anticipate no difficulty in providing them with Swadeshi cloth, but where there is a question of religion there is no room for thoughts of difficulties. The general climate of India is such that we require very little clothing. It is no exaggeration to say that three-fourths of the middle class population use much unnecessary clothing. Moreover when many men take the vow there would be set up many spinning wheels and hand looms. India can produce innumerable weavers. They are merely awaiting encouragement. Mainly two things are needful, *viz.*, self-denial and honesty. It is self-evident that the covenanter must possess these two qualities, but in order to enable people to observe such a great vow comparatively easily, our merchants also will need to be blessed with these qualities. An honest and self-denying merchant will spin his yarn only from Indian cotton and confine weaving only to such cotton. He will only use those dyes which are made in India. When a man desires to do a thing, he cultivates the necessary ability to remove difficulties in his path.

DESTROY ALL FOREIGN CLOTHING

It is not enough that we manage if necessary with as little clothing as possible, but for a full observance it is further necessary to destroy all foreign clothing, in our possession. If we are satisfied that we erred in making use of foreign cloth, that we have done an immense injury to India, that we have all but destroyed the race of weavers, cloth stained with such sin is only fit to be destroyed. In this connection it is necessary to understand the distinction between Swadeshi and Boycott. Swadeshi is a religious conception. It is the natural duty imposed upon every man. The well-being of people depends upon it and the Swadeshi vow cannot be taken in a punitive or revengeful spirit. The Swadeshi vow is not derived from any extraneous happening, whereas Boycott is a purely worldly and political weapon. It is rooted in ill-will and a desire for punishment; and I can see nothing but harm in the end for a nation that resorts to boycott. One who wishes to be a Satyagrahi for ever cannot participate in any Boycott movement and a perpetual Satyagraha is impossible without Swadeshi. This is the meaning I have understood to be given to boycott. It has

been suggested that we should boycott British goods till the Rowlatt legislation is withdrawn, and that the boycott should terminate with the removal of that legislation. In such a scheme of boycott it is open to us to take Japanese or other foreign goods, even though they may be rotten. If I must use foreign goods, having political relations with England I would only take English goods and consider such conduct to be proper.

In proclaiming a boycott of British goods we expose ourselves to the charge of desiring to punish the English, but we have no quarrel with them; our quarrel is with the Governors. And, according to the law of Satyagraha, we may not harbour any ill-will even against the rulers, and as we may harbour no ill-will, I cannot see the propriety of resorting to boycott.

THE SWADESHI PLEDGE

For a complete observance of the restricted Swadeshi vow suggested above, I would advise the following text:—"With God as my witness, I solemnly declare that from to-day I shall confine myself, for my personal requirements, to the use of cloth, manufactured in India from Indian cotton, silk and wool; and I shall altogether abstain from using foreign cloth, and I shall destroy all foreign cloth in my possession."

II.

For a proper observance of the pledge it is really necessary to use only handwoven cloth made out of handspun yarn. Imported yarn even though spun out of Indian cotton and woven in India is not Swadeshi cloth. We shall reach perfection only when our cotton is spun in India on indigenous spinning wheels and yarns so spun is woven on similarly made hand looms. But the requirements of the foregoing pledge are met if we all only use cloth woven by means of imported machinery from yarn spun from Indian cotton by means of similar machinery.

I may add that the covenantors to the restricted Swadeshi referred to here will not rest satisfied with Swadeshi clothing only. They will extend the vow to all other things as far as possible.

ENGLISH-OWNED MILLS

I am told that there are in India English-owned mills which do not admit Indian shareholders. If this information be true, I would consider cloth manufactured in such mills to be foreign cloth. Moreover, such cloth bears the taint of ill-will. However well-made such cloth may be it should be avoided.

Thousands of men believe that by using cloth woven in Indian mills they comply with the requirements of the Swadeshi vow. The fact is that most fine cloth is made out of foreign cotton spun outside India. Therefore the only satisfaction to be derived from the use of such cloth

is that it is woven in India. Even on handlooms for every fine cloth only foreign yarn is used. The use of such cloth does not amount to an observance as Swadeshi. To say so is simple self-deception. Satyagraha, *i.e.*, insistence on truth is necessary even in Swadeshi. When men will say, 'we shall confine ourselves to pure Swadeshi cloth, even though we may have to remain satisfied with a mere loincloth,' and when women will resolutely say, 'we shall observe pure Swadeshi even though we may have to restrict ourselves to clothing just enough to satisfy the sense of modesty,' then shall we be successful in the observance of the great Swadeshi vow. If a few thousand men and women were to take the Swadeshi vow in this spirit others will try to imitate them so far as possible. They will then begin to examine their wardrobes in the light of Swadeshi. Those who are not attached to pleasures and personal adornment, I venture to say, can give a great impetus to Swadeshi.

KEY TO ECONOMIC SALVATION

Generally speaking, there are very few villages in India without weavers. From time immemorial we have had village farmers and village weavers, as we have village carpenters, shoemakers, blacksmiths, etc., but our farmers have become poverty-stricken and our weavers have patronage only from the poor classes. By supplying them with Indian cotton spun in India we can obtain the cloth we may need. For the time being it may be coarse, but by constant endeavours we can get our weavers to weave out fine yarn and so doing we shall raise our weavers to a better status, and if we would go a step still further we can easily cross the sea of difficulties lying in our path. We can easily teach our women and our children to spin and weave cotton, and what can be purer than cloth woven in our own home; I say it from my experience that acting in this way we shall be saved from many a hardship, we shall be ridding ourselves of many an unnecessary need, and our life will be one song of joy and beauty. I always hear divine voices telling me in my ears that such life was a matter of fact once in India, but even if such an India be the idle dream of the poet, it does not matter. Is it not necessary to create such an India now? Does not our *purushartha* lie therein? I have been travelling throughout India. I cannot bear the heart-rending cry of the poor. The young and old all tell me, 'we cannot get cheap cloth, we have not the means wherewith to purchase dear cloth. Everything is dear, provisions, cloth and all. What are we to do?' and they have a sign of despair. It is my duty to give these men a satisfactory reply. It is the duty of every servant of the country, but I am unable to give a satisfactory reply. It should be intolerable for all thinking Indians that our raw materials should be exported to Europe and that we have to pay heavy prices therefore. The first and the last remedy for this is *Swadeshi*. We are not bound to sell our cotton to anybody, and when Hindustan rings with the echoes of Swadeshi, no producer of cotton will sell it for

its being manufactured in foreign countries. When Swadeshi pervades the country every one will be set a-thinking why cotton should not be refined and spun and woven in the place where it is produced, and when the Swadeshi *mantra* resounds in every ear millions of men will have in their hands the key to the economic salvation of India. Training for this does not require hundreds of years. When the religious sense is awakened people's thoughts undergo a revolution in a single moment. Only selfless sacrifice is the *sine qua non*. The spirit of sacrifice pervades the Indian atmosphere at the present moment. If we fail to preach Swadeshi at this supreme moment we shall have to wring our hands in despair. I beseech every Hindu, Mussalman, Sikh, Parsi, Christian and Jew, who believes that he belongs to this country to take the Swadeshi vow and to ask others also to do likewise It is my humble belief that if we cannot do even this little for our country, we are born in it in vain. Those who think deep will see that such Swadeshi contains pure economics. I hope that every man and woman will give serious thought to my humble suggestion. Imitation of English economics will spell our ruin.

APPENDIX II

APPRECIATIONS

COUNT LEO TOLSTOY

"God help our dear brothers and co-workers in the Transvaal! That same struggle of the tender against the harsh of meekness and love against pride and violence, is every year making itself more and more felt here among us also, especially in one of the very sharpest of the conflicts of the religious law with the worldly laws, in refusals of Military Service. Such refusals are becoming ever more and more frequent. I greet you fraternally, and am glad to have intercourse with you."

Your activity in the Transvaal, as it seems to us, at the end of the world, is the most essential work, the most important of all the work now being done in the world, and in which not only the nations of the Christian, but of all the world, will unavoidably take part. (*Letter to Mr. Gandhi.*)

PROF. GILBERT MURRAY

Let me take a present day instance of this battle between a soul and a Government, a very curious instance, because it is almost impossible without more knowledge than most people in England possess to say who was wrong and who right.

About the year 1889 a young Indian student called Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, came to England to study law. He was rich and clever, of a cultivated family, gentle and modest in his manner. He dressed and behaved like other people. There was nothing particular about him to show that he had already taken a Jain vow to abstain from wine, from flesh, and from sexual intercourse. He took his degree and became a successful lawyer in Bombay, but he cared more for religion than law. Gradually his asceticism increased. He gave away all his money to good causes except the meagrest allowance. He took vows of poverty. He ceased to practise at the law because his religion—a mysticism which seems to be as closely related to Christianity as it is to any traditional Indian religion—forbade him to take part in a system which tried to do right by violence. When I met him in England in 1914, he ate, I believe, only rice, and drank only water, and slept on the floor; and his wife who seemed to be his companion in everything, lived in the same way. His conversation was that of a cultivated and well-read man

with a certain indefinable suggestion of saintliness. His patriotism, which is combined with an enthusiastic support of England against Germany, is interwoven with his religion, and aims at the moral regeneration of India on the lines of Indian thought, with no barriers between one Indian and another, to the exclusion as far as possible of the influence of the West with its industrial slavery, its material civilisation, its money-worship, and its wars. (I am merely stating this view, of course, not either criticising it or suggesting that it is right.)

Oriental peoples, perhaps owing to causes connected with their form of civilisation, are apt to be enormously influenced by great saintliness of character when they see it. Like all great masses of ignorant people, however, they need some very plain and simple test to assure them that their hero is really a saint and not a humbug, and the test they habitually apply is that of self denial. Take vows of poverty, live on rice and water and they will listen to your preaching as several of our missionaries have found; come to them eating and drinking and dressed in expensive European clothes—and they feel differently. It is far from a perfect test, but there is something in it. At any rate I am told that Gandhi's influence in India is now enormous, almost equal to that of his friend, the late Mr. Gokhale.

And now for the battle. In South Africa there are some 150,000 Indians, chiefly in Natal; and the South African Government, feeling that the colour question in its territories was quite sufficiently difficult already, determined to prevent the immigration of any more Indians, and if possible to expel those who were already there. This last could not be done. It violated a treaty: it was opposed by Natal, where much of the industry depended on Indian labour; and it was objected to by Indian Government and the Home Government. Then began a long struggle. The whites of South Africa determined to make life in South Africa undesirable, if not for all Indians, at least for all Indians above the coolie class. Indians were specially taxed; were made to register in a degrading way; they were classed with Negroes; their thumb-prints were taken by the police as if they were criminals. If, owing to the scruples of the Government, the law was in any case too lenient, patriotic mobs undertook to remedy the defect. Quite early in the struggle the Indians in South Africa asked Mr. Gandhi to come and help them. He came as a barrister in 1893; he was forbidden to plead. He proved his right to plead; he won his case against the Asiatic Exclusion Act on grounds of constitutional law, and returned to India. Gandhi came again in 1895. He was mobbed and nearly killed at Durban. I will not tell in detail how he settled down eventually in South Africa as a leader and counseller to his people; how he found a settlement in the country outside Durban, where the workers should live directly on the land, and all be bound by a vow of poverty. For many

years he was engaged in constant passive resistance to the Government and constant efforts to raise and ennoble the inward life of the Indian community. But he was unlike other strikers or resisters in this: that mostly the resister takes advantage of any difficulty of the Government in order to press his claim the harder. Gandhi, when the Government was in any difficulty that he thought serious, always relaxed his resistance and offered his help. In 1899 came the Boer War. Gandhi immediately organised an Indian Red Cross Unit There was a popular movement for refusing it and treating it as seditious. But it was needed. The soldiers wanted it. It served through the War, and was mentioned in despatches, and thanked publicly for its skilful work and courage under fire. In 1904 there was an outbreak of plague in Johannesburg and Gandhi had private hospital opened before the public authorities had begun to act. In 1906 there was a Native rebellion in Natal; Gandhi raised and personally led a corps of stretcher bearers, whose work seems to have proved particularly dangerous and painful Gandhi was thanked by the Governor in Natal and shortly afterwards thrown into jail in Johannesburg.

Lastly in 1913 when he was being repeatedly imprisoned among criminals of the lowest class, and his followers were in jail to the member of 2,500; in the very midst of the general strike of Indians in the Transvaal and Natal, there occurred the sudden and dangerous railway strike which endangered for the time the very existence of organised society in South Africa. From the ordinary agitator's point of view the game was in Gandhi's hands. He had only to strike his hardest. Instead he gave order for his people to resume work till the Government should be safe again. I cannot say how often he was imprisoned, how often mobbed and assaulted, or what pains were taken to mortify and humiliate him in public. But by 1913 the Indian case had been taken up by Lord Hardinge and the Government of India. An Imperial Commission reported in his favour on most of the points at issue and an Act was passed according to the Commission's recommendations, entitled the Indian Relief Act.

My sketch is very imperfect; the story forms an extraordinary illustration of a contest which was won, or practically won, by a policy of doing no wrong, committing no violence, but simply enduring all the punishments the other side could inflict until they become weary and ashamed of punishing. A battle of the unaided human soul against overwhelming material force, and it ends by the units of material force gradually deserting their own banners and coming round to the side of the soul!

Persons in power should be very careful how they deal with a man who cares nothing for sensual pleasure, nothing for riches, nothing for comfort or praise or promotion, but is simply determined to do what he believes to be right. He is a dangerous and

uncomfortable enemy because his body, which you can always conquer, gives you so little purchase upon his soul. (*Hibbert Journal*).

LORD HARDINGE

Recently your compatriots in South Africa have taken matters into their own hands, by organising 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. (*Speech at Madras, December, 1913.*)

LORD AMPTHILL

Mr. Gandhi has been denounced in this country, even by responsible persons, as an ordinary agitator; there have not even been wanting suggestions that his motives are those of self-interest and pecuniary profits.

A perusal of these pages (Doke's Gandhi) * ought to dispel any such notions from the mind of any fair man who has been misled into entertaining them. And with a better knowledge of the man, there must come a better knowledge of the matter.

* * * *

I have no more earnest hope than that Mr. Gandhi and his fellow-countrymen may see the accomplishment of that end, for which they have struggled so bravely and sacrificed so much, before this book is published. (*From the Introduction to Rev. Mr. Doke's book "An Indian Patriot in South Africa.*)"

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS

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 the men who have thrown him into prison and yet call themselves by the name of Christ. (Loud applause.) (*Speech at the Y. M. C. A. Auditorium, December*, 1913).

---

* M. K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa. By Rev. Joseph Doke; with an Introduction by Lord Ampthill. Price Re. 1. G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras.

LORD GLADSTONE

Mr. Gandhi has shown a single-minded devotion to his cause which has won the admiration of all who understand the difficulty and danger of the position. [*Letter to the Chairman of the Reception Committee at the Hotel Cecil, London, 8th August, 1914*].

THE HON. MR. JAMESON

As for Mr. Gandhi, he would leave behind him a high reputation of whole-heartedness of purpose, of healthy ambition and self-sacrifice, and of everything which an Englishman respected in the making of a man. (*At a Farewell Meeting at Durban, July, 1914.*)

Indian Opinion—SOUTH AFRICA, 1914

It has been our lot to bid farewell to many a friend during the years this journal has been in existence, but never before have we experienced such a sense of loss as we do at the present moment by the departure of Mr. Gandhi and his dear wife to India. Mr. Gandhi's associations with this paper and the Phœnix Settlement have been so intimate that we cannot trust ourselves to make any lengthy reference to his various activities on our behalf. Mr. Gandhi is a part of ourselves; his life has been our life; his ideals ours. It is not possible to express in printed words our feelings on this occasion. He has been "a guide, philosopher and friend" and, what is much more, a brother in whom we have confided our joys and sorrows, our hopes and fears. We venture to say that his influence upon us will remain even though his physical body is removed to a distance. We only hope that our feeble efforts on behalf of the Indian community and the Empire will possess some spark of the greatness of purpose, nobleness of mind and selflessness of character that have so marked the life of Mr. Gandhi. Mrs. Gandhi has played the part of both mother and sister and we shall ever remember her with affection and esteem.

SIR HENRY COTTON

Mr. Gandhi had practically won the battle he had been fighting and was returning to India to resume, as they all hoped, the practice of his profession under happier auspices than it had been his fate to enjoy in South Africa, and to meet the thousands of his countrymen by whom his name would never be forgotten. (*Farewell in London*).

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS, M.P.

The work which Mr. Gandhi had at heart was mainly accomplished as far as South Africa was concerned, although it might remain to be more completely fulfilled in other parts of the Empire. He should like to take the opportunity of thanking Mr. Gandhi for

the help he had rendered to the ambulance movement, and to testify to the really excellent work which Indians were doing in connection with it. (Hear, Hear). It might be that in leaving England Mr. Gandhi felt to some extent disappointed in the hope of giving that help which he had so willingly afforded in South Africa; but the prospect lay before him of more good work in India. (Hear, Hear). (*Farewell Meeting in London*).

SENATOR W.P. SCHREINER

He had great pleasure in testifying here that among the pure spirited men who worked for no gain, no profit, many kicks, but with high ideals, they could recommend themselves to Mr. Gandhi. An unselfish man, one whom, he was proud to say, he recognised as a member of the profession to which he himself belonged, and one who in any other calling might have made great gains. In going round with Mr. Gandhi he believed Mr Gokhale would be introduced, without any bias and bitterness, to the problems in detail which he would have to meet. (*Speech at the Cape Town Meeting, Oct. 22*, 1912.)

G. K. GOKHALE

Only those who have come in personal contact with Mr. 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. Nay more. He has in him the marvellous spiritual power to turn ordinary men around him into heroes and martyrs. During the recent passive resistance struggle in the Transvaal—would you believe it?—twenty-seven hundred sentences of imprisonment were borne by our countrymen there under Mr. Gandhi's guidance to uphold the honour of their country. Some of the men among them were very substantial persons, some were small traders, but the bulk of them were poor humble individuals, hawkers, working men and so forth, men without education, men not accustomed in their life to think or talk of their country. And yet these men braved the horrors of jail life in the Transvaal and some of them braved them again and again rather than submit to degrading legislation directed against their country. Many homes were broken in the course of that struggle, many families dispersed, some men at one time wealthy lost their all and became paupers, women and children endured untold hardships. But they were touched by Mr. Gandhi's spirit and that had wrought the transformation, thus illustrating the great power which the spirit of man can exercise over human minds and even over physical surroundings. In all my life 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. The Indian cause in South

Africa has really been built up by Mr. Gandhi. Without self and without stain, he has fought his great fight for this country during a period now of twenty years, and India owes an immense debt of gratitude to him. He has sacrificed himself utterly in the service of the cause. He had a splendid practice at the Bar, making as much as £5,000 to £6,000 a year, which is considered to be a very good income for a lawyer in South Africa. But he has given all that up and he lives now on £3 a month like the poorest man in the street. One most striking fact about him is that, though he has waged this great struggle so ceaselessly, his mind is absolutely free from all bitterness against Europeans. And in my tour nothing warmed my heart more than to see the universal esteem in which the European community in South Africa holds Mr. Gandhi. At every gathering, leading Europeans, when they come to know that Mr. Gandhi was there, would immediately gather round him anxious to shake hands with him, making it quite clear that though they fought him hard and tried to crush him in the course of the struggle they honoured him as a man. To my mind Mr. Gandhi's leadership of the Indian cause in South Africa is the greatest asset of that cause and it was an inestimable privilege to me that he was with me throughout my tour to pilot me safely through my difficulties *(Speech at the Bombay Town Hall Meeting in December, 1912)*

REV. JOSEPH DOKE

It would be difficult to imagine a life less open to the assaults of pride or sloth, than the life lived here. Everything that can minister to the flesh is abjured. Of all men Mr Gandhi reminds one of "Purum Dass", of whom Kipling writes :—"He had used his wealth and his power for what he knew both to be worth : he had taken honour when it came in his way ; he had seen men and cities far and near, and men and cities had stood up and honoured him. Now he would let these things go as a man drops the cloak he needs no longer. This is a graphic picture of our friend. He simply does what he believes to be his duty, accepts every experience that ensues with calmness, takes honour if it comes without pride : and then lets it go as a man drops the cloak he needs no longer." In the position of "Purum Bhagat," he would do easily what the Bhagat did and no one even now would be surprised to see him go forth at some call which no one else can hear, his crutch under arm, his begging bowl in his hand, an antelope skin flung around him, and a smile of deep content on his lips.

"That man alone is wise
Who keeps the mastery of himself."

(From "An Indian Patriot in South Africa)"

MRS. ANNIE BESANT

Among us, as I write, is dwelling for brief space one whose presence is a benediction, and whose feet sanctify every house into which he enters—Gandhi, our Martyr and Saint. He too by strange ways was led into circumstances in which alone could flower all that he brought with him of patient, unwearying courage that naught might daunt, unselfishness that found its joy in sacrifice, endurance so sweetly gentle that its power was not readily understood. As I stood for a moment facing him, hand clasped in hand, I saw in him that deathless Spirit which redeems by suffering, and in death wins life for others, one of those marked out for the high service of becoming Saviours and Helpers of humanity, I who tread the path of the warrior, not that of the Saint, who battle against Enthroned Injustice by assault, not by meakness, I recognise in this man, so frail and yet so mighty, one of those whose names live in history among those of whom it is said : "He saved others : himself he could not save". *(New India).*

SIR P. M. MEHTA

"The whole country has resounded with the tale of Mr. Gandhi's great deeds, his courage, his great moral qualities, his labours and his sufferings in the cause of Indians in South Africa. So long as we have Indians like Mr. Gandhi and Indian women like Mrs. Gandhi we need not despair of our country. They show that at the proper time and as occasion may arise they are possessed of the highest qualities of courage, heroism and capacity of endurance and suffering." *(At the Bombay Town Hall Meeting in December, 1912)*

I tell you what I feel sincerely that there has been no more touching episode in the whole history of the campaign than the conversation which Mrs. Gandhi had with her husband before she cast in her lot with him in the Passive Resistance Movement. After the decision of the Supreme Court there denying the legitimacy of Hindu and Mahomedan marriages, she asked him : "Am I your wife or not? I am not your wife if this decision stands, and if I am not your wife, I am not a woman of any true womanhood in the estimation of my own sex, and my children are illegitimate." Mr. Gandhi must have known what it was to expose tender women to the hardships of the campaign, but in spite of his pleading, that brave lady decided to cast in her lot with those men who were fighting for the cause. History records the deeds of many heroines, and I feel that Mrs. Gandhi will stand as one of the foremost heroines in the whole world. *(Speech at the Bombay Town Hall Meeting, Dec., 1913).*

MRS. SAROJINI NAIDU

She (Mrs. Gandhi) sat by her husband's side simple and serene and dignified in the hour of triumph as she had proved herself simple and serene and dauntless in the hour of trial and tragedy.

I have a vision too of her brave, frail, pain worn hand which must have held aloft the lamp of her country's honour undimmed in an alien land, working at rough garments for wounded soldiers in another.

The great South African leader who, to quote Mr. Gokhale's apt phrase, had moulded heroes out of clay, was reclining, a little ill and weary, on the floor eating his frugal meal of nuts and fruits (which I shared) and his wife was busy and content as though she were a mere modest housewife absorbed in a hundred details of household service, and not the world famed heroine of a hundred noble sufferings in a nation's cause. (*From letter to Lady Mehta on Mrs Gandhi, February, 1915*)

Dr. Subramania Iyer

It is a life every incident in which from the day on which he set his foot on the South African soil to the day on which he left it, deserves to be recorded in every vernacular of this country in chaste and impressive language and distributed broadcast so that the knowledge thereof may extend to every man, woman or child (cheers). The work done by him is such as to extort from the historians of this century admiration. Great as has been the work done by him, my conviction is that the work he has done is simply a preparation to what he is destined to do in the future (cheers).

What is wanted in India is not so much martial capacity, physical force, power to threaten other people. We want the soul-force which Mr. Gandhi is trying to work up. Soul-force consists in a man being prepared to undergo any physical or mental suffering, taking the precaution that he will not lay a single finger to inflict physical force upon the other side. It was that soul-force that was manifested by the South African Indians and it was the same force that should be developed in this country. [*Speech in Madras in welcoming Mr. and Mrs. Gandhi, June, 1915.*]

Sir Rabindranath Tagore

The power our fellow-countrymen have shown in standing firm for their cause under severest trials, fighting unarmed against fearful odds, has given us a firmer faith in the strength of the God that can defy sufferings and defeats at the hands of physical supremacy, that can make its gains of its losses. [*Letter to Mr. Gandhi.*]

Bal Gangadhar Tilak

The duty of every patriot is to insist on the oppressions, miseries and complaints of the people in such a way that they may compel the attention of the Government and force them to bring in reform. Mr. Gandhi did this duty very well, and so he deserves the honour and praise given to him by the public. [*From the Foreword to Mr. Gandhi's "Life" in Marathi.*]

LALA LAJPAT RAI

Gandhi's simplicity, openness, frankness and directness confound the modern politician, parliamentarian and publicist. They suspect him of some deep design. He fears no one and frightens no one. He recognises no conventions except such as are absolutely necessary not to remove him from society of men and women. He recognises no masters and no *gurus*. He claims no *chelas* though he has many. He has and pretends to no supernatural powers, though credulous people believe that he is endowed with them. He owns no property, keeps no bank accounts, makes no investments, yet makes no fuss about asking for anything he needs. Such of his countrymen as have drunk deep from the fountains of European history and European politics and who have developed a deep love for European manners and European culture neither understand nor like him. In their eyes he is a barbarian, a visionary, and a dreamer. He has probably something of all these qualities, because he is nearest to the verities of life and can look at things with plain eyes without the glasses of civilization and sophistry.

Some say he is a nihilist; others that he is an anarchist; others again that he is a Tolstoian. He is none of these things. He is a plain Indian patriot who believes in God, religion and the Scriptures.

DR J. H. HOLMES

As he moves from city to city, crowds of thirty and even fifty thousand people assemble to hear his words. As he pauses for the night in a village, or in the open countryside, great throngs come to him as to a holy shrine. He would seem to be what the Indians regard him—the perfect and universal man In his personal character, he is simple and undefiled. In his political endeavours, he is as stern a realist as Lenin, working steadfastly toward a fair goal of liberation which must be won. At the same time, however, he is an idealist, like Romain Rolland living ever in the pure radiance of the spirit. When I think of Rolland, as I have said, I think of Tolstoi. When I think of Lenin, I think of Napoleon. But when I think of Gandhi, I think of Jesus Christ. He lives his life; he speaks his word; he suffers, strives and will some day nobly die, for His kingdom upon earth.

Do you recall how it is told of Jesus, that one day, as he was journeying, he heard his disciples quarrelling. And he said, "What were ye reasoning on the way?" And they said they had disputed who was the greatest. And Jesus said, "If any man would be first among you, let him be the servant of all."

MR. W. W. PEARSON

Whatever may be one's personal opinion of the Indian leader, M. K. Gandhi, there can be no doubt that he is a remarkable man. Remarkable because his standard of conduct and method of action are so entirely different from those of other Indian leaders. Statesmen and politicians are seldom guided by the motives which compel Gandhi to action, and the very fact that in him we see a man who wields enormous influence over his countrymen by a character—the exact antithesis of the ordinary political leader—gives to his personality a peculiar interest. One Governor of a British Province in the East has described him as "a dangerous and misguided saint." Everyone, whether foe or friend, agrees in regarding him as a saint. And it is because of his evident saintliness of character that he has such an unparalleled influence in India at the present day.

Gandhi has been able to unite people of India as they have never before been united not only because of his unfaltering loyalty to a moral ideal and by his austere and ascetic personal life, but because the British Government has itself fed fuel to the fires of national aspiration. Confronting the most powerful Empire in existence stands one man, Gandhi, who cares nothing for his own personal life, who is uncompromising and fearless in the application of principles which he has once accepted, and who scorns any longer to receive or beg for favours from a Government which he regards as having "forfeited all title to confidence, respect or support." He believes in conquering hate by love, in the triumph of right over might, and all the effort of his public life is directed towards persuading the masses of India of the truth of this ideal (*The Asian Review.*)

MR. PERCIVAL LANDON

Seated on the floor in a small, barely furnished room, I found the Mahatma, clad in rough, white home-spun. He turned up to me, with a smile of welcome the typical head of the idealist—the skull well formed and finely modelled; the face narrowing to the pointed chin. His eyes are deep, kindly, and entirely same; his hair is greying a little over the forehead. He speaks gently and well, and in his voice is a note of detachment which lends uncanny force to the strange doctrines that he has given up his life to teach One could not imagine him ruffled, hasty, or resentful, not the least part of the moral supremacy in his crusade is his universally-known willingness to turn the other cheek to the smiter. From the first it must be realised that consciously his teaching has been influenced by that of Christ, for whom his admiration has long been the almost dominating feature of his spiritual life and probably the external character of his daily activity has been modelled also upon Him. He made a curious observation during our conversation, which throws some light upon his interpretation of the Galilean Teacher In answer to a remark of mine that Christ

strictly abstained from interfering in politics, Mr. Gandhi answered, "I do not think so but, if you are right, the less Christ in that was He." (*Daily Telegraph.*)

COL. J. C. WEDGWOOD, M. P.

One does not feel it blasphemous to compare him with Christ; and Christ, too, one suspects, gave infinite trouble to reasonable and respectable followers. For Gandhi is a philosophic anarchist—a new edition of Tolstoy, without Tolstoy's past and a Tolstoy who has long since subdued Nature and shrunk into simplicity. (*The Nation.*)

MR. BLANCH WATSON

The West is watching the people whose high privilege it is to the world that the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth are practicable. Gandhi is a born leader, and all sorts and conditions of people are seconding him. These millions of men and women are carrying the fight for independence to the high ground of the spirit, and their goal is a free India. And India freed by such methods will mean a free world! (*The "Sinn Feiner" of New York.*)

BENJAMIN COLLINS WOODBURY

When shall there be again revealed a Saint,
A holy man, a Saviour of his race,
When shall the Christ once more reveal his face?
Gautama left his ' bode without complaint,
Till weary, hungered, desolate and faint.
He sank beneath the bo-tree with his load,
As on the Path of solitude he stood;
And Jesus died to still the sinner's plaint.
Lives there a man as faithful to his vow?
Mahatma to a bounded race of men?
Aye, Gandhi seeks his nation's soul to free;
Unto the least, Ye do it unto Me!
Hath Buddha found in peace *Nirvana* now;
Or doth a Christ walk on the earth again?

"*Unity*," *Chicago.*

MR. BEN SPOOR, M. P.

Who and what is this man of whom it can be said as it was said of one of old that even his enemies "can find no fault in him"? His bitterest opponents unite in tributes to his transparent sincerity, moral courage, and spiritual intensity. (One can, of course, disregard the irresponsible comments of certain members of the British Parliament whose cloudy prejudice obscures judgment—their remedy of "hang Gandhi" has just that weight which a pitiful bigotry ensures). Even Sir Valentine Chirol, while of opinion that Gandhi is "more unbalanced," suggests that he has "increased in spiritual stature." Some folks believe Mahatmaji is

mad—all who know him agree that he is good. In this topsy-turvy world it may well be that goodness and honesty lie strangely near to madness. In an age of false values what chance has Right? And with Truth on the scaffold and Wrong on the throne, it is too much to expect fair estimates of men and movements. Still to those who have met and talked with Gandhi, who have seen him in a small business meeting or holding vast multitudes under same subtler spell than mere oratory produces ; we have sat alone with him in the quiet, or seen the eager throng pressing around to touch the hem of his garment or to kneel and touch his feet—to those he seems to possess a power granted to few. Call it madness if you like, there is a strength in that frail body which defies all the combinations of political expediency however highly-organised they may be. Gandhi has probably a larger following than any living man. And it is not the "masses" only who accept his leadership. He is "Mahatmaji" to intellectuals, even highly-placed officers of the Government exist who recognise in him the compelling authority of real character. The West has produced a Lenin, strong, masterful, relentless alike in logic and method. The East had given birth to a Gandhi, equally strong, masterful and relentless. But whilst the former pins his faith on force, the latter relies on non-resistance One trusts the sword, the other trusts the spirit. In an extraordinary manner these men appear to incarnate those fundamentally opposing forces that—behind all the surface struggles of our day—are fighting for supremacy. *(Farewell letter to the Press, Jan.,* 1921).

"D. P"

'G.'s,' genius lies in making lost causes live. To his disarming sweetness of a saint he adds all the arts of the advocate. In South Africa he matched even General Smuts. They sparred for years over Indian claims without quarrelling.....

The key to Gandhi and Gandhism is wrapped in his self-revealing sentence: 'Most religious men I have met are politicians in disguise: I, however, who wear the guise of politician, am at heart a religious man.' (*The Daily Mail*).

THE NATION AND THE ATHENEUM

Mr. Gandhi is a figure of such significance that even the remoteness, mental and physical, of India cannot obscure him One realizes that he is in India what Tolstoy was in Russia, a personality which incarnates the characteristic spiritual vision of his race.

MR. S. E. STOKES

At last we have found a MAN, honest, fearless, and fired with true patriotism—a man whom the common people trust and one who is able to fire them with the flame of his own idealism. If we sacrifice him to our petty doubts and fears, the time will come when we shall deeply and vainly regret it, for such leaders are not granted to a nation every day.

There is no question as to whether Mahatmaji is worthy to lead India; it remains to be seen if India is worthy of its great leader, and will loyally support him in his great act of faith.

VINCENT ANDERSON

All India is at the feet of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. Preaching a political creed that is new to the Hindu and renewing Vedic ideals of asceticism and sacrifice in his own life, this man has within a brief span of months united Hindu and Muhammadan in a common bond of fraternity that has not existed in India since the days of Gautama. A small, slim, dark, composed man with a tremendous personal magnetism, a man with the untiring energy of Roosevelt, the human sympathy of Debs and the philosophy of Tolstoy, Gandhi has developed into a force so potent that the English dare not imprison him.* (*Nation, New York*).

SIR VALENTINE CHIROL

Of his earnestness and sincerity no one who listens to him can entertain much doubt, nor of his childlike simplicity if he can persuade himself that all those behind and beside him are inspired by his own idealism.

With a perfect command of accurate and lucid English, and in a voice as persuasive as his whole manner is gentleness itself, he explains, more in pity than in anger, that India has at last recovered her own soul through the fiery ordeal which Hindus and Mahomedans had alike undergone in the Punjab and the perfect act of faith which the 'Khilafat' meant for all Mahomedans.

Not, however, by violence, but by her unique 'soul force,' would she attain to 'Swaraj,' and, purged of the degrading influences of British rule and Western civilisation, return to the ancient ways of Vedic wisdom, and to the peace which was hers before alien domination divided and exploited her people.—*Times*

MR. C.F. ANDREWS

. . . In Mahatma Gandhi we have a volcanic personality, a moral genius of the first order, who has revealed to us all the hidden power of a living freedom from within, who has taught us to depend not on any external resources but on ourselves My whole heart goes out to his appeal and I have a great hope that, along this path, independence will be reached at last.

---

* Written some months before his arrest.

. . . I come back from this method of doubtful evolution to the more incisive method of Mahatma Gandhi: I can see that he cuts at the very root of the disease. He is like a surgeon performing an operation rather than a physician administering soothing drugs. And as his surgeon's knife cuts deep, we can see at once the recovery of the patient beginning to take place—the recovery of self-respect and manhood and independence..... Such personalities as that of Mahatma Gandhi which can inspire a whole nation are rare indeed in human history.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

"The secret of Gandhi's success lies in his dynamic spiritual strength and incessant self-sacrifice. Many public men make sacrifices for selfish reasons It is a sort of investment that yields handsome dividends. Gandhi is altogether different. He is unique in his nobility. His very life is another name for sacrifice. He sacrifice itself.

"He covets no power, no position, no wealth, no name and no fame. Offer him the throne of all India, he will refuse to sit on it, but will sell the jewels and distribute the money among the needy.

"Give him all the money America possesses, and he will certainly refuse to accept it, unless to be given away for a worthy cause for the uplift of humanity.

"His soul is perpetually anxious to give and he expects absolutely nothing in return—not even thanks. This is no exaggeration, for I know him well.

"He came to our school at Bolpur and lived with us for some time. His power of sacrifice becomes all the more irresistible because it is wedded with his paramount fearlessness.

"Emperors and Maharajas, guns and bayonets, imprisonments and tortures, insults and injuries, even death itself, can never daunt the spirit of Gandhi.

"His is a liberated soul. If any one strangles me, I shall be crying for help; but if Gandhi were strangled, I am sure he would not cry. He may laugh at his strangler; and if he has to die, he will die smiling.

"His simplicity of life is childlike, his adherence to truth is unflinching; his love for mankind is positive and aggressive. He has what is known as the Christ spirit. The longer I know from the better I like him It is needles for me to say that this great man is destined to play a prominent part in moulding the future of the world."

["*Such a great man deserves to be better known in the world. Why don't you make him known, you are a world-figure?*" *asked the interviewer. Tagore said,* :—]

"How can I make him known? I am nothing compared to his illumined soul. And no truly great man has to be made great. They are great in their own glory, and when the world is ready they become famous by dint of their own greatness. When the time comes Gandhi will be known, for the world needs him and his message of love, liberty and brotherhood.

"The soul of the East has found a worthy symbol in Gandhi; for he is most eloquently proving that man is essentially a spiritual being, that he flourishes the best in the realm of the moral and the spiritual, and most positively perishes both body and soul in the atmosphere of hatred and gunpowder smoke."—*(From an interview in America).*

S. W. CLEMES

As I talked with Mr. Gandhi, I marvelled at the simplicity of his dress. He wore coarse white cloth, with a *kambal* thrown over his body to protect him from the cold. A little white cap was his only head covering. As he sat on the floor facing me, I asked myself, how can this little man, with his thin face and large protruding ears, and quiet brown eyes, be the great Gandhi about whom I have heard so much? All doubts were set aside, when we began to talk. I do not agree with all the methods that Mr. Gandhi employs to bring about the desired end; but I do want to bear this personal testimony of the man himself. Mr. Gandhi is a spiritual man. He is a thinker. In my short interview, I had the same heart-to-heart fellowship with him as I have had scores of times with some of God's saints. I took knowledge that this man had been to the source of Christian strength and had learned from the great Christ. (*Indian Witness.*)

MR. W. E. JOHNSON

There is a man, sent of God, who is called the Mahatma Gandhi. He comes to the surface out of that great sea of human beings that compose the Empire of India, one-fifth of the people in all the world. As this is written in October, he is going about with no clothing except a homespun cloth wound around the lower part of his body and partly covering his legs. If all the Indian people had only this much for each, there would be none left, and it would be "stealing" for him to take more than his share. He rides third-class in the railway carriage set apart for coolies and eats the food on which the meanest of human beings exist.

Much is said regarding this man to his disadvantage. His name is anathema to many wedded to the existing order of things—especially alcoholic things. Those who attack him and there are many, such never attack his sincerity, his character or his ability. To them, he is of the devil, because he attacks British rule in his country. And yet, after all has been said that can be said against him, this fact remains silhouetted against the sky—in two years by

pure personal influence, he has caused a greater diminution of the use of intoxicating liquors than has been accomplished by any other man in the history of the world during his life time.—*Christian Herald.*

THE RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

Politics is not separable from life. Mr. Gandhi would not countenance the separation, for his great aim is to strip life of its sophistication and reduce it to its own nature—simple, rounded, pure. It merely happens that for the moment his activity is in the field of politics. It merely happens that for the moment he is confronting Government and daring its wrath. It merely happens that for the moment his cry of *Swaraj* for India has caught the ear of the world and the world is anxious to know what his *Swaraj* is. His real and final objective is a radical reform of human kind. His Gospel is "Back to Nature." He avows himself an implacable enemy of Western Civilisation. In his mighty war against Western civilization *Swaraj* for India is but a campaign. The rules of the campaign are the rules of the mighty war; the weapons to be used in the campaign are the weapons to be used in the campaign of the mighty war; the virtues to be evoked by the campaign are the virtues which will win the mighty war in the end. The cardinal rule of both, the war and the campaign, is non-violence. Non-violence is of the heart as well as of the body. By thought, word and act you may not injure your adversary. Enemy in a personal sense is too strong a word for his dictionary. But as the adversary does not follow the rule you will be subjected to great suffering and loss. Rejoice in the suffering and loss and court them. If you cannot rejoice in them, do not avoid or complain against them. Love your enemies; if you love them, pardon them and never retaliate against them. Force is wrong and must go under. The soul is invincible; learn to exercise its full power. Hold to the truth at all costs; Satya triumphs in the end. Out of this cardinal rule, almost logically, proceed a number of principles which will keep us straight in the war and this campaign for Swaraj. Since Western civilization and the existing system of British Government have to be got rid of, we must have nothing to do with either offspring of Satan; we must cut off our connection with those large and powerful institutions by which they enslave us. These are schools, courts, legislatures. Withdraw children from schools, sue not for justice in courts, and avoid the polling-booth. Machinery being another invention of Satan and mills being the mainstay of British domination in India, boycott both, cease to import foreign cloth, and erect a spindle in each home. The motion of the *Charka* has mystic properties, its music chastens the soul, and its products most adorn the human form, especially the female form. These principles and courses of action have more or less permanent validity because the war against modern civilization must be expected to be of indefinite duration. It is a picked body, however,

namely, the members of the *Satyagrahasrama* in Ahmedabad—who are engaged in this exalted enterprise and owe lifelong allegiance to those principles and courses of action. The numerous levies now fighting in India under the flag of non-co-operation are enrolled only for a single campaign and may lapse into the common grooves of life as soon as the British Government has been brought to its knees and consented to change its basis. In the intensive operations of this campaign it may become necessary to resort to civil disobedience of selected laws and non-payment of taxes. But wherever the severity of the measures which such action may provoke the authorities to adopt, non-co-operators are precluded from the slightest infraction of the commandment as to non-violence.

To understand Mr. Gandhi's view of life, attention must be fixed on the rules he has laid down for the regulation of his Ahmedabad institution. Its name, *Satyagrahasrama*, means the hermitage of the determined practice of truth or the abode of soul-force. The *Asrama* is still small. It has had no real chance of proving its vitality, for ever since its establishment other things have claimed the energies of its founder. But the attainment of its objects is conditioned by the increase of its numbers and the acceptance by the community at large of these austere ideals as at present exemplified in the lives of a few apostles. No estimate can be formed of the prospective influence of the new gospel without an examination of its real nature.

Truth in the highest sense is possible only where the individual enjoys complete freedom. All forms of force or coercions are thus at once barred. Compulsion, authority, government, these are anathema maranatha to one who at bottom is a philsophical anarchist. In fact, he describes the essence of his doctrine sometimes as love, sometimes as truth, sometimes as non-violence (ahimsa), these forms are in his opinion interchangeable: For organized government in the ideal world, is justifiable. The merit of the British Government is that it governs the least. Even a family and a school must trust entirely to the power of love and moral reasoning. Flagrant misconduct he deals with by himself fasting for a certain number of days, the guilty party being invariably brought to a state of contrition within that period. Sometimes ago he applied this remedy to end a serious strike in a mill, the employers coming to reason for fear of incurring sin. Within the last few weeks the violence practised by some persons in Bombay in the name of non-co-operation on the occasion of the Prince of Wales' visit entailed this form of self-chastisement on his part, and by all accounts it had the desired result.

Nobody is entitled to possess more than is absolutely necessary for the moment. To hold in excess of the need is to be guilty of theft. He and his wife have given away all their property—he practised law for many years with success—and now own nothing

beyond the clothes they wear and a change or two and may be a bag or box to contain these. The Asrama in Ahmedabad contains the barest necessaries.

Each person must supply his wants by his own exertion. The ideal is to grow the corn that one eats and weave the cloth that one wears Even the brain worker is not exempt from this bodily labour. In fact, the spindle has grown to be a fetish with Mr. Gandhi Its music has a charm for him. He prescribes it for all men and women. Boys must prefer it to books. Lawyers must cast away their briefs for it. Doctors must abandon stethoscope and take to it.

So far its products have been coarse; but he asks, can a man or woman look more beautiful than in the Khaddar made by himself or herself? When a lady pupil of his wore the first Sari of her own making, he surveyed her and pronounced her divinely attractive. Without a doubt his eyes so saw her and his mind so judged her.

Control of the senses is a requisite of the first importance It is very hard and can be only very slow. But it must be incessantly and ruthlessly practised. Luxuries are, of course, taboo Even comforts must be steadily reduced. The palate is a particularly venal sense and has to be rigidly curbed. Simple hard fare is a condition of spiritual advancement. Celibacy is also enjoined on the inmates of the Asrama. Married couples may not be admitted unless they agree to surrender their marital relation and adopt that of brother and sister. If Mr. Gandhi had his way he would recommend this course to mankind. The resulting extinction of the species has no terrors for him. He merely asks, why should we not all go to a better planet and live on a higher plane? The question would not appear so fantastic after all to one who believed in the re-birth of souls according to the law of Karma and remembered that no person would be a celibate except of his or her own free choice and when the sex passion had been transcended.

Machinery, being one of the most inseparable adjuncts of modern civilization, must be abandoned. It is of the kingdom of Satan. Mills and factories where the labourer is done out of his humanity, have no place in his scheme. The wealth they create, it needs no saying, is an abomination. Posts and telegraphs and railways are likewise condemned and with them goes the printing press. He says that every time he himself uses one of these instruments of civilisation he does so with a pang. It would be nearly as hard for him to carry on his work without resort to them as it would be to escape from the atmosphere of the earth: but perhaps the use of evil might be defensible in its own destruction. Rapid and easy means of communication have but multiplied crime and disease. Could not man infer from the fact of God having given him legs that he was not intended to go farther than they could carry him? What are ordinarily called the benefits of railway

and similar things are in reality the opposite, being added enjoyments or means of gratifying the senses.

Medicine does not escape his judgment; he calls it black magic and actually says it is better to die than be saved by a drug prescribed by the doctor. The fear of immorality and unhealthy modes of life has been materially weakened if not totally removed by the hope of being saved from the evil consequences by the help of the doctor. A return to the cure of nature and her simple ways would redeem mankind.

These and similar doctrines, which appear harsh to the ordinary person, form the substance of Mr. Gandhi's ethics. Let it not be supposed that they are logical abstractions formulated for the purposes of a moral treatise or sermon, and with no intended application to life. Their propounder practises them in the spirit and in the letter, and the limitations on their practice do not proceed from any tenderness for himself or his relatives. His renunciation of worldly goods has already been mentioned. He does not seek the medical man in sickness. He eats hard fare. He wears *Khaddar* woven by his own hands and in that dress and barefooted appears before the Viceroy of India. He knows no fear and shrinks from nothing which he advises others to do. In fact his love of suffering and hardship as a means of spiritual progress is almost morbid. His composion and tenderness are infinite like the ocean, to use an eastern simile. The present writer stood by as he wiped the sores of a leper with the ends of his own garment. In fact it is his complete mastery of the passions, his realization of the ideal of a "sanyasin" in all the rigour of its eastern conception, which accounts for the great hold he has over the masses of India and has crowned him with the title of Mahatma or the Great Soul.

Now to a few other doctrines of a subordinate grade. Curiously enough he is a believer in the system of caste, though the pride of caste and its exclusiveness will receive no quarter from him. Apparently he is convinced of its beneficence, if maintained in its original purity, and holds it to be of the essence of Hinduism. In this belief, however, he is not likely to be followed by a great section of his countrymen, who are anxious to restore their religion to its ancient purity. But he is at one with them and in fact with the awakened conscience of India in desiring to exorcise the demon of untouchability. Millions of people are held by caste Hindus to be beneath their physical touch and live in conditions which are scarcely fit for human beings. These he would uplift, asserting that Hinduism gives no kind of justification for the abuse. But his work for the depressed classes, as they are called, would take the form which has quite recently been given to social work of that kind, in the West. He would have the worker cast aside his own status and live the life of the class to be helped, do their work and earn their wage, exactly as they do. So

only can real understanding and sympathy come, so only can that confidence be engendered which is an essential pre-requisite of all work of amelioration.

His non-co-operationist followers seem in places to have mixed up his humanitarian work with politics and so suffered a check. In the Mahatma's eyes no political rights will be of the slightest use to a community which is the prey of great social failings, and work for *Swaraj* can never reach any success without simultaneous work for great social reforms. But violent political excitement is not a favourable condition, for such antagonism of government and its officials is only to be expected to the activities of hosts of young picketeers who are pledged at the same time to embarrass and even destroy the ordinary administration.

The educational ideals of the Mahatma have not yet received a clear expression. To compulsion even of rudimentary education, he must be averse. The higher sciences and arts, the specialised forms, historical research or economic enquiry with their glorification of machinery and wealth in its varied forms, will find no room in his simple scheme. Of the necessity of introducing one language for common use in India he has been for long a persistent advocate. He has chosen Hindi for the place of this *lingua franca*. With characteristic earnestness he has collected funds for the purpose of spreading a knowledge of this language and has sent out enthusiastic teachers to all parts of India. The non-co-operation turmoil may have for the time overshadowed this activity. Perhaps, too, the bulk of educational workers in India has not yet accepted the Mahatma's conclusions in this regard, and for this reason his efforts on behalf of Hindi have not been co-ordinated with the educational work of the country generally.

The writer of these lines is not of Mr. Gandhi's political followers or a disciple of his in religion. But he claims to have known him for some years and to have been a sympathetic student of his teachings. He has felt near him the chastening effects of a great personality. He has derived much strength from observing the workings of an iron will. He has learned from a living example something of the nature of duty and the worship due to her. He has occasionally caught some dim perception of the great things, that lie hidden below the surface and of the struggles and tribulations which invest life with its awe and grandeur. An ancient Sanskrit verse says:—"Do not tell me of holy waters or stone images; they may cleanse us, if they do, after a long period. A saintly man purifies us at sight".—*Survey Graphic*.

MR. H. S. L. POLAK

LOVE OF TRUTH

If there is one characteristic more than another that stamps Mr. Gandhi as a man amongst men, it is his extraordinary love of truth. His search for it is the one passion of his life, and every action of his indicates the devotee of this usually distant shrine. Whatever he says, even those most hostile to him unhesitatingly believe, as being the truth so far as he is aware of it, and he will not hesitate to retract, publicly and immediately, anything that he may have unwittingly declared to be a fact, but which he afterwards finds to be unwarranted. His political opponents admit unquestioningly that every action of his is prompted only by the most conscientious and impersonal motives. In his legal practice, which he long ago definitely abjured as an "unclean thing," he was highly regarded by his fellow-practitioners as an able lawyer and an honourable colleague or opponent, and Magistrates and Judge alike paid careful attention to any case that Mr. Gandhi advocated, realising that it had intrinsic merits or that he sincerely believed that it had. He has been known to retire from a case in open Court, and in the middle of the hearing, having realised that his client had deceived him, and he never accepted a case except on the express understanding that he reserved to himself the right to withdraw at any stage if he felt that his client had not dealt honestly with him.

SELF-SUPPRESSION

His self-suppression and courtesy are universally recognised and appreciated. He has scarcely ever been known to give angry expression to his feelings, and then only when moved by a sense of righteous indignation. He has never, during the whole course of his public career, condescended to the use of the average politician's dictionary of invectives, and his courtesy and urbanity towards opponents arises from his desire and ability to place himself in their position before attacking it.

GENEROSITY

His generosity is proverbial. He never issued a formal demand for payment of a debt due to him, conceiving that his debtor, if an honest man, would pay when he could, and if a dishonest man, would not be made the more honest by the use of legal compulsion. Indeed, in his every action, he vindicates his hostility to the doctrine of force and his abiding affection for that of love as a rule of life. When he was nearly done to death by a fanatical Pathan, in 1908, he absolutely refused to charge his assailant or to give evidence against him. He preferred to conquer him by love, and succeeded; for early the following year the Pathan, who had been deported to India because he sturdily refused to comply with the Transvaal Law, addressed a letter to

Mr. Gandhi in which he assured the latter that all his sympathies were with him, and he would do what he could to help the cause.

SENSE OF PUBLIC DUTY

Mr. Gandhi's sense of public duty is profound. Just before his first arrest, he received the news that his youngest child was desperately ill, and he was asked to go to Phœnix at once if he wished to save him. He refused, saying that his greater duty lay in Johannesburg, where the community had need of him, and his child's life or death must be left in God's hands. Similarly, during his second imprisonment, he received telegraphic news of Mrs. Gandhi's serious illness, and was urged even by the visiting Magistrate to pay his fine and so become free to nurse her. Again he refused, declining to be bound by private ties when such action would probably result in weakening the community of which he was the stay and the inspiration. And although after his release and his subsequent re-arrest, he could have secured indefinite postponement of the hearing of his case, so that he might nurse Mrs. Gandhi back to health after a serious operation, as soon as he heard that the Transvaal Government were anxious to see him back again in gaol, he hastened to the Transvaal from Natal, leaving Mrs. Gandhi, for aught he knew to the contrary, on her deathbed.

* * *

Yet he is a devoted husband and father, and is intensely attached to children. Indeed, he is never happier than when with little children. His sense of duty was never more strikingly demonstrated than when he set out, on that fateful morning in February, 1908, to fulfil his pledge to the Transvaal Government that he would undertake voluntary registration. He knew that owing to a misunderstanding, which even his lucidity and persuasiveness could not overcome, a small section of the community had been rendered bitterly hostile to him, and that his future assailant was at that moment in his office and waiting an opportunity for a physical attack, which could only be effected in the open street. Mr. Gandhi had no thought of seeking police protection against a compatriot, but walked straight to the Registration Office, and on the way the expected attack was delivered. Bleeding from open wounds and in the greatest pain, he was taken to the Rev J.J. Doke's house, but before he would permit the doctor to stitch up his face, which was badly gashed, he insisted upon completing the form of application for voluntary registration in the presence of the Registrar of Asiatics, giving full details as to identity, like the least of his followers—Mr. Gandhi has always steadfastly refused, either within or outside of prison, to avail himself of any privilege that is not accorded to the humblest of his countrymen—and then permitted his wounds to be sewn up without availing himself of an anæsthetic. That same day, though tossing feverishly upon a sick-bed, he issued the following manifesto

to the Indian community, which had for the moment been taken aback by the suddeness of the assault and by a series of foolish errors on the part of the registration officials :—

" Those who have committed the act did not know what they were doing. They thought that I was doing what was wrong. They have had their redress in the only manner they know. I, therefore, request that no steps be taken against them.

" Seeing that the assault was committed by a Mahomedan or Mahomedans, 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 to day cement the two communities indissolubly—such is my heartfelt prayer. May God grant it ! . . . . . The spirit of passive resistance rightly understood should make the people fear none and nothing but God—no cowardly fear, therefore, should deter the vast majority of sober-minded Indians from doing their duty. The promise of repeal of the Act, against voluntary registration, having been given, it is the sacred duty of every true Indian to help the Government and the Colony to the uttermost."

To assume responsibilities, to recognise obligations, was always Mr. Gandhi's main thought in his relations with the European colonists of South Africa ; for he knew that the completest rights cannot be availed of by undeveloped and irresponsible people. Hence his offers, on behalf of the community, of ambulance and stretcher-bearer corps, his desire to afford the Government and Municipal authorities the utmost help at all times in the proper conduct of public affairs and the governance and uplifting of the Indian community. He always felt that the only possible road to progress was by compelling the European colonists to recognise the real worth and sterlingness of character of his compatriots and a deep-seated desire to secure mutual respect was at the bottom of his action in advising his fellow-countrymen to continue the struggle for the preservation of their manhood.

Mr. Gandhi will not hesitate, when necessary, to set himself against the opinion of many of his countrymen or boldly to declare whose is the responsibility for any recognised evil. Indeed his general attitude may be briefly summed up in the following statements he once made to the writer : " Most religious men I have met are politicians in disguise ; I, however, who wear the guise of a politician, am at heart a religious man."

HINDU-MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD

So far as the Indian community itself was concerned, Mr. Gandhi had appointed for himself one supreme task—to bring Hindus and Mahomedans together and to make them realise that they were one brotherhood and sons of the same Motherland.

His attitude as a Hindu towards Mahomedans is well defined in the following letter addressed by him to a Mahomedan correspondent:—

"I never realise any distinction between a Hindu and a Mahomedan. To my mind both are sons of Mother India. I know that Hindus are in a numerical majority and that they are believed to be more advanced in knowledge and education. Accordingly, they should be glad to give way so much the more to their Mahomedan brethren. As a man of truth, I honestly believed that Hindus should yield up to the Mahomedans what the latter desire, and they should rejoice in so doing. We can expect unity only if such mutual large-heartedness is displayed. When the Hindu and Mahomedans act towards each other as blood-brothers, then alone can there be unity; then only can we hope for the dawn of India."

And as has already been seen, Mr. Gandhi is prepared to shed his blood in order that the bonds of Hindu-Mahomedan brotherhood might be the more firmly cemented.

CHIVALRY

His chivalry is at once the admiration of his friends and followers and the confusion of enemies. A telling example of this was given when, in October, 1908, together with a number of compatriots, he was arrested and charged at Volksrust, the Transvaal border town. Mr. Gandhi then gave the following evidence on behalf of his fellow-countrymen whom he was defending, and though he was not called upon to make these admissions:—

"He took the sole responsibility for having advised them to enter the Colony. They had largely been influenced by his advice, though, no doubt, they had used their own judgment, he thought that, in giving that advice, he had consulted the best interests of the State. He asked the accused to enter at a public meeting and individually. They probably, at that time, had no idea of entering the Colony, except, perhaps, one of them. He would certainly admit that he had assisted the accused to enter. He admitted aiding and abetting them to enter the Transvaal. He was quite prepared to suffer the consequence of his action, as he always had been.

Later, when giving evidence on his own behalf, he said:—

"In connection with my refusal to produce my registration certificate and to give thumb-impressions or finger-impressions; I think that as an officer of this Court, I owe an explanation. There have been differences between the Government and British Indians, whom I represent as Secretary of the British Indian Association, over the Asiatic Act, No. 2 of 1907, and after due

deliberation, I took upon myself the responsibility of advising my countrymen not to submit to the primary obligation imposed by the Act, but still, as law-abiding subjects of the State, to accept its sanctions. Rightly or wrongly, in common with other Asiatics, I consider that the Act in question, among other things, offends our conscience, and the only way, I thought, as I still think, the Asiatics could show their feeling with regard to it was to incur its penalties. And in pursuance of that policy, I admit that I have advised the accused who have preceded me to refuse submission to the Act, as also the Act 36 of 1908, seeing that in the opinion of British Indians, full relief, that was promised by the Government, has not been granted. I am now before the Court to suffer the penalties that may be awarded me."

And when he was next sentenced, Mr. Gandhi made the following declaration :—

"It is my misfortune that I have to appear before the Court for the same offence the second time. I am quite aware that my offence is deliberate and wilful. I have honestly desired to examine my conduct in the light of past experience, and I maintain the conclusion that, no matter what my countrymen do or think, as a citizen of the State and as a man who respects conscience above everything, I must continue to incur the penalties so long as justice, as I conceive it, has not been rendered by the State to a portion of its citizens. I consider myself the greatest offender in the Asiatic struggle, if the conduct that I am pursuing is held to be reprehensible. I, therefore, regret that I am being tried under a clause which does not enable me to ask for a penalty which some of my fellow-objectors received, but I ask you to impose on me the lightest penalty."

Thus, Mr. Gandhi indicated his willingness to become a passive resister even against his own countrymen, if need be, and his anxiety, like the Greek hero who rushed into the fray and found death by gathering into his own breast the spears of the enemy, to bring salvation to his people by accepting the fullest responsibility and the heaviest penalties. Even whilst in gaol, he was a passive resister ; for he declined to eat the special food provided for him until his Indian fellow-prisoners were given a more suitable diet, and he deliberately starved himself upon one wretched meal a day for six weeks, until the authorities were obliged to promise a modified diet scale for Indian prisoners, a promise which they later fulfilled—for the worse.

Mr Gandhi put his thought on the meaning of passive resistance concisely and in a direct form, when he addressed the following exhortation to the Transvaal Tamil community :—

"Remember that we are descendants of Prahlad and Sudhanva, both passive resisters of the purest type. They disregarded the dictates even of their parents when they were asked to deny God,

They suffered extreme torture rather than inflict suffering on their persecutors. We in the Transvaal are being called upon to deny God, in that we are required to deny our manhood, go back upon our oath, and accept an insult to our nation. Shall we, in the present crisis, do less than our forefathers?"

HIS DEEP SPIRITUALITY

His simplicity is extreme. He is a devoted follower of Tolstoy and Ruskin in their appeal for simpler life, and himself lives the life of an ascetic, eating the simplest fruits of the earth, sleeping often on a piece of sacking on the bare earth in the open air, and he cares nothing for personal appearance. He has reduced himself to a condition of voluntary poverty, and he has entirely abandoned the practice of law believing that he cannot consistently obtain his livelihood from a profession that derives its sanction from physical force He acknowledges no binding ties of kin or custom, but only of the obligation of his own conscience. Ram Krishna tested his freedom from caste-prejudice by sweeping out a pariah's hut with his own hair, Mohandas Gandhi has tested his by tending the wounds of a Babu savage with his own hands. With him the spirit of religion is everything, the world and its opinion nothing. He does not know how to distinguish Hindu from Mahomedan, Christian from infidel. To him all alike are brothers, fragments of the Divine, fellow-spirits struggling for expression. All he has, he gives. With him self-surrender and absolute sacrifice are demands of his very nature. His deep spirituality influences all around, so that no man dares to commit evil in his presence. He lives in the happiness of his friends, but he does not hesitate to create a condition of spiritual unrest in them when he conceives it his duty to point out the right and condemn the wrong. He cannot condone falsehood, but he reproves and rebukes lovingly. Indeed, love is his only weapon against evil He sees God in every living thing, and therefore loves all mankind and the whole animal world. He is strictly vegetarian, not because of orthodoxy, but because he cannot cause the death of any creature and because he believes that life is of God. In faith he is probably nearer in touch with pure Jainism or Buddhism than any other creed, though no formal creed can really hold him. To him all is God, and from that reality he deduces his whole line of conduct. Perhaps, in this generation, India has not produced such a noble man—saint, patriot, statesman in one. He lives for God and for India. His one desire is to see unity amongst his fellow-countrymen. His every endeavour in South Africa was directed to showing the possibility of Indian national unity and the lines upon which the national edifice should be constructed. His winning manners, pleasant smile and refreshing candour and originality of thought and action mark him out as a leader of men. But those who know him best recognise in him the religious teacher, the indicator of God, the inspiring example of "a pure,

holy soul," as he has been called by the Rev. F. B. Meyer, the modesty, humility and utter self-abnegation of whole life provide a lesson for all who have eyes to see, ears to hear and an understanding spirit

How he starved and fasted and sought to purify his physical nature, is to tell the story of a man to whom self-suffering is a daily joy and delight. And he did not subdue his body at the cost of his spirituality, as is the habit of so many self-tormentors, but his soul grew in exultation as he felt himself free to express his higher nature and to devote greater energy to the service of his countrymen. He has been a true Bhakta, a devotee of the most earnest and humble type. Praise has always been painful and distasteful to him, though he has been lavish of it as regards his fellow-workers.

Every action of his life has been performed in the service of that Divine Essence that has so profoundly permeated his own being—from the grinding of wheat in his own home to the planting of fruit trees, the teaching of little children and the serving of his countrymen at the Kumbha Mela at Hardwar.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE MAN

But it is the majestic personality of the man Mohandas Gandhi, that overshadows his comparatively insignificant physique. One feels oneself in the presence of a moral giant, whose pellucid soul is a clear, still lake, in which one sees Truth clearly mirrored. His is the meekness that has turned away with a thousand times, and that has disarmed opponents even when most hostile. Unarmed for war, he yet has conquered peace, for his weapons have been the age-old arms of moral fervour, calm determination, spiritual exaltation, sacrifice of the lower self, service of his fellowmen, lowliness, steadfastness, and an overwhelming love bestowed equally upon every living thing. A movement with such a man at its heart could not but succeed, and so the Passive Resistance struggle came to an end and freed its greatest exponent for still greater service on a wider stage. Meanwhile, he has fixed the lines of growth of his countrymen in South Africa, indicated the path and means of patriotic development for his countrymen in the Motherland, rallied the best of European sentiment to the South African Indian cause, developed the possibilities of Passive Resistance, and added yet one more name to the Golden Scroll of those who have deserved well of their country and of mankind.

Yet this is not the whole man. You cannot say this is he, that is he. All that you can say with certainty is that he is here, he is there. Everywhere his influence reigns, his authority rules, his elusive personality pervades; and this must be so, for it is true of all great men that they are incalculable, beyond definition. They partake of the nature of the Illimitable and the Eternal from

which they have sprung and to which they are bound. With their feet firm-set on earth and their hands amongst the stars, they are pointers of the way to those who search, encouragers of the faint and weary, inspirers of those breathing in deep draughts of hope.

MR. K. NATARAJAN

The two questions which made Mahatma Gandhi start non-co-operation were the Rowlatt Act and the Khilafat. The Government agree with him in both. In constitutionally governed countries the Opposition Leader, whose policy on two such capital questions was accepted by Government, would as a matter of course be put in charge of the Government. A bureaucracy, however, can only imprison him. The bureaucracy accepts new ideas when it can no longer oppose them but punishes the promulgator for disturbing it. The Indian Government cannot tolerate tall poppies. The Montagu reforms have not altered this one bit and that is the conclusive condemnation; my objection to the system is not so much that it has failed in this or that branch of administration, but that in its total and inevitable incidence it condemns our soul to a stinted aimless life. The remedy is a complete change of system to complete responsible Government. The conversion of the present system can be carried out only by a plan steadily and persistently worked upon. Such a scheme will be shortly placed before the country. Non-co-operation by itself is not enough. It is like one who has voluntarily renounced the use of one of his limbs. We should study the system not only in its weak points but also its strong ones. Violence is not force. Effective strength always implies perfect non-violence. The Mahatma's greatest contribution to humanity is the application which he has elaborated of the grand principle of ahimsa to the region of politics.—(After Mr. Gandhi's arrest; in the *"Bombay Chronicle."*)

MRS. SAROJINI NAIDU

A convict and a criminal in the eyes of the Law! Nevertheless the entire Court rose in an act of spontaneous homage when Mahatma Gandhi entered—a frail, serene, indomitable figure in a coarse and scanty loin cloth, accompanied by his devoted disciple and fellow-prisoner, Shankerlal Banker.

"So you are seated near me to give me your support in case I break down," he jested, with that happy laugh of his which seems to hold all the undimmed radiance of the world's childhood in its depths. And looking round at the hosts of familiar faces of men and women who had travelled far to offer him a token of their love, he added, "This is like a family gathering and not a law court."

A thrill of mingled fear, pride, hope and anguish ran through the crowded hall when the Judge took his seat—an admirable Judge deserving of our praise alike for his brave and resolute sense of duty, his flawless courtesy, his just perception of a unique occasion and his fine tribute to a unique personality.

The strange trial proceeded and as I listened to the immortal words that flowed with prophetic fervour from the lips of my beloved master, my thoughts sped across the centuries to different land and different age when a similar drama was enacted and another divine and gentle teacher was crucified, for spreading a kindred gospel with a kindred courage. I realised now that the lowly Jesus of Nazareth cradled in a manner furnished the only true parallel in history to this sweet invincible apostle of Indian liberty who loved humanity with surpassing compassion and to use his own beautiful phrase, "approached the poor with the mind of the poor."

The most epic event of modern times ended quickly.

The pent-up emotion of the people burst in a storm of sorrow as a long slow procession moved towards him in a mournful pilgrimage of farewell, clinging to the hands that had toiled so incessantly, bowing over the feet that had journeyed so continuously in the service of his country.

In the midst of all this poignant scene of many-voiced and myriad-hearted grief he stood, untroubled, in all his transcendent implicity, the embodied symbol of the Indian Nation—its living sacrifice and sacrament in one.

They might take him to the utmost ends of the earth but his destination remains unchanged in the hearts of his people who are both the heirs and the stewards of his matchless dreams and his matchless deeds.—(*Contributed to the "Bombay Chronicle" soon after Mr. Gandhi's trial.*)

BABU DWIJENDRANATH TAGORE

Let critics of Mahatma Gandhi then look to history before they condemn him for trying to bring this much-belauded Modern Civilisation down to the common starting point of all great civilisations. We are at dawn of a New Era, and Mahatma Gandhi is the one leader who shows to us the right path. He at least is watering the roots, while all others who try to keep alive the Civilisation of the Western nations are like foolish gardeners who lavish water on the withering leaves of a dying tree and never think of watering its roots.—(*Young India.*)

THE CHALLENGE—(LONDON)

Here is a man of whom all those who know him testify that he is singularly Christ-like, one who has based his whole position upon the ultimate supremacy of moral over physical force, one of whom the worst that can be said is that he is a visionary whose dreams could not, in the present state of human society, be realised. Unpractical—"My Kingdom is not of this world," an agitator—"He stirreth up the people"; better arrested—"It is expedient that one man should die for the people." We have read, with growing conviction of the parallelism,

the attempts of the Press to justify our Government's action ; and hitherto apart from the mass and abuse which all reliable evidence of the Mahatma's character and actions shows to be irrelevant, have found nothing which could not have been written with equal accuracy by an apologist for Caiphas or Pilate. And the result has given us a shock the more unpleasant because here, also, it is not the particular wickedness or failure of any one individual, but the unchristian quality of the whole system that is revealed. We do not believe that any special persons are individually to blame, it is simply that our accepted outlook and standards have come into conflict with a singularly pure and sincere idealist. We have judged him, and, in doing so, have condemned ourselves.

THE NATION (NEW YORK)

Consider the man. In the space of a few years he has done more for his people than any government in centuries. He has been the bearer of new hope and human dignity to the untouchables ; he has been the weaver of bonds of unity between the Moslems and Hindus whom the British would keep asunder ; he has fought the liquor traffic which was debasing his people, and the infamous opium monopoly by which, for its own profit, the British Government menaces not only India but all mankind. He has given to revolution non-violent instruments which promise the release of humanity from the seeming necessity of wars for freedom. He has sincerely preached love for the enemy. Not he, but Lord Reading by his refusal to abandon repression prevented the proposed Round Table Conference which might have furthered the peaceful settlement of grievances. Even on the vexed question of the Cabinet, we believe that Gandhi's voice might have been potent in persuading his Moslem friends to grant to non-Moslem communities the justice they seek for themselves. And it is this hope which the British Government has almost shattered—apparently with the consent of those British liberals who would approve the deportation or imprisonment of Gandhi while they prattle his saintliness. Yet that hope is not dead while Gandhi's spirit is powerful in India. How long his people will follow the way he pointed out we do not know ; already there are signs of revolt. But this we know. If the Indian people, like the oppressed of other lands, finally take the way of the sword, the primary blame for the tragedy that will follow must rest not on those who have preached freedom and justice or even on those who seek them by violence but on these who have made violence the very foundation of their continuing dominion over unwilling subjects.

M. K. GANDHI

By REV. JOSEPH DOKE

WITH A FOREWORD BY LORD AMPTHILL

This is a cheap, popular edition of an inspiring book (M. K. Gandhi : An Indian Patriot in South Africa) written by a great Christian friend and admirer of Mr. Gandhi. The Rev. Doke, the author, gives a vivid and penetrating analysis of Mr Gandhi's character illustrated with ample instances of his doings in South Africa. The book is crammed with many striking passages from his utterances on various subjects, besides many an intimate description of dramatic incidents narrated with warmth and colour. *Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," As. 12.*

HIND SWARAJ

OR THE INDIAN HOME RULE

By Mr. M. K. GANDHI

It is certainly my good fortune that this booklet of mine is receiving wide attention. * * * In my opinion it is a book which can be put in o the hands of a child. It teaches the gospel of love in the place of that of hate. It replaces violence with self-sacrifice. It pits soul force against brute force. It has gone through several editions and I commend it to those who would care to read it. I withdraw nothing except one word of it, and that in deference to a lady friend.—(*Young India, 26th January, 1921.*)

A CHEAP, POPULAR EDITION.

Price 8 As. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," 6 As.

The INDIAN PROBLEM

BY MR. C. F. ANDREWS

INDIAN INDEPENDENCE
INDIA AND THE EMPIRE
LETTERS ON NON-CO OPERATION
THE SWADESHI MOVEMENT
NATIONAL EDUCATION
THE DRINK EVIL
THE OPIUM TRADE OF INDIA.

☞ All in one volume, with a nice frontispiece.

Price Re. One

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," As. 12.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, Madras.

INDEX

PAGE

A

Abdul Bari, Letter to ... 745
Address to indentured Indians ... 89
——— Social Service Conference ... 397
——— the Tamil Community ... 91
Advice to South African Indians ... 117
——— Students ... 233
After the Arrest ... 735
Ahimsa ... 282
——— Doctrine of 269, 320
Ahmedabad Congress Speech ... 650
——— Mill hands ... 420
——— Speech at ... 473
Ajmal Khan, Letter to ... 737
——— Arrest of the ... 601
Allahabad, Speech at ... 443
Amritsar Appeals, The ... 484
Anarchical Crimes, on ... 229
Andrews, Introduction by.. xiii
——— Letter to Mr. ... 748
Apology, the Ali Brothers'. 585
Appeal to the Viceroy on Rowlatt Bills ... 450
——— The Women of India ... 597
——— Young Bengal ... 565
Appreciations *appx.* ... 17
——— After the ... 735
Arrest, Message after ... 468
——— of the Ali Brothers.. 601
——— The ... 735

PAGE

Arya Samaj, work of the ... 270
Attitude towards the assailants ... 54

B

Bangalore Address, Reply to ... 241
Bardoli—Civil Disobedience in ... 666
——— Decisions, in defence of ... 689
Barnes, Gandhi and Sir George ... 123
Before the Court in 1907 ... 50
——— In 1913 ... 66
Beginning of the Struggle, The ... 1
Behar, Labour Trouble in 193
Benares Hindu University Speech ... 249
——— Incident, The .. 258
Bengal, Appeal to Young... 565
Besant (Mrs.) and Gandhi. 258
Bombay Conference ... 657
——— Reception in ... 110
——— Riots ... 617
——— Riots : Appeal to co-workers ... 628
——— Riots : Appeal to Hoolegans ... 625
——— Riots ; Message to the citizens ... 623
——— Riots, Moral Issue. 633
——— Riots : Peace at last ... 631

PAGE

Bombay Riots: the Statement ... 617
——— Speech ... 444
Boycott of the Councils ... 534
British Citizenship, Duties of ... 225

C

Cachalia, A. M. ... 119
Celibacy, vow of ... 322
Champaran Agrarian Bill... 195
——— Enquiry ... 193
Chauri Chaura, the crime of ... 679
Chelmsford, Letter to Lord. 426
———, Open Letter to ... 511
Child Marriage ... 416
Citizen rights for South African Indians ... 77
Civil Disobedience ... 636
——— In Bardoli ... 666
——— Preparations for ... 660
Civil Service, Indians in ... 439
Class Legislation ... 39
Colour Legislation, Repeal of ... 31
Commission, Another S. A. 129
Compartments, Doctrine of. 437
Confession of Faith, A ... 769
Congress Committee, Delhi Resolutions ... 695
——— Demands ... 661
——— Message to the ... 185
——— Report on Punjab Disorders ... 494
——— Special, Speech at the ... 541
——— Speech (Ahmedabad) ... 650
——— The Creed of the ... 561
Connaught, Open letter to the Duke of ... 569
Co-operation, Moral Basis of. 293
Councils, Boycott of the ... 534

PAGE

Courts and Schools ... 520
Covenant, The Meaning of the ... 210
Cow-protection ... 811
——Protection of the ... 407
Creed of the Congress, the. 561
Crewe, Letter to Lord ... 108
Crime of Chauri Chaura ... 679
Critics, Reply to ... 703

D

Death, the Fear of ... 823
Delhi Resolutions, The ... 695
Deputation to Lord Elgin. 43
——— Selborne ... 30
Divine Warning, A ... 720
Doctrine of Ahimsa. 269, 320
——— Compartments ... 437
——— The Sword, The ... 788
Durban, Farewell Speech at. 85
Duties of British Citizenship ... 225
Duty of Title-holders ... 537

E

Earlier Indian Speeches ... 225
Economic v. Moral Progress ... 286
Education, Faulty System of ... 414
——, Real ... 234
——— Through the Vernaculars. 327, 335
Educational Conference, Gujarat ... 335
——— System, Defects in our ... 358
Elgin, Lord, Deputation to. 43
Emigrants, Indian and European ... 133
Emigration, Indian Colonial ... 139
Empire, a Service to the ... 538

PAGE

End of the Kaira Struggle ... 217
England, Farewell to ... 109
——— Reception in ... 107

F

Farewell Address at Verulam ... 89
——— Speech at Durban. 85
——— Speech at Johannesburg ... 95
——— To England ... 109
——— To Indentured Indians ... 89
——— To South Africa ... 102
——— To the Tamil Community ... 91
Fearlessness, Spirit of ... 266
——— Vow of ... 326
Fear of Death, the ... 823
Freedom of Opinion, Manifesto ... 606
Freemasonry, Political ... 515

G

Gains of the Passive Resistance Struggle ... 188
Gandhi and E.M. Gorges. 61
——— and Mr. Irwin ... 332
——— and Sir George Barnes ... 123
——— Appreciations *appx.* 17
——— Mr., South African Papers on ... 17
——— Smuts Agreement. 125
Gandhi's Address to Lord Selborne ... 32
——— Challenge ... 212
——— Jail Experiences, Third ... 167
——— Religion *appx* ... 1
——— Statement ... 735
——— Ultimatum ... 669

PAGE

Genesis of Passive Resistance ... 182
Gokhale, late Mr. ... 244
——— Three Speeches on. 242
——— Tilak and Mehta. 818
Gokhale's portrait, unveiling of ... 242
——— Services to India ... 247
Gorges, E. M. and Mr. Gandhi ... 61
Govt. of India, Letter to ... 670
Great Sentinel, The ... 607
——— Trial, The ... 749
Grievances of Indian Settlers in South Africa ... 1
Gujarat Educational Conference ... 335
——— Political Conference ... 372
——— Sabha ... 197
Gurukula, The ... 265
Guzarat National University 793

H

Handcuffs 174
Hand-weaving ... 329
Hardinge's Condition of Abolition of Indenture ... 136
Hazrat Mohani's Resolution 655
Hindi and Urdu ... 355
——— Plea for ... 418
Hindu-Mahomedan Problem ... 334
Hindu-Moslem Unity ... 811
Hinduism ... 826
Hindus and Mahomedans... 55
Hindustani and English ... 800
Hindu University Speech ... 249
Honour of a Satyagrahi ... 220
——— The Prince ... 614
How to Work Non-Co-operation ... 507
Hunger Strike ... 759

PAGE

I

"If I am Arrested ... 726
Imperial Conference Resolutions ... 149
Indenture, Abolition of, Hardinge's Condition ... 136
——— system, Iniquities of ... 144
Indentured Indians, Address to ... 89
——— labour ... 136
Independence Resolution ... 655
India, A Lesson to ... 184
———And the Dominions. 131
———Is and must be non-violent ... 724
Indian and European Emigrants ... 133
———Colonial Emigration. 139
——— Field Ambulance ... 109
———Imigration Amendment Bill ... 1
——— Medicine ... 788
——— Merchants ... 330
——— Relief Act ... 83
———Rights in the Transvaal ... 125
——— South African League 112, 115
Indians and Citizen Rights. 77
———In Civil Service ... 439
———In South Africa ... 122
———In the Colonies ... 131
Industrial Training ... 271
Iniquities of the Indenture System ... 144
Interview in Jail ... 742
——— the Gandhi—Reading ... 579
Irwin and Gandhi ... 332
Issue at stake, The ... 56

J

Jail Experiences ... 152
——Experiences (First) ... 152
Jail Experiences (Second). 163
——Interview in .. 742
——Life in India ... 759
——Pretoria ... 169
Jails, Work in ... 763
Johannesburg Addresse 91, 95
Judgment, The ... 757

K

Kaira and Guzarat, Appeal to ... 435
——— Distress, Statement on the ... 200
——People, A Tribute to ... 220
——Press Note, Reply to... 211
———Question, The ... 196
——Reply to the Commissioner ... 206
——Struggle, End of the... 217
——Struggle, the Last Phase ... 221
———The Situation in... 196
Karachi Address, Reply to... 263
Kelkar's Article, Reply to... 713
Khilafat Demands ... 661
———Movement, Why I have Joined ... 491
———Question, the ... 487
——Wrongs, the Punjab and ... 481

L

Labour, Rights and Duties of ... 784
———Trouble in Behar... 193
Language for India, National 353
Last Phase, the Kaira Struggle ... 221
Lawyers and Non-Co-operation ... 536
Legislation Class ... 89
Lesson, A, to India ... 184
Lessons of Passive Resistance ... 175

PAGE

Letter, Open, to the Duke of Connaught ... 569
——To Government of India ... 670
——To Hakim Ajmal Khan ... 737
—To H. E. the Viceroy 666
—To Lord Chelmsford ... 426
—To Lord Crewe ... 108
—To Moulana Abdul Bari 745
—To Mr. Andrews ... 748
—To Urmila Devi ... 742
Literary Education ... 413
Loyalty to the British Empire ... 232

M

Madras Indian South African League 112, 115
—Law Dinner Speech ... 232
—Provincial Conference. 131
—Reception in ... 112
—Speech at. 446, 524
Mahomedans and Hindus... 55
Malaviya Conference ... 657
Malegaon Incident, The ... 577
Manifesto on Freedom of Opinion ... 606
—To the Press ... 440
Marriage Question, the ... 61
Maude, Hon. Mr. ... 195
Mayavaram, Speech ... 238
Meaning of the Covenant, The ... 210
——Imprisonments ... 759
Media of Instruction, Vernacular ... 307
Mehta, Gokhale, Tilak and. 818
Message, After Arrest ... 468
Message to Co-workers ... 732
—Of the Charka ... 736
—To Bombay Citizens. 463
—To Kerala ... 734
—To Madras Satyagrahis. 462

PAGE

Message to Satyagrahis ... 465
—To the Congress ... 180
—To the Country ... 758
—To the Parsis ... 746
Mill hands, Ahmedabad ... 420
Miscellaneous ... 769
Missionary Conference ... 273
Moplah Outbreak ... 640
Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme ... 437
——Memorial to Mr. *appx* ... 10
Moral Basis of Co-operation. 293

N

Natal Indian Association. 73
—Nine o'clock Rule in ... 13
Natesan, G A. 112, 115, 131
National dress ... 332
—Language for India ... 353
Need for Humility, The ... 573
—Non-Co-operation ... 526
Neither a Saint nor a Politician ... 805
Nellore Provincial Conference ... 131
Nine O'clock Rule in Natal 13
Non-Co-operation ... 481
——and Lawyers ... 536
——and Special Congress ... 533
——, How to Work ... 507
——, Is it Unconstitutional ... 529
——Need for ... 526
——Parents and ... 537
——Resolution ... 541

O

On the Eve of Arrest ... 726
Open letter to Lord Chelmsford ... 511

PAGE

Ordinance, Peace Preservation ... 30
Origin of the Movement in South Africa ... 181

P

Parents and Non-Co-operation ... 537
Parsis, Message to the ... 746
Passive Resistance ... 179
———and Satyagraha ... 501
———How the idea Originated ... 179
———In Tolstoy Farm ... 773
———Lessons of ... 175
———Origin of the Movement in S. A. ... 181
———Struggle, Gains of the ... 188
———The Genesis of ... 182
———Theory and Practice of ... 776
———The Vow of ... 199
Passive Resisters in the Tolstoy Farm ... 183
Patriotism, True ... 314
Peace Preservation Ordinance ... 30
Plea for Hindi ... 418
———The Soul, A ... 226
Political Conference, Gujarat ... 372
———Freemasonry ... 515
Politics ... 329
———And the People ... 238
Pretoria jail ... 169
Prince, Honour the ... 614
Prisoner, A Model ... 766
Prohibited Literature, Distribution of ... 466
Protection of the Cow, The ... 407
Public Life, Reward of ... 241
Punjab and Khilafat Wrongs. 481

PAGE

Punjab Demands ... 661
———Disorder: A Personal Statement ... 500
———Disorders, Congress Report on ... 494

R

Rabindranath Tagore, Reply to ... 607
Railway Restrictions in Transvaal ... 119
Railways, Third Class in ... 301
Rationale of Suffering, The. 774
Reception in Bombay ... 110
———In England ... 107
———In Madras ... 112
Reciprocity between India and the Dominions ... 131
Recruiting, Appeal to Kaira 435
———For the War ... 430
———Objections Answered ... 433
Registration of Coloured Servants' ... 13
———Voluntary ... 54
Religious study ... 162
Repeal of Colour Legislation 3
Reply to Critics ... 703
———Kaira Press-note ... 211
———Karachi Address ... 263
———Lord Ronaldshay ... 642
———Rabindranath Tagore ... 607
———The Commissioner. 206
Rest Cure, A ... 762
Reward of Public Life ... 241
Rights and Duties ... 236
———Of Labour ... 784
Robertson, Sir Benjamin ... 129
Ronaldshay, Reply to Lord ... 642
Round Table Conference ... 647
Rowlatt Bills and Satyagraha ... 440

PAGE

Rowlatt Bills, Appeal to the Viceroy ... 450
Rules and Regulations of Satyagrahasrama Appx. 5

S

Satyagraha and Duragraha, 471
——— and Passive Resistance ... 501
———Committee ... 466
———Day ... 454
———Day in Madras ... 455
———Pledge ... 442
———and Rowlatt Bills 440
Satyagraha Sabha ... 466
———Temporary Suspension ... 479
Satyagrahashrama ... 316
———; the Rules and Regulations of *appx.* ... 5
Satyagrahi, Honour of A ... 220
———The ... 470
Satyagrahis, Message to ... 460
Schools, Courts and ... 520
Selborne, Lord, Deputation to ... 30
Service, A, to the Empire... 538
Settlement, the ... 83
Should Indians have full Citizen Rights ... 73
Simla Visit, The ... 579
Situation in Kaira, the ... 196
Smuts-Gandhi Agreement... 125
———Interview ... 80
Social boycott ... 802
——Laws, Man-Made.. 412
———Service ... 309
———Service Conference. 397
Solomon Commission, The. 69
Soul force and Indian Politics, on ... 779
———*v.* Physical force... 180
South Africa, Farewell to ... 102
South African Commission. 129

PAGE

South African Indian Question ... 1
———Indians, Advice to. 117
Special Congress, Non-Co-operation and ... 533
———Speech at the ... 541
———Ahmedabad ... 473
———Allahabad ... 443
———Bombay ... 444
———Madras. 446, 524
———The Special Congress ... 541
Spinning wheel ... 610
———Truth of the ... 747
Spiritualising the Political Life ... 243
Srinivasa Sastri, V.S. ... 233
Statement before the Court. 749
Statement on the Kaira Distress ... 200
———,Oral ... 749
———,Written ... 751
Strike, Hunger ... 759
Strikes ... 574
Students, Advice to ... 233
Suppressed Classes Conference, Address to ... 815
Swadeshi ... 273
———Meaning of ... 267
———Vow *appx* ... 12
———Vow of ... 325
Swaraj ... 374
——Demands ... 661
——In one year ... 548
——Is the Attempt to Win It 721
——Ways and Means ... 432

T

Tagore, reply to Rabindranath ... 657
Tamil Community, Address to ... 91
———Studies, My (Mr. Gandhi's) ... 173

PAGE

Tax, £ 3, Abolition of .. 83
Temporary Suspension of the Movement ... 479
The Delhi Incident ... 461
Theory and Practice of Passive Resistance ... 776
"The Two Incompatibles." 597
Third Class in Indian Railways ... 301
Three Speeches on Gokhale. 242
Tibbi College, Delhi ... 788
Tilak ... 525
—— And Mehta, Gokhale... 818
Title-holders, Duty of The. 537
"To Every Englishman in India" 553, 557
Tolstoy farm, Passive Resistance in ... 773
Top heavy Administration. 439
Trade Licenses Laws ... 84
Transvaal, Railway Restrictions in ... 119
Tribute to Kaira People ... 220
Truce with the Government, A ... 80
Truth of the Spinning Wheel ... 747
Truth, Vow of ... 318

U

Unregistered Newspapers, Circulating ... 467
Untouchability ... 815
Unveiling of Gokhale's Portrait ... 242

PAGE

Urdu and Hindi ... 355
Urmila Devi, Letter to ... 742

V

Vernaculars as Media of Instruction ... 307
Verulam, Address at ... 89
Viceroy, Letter to H. E. ... 666
Viceroy's Call for Concord (*Re* Kaira Struggle) ... 216
Violence and Non-violence. 593
Voluntary Registration ... 554
Vow of Celibacy ... 322
——— Control of the Palate ... 323
——— Fearlessness ... 326
——— Non-thieving ... 324
——— Passive Resistance... 199
——— Swadeshi ... 325
——— Truth ... 318

W

Warning, A Divine ... 720
War, Recruiting for ... 430
"What I read" ... 176
"Why I have joined the Khilafat Movement" ... 491
——— Suffer ... 760
Womanhood, on ... 411
Women of India, Appeal to the ... 597
Work in Jail ... 763

INDEX PRINTED AT THE MODERN PRINTING WORKS, MADRAS.

GANDHI: HIS LIFE & SPEECHES

Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule. By Gandhi. Cheap popular Edition. As. 8. To Sub. "I.R." As. 6.

M. K. Gandhi: A sketch of his life and career. There are ample quotations from his speeches and writings on different subjects. Price Annas Four.

Gandhi's Speeches and Writings. Third Edition, up-to-date and considerably enlarged. Contains his speeches and writings on the South African Indian



Question his views on indentured Labour and Indians in the Colonies, his jail experiences in South Africa, his pronouncements on the Champaran and Khaira affairs, Rowlatt Bills and Satyagraha, the Punjab outrages, the Khilafat Question, Swaraj, Non-Co-operation, Swadeshi, National Education. Contains also an account of his arrest, and trial and messages from the gaol. With numerous appreciations, portraits and illustrations, cloth bound, indexed.

Rs. 3 To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," Rs.2 8.

M. K. Gandhi. By the Rev. Joseph Doke. With a Foreword by Lord Ampthill This is a cheap, popular edition of an inspiring book (M. K Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa) written by a great Christian friend and admirer of Mr. Gandhi. Price Re. One. To Subscribers of the *Indian Review* As. 12.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

Eminent Orientalists.

INDIAN, ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN AND AMERICAN.

This is the first attempt to present under one cover a succinct account of the lives and achievements of well-known Orientalists, who have done pioneer work in the field of Indology. The activities of this group of savants—English, Scotch, French, German, American and Indian, have been many-sided. They have explored the regions of archæology, epigraphy and palæography, not to speak of their valuable researches in regard to the religion of the Vedic Aryans, and have thus opened out vistas of knowledge in directions never before thought of.

Among the Orientalists Studied are: Sir William Jones, Sir Charles Wilkins, Colebrooke, Horace Wilson, George Tournour, Fergusson, Rajendralal Mitra, Telang, Bhau Daji and Indraji, Dr. Buhler, Monier Williams, Max Muller, Sir John Fleet, Edwin Arnold Nivedita, Griffith, Whitney, Vincent Smith, Tilak, Anundoram Borooah, Bhandarkar, Macdonnel, Keith, Paul Deussen and Sylvain Levi.

Among the contributors to the volume are: Prof. P. Seshadri, Prof Radhakrishnan, Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayengar. Prof. P. P. S Sastri, Mr. Shumbu Chunder Dey, Prof. Suryanarayana, Mr. Vasant Naik, Mr. K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, Prof. M. S. Ramaswami Ayengar, Prof. Surya Kumar Bhuyan, Prof. Srinivasachari, and Mr. D. W. Wickramarachi.

New India.—The field of Indology has indeed commanded the services of very eminent men, and Messrs. G. A. Natesan & Co., have done a real service in bringing out in book form the lives of 25 of them. The volume supplies a much felt want and ought to prove very useful in spreading knowledge of those who have secured a just appreciation of India to the West.

Price Rs. Two.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review" Re. 1-8.

Books are given at concession rates only to subscribers of "The Indian Review." Any one who wishes to buy books at concession rates must remit Rs 5, one year's subscription to the Review in advance. It is cheapest to send in the annual subscription of Rs. 5 (Five) by M.O. If by cheque it should be for Rs. 5-4

G.A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

15 UNIFORM CLOTH-BOUND VOLUMES.

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF

SIR J. C. BOSE.
His Life, Discoveries and Writings.

Dr. RAY'S ESSAYS AND DISCOURSES.

ANNIE BESANT. An up-to-date collection.

THE RT. HON. LORD SINHA.
First up-to-date collection.

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA. 6th Edition.

DADABHAI NAOROJI. 2nd Edition.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN.

MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA.

MOHANDAS K. GANDHI.
Third Edition, revised, enlarged and up-to-date.

SURENDRANATH BANERJEA.

SIR DINSHA WACHA.

Price of each Vol. Rs. 3.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," Rs. 2-8 as.

GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE.
3rd Edition. Price Rs. 4. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 3-8.

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

Indian National Evolution. By Amvica Charan Mazumdar. Second Edition. Price Rs. 3. To Subscribers of the "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

The Governance of India. A hand-book of progressive politics by Babu Govinda Das. Price Rs. 3. To Subscribers of the "I R." Rs. 2-8.

The Mission of Our Master. Essays and Discourses by the Eastern and Western Disciples of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda. Rs. 3. To Subs. of "I R" Rs. 2-8.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

HINDU RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

The Three Great Acharyas; Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhava: A study of their Life and Times and a critical exposition of their philosophy. In one volume. Rs. Two. To subscribers of I.R. Re. 1-8.

The Life and Teachings of Buddha. By A. Dharmapala. Price As. 12. 2nd Edn. To Subscribers of "I. R." As. 8.

Sri Sankaracharya's Select Works. The Text in Sanskrit Devanagiri type and an English Translation. By S. Venkataramanan, B.A. 2nd Edn. Rs. 2. To Subs. I.R. Re. 1-8.

The Vaishnavaite Reformers of India.—Critical Sketches of their Lives and Writings. By T. Rajagopalachariar, M.A., B L. Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of "I.R." As. 12.

Swami Vivekananda: Speeches and Writings. *With four Portraits.* 6th Edn. Rs. 3. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

Aspects of the Vedanta. By various writers. Third Edition. Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "I.R." As. 12.

Ten Tamil Saints. By M. S. Purnalingam Pillai, B.A., L.T. Price As. 12. To Subscribers of "I.R.," As. 8

Essentials of Hinduism. As. 12. To Subs. of "I..R." As. 10

Hindu Psalms & Hymns. By K. V. Ramaswami. As. 4.

Maitreyi: A Vedic Story. By Pandit Sitanath Tattvabhushan. Price As. 4.

Vemana, The Telugu Poet and Saint. By C. Ramakrishna Rau. As. 4.

Aggressive Hinduism. By Sister Nivedita. As. 2.

WARFARE IN ANCIENT INDIA.

BY

MR. P. JAGANNADHASWAMI, B. A., L. T.,

In this book the author gives a vivid picture of warfare in Ancient India. He has drawn largely from the ancient literature extant on the subject in Sanskrit Sukraniti and Kamandikiya, Manu, the Vedas, the Smrithis; and the Epics are all quoted *in extenso* to give a real picture of warfare as understood and practised in ancient India. Price As. Four.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, GeorgeTown. Madras.

INDIAN ARTS, INDUSTRIES & AGRICULTURE

Indian Industrial and Economic Problems. By **Hon.** V. G. Kale, Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I.R." Re. 1-8.

Essays on Indian Economics. (3rd Edition.) By **Mahadev** Govind Ranade. Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I. R." Re. 1-8.

Industrial India. By Glyn Barlow, M.A. Second **Edition.** Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "I.R." As. 12.

The Swadeshi Movement.—A Symposium. **Second** Edition. Re. 1-4. To Subs of the "I.R." Re. 1.

Agricultural Industries in India. By Seedick R. Sayani. Second Edition. Revised and enlarged. **Re. 1. To** Subscribers of the "Indian Review." As. 12.

Lift-Irrigation. By A. Chatterton. Second **Edition.** Rs. 2. To Subscribers of "I.R." Re. 1-8.

The Improvement of Indian Agriculture.—Some **Lessons** from America. By Cathelyne Singh. Second **Edition.** Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of "I. R." As. 12.

---

184 INDIAN TALES

OF

FUN, FOLLY AND FOLK-LORE

A COLLECTION OF THE

TALES OF TENNALI RAMAN
TALES OF MARIADA RAMAN
TALES OF RAJA BIRBAL
KOMATI WIT AND WISDOM
THE SON-IN-LAW ABROAD
NEW INDIAN TALES
TALES OF RAYA AND APPAJI
FOLKLORE OF THE TELUGUS

This collection is an attempt to preserve in a handy and permanent form many of the stories and anecdotes published from time to time in separate booklets. Brought under one cover, they offer a pleasant reading to the old and young.

☞ **Eight booklets in one volume.** ☜

Price Re. 1-4 as. To Subscribers of *I. R* Re. 1.

G.A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

BIOGRAPHIES OF

EMINENT INDIANS.

A Series of uniform Booklets each with a Portrait and a succinct biographical sketch with copious extracts from the Speeches and Writings of the personages described.

Dadabhai Naoroji	Raja Ram Mohan Roy
Sir P. M. Mehta	Devendranath Tagore
G. K. Gokhale	Dinshaw Edulji Wacha
Lala Lajpat Rai	Mahadev Govind Ranade
Ravi Varma	Sir Rash Behari Ghose
K. T. Telang	Sir Surendranath Banerjea
Ananda Mohan Bose	Sir T Muthusami Iyer
W. C. Bonnerjee	H H the Aga Khan
Lal Mohun Ghose	Sir S Subramania Iyer
Sir J. C. Bose	Bal Gangadhar Tilak
Dr. P. C. Ray	Madan Mohan Malaviya
Lord Sinha	Babu Kristo Das Pal
Prof. D K. Karve	V. Krishnaswami Aiyar
Budruddin Tyabji	Rahimtulla Mohamed Sayani
Sir Syed Ahmed	Iswara Chandra Vidyasagar
Sir Syed Amir Ali	Behramji M. Malabari
M. K Gandhi	Sir C. Sankaran Nair
R. N Mudholkar	H H the Gaekwar of Baroda
J. N Tata	Sir N. G. Chandavarkar
Sasipada Banerji	Pratapchandra Mazumdar
V. K Chiplankar	Sir V. Bhashyam Iyengar.
Keshavchandra Sen	Dr. Asutosh Mukherjee.
Syed Hassan Imam	C. R. Das.
	Arbindo Ghose.

Foolscap 8 vo. Price **Annas Four** each.

INDIAN POETS

Each of these sketches begins with a brief and succinct account of the life and career of the poet described, followed by a scholarly criticism of his or her works.

Ghalib	Toru Dutt
Romesh Chander Dutt.	Michael Madhusudan Dutt.
Rabindranath Tagore	Mrs Sarojini Naidu.
	Bankim Chandra Chatterjee.

Price 4 As each.

☞ **Books are given at concession rates only to the subscribers of Indian Review. The Annual subscription to the Review is Rs 5 (Indian) Rs. 7-8 (Foreign). Send an M.O. for Rs. 5 or cheque for Rs. 5-4, and enrol yourself as an annual subscriber.**

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

Indian Statesmen.

This is a new series of uniform booklets containing sketches of the lives and careers of eminent Indian Statesmen, notably those who have been Dewans and Prime Ministers of well-known Indian States.

V. P. Madhava Rao	Sir M. Visveswarayya
Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk	A. Seshiah Sastri
Sir Salar Jung	Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao
Dewan C Rangacharlu	Sir Dinkar Rao
R. Ragunatha Rau, C.S.I.	R. C. Dutt
Sir Seshadri Aiyar	

Price Annas Four each.

"Saints of India" Series

These lives are all based on the original accounts and biographies in the several Indian languages. Each book also contains a special account of the peculiar religious doctrines which each saint taught. Each volume has a fine frontispiece.

Dayaneshwar	Nammalwar	Vallabhacharya
Namdev	Appar	Nanak
Ekanath	Nanda	Guru Covind
Ramdas	Kabir	Dayananda
Tukaram	Chaitanya	Ramakrishna
Tulsidas	Vivekananda	Ram Tirath

Price Four Annas each.

"Friends of India" Series

These biographies are so written as to form a gallery of portraits of permanent interest to the student as well as to the politician. Copious extracts from the speeches and writings of the "Friends of India" on Indian affairs are given in the sketches. Each volume has a fine frontispiece.

Lord Morley	Bradlaugh	Lord Macaulay
Lord Ripon	Rev. Dr. Miller	Edmund Burke
Wedderburn	Henry Fawcett	Lord Hardinge
Annie Besant	A. O Hume	John Bright
Lord Minto	Sir Henry Cotton	

Foolscap 8vo. Price Annas Four each.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

BOOKS ON INDIA.

Prince Edward's Speeches in India. A collection of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales' Speeches in India with a biographical sketch, an account of his tour and numerous portraits and illustrations. Price Re. One. To Subscribers of the "I. R." 12 as.

King George's Speeches on Indian Affairs. Full text of all the speeches delivered by His Majesty both as Prince of Wales and during the Coronation Durbar Tour. Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of "I.R." As. 12.

Delhi. The Capital of India, Revised, and enlarged edition of "All About Delhi." With 54 illustrations. Price Rs. 2. To Subscribers of *I.R.*, Re. 1-8.

The Indian Problem. By Mr. C. F. Andrews. A handy collection of Essays and discourses on "Indian Independence" "Non-Co-operation," "Swadeshi," "National Education," etc. Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of the 'I. R." As, 12.

Bureaucratic Government. A Study in Indian Polity. By Mr. Bernard Houghton, I.C.S. (Retd.) Price Re. 1-8. To Subscribers of the "I.R." Re. 1-4.

Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule by Mr. M. K. Gandhi. Price As. 8. To Subs. of the "I.R." As. 6.

An Indian Patriot in South Africa, M. K. Gandhi: A Study. By the Rev. Joseph Doke with an introduction by Lord Ampthill. Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "I.R." As. 12.

Eminent Orientalists. Indian, English, German, French and American. Cloth bound Rs. 2. To Subscribers of the "I. R." Re. 1-8 as.

MONTAGU'S INDIAN SPEECHES

CONTENTS.—The Indian Budget 1910, 1911, 1912 & 1913. Irrigation and Railways; Indian High Courts Bill; The Government of India Bill; Liberalism and India; Indian Land Policy; First visit to India; The Mesopotamian Commission and Indian administration; Speech at Cambridge.

Appendix:—The Council of India Bill; The late Mr. Gokhale; The goal of British policy. *Index.*

Price Re. 1-8. To Subs. of "Indian Review." Re. 1-4.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.